

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 6 May 1997

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

FROM/EXP. Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner

SUBJECT/OBJET **TRANSMITTAL REPORT ON DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN**

### **DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION**

**That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council adopt the proposed Regional Official Plan with the changes recommended in Annex A of this Report.**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report addresses the 321 submissions received as of 28 April 1997. Staff carefully considered every comment and prepared recommendations leading to changes, or in some cases, no changes to the draft Regional Official Plan (Annex A). Submissions received after April 28th will be dealt within a separate report available for Committee at the public meeting.

### **SUPPORTIVE COMMENTS**

Staff were pleased to receive a number of complimentary comments about the draft Regional Official Plan. Particularly prevalent were comments about the new format, the readable language, and the overall presentation. These came from individuals, agencies, and municipalities alike.

In addition, many indicated strong support for the overall development strategy, including the Federation of Citizens' Associations, the City of Ottawa, the Province, and the By-ward Market BIA to name a few.

Although controversial, the natural environmental policies of the Plan also drew a number of very positive comments, including those from the National Capital Commission and a number of community groups.

The new economic policies are generally well-received, with supportive comments coming from a wide audience, such as the Township of Rideau, City of Kanata, and various business groups.

Finally, many, like the City of Kanata, Citizens for Safe Cycling and individual residents, expressed “congratulations” and “commendations” to the Region for following through on a process led by a community vision and promoting extensive public consultation.

## MAJOR ISSUES

Of all the comments received, five major areas of contention emerged. They can be summarised as follows:

1. Too detailed - Most municipalities and some developers commented that the draft Regional Official Plan is far more detailed and “more prescriptive” than the current Official Plan.

In response, staff propose to modify certain sections of the Plan to make the language less prescriptive. However, the Regional Official Plan needs strong policies to make sure objectives translate into action and to safeguard regional investments.

RMOC authority for planning - Developers and municipalities, in particular, expressed concern that the Region might be overstepping its authority when proposing requirements for development for applications where it is not the approval authority (e.g. - site plans). A related criticism is that the Regional Official Plan does not rely on local Official Plans for implementation.

In response, staff propose changes to more explicitly acknowledge the important contribution of local municipal planning and to amend certain sections of the Plan to include references to local Official Plans. However, the Region’s interest in development stems from Council’s role in approving, commenting, and appealing various types of applications as well as an over-riding interest in good planning.

Not enough recognition of urban greenspace - While applauding the environmental policies in the rural area, many community associations and the City of Ottawa criticised the draft Plan for ignoring the value of greenspace in the urban area. Related to this is a concern that too much employment is planned in the Greenbelt.

In response, staff propose significant revisions to Section 6 of the Plan, Regional Open Space and Cultural Heritage, including new policies on urban open space and a new Schedule I showing an urban open space network. With respect to the Greenbelt, staff propose a new designation called “Greenbelt Institution” to better distinguish the types of uses currently existing in the Greenbelt.

2. Too much Rural Resource - The proposed Rural Resource designation generated the most comments, particularly from rural landowners and municipalities. A common criticism was that the requirements for country lot severance (10 hectare, 300 metre frontage) were excessive. Other concerns challenged the need for this designation, suggesting that RMOC rely instead on rural residents acting as stewards of natural environment areas. Many individual landowners questioned the appropriateness of the designation for their particular property.

In response, staff propose to:

- delete the Rural Resource designation on Schedule A;
  - redesignate Rural Resource lands as General Rural on Schedule A;
  - establish a new Schedule K called “Natural Environment Systems (Rural)” with related policies which require an EIS for significant development proposals (e.g. - subdivisions).
3. Too much mineral resource - Property owners, neighbouring landowners, and some municipalities commented on the amount of land designated for mineral resource purposes (particularly Limestone Resource Area. Many noted the significant increase in the amount designated compared to the current Regional Official Plan, suggesting that the Plan limit the total to a 25-year supply - the horizon of the Plan.

In response, staff propose changes to Schedule A to reduce the amount of land designated for mineral resource purpose, following closer scrutiny of lands designated. In particular, sites were reviewed for their proximity to existing residences or other potential conflicts (e.g. - impact on the Jock River). However, it should be noted that compliance with the Provincial Policy Statement means that official plans designate as much as is realistically possible, not an amount based on 25 years’ supply.

## PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of this report is to request Committee recommendation for Council adoption of the Regional Official Plan, circulated as a draft document in February 1997. A by-law will be passed subsequently by Council to formally adopt the new Official Plan. This report has the further purpose of summarising the written comments received as of 28 April 1997 and providing Council with staff’s recommendations for each of the changes requested by individuals, agencies, and municipalities (contained in Annex A).

Included as a separate report in today’s Agenda for Planning and Environment Committee is a report summarising comments received on the Water Master Plan and the Wastewater Master Plan, along with recommendations for approval of both documents.

Also included is a separate report on the applications to amend the 1988 Regional Official Plan to allow urban expansions in the west. They are being dealt with as part of the public meeting on the new draft Official Plan since approval of the amendments would mean a change to the new Regional Official Plan. They are also being considered in the context of the Regional Development Strategy contained in the draft Official Plan.

A separate report has been prepared for Transportation Committee and Council approval of the Transportation Master Plan.

## FORMAT OF THE REPORT

This report consists of the following components:

- Annex A - Summary of Comments and Recommendations with revised Schedules A - K (Schedule H is included but has no changes)
- Annex B - Index of Submissions Received, chronologically and alphabetically
- Annex C - Official Plan Monitoring Program
- Annex D - Summary of Changes to Schedules A-F

Annex A of this report provides a summary of all written comments received on the draft Official Plan as of 28 April 1997. The report outlines overall comments on the Plan, as well as general and specific comments for each Section, along with staff's response and recommendations for any changes to the Official Plan, including changes to the Schedules. Every comment is attributed to the relevant source, indicated by a number corresponding to the original submission. (See Annex B for the Index). Broad comments on the Plan are summarised immediately prior to the discussion of Section 1.

In a few instances, staff were able to provide clarification or answer questions raised in various briefs through telephone contact or personal meetings. These comments are not specifically addressed in the report where a satisfactory resolution of the issue was reached and no change is needed to the draft Plan.

Annex B of this report is an index of submissions received. Separate volumes containing copies of all submissions received are available in the Corporate Resource Centre in the Regional Clerk's Office.

Annex C provides an outline of the main components of the Official Plan monitoring program. The purpose of this program is to measure the effectiveness of policies in the new Official Plan and to ensure that the objectives of the Plan are being achieved. The Regional Official Plan to be adopted by Council will indicate the elements to be monitored in two ways. A section will be added immediately preceding the glossary to describe the monitoring program, similar to that found in Annex C. In addition, objectives and policies to be monitored will be identified throughout the text by placing icons in the margins.

Many of the detailed monitoring items are related. For example there are numerous references in the Plan to the population of specific geographic areas. All of these can be monitored by collecting population information and aggregating the data accordingly. A population icon will be placed in the margin, referring the reader to the monitoring section, to indicate policies and items for which population will be monitored.

Annex D is a summary of changes to Schedules A - F of the draft Regional Official Plan. All changes are described in more detail throughout the text of this report.

## CONSULTATION

As of the deadline for comments, 321 submissions had been received in writing, by Fax, e-mail or internet, in person or by telephone. Additional submissions have been received, although submitted too late for this report and will be included in an addendum that will be forwarded to Planning and Environment Committee and Transportation Committee.

Since the release of the draft Regional Official Plan and Master Plans, staff have held a number of meetings with members of the public, municipal staff, consultants and developers, including a number of site visits throughout the region. Formal meetings with local Councils were organised jointly with public information sessions in each municipality. The following list shows the date and place of these sessions, along with the attendance (number of attendees in parentheses.) at the open houses.

February 11	Goulbourn Township Hall (90)
February 17	Kanata City Hall (46)
February 18	Nepean Civic Square (22)
February 26	Rideau Township Hall (71)
March 4	West Carleton Township (26)
March 10	Village of Rockcliffe Park (2)
March 10	Cumberland Town Hall (29)
March 11	Osgoode Township Hall (43)
March 18	Gloucester City Hall (20)
March 24	Vanier City Hall (Councillors only)
March 25	City of Ottawa City Hall (5)
April 7	Ottawa-Carleton Centre (20)

In addition to the public information sessions, staff attended various special meetings and information sessions upon request. These events were as follows:

#### Councillors Ward Meetings

April 15	Councillor Cullen
April 3	Councillor Stewart
May 8	Councillor Legendre

#### Community Sessions

March 27	Greenspace Forum
April 14	Citizens For Safe Cycling Forum
April 26	FCA Forum on the Official Plan
May 12	West Carleton Open House

#### Sounding Boards

Business Sounding Board  
 Rural Sounding Board  
 Agricultural Advisory Committee  
 Housing Advisory Committee  
 NESS Open House  
 CATPAC

### Community Associations

April 2 Beaverbrook Community Association  
April 7 Katimavik-Hazeldean Community Association  
April 10 Bridlewood Community Association  
April 3 Riverside Community Association

Public consultation has been carried out in accordance with the *Planning Act* and Provincial Environmental Assessment requirements. Schedule B projects occurring in the first ten years of the 2021 planning horizon will be filed publicly after the Master Plans have been approved by Regional Council.

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The draft Regional Official Plan and the Master Plans were prepared based on a Council-approved framework which highlighted the need for a comprehensive and affordable strategy to manage change. Achievement of the regional development strategy as outlined in Section 2 of the draft Plan is expected to cost approximately \$1.6 billion in regional infrastructure, compared to \$3.6 billion for the current Regional Official Plan. The expected \$2 billion savings represents a significant change, based on the sensible, affordable planning strategy agreed to by Council as part of the Regional Development Strategy.

### CONCLUSION

The draft Official Plan was circulated to elicit comments and suggestions from the public, local municipalities and agencies. Staff have seriously considered suggestions and in many cases are recommending changes to the draft plan. We would like to thank all those who took the time to read the draft and provide us with input. We believe the revised draft will reflect the community's input and is a better document as a result.

*Approved by*  
*N. Tunnacliffe, MCIP, RPP*

## **Overall Comments on the Draft Regional Official Plan**

**1. Too Detailed** - Most municipalities and some developers have commented that the draft Regional Plan is far more detailed than the current Plan (“too prescriptive”, “unnecessary level of detail”) particularly in matters which fall within the jurisdiction of the local municipality. A specific concern has been raised with regard to the frequent references to zoning by-laws as a direct implementation tool for the Regional Official Plan.(109, 87, 88, 145, 212, 227, 244, 279)

**Response** - The draft Regional Plan in fact provides more detail in many policy areas than the current Plan, relying on strong statements to make sure policies translate into actions. We believe the execution of good planning principles is well within RMOC’s authority. Policies in the draft Plan are needed to achieve important objectives linked to:

- regional investments (e.g. - transit, water, regional roads);
- implementing the Regional Development Strategy; and
- other regional interests (e.g. - implementing the Community Vision).

Details included within the draft Plan are provided to enhance the clarity, and meaning of what might otherwise read as vague policies. Official Plans provide guidance and policy and therefore are prescriptive.

Requiring zoning by-laws to be passed to implement specific aspects of the Regional Official Plan makes good sense. Zoning is a very important tool to achieve regional objectives.

However, we agree that in some instances, wording of the policies could be improved and more flexibility introduced. For example, it is not our intent through our retail or community policies to create developments identical in form and urban design everywhere in Ottawa-Carleton.

**Recommendation** - **Changes to specific sections are recommended and noted throughout the report. However, we believe that clear language is appropriate and desirable for certain policy areas to express Council’s intent.**

**2. Local Official Plans** - Most municipalities have commented that the draft Plan has no reference to local Official Plans and this is inappropriate. (163, 87, 88, 109, 227, 244, 256, 279)

**Response** - In fact, Section 1.6 outlines the role of local Official Plans. However, the policies included throughout the draft Plan do not specifically refer to local Plans. We have drafted the Regional Official Plan so that it can be implemented without depending on local Plans. This is not the same as saying we have one Official Plan that is wholly self-contained. Rather, we have a draft Plan that can be used as the basis for one-tier planning. More work would be needed to address community and neighbourhood issues now contained in local planning documents, particularly in the urban areas, should that be the direction in which area municipalities choose to go.

Nevertheless, we agree that the important contribution of local planning should be recognised. We propose to re-introduce references to local Official Plans in policy areas where planning

impacts are more closely tied to local, rather than regional issues. These will be noted throughout the transmittal report in the appropriate section.

**Recommendation - Change Section 1.6 to acknowledge more explicitly the contribution of local municipal planning (see comment on policy 15 of Section 1.6); and as noted throughout this Report, change Sections of the Draft Regional Official Plan, where appropriate, to include references to local Official Plans.**

**3. Authority for Development Approvals -** Related somewhat to the above two issues is a concern about Regional Official Plan policies related to the review/approval of development applications. Many parts of the Plan include policies which begin with: “When considering development applications, Council shall ensure...”. Several municipalities have pointed out that the Region only has approval authority for certain types of applications (e.g. - subdivisions, local Official Plans) while local municipalities have responsibility for others (e.g. - zoning, site plans). Generally, they would prefer the Regional Official Plan explicitly refer only to those types of applications for which the Region is the approval authority. (109, 145,279)

**Response -** These types of policies are intended to do three things:

- Guide Regional Council when making decisions on matters for which they are the approval authority;
- Guide Regional Council when providing comments on applications or making decisions on whether to appeal applications, circulated to them from local municipalities or other agencies; and
- Influence municipalities and other agencies when making decisions on applications for which they are the approval authority.

Moreover, RMOC has a statutory obligation to advise the Ontario Municipal Board on by-laws and a “prudent” need to review severances for conformity with the Regional Official Plan. Most recently, the Province has transferred their development review authority to the Region for ensuring provincial interests are considered in the context of the Provincial Policy Statement.

**Recommendation - Add the following to the last paragraph in Section 1.5, Interpretation: “Many policies in this Plan provide direction for the review, consideration, and approval of development applications. These policies are intended to: guide Council when making decisions on matters for which they are the approval authority; guide Council when commenting on applications or considering appeals on applications circulated to them from local municipalities or other agencies; and to influence municipalities and other agencies when making decisions on applications for which they are the approval authority.”**

**4. Studies -** Some of the development corporations in RMOC have asked for clarification on the status of their applications with particular regard to the requirement for certain studies (e.g. - master drainage plans, traffic studies). In all cases, they believe they have completed enough studies to satisfy the new Regional Plan. (79, 112, 274)

**Response -** In general, applications which have received draft approval will not be subject to further studies, although changes to the draft approval conditions may be made if appropriate.



For other lands, additional studies may be required to comply with the new Regional Official Plan once adopted by Council. Decisions on which studies are needed will be made on a case-by case basis in consultation with the applicants.

**Recommendation - No change is needed to the draft Plan. However, staff will meet with each company and clarify the adequacy of reports already submitted in light of the new policies.**

**5. Effects of Restructuring -** Concern was expressed about the effects of municipal restructuring on planning in our region; particularly in cases where local Official Plans include more restrictive policies than the Regional Official Plan. A recommendation was put forward that the Regional Official Plan commit to a principle of incorporating the “legacy, stewardship, and planning investment made by local municipalities” in the event of a single-tier (regional) government. (161)

**Response -** Since the governance issue has not been resolved, staff assume that the two-tier municipal system will continue. Changes in governance will occur through legislation and this concern can be appropriately dealt with at that time.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**6. Integrated Decision Making -** Section 1 of the Regional Official Plan talks about integrated decision making. Why can't the Planning and Environment Committee and Transportation Committee review the Regional Official Plan together? (310) Specific wording is needed to promote integrated decision making on all levels, recognising that environment cannot be separated from transportation or development, for example. (319).

**Response -** Staff agree a joint meeting would be preferable and would have helped drive home the integrated process. However, the only way to meet the timeline for Council in July (when the integrated decision making will happen) was to schedule separate meetings. Staff believe the draft Regional Official Plan embodies the principle of integrated decision-making, with explicit references (Section 1.2) and through a commitment to healthy communities (especially evident in Sections 1 and 3). Furthermore, staff have received many compliments on the process followed to achieve the Regional Official Plan, the Transportation Master Plan and the Water and Wastewater Master Plans as a model of integrated decision making.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**7. Ecological Development Strategy-** FCA and Greenprint jointly endorsed a community statement requesting that the Regional Official Plan and Master Plans be consistent with an ecological development strategy for Ottawa-Carleton. This involves planning and designing within and with nature, as distinct from conceiving nature as component elements and spaces around developed areas. (266,319).

**Response** - Staff believe that this has been achieved through the documents themselves but also through the process followed to complete them. One of the important differences between the current Regional Official Plan and the draft Plan is the way in which the natural environment is treated. Proposed Section 5, along with Section 6 as revised, go a long way towards identifying natural systems and linkages, rather than simply relying on discrete pockets of natural areas. Section 3 pulls together the various elements that make up a healthy community: transportation, open space, housing, etc. Staff agree more challenges lie ahead in trying to follow through on this approach when implementing the Regional Official Plan.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**8. Organisation of the Plan** - The FCA/Greenspace Community Statement and the City of Kanata commented that the organisation of the Plan should be reviewed. Specifically, Kanata would like to see all of the policies relating to a specific designation lodged in only one section of the Plan. The example given was “Town Centres”, with references in Sections 4.3.3, 4.3.1, 3.2 etc. The Community Statement calls for a “seamless” mix of social, environmental, and economic issues, preferring more integration in the Plan to the current framework of “isolated sections.” (212, 319).

**Response** - Staff agree that some improvements can be made. First of all, the final version of the Regional Official Plan will contain an index so that readers can easily navigate their way through the Plan. The index will direct readers to all references to Town Centres, for example. In addition, as part of implementation, we will endeavour to compile something akin to a “developer’s guide to the Plan.” With regard to greater integration of the elements of the Plan, staff struggled with various ways to address this right from the beginning. It is difficult to construct a Plan that is “seamless” without creating a lot of repetition. Some improvements are noted throughout this report to ensure consistent messages come through, especially with regard to natural environment policies (see revised Section 6).

**Recommendation - Include an index in the adopted version of the Regional Official Plan.**

**9. Independent Assessment of the draft Regional Official Plan** - The FCA and Greenprint’s community statement calls for an independent review of the draft Regional Official Plan for two purposes: 1) to consider whether the Plan conforms to original Terms of Reference produced by Dr. Middleton; and 2) to address whether the Plan does indeed reflect the Community Vision. (319)

**Response** - The Terms of Reference prepared by Dr. Middleton were undertaken in 1992 for the Environmental Review of the Plan. Much of his work led to the formulation of the staff-prepared document “*Principles to Practice*”, which became a cornerstone for the Official Plan Review. With the decision to undertake a comprehensive review of the Regional Official Plan, Council approved a new Framework for the Official Plan Review on 27 September 1995. Staff do not believe it is necessary for Dr. Middleton to review the Plan, although we would be interested in his opinion. Checking the Regional Official Plan against the Community Vision would be a good idea as a monitoring exercise and could be undertaken once the Plan is approved. Staff do not believe either assessment is necessary before the Regional Official Plan is approved. Furthermore,

there is not enough time to conduct these assessments and still meet Council's approved timeline for the new Regional Official Plan.

**Recommendation - Include a reference to monitoring the Official Plan for consistency with the Community Vision in the new monitoring section of the draft Regional Official Plan. (See recommendation 12).**

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

**10. Goals of the Plan -** Where do these goals come from and did the public have any input to them? (310)

**Response -** The goals draw heavily from the Community Vision. They also reflect the Shared Principles described in Section 1.3 of the Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement.

**Recommendation - No change.**

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

**11. Section 1.3 -** The reference to the community vision does not reflect the W. Carleton Community Vision. The "Shared Principles" on page 4 do not even refer to the rural area. (163) Another comment suggests that several vision statements are in conflict with each other; for instance, how is it possible to build a sound economic base when most of the land has been sterilised? (219) Another suggests that residential use should be promoted to get more people living in the Central Area as well as working there. (310)

**Response -** Section 1.3 repeats the words of the approved Community Vision, as approved by Regional Council. It reflects the shared vision of several thousand residents who participated in its creation in 1994-95. The Vision, as well as the Regional Official Plan articulates a balanced set of goals and ideals. In any case, most of the land in RMOC is not sterilised, but rather may be subject to policies governing the way in which development may proceed.

The "Shared Principles" were collectively approved by the four partners identified. They include a number of broad statements equally relevant to the rural and urban areas.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**12. Section 1.4 -** The goals use terms like "balanced", "high quality", "support" - all are "value" words, but they are for public consumption only, not to set practical direction. Accountability for these comes with implementation. (41)

**Response -** Many of the goals come from the Community Vision and are therefore a deliberate expression of community values. We agree that the words will mean something only if we can carry out the policies of the Plan consistent with the values and goals. We propose to monitor objectives and policies of the Plan to measure how well we are following through.

**Recommendation - Include monitoring mechanisms in the Official Plan as described in Annex C.**

**13. Section 1.4, goal 3** - Establishes job creation and business development as a primary objective. This one goal should not be achieved above all others, but rather a balance should be sought. (109, 310)

**Response** - Staff agree clarification is needed. The intent was not to make it more important; however this wording comes from one of the council-approved RDS principles.

**Recommendation - Change Section 1.4, goal 3 by rewording the goal to: “Recognise the importance of job creation and associated business development to Ottawa-Carleton’s Official Plan.”**

**14. Section 1.4, goal 5** - A statement on affordable housing should be added here. (310)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Section 1.4, goal 5 by adding: “and affordably” between the words “adequately” and “housed.”**

**15. Section 1.4** - Goal 14 strives for a balanced transportation system. The review of proposed expenditures, as shown on page 65 of the Transportation Master Plan suggest the opposite for the first ten years. (108)

**Response** - The expenditures balance out over the lifetime of the Plan.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**16. Section 1.4** - An additional goal is suggested: “To recognise and respect the rights of landowners fairly and equitably.” (90)

**Response** - The only goals which talks about a specific landowner are the ones relating to publicly owned land (goals 4, 7) and the intent is to preserve the Greenbelt and public open space for the public good. The Regional Plan strives to balance the public and private interests and it would not be appropriate to highlight the rights of individual landowners.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**17. Section 1.4** - An additional goal is suggested to ensure consultation and reference to the Outaouais Official Plan, especially to ensure co-ordination on transportation matters.

**Response:** The shared principles in Section 1.3 were developed jointly with all municipalities in the NCR, along with the National Capital Commission.

**Recommendation: No change**

**18. Section 1.5, Village boundaries** - These should not be firmly set on Schedule A, but rather shown as a symbol, much like the current Regional Official Plan. (163)

**Response** - Changes are proposed in order to allow for minor amendments to Villages without the need for a Regional Official Plan amendment. This is described in more detail in the comments under Section 3.7.

**Recommendation - Change Section 1.5 by deleting the words “and Villages” in the second sentence of paragraph 4.” And change Section 1.5 in accordance with recommendation number 19.**

**19. Section 1.5, Monitoring** - Monitoring of objectives and targets should be lodged in one place in the Regional Official Plan, not in each Section. Monitoring should reflect the critical inter-relationships between land use and transportation. Specifically, FCA suggests the following be monitored: water quality, water consumption, air pollution, energy consumption, waste reduction, modal share on a community basis, parking supply, open space gained and lost (310). A State of the Environment Report should also be prepared. Measurable targets to assess human activity on the ecological footprint of the Region and its commutershed are needed (319).

**Response** - The Regional Official Plan will include a Monitoring section at the back of the Plan, in front of the Glossary. Icons or symbols will be used in the margins of the Plan to indicate objectives and policies to be monitored. Formatting will be done for the final version of the Plan.

**Recommendation - Include monitoring mechanisms in the Regional Official Plan as described in Annex C of this report, and change Section 1.5, paragraph 3 by replacing “within each section” with “in the monitoring program, annexed to this plan”.**

**20. Section 1.6, policy 1** - The phrase “If certain area municipalities choose not to have a local Official Plan, the Regional Official Plan should include sufficient detail to serve as the local Official Plan” should be deleted. Instead, local Official Plans should be encouraged. (109, 256) Another comment questioned what would happen if a local municipality chooses not to amend its Plan to bring it into conformity with the Regional Official Plan. (108, 109).

**Response** - Regional staff believe the wording in the draft Plan is appropriate in a document that plans for 25 years and is likely to remain in effect for up to 10 years. This statement simply states the obvious. With respect to the issue of conformity, The *Planning Act*, (Section 2(2) gives RMOC the authority to amend local Official Plans directly and furthermore, to amend zoning by-laws where the local municipality has failed to bring them into conformity within one year of the approval of the Regional Official Plan. This is also reflected in the current Regional Official Plan.

**Recommendation - Change policy 1 of Section 1.6 by adding a sentence to ensure that where local Official Plans exist, they must be brought into conformity with the Regional Official Plan within one year of the date of approval of the Regional Official Plan.**

**21. Section 1.6, policy 2 -** The policy “land may be acquired in order to implement any feature of this Plan” has no basis in law and its meaning is unclear. Also, please provide examples of lands to acquire (e.g. - woodlots, transitway corridors?) (108, 145).

**Response -** This policy is in fact quite “legal” and relates to Subsection 25(1) of *The Planning Act*: “25(1) If there is an official plan in effect in a municipality that includes provisions relating to the acquisition of land,.. the council may, in accordance with such provisions, acquire and hold land within the municipality for the purpose of developing any feature of the official plan..” The examples suggested by the commenter are appropriate ones.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**22. Section 1.6, policies 3 and 4 -** The comparable statements in the current Regional Official Plan are easier to understand. (212)

**Response -** The policies in the draft Regional Official Plan are a refinement of policy 6 of Section 1.7.2 in the current Official Plan and are preferred.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**23. Section 1.6, policy 4 -** A suggestion has been made to distinguish wireless telecommunication facilities from other public utilities; specifically, to allow them in Agricultural Resource areas. ( 160)

**Response -** There appears to be no real justification for making this exception.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**24. Section 1.6, policy 4 -** The conditions relating to the location of municipal services and facilities should not be in the Regional Official Plan. They are at a level of detail suited to a local Official Plan.(109) Environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs) should be specifically included in the list of areas to which restrictions apply. (202)

**Response -** Generally, policy 4 simply sets out good planning principles. Specific requirements for parking, loading etc. are not prescribed, but rather are left to the local municipality. With regard to ESAs, the designations listed in this policy take account of this concern.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**25. Section 1.6, policy 5** - Delete the phrase “as far as is practicable.” (310)

**Response** - In the context of regulating undertakings by senior level governments, this qualifier makes sense.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**26. Section 1.6, policy 7** - The intent of this section seems to be that existing uses which are legal will not be made legal non-conforming. Does this mean that as municipalities prepare new by-laws, their by-laws may not comply with the Regional Official Plan? (279) Kanata prefers the wording in the current Regional Official Plan. (212)

**Response** - The draft policy is worded to recognise existing legal non-conforming uses but not to allow illegal non-conforming uses.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**27. Section 1.6, policy 8** - What constitutes an “acceptable level of service”? Under what criteria would RMOC evaluate development applications with respect to imposing a greater burden on regional infrastructure? Are RDCs being considered to fund required improvements in areas with intensification targets? (108, 109, 145) FCA also suggested deleting the words “unless improved facilities are provided” because they want no licence to develop for developers willing to pay upfront.(310)

**Response** - The Master Plans define service standards for water, wastewater, and transportation services. Evaluating applications against adequate service provision is a fundamental and necessary part of the planning review process and simply reflects current practice. Service capacity levels are generally described in the draft Regional Official Plan and more specifically in the Master Plans. Including the phrase “unless improved facilities are provided” allows for flexibility but is not intended to circumvent the phasing strategy of the RDS.

With respect to RDCs, a separate exercise is being conducted by a corporate team of regional staff. Recommendations will be issued separately for a proposed new Regional Development Charges By-law.

**Recommendation** - Change Policy 8 by adding: “ as generally described in the respective Master Plans” after the words: “acceptable levels of service.”

**28. Section 1.6, policy 9** - The phrase “among other things” should be deleted because the Ontario Municipal Board agreed that the phrase is too open-ended (in commenting on Ottawa’s Official Plan). Secondly, shouldn’t there be criteria to ensure existing areas are protected from the negative effects of intensification? (108,109). The FCA also suggests using the term “shall use the following criteria” instead of “have regard to”.(310)

**Response** - Firstly, in this case the use of the term “among other things” is deliberate, since various policies in the rest of the Official Plan will apply depending on the nature of the proposal. It would be impossible and counter-productive to list them all up front. Secondly, the principle suggested by such a criterion is included in a more positive light in Section 2.5 (policy 6) of the Draft Regional Official Plan.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**29. Section 1.6, policy 10** - This policy is unclear. Is the intent to incorporate other lands into site-specific Official Plan Amendments which were not part of the original application? Does “this” Plan refer to the Regional Official Plan or could it also apply to local Official Plans? (109)

**Response** - This simply proposes additional evaluation criteria when dealing with specific sites, rather than a general or strategic policy change; for example, when evaluating an application for a major community facility such as a sports stadium. “This” Plan always means the Regional Official Plan.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**30. Section 1.6, policy 11** - A new clause should be added to ensure that consideration of the need to review the Regional Official Plan includes the recognition of societal and market trends. (244)

**Response** - The two clauses included here are broad enough to capture the intent of this comment.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**31. Section 1.6, policy 12** - The term “corrective action” should be revised to reflect the intent to review the policies in light of their ineffectiveness. (279) The rest of the Regional Official Plan does not follow through on this policy on monitoring. (310) Concern was expressed about the adaptability of the Transportation Master Plan in the event of unforeseen trends (301)

**Response** - Agree to change the policy to clarify the intent. As noted above, the Regional Official Plan will include a new section on monitoring, which will assist in tracking transportation trends also.

**Recommendation** - Change policy 12 of Section 1.6 by adding the phrase: “or a policy review” after “corrective action”; and see Annex C of this Report.

**32. Section 1.6, policy 13** - This Section should be revised to reflect the streamlined approvals process. An alternative approach suggested would be to add a new policy to read: “When implementing the Plan, the RMOC will strive to achieve the most efficient delivery of planning activities and decisions, in terms of timing, cost, and client service.” (145, 279)



**Response** - This is consistent with the Region’s philosophy and is underscored by the recent Business Process Re-Engineering Study completed in the Planning and Development Approvals Department. We generally support the change with the understanding that “client” is interpreted in its broadest sense, and with the addition of the word “effective” in order to reflect complex situations incorporating a number of variables and a number of key players.

**Recommendation** - **Add a new policy 16 to Section 1.6 to read: “When implementing the Plan, Council will strive to achieve the most efficient and effective delivery of planning activities and decisions, in terms of timing, cost, and client service.”**

**33. Section 1.6, policy 14** - Is there a mediation process available now? (310)

**Response:** Yes, there is.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**34. Section 1.6, policy 15** - What innovative ways of consultation are you contemplating? (108)

**Response** - This is a broad statement to allow the Region to pursue consultation activities which go beyond the minimum requirements of the *Planning Act*. It also suggests the Region is interested in exploring new ways of doing things which should improve the whole development approvals process from the community as well as the developer point of view. The intent is to be broad enough to allow the region to seek consultation on a wide range of planning activities which may occur outside of the formal “Amendment” process. In light of concerns raised by local municipal Councils, this policy should also be expanded to recognise the important contributions of local municipal planning and will seek municipal partnerships for planning studies, particularly those affecting community and neighbourhood-scale activities.

**Recommendation** - **Replace policy 15 with: “Council shall seek opportunities to consult with local municipalities and other representatives of the community on a wide range of planning activities described in this Plan. In particular, Council shall seek partners to undertake planning studies, particularly for those affecting community and neighbourhood-scale activities. In carrying out this Plan, Council shall seek innovative ways to involve its public, community and private partners.”**

### **Errors, Omissions, and Clarifications in Section 1**

**35. Recommendation** - **Make the following corrections to Section 1:**

**Section 1.1** - Bytown became the nation’s capital in 1854, not 1857. Change the date to 1854 on page 2..

**Comment on Interpretation** - References throughout the Regional Official Plan are made to “uses existing” or “lots created prior to 1996. Change references throughout the Plan to change “prior to 1996” to “prior to the date of adoption of this Plan.”

### **General Comments on Section 2: Regional Development Strategy**

**36. Expansion of Urban Area (West)** - A number of requests have been submitted requesting that additional areas be included within the Urban Area. Most are in the west end and would result in either an expansion to Stittsville, or expansions between Kanata and West Carleton. (66,67, 156, 263,278 and also see: May 5, 1997 PEC Report on Public Meeting to consider draft Regional Official Amendments). As an alternative, two of these requests suggest redesignation to “Future Development”.

A related request asks the Region to participate in a study in the vicinity of the Corel Centre to determine appropriate neighbouring uses. The expressed intent is to designate this for urban purposes. (163, 87, 212).

**Response** - In preparing the Regional Development Strategy, staff followed a comprehensive process to identify the need for urban land to the year 2021. Many reports are available documenting the analysis based on land use, transportation, water, and wastewater requirements. Staff concluded, and Council agreed on 13 November 1996 that the size of the currently-designated (i.e.- 1988 Regional Official Plan) urban area should not be increased. Redesignation to “Future Development” is not appropriate. This designation expressly refers to the South Urban Centre. The legend on Schedule B will be corrected.

With respect to the proposed study around the Corel Centre, staff do not believe there is an immediate need to undertake such a study. The need for urban land for residential and employment purposes was assessed through the Regional Development Strategy work, as noted above.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**37. Amount of Development Inside the Greenbelt** - The City of Nepean’s brief is the only one to comment that the draft Regional Official Plan is based on targets for residential intensification that cannot be achieved. They recommend the Plan be revised to include a lower target which reflects the needs and wishes of the community. (88) Somewhat related is a comment received from ARPO objecting to the premise that baby boomers who don’t live in the City now will move downtown into “rabbit warrens.” (219) However, a number of briefs, including FCA and other individual community associations, the Province, etc., support the overall regional development strategy.(310, 321)

**Response** - This issue was explored in depth during the deliberation of the Regional Development Strategy in November 1996. Significant effort was put into researching demographic trends. More detailed work on the supply side was completed subsequently by FoTenn consultants, which supported the range of growth identified in the Regional Development Strategy now incorporated into the draft Regional Official Plan for areas inside the Greenbelt.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**38. Infrastructure Inside the Greenbelt -** There is concern that regional funds earmarked to support growth inside the Greenbelt will be wasted if growth does not occur. A breakdown of projected spending for areas inside the Greenbelt and outside the Greenbelt is requested. (108)

**Response -** Some of the infrastructure spending for projects inside the Greenbelt is required to upgrade or rehabilitate older systems to accommodate existing development. In other words, not all is growth-related. Furthermore, the Draft Regional Official Plan phasing policies are based on a “just-in-time” approach to ensure that “funds are not wasted” on infrastructure which is not needed. Funding details are in the Master Plans and were also addressed more generally in the September 1996 Report to Council on the proposed Regional Development Strategy .

**Recommendation - No change.**

**39. Potential Sites Inside the Greenbelt -** Where is the Schedule showing potential development sites inside the Greenbelt? If sites in the FoTenn report are proposed for development at lesser densities, will RMOC oppose these applications? (79, 108,274) Specific concern was raised with respect to the Zaidan lands in the City of Ottawa (274). The Glabar Park Community Alliance expressed concern about the potential for 400 units in their neighbourhood. (213)

**Response -** Potential residential development sites inside the Greenbelt are inventoried in the February 1997 FoTenn Report. They are not intended to form part of the Regional Official Plan because: they are at a small scale, inconsistent with the Schedules of the Plan; and proposals may be submitted at densities different than those suggested in the Report and a Regional Official Plan amendment would be cumbersome and undesirable. Regional staff will assess the merits of applications on a site-specific basis against the full range of criteria in the Regional Official Plan, particularly those described in Sections 2 and 3.

With respect to Glabar Park, there was no proposal to add any significant number of units in this neighbourhood.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**40. Effect of New City of Ottawa Zoning By-law -** The development industry is concerned that 2020Z will significantly restrict infill potential, and wants to know if the Region will get involved. (274)

**Response -** A study is now underway by builders and architects on the potential impact of 2020Z. Regional staff are also concerned with the possible effects of the proposed by-law and will provide input to the City.

**Recommendation - No change.**

### **Specific Comments on Section 2 - Regional Development Strategy**

**41. Section 2 (introduction) -** The paragraph on “Economy” should recognise that development must take cognizance of other priorities. (202) FCA had a number of suggestions: Under “Economy”, delete “aims to resolve servicing constraints to development”. Under “Caring Communities”, add in “General Urban Areas” to the phrase “beside existing communities”; and add to the end “Where the services do not exist with a minimal level of access - primarily within walking distance-- they will be developed through community plans.” Under “Urban Development”, add “encouraging additional balanced development”; and use the exact words from the Vision “communities in which car ownership is not required.” Rural development” should be required to conform to the same principle of balanced development as urban development. Replace “continued rural residential development” with “rural development focusing on improved village integrity rather than scattered development with dependency on urban services and automobile commuting to urban employment.” (310)

**Response -** The purpose of this set of paragraphs is to explain how this Regional Official Plan implements the Community Vision. As such, it is intended to guide the reader and provide examples by linking to various policies in the Plan in a general way. Staff prefer the original wording as a better reflection of the policy direction contained in the draft Regional Official Plan. When all elements are read together, a balanced set of priorities emerges.

**Recommendation - Change Section 2 introductory paragraph on *Urban Development* by replacing the words “that are less auto-dependent” with the words “in which car ownership is not required.”**

**42. Section 2.1, Table 1 -** The table should be modified to include population and employment projections for each municipality. (321) The FCA suggests the projections are too high and would prefer ranges, not targets. (310)

**Response -** The Regional Development Strategy directs growth primarily through policies in Sections 2.4 (development pattern and servicing) and S.2.6 (Phasing). Policies directed at the municipal level would too detailed and would also fail to encompass the essential urban structure of the region, which is divided into an urban core inside the Greenbelt, newer suburban areas outside the Greenbelt, and a significant rural area. With regard to the projections as targets or ranges, staff suggest the numbers in the Table are appropriate as is. They reflect the numbers used when the various development scenarios were modelled in both the strategic and detailed evaluation phases of the Regional Development Strategy.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**43. Section 2.2 -** a) Add a fourth factor on environment and greenspace considerations. (202)  
b) In the “economic” paragraph, the phrase “when and where required” is too permissive. Instead, replace it with “required to support Council’s economic growth policies.” (310)

**Response -** a) The point of this section is to describe the trends influencing the amount and direction of growth at a broad regional scale. With this in mind, it would be appropriate to add something about the Greenbelt because it is a defining element for Ottawa-Carleton. b) Agree this would be clearer.

**Recommendation -** a) **Change Section 2.2. by adding another paragraph in Section 2.2 immediately before the paragraph on “Aging of the baby boom” as follows: “National Capital Commission Greenbelt: Ottawa-Carleton’s urban area is structured by the federal Greenbelt, which is a defining element for this Region. The Greenbelt’s predominantly rural character creates a separation between the urban area inside the inner limit of the Greenbelt and the distinct communities which have established just beyond the Greenbelt. This Plan assumes the Greenbelt will continue to be maintained by the federal government.”**

**Recommendation -** b) **Change Section 2.2 in the paragraph beginning “The need to encourage economic development”, replace the phrase “when and where required to support economic growth” with the following: “required to support Council’s economic growth policies.”**

**44. Section 2.3 -** The objectives for the Regional Development Strategy should include something relating to urban greenspace. This is especially important since the draft Regional Official Plan favours intensification within the Greenbelt. The City of Ottawa suggests adding: “Minimise the loss of greenspace.” (80,109, 310). Another suggestion is to add: “to provide a framework for the RMOC to work with local governments and communities to strengthen existing neighbourhoods.” (295).

**Response -** The suggestion on “greenspace” is a good one and is in keeping with changes proposed for Section 6 on urban open space. Staff prefer to link this with objective 3 to better reflect the intent. For clarification, the Regional Development Strategy does not promote development on greenspace lands. The suggestion regarding “working with local governments and communities” has been addressed through a recommended change in Section 1.6 (see recommendation 34).

**Recommendation -** **Change Section 2.3 by adding the following phrase to the end of objective 3: “while minimising the loss of greenspace.”**

**45. Section 2.3, Objective 2 -** Add the words “and more balanced” after “compact” to ensure mixed use is part of the objective. (310)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation -** **Change Section 2.3 by adding to objective 2 the following phrase, immediately after the word “compact”: “and more balanced.”**

**46. Section 2.3, Objective 5** - Ottawa wants clarification on how the Region determines areas of “high employment growth potential.” (109) The FCA requests the word “urban” be included before the words outside the Greenbelt. (310)

**Response** - In preparing the draft Regional Official Plan, staff reviewed historic employment growth in the Region, updated the 1991 Employment Survey, and consulted with members of the business community through the Business Sounding Board. All indicators point to the western part of RMO as one of the key areas with high growth potential. This was reflected in the Regional Development Strategy. Certainly, the meaning of this objective relates to “urban” areas.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 2.3 by adding to objective 5 the word “urban” immediately before the phrase “areas outside the Greenbelt.”**

**47. Section 2.3, Objective 6** - Including “transit, walking, and cycling-first” priorities in this order conflicts with the hierarchy set out in the Transportation Master Plan (walking, cycling, transit). (109,310)

**Response** - There is no conflict. Of these three modes of travel, none is valued more the other. As a group, these “green” modes of travel should be given priority over automobile use.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**48. Section 2.3, Objective 8** - a) How does employment demand referred to here relate to employment growth potential included in objective 5? (109) b) The FCA wants the phrase “if affordable” inserted before “services”, citing the policy as too simple. (310)

**Response** - a) The two expressions are related but the objectives are different. Ideally, areas of employment demand should occur in areas where economic potential has been forecast. Demand is more immediate; potential is more long-term. Objective 5 aims to encourage the development in houses in areas with good potential for jobs. Objective 8 aims to support economic development with the timely provision of services. b) A number of policies address the issue of affordability of servicing and including it here is not necessary.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**49. Section 2.3, Objective 9** - It would be useful to know how objective 9 relates to objective 5 with regard to cost-effectiveness of servicing. Are all urban areas equally cost-effective to service? (109) Expand the policy so as not to preclude the desirability of “choice.” (256)

**Response** - Planned growth for the urban areas was based on the Regional Development Strategy, which in turn was developed through a comprehensive assessment of various growth scenarios. Cost-effectiveness was one of about 30 criteria used to evaluate alternatives. Background reports prepared for the Regional Development Strategy indicate variations in the cost of servicing different areas of the Region. While the principle of cost-effectiveness is

important and is emphasised in objective 9, the overall objectives of the Regional Official Plan must be read together, in balance with each other.

The Regional Development Strategy recognises the importance of choice in the market place, through policies such as 2.4.1 and the discussion on page 12, paragraph 2. A wording change would be appropriate.

**Recommendation - Change Section 2.3, objective 9 by adding the following phrase at the end: “while supporting choice in the market.”**

**50. Section 2.4 -** Rideau has asked for policies to recognise the historical commitment to extend services to Manotick.(256).

**Response -** Policy 10 of Section 2.4.1 provides opportunity to extend services to rural areas.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**51. Section 2.4, paragraph 2 -** The phrase “provided the land market functions in theory as it should” is not clear. (109)

**Response -** The Regional Official Plan need not get into an explanation of the theoretical underpinnings of the housing market. The phrase can be deleted.

**Recommendation - Change Section 2.4 paragraph 2 by deleting the phrase “provided the land market functions as in theory it should” from paragraph 2 of Section 2.4.**

**52. Section 2.4.1 -** The FCA requests a specific policy be added on protecting parks and greenspace. (310)

**Response -** Significant changes proposed for Section 6, along with Schedules I and J, address this in a more comprehensive way.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**53. Section 2.4.1, policy 1 -** The FCA suggests this be modified to indicate that the increase in the share of units inside the Greenbelt will “mostly occur after 2001”, rather than “will not increase before 2001.” (310)

**Response -** The policy as written fits better with Table 3. There is nothing to preclude development from occurring at a faster rate inside the Greenbelt before 2001. Consequently, staff suggest a modification to delete the reference to “after 2001” .

**Recommendation - Change Section 2.4.1 by deleting the words “after 2001” in policy 1 and add the words “generally before “set out in Table 3”.**

**54. Section 2.4.1, policy 4** - Suggestions have been made to separate out Leitrim and Gloucester South Urban Centre here and on Table 6. (79, 108, 145, 230,244). Also, the policy to allow for five years' supply of residential land should apply to all four growth areas, not three out of four. (108). Another suggestion is to ensure that no community falls below two years' supply. (279).

**Response** - The purpose of policy 4 is to ensure choice in the housing market is maintained throughout Ottawa-Carleton. The rationale for providing for "three out of four areas" is to allow the Region to implement the phasing policies for infrastructure. This recognises that there may be periods when certain of the urban growth areas will fall below the five years' supply pending the emplacement of infrastructure in Phase 2 of the Regional Official Plan. Read in conjunction with the phasing policies of Section 2.6, the intent is to bring infrastructure on-stream when it is needed ("just in time"). Separating Leitrim and Gloucester South Urban Centre in Table 6 and Section 2.4.1 is reasonable.

**Recommendation** - **Change Table 6 of Section 2.4.1, to split Leitrim and Gloucester South Urban Centre as per Recommendation 74. Change policy 4 of Section 2.4.1. by: changing the phrase "four major urban areas" to "five urban areas"; deleting "Leitrim" from clause d) and adding a new clause: "e) Leitrim."**

**55. Section 2.4.1, policy 5** - Does this require the 1.1:1 job ratio to be contained in the local Official Plan? Is there a standard set of job to floor area ratios for the range of uses permitted in the urban areas? Do we assume full use of the permissible densities? (109) Concern was expressed by some downtown BIAs that this policy might hurt the Central Area? (221,265)

**Response** - This policy is directed to areas of the Region beyond the Central Area. The intent is to provide opportunities for a balance of jobs and housing and especially to foster commercial and industrial opportunities in areas which could benefit from more jobs, that is, those outside of the Central Area. The effect of zoning by-laws should be to allow this to happen. The jobs/housing balance in the Central Area was just over 20:1 in the 1991 census. There are many other supporting policies in the draft Regional Official Plan to promote the Central Area.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**56. Section 2.4.1, policy 6** - The FCA requests that the following phrase be added "any amendment shall be supported by the studies noted." (310)

**Response** - The first part of policy 6 already includes these words.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**57. Section 2.4.1, policy 7** - ARPO asks why allow development on agricultural land and not give the same flexibility to other designations? (219) FCA applauds this policy but questions how it will be implemented. (310)



**Response** - This applies only to the South Urban Centre Future Development Area. Clarification on implementation is dealt with by adding a sentence regarding permitted uses. This was inadvertently omitted from the original draft of this Plan.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 2.4.1 by adding a sentence to the end of policy 7: “Uses permitted on the lands designated “Future Development” are those permitted in Agricultural Resource Areas.”**

**58. Section 2.4.1, policy 8** - Kanata has suggested that reference to the South March Highlands Wetland be deleted since this is no longer a provincially significant wetland. (212) Cumberland has requested that a time limit be put on the completion of studies for Kanata North. (279) Several downtown BIAs do not support Kanata North development, but rather support all attempts to create opportunities inside the Greenbelt or in urban centres before designating more lands outside the Greenbelt. (265, 221, 222)

**Response** - This reflects the Ontario Municipal Board decision on Kanata North and should be respected. Also, the South March Highlands is designated as Natural Environment Area B in the draft Regional Official Plan and the requirement for further study is still appropriate.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**59. Section 2.4.1, policy 9** - Reference is made to this policy suggesting that there may be a need for additional criteria by which proposals to expand the urban area can be evaluated. (212) Ministry of Municipal Affairs does not support the policy and questions why development on private services would be permitted in the urban area. (321) The Conservation Authority accepts this, but wants to ensure that these situations are viewed as exceptions, and not the rule. (229)

**Response** - In fact, the intent of this policy is not to deal with urban expansions but rather to allow for a limited amount of opportunity for interim uses on private services in the urban area. Policies relating to changes to the plan to allow expansions of the urban area (or other changes) are contained in Section 1.6, policies 8 and 9. Also, specific criteria for two potential urban areas are found in Section 2.4.1, policies 6 and 8.

In response to the Ministry’s comments, this policy was introduced to address the issue that under current policies all development in unserviced future growth areas is effectively sterilised until central services are extended. This could mean that in some fringe areas no development at all would be permitted for 20 years or more. The policy was introduced to allow minor uses such as a church or small store to be built in such areas. The policy provides conditions to ensure this type of development would not be widespread and would not compromise planned urban development.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**60. Section 2.5, policy 1** - The Conservation Authority requests a policy requiring Council to consider the impact of increased development on the capacity of the storm sewer system and potential impacts on surface and sub-surface water resources. (229)

**Response** - The purpose of this Section is primarily to provide policies in support of development inside the Greenbelt. The impacts by identified the Conservation Authority must be taken into account with development proposals and are generally addressed by policy 8 of Section 1.6.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**61. Section 2.5, policy 2** - Clarify the meaning of “mainstreet” ~ if not a regional road, is it not a local interest?. This policy “encourages uncontrolled expansion of commercial uses and is fundamentally at odds with the City of Ottawa Official Plan.” The language should be less prescriptive to allow municipalities to be more selective about the location of mixed use development. (109, 145). FCA generally supports this but proposes a rewording to say “on mainstreets and on selected parts of most Regional roads with trunk transit routes.” The policy should ensure that the non-residential uses meet local needs. (310)

**Response** - “Mainstreet” is defined in the Glossary as a “commercial street with strong pedestrian orientation...” (see page 149 of the Draft Regional Official Plan). Like the other policies in Section 2.5, this policy facilitates the achievement of the Regional Development Strategy for growth inside the Greenbelt. The specific intent is to encourage more residential uses on traditionally commercial streets. Agree to modify the wording to clarify the intent.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 2.5 by adding the word “appropriate” before “mix of” in policy 2.

**62. Section 2.5, policy 3** - A local policy approach should be taken with respect to accessory apartments. Given the repeal of the provincial legislation, what is the Region’s authority for requiring accessory apartments in most residential areas? ( 108, 109 and see Comment under Section 3.2).

**Response** - This policy was developed in conjunction with a housing committee of municipal representatives and the wording of “most residential areas” was agreed to. This allows municipalities the flexibility of determining the appropriate areas. Section 1.2 of the new Provincial Policy Statement maintains policies on housing and provides an adequate basis for the proposed Regional policy. Specifically, it “encourages all forms of residential intensification in parts of built-up areas...”; and provides a definition of “residential intensification” which includes accessory apartments, among other things.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**63. Section 2.5, policy 4** - Where are the provisions for increasing social services to deal with effects of increasing density? Look at cities in the U.S. (219)

**Response** - Radical increases in densities are not expected. Cities in the U.S. developed differently and suffer from a complex array of socio-economic problems foreign to Canada.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**64. Section 2.5, policy 6** - Policy 6 referring to the characteristics of established communities should be restricted to matters of regional jurisdiction (109, and 145). The test for community impacts should not be restricted to residential development; a bias against housing redevelopment is expressed here (145). Policy 6 unduly focuses on the potential impacts of redevelopment of surplus land. Delete entirely or amend by deleting reference to “surplus government, industrial, commercial, institutional and other”. (258) The Province wants clarification that it is the physical characteristics of established communities that are to be respected. (321) Revise to respect the “character” not “characteristics” of communities. (FCA).

**Response** - The policy is intended to provide support for increasing residential development inside the Greenbelt in a manner which is sensitive to existing communities. Like all other policies, Council will exercise its authority within the bounds of its jurisdiction. In the case of zoning, this means commenting on draft zoning by-laws and appealing adopted zoning by-laws which do not conform to the Regional Official Plan. No bias against housing is intended; this will be made clearer. Nor is there any intent to discourage ways to achieve the Regional Development Strategy. The suggestion to simplify the policy is appropriate. The suggestion to specify “physical characteristics” ignores that there may be relevant economic or social issues which may be appropriate to respect. Staff prefer “characteristics” to “character” because it is easier to apply in a planning context.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 2.5.1. by replacing policy 6 with: “Respect the characteristics of established communities. When considering the redesignation and rezoning of land to create suitable sites for housing and other uses, ensure that the significant impacts of the proposed development are minimised.”**

**65. Section 2.5, policy 7** - The definition section of the draft Official Plan should define the terms “formal parkland”, “sensitive natural areas,” and “open space linkages.” (258) The policy should be strengthened by saying “Council shall protect” instead of “support the protection of”. Also it should refer to NILM lands and Ottawa’s greenway system (202, 310).

**Response** - Agree to add definitions to the glossary. The wording in the draft Regional Official Plan better reflects the many parties involved in the protection of parkland. Proposed changes to Section 6 also respond to these concerns.

**Recommendation** - **Add the following definitions to the Glossary:**

**“Formal parkland: lands managed by a public authority as a public park.”**

**“Sensitive natural areas: areas including significant natural features and functions.” “Open space linkages: the elements contained on Schedules I and J.”**

**66. Section 2.6, Table 5 - Leitrim** - Table 5 shows post 2021 build-out for Leitrim as 4-5,000 units, while most of the background documents show a range of 4-5,200. Please clarify. (230)

**Response** - 5,000 units in Leitrim is not a change in policy, but rather due to rounding. All of the “build-out” numbers are rounded.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**67. Section 2.6, Table 5 - Stittsville** - Stittsville should be increased from 8,000 to 8,500-9,000 dwelling units in order to facilitate the development of Stage 2 lands (as shown in Goulbourn’s Official Plan). (296) Clarification is sought on the dwelling unit count in Stittsville as to whether policies on administering the allocation and funding of infrastructure will be included in the draft Regional Official Plan. (220)

**Response** - Agree to increase the Phase 2 dwelling unit allocation to 8,500 to better accommodate the designated stage 2 lands. No policies are included regarding the administration of units or the funding of infrastructure specifically in Stittsville. However, phasing policies (Section 2.6.1 and Table 6) are included in the draft Regional Official Plan explicitly to ensure Council expenditure on major infrastructure occurs in accordance with Council’s development strategy. Staff agree that clarification is needed to ensure contiguity of development to optimise the use of regional infrastructure. This leads to a new policy in Section 2.6.1.

**Recommendation** - Change Table 5 by changing the dwelling unit count for Stittsville from “8,000 to 8,500” for Phase 2, 2021 and accordingly change Tables 2 and 4 to reflect the additional 500 units in Stittsville leading to an increase in 500 units overall in RMOC; and change Section 2.6.1 by adding a new policy 6): “ 6) Within each urban centre, including Stittsville and Leitrim, generally approve plans of subdivision and condominium so as to achieve a contiguous pattern of residential development.”

**68. Section 2.6.1** - Road projects seem to predominate over walking and cycling facilities, even though the reduced level of service for roads and reduced auto modal share should mean fewer new roads. The Plan is imbalanced. (142)

**Response** - There is a substantial reduction in the need for new roadways, compared to the current Plan. An extensive number of cycling and pedestrian facilities are planned. Agree to show these on Table 6.

**Recommendation** - Change Table 6 to include pedestrian and cycling facilities, as per recommendation 74.

**69. Section 2.6.1, policy 2** - A change is requested to allow phasing adjustments to be introduced in response to market demands within individual growth areas without amendment to the Plan. (244)

**Response** - Clause (a) refers to actual rates of development, which is a good barometer of market demand.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**70. Section 2.6.1, policy 4** - National Capital Commission asks that the words “most of” and “under construction” be deleted to emphasise importance of LeBreton Transitway. (258). Confirmation is sought that changes to the infrastructure schedule would not require an Official Plan amendment. (145, 212, 230).

**Response** - Council needs some latitude in prioritising projects. This needs to be clarified. Also, it is not intended that an Official Plan amendment would be required to allow for changes in the Table. This should be made clearer and can be done with a text change

**Recommendation - Add the following phrase at the beginning of Section 2.6.1, policy 4: “Have regard to Table 6 when setting spending priorities for major water, wastewater, road, and transit works in order to...”, and add another sentence at the end: “an Official Plan Amendment is not required for changes to Table 6.”**

**71. Section 2.6.1, policy 5** - The Township of Goulbourn and certain landowners request this policy be deleted, citing it as discriminatory. They note that a shuttle bus and commuter bus service already serve Stittsville. (87, 284,296)

**Response** - Agree that some flexibility should be introduced into this policy. However, the proposed policy reflects the changing nature of Stittsville from a village to an urban area. From a transportation perspective, the peak period travel patterns of Stittsville residents are very similar to those of Kanata, except that Stittsville’s share of travel by transit is less than half of that for Kanata. To balance the system, it is reasonable to try and ensure that the transit share of travel for Stittsville residents is similar to that of other urban areas beyond the Greenbelt.

**Recommendation - Change Section 2.6.1 by deleting policy 5 and replacing it with the following new policy 5: “Work with the Township of Goulbourn to provide peak period transit service in Stittsville to a level equivalent to the public transit service provided in other urban areas in Ottawa-Carleton, prior to undertaking the widening of Hazeldean Road.”**

**72. Section 2.6.1** - An additional policy is suggested to provide opportunities for front-end financing of services.(244)

**Response** - This suggestion has the potential to undermine the phasing strategy of the Regional Development Strategy. However, front-end financing will be looked at in the context of the Regional Development Charges review, following passage of The Development Charges Act.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**73. Section 2.6.1** - Richcraft Homes Ltd. requests that a new policy be added stating that Council will use its discretion to permit developers to oversize services for future growth.

**Response** - There is already a policy which addresses this in Section 10.1.2, policy 10. This policy also sets out criteria for assessing whether the oversizing is in the best long term interests of the region.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**74. Section 2, Table 6** - Several were received, including:

- a) Delete the Table. (145, 244)
- b) Include Hazeldean Pumping Station as a “First Priority”, not Second. (87, 296)
- c) Include Hazeldean widening on Table 6 (87)
- d) Table 6 does not include the recently approved EUC feedermain project and both phases should be shown. (79, 108)
- e) Table 6 should have costs assigned to it in order to determine whether funds are being spent to accommodate levels of growth inside the Greenbelt which will not occur.
- f) Separate Leitrim and Gloucester South Urban Centre (79,108,145,230,244,274)
- g) Rideau would like Manotick servicing to be shown. (256).
- h) Cycling priorities should be shown on Table 6. (303), especially Pooley’s Bridge (190, 206).
- i) The Airport Authority requests advancing the timing for twinning of the Airport Parkway. (105). Another brief opposes this project due to pressure on Bronson north of Canal Bridge. (269)
- j) Kanata would like March Road and Carling Ave widenings to be First priority. (212).
- k) FCA would like changes to First Priority: delete all transportation projects except transit (same for Second Priority); add pilot rail (310, 200, 232, 235, 250); add pedestrian facilities(also in Second Priority); replace West Transitway with LeBreton station or transitway. Other changes to Second Priority: delete Bronson Avenue widening. (89,310)
- l) Extend Greenboro Transitway to link to pilot rail project (232)
- m) Oppose all road widenings to six lanes (303)

**Response** -

- a) The Table is intended to guide Council when preparing annual budgets for roads, transit, water, and wastewater services. It provides a good indication of priorities for investment consistent with and complementary to the phasing strategy of the Regional Official Plan.
- b) Operational considerations and performance would have to be reviewed before making any decisions to move this to First Priority.
- c) Agree. This was an error.
- d) Table 6 shows major pieces of infrastructure, not internal watermains. This project is still planned.
- e) It is inappropriate to include costs in the Regional Official Plan, since they can vary from year to year. Furthermore, some of the infrastructure improvements inside the Greenbelt are to correct existing problems and are not wholly attributable to growth.
- f) Agree

- g) Manotick is a village and not part of the urban area.
- h) Agree to incorporate this.
- i) First priority projects reflect Council's approved five-year spending plan for roads. The project is suitable for Second Priority; there are no plans to widen Bronson north of the Canal Bridge.
- j) First priority projects reflect Council's approved five-year spending plan for roads.
- k) Spending on roads in the First Priority is already moderate. The pilot rail project is appropriate after 2001 because of the planning and negotiation time needed. Commitments have already been to the West Transitway. Agree to include pedestrian facilities. Bronson Avenue widening is part of the previously approved Dunbar Bridge project. No widening north of the Rideau Canal Bridge is proposed.
- l) Extension to Greenboro would duplicate the existing Southeast Transitway.
- m) Road widenings are planned to meet requirements for additional capacity based on growth.

#### **Recommendations -**

- a) **No change.**
- b) **No change.**
- c) **Change Table 6, Second Priority by adding: "Hazeldean Road widening (RR 5 to Terry Fox)" as a transportation project for Kanata Urban Centre and Stittsville.**
- d) **No change.**
- e) **No change.**
- f) **Change Table 6 to show Leitrim and Gloucester South Urban Centre separately, with the following Second Priority projects assigned to each:**
  - **Leitrim: Gravity sewer extensions and pumping station and forcemain; expand South Gloucester pumping station; Leitrim Park and Ride lot; Airport Parkway twinning (also serves Gloucester South Urban Centre and Inside Greenbelt).**
  - **Gloucester South Urban Centre: River Rd. widening (Limebank to Hunt Club); Bowesville Rd. extension (Leitrim Rd. to Lester Rd.), Airport Parkway twinning (also serves Leitrim and Inside Greenbelt).**
- g) **No change.**
- h) **Change Table 6 to add a new row at the bottom to apply to all urban areas for both First Priority and Second Priority to include:**
  - **Walking and cycling facility improvements included in the above projects**
  - **Walking and cycling facility improvements independent of the above projects.**
- i) **No change.**
- j) **No change.**
- k) **Change Table 6 to add a new row for walking and cycling facility improvements, as described in h) above.**
- l) **No change**
- m) **No change**

#### **Comments on Schedule B (see revised Schedule B attached)**

**75. Township of Goulbourn, nw corner Lot 25, Concession 9** - The property owner, Mr. Davidson, requests that a small portion of his lot (2800 sq.m.) be included in the Urban Area to

allow a connection to water service. The lot with the existing house is already connected to the sewer line. (65)

**Response** - Staff agree. This is a minor adjustment to Schedules A and B.

**Recommendation** - **Change Schedule A by changing the designation of the northwest part of Lot 25, Concession 9, Township of Goulbourn from General Rural to Urban Area; and Change Schedule B by adding the northwest part of Lot 25, Concession 9, Township of Goulbourn to General Urban Area.**

### **Errors, Omissions, and Clarifications in Section 2**

#### **76. Recommendation - Make the following corrections to Section 2.**

**Section 2.4.1, policy 6 and 7** - The designation should be identified as “South Urban Centre Future Development” and policy a) should read “the timing of need for additional urban land...”. Change Section 2.4.1, policy 6, by: adding the phrase “South Urban Centre” before the words “Future Development” in the first sentence; and Change clause a) by adding the phrase “timing of” before the words “need for additional ....”; and Change policy 7 by adding the words “South Urban Centre” before the words “Future Development”.

### **General Comments on Section 3 - Community and the Built Environment**

**77. Healthy Communities** - Support Section 3 committing RMO Council to foster healthy and sustainable communities fiscally, economically, socially and environmentally. Fiscal criterion is extremely important in controlling urban sprawl. (313)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**78. Open Space** - Communities need to incorporate open spaces, linkages, and locally significant natural features. A link between this section and the policies contained in Sections 5 and 6 should be established. The section introduces environment as a key consideration but only a few words refer to protecting and preserving the natural environment and open spaces. (109) (243) (202)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 3 by making a reference to open spaces in the introduction, the objectives and in the policies by adding:**

- “open spaces,” in the last sentence of the first paragraph of page 23 after the words “community services”;
- “open spaces and” in Objective 5 after the word “enhances”;
- a seventh objective which would read as follows:
  7. “To contribute to and enhance a network of parkland, natural areas and open spaces in Ottawa-Carleton communities”.



- by replacing Policy 1 f) by “a network of open spaces, linkages and natural features.”;
- and a new policy, Policy 13 f), “creating opportunities to incorporate open spaces, recreational pathways, natural features and stormwater control as part of an open space network within and between communities.”

**79. Community plans** - a) Encourage each community to develop its own “integrity plan” with specific actions to reduce the community’s footprint. Also the plan does not seem to recognize the need to “retro-fit” the existing communities. (142) b) This deserves a separate section: “Section 3.4: Retrofitting Existing Communities”. (142)

**Response** - a) Section 3.2, Policies 3 and 10 encourage the creation of plans around Transitway stations and in development or redevelopment areas. While it is a good idea to encourage each community to do a plan, this is beyond the scope of the Regional Official Plan. However, this may be something the Federation of Community Associations could encourage. b) Do not think it deserves another section.

**Recommendation** - a) and b) **No change.**

**80. Community Councils** - Allow communities to establish their own councils and levy property taxes, and to take over parks, road and pathway maintenance, parking, and zoning/variances. (142)

**Response** - This is an issue of governance that cannot be dealt with in the Official Plan.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**81. Confusion in terms** - There is confusion of language concerning transit routes, transit stops, Transitway stations and transit stations. (212) (277)

**Response** - The use of the four terms may seem confusing however they have different meanings and the definitions will be added to the Regional Official Plan Glossary subsequent to the development of a Glossary for the Transportation Master Plan and prior to finalising both plans.

**Recommendation** - **Change by adding/modifying the definition of Transitway station, transit station, transit stop and transit route to the Glossary.**

### **Specific Comments on Section 3 - Community and the Built Environment**

**82. Section 3.1** - The reference to “safe community” and “social space” is supported but need to be augmented with the recognition that most communities are represented by community associations and that communities need to function in an integrated way to implement the objectives of the plan. (310)

**Response** - There is no need to change the text as this is implied in the first paragraph of Section 3.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**83. Section 3.1** - Define the term “natural systems” in the Glossary. (202)

**Response** - Refer to the amended introduction of Section 5 for a definition.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**84. Section 3.1, Objective 1 and Introduction to Section 3.3** - Add the concepts of “life cycle” and “aging in place” to Section 3.1, Objective 1, and to the introduction of Section 3.3 to convey that no resident of a community will need to leave the community because of a lack of appropriate housing. (142) ( 310)

**Response** - Agree. However, the concept of “changing needs” can be more easily added to Objective 3 than to Objective 1.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 3.1 by adding the word “changing” to Objective 3, between the words “the” and “needs”. Insert a new sentence after the second sentence in the first paragraph of Section 3.3: “Housing options must be available in each community to meet the changing needs of all residents.”

**85. Section 3.1, Objective 3** - Describe “variety of uses” as “ensuring uses that provide a full range of private and public services to allow most needs to be satisfied with a walk rather than a drive”. (310)

**Response** - This idea is captured in Objective 4 and in the definition of mix of uses in the Glossary.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**86. Section 3.1, Objective 3** - Clarify “reducing the need to travel” to refer to trips length rather than number of trips. ( 310) (303)

**Response** - “Reducing the need to travel” refers to both.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**87. Section 3.2** - a) The policies of this section may lead to conflict since many of the requirements are subject to local municipal authority, and should be worded as objectives rather than requirements. For example, the content of Policies 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 would lead to the

formulation of conflicting development proposals if the intent of each individual section were to be respected. (145) b) Endorse Policies 3, 4, 12 with the addition of “cyclist-friendly”. (303)

**Response -** a) On the first point made by OCHBA, refer to the first response in Overall Comments. As for the second point, it is not clear how the content of Policies 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 would lead to the formulation of conflicting development proposals. Staff have requested clarification from OCHBA. b) Agree to add “cyclist-friendly” to Policies 3, 4, and 12.

**Recommendation -** a) See Recommendation # 1 and 2. Also refer to changes proposed to Section 3.2, Policies 1, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 14. b) Change Section 3.2, Policies 3, 4 and 12 by adding the word “cyclist-” after the word “transit-”.

**88. Section 3.2, Policy 1 -** a) Clarify how flexible zoning to allow the creation of additional units as needs change (Policy 1 c) can be implemented or delete. The notion of accessory units is already addressed in Policy 1d). (109) Policy 1 c) is unclear. (223) b) Policy 1d) should “encourage” rather than “require” accessory apartments. (223) Policy 1 f) requiring zoning-by-laws to deal with the issue of open space is a local issue. (109) The Planning Act does not permit zoning by-laws to require certain amounts of land for open space. (212) (223) c) Support the requirement for zoning to allow a mix of uses in communities. This should however be augmented with a discussion on the role of main streets as viable commercial areas and community cores. (310) (317) d) Replace the words “by providing for” by “will support”. (108)

**Response -** a) Section 3.2, Policy 1 c) is in the current Regional Official Plan (Section 6.2.3, Policy 19) and in the 1989 Provincial Housing Policy Statement (Policy 5.1b). The idea is to facilitate alterations to the housing stock to meet the changing needs of households by creating new units such as in-law suites or accessory units, duplexes or semi-detached units. b) We agree that the wording of the policy could be more flexible. c) Agree to add to Policy 1 regarding the enhancement of mainstreets as viable commercial areas and community cores. d) The recommended word change would be inconsistent with the beginning of the sentence.

**Recommendation -** a) No change. b) Change Section 3.2, Policy 1 by Replacing the beginning of Policy 1 “Require zoning-laws” with require municipalities”. c) Change Section 3.2, Policy 1 by adding the following to Policy 1:

g) “the enhancement of mainstreets as viable commercial areas and community cores.”

d) No change.

**89. Section 3.2, Policy 2 -** a) Does the one third requirement apply to each application or the overall total? How will the policy be implemented and monitored? Under what authority is the policy written? (109). Recommend that this policy be revised to replace the word “require” with the words “encourage municipalities to ensure” (88) A definition of “community” is required to implement the one third policy. (212) (279) b) Add the words “within new plans of subdivision” after the words “new housing”. (88)

**Response** - a) There is no need for change. This has been a Regional policy since 1992. The current Regional Official Plan policy has a similar intent and wording as the draft policy; it “requires municipalities to ensure”. The draft policy applies to communities as defined in Section 3 and not necessarily to each application. Traditionally it has been implemented through secondary or concept planning. It is the Region’s way to implement the Policy Statement to encourage “housing forms and densities designed to be affordable to moderate and low income households” (Policy 1.2.1c of the 1996 Policy Statement). b) The change would go against the intent of the policy which applies to all new housing, not only housing in new plans of subdivision.

**Recommendation** - a) and b), no change.

**90. Section 3.2, Policy 3, Policy 5** - a) Agree that Region should take a lead role in planning development around Transitway stations and are especially pleased with the wording of compact and mixed-use to describe such development. (317) b) Recommend Policy 3 be amended to indicate that the Region will take a lead role in setting dwelling unit and employment targets for these areas in consultation with the community and the local municipality and that the local municipality be required to prepare a secondary plan to guide the implementation of these targets. (88) Reword Policy 5 to indicate that Regional Council will work with area municipalities and local communities in the creation of plans for the future development around selected transit stations. (109) Too prescriptive (244) c) Taking a lead role in planning communities and developments around existing and proposed transit stations is in direct conflict with the priorities set for the Central Area where the plan recommends a 20% share of jobs for the Central Area. (265) (271)

**Response** - a) Agree. b) Regarding Policy 3, the Region will take a lead role while working with area municipalities and communities as proposed in the change to policy 15 of Section 1.6. Regarding Policy 5, staff agree to change the wording. c) It is not in conflict as it is possible to maintain the share of jobs in the Central Area while at the same time encouraging new jobs outside the Central Area where infrastructure such as Transitway stations can be optimised. There is room for employment growth both inside and outside the Central Area.

**Recommendation** - a) No change. b) Change Policy 5 by replacing the word “Require” by “Work with area municipalities and communities to ensure”. c) No change.

**91. Section 3.2, Policy 6** - a) Does this mean that opportunities should be provided along the road where a bus travels (which may be through a residential community) or on major trunk bus routes being primarily on regional roads? On collector roads in new urban communities, uses are residential, not commercial, and therefore placement close to the sidewalk does not make sense. (279) (244) b) (310) Add “the provision of trees”. (257)

**Response** - a) Agree that the policy needs to be clarified. b) Agree.

**Recommendation** - a) Change Section 3.2 by replacing the beginning of Policy 6 with:

6. **“Foster transit- cyclist- and pedestrian-friendly streetscape design along roads with all day/frequent transit service by encouraging where appropriate:” (...)**
- b) **Add to Policy 6 the following: “e) the provision of trees.”**

**92. Section 3.2, Policy 7 -** a) Policy 7 allows infill and redevelopment virtually everywhere. It is not consistent with the City of Ottawa Official Plan and may ultimately prove impossible to effect. (109) It is not clear what constitutes a “transit route” or a “residential area” and it may be that a local municipality does not want to allow infill and redevelopment along every transit route or in each residential area. (212) (279) ( 43) b) “Encourage” rather than “require” infill and redevelopment. (223)

**Response -** a) The intent of the policy is to encourage infill and redevelopment along roads frequently served by transit and in residential areas, especially areas adjacent to transit routes. While it is not expected that infill and redevelopment will occur in every area adjacent to transit routes, this is where it is most desirable and likely to happen. Also, policy 7 is consistent with the current Regional Official Plan policy, as well as the Provincial Policy Statement. b) See Recommendation # 1.

**Recommendation -** a) **Replace Policy 7 of Section 3.2 to clarify the intent of Policy 7 with:**

7. **“Require municipalities to permit infill and redevelopment:**

- a) **along roads with all day/frequent transit service;**
- b) **in residential areas adjacent to roads with all day/frequent transit service; and**
- c) **other residential areas considered appropriate by area municipalities.”**

**To be consistent, also replace the words “transit routes” in Policy 12 f) by the words “roads with all day/frequent transit service.”**

b) **No change.**

**93. Section 3.2, Policy 8 -** Request that zoning by-laws be “required” to regulate the physical character of infill or redevelopment projects to ensure their compatibility with established communities. (310) (317) Regulating the compatibility of development is a local issue and the Municipal Act does not require the Region to “allow” zoning by-laws to regulate it. (109) This section could encourage the preparation of design guidelines where appropriate. (279) Would be better to make reference to local Official Plans. (244)

**Response -** Agree that the policy could be more flexible.

**Recommendation -** **Change Section 3.2 by replacing Policy 8 with:**

8. **“Require municipalities to develop site specific criteria relating to the physical character of infill or redevelopment projects to ensure their compatibility with established communities while at the same time encouraging infill and redevelopment activity.”**

**94. Section 3.2, Policy 9** - a) Clarify that the policy applies only to applications where the Region has approval authority. (109) (244) b) Request that a policy be added to require that, in case of large infill sites, the street pattern be similar to and integrated with the surrounding street patterns so as to ensure compatibility. (317)

**Response** - a) This is a general issue dealt with in Overall Comments. The intent of the policy is to ensure that all involved in approving redevelopment or infill applications, either as an approval agency or a commenting agency, consider the impact of the proposed development on the neighborhood. b) This issue is implied in Policy 9 and it is addressed in the proposed changes to Policy 14.

**Recommendation** - a) See Recommendation # 3. b) Refer to proposed changes to Policy 14.

**95. Section 3.2, Policy 10** - a) Not clear whether the policy creates additional planning requirements at the regional level. It appears to duplicate municipal requirements (e.g., Official Plan Amendment/plan of development). (258) Clarify the policy to indicate that Regional Council could only “ensure” that such concept plans are prepared in association with matters under Regional jurisdiction. (109) Say “Initiate and support”. (212) Say “encourage local municipalities to prepare versus “ensure” (279). Modify to explain how the concept plans are integrated in the municipal planning process and clarify the timing, who would prepare them and the role they would play in terms of municipal policy setting. (163) (223) (88) b) Eliminate the second sentence as concept plans are a local responsibility; also eliminate Policy 11. (244)

**Response** - a) Agree that this policy needs to be clarified. b) Both the Region and area municipalities have an interest in concept plans because of the interrelationship of all planning decisions in building communities. The line between the Regional interest and the area municipality’s interest is not as clear as what the Municipal Act or the Planning Act indicate. No changes are proposed other than to replace the words “concept plans” in Policy 11 by the words “local Official Plan amendment”.

**Recommendation** - a) Change Section 3.2, Policy 10 by replacing the first sentence of the policy with the following two sentences:

**10. “Require that a local Official Plan amendment be prepared for an overall concept plan to guide development in areas with substantial amount of vacant land, in areas with potential for significant redevelopment and in areas with multiple owners. Work with municipalities to identify where such plans need to be done.” (...)**

**b) Change Section 3.2 by replacing the words “concept plans” in Policy 11 by the words “local Official Plan amendment”.**

**96. Section 3.2, Policies 12, 13, 14, 15** - a) The policies set out to ensure design details of concept plans and/or development applications which are not regional concerns. (109) Include only matters of Regional interest in policy 13 and refer to matters of local interest as something

the Region would like to see considered. (163) Provide flexibility in applying Policy 13 d) (43) (223) Policy 14 is too prescriptive. (244) b) The specific requirements of Policy 12 and 13 are strongly supported. Add to Policy 13 “local road system which minimize cul-de-sacs and crescents”. (310) c) Reword Policy 13 to indicate that street pattern of large redevelopment be similar to and integrated with surrounding street patterns to ensure compatibility. (317) d) Increase walking distance to transit stops to 500 metres to reduce operating costs. (108) e) Endorse the support for bicycle access in Policies 12, 13 and 14, especially the provisions for personal safety. (303)

**Response** - a) Policies 12 and 15 should not be a concern as they “encourage” area municipalities to implement the policies. Most elements of policy 13 are current Regional Official Plan policies. The other elements take into account that local roads are an integral part of the whole transportation system and have a great impact on the regional road network and urban form. As stated in Section 3.1, Council’s objective is to encourage a street pattern and community design which reduce the need to travel and facilitate transit use, walking and cycling. b) As suggested by FCA, staff recommend adding to Policy 13 “local road system which minimizes cul-de-sacs and crescents;” c) Agree to reword Policy 13 to indicate that street pattern of large redevelopment be similar to and integrated with surrounding street patterns to ensure compatibility d) Increasing the maximum walking distance to transit stops would go against Council’s objective of increasing the use of public transit. e) Agree.

**Recommendation** - a) **No change for Policies 12 and 15. See changes proposed for Policy 14 to make it less restrictive.** b) and c) **Change Section 3.2 by adding two new sub-sections to Policy 13:**

- b) “local road system which minimizes cul-de-sacs and crescents;”
- c) “a street pattern for large redevelopments compatible to surrounding street patterns”

**and renumber subsequent clauses accordingly.**

**d) and e) No change.**

**97. Section 3.2, Policy 14** - The following should be added to ensure safety: a) good walking surfaces, b) barriers to protect pedestrians at dangerous, high volume intersections, c) traffic calming, d) protection from vertical dangers, e) moderation of wind effects at the base of buildings, and f) sidewalk designs to reduce build up of ice. (142) (310) (303)

**Response** - Generally agree.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 3.2, Policy 14 by replacing the words “ensure that” by the word “consider” to take into account the comments made by municipalities above. Add the following wording to Policy 14:**

- f) design of good walking surfaces; and
- g) barriers to protect pedestrians at dangerous, high volume intersections.

**98. Section 3.2, Policy 15** - a) Support the concept of flexible development standards, but the principle of flexibility must apply to all areas including rural areas. (272) b) This policy deals exclusively with matters which are of local concern. It is not necessary that this policy be in the regional plan. Clarify what is meant by alternative standards for schools and parks? (279) c) How do you intend to achieve the goal of alternative standards when most municipalities resist, primarily because of snow removal issues? (108)

**Response** - a) The intent is to encourage the use of flexible standards in all municipalities. b) As previously mentioned this policy “encourages” the use of more flexible standards. This policy implements Policy 1.2.1 e) of the Provincial Policy Statement asking municipalities to “establish cost-effective development standards for new residential development and redevelopment to reduce the cost of housing”. The Region is well placed to pursue the co-ordinating role it played in developing alternative development standards for local road allowances and lot sizes. It can for example explore alternative standards for schools and parks by bringing stakeholders together to question the rationale for the current standards and assessing the feasibility of various ways to use more effectively land dedicated for schools and parks (for example combining various uses, looking at locations and flexible structures that can accommodate changing needs over time). c) Several municipalities have implemented one or more alternative standard related to local road allowances or lot sizes. The intent of Policy 15 is to explore the feasibility of a variety of alternative standards to provide flexibility to municipalities and the development industry so that they can apply them where they see fit.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**99. Section 3.3, Housing** - In the paragraph relating to affordability, the draft mentions that “much of the existing stock, particularly the private rental stock, is aging...”. We note that much of the social housing stock is also aging. Delete “particularly the private rental stock”. (128)

**Response** - Agree that the social housing stock is also aging. The fact that the rental stock is aging faster than the ownership stock and must be maintained and protected should be mentioned. We suggest keeping that thought and only deleting the word “private”.

**Recommendation - Change Section 3.3 by deleting the words “private” from the third paragraph of Section 3.3.**

**100. Section 3.3, Objectives** - Include an objective related to affordability. (109)

**Response** - Objective 2 deals specifically with the issue of affordability. Therefore there is no need to add a similar objective.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**101. Section 3.3, Objective 4** - The wording of the current housing objective for persons with special needs of “ensuring opportunities for a range of housing options and support services” is



more appropriate than the proposed policy “to allow persons with special needs to live in residential areas throughout Ottawa-Carleton”. (109), (128)

**Response - Agree.**

**Recommendation - Change Section 3.3 by deleting Objective 4 and replace it with:**

**4. “To ensure opportunities for a range of housing options and support services for persons with special needs in all residential areas throughout Ottawa-Carleton.”**

**102. Section 3.3.1 -** We request clarification as to how the objectives for housing will be implemented by the RMOC when evaluating development applications. (145)

**Response -** The housing objectives are very similar to the current Regional Official Plan objectives and will be implemented in a similar way as described in the policies of Section 3.3.2 which are also similar to current housing policies.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**103. Section 3.3.2, Policy 2 c) -** Specify the type of information to be monitored on an annual basis to evaluate the RDS and to assist municipalities in assessing their success in implementing Regional policies. (109)

**Response -** Monitoring indicators will be added to the Official Plan. To be consistent with policy 2 a) and 2 b), we suggest adding the following wording to policy 2 c): “against the objectives of this plan.”

**Recommendation - Change Section 3.3 by adding the following words to Policy 2 c): “against the objectives of this plan”. See Annex B on monitoring.**

**104. Section 3.3.2, Policy 3 - a)** The Regional Official Plan should have a stronger statement regarding the Region’s role. Change the word “Encourage” to the words “Provide for”. (128)

b) Support that 25% of all new housing be affordable each year in each municipality; this will create a better distribution. Tie the definition of affordability to specific income levels. (109) (128) (43) Recommend that the definition of affordable housing in Policies 3 and 4 be tied to households between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> income percentiles. (128) Recommend that the 25% affordable housing target apply to the regional market rather than the local one. (163) (223) Recognize that such targets cannot be achieved in areas of limited growth. Revise the policy to reflect the 1996 Provincial policy Statement where there is no specific numerical target. (256) This is more onerous than the Provincial Policy Statement. (227) (223)

**Response - a)** The role of the Region in housing is primarily to co-ordinate and facilitate the provision of housing in Ottawa-Carleton and not to provide housing. This is why Policy 3 says “Encourage” and not “Provide for”.

b) Agree to tie the definition of affordability to the 30<sup>th</sup> income percentile for the rental market (because it approximates the median tenant income), and to the 60<sup>th</sup> income percentile for the ownership market. Disagree with West Carleton as the intent of the policy is to create a better distribution of affordable housing throughout Ottawa-Carleton. Disagree with Rideau because the affordable housing policy needs targets to be effective and to be monitored. The intent of the policy is to ensure that every municipality will provide opportunities for a mix of housing types appropriate for residents of all income levels.

**Recommendation - a) No change.**

**b) Change Section 3.3.2 by adding the following sentences to Policy 3: “Affordable home ownership will be targeted to households up to the 60<sup>th</sup> income percentile and is calculated on the basis of a 3-year average of the 3-year mortgage rate, taxes at 1.5% of house price, and a down payment of 10%. Affordable rental housing will be targeted to households up to the 30<sup>th</sup> income percentile.”**

**Also rewrite Policy 4 to say:**

**4. “Establish and monitor affordable rental and ownership prices each year targeted to households at the 30<sup>th</sup> and 60<sup>th</sup> income percentiles.”**

**105. Section 3.3.2, Policy 5 - a)** Add the review of zoning standards as a means of implementing affordable housing policies. (108) **b)** The draft Regional Official Plan no longer refers to a number of specific actions to implement its affordable housing policy such as negotiating agreements with the private sector through the subdivision and condominium approval process. It is important that the Region’s role as an advocate to encourage the production of affordable housing not be lost. (109)

**Response - a)** No change needed as the implementation of Policy 5 a) and 5 c) implies a review of zoning standards. **b)** Agree.

**Recommendation - a) No change. 2) Change Section 3.3.2 by adding to Policy 5 the following:**

**e) “conditions for development approval.”**

**106. Section 3.3.2, Policy 6 - Support policy. (128)**

**Response - Agree.**

**Recommendation - No change.**

**107. Section 3.3.2 Policy 7 - Support the intent of the policy. Clarify the word “stakeholders” (109) (128) Many social housing providers are required to provide units at market rents. Modify the words “at below market rents” to “at or below market rents” (128)**

**Response** - The word “stakeholders” refers to all who have an interest in protecting the social housing stock. There is no need to change it. Agree to modify the words “at below market rents” to “at or below market rents”

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 3.3.2, Policy 7 by modifying the words “at below market rents” to “at or below market rents”**

**108. Section 3.3.2, Policy 9** - a) There is concern with the effectiveness of using average rental price per unit type, regardless of vacancy rate, as a guideline for approving conversions. Also tie rental conversion to the vacancy rate. (109) (128) (43) b)The policy fails to exempt heritage properties, as is done in the current Regional Official Plan and in the City of Ottawa Official Plan. (109) c) Why use the “average” rental price as it is generally too low for considering conversions? Policy 9 c) may conflict with the intent and spirit of the proposed Tenant Protection Act. (321) d) Support the policy but suggest including a vacancy rate on a region wide basis. A six months notice is too short. (79) e) Conversion policy should apply to geographic areas different from municipal boundaries to avoid the situation of Redwood Court where a project lies within two monitoring areas. (108)

**Response** - a) The intent of the proposed policy is to protect the affordable rental stock from being converted to ownership tenure. This is why the conversion policy is now tied to rental prices. The reference to the vacancy rate was deleted to allow the conversion of more expensive rental units to affordable ownership units. This is what has happened over the last 18 months in the City of Ottawa. While it is good that purchasing prices have been affordable and that the units get upgraded, there is a concern that too many rental units are being lost. We therefore agree with CCOC and the City of Ottawa to continue tying the conversion of rental units to the 3% vacancy rate but for the Ottawa CMA average vacancy, for a period of one year rather than two years and for units above the average rental prices. b) We agree to exempt heritage properties, as is done in the current Regional Official Plan.

c) Average rental prices are used as the threshold because they are readily available from CMHC. As for the proposed Tenant Protection Legislation, it will guaranty lifetime security to sitting tenants of units converted to condominium tenure but not to tenants of units converted to freehold tenure. A great number of townhouses are converted to freehold tenure. Therefore, we suggest that municipalities enter into an agreement with the proponent to provide lifetime security of tenure to all sitting tenants not willing to purchase their respective unit. d) Agree. e) No change needed as the proposed policy applies to the Ottawa CMA.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 3.3.2 by replacing Policy 9 by:**

9) **“Permit the conversion of rental housing to condominiums and equity co-ops and other forms of tenure provided that: 1) the vacancy rate for the Ottawa CMA exceeds 3 percent and 2) the rental prices of the units to be converted are above the average rental prices as reported yearly for the Ottawa CMA by CMHC’s Rental Market Survey for each unit and bedroom type. However, a heritage building designated under parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act may be exempted from this policy at the discretion of the area municipality. In the event that rental**

**housing is converted to other forms of tenure, encourage area municipalities to enter into an agreement with the proponent to protect the tenants' interests. Such an agreement may require the proponent to:**

- a) **Sell the units at or below the affordable ownership price established annually by RMOC as per policy 4 above;**
- b) **offer to tenants first right of refusal to purchase their respective unit; and**
- c) **guaranty lifetime security of tenure to sitting tenants not willing to buy their respective unit.”**

**109. Section 3.3.2, Policy 10** - Recommend that the Region support innovative housing development for all housing types not just housing affordable to the lowest income groups. (163)

**Response** - Section 3.3.2 focuses on providing housing choices for people who are not served by the private sector or the non-profit sector namely seniors, people with special needs and people with housing affordability problems. This is why Policies 6 and 10 address specifically innovation for the lowest income groups and seniors.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**110. Section 3.3.2, Policy 11** - a) The prescriptive nature of this policy differs from the present Regional Official Plan which “encourages” municipalities to identify zones and is unnecessary and inappropriate. (109) (256) (163) Rewrite as per existing plan to show option of permitting garden suites in zoning by-laws as-of-right or allowing such with a temporary use zoning under section 38 of the Planning Act. (279) To permit “in certain zones” implies as-of-right ability, however, the very nature of Temporary Use By-laws is that they are considered on a site specific basis. (223) Osgoode has not permitted garden suites because of servicing constraints and the difficulty in maintaining bonds to make sure the use is removed. We have instead allowed accessory apartments to be built into or added onto every single dwelling. (227) b) In order to avoid the implication that zoning can control tenure, we recommend that this section be expanded to provide wording to the effect of e.g. “permit garden suites suitable for seniors”. (321)

**Response** - a) The policy gives municipalities the flexibility to identify zones where garden suites for seniors will be permitted. However, we agree that municipalities may choose to use temporary zoning bylaws as an alternative. b) The intent is to provide a temporary dwelling unit for seniors only. While zoning cannot control tenure, garden suites can be specifically reserved for the use of seniors. Section 15 (2) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms states that it does not preclude any law, program or activity that has as its object the amelioration of conditions of individuals or groups including those that are disadvantaged because of age. Also we propose to replace Policy 11 with the current Regional Official Plan policy approved by the Minister which also says “garden suites for seniors”.

**Recommendation - a) Change Section 3.3.2 by replacing Policy 11 by:**

- 11. Encourage municipalities to identify zones in which garden suites for seniors may be permitted as of right or alternatively, to expedite the procedures for temporary zoning of the site.**

**b) No change.**

**111. Section 3.3, Policy 13** - a) Support the intent of the policy but think the definition of group homes should be amended so that group homes can accommodate up to 30 people as permitted in high density areas by the City of Ottawa's by-law. (128) b) The reference to by-laws regulating separation distances and location of certain types of group homes must be based on legitimate land use planning criteria. (321)

**Response** - a) No change is proposed as this policy does not preclude a municipality to allow a larger group home. b) Regulating separation distances and location of certain types of group homes allow municipalities to ensure an even distribution of group homes within local boundaries. The wording of this policy is almost the same as the current policy approved by the Minister. No change is proposed.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**112. Section 3.3.2, Policy 13 and 14** - a) The prescriptive nature of these policies is unnecessary and inappropriate. (109, 163) b) More detail would be helpful. (321) Delete the word "some" to avoid municipalities "spot zoning" certain areas as residential for rooming houses. (128)

**Response** - a) The policy on group homes is almost identical to the current Regional Official Plan policy. To be consistent with other policies, we suggest that Policy 14 be modified to say also "Ensure that zoning by-laws permit...". The wording of both policies reflect the fact that they can only be implemented through zoning by-laws. b) We agree that Policy 14 needs some clarification but expect area municipalities to provide more detail in their zoning by-laws.

**Recommendation - a) and b) Replace Policy 14 of Section 3.3.2 with:**

- 14. "Require municipalities to identify which residential zones permit rooming, boarding and lodging houses as of right."**

**113. Section 3.4 Central Area-** a) Add a new objective and policy to support the City of Ottawa's architectural controls and heritage protection for the Central Area. This will encourage tourism as well as protect heritage features. (279) b) The existing network of roads cannot be expanded. The elimination of the private car in trips to the Central Area would mean devastation for local business. Since the majority of weekend trips are shopping trips, the ease with which a car accomplishes this will never be replaced. (265) c) The Central Area boundaries should be expanded to include the National Gallery, the War Museum and the Mint. (258) The boundaries should be expanded slightly so that they do not run down the middle of important roads but ensure that both sides of these roads have the same status. Refer to the transportation strategy by its original name "Central Area Transportation Strategy". (310) Extend the Central Area to

include a larger existing central business district i.e. the Bank Street South Corridor to at least Gladstone, including the precincts of our Somerset Village. Surely this area must be included before the open fields of LeBreton Flats. (293) d) Identify the Central Area as the Region's principal shopping area, as was the case in the 1989 Regional Official Plan. (317)

**Response** - a) Agree, this can be done by adding a reference about historical resources to already proposed objectives and policies. b) The capacity of the existing road network in the Central Area can be increased by increasing transit usage, walking and cycling for commuting trips. Additional trips to the Central Area will translate into more customers and will benefit businesses. Also the transportation strategy has been developed to accommodate the peak hours travel demand and therefore would not affect weekend shopping for people riding cars. c) The boundaries have been expanded to correspond to the City's and now include the National Gallery, the War Museum and the Mint. Policies for the Central Area apply to both sides of the road boundaries. Agree to refer to Central Area Transportation Strategy. d) A change is not required because the introduction to Section 3.4 and Objective 1 refer to retail which includes shopping.

**Recommendation** - a) **Change Section 3.4 by adding the words "and historical character" to Objective 2 so it reads as follows:**

2. **"To promote the unique image and historical character of the Central Area as the site of Parliament Hill and the symbolic heart of Ottawa-Carleton and Canada."**

**Also add to Section 3.4.2, Policy 1, the following:**

- g) **Supporting the protection of the Central Area's unique heritage resources."**
- b) **No change.**
- c) **Replace in the last paragraph of Section 3.4 the words "a transportation strategy for the Central Area" by the words "the Transportation Strategy for the Central Area which..."**
- d) **No change.**

**114. Section 3.4.1** - a) Support the objectives stated in Section 3.4.1, most notably Objectives 3, 4, 5, and 6. (317) Strongly support Objective 5. (303) b) A new objective and policy are needed to accommodate the LeBreton Amendment Regional Official Plan Amendment 66, if approved by Council. (staff)

**Response** - a) Thanks b) Will add a new objective to Section 3.4.1 and a new policy to Section 3.4.2. Schedules B, C1 and C2 will also be amended accordingly.

**Recommendation** - a) **No change.** b) **Change Section 3.4.1 by adding the following objective after Objective 4 and renumbering Objective 5 and subsequent objectives accordingly:**

5. **"To re-establish a vibrant, urban community on LeBreton Flats"**

Also change Section 3.4.2 by inserting the following new policy after Policy 5 and renumbering Policy 6 and subsequent policies accordingly:

6. When reviewing development applications for LeBreton Flats ensure that the overall development will:
- a) create a compact, pedestrian-oriented, mixed use community;
  - b) create an open space network within the site, including an approximately 4 hectare park north of LeBreton Boulevard as a focus for public gatherings marking events of national and regional significance;
  - c) reflect the site's importance in the future development of the nation's capital;
  - d) respect and conserve the cultural heritage resources on the site;
  - e) ensure the compatibility of road design and maintenance with the adjacent land uses.

Change Schedule B to designate LeBreton Flats as Central Area and Waterfront Open Space. Also change Schedules C1 and C2 to show the future urban roads and urban regional roads rights-of-way protection on LeBreton Flats.

**115. Section 3.4.1, Objective 1** - a) Upholding the supremacy of the Central Area as the primary commercial and residential hub, will ensure the sustainability of a vibrant downtown core. (265) (271) b)The objective should also reflect the desire to increase residential use in the Central Area. (128) (310) (285)

**Response** - a) Agree. b) Agree to add the word "housing". Note that Objective 4 also addresses this.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 3.4.1, Objective 1 by adding the word "housing" between the words "tourism" and "entertainment".

**116. Section 3.4.1, Objective 3** - Add after the words "broad range of land uses" the words "including residential and mixed use buildings".(285)

**Response** - A change is not needed as the term " broad range of land uses" includes residential uses and mixed use buildings.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**117. Section 3.4.2** - a) The draft Official Plan should acknowledge the principles of growth management to ensure a proper balance between growth and the system serving this growth. (109) b) Support Policies 1 e), 2 and 3 in Section 3.4.2. However, Policy 2 would be strengthened by adding a lead-in statement supporting the protection and enhancement of the visual integrity and symbolic primacy of the Parliament Buildings and other natural symbols in the Parliamentary Precinct. (258)

**Response** - a) Although the proposed plan no longer link employment growth to the transportation capacity of the Central Area, it nevertheless states that Council shall ensure that proposed development does not impose a greater burden on regional services than they are capable of supporting (Section 1.6, Policy 8). The capacity of the transportation system serving the Central Area is no longer perceived as a limit to growth in the Central Area. The Regional Development Strategy is based on a walking, cycling and transit first policy hence increasing the potential capacity of the existing transportation system in the Central Area. Policies also support development in the Central Area by upgrading regional water and wastewater services. b) The NCC's comment is addressed by the changes proposed to Objective 2 and Policy 1.

**Recommendation** - a) No change. b) See Recommendation # 113

**118. Section 3.4.2, Policy 1** - a) Rather than “permitting”, Policy 1 a) and b) should be “encouraging” a broad range of uses and new Major Community Facilities. (279) b) The provision of roads, servicing and adjustments in taxes should also be considered as a way of encouraging the Central Area. (279) c) The Central Area health should be more vigorously supported by a policy that encourages large-scale retail to locate in the Central Area. (310) d) Support Policy 1 e) encouraging the Federal Government to continue occupying office space in the Central Area. Also add a policy to encourage the Federal Government to investigate the innovative use/reuse of office space. (109)

**Response** - a) Agree that “encouraging” a broad range of uses may be more appropriate wording. On the other hand “permitting” new Major Community Facilities without amending the plan is entirely appropriate. b) Policy 5 refers to the improvement of the existing infrastructure network in the Central Area and the issue of taxes is beyond the scope of the Regional Official Plan. c) Policy 1 a) addresses this issue by encouraging all scales of retail facilities. d) No change proposed. The Federal Government leases 70% of the office space it occupies in the Central Area and therefore is not likely to investigate ways to use/reuse most of the space it occupies. The Regional interest is to encourage the Federal Government to maintain its concentration of administrative functions in the Central Area either in leased or owned space.

**Recommendation** - a) Change Section 3.4.2. by replacing the word “permitting” in Policy 1 a) by the word “encouraging”. b) No change. c) No change. d) No change.

**119. Section 3.4.2, Policy 2** - The Region has no frame of reference or context to appeal any rezoning or minor variance for an increase in building height in the Central Area. Revise the policy to indicate support for the policies and initiatives of the City of Ottawa in limiting building heights to preserve the visual integrity and symbolic primacy of the Parliament Buildings. (109)

**Response** - Policy 2 ties in with Objective 2 and Policy 1g). It states a regional interest in protecting the visual integrity and symbolic primacy of the Parliament Buildings beyond its support for the City's policies.

**Recommendation** - No change.



**120. Section 3.4.2, Policy 4** - Delete the words “provided that they are cost effective”. (285)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 3.4.2. by deleting the words in Policy 4 “provided that they are cost effective”.**

**121. Section 3.4.2, Policy 5** - Support additional units to the Central Area, but suggest providing a more detailed policy direction and indicating support for the City’s policy. (109) Strongly endorse Policy 5 b). (303)

**Response** - The specific policies of the City could be considered. There is no need to refer to the City of Ottawa’s policy.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**122. Section 3.4.2, Policy 6** - This policy is in contrast with all other areas for which no requirement to provide open spaces for residents is clearly stated. The need for open space is one shared by all residents of all areas and this notion should be set out in unequivocal term in the plan. (202)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Refer to Recommendation 78.**

**123. Section 3.4.2, Policy 7** - Strongly endorse giving priority to transit, cycling, and walking as the principal modes of improving access to and mobility within the Central Area. (303)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **No Change.**

**124. Section 3.4.2, Policy 9** - Suggest the following for Policy 9: “Accommodate pedestrian movements in the Central Area primarily at-grade along public streets. At selected locations, support development of a continuous below-grade pedestrian network, such as between hotels and convention facilities, and consider above-grade, weather-protected links, where these facilities do not detract from the quality of the street environment.”

**Response** - No change needed as the proposed wording is very similar to Policies 8 and 9.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**125. Section 3.4.2, Policy 10, 11, 12** - These policies should apply to all urban areas. (310)

**Response** - No change needed as similar recommendations applying to all urban areas are embodied in the Transportation Master Plan.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**126. Section 3.4.2, Policy 10** - a) Add to Policy 10 a) “to accommodate pedestrian demand”. (285) b) Add the following to Policy 10: d) “ensuring that the local zoning by-law requires uses at grade to be street-oriented, having their principal entrance fronting on the sidewalk.” (317)

**Response** - a) No change needed because the introduction to Policy 10 a) assumes this. b) Agree.

**Recommendation** - a) No change. b) **Change Section 3.4.2 by adding the following to Policy 10:**

d) **“requiring uses at grade to be street-oriented, having their principal entrance fronting on the sidewalk.”**

**127. Section 3.4.2, Policy 11** - a) Delete “where feasible” in Policy 11 c) because space should always be provided for pedestrians even if less than ideal. (109) b) Replace “whenever possible” in Policy 11 d) with “in any new road construction or road reconstruction, with the option of removing current instances wherever possible”. (303) c) Change Policy 11 by: “a) giving pedestrian priority; b) providing curb drops and adequate waiting space for pedestrians at all intersections; c) removing channelled right-turn lanes and avoiding multiple left-turn lanes where there are significant volumes of pedestrian traffic.” (285)

**Response** - a) Agree. b) No change is needed as the intent of “whenever possible” is to cover the situations of road construction, reconstruction as well as removing current instances wherever possible. c) Agree to change Policy 11 d).

**Recommendation** - a) **Change 3.4.2. by deleting “where feasible” from Policy 11 c).** b) **No change** c) **Change Section 3.4.2, Policy 11 d) by replacing it with the following:**

d) **“when constructing, reconstructing or rehabilitating Regional roads, avoid or remove channelised right-turn and multiple left-turn lane configurations wherever possible.”**

**128. Section 3.4.2, Policy 14** - Add another policy to read “request the City of Ottawa to eliminate parking requirements for commercial buildings in the Central Area” (285)

**Response** - Do not think it would be appropriate to add such wording. Council will work with the City of Ottawa to implement Policy 14.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**129. Section 3.4.2, Policy 15** - The policy should be reworded along the lines of “Council shall work with the City of Ottawa to ensure the provision of adequate off-street loading facilities and services through the development approvals process.” (109)

**Response** - Agree to change Policy 15 to say “work with the City of Ottawa to ensure...”.

**Recommendation** - **Change Policy 15 by replacing the words “In reviewing development applications, require” by the words “Work with the City of Ottawa to ensure”...**

**130. Section 3.4.2, Policy 16** - a) Endorse managing loading zones to minimize conflicts with cyclists and other modes. In addition, loading zones should be relocated so as not to conflict with designated cycling routes in the Cycling Transportation Network. (303) b) Add “existing” loading zones and “taxi stands” and delete “vehicular”. (303)

**Response** - a) Agree but not always possible, and wording should reflect this. b) No need to change as this policy applies to existing as well as future loading zones and its intent is to minimize their effects on pedestrian, cycle and also vehicular movement.

**Recommendation** - **a) Change Section 3.4.2, Policy 16, by adding “,with particular attention paid to designated Cycling Transportation Network Routes. b) No change.**

**131. Section 3.5, Major Community Facilities** - a) State in paragraph 4 that once selected as the best location, a site will be serviced at no cost to the Region. (163) b) While access by transit is emphasized, access by bicycle is not. All such facilities should include safe, convenient access routes by bicycle from existing cycling network routes. (303) c) The first and fifth paragraphs of Section 3.5 list the Central Canada Exhibition as a Major Community Facility. Rewrite to take into account that this is not a facility but an event. (109)

**Response** - a) Policy 6 addresses this principle. Changes are not required. b) Agree, however no change needed as Section 9 addresses this. c) Agree, it is the site of the Central Canada Exhibition that is designated as a Major Community Facility. The site is designated in the Regional Official Plan to ensure that a proposed new site be screened against the impacts it may have on Regional Services and against the objectives of the Regional Official Plan.

**Recommendation** - **a) and b) No change. 3) Change Section 3.5 by inserting the words “the site of” in front of “the Central Canada Exhibition” in the first and fifth paragraph of Section 3.5.**

**132. Section 3.5.1, Objective 1** - a) Delete the words “and road” to strengthen the other provisions of the plan which give priority to alternative travel modes. (285) b) Who defines “important” natural environment, public open space and heritage resources?

**Response** - a) No change required as the intent is to provide a balance b) The importance of natural environment, agricultural, mineral aggregate, and public open space resources will be assessed against the criteria used for the plan designations. As per Policy 2 of Section 6.8, information will need to be gathered to assess the significance of heritage resources.

**Recommendation** - a) and b) no change.

**133. Section 3.5.1, Objective 2** - Modify Objective 2 to encourage the location of Major Community Facilities anywhere by not requiring an amendment to the Regional Official Plan and by requiring a rationale from a proponent for any site not within the Central Area. (163)

**Response** - This would be contrary to Council's objectives and policies regarding its control over the designation of sites for Major Community Facilities.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**134. Section 3.5.2, Policy 1** - Add the words: "provided that the proposed Major Community Facility will not have a negative impact on the residents of the Central Area". (285)

**Response** - This concern is addressed in Policy 6 of Section 2.5 as well as in Policy 9 of Section 3.2.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**135. Section 3.5.2, Policy 2** - a) Require the element of economic benefit to be included within any review. (163) b) Add "and the Town Centres". (279) c) The anticipated environmental impacts are to be mitigated to an acceptable level. Who decides, and against what standards what is the acceptable? (202) d) Site selection for a hospital should include a noise study to assess the noise impact of airport operations including helicopter noise during medevac flights. (105)

**Response** - a) Policies of this section are directed at selecting the most appropriate site. Proponent of facilities with a strategic importance will be expected to provide such a study as described in Section 4.1.2, Policy 10. b) Agree. c) Council will make a decision with the input from staff and environmental experts. d) When selecting a site for a hospital, staff agree to require a study to assess the noise impact of airport operations.

**Recommendation** - a), and c) No change. b) and d) Change Section 3.5.2 by adding "and Town Centres" after "outside the Central Area"; and the following to Policy 2:

f) "noise impacts of airport operations, including noise from medevac flights, have been addressed when selecting a site for a hospital."

**136. Section 3.5.2, Policy 5** - First, there is some question as to whether the Region can prevent an area municipality from enacting a zoning by-law pending an agreement that has no basis in the

Act. Second, it is not appropriate for the Region to prevent an area municipality from listing a university, college, stadium, hospital or like use as a permitted use, except by site specific zoning amendment. (109) Delete and replace with a policy requiring a plan of subdivision to protect the Region's interest. (163)

**Response** - Agree on the first point. It may not be necessary to require that a proponent enter into an agreement with the Region before enacting a zoning by-law as the agreement would be dealt with at the time of the Regional Official Plan approval and precede a zoning by-law amendment. Disagree on the second point as the site selection for new major community facilities must respect the policies of the Regional Official Plan.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 3.5.2 by replacing Policy 5 based on the current Regional Official Plan policy:**

5. **“When considering a proposed new site for a Major Community Facility, require that the proponent has resolved who bears the cost, the form of financial security and land required to provide provincial highway improvements, regional roads, public transit and any other infrastructure required to service the proposed Major Community Facility to the satisfaction of Regional Council.”**

**137. Section 3.5.2, Policy 6** - Wording should be added to allow more flexibility and encourage alternative financing initiatives. (279)

**Response** - No need to add such wording as the intent of the policy is to simply state that Council will not contribute to costs of improving or constructing services for new Major Community Facilities if it means that improvements to services elsewhere will be delayed.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**138. Section 3.6, General Urban Area** - Remove the “wherever possible” in the first paragraph as all shopping, services and community facilities should be reachable safely and conveniently without a car - both as a matter of basic equity for those without cars, and to ensure this plan meets its modal share targets. (303)

**Response** - Generally agree. However, the “wherever possible” recognizes that many facilities are not accessible. The plan is seeking to achieve accessibility by all travel modes.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**139. Section 3.7 General Rural and Villages** -

1. Introduction needs to be amended to reflect the character of the rural area and define type of development envisioned. Need reference to hamlets. (163)
2. Emphasis should be added to utilize new technology solutions related to water, waste water, heating and cooling systems. Without such an objective we will continue to develop using outdated technology. (163)

3. It may be appropriate to require municipalities to create a differentiation between small villages, large villages and hamlets and rural development to define a set of objectives for each. This would allow municipalities to set out how Regional objectives are to be attained by each municipality. (163)

**Response -**

1. Agree add a short description of types of development in the rural area.
2. The objective in the official plan is to protect the environment. How to achieve this is not an objective. The policies stating how this objective is to be achieved are in Section 10.3 which provides a wide range of servicing options.
3. Villages are designated in the Regional Official Plan. Agree that the Region Official Plan should provide direction on what should be contained in a village plan. This is added to Section 3.7.3.

**Recommendation - See recommendation 141 and 150.**

**140. Section 3.7 -** How does one reconcile a) keeping the distribution of development consistent with rural character with b) focusing it in the villages, while c) respecting existing Village Character? They seem to be in conflict. Either you allow the usual estate lot development or you focus on the village.

**Response -** The intent is to focus development in the villages. In many villages designated in local official plans there is a large supply of vacant land to accommodate a lot of the future growth anticipated. Estate lot development will continue to be permitted (see Section 3.7.4).

**Recommendation - See Recommendation 141.**

**141. Section 3.7 -** Directing development to the General Rural Area would appear to conflict with many of the objectives of the RDS and other policies of this plan. We recommend that this policy be modified to delete the reference to directing development to the General Rural Area (321)

We support the focusing of residential development in villages the latter can potentially provide the same role as integrated communities in the urban area, especially to reduce private automobile trips. (310)

**Response -** Agree. The objective in Section 3.7.1 is to focus the development in villages.

**Recommendation -** Change Section 3.7 by deleting the sentence “Development is mainly directed to the General Rural Area and Villages” and replace it with “Rural development is focused in Villages. In areas designated General Rural Area lower density country lot development is permitted.”

Section 3.7, second paragraph add “Residential development will occur on primarily on larger country estate lots. Industrial and commercial uses that require larger land areas that are not appropriate to locate in villages are located in General Rural Areas.”

**Section 3.7 third paragraph add “Development will occur primarily on smaller lots. Section 3.7, add a paragraph after paragraph 3. “In addition small clusters of development occur in hamlets throughout the rural area. There is some potential for infilling in these areas.”**

**142. Section 3.7.1 - a)** Recommend objectives for home based businesses, high technology based incubators and resource related research and development initiatives.

b) Recommend an objective be added to promote new technology advancements to create new communities. (163).

**Response - a)** Objective 7, to promote a vibrant rural economy is broad enough to support the suggested objective for home based businesses etc.. References to these types of activities have been added to Section 3.7.4 policy 1c).

b) The objective of the plan is to focus rural development in Villages and to permit an amount and distribution of development consistent with maintaining rural character. The policies in Section 10.3 allow for a variety of servicing options to achieve the objectives.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**143. Section 3.7.1 -** The objectives should be developed and implemented in concert with the local municipality. (256)

**Response -** The objectives for rural development are based on input on the Community Vision, the rural workshops and consultation with the area municipalities. Agree that implementation of the objectives will be done in concert with the area municipalities.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**144. Section 3.7.1 -** Add a tenth objective namely:

10. to minimize adverse impact on the environment.(229)

**Response -** Section 1.4 Goal 8 “preserve the integrity of natural systems by directing land use and development in a way that maintains ecosystem functions over time” applies to all sections of the official plan. Restating the objective in Section 3.7.1 is not necessary.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**145. Section 3.7.1 Objective 8 -** Reference should be made to page 41 which indicates where this would apply. Need a greater range of opportunities to allow communal services. (163)

**Response -** The objective is to allow for communal/central services. The policies stating when communal services would be considered are found in Section 10.3 Water and Wastewater Services in the Rural Area.

**Recommendation: No change.**

**146. Section 3.7.2 policy 1** - Recommend that this section be reworded to add a clause encouraging the use of alternative environmentally sound technologies for individual systems. (163)

**Response** - Section 10.3 contains the policies for water and wastewater services. The section does not specify the types of system to be used as long as it is environmentally sound. The clause is not necessary.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**147. Section 3.7.2 policy 2** - This policy should refer to “rural policy areas” in line 2 rather than “rural municipality”. (87)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Section 3.7.2 policy 2 by deleting the words “rural municipality” and replace them with “rural policy areas”**

**148. Section 3.7.2. policy 2** - This section should be amended to note that communal systems will be considered for rural development. A servicing options study can be used to determine whether communal systems are feasible. (321)

**Response** - Section 10.3 has policies for a variety of servicing options in the rural area, including communal services. Policy 2 should be clarified to indicate that the policy only refers to the extension of central services or the installation of communal services on a large scale. Policy 1 would be clearer if the reference was only to Section 10.3 and didn’t refer to development on the basis of private services. Private individual services is only one of the alternatives permitted in Section 10.3

**Recommendation - Delete Section 3.7.2 policy 1 and replace it with:**

**1. “Approve development in the rural area in accordance with the policies of Section 10.3 for water and wastewater services”.**

**Delete Section 3.7.2 policy 2 and replace it with:**

**2. “Not consider any development on the basis of the extension of central services or the installation of communal services on a large scale in a rural municipality, except to remedy a health problem, until a study has been completed to justify the extension or installation of services, in accordance with Section 10.3.8”**

**149. Section 3.7.3 policy 1** - Village boundaries should be defined in local official plans. A Regional Official Plan amendment should not be required to change village boundaries. This should be left to the local level. (227, 87, 256, 163, 279, 132)



**Response** - Agree. The definition of the village boundary is a local matter that is best handled at the community level through local Official Plans. It is proposed that the village boundaries be defined in local official plans.

**Recommendation** - Delete Section 3.7.3 policy 1 and replace it with:

1. **“Villages are designated on Schedule A. The Village boundaries shown on Schedule A are general in nature. Area municipalities shall define precise Village boundaries in local official plans.”**

**150. Section 3.7.3** - Should include the use of local official plans to define the specific development layout for the community. (163)

**Response** - Agree. The 1988 Regional Official Plan contains policies for local official plans.

**Recommendation** - Add a new Section 3.7.3 policy 2 and renumber the policies that follow accordingly.

2. **“Area municipalities shall plan for the development of Villages in local official plans which shall:**
  - a) **define the expected growth for at least a ten year planning period,**
  - b) **include a plan of the Village showing existing and proposed land uses, the boundary of the Village and the total number of dwelling units within the boundary,**
  - c) **support development in historic village cores and main streets with a mix of uses and a pedestrian friendly street scape,**
  - d) **ensure that development fronts on local and Regional Roads rather than reverse lotting unless compelling reasons exist to do otherwise,**
  - e) **encourage the establishment of community facilities and commercial uses within village boundaries.”**

**151. Section 3.7.3 policy 2** - The phrase “keep to a minimum any additional lot creation outside the Village” should be removed or clarified to convey how it will be interpreted. (87, 227)

The phrase “maximize the use of any service” could imply increased densities. Densities should be developed with desired village character and priorities as the paramount factor. The clause should be rewritten to ensure development form is not implied through such a clause. (256)

**Response** - Add a reference to respecting existing communities and village character after shall maximize the use of any service. Agree to clarify the phrase “keep to a minimum any additional lot creation outside the village” including it in Section 10.3.8.

**Recommendation** - See recommendation 650; and delete Section 3.7.3 policy 2 and replace it with:

2. **“Ensure that Village development on communal/central services is consistent with the servicing policies of Section 10.3 and shall maximize the use of any services while respecting existing communities and Village character.”**

**152. Section 3.7.3 policy 3** - The required studies should preclude the need to change the Regional Official Plan. (256)

**Response** - Precise boundaries are to be defined in local official plans (see revision Section 3.7.3 policy 1). The policy should be reworded to refer to local official plans.

**Recommendation** - **Section 3.7.3 policy 3 delete “When considering expansions to the boundaries of villages, or increasing the total potential development in the Village, require a study to :” with “When considering local official plan amendments which expand the boundaries of villages or increase the total potential development in the Village, require a study to:”**

**153. Section 3.7.3 policy 3** - The Section sets out many criteria for Village expansion. However there seems to be no consideration of surrounding agricultural lands. An expansion study should review the direction of development in order avoid prime agricultural areas. Recommend the following policy be added:

- e) expansions to Agricultural Resource Areas are only permitted where:
1. there are no reasonable alternatives which avoid prime agricultural areas ;and
  2. there are no reasonable alternatives with lower priority agricultural lands in the Agricultural Resource Area (321)

**Response** - Agree. Add criteria for village expansions.

**Recommendation** - **Section 3.7.3 policy 3b) add new policies:**

- e) **justify any proposal to extend the existing Village on lands designated Agricultural Resource Area on Schedule A, based on the long term demand for the village expansion in the area municipality as a whole and demonstrate that there are no reasonable alternatives which avoid Agricultural Resource Areas and no reasonable alternates to avoid poorer soils within Agricultural Resource Areas;**
- f) **ensure that any proposal to extend the existing Village does not extend the Village onto lands designated Provincially Significant Wetland, Natural Environment Area ‘A’, or Natural Environment Area ‘B’ as designated on Schedule A."**

**154. Section 3.7.3 policy 3b) iii)** - This section is not clear. Suggested wording: “specific requirements associated with draft subdivision approval in any phase of the proposed Village.” (229)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Delete Section 3.7.3 policy 3b) iii) and replace it with:**

- iii) **“specific requirements associated with draft subdivision approval in any sub-area of the Village.”**

**155. Section 3.7.3 policy 4** - The term substantial needs to be defined by set criteria because it is too vague and open to interpretation. (229)

**Response -** Agree. Reword the policy to clarification.

**Recommendation - Delete Section 3.7.3 policy 4 and replace it with:**

4. “ Consider modifying the specific study requirements of Policy 3 above, if the approval authority under the Part VIII program of the *Environmental Protection Act* has sufficient information to evaluate the servicing implications of the expansion of the Village boundary.”

**156. Section 3.7.3 policy 4 -** The Conservation Authorities have the approval authority now but area municipalities are proposed to have it by October. Suggest you use the term approval authority.( 227)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Section 3.7.3 policy 4 delete the words “Conservation Authority” and replace them with “approval authority of sewage disposal systems under Part VIII of the *Environmental Protection Act*”.**

**157. Section 3.7.3 policy 5 -** Change reference to Agricultural Code of Practice to Minimum Separation Distance, since the former no longer exists. (279, 321)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Section 3.7.3 policy 5 delete the words “*Agricultural Code of Practice*” and replace them with “*Minimum Distance Separation* as amended from time to time.”**

**158. Section 3.7.3 policy 7 -** Zoning is a local matter. We permit some forms of multiple unit development in villages now as servicing permits. We don’t want mobile home parks in village areas. (227)

Recommend that if the Region has an interest in allowing this form of development only in villages then the section should clearly reflect this interest. This would not be supported by West Carleton. If the intent is to deal with servicing then there should simply be a reference to servicing agreements where they are to be developed in Villages. (163)

**Response -** It is recognized that zoning is a local responsibility. There is no requirement in the policy to require area municipalities to permit mobile home parks in villages (the reference to mobile home parks is used as an example). The intent of the policy is that multiple unit development occur only where the area municipality is supporting the development in the local official plan. Section 3.7.4 policy 1b) permits multiple unit development on the General Rural Area. The requirements for multiple unit development are found in Section 10.3.4.

**Recommendation - Section 3.7.3 policy 7, delete the first sentence and replace it with, “Permit multiple unit development provided that area municipalities provide for multiple unit development in the local official plan.”**

**159. Section 3.7.3 policy 7** - Suggest that the last sentence should read “Development shall be supported by the servicing studies and agreements required in Section 10.3”.(229)

**Response** - The requirement for servicing agreements for this policy are found in Section 10.3.4

**Recommendation** - No change.

**160. Section 3.7.4** - Section 7.4.3 requires that severances within Agricultural Resource Areas have a covenant on title acknowledging that the lot is in an agricultural area and may be subject to nuisances from agricultural operations. Suggest this policy be included for all designations.(272,)

**Response** - Farming is only one of the permitted uses in the General Rural Area. Since other uses may be permitted in the designation, it is possible that in the future, farming could be replaced by another land use on the property. As a result it is not advisable to put a covenant on title warning of potential impacts of farming activities.

**Recommendation** - No change. The covenant on title will only apply in lands designated Agricultural Resource Area.

**161. Section 3.7.4 policy 1c)**

a) Suggest additional wording to read: “to meet the needs of the rural and travelling public”.(132)

This is too restrictive A broader range of uses are required. The range of uses should be broadened to include business parks, home based opportunities, research and development and incubator operations. Recommend tourism be added to the list. (279, 163)

b) The policy allows for industrial and commercial uses and the development of large tracts of land for industrial uses without demonstrating the need for the proposed uses in a manner consistent with other growth related objectives for the plan.. We request that this be modified to reflect orderly, planned growth. (321)

**Response** - a) Agree to broaden the range of uses to include rural, home based opportunities and tourism.

b) The official plan allows for these uses to be established in the General Rural Area because due to the nature of these uses and the large land requirements they are not suitable to be located in the urban serviced area or in many cases villages. These uses are necessary to support a vibrant rural and regional economy.

**Recommendation** - Delete Section 3.7.4 policy 1c) and replace it with:

c) “ industrial and commercial uses to meet the needs of the rural and travelling public, or which relate to local resources, or industrial uses requiring large tracts of land, or home based opportunities including research and development”

add new policy “1k) tourism uses”.

**162. Section 3.7.4 policy 1g) -** The Province recommends adding the words “portable asphalt plants” after the word “quarries” in accordance with provincial Policy Statements to recognize and permit portable asphalt plants. (321)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Section 3.7.4 policy 1g):** add the words “portable asphalt plants” after the word “quarries”

**163. Section 3.7.4 policy 1h) -** Site plans require screening, by-laws do not.

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Section 3.7.4 policy 1h) by replacing “the by-law” in the last sentence and replace it with “area municipalities”.**

**164. Section 3.7.4 policy 1j) -** Use the term Agricultural Uses instead of farming. (154)

**Staff Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Section 3.7.4 policy 1j) by deleting the word “farming” and replace it with “Agricultural Uses”.**

**165. Section 3.7.4 policy 1j) -** This policy should be deleted. The requirement that farms in the General Rural Area designation must be subject to the severance policies which apply to the Agricultural Resource Area designation is extremely unreasonable. (212)

**Response -** Country lots and infill lots are permitted within General Rural Areas. The intent of this policy is to also permit farm severances. This approach adds flexibility for farmers wishing to sever a lot for farm purposes that would not meet the criteria for country lot or infill.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**166. Section 3.7.4 policies 2 & 3 -** The Conservation Authorities support the minimum lot size in the General Rural Area as well as complementary policies for portions of the River Corridors. (229)

Recommend that this be a general criteria with objectives articulated for why various sizes should be encouraged, even within a plan of subdivision. These criteria may be related to the use on environmentally sound technologies, recognition of specific conditions, such as geology, natural features etc.. (163)

Minimum lot size of 10 hectares is necessary to maintain a rural area distinct from the urban area. (191)

Add to the end of the existing sentence “the development has an average lot size of not less than .8 ha per dwelling unit when averaged over all the land in the development including parkland and

other public dedications. This approach would be beneficial to the RMOC and its residents in our attempts at environmental protection of significant rural resources. (132)

**Response** - The intent of establishing a 0.8 ha minimum lot size for country lots is to maintain rural character, provide a choice in rural residential housing types and make a distinction between larger country lots and smaller village and hamlet lots.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**167. Section 3.7.4 policy 2 -**

a) The General Rural Area designation minimum lot size provisions do not adequately protect the groundwater resources in the area and does not adequately reflect the existence of extensive woodlots and wildlife habitat that coexists with agricultural usage. It does not recognize 1995 decisions by Kanata City Council and Ontario Municipal Board decisions regarding the existing 2 ha minimum, average 3 ha

lot sizes for development purposes. The Kanata Rural Conservation Group is concerned for the paramouncy of these municipal conditions in the event of restructuring of municipal/regional government. (125, 161)

b) This section should be expanded that if country lots are to be established by plan of subdivision, an impact assessment to determine the impact of sewage effluent on the groundwater will establish the minimum lot size. (321)

**Response** - a) The area is designated General Rural Area in the current (1988) Regional Official Plan. No change is proposed in the draft Official Plan. The policy defines the minimum lot size. The Kanata Official Plan provides more detail and is more restrictive than the Regional Official Plan in this area. If municipal structures are reorganized than local and Regional Official Plan policies would be required to be consolidated into one comprehensive document. Clarification is required to identify the circumstances that may result in the need for larger lots. A clause sentence should be added to the policy to indicate that a larger minimum lot size may be required for the safe operation of water and wastewater systems.

b) Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 3.7.4 policy 2 after the sentence “Require that country lots have a minimum lot size of 0.8 hectares, whether created by plan of subdivision or severance” by adding “Lot sizes of greater than 0.8 hectares may be required to ensure that there will be no adverse effect on the quality or quantity of water in other wells operating in the general area and to provide for the safe operation of wastewater disposal systems. This will be determined by studies required in Section 10.3.2”.**

**168. Section 3.7.4 policy 2a) -** Is the Rideau Canal itself and the lock stations considered to be a cultural landscape feature? Support this policy provided that there is sufficient setback and design controls to protect the heritage values of the shoreland. (236)

**Response** - The policies would apply to the Rideau Canal.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**169. Section 3.7.4 policy 3a) -** Recommend that the policy be altered to note that there may be a natural feature where an extension to that point is logical and recognize that the increase in depth may be justified to provide a more rational remnant situation or better servicing situations. The need for options is essential to make this policy work in practice. (163)

**Response -** Revise the policy to include natural features and roads. The depth of the lots may vary slightly but the frontage of the new lot must be on the existing road. the intent of the policy is to not create a second tier of lots behind the existing development.

**Recommendation - Change Section 3.7.4 by adding a new policy 3b)**

**“3b) features such as rivers and creeks and roads may be used to define the extent of development”**  
**polices 3b) and 3c) are renumbered 3c) and 3d).**

**170. Section 3.7.4 policy 3c) -** Osgoode objects to the preclusion of the development of residentially-sized lots on the river side of River Road. (227)

We support this policy as a way of curtailing infill along the canal south of Regional Road 6. (236)

**Response -** The policy does not apply in Osgoode because there is no land designated General Rural Area upstream of Regional Road 6.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**171. Section 3.7.4 policy 4 -** Recommend that this be amended to clearly state that while it is not encouraged it is possible, provided the design is done recognizing the inevitable future of the area. (163, 132)

Request that the policy be amended to allow for development to occur as either country lot development on private services or private services (commercial) as long as the future urban purposes is not jeopardized. Examples of steps that could be taken include siting of units to allow for redevelopment or having clusters at high densities with the bulk of the lands left vacant. (113)

**Response -** The Provincial Policy Statement states that development and land use patterns that would hinder the efficient expansion of urban areas or rural settlement areas are not permitted in adjacent areas. Policy 4 does not to permit country lot development where it would occupy the only possibility for expansion of an urban area or village. It intent is not to create low density development that will create an inefficient development pattern in later years.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**172. Section 3.7.4 policy 4 -** There may be more than one possibility for expansion of villages or urban areas and as such development should not be permitted in those areas. Recommend that the words “the only” be deleted and replaced with the word “a”. (321)

**Response** - The intent of the policy is not to create low density development that will create an inefficient development pattern in later years. There is no justification for limiting development in General Rural Areas where it is clear that the area will not be included in future urban area/village expansions.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**173. Section 3.7.4 policy 5** - Revise to clarify if the 10 ha requirement is intended to apply to country lots or country lot subdivisions of that size. (87)

How will the RMOC ensure that building permit applications results in the planting of trees except through subdivision agreements? It is suggested the policy be rethought or be removed entirely. (212)

Who determines whether a site has sufficient mature tree cover and/or topographic variety? Is it reasonable to require a 10 hectare severance to plant trees? The principle is good but the implementation seems excessive. (279)

The environmental/ecological value of this policy should be acknowledged in the plan not just the aesthetic value. (229)

Recommend that this be applied universally and that tree cover desires be clearly articulated, with a rationale for the need. (163)

Terms such as “visually dominant” and “attractive sites” are subjective, judgmental and likely unenforceable. Section 5.2.3 Design with Nature deals with the issue more effectively. (272)

**Response** - The policy applies to the creation of new country lots and does not apply to existing lots (won't affect the issuance of building permits for existing lots).

The decision on whether the site meets the criteria will be made by the approval authority: The Region for country lot subdivisions and Regional Land Division and local Committees of Adjustment for severances. Tree planting may be required to ensure that the house would not be visually dominant on the landscape but this would not require trees to be planted on the whole 10 ha site.

The ecological and environmental benefits of trees are addressed in Section 5.2.1 Protection of Vegetation Cover, Section 5.2.2 Protection of Water Resources and Erosion Prevention and Section 5.2.3 Design with Nature.

Agree that the policy should apply to all country lots regardless of size.

**Recommendation - Change Section 3.7.4 policy 5 by deleting “having lot sizes of less than 10 hectares”.**

**174. Section 3.7.4 policy 6** - Parks Canada is very concerned about potential strip development along Regional Road 2 where the road is in close proximity to the canal. We trust this policy will prevent this from occurring. (236)

Strip development should be defined (212, 272, 229)

Very good to have this included. Reference to 6.4 should be 6.5 (279)

**Response** - Strip development is defined in Section 3.7.3 Policy 6 as extensions in length beyond the limit of lots of record existing on the date of the adoption of this Plan or in new lots significantly smaller than existing lots.



**Recommendation - No change.**

**175. Section 3.7.4 policy 6** - It is suggested that the policy be expanded to also restrict strip development on all public roads. Strip development in rural areas can lead to the requirement for additional municipal services in an area. (321)

**Response** - The Regional interest in limiting strip development along Regional Roads and Provincial Highways is related to safety issues. Provincial Highways and Regional Roads carry higher volumes of traffic that move at a greater speed. The interest is in the movement of traffic. Policies for local communities including villages, hamlets and development along local roads (including frontage requirements) are addressed in local official plan since they are related to community design and local requirements.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**176. Section 3.7.4 policy 7** - Will the Region be providing mapping and information on land which is unsuitable for development? (279)

**Response** - Where the information exists, the Region will provide information to the area municipalities. In some cases the area municipalities have completed private services studies that assess the suitability of an area for development. Also Environmental Constraints are identified on Schedule G, Natural Environment Areas A and B are designated on Schedule A and Environmental Features are designated on Schedule K.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**177. Section 3.7.4 policy 8** - Change reference from Agricultural Code of Practice to Minimum Separation Distance since the former no longer exists. (Cumberland 279, 321)

Does this reflect the intent of the Policy Statement, our interpretation has been that new development must conform to the requirements. (163)

**Response** - The Regional Official Plan must have regard to Provincial Policy statements. The policy states that the Region will have regard to the Minimum Distance Separation in the policy statement. The reference will be changed to Minimum Distance Separation formulae.

**Recommendation - Change Section 3.7.4 policy 8 by deleting the words “Agricultural Code of Practice” and replacing them with “Minimum Distance Separation as amended from time to time.”**

**Comments on the General Rural Area Designation on Schedule A**

**178. Cumberland, Conc. 1, 3, Lot 21** - The two parcels of land on the south side of Regional Road 26 are shown as General Rural Area. These lands are within an area that is largely

agricultural in nature and should be retained as Agricultural Resource Area. By permitting these areas to be designated as General Rural Area, these properties could be subject to extensive lot creation along a Regional Road. This form of strip development is not desirable. (279)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Change from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area.**

**179. Cumberland, Conc. 6, E 1/2 Lot 4** - A small portion of the property is not suitable for agriculture. (83)

**Response** - Agree. The property is designated General Rural Area in the draft Official Plan.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**180. Cumberland, Conc. 6, NE 1/4 of Lot 19** - This property should not be designated as farm land.(13)

**Response** - Agree. The property is designated General Rural Area in the draft Official Plan.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**181. Cumberland, Conc. 9, 10, Lot 9** - The lands although treed represent a small pocket of marginal land amongst the surrounding agricultural area. The property should be designated Agricultural Resource Area.

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Change Conc. 9, 10, Lot 9 Cumberland from Rural Resource Area to Agricultural Resource Area.**

**182. Osgoode, Conc. B.F., Lots 31, 32, 33** - The proposed General Rural designation will cause conflicts for existing farming operations to the north (dairy farm on lot 30) and south. Changing the Agricultural Resource Area designation will limit the use of the land and change the way of life for the people in the area. The draft Official Plan states that rezoned land must be in blocks of 600 acres (250 ha) or more. The area in question is approximately 450 acres in size. Lot 31 (sod farm, red pine plantation, hay, pasture), lot 32 (grain, corn, red and white pine plantation) and lot 33 (hay, Christmas trees) are presently being used for agriculture. Regional Council voted to keep this land as Agricultural Resource Area (Amendment 42, Kent Currie et Al). (182, 183, 184, 245, 215, 239, 288)

**Response** - Agree. Staff have re-evaluated the area south of Osgoode village using revised soils information provided by the OMAFRA. The area has a mix of Class 3 and 4 soils and part of the area is being used for agriculture. The remaining area of Class 4 soils is not large enough to be

designated as General Rural Area. It is recommended that the area be designated Agricultural Resource Area. The poor pockets policy will provide some flexibility regarding lot creation on the Class 4 lands.

**Recommendation - Change Conc. B.F., Lots 31, 32, 33 Osgoode from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area.**

**183. Osgoode, Conc. 3, SE pt Lot 14** - The property has class 3 soils, is being farmed and should be designated Agricultural Resource Area, similar to the adjacent property. (Information Session)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Conc. 3, SE pt Lot 14 Osgoode from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area.**

**184. West Carleton, Conc. 10, E 1/2 Lot 20 (Fitzroy)** - The property has been farmed for many years and should be designated Agricultural Resource Area (5)

**Response -** Agree, change boundary of Agricultural Resource Area

**Recommendation - Change Conc. 10, E 1/2 Lot 20 Fitzroy from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area**

### **Errors, Omissions, and Clarifications in Section 3**

**185. Recommendation - Make the following corrections to Section 3.**

**Section 3.2, Policy 13 a)** - Change Policy 13 a) by replacing the word “routings” to the word “routes” to be consistent with the use of the term “transit routes”.

**James Island, Rideau Township** - James Island has not been designated in the draft Official Plan. Designate James Island General Rural Area on Schedule A.

### **Comments on Village Designation of Schedule A**

**186. Cumberland, Conc. 8, Lot 11 (adjacent to village of Navan)** - should be included within the village boundary. The property is a remnant parcel of land that due to an oversight was not originally included in the village boundary. Cumberland Township supports the change. (106, 279)

**187. Kanata, Conc. 4, Lot 27 (adjacent to the Village of Dunrobin)** - Request that the village boundary be expanded to include a two acre parcel west of the Village boundary. (188)

**188. West Carleton, Conc. 4, Lot 17 (Torbolton) (adjacent to the village of Constance Bay)**  
 - Village boundaries are shown on the draft Official Plan. No consideration has been given to future expansion and growth of villages. These boundaries should be looked at now for expansion not to stunt village growth (3).

**189. West Carleton, Conc. 4, NW 1/2 Lot 2, SE 1/2 Lot 3 (Torbolton) (adjacent to the Village of Dunrobin)** - Request that the property be included within the Village of Dunrobin. (251, 252)

**Response** - There has been criticism (see comments on Section 3.7.3) that a Regional Official Plan amendment would be required for expansion of village boundaries. The definition of the village boundary is a local matter that is best handled at the community level through local Official Plans. It is proposed that the village boundaries be defined in local official plans. The existing village boundaries will be shown on Schedule A conceptually with a note in the legend stating that the boundaries of villages are conceptual and that the precise boundaries are defined in local Official Plans. Requests for village expansions will be dealt at the local official plan level by amendment. The Village boundaries will not be defined in the Regional Official Plan level.

**Recommendation** - **The Village boundaries be shown conceptually on Schedule A. A note in the legend shall state that “Precise village boundaries shall be defined in local official plans”.**

**190. Goulbourn Boundary of Richmond** - The boundary of Richmond should be adjusted to coincide with the boundary in the Goulbourn official plan and also include the draft approved subdivision known as Cedarstone Investments. (87)

**Response** - Agree. The village boundaries for schedule A will be revised. As noted above Schedule A will indicate that “Precise village boundaries shall be defined in local official plans”.

**Recommendation** - **Revise the village boundaries for Richmond to coincide with the designation in the Goulbourn official plan.**

**191. Kanata, Conc. 3, Lot 27** - Dunrobin Private Services Study, Phase I (March 1992) indicated that further study should be undertaken before there is an attempt to create a village in the Kanata portion of Kanata. It is recommended that that the designation General Rural be extended to what is now called Village.( 212)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Change Conc. 3, Lot 27 Kanata from Village to General Rural Area.**

**192. Nepean, Conc. 2, pt Lot 1 & 2 (Village of Manotick)** - The lands in question are designated a Village by Nepean Official Plan amendment 2. If there is not immediate agreement that the omission was an oversight please treat this as an objection. (175)

**Response - Agree.** The area will be shown as village on Schedule A.

**Recommendation - Change Conc. 4, pt. Lot 1 & 2 Nepean from Agricultural Resource Area to Village.**

**193. Osgoode, Conc. 10, Lot 26 (adjacent to the village of Kenmore) -** The property is designated Village in the Osgoode Official Plan but approval of the village expansion is deferred pending justification for the need for the village expansion onto agricultural land. The Region should adopt the Village boundary for Kenmore in the Regional Official Plan. It is better to refer to one plan rather than two plans, it would be less confusing. A second recommendation is that since a large portion of the property is stony, gravelly and underlain by large boulders, the designation should be changed to General Rural Area. (282)

**Response -** As noted above, precise Village boundaries are to be defined in local official plans. The inclusion of the property into the village is being dealt with at the local level. The municipality is required to provide justification for the village expansion to lift the deferral of the designation. The land has class 3 soils, is in a larger Agricultural Resource Area and should remain as Agricultural Resource Area until the village expansion issue is dealt with.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**194. Comment -** The Village boundaries for Cumberland, Navan, Sarsfield and Vars are incorrect and should be revised. (279)

**Response - Agree.**

**Recommendation - Revise the Village boundaries to coincide with the approved boundaries in the local official plan.**

#### **General Comments on Section 4 - Economic Activity**

**195. a) Policies on economic development -** Region is commended for establishing policies to aid economic development in Ottawa-Carleton. (212) We are pleased to see a strong recognition in the Plan of economic development needs. There is a strong and accurate reflection of the ongoing structural changes in the economic base of the region. We support the priority given to strategic economic development initiatives. If the policies are to be effective, response times to strategic initiatives must be immediate. (278)

**b) Global market -** This section should look at promoting the Region on the Global market. (279)

**c) Economic Region -** The policies do not reflect the reality, noted on page 43, that the economic region extends beyond Ottawa-Carleton's boundary. (258)

**d) Employment -** The policies intend to create jobs for Ottawa-Carleton residents. However, movements to/from the region should not be understated. (258)

- e) **Environment** - Although this is not the section for major natural resource statements, much more could be done to flesh out the very important statement in the introduction to the section, that quality of life attracts business and tourists to the Region and therefore must be preserved and enhanced. (202) (266)
- f) **Culture** - There should be more emphasis on the cultural sector, as both a direct employer and a generator of tourism. Its role in helping to attract new employees should also be noted. Opera, book readings, plays, art galleries, etc. are not mentioned. Film location and festivals may deserve some attention. The role of neighbourhoods and villages has also been neglected. (310 and 266)
- g) **Other Issues** - This Section should also consider: employment to/from both provinces (government and private); economic retail activities in terms of benefits/leaks; economic growth related to competition vs. complementary; employment in the Central Area and the transportation overlap; potential influence of Québec economic development policies on the future economic activities of the Region. (258)

**Response** - a) Thanks. b) Agree but it would be more appropriate to do this through an economic development plan rather than through a land use plan. c) The Regional Official Plan policies must respect the RMOC's legal boundary, rather than the economic hinterland. d) Commuting patterns have been noted in several background reports, such as "OMATOC" and "Perspectives On The Ottawa-Carleton Economy", and considered during policy formulation. Regional Official Plan policy cannot directly be applied to the wider commutershed. e) Staff agree that there could be more background on this important aspect in Section 4. However, there could be more discussion on virtually every statement in the Section. Wording in the Plan is very tight to reduce its length. The Section notes the importance of quality of life, but leaves the specific policies to accomplish this in more appropriate sections of the Plan. f) Staff agrees that culture has a role in economic development. The Central Area policies (Section 3.4) does mention culture. g) Many of these were considered during the formulation of the policies.

**Recommendation** - No change.

#### **Specific Comments on Section 4 - Economic Activity**

**196. Section 4.1** - It makes little sense to say that less office-based activity is occurring in the Central Area. Since the majority of existing office space is located in downtown Ottawa, to decentralize this would place undo hardship places on retail within the office service area. The BIA recommends that all office space within the central area must be leased before office commercial development is approved." (265)

**Response** - There is no intent to decentralize office space out of the Central Area. The recommendation would have a major negative effect on the regional economy. Nevertheless, staff agrees to delete the words "and less office-based activity in the Central Area."

**Recommendation** - Change Section 4.1, the second bullet, by deleting "and less office-based activity in the Central Area." so that it reads as follows:

**“a greater proportion of regional economic activity occurring in the newer suburbs, especially those in the west;”**

**197. Section 4.1.1** - a) Add objectives to support cultural initiatives in light of their contribution to Ottawa-Carleton’s quality of life and direct employment. (109) List tourism and cultural heritage as a Council objective. (279) b) Mention the Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport, telecommunications and high technology. (258) c) Add three new objectives:

- “To create opportunities for cultural sectors to contribute to the Region’s economic and social development.”;
- “To ensure that major transportation infrastructure such as airports and train stations function efficiently.”; and
- “Support the implementation of a toll-free one-tier telecommunication service across the Region to promote economic development, improve overall communications and provide for equal opportunities for safe, healthy and balanced communities.” (310).

**Response** - a) Objective 4 as well as Section 3.4 on the Central Area address these points b) These matters are mentioned in the policies (Section 4.1.2) rather than in the objectives. c) Staff do not understand what kind of support can be given to cultural sectors, beyond what is already in the Plan, that is appropriate for a regional official plan. The Region does not have jurisdiction over the noted transportation infrastructure. For this reason staff feel the existing policies on these facilities cannot be elaborated. Toll-free telecommunication service for the entire region is a great economic development policy, but it is not an appropriate policy for an official plan - it needs to be in an economic development plan.

**Recommendation** - a), b) and c) **No change.**

**198. Section 4.1.1, Objective 1** - Replace “create” jobs by “facilitate the creation of” jobs. (109)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Replace “create” jobs by “facilitate the creation of” jobs.**

**199. Section 4.1.1, Objective 2** - Add a phrase such as “particularly in the Central Area and the Town Centres, and in established neighbourhood and village commercial areas.” (310)

**Response** - Agree with the first part, but not the second.

**Recommendation** - **Replace Objective 2 of Section 4.1.1 with: “To support the location of economic activity throughout Ottawa-Carleton, with special emphasis on the Central Area and Town Centres, consistent with other Council objectives.”**

**200. Section 4.1.1, Objective 3** - Mention greenspace, cultural life, active neighbourhoods which foster community, social, recreational and economic activities, as aspects of the quality of life in the Region. Affordability is also an issue. (310)

**Response** - Objective 3 is supported by Policy 2, which refers to other sections of the Plan which deal with the matters raised in the comment.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**201. Section 4.1.1, Objective 4** - How can the Region maintain and enhance the Central Area as the Region's focus for economic activity, and at the same time encourage development around transit stations. These policies are in direct conflict. This brief has a similar concern with Section 4.1.2, Policy 17. (265)

**Response** - The distribution of economic activity is not a zero-sum game. As economic activity and employment increase (see employment projections) many areas of the region will benefit. Also, due to the connectivity of the Transitway, development at many transitway stations will foster economic growth in the Central Area.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**202. Section 4.1.1, Objective 5** - Qualify with "affordable" and add if zoning allows such a use. (310)

**Response** - Sections 2, 9 and 10 of the Plan have policies on efficient servicing. Services will only be provided where the employment use is permitted by the Regional Official Plan, as required by the Planning Act. Services will not be provided for proposed development (economic or other) that does not, or will not in the future, comply with zoning. This qualification cannot realistically be added to every policy where it would be applicable.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**203. Section 4.1.1, Objective 7** - The objective does not have a corresponding policy .

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation - Add an additional policy in Section 4.1.2, Policy 18:**

**18. "Minimize the costs of Regional services/infrastructure and compare those costs with the costs of other comparable metropolitan areas."**

**204. Section 4.1.2** - Add a new policy for the Region to undertake a study on how the Corel Centre can be used as a basis to increase economic activity. (223)



**Response** - The Corel Centre has about 100 hectares of land approved for associated uses. Such a study is not needed at this time given the Regional Development Strategy.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**205. Section 4.1.2 Policy 1** - a) Suggest changing policy from 1,000 jobs to 2,000 jobs because 1,000 jobs could easily be added through one development and there should be allowance in the minimum level of servicing capacity for additional employment growth (212). b) Clarify how Policy 1 of Section 4.1.2, which discusses 1,000 jobs in employment areas in each Urban Centre and at selected locations inside the Greenbelt, fits with Section 4.4, Policy 2, which states that employment uses with a potential of fewer than 2,000 employees are permitted in the General Urban Area. (109) c) Also qualify the term “selected locations”. (109) (310)

**Response** - a) Generally agree. However the principles was debated and approved for 1,000 jobs when the RDS was considered. b) The two policies are not directly related. The purpose of Policy 1, Section 4.1.2 is to maintain a minimum reserve of water and wastewater capacity for major employment areas so that servicing will not be a barrier to job development at those locations where from a Regional perspective jobs would best be located. Policy 4, Section 4.4 is a general policy permitting employment uses in clusters of less than 2,000 jobs within designations not specifically related to employment, such as General Urban Area. These areas are not as large, so no servicing reserve is proposed to apply in the Official Plan. c) Qualification of the term “selected locations” would be cumbersome within Official Plan policy. The “selected locations” will change from time to time (once they are developed to their potential they will cease to be a selected location). In general, the selected locations inside the Greenbelt will be those that best support Regional Official Plan policy, e.g. the Central Area and Primary Employment Centres.

**Recommendation** - **Replace Section 4.1.2, Policy 1, with the following:**

1. **“Assist in maintaining an adequate supply of serviced land for economic development, by reserving sufficient water and wastewater capacity for new development/redevelopment proposals, which would directly create at least 1,000 jobs in designated employment areas, in each Urban Centre and at selected locations inside the Greenbelt.”**

**206. Section 4.1.2, Policy 3** - a) It would be helpful to clarify how “areas of strategic economic importance” are to be identified. (109) b) The policy should be consistent with Section 2.6.1. (310)

**Response** - a) It would be difficult to identify in advance, areas that may take on, over time, a status of economic importance. b) It is consistent.

**Recommendation** - **a) and b) No change.**

**207. Section 4.1.2, Policy 4** - You may want to refer to other policies. (310)

**Response** - This could be done, but there is an attempt to keep cross references to a minimum.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**208. Section 4.1.2, Policy 5** - a) The Regional Official Plan should not determine what the zoning by-law can regulate. Rewrite the policy to encourage area municipalities to implement the Regional strategy. (109) (212) b) Acknowledge the difference between residential zones as home-based businesses are inappropriate in apartments. (212) c) Add type of business to the matters controlled by zoning. (310)

**Response** - a) This policy helps implement such Regional Official Plan objectives as improving the balance of jobs and housing and reducing travel needs. To be consistent with other policies, Policy 5 should say “require” rather than “ensure”. The intent of the second sentence is to give examples of what could be regulated in relation to permitting home-based businesses. It should be deleted. b) Disagree with City of Kanata; certain home-based businesses are appropriate in apartments, particularly the ones that do not generate external visits. c) The entire reference to zoning is recommended for removal per the above.

**Recommendation** - **Change Policy 5 of Section 4.1.2 by replacing the word “Ensure” with the word “Require” and delete the second sentence of Policy 5.**

**209. Section 4.1.2, Policy 6** - The matter of permitting this type of use in the zoning by-law is a local responsibility and the prescriptive language should be deleted. Define the term “neighbourhood”. (109)

**Response** - This matter is of Regional interest and this policy helps implement several Regional Official Plan objective. To be consistent with the wording of other policies, “Ensure that local municipalities” should be replaced by “Require that zoning by-laws”. The word “neighbourhood” is used in the same sense as the word “community” as defined in Section 3 and for consistency should be replaced.

**Recommendation** - **Change Policy 6 of Section 4.1.2 by replacing “Ensure that local municipalities” with “Require that zoning by-laws” and by replacing the word “residential neighbourhoods” with the word “communities”.**

**210. Section 4.1.2, Policy 8** - Delete the policy. (310) (124)

**Response** - Agree. See response in Section 6.

**Recommendation** - **Delete Policy 8 of Section 4.1.2 and renumber the subsequent policies accordingly.**

**211. Section 4.1.2, Policy 9** - a) Define the term “telecentres” in the Glossary. (109) b) Expand the policy to look at the issue of long distance charges within the region to eliminate the problems of calling east/west for example. (279) (310)

**Response** - a) Agree. b) Agree with the issue but the Regional Official Plan is not the appropriate vehicle to achieve this. This issue could be addressed in an economic development plan.

**Recommendation** - a) Define the term “telecentre” in the Glossary as “A small satellite office within a community, linked electronically to a head office(s) or other offices.”  
b) No change.

**212. Section 4.1.2, Policy 10** - a) Include also the example of Major Community Facility (212), “chip fab” (279). b) Clarify that the function of universities is to provide support for such initiatives. (279) c) How is strategic benefit determined, and who determines it? Add a requirement for efficient transit and that other policies of the Plan will be met. (310)

**Response** - a) A research park is given as an example; this example is not exclusive. A number of other initiatives meeting the requirements of the Plan, could also be considered. b) Agree. c) Strategic benefit is determined based on the listed criteria, by the Region. Policy 10 outlines criteria to evaluate the value of a concept rather than the location of a development, therefore transit cannot be a determining criteria. The initiative will have to conform to the other policies of the Plan.

**Recommendation** - a) and c) No change. b) Replace in Section 4.1.2 Policy 10 c) the word “for” by the word “from”.

**213. Section 4.1.2, Policy 11** - a) The policy is premature, it depends on the results of a study per Policy 10. (4) b) Provide an additional policy which facilitates special initiatives in the provision of servicing for such new facilities. (279) c) Add a qualification for the normal public participation process. (310)

**Response** - a) The implementation of Policy 11 is dependent on criteria (not a study) listed in Policy 10. Staff do not feel this makes the policy premature. b) Agree.  
c) The normal public participation process is outlined in Section 1.6, Policies 13 to 15, and does not require restating.

**Recommendation** - a) and c) No change. b) Change Policy 11 of Section 4.1.2 b) by adding the following words: “and required services are in place;”

**214. Section 4.1.2, Policy 12** - The measures to consider with respect to an official plan amendment for a strategic economic development should include the need for additional land to be developed. (321)

**Response** - The lead-in to the policy states that certain measures will be taken into account if an official plan amendment “is required for a strategic economic development defined in policy 10.” In other words, the need for additional lands has already been determined. The intent of the policy is to streamline the approval process in recognition of the benefit to the regional economy from the strategic economic development.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**215. Section 4.1.2, Policy 13** - a) The airport supports the policy. However, the recently established Airport/RMOC/Municipal Liaison Committee could be used as a forum rather than the study noted. (105) b) Adjacent landowners should be on the study team. (108)

**Response** - a) Thanks for the support. The “study” could be of many forms, including the one mentioned. b) The role of adjacent landowners will be determined at the time of the study.

**Recommendation - a) and b) No change.**

**216. Section 4.1.2, Policy 15** - a) Provide a better vision of the airport and its future development potential. Expand the types of uses expected beyond simply saying “Business Park”. (279) b) We understand there is flexibility in the designation. Potential use of the airport lands will be further refined over the next year or so. (105)

**Response** - a) The Business Park designation provides flexibility for the development of the airport. However, staff agree that hotels and related uses can be added to the policy. b) The Region will provide assistance as required.

**Recommendation - a) Change Policy 15 of Section 4.1.2 by adding “c) hotels and related commercial uses. b) No change.**

**217. Section 4.1.2, Policy 16** - a) This policy has no corresponding objective. (109) b) Current policies have worked well and should be left in place. (108)

**Response** - a) The policy corresponds to Objectives 1 and 2. Council’s objective is to foster economic development and support the location of economic activities. Policy 16 recognizes the economic contribution of the airports and refers to Section 11.6 to protect the airports from adjacent land uses that could interfere with airport operations. b) Current policies have not worked well from the airport’s perspective.

**Recommendation - a) and b) No change.**

**218. Section 4.1.2, Policy 17** - a) Replace “selected Primary Employment Centres” with “Primary Employment Centres adjacent to the Transitway.” (310) b) Are you contemplating area specific development charges to promote economic development? (108)

**Response -** a) All Primary Employment Centres, except for Vanier's, are adjacent to the Transitway. Not all Primary Employment Centres can be subject to this policy all of the time, hence the qualifier "selected" is used. b) Yes, as noted in clause a).

**Recommendation - a) and b) No change.**

**219. Section 4.2 -** a) Employment should also be directed to areas of high need employment, for example the Orléans community. As well, what about directing employment to the rural areas? (279) b) A clause should be added to recognize the unique nature of rural communities, which compete for economic activities against communities beyond the region. The Plan needs to be flexible to ensure economic opportunities are not lost due to undue restrictions. (256) c) Add to paragraph three a statement on using transit priority measures for suburban employment not on the Transitway. (310)

**Response -** a) The policies are intended to support the market rather than redirect it. b) Staff are suggesting an additional clause to reference rural employment, in addition to others already in the Plan (e.g. Section 3.7.1, Objective 7). With respect to competition, both urban and rural areas are subject to this, and it is hoped that Section 4 will help the entire region be more competitive. c) Policies on transit priority measures are found in Section 9.4.

**Recommendation - a) and c) No change. b) Change Section 4.2 by adding the following to the start of the second paragraph: "While employment uses are permitted in several designations in both the urban and rural areas, ..."**

**220. Section 4.2.1, Objectives -** The majority of this sub-section is well written. However, the transportation impact of Primary Employment in the Core does not take the STO into consideration (transportation overlap). The Plan needs to reinforce the relationship with the Outaouais (which is mentioned only once on p.43). (258)

**Response -** The issue of inter-provincial travel is addressed in the Transportation Master Plan. With regard to land use, the Regional Official Plan is limited to the application of planning regulations in Ontario. Staff is working to integrate planning decisions with the Outaouais as stated in Section 1.3.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**221. Section 4.2.1, Objectives 1 and 2 -** By encouraging, in Objective 1, additional lands to accommodate possible employment growth, how does the Region intend to enhance the Central Area as stated in Objective 2? (109)

**Response -** The intent is to maintain the Central Area as the region's single largest area of employment by maintaining its 20% share of regional jobs (Objective 11). At the same time the RDS supports economic development elsewhere in order to improve the balance of jobs and housing throughout Ottawa-Carleton. See Sections 3.4 and 4.7 for specific policies encouraging employment in the Central Area.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**222. Section 4.2.1, Objective 8** - a) An additional policy should be added to encourage a vibrant rural economy. (279) b) Add that this objective is consistent with other objectives of this Plan. (310)

**Response** - a) Policy 4, Section 4.5 deals with employment in the rural area. The policy is worded to provide flexibility. b) Agree.

**Recommendation** - a) No change. b) That Section 4.2.1, Objective 8, be changed to: “To support economic development in the rural area, consistent with other objectives of this Plan.”

**223. Section 4.2.1, Objective 11** - The objective states that at least 20% of total jobs will be maintained in the Central Area. What is the current percentage? (279) (108)

**Response** - In 1991, the employment share of the Central Area was 21.5%.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**224. Section 4.3** - To be consistent with Section 4.3.1, Policy 1, which “requires” a mix of uses”, it would be better to state in Section 4.3 that “Employment Centres are or have the ability in the future to become mixed use developments”(109) (310)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 4.3.1 by replacing the words “or could be” in the second sentence with the words “or have the potential to become over time,”.

**225. Section 4.3.1** - a) Some land parcels are small and difficult to develop in accordance with the policies. b) Introduce a policy to relieve Town Centres and Primary Employment Centres from the policies if they are under development and meet the employment targets. (108)

**Response** - a) If a parcel is large enough to be developed, it can be developed in accordance with the policies. b) There is no logic in waiving Regional objectives precisely in the locations where they are currently being accomplished.

**Recommendation** - a) and b) No change.

**226. Section 4.3.1, Policy 1** - The policy indicates that residential development at medium density is also permitted in Primary Employment Centres and may serve as a buffer to lower

residential density neighbourhoods. It would be better to state that it will serve as a “transition” to lower residential density neighbourhoods. (279) (109)

**Response - Agree.**

**Recommendation - Change Section 4.3.1, Policy 1, by replacing the words “as a buffer” with “as a transition” in the last sentence.**

**227. Section 4.3.1 Policy 2 and Section 4.5, Policy 5 -** a) These policies reflect a local concern. The policies should be revised to indicate that the Region will work with area municipalities to achieve the provisions of the policies through local planning processes. (109) Policy 2 b) and 2 d) should be deleted or treated as guidelines not requirements. (City of Nepean, 88) b) It may not always be possible to achieve Policy 2 b). (88)

**Response -** a) Refer to the first response in Overall General Comments on the Draft Official Plan. b) In the past the attributes noted in the policy were not always achieved. The intent is to insist on the attributes once the new plan is in force.

**Recommendation - a), b) and c) No change.**

**228. Section 4.3.1, Policy 3 -** a) It is inappropriate for the Regional Official Plan to require that zoning by-laws provide for higher density employment uses close to transit service. (109) b) It should be clear that this applies to Primary Employment Centres and Town Centres only. (310)

**Response -** a) It is very appropriate for the Region to ensure that employment lands in Town Centres and Primary Employment Centres which are close to transit service (especially transitway stations) are zoned to permit higher density employment. This will encourage transit use and therefore reduce the potential vehicle demand on Regional roads. This will better serve the public by increasing the ease of using transit for those who choose this mode, reduce future costs for road improvements, and support the tremendous investment the Region has made on transit. b) All of Section 4.3.1 applies to Primary Employment Centres and Town Centres only.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**229. Section 4.3.2, Policy 2 -** a) Explain in the text the justification for a Primary Employment Centre in Vanier, as an exception. (258) b) This policy should be removed as it may appear to indicate a lack of commitment to the success of the Vanier Primary Employment Centre. Instead, a clause should be added for the Region to examine ways to improve accessibility to the Centre. (43)

**Response -** a) This exception reflects the current situation. The justification was determined during the last official plan review. b) Agree to change the policy, but do not agree to the second request as this would give some special status to the Centre. The Region will increase accessibility when it can.

**Recommendation - a) No change. b) That Section 4.3.2, Policy 2, be changed to read:**

**“Designate a Primary Employment Centre in Vanier, notwithstanding the lack of a Transitway station.”**

**230. Section 4.3 2, Policy 3** - a) First, the appropriateness of the Regional Official Plan determining specific zoning density is questioned and as such should be deleted or made less prescriptive. Secondly, it is not considered appropriate to generalize specific fsi for Employment Centres. The ability of the area municipality to influence substantive development within its boundaries is severely constrained by the wording of Policies 3, 4, 6, and 7. (109) b) It should be clear the policy only applies to Primary Employment Centres. (310)

**Response** - a) Lands, or proposed developments, that cannot meet the Regional requirements for a “Primary Employment Centre” should not be designated as such. If the City of Ottawa feels that some of the proposed sites for “Primary Employment Centre cannot satisfy the Regional Official Plan policies, it should suggest alternative designations, most likely “General Urban Area”. The policy does not require individual developments be at a certain F.S.I., but that instead the current development must not prevent future development or redevelopment on the same site to be at a certain minimum density. Council’s main objective is to ensure, over the long term, that “Primary Employment Centres” do indeed become community focal points with employment at relatively high densities, with the highest concentrations being adjacent to transitway stations. Otherwise, there is no point in having the “Primary Employment Centre” designation. b) All policies in Section 4.3.2 apply to just Primary Employment Centres.

**Recommendation** - a) and b) **No change.**

**231. Section 4.3.2, Policy 4** - a) This is a good policy because it recognizes the gradual development which will occur in the new employment centres but delete 4 b) as it is not possible to institutionalize the making of a deal. (279) This waters down the policy too much. If this is meant to allow for phasing this should be stated. (310) b) What mitigation measures do you have in mind in 4 b). (108)

**Response** - a) Agree. b) An example would be contributing to the provision of the transitway station.

**Recommendation** - a) **Delete Policy 4 b) so that Policy 4 will read as follows:**

**“Consider permitting proposed developments that do not meet the policies for mixed use, or the densities identified in policy 3 provided opportunities are maintained for future site redevelopment to satisfy the policy.”**

**b) No change.**

**232. Section 4.3.2, Policy 6** - a) Which are the “selected Primary Employment Centres”? (279) (310) (277) b) What happens if development applications are submitted in advance of the relevant studies? (277)



**Response** - a) The selected Primary Employment Centres will be those experiencing the greatest demand for employment and/or the centres of greatest strategic importance to the Region. b) The applicants will have to provide the studies or in some other way demonstrate they can satisfy the Regional policy.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**233. Section 4.3.3** - This section does not provide any clear purpose for the town centres. There should be a discussion of the vision for the centres. (279)

**Response** - Objectives 3 and 6 outline the Region's vision of the town centres. Municipalities can develop further this vision by implementing the policies outlined in Section 3.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**234. Section 4.4** - a) The introductory paragraph should encourage a full range of business parks uses ranging from warehousing and outside storage, mixed business parks, through to prestigious research parks and rural industrial parks. (279) b) There is a problem because Business Parks are permitted in the rural area but not shown on any schedule. There should not be a requirement for sidewalks in rural Business Parks. (227)

**Response** - a) The introductory paragraph already outlines a full range of uses with the exception of rural industrial uses. b) The premise that designated "Business Parks" are permitted in the rural area is wrong. Policy 1 indicates they are to be designated on Schedule B, which is the Urban Policy Plan. Any business park/industrial development in the rural area must have less than 2,000 jobs, per Policy 2, and do not require (but may have) sidewalks.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**235. Section 4.4, Policy 2** - a) Policy 2 seems out of place under this section. It is a general policy that would be more appropriately located under Section 4.1.2, the general economic development policies where it could also complement and help to clarify Policy 1 of Section 4.1.2. (109) b) What does "where noted" mean? (310)

**Response** - a) Agree with the general point, but not the suggested change. Staff feels that this issue should be covered in the policies for "Employment In Other Areas". This section already mentions maximum jobs in clusters in the "General Urban Area". Reference is required with regard to the "General Rural Area" and other designations. b) The use of examples should clarify this.

**Recommendation - a) Change Section 4.4, by deleting Policy 2., and renumbering the subsequent policies accordingly. b) Change Section 4.5, Policy 4., by adding a new phrase at the end of policy, so that it reads as follows:**

**4. "Permit certain types of employment in the General Rural Area, Agricultural Resource Areas, and Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas, as described in Sections 3.7, 7.2, and**

**8.2, which can be in clusters with a potential for up to 2,000 jobs. Other designations of this Plan, such as “Waterfront Open Space” and “Central Experimental Farm,” permit limited employment where noted.”**

**236. Section 4.4 , Policy 3** - a) It would seem that that this policy could allow Regional-Scale Retail facilities and/or warehouse retailing within Business Park designations. (109) (310) b) Modify the policy to “consider” permitting the listed non-residential uses. (279)

**Response** - a) “Regional-Scale Retail Facilities” require specific designation and cannot be built in a “Business Park” as of right. Warehouse retailing can and does occur in “Business Parks” where permitted by the area municipalities who control this use through zoning. Nevertheless, in certain situations the Region would not support zoning for warehouse retailing, for example if traffic issues could not be resolved. b) The area municipality can be more restrictive in its official plan/zoning.

**Recommendation - No Change.**

**237. Section 4.4, Policy 4** - a) This policy deals with local responsibilities generally exercised at site plan approval. Clarify the Region’s role and authority. (109) (88) (279) b) Policy 4 a) indicates that development shall include a mix of land uses which provide basic goods and services to employees within reasonable walking distance. This needs clarification, as it could apply to subdivisions, but not to individual site plans or proposals. c) Policy 4 d) requires buildings in Business Parks to be located close to the street with no parking in front of the building, and all parking at the side or back. It should be deleted. d) Policy 4 e) requires individual sites adjacent to the future rail corridors to be planned and developed to provide for direct and convenient public walkways to stations/stops on the future transit system. This is too detailed and it is not right to tie a development to something that may happen in the future, it will require a site plan agreement to run on title beyond what is the current norm. (109) e) Delete clauses a, c and d. (279) f) The policy should not be applied on a site by site basis, but at the subdivision or larger scale. (223) (256) g) Clause c) on sidewalks should be deleted. h) “The combined effect of 4.4.4 and 4.4.5 suggests that regional approvals will be withheld unless these matters are provided to the Region’s satisfaction”. (223) i) Part b) should refer to “maximum transit coverage”. (310)

**Response** - a) This policy will be addressed through mandated Regional approvals and when warranted through comments on site plans, zoning amendments, etc.. Also refer to Response 1 on the “General Comments on the Draft Regional Official Plan”. b) Agree. c) This policy is intended to support transit use, but as written is too restrictive. Staff are recommending a change. d) Staff do not feel a revision is required. Separate site agreements between the affected developers/owners and the RMOC may be required. e) Staff are recommending changes to a) and d). Staff feel that c) should remain as sidewalks are important for pedestrian circulation and transit users. f) Parts of the policy are intended to apply to individual sites. Other parts are to apply at a larger scale. The recommended rewording for the policy clarifies the situation. g) See the last sentence of response e). h) The policies will be applied in accordance with the Planning Act. This includes the right/legal requirement to not approve a development application that does not conform to the Regional Official Plan. i) “Maximum” has to be balanced with efficiency, modal choice and reality.

**Recommendation - Change Section 4.4.. Policy 4 by replacing a) and b) as follows:**

- a) **“Business Parks shall include a mix of land uses which provide basic goods and services to employees of the Park, within reasonable walking distance of their places of employment to the greatest extent possible.”**
- b) **“Larger parking areas shall be located to the side or rear of buildings and where feasible, buildings will be located close to the street with minimal or no parking in front.”**

**238. Section 4.4, Policy 5 -** a) The policy could be interpreted as conferring authority to Regional staff to comment on individual applications from area municipalities with the implied weight of Regional Plan conformity. (109) b) Delete the requirement for a site specific transportation study. (279)

**Response -** a) That is in fact one of the purposes of the policy. The Region has the authority under the Planning Act to comment with respect to the Regional Official Plan on applications before area municipalities for approval. It would be irresponsible to do otherwise. b) The study is not a requirement, just a possibility.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**239. Section 4.4, Policy 6 -** a) This clause should be clarified. b) A clause should be included in the Rural section to promote rural industrial parks. (279)

**Response -** a) Clarification would reduce flexibility. b) The Regional Official Plan permits rural economic/industrial development but does not promote rural Business Parks because they do not support the achievement of the Regional Development Strategy.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**240. Section 4.5, Policy 2 -** a) The policy refers to permitting non-residential uses in the General Urban Area in discrete clusters of up to 2,000 jobs. Policy 5 permits clusters of non-Business Park Employment of between 2,000 and 5,000 jobs in the General Urban Area. Is there an implied difference between what the Region perceives as discrete and non-discrete clusters? b) There should be some reference to zoning. (310)

**Response -** a) Agree that the policy requires some clarification. b) All development must comply with zoning.

**Recommendation -** a) Change Section 4.5, Policy 2, by deleting the word “discrete”. Add the following definition of “employment cluster” in the Glossary: “A concentration of employment uses within a particular area. The concentration should be distinct from other clusters by being separated by other land uses.” b) No change.

**241. Section 4.5, Policy 3** - Various briefs disapproved of encouraging expansions to Greenbelt Employment Areas: This policy provides direction for employment on Greenbelt lands. It should be revised to delete reference to new employment areas. (88) Employment activities of a non-rural nature in the Greenbelt should be discouraged. Employment activities of an agricultural nature should be encouraged. (257) No new land should be designated for employment inside the Greenbelt. (310) High technology employment should be located in research parks outside the Greenbelt. (286)

**Response** - Greenbelt Employment Areas do not include significant additions to existing areas. To clarify uses, staff propose a new designation “Greenbelt Institutional” to be distinct from “Greenbelt Employment”.

**Recommendation - Replace Section 4.5, with:**

**“Permit employment activities on lands designated Greenbelt Employment and Greenbelt Institutional on Schedule B in accordance with policies 4 and 5 of Section 6.2.”**

**242. Section 4.5, Policy 5** - We support this policy. (310)

**Response** - Thanks.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**243. Section 4.6, Policies 1 to 8** - a) There are inconsistencies between the policies of Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 49 and the policies of Section 4.6. It is critical that the draft Regional Official Plan not introduce any ambiguity as to the intent of Regional Council. It is recommended that Policies 1 to 8 of the draft Regional Official Plan be replaced with policies 9 to 15 from Regional Official Plan Amendment No 49. (109) (258) b) This policy would require that holding zones be used, but there are no provision in the plan to allow for this, which is required by the Planning Act, unless it is assumed the holding provisions of the local plan will be applied. (279) c) Question why Confederation Heights has been identified for discussion, given the similar importance of other employment nodes and wonder whether a people-mover is realistic. (258) ( 277) d) Concerns for the natural environment and the preservation of open space have not been sufficiently addressed nor have stakeholders been adequately consulted. (313)

**Response** - a) Agree that Policies 1 to 8 of the draft Regional Official Plan should be replaced with policies 9 to 15 from Regional Official Plan Amendment No 49. Any reference to the completion of a Master Drainage Plan will be deleted as the Drainage Plan has been completed to the satisfaction of all agencies. b) The holding provisions of the City of Ottawa will apply. c) Development on Confederation Heights has been the object of a site specific Regional Official Plan Amendment adopted by Council and referred to the OMB. The new plan will reflect Council’s decision unless there is a requirement to change it to comply with the OMB decision. d) There was a longer than usual consultation process for the Regional Official Plan Amendment.

**Recommendation - Change Section 4.6, by deleting the words “Council shall” in the first paragraph and replacing Policies 1 to 8 with Regional Official Plan Amendment 49 with the exception of the requirement for a Master Drainage Plan:**

1. “Notwithstanding the requirement for adjacency to an existing or proposed transitway station, Confederation Heights is designated on Schedule B, Urban Policy Plan, as a Primary Employment Centre on the basis that alternative measures will be implemented to achieve the level of convenient transit access and high modal splits to transit expected of locations adjacent to a transitway station. This may require a people-mover system to link the employment centre to the Heron transitway station or alternative transit solution.
2. The local official plan amendment to designate Confederation Heights as a Primary Employment Centre shall establish objectives and policy to provide for:
  - a) a maximum of 700000 m<sup>2</sup> of employment-generating development, including retail and personal services for the employees and residents of the area;
  - b) compact, pedestrian-oriented, mixed use development, which shall include residential development;
  - c) improved pedestrian and cycling facilities;
  - d) protection of a corridor for a people-mover system;
  - e) adequate control by OC Transpo and/or RMOC over operating conditions for transit on internal roads which may accommodate transit through legal agreements registered on title covering matters such as construction standards, long term access, maintenance, parking, etc. and City Council support for the eventual creation of public roads.
3. Development in Confederation Heights beyond threshold levels set out in the table below may be permitted only if the transit modal splits in the table are achieved.

**Table 7**

Floor Area (m <sup>2</sup> ) of Employment-Generating Uses may not exceed this level until modal split in next column is attained	Inbound A.M. peak hour Modal Split to Transit for Confederation Heights Node
290000 m <sup>2</sup>	25%
325000 m <sup>2</sup>	30%
370000 m <sup>2</sup>	35%
420000 m <sup>2</sup>	40%
465000 m <sup>2</sup>	45%
510000 m <sup>2</sup>	50%

4. Notwithstanding the table above, a one-time increment of 45000 m<sup>2</sup> of development may be permitted on the basis of implementation of a people-mover system or alternative transit solution that provides a similar level of service and achieves modal split objectives. Following such implementation, all additional development shall be governed by the table above. Development above 510000 m<sup>2</sup> shall be conditional on maintaining the 50% modal split to transit.

5. **In addition rezonings, whether for increased densities or changes in permitted uses, may be permitted only if supported by a traffic impact study which demonstrates that the traffic generated by the proposed development can be adequately accommodated by viable short term solutions which mitigate adverse community traffic impacts and ensure that no more than 35% of the combined capacity of Riverside Drive, Heron Road, Hog’s Back/Brookfield Road and Bronson Avenue/Airport Parkway is utilized by traffic generated by the Confederation Heights Primary Employment Centre. Such traffic impact studies shall be based on the transportation conditions of the day and shall be to the satisfaction of the City of Ottawa and the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.**
6. **Holding zones shall be used where the studies of traffic impact or sanitary servicing and water supply indicate a requirement for system expansions, for which the funding is not committed.**
7. **In order to concentrate employment-generating uses on the sites with the best access to the transitway, the City of Ottawa shall permit the reallocation of density rights for office uses from peripheral sites to the Revenue Canada site, which is located adjacent to the Heron transitway station, through density transfer or other appropriate mechanisms.”**

**244. Section 4.7 -** a) Controlling the size of malls inside the Greenbelt will not necessarily salvage the Central Area. Policies to make the Central Area more unique, pedestrian friendly and safe are more relevant. (279) b) The Plan should make a distinction between a warehouse and a warehouse retailing to protect the Central Area. (271) c) Change “allowing” to “enabling” in paragraph on “Retailing and transit use”. (279) d) Malls both inside and outside the Greenbelt compete with the Central Area. (295) e) Insert a policy into the paragraph on “Warehouse retailing” requiring that they have good connections to transit. (295)

**Response -** a) Agree, polices to support the above-mentioned aspects of the Central Area are needed, and are provided for in Section 3.4 of the draft Plan. However, polices to protect the downtown from destructive competition are also important. b) The Plan recognizes warehouse retailing, defined in paragraph 6 of Section 4.7, and includes them in the definition of Regional-Scale Retail Facilities in Section 4.7.3 through reference to “retail concentrations planned as a unit and which may include free-standing buildings and other forms of retail development”. c) Agree. d) Regional malls outside the Greenbelt are in the Town Centres. No limits to their development are proposed because they are an important focus of these areas. e) The paragraph only describes recent changes in retailing and is not intended to have policies. Section 4.7.2 contains polices for transit and pedestrian access which apply to all retail development applications, including warehouse stores.

**Recommendation - Change Section 4.7 by replacing the word “allowing” with “enabling” in paragraph on “Retailing and transit use”.**

**245. Section 4.7.1, Objectives -** a) In Objective 1, reference to residential uses should also be included. b) In Objective 3b, concern expressed that retail development at some transitway stations might disrupt an existing residential or commercial community (e.g. retail at Westboro Transitway station might disrupt retailing on Richmond Road). (310, 305) c) Delete subsections

in Objective 3. (295) d) In Objective 4, change “allow” to “encourage”. (279, 310, 305) Change to “promote”. (295) Add word “conveniently” before “use”. (303) e) In Objective 6, clarify that “communities” refers to residential communities. (279) f) There should be an objective supporting the retail role of the region’s main streets. (317)

**Response** - Agree to a) and d); “conveniently” not required with recommended revision. Regarding b), it is agreed that at some stations a minor amount of retail may be most appropriate. Objective 6 (“to ensure that retail operations do not adversely affect surrounding communities”) is intended to recognize this. On c), the subsections should be retained since there are roles for both roads and transit in retail planning. Regarding e) the community associations’ comment demonstrates that in some circumstances there may be more than just residential communities affected. On f), Section 3.2, Policy 12 sets out Council’s policies for development of community cores, which generally includes the concept of main streets. Section 3.7.3 Policy 6 has policies for main streets in rural villages; a policy on main streets in urban areas is warranted.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 4.7.1, Objective 1 by adding “residential” after the word “shopping” and changing “allow” to “encourage” in Objective 4. Also refer to new policy regarding mainstreets in urban communities in Section 3.2.1, Policy 12.**

**246. Sections 4.7, Section 4.7.1 Objective 5 and Section 4.7.2** - Section 4.7, paragraphs dealing with “Accessibility” and “Impacts on surrounding neighbourhoods”, Section 4.7.1, Objective 5 and Section 4.7.2 are inappropriate because they are too detailed and address matters of a local nature which are part of an area municipality’s responsibility. (109) Remove unnecessary detail related to local site plan control approval. (88)

**Response** - These policies provide the details necessary to translate Regional objectives into action. We believe the statements and policies are well within Council’s authority.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**247. Section 4.7.1, Objective 3b)** - Since the Plan contains land use policies relating to Transitway stations and selected transfer points, identify the location of Transitway stations and selected transfer points to enable local municipalities to carry out their planning in accordance with Regional objectives. (109)

**Response** - The Glossary defines “Transit Stations as all stations on the Transitway and major transfer points not on the Transitway.” Some policies refer to transit stations but not to selected transfer points. Section 3.2, Policy 3 indicates that Council will “take a lead role in planning development around Transitway stations which have the potential to develop over time as compact, mixed-use, transit- and pedestrian-friendly cores. Transitway stations with significant potential for employment growth are identified as Primary Employment Centres and governed by policies of Section 4.3”.

**Recommendation** - **Stations will be shown in the Transportation Master Plan.**

**248. Section 4.7.1, new policy** - Add a new policy to ensure that new retail development does not adversely affect housing, jobs, culture, tourism, and retail in the Central Area. (295)

**Response** - This is essentially addressed by Objective 1.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**249. Section 4.7.2, Policy 2)** - a) In 2) a), with respect to the definition of Gross leasable Area (GLA) it is not clear whether storage areas would be considered easily convertible to retail use and hence included in GLA. (279) b) Also in a), there are commercial sites permitting over 10,000 sq.m which are not on regional roads or provincial highways; the policy should add a reference “access to an arterial or collector”. (279) c) In b), building form is more appropriately determined on a site by site basis. Is the policy intended to prohibit shopping centres? 4) In g), add the word “residential” after adjacent. (223) e) The policy should be restricted to matters of Regional interest. Development applications are a local concern regulated through site plan control and zoning. (256, 279, 88) f) In f), change “must be” to a word more appropriate to a guideline. (279)

**Response** - a) The most obvious criteria as to whether storage space could be converted to retail is its grade (e.g. basement storage would not be considered easily convertible unless the centre already included below grade commercial areas). However, setting out all possible situations is too cumbersome to put into an Official Plan policy. b) A retail centre of more than 10,000 sq.m is of significant size (for example, Shoppers City East is about 10,900 sq.m) and it should be located on a Regional road or highway to ensure that traffic can be accommodated without negatively impacting local streets. Adding the words “access to” would only confuse the policy since all roads have at least indirect access to the Regional road system. c) Staff do not understand the comment as referenced. It is possible it was intended to apply to Section 4.4, Policy 4 d). If this is the situation, staff have recommended an appropriate rewording for 4.4, 4 d). d) The policy is intended to apply to residential and other land uses. e) The matters in the policy are of Regional interest and the Region has a role in zoning and the site plan approval process. f) The policy expresses the desired outcome directly but other words in the policy (for example, “main entrances close to the street”) provide latitude in how this end is achieved.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**250. Section 4.7.3, Policies 1 and 2-** Clarify whether a Regional-Scale Retail Facility outside the Central Area has “more than 35,000” square metres of gross leasable area or “35,000 or more” square metres of gross leasable area. (109)

**Response** - The words “35,000 square metres or more” should read “more than 35,000 square metres”.

**Recommendation** - Replace the words “35,000 square metres or more” in Section Policies 2 a) and 2 b) in Section 4.7.3 with “more than 35,000 square metres”.



**251. Section 4.7.3, Policy 3** - Council should consider the special circumstances of retail warehouse development. (297)

**Response** - Regional Scale Retail developments are by their nature very large (over 35,000 sq.m) and should be located at transitway stations. The policy allows consideration flexibility in the locations of retail developments under 35,000 sq.m.

**Recommendation - No Change.**

**252. Section 4.7.3, Policy 4** - a) Policy 4 states that Council shall “consider” requiring the applicant to prepare a market study of the effects of a new Regional-Scale Retail Facility on the Central Area. This is ambiguous and inconsistent with the objectives and policies with regard to strengthening, maintaining and enhancing the Central Area as the regional focus for retail and employment. The completion of market studies as part of the approval of new Regional-Scale Retail Facilities is an appropriate means to ensure this is achieved. (109, 310, 295) b) Require the market study to assess the impact of a proposed Regional-Scale Retail Facility not only on the Central Area and the Town Centres but also on the Regional Shopping Centres now located inside the Greenbelt. (165, 247) c) Does this policy apply to expansions of centres with caps? (279) d) Include reference that retail study is to be done in accordance with staff or committee approved terms of reference. (295)

**Response** - a) Agree. b) Disagree because the intent of the policy is to ensure a good balance between Central Area commercial activity and other shopping malls as well as strengthening commercial activity in the Town Centres. The Region wishes to foster competition between other retail facilities and so does not have the same interest in protecting vested interests. c) Yes, the policy also applies to expansions, as set out in Policy 7. However, a revision is recommended to make this more clear. d) All studies are conducted according to terms of reference and there is no need to specify this in the Official Plan.

**Recommendation - Change Section 4.7.3 by replacing the words “consider requiring” in Policy 4 and 7 by the words “require”. Combine Policies 6 and 7 and renumber accordingly.**

**253. Section 4.7.3, Policy 5** - Also review Regional malls inside vs. outside the Greenbelt and the effects on Town Centres. (279)

**Response** - The dynamics of competition between malls in various parts of the region are implicit in the policy. Further details will be elaborated in the terms of reference for future studies. However, as not all Town Centres yet have Regional malls, the policy is recommended for revision to include specific reference to them.

**Recommendation - Change Policy 4 of Section 4.7.3 by inserting the phrase “including the effects on Town Centres outside the Greenbelt” after the word “facilities”.**

**254. Section 4.7.3, Policy 6** - There is no need to limit the size of St. Laurent Shopping Centre to 77,000 sq.m. ( 247)

**Response** - The purpose of limiting the size of centres as set out in Table 8 is, as explained in paragraph 3 of Section 4.7, “so that they do not diminish the role of the Central Area”.

**Recommendation - No Change.**

**255. Section 4.7.3, Policy 7** - Modify to specifically identify that the words “this policy” refers to Policy 6. (109)

**Response** - Agree; addressed by a previous recommendation to combine Policies 6 and 7.

**Recommendation - Add the policy contained in Policy 7 of Section 4.7.3 to the end of Policy 6 and renumber the subsequent policies accordingly.**

**256. Section 4.7.3, Policy 8** - a) What effect does the lack of designation of a Regional-Scale Retail Facility in Kanata’s Town Centre have on Policy 8? b) Walmart and Canadian Tire might not have been permitted if the policy had been in place. ( 212) c) Policy not required for Orléans, since there is already an existing Regional shopping centre. (279) d) Clarify that the policy would not require an amendment to the Regional Official Plan to allow for planned development of the South Nepean Activity Centre. (88) e) Policy is unreasonable in the Nepean South Urban Centre as it would limit development at Hwy. 416 and Strandherd. (297)

**Response** - a) There is no effect. A Regional-Scale Retail Facility is permitted in Kanata’s Town Centre without the need for a designation. b) Walmart and Canadian Tire were permitted under the current Policy 7, Section 3.2.3.2 which is the same as the proposed Policy 8. c) Since the policy has no negative effect on Orléans, the reference should be retained to make it clear that all Town Centres are being treated the same. d) Nepean’s draft Amendment 7 to the local Official Plan proposes a maximum 42,500 sq.m of retail and entertainment uses in the District Retail designation, approximately 9,800 sq.m of retail space in the Civic Mixed Use designation, 4,900 sq.m of retail in the Main Street Mixed Use designation, and a maximum of 21,900 sq.m of retail/entertainment space in the Highway Commercial designation in the Activity Centre (town centre). This would be permitted by the proposed policy. e) The proposed policy would permit a limited amount of development at Hwy. 416 and Strandherd, but until retail at the Town Centre is well-established a larger facility should not be built. It is also noted that the Canril application is incomplete and their market study has not been submitted to the Region.

**Recommendation - No change**

**257. Section 4.7.3, Policy 9** - It is recommended that this section be deleted as an unnecessary and onerous requirement. (88)

**Response** - Subdivision approval is one way Council can implement its objectives and policies.

**Recommendation - No Change.**

**258. Definitions:** There is no definition of Gross Leasable Area (GLA), or what is meant by “commercial service facilities”; does it include offices? (247)

**Response -** GLA is defined in 4.7.2 Policy 2a. Commercial service facilities are defined in 4.7.2.1, “Definition of retail”; offices are not included.

**Recommendation - Include definition of Gross Leasable Area in Glossary.**

**Errors, Omissions, and Clarifications in Section 4**

**259. Recommendation - Make the following corrections to Section 4.**

**Section 4.3.2, Policy 3 -** Delete the words “of employees” to be consistent with Policy 1, Section 4.3.1.

**Section 4.7.3, Policy 8 -** Replace the word “designated” by the word “permitted” to be consistent with Policy 1 b), Section 4.3.3.

**General Comment on Section 5 - Natural Environment**

This section generated the most comment. The general nature of these comments varied widely:

- general objections to additional restrictions on landowners and the lack of sensitivity to rural needs and values (219, 251, 187, 28, 249);
- general support and encouragement for environmental provisions, and suggestions to strengthen policies (265, 305, 310, 316, 229, 313, 248, 46, 9, 75, 236, 199, 287);
- concern that the Rural Resource category was overly restrictive and not justified ( approximately 50 submissions); and
- concern that the plan does not do enough to protect urban features or areas of local significance (109, 257, 286, 305, 310, 295, 202, 135).

Prior to discussing the comments and responses, it is useful to provide some background and an overview of the policy approach. Since initiating the Environmental Review, Regional Council has expressed a strong commitment to protect the quality of the environment in Ottawa-Carleton. Included in this commitment is a recognition that it is not sufficient to protect isolated patches of green but rather to recognize that it is a system and to accommodate the interactions among the areas. To ensure that this system is sustainable, it is important to:

- maintain natural processes which support life, such as natural hydrological cycles; and
- maintain the ecological diversity of the Region.

At the same time, the Province of Ontario has provided additional policy direction to:

1. not permit development in significant wetlands and to not permit development in significant portions of the habitat of endangered and threatened species (both identified by the Province); and
2. permit development and site alteration in the following areas only if it can be demonstrated that there will be no negative environmental impacts on:
  - fish habitat;
  - significant wetlands in the Canadian Shield (identified by the Province);
  - significant woodlands;
  - significant valleylands;
  - significant wildlife habitat; and
  - significant areas of natural and scientific interest (identified by the Province).

Where the feature has not been specifically identified by the Province, it is up to the municipality to determine what should be considered ‘significant’. The Natural Environment Systems Study has been used as a framework for doing this at a regional scale.

The draft Regional Official Plan includes a combination of designations and general policies to protect the natural environment system. The draft Plan contains the following environmental designations are:

1. Provincially Significant Wetlands: Boundaries are precise and prescribed by the Province. No development is permitted within them. Development adjacent to the boundary is subject to an Environmental Impact Statement. (adopted by Council as Regional Official Plan Amendment 61)
2. Natural Environment Areas (A): Areas identified as being of environmental significance and largely in public ownership or in an area where public acquisition has been a long held policy. Lands in these areas can be managed to protect the environmental values and no new lot creation is permitted.
3. Natural Environment Areas (B): These are areas of environmental significance mainly in private ownership. The boundaries of these areas are fairly precise. In these areas development is permitted if the proponent can demonstrate that there will be no negative impact. All significant wetlands in the Canadian Shield and provincially significant Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest are in Natural Environment Area A or B.
4. Rural Resource: These are other areas of environmental significance including significant woodlands and significant wildlife habitat. The boundaries are not precise. The designation area means that within that area there are features (e.g.-trees, streams) and functions (e.g.-habitat, recharge) that are important. Development proposals must demonstrate that there are no negative environmental impacts. Because there are pockets of low environmental significance within these areas, it will often be possible to demonstrate that the development is outside of the key feature and that every effort has been made to minimize the impact.

Urban features that are significant for a number of reasons, including ecological values that may be important at regional and/or local scales, are also a critical part of the system. They have been recognised through designations of some areas, support for area municipal efforts to identify and

protect additional features, as well as components of Chapter 6 (Regional Open Space and Cultural Heritage).

It is also important to ensure that development is sensitive to the environmental functions across the Region. These functions play an important role in maintaining both the overall environmental quality in the urban and rural portions of region, and sustaining the features and functions in more clearly defined areas of environmental significance, such as wetlands. This is addressed through the general policies and the design with nature provisions.

The most critical response to this section focused on the use of the Rural Resource category which will be addressed first.

### **General Comments on Section 5.5 - Rural Resource**

**260.** This designation has prompted a significant response. These responses have expressed concern with additional planning requirements in these areas and the change from General Rural designations in existing plans. However, there has also been support for the increased level of environmental considerations reflected in the policy.

Most of those expressing concern focused on the 10 ha. lot size and 300m. frontage which was meant as an initial standard which could be varied if a significant feature was not being adversely affected. Submissions have argued that there is no need or justification for a rural resource designation for a number of reasons:

- Most rural landowners have managed property in an environmentally responsible fashion and many have made improvements, such as tree planting. More regulations simply penalise those who have left their property in a natural condition;
- The provincial policy does not require the physical extent of natural area protection provided for in the Rural Resource designation;
- The evaluation of candidate natural areas has been too broad and general to justify the new policies on a property by property basis. The information is based on assumptions which are difficult to defend and remote data which is inaccurate in some specific locations;
- Ottawa-Carleton is a developed region in a larger natural region that has abundant amounts of natural habitat. Using RMOC as a basis for evaluation criteria and targets does not reflect this reality; and
- The policy places the burden of proof on a landowner who needs to prepare an EIS to prove that there is not a significant features on function on the property.

A large number of individual submissions have expressed these concerns as listed under specific comments.

On the other hand, general support has been offered for the designation ( 75, 46, 9, 78 ), and requests made for inclusion of additional Rural Resource areas ( 29,272,78,192,191).

Area Municipal and Agency Comments are summarised below:

- Gloucester (244) recommends that the designation be deferred pending resolution of landowner concerns, and also suggests eliminating frontage provisions and clarifying EIS provisions. They have also suggested that an acquisition policy be included for Rural Resource areas;
- West Carleton (163) recommends that the designation be eliminated and replaced with strengthened design with nature provisions and a constraint schedule, and have supported a number of the individual submissions made on specific properties;
- Rideau (256) recommends that the designation respect rural development opportunities similar to General Rural unless the RMOC can provide clear and unequivocal evidence for the more restrictive policies;
- Kanata (212) suggests that severance standards for lot size and frontage be consistent with existing policies;
- Osgoode (227) questions the need and rationale for the designation. Attention should be paid to building with nature for all subdivisions;
- Goulbourn (223) suggests a lot frontage of 100m. and that the generalised boundaries for these areas be revised reflect the actual limits of the areas of significance;
- Cumberland (279) suggests a lot frontage of 100m. and a lot size of 2 - 4 ha.;
- The Province (321) while supporting the designation, has expressed some concern that the designation is not explicit enough in identifying the individual components of the Provincial Policy Statement which make up the Rural Resource Designation (e.g. significant woodlands, significant wildlife habitat). They have also expressed some concern that there are no policies dealing with development adjacent to the Rural Resource areas; and
- Conservation Authorities (229) while supporting the approach, have suggested that EIS provisions should be included for the creation of lots by severance but have emphasised the need to design a “user friendly” process.

**Response** - Agree that a revised approach is appropriate. The designation was meant to continue to allow the types of uses and development which occur in the General Rural area, but require that development which could potentially alter significant features and functions demonstrate that those features and functions will not be adversely affected.

One way of doing this would be to replace the Rural Resource designation with an Environmental Features overlay on a new Schedule K. Areas shown as Rural Resource on Schedule A would, subject to the site specific recommendations in this report, be shown as Environmental Features on Schedule K. On Schedule A, the designation would become General Rural and permitted uses would clearly be established by the General Rural designation.

Much of the concern over this designation related to the lot size and frontage standards for individual severances. Under the overlay option, severance policies would reflect the provisions in the General Rural designation. While individual severances along opened road allowances in these areas may not have significant impacts, particularly in areas that are already disturbed by previous severance activity, a concern over incremental change and cumulative impact remains. The strengthening of design with nature provisions, and a careful monitoring of severance activity, provides a partial response.

**Recommendation** - Delete Rural Resource areas from Schedule A and add a new Schedule K, Natural Environment System (Rural), that shows the Rural Resource areas, subject to the specific recommendations in this section, as an Environmental features overlay; and

Replace Section 5.5 with the following as Section 5.4.3:

**“Council shall:**

- I. **Protect significant environmental features and functions in addition to Natural Environment Areas A and B and Provincially Significant Wetlands by applying the following policies in areas which have been included within the areas shown as Environmental Features on Schedule K. These include:**
  - A. **woodlands that may be uncommon or large, high quality examples of more common woodlands;**
  - B. **areas that may contribute to the overall diversity of a natural area;**
  - C. **areas that may support endangered, threatened, or rare species;**
  - D. **areas that may support hydrological functions such as springs, seeps and recharge areas; and**
  - E. **areas that may have significant wildlife and fish habitat.**
  
- II. **Require all applications for subdivisions or non-residential use 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.**
  
- III. **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.”**

And amend Section 3.7.4 by adding to Policy 1:

- k) **“uses that will help conserve or manage water supplies, wildlife, or other natural features and functions; and**
- l) **uses involved in the scientific or educational study of the natural characteristics of the area.”; and**

Adding new Policies 9 and 10 as follows:

- I. **Require that when lots are created in the General Rural area, every effort will be made to minimize the impact on natural features by:**
  - A. **locating the lot in an area which will minimize the removal of mature vegetation;**
  - B. **maintaining setbacks from natural stream courses; and**
  - C. **aligning lots to provide an opportunity to preserve linear natural features such as wooded corridors and mature hedgerows.**

**II. Require that reference also be made to Section 5.4.3 and schedules G and K when determining requirements for consideration of rural development proposals.**

**Evaluation of Areas and Boundaries** - Many requests have been received for removal from the Rural Resource designation. These requests have questioned the significance of the features or functions on specific properties, and have questioned the assumptions and approach taken in the analysis. Other requests have involved questions related to specific boundary issues and inclusion of areas with approved or draft approved development applications. Submissions dealing with specific properties and areas are listed at the end of this section.

**Response** - The fundamental premise of the overlay designation is that there are significant environmental features within the general area which are worth protecting. The Rural Resource designation is based on a systematic review of natural areas at a regional scale. The evaluation assessed natural complexes at a reconnaissance level using a combination of existing reports, remote data from Stage 1 of the Natural Environment Systems Study, and additional field work and review of air photography.

It did not assess areas at a detailed level on a property by property basis for several reasons:

- approximately 70% of those contacted over the summer either refused permission or did not respond;
- detailed inventory work requires significant time and resources and is not required unless development is actually proposed on a site; and
- the definition of precise boundaries of these features and their interrelationships is best undertaken within the context of a development proposal. or within the context of a comprehensive study such as a sub-watershed plan where such information is required. Where no development is proposed, or no issues exist which prompt a comprehensive study, it is not necessary to complete this more detailed analysis.

As a result, this evaluation provided a general assessment of the relative significance of natural areas. The policy has been designed to reflect this level of analysis by providing for development as per the policies in the General Rural within the context of some additional environmental screening for subdivisions and non-residential uses. Additional work would reflect both the scale of the proposal and the potential significance of the area.

Many of the site specific questions and concerns involve this next level of analysis, namely the more precise definition of significant features and functions on a property basis. This is difficult to respond to in that, to be equitable, this work should be done on a systematic basis across the region. It would take significant resources, widespread permission to enter private property and as noted above, is not necessary at this stage of the planning process given the nature of the Rural Resource designation and the changes suggested in this report. In addition, some of the concerns leading to specific questions about the significance of an area or the boundary of the designation have been addressed by suggested modifications to the policy.

Given the volume of requests received in the days preceding the commenting deadline, it was not possible to examine all requests and determine an approach to address each concern. Staff will



continue to review property concerns on an ongoing basis, particularly as pre-consultation on development proposals occurs. Furthermore, the suggested revisions to the policy approach would appear to satisfy many of those who have requested removal from the designation. Staff recommend that those individuals who have made property specific requests be provided with the suggested revised policy approach and given an opportunity to discuss their concerns further with staff.

Finally, some changes have been suggested and incorporated into the revised schedule. These generally reflect some areas in which:

- there are approved or draft approved development proposals;
- there is existing development in which a rural resource designation is ineffective; and
- generalization of the boundary needs some adjustment.

These are reviewed in the comments on specific properties.

**261. Concern about limitations on normal rural land management** - Some comments have expressed concern that the designation would limit the types of rural land management and objectives currently practised by some landowners (17, 320). Examples include agricultural activities and forest management. One response (184) suggested that a policy should be included to prevent cattle grazing in creek areas and headwaters.

**Response** - The list of permitted uses in the General Rural designation includes agriculture and forest management. The Official Plan has limited control over specific land management decisions such as the clearing of brush or decisions related to farm management. There is some reference to tools which can address land management practices such as sub-watershed plans, but there is not an implementation tool under the Planning Act, and attempts to control individual land management decisions on rural properties would not be supported by the majority of land owners who have participated in the process to date. Additional policies supporting stewardship and education help address this concern.

**Recommendation** - No change.

### **Specific Property Submissions on Section 5.5 (Rural Resource)**

The following is a list of property specific comments on the Rural Resource designation. They are grouped into two categories:

1. Those that involve a basic issue with the Rural Resource category. Many of these were received towards the commenting deadline and have not been fully investigated. Others have been examined in more detail but with the suggested change in approach, staff are recommending that these respondents be provided with the suggested policy revisions and given an opportunity to respond and discuss their issue further with staff.

2. Those submissions for which areas are being removed as a result of approved development or minor adjustments, or suggested additions which do not conform to the basic policy approach. Recommendations are included for these submissions.

## **262. Category 1 - Basic Concerns**

East of the Rideau:

**Cumberland, Lot 18, Conc. 1 (Raymond, 155)** - Had improved property with forest management and now are being penalized. Lot provisions as per the Cumberland Plan should apply

### **Gloucester, Lots 11,12,13,14, Conc. 8 (320) -**

Has two designations on his property and is concerned that this may cause a problem. Concerned that Rural Resource and General Rural may limit his farm management activities (runs a sod farm).

**Response** - Proposed designations would not affect farm management decisions.

**Gloucester, Conc. 3, Lot 28 ( 216)** - Objects to Rural Resource.

**Gloucester, Conc. 6, Pt. Lot 13 (275)** - Objects to Rural Resource as the lot size and frontage requirement make it impossible to apply for a severance

**Gloucester, Conc. 8, Lots 16-20 (24)** - Concerned that the evaluation does not reflect the nature and use of the property. It is not a part of the Findlay Creek system, and consists of brush and alders which are being cleared. It is dry now that a drainage ditch has been dug. Objects to the distinction between Rural Resource and General Rural.

**Response** - Staff have recently visited the site with the consultant who evaluated the area. The area on Conc. 8 has been disturbed along Eighth Line road with some residential development, clearing and drainage work. The area does not drain to the Findlay Creek, but is part of a continuous natural complex with some wetland features which has a drainage divide down the middle of the Concession. Staff are reviewing the area further to confirm the area most appropriate boundary for the Environmental Features overlay.

**Gloucester, Conc. 8, Lot 18 (254)** - Objects to the Rural Resource designation.

### **Gloucester, Conc. 8, Lot 19 (148) -**

Does not feel property is significant and does not contribute to Findlay Creek.. Concerned that lot size and frontage may prevent construction of a house on an approved, but yet to be registered, lot. Lot size and frontage unrealistic.

**Gloucester, Conc. 6, Lot 19 (178)** - Requests reduced frontage (45m.), addition of a land acquisition policy for those areas where development is effectively prohibited, and deferral of areas pending resolution of landowner concerns.

**Gloucester, Conc. 4, Pt. Lots 1 and 2 (Smith, 292)** - Requests a redesignation to General Rural to facilitate future expansion of the mobile home park and additional development.

**Gloucester, Conc. 8, Lot 17 (290)** - Objects to Rural Resource. No justification as there is plenty of protected land in the area.

**Cumberland, Conc. 5, Lot 25 (129)** - Objects to Rural Resource. Good location for General Rural as the waterline to Vars runs immediately South.

West of the Rideau:

**West Carleton (Torbolton), Conc. 7, Lot 6, and Conc. 6, Lot 5 (262)** - Objects to Rural Resource. Area is woodland because they have chosen not to cut the timber.

**West Carleton (Torbolton), Conc. 7, Lot 5 (262)** - Objects to Rural Resource Designation as it provides not flexibility for future options.

**Goulbourn, Conc. 2, Lots 9 and 10 (26)** - Objects to Rural Resource. Boundary of the environmental area should be along Soldiers Line Rd. as was decided during development of the Goulbourn Official Plan.

**Response** - The area in question was deferred at the time of the Goulbourn Official Plan so that MNR could provide more information on wildlife habitat. The area north of Soldiers Line road is similar to the area south and was included in the same ecological unit during the assessment of candidate natural areas.

**West Carleton (Fitzroy), Con 1, Lot 1 (166)** - Concerned with designation on Panmure area. Had planned a couple of severances and finds lot size and EIS requirements for severances unreasonable.

**West Carleton, Torbolton Ridge (162)** - Argues that the regulatory approach penalizes land owners. Recommends that Rural Resource be put on hold, that the focus be on incentive programs, and that no changes be made until the form of regional government is confirmed.

**Rideau, Conc. 1, Lots 7-10 (20, 209)** - Concern that Rural Resource designation is based on a wetland area which has been created by a dam which they are trying to have removed (constructed by a neighbour). Generally object to the designation.

**Response**- Area was evaluated as having moderate significance because of some of the upland woodlands as well. While the wetland area adds to the diversity of the site, removal of the wetland would not necessarily change the overall evaluation.

**Rideau, Conc. 1, Pt Lot 9 (North Gower) ( 210)** - Requests that the portion of the Property designated Rural Resource be designated General Rural as the lower area that is wet is due to recent blockage of the natural outlet to north (same as above).

**Goulbourn, Conc. 12, Pt Lot 18 - (123)** - Requested the justification for Rural Resource designation.

**West Carleton, Conc. 4, Pt Lots 2 and 3 (251 and 252)** - General objection to Rural Resource, lot standards, and the need for more studies.

**West Carleton, Conc. 1, Lots 3,4,5 and 6 (Fitzroy) (318)** - Objects to Rural Resource designation. Alvars do not seem to provide sufficient justification and there are other components of the natural area evaluation he questions. Would prefer Aggregate designation, with General Rural as a second choice. Had been planning a under-ground mining and storage operation. (Sub-Space)

**Response** - The Panmure Alvar was ranked as having high significance on a Regional Scale. Sub-space proposal would be a permitted use under the Rural Resource policy or the approach recommended in this report (Schedule K). It would be necessary to demonstrate that the sub-space proposal would not have an adverse impact on the features on the surface.

**West Carleton, Conc. 8,9. Lots 18-26, (133)** - General objection to Rural Resource designation in the Marathon West area. Landowners have chosen to protect and preserve the features that exist in this area and are now being penalised. The real cost in terms of landowners losing land value is not factored into the plan. Lot size and frontage is unreasonable. Analysis is vague and does not justify the designation. Specific properties do not meet the criteria for high or moderate significance.

**West Carleton, Conc. 8, Lot 24 ( 96)** - General objection to Rural Resource.

**West Carleton, Conc. 7, Lot 17 (31)** - Concern with lot size and frontage standards.

**Goulbourn, Conc. 9, Lots 14 and 15 ( 253)** - Object to Rural Resource designation. Justification does not indicate what exactly may be significant on the Yzenbrandt property. Frontage provisions are not acceptable.

**Rideau, Conc. 2 and 3, Lots 9-12, (Brooks et al.)** - General Objection to designation, Nothing special about this cedar bush. Traditionally an area used for severances.

**West Carleton, Conc. 8 and 9, Lot 17 (Brown, 140)** - Objects to Rural Resource Designation as there is an intent to develop the area by Plan of subdivision and provisions have been made to connect to adjacent developments.

**West Carleton, Conc. Kingdon Holdings, (16)** - General Objection to the Designation. No significant woodlands within the proposed development area. This area has been accepted as a future development area for years. Proposed golf course and country estate development (Vydon Acres).

**Response** - Proposed approach would not preclude the development. Environmentally sensitive development is a stated objective of the landowner and a certain amount of environmental work will be required regardless of the designation.

**West Carleton, Conc. 1, Lot 5, Torbolton (27)**

Recognises environmental value of property, but objects to frontage requirement and questions the need for the designation. Concerned that local area and regional policies are not in synch.

**West Carleton, Conc. 1, Lot 14 (184)** - Suggests extension of Natural Environment area. Also commented that the Rural Resource designation adds restrictions and compensation in the form of tax relief should be provided.

**West Carleton, Conc. 1, Lot 21, Torbolton ( 48)**

Comments that Rural Resource designation is a re-run of previous efforts which were not accepted. Lot size and frontage not acceptable.

**Rideau, Conc. 2, Lots 26 and 27 (23)**

Strongly objects to further restrictions on land use and devaluation of property.

**West Carleton, Conc. 9, Lot 20 (17)**

Concerned that part of property is rural resource and that this could affect farm plans.

**Response** - Agriculture is a permitted use in Rural Resource.

**West Carleton, Conc. 1, Lots 6 and 7, (174)** - Recommends adjustment to Rural Resource boundary to exclude field areas, and objects to the general policy provisions.

**Rideau, Conc. 3, Lot 3, Marlborough (74)**

Concerned about Rural Resource designation on portion of property. They could not meet proposed lot size and frontage requirements

**West Carleton, Conc. 4, Lot 5 ( 4)** - Objects to restrictions on severances.

**West Carleton, Conc. 1, Lot 22 (70)** - Objects to lot size and frontage.

**Goulbourn, Con. 6, Lot 1 and Conc. 2, Lot 22 (255)** - Objects to the designation. Significant feature not specifically identified on the property.

**Goulbourn, Conc. 10, Lot 17 and 18 (Harris, 260)** - Objects to designation. Has been pursuing an Estate Lot subdivision for a significant time.

**Response** - property also contains Provincially Significant Wetland and an Environmental Impact Statement will be required in any case.

**West Carleton, Conc. 4, Lots 1 and 2 (170)** - Request removal of Rural Resource Designation as the area has been previously logged of mature trees and the land is at the proposed interchange New Highway 7 and Regional Road 36. Wants uses similar to those allowed at 416/417 interchanges.

**Goulbourn, Conc. 5, Lot 15 (157)** - Objects to Rural Resource designation. Lot size and frontage is too big. If the trees were removed, an EIS would not be required.

**West Carleton, Conc. 7, Lot 6, (19)** - Concerned about limits on severance potential.

**Rideau, Conc. 4, Lot 23 (Marl.) (22 )** - Request removal of Rural Resource designation as a part of the area is farmed and there are no “significant features” associated with the property.

**West Carleton, Conc. 7, Lots 19 and 20, (33)** - A portion of the property is Rural Resource. Concerned with the lots size provisions and possible restrictions on crossing the wetland area with a farm access road.

**Response** - Provisions in the draft Plan would not affect a farm access lane, although permits may be required from the Province if stream or fish habitat alteration is involved.

**West Carleton, Conc. 1, Lot 25 and Conc. 2., Lot 26 (299)** - Objects to Rural resource on the two properties, Requests a general rural designation.

**West Carleton, Conc. 4, Lot 3 (Deerwood Estates Partnership)** - Objects to Rural Resource designation as the area is heavily grazed and some strip development has occurred along the Concession Road.

**Kanata, Conc. 7 and 8, Lot 26 (126)** - Objects to Rural Resource as the area has been under consideration for estate and recreational development.

**Goulbourn, Conc. 9, Lot 17 (Argue, 18)** - Concerned that 300m. frontage will affect a proposed severance.

**West Carleton (Fitzroy), Conc. 9, Lot 13 (15)** - Questions justification for designation. Under the previous plan, rural estate was encouraged in wooded areas.

**Recommendation - That those property owners who have made specific submissions objecting to a Rural Resource designation on their property be provided with a copy of the suggested revised policies and given an opportunity to discuss concerns further with staff.**

### **Category 2 (Recommended Action) - No change**

**263. Rideau, Conc. 1, Lot 16, North Gower (29)** - Wants a small woodland within an agricultural area designated Rural Resource.

**Response** - The woodland has not been assessed as having potential significance at a regional scale. Isolated features within agricultural areas have not been designated Rural Resource to prevent development within larger farming areas. If this is a potential area for severances, it could be considered under the policies in Section 7.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**264. Rideau, Conc. 1, Lots 9 - 18 (191)** - Request that this area be shown as Rural Resource to prevent continued rural development.

**Response** - The area in question was assessed as having moderate significance. However, a significant portion of the area included a previously approved plan of subdivision, and high quality aggregate deposit that was designated as Limestone Resource. The areas remaining that were assessed as moderately significant were designated Rural Resource.

**Recommendation - No change**

**265. Kanata, Conc. 6 and 7, Lots 21 - 24 (192, 78, 272, 287, 238)** - Several submissions have recommended inclusion of this area in Rural Resource.

**Response** - Area was assessed as having low significance at a regional scale and therefore was not placed in Rural Resource. Section 5.2 would apply to any proposed development in terms of tree conservation and designing with nature. Area municipality could also examine the area in terms of local significance.

**Recommendation - No change**

**Category 2 (Recommended Action) - Schedule Changes**

**266. Goulbourn, Conc. 2, Lot 21** - Township of Goulbourn has indicated that an area with a draft approved plan of subdivision has been placed in Rural Resource.

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation - Delete the area of the draft approved plan of subdivision in Goulbourn, Conc. 2, Lot 21 shown as Rural Resource on Schedule A from the Environmental Features overlay on Schedule K.**

**267. Goulbourn, Conc. 3, Lot 15 (25)** - Objects to the boundary of the rural resource designation. Lands included on their property were clear-cut approximately 15 years ago.

**Response.** Agree in part. The land area in question has been clear-cut and altered significantly. This does not necessarily mean that there are not some environmental concerns to be addressed should a development proposal come forward as the property is adjacent to a Provincially Significant Wetland. Any proposed development would therefore, require an EIS under the provisions in Section 5.6.

**Recommendation - Adjust the Environmental Features overlay on schedule K to follow the limits of the Provincially Significant Wetland designation through Lot 15, Conc. 3, and Goulbourn.**

**268. Goulbourn, Conc. 9, Lot 10** - Goulbourn (223) has indicated that an area of low significance has been designated as Rural Resource. However, the North West Goulbourn Community Association (199) recommends that it remain.

**Response** - Areas shown as low significance have not been designated elsewhere. Section 5.2 would apply to any development in the area, and the local municipality could also examine the area in terms of local significance.

**Recommendation - Delete the Rural Resource area on Schedule A in Conc. 9, Lot 10, from the Environmental Feature overlay on Schedule K.**

**269. Cumberland, Lot 17, Conc. 1 (130)** - Portion of lot is field and small severance's as per the Cumberland Official Plan would not affect the Woodland.

**Response** - Suggested revisions would allow severances as per the Cumberland Plan. Designation. In addition, designation can be revised to more accurately reflect the feature.

**Recommendation** - **Delete the field area shown as Rural Resource on Schedule A in Cumberland, Conc. 1, Lot 17 from the Environmental Feature overlay on Schedule K**

**270. Cumberland, Conc. 11, Lots 18,19,20 and 21** - Cumberland (279) has indicated that an area within the Rural Resource designation has just had approval for extension of a golf course and a resort/recreational development. In addition, a portion of the area designated is not within the defined natural area.

**Response.** Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Delete the Rural Resource area in Conc. 11, Lots 18,19,20 and 21, from the Environmental Feature overlay on Schedule K.**

**271. Osgoode, Conc. 7, Lot 30** - A cemetery property has been included in the Rural Resource designation as a result of using the road as a boundary.

**Response** - Needs adjustment.

**Recommendation** - **Delete the Rural Resource area shown in Conc. 7, Lot 30, Cemetery property (Schedule A) from the Environmental Feature overlay on Schedule K .**

**272. West Carleton, Conc. 8, Lot 16 and Lot 17 (Brown, 140)** - Area of Rural Resource is within an approved Plan of Subdivision.

**Response.** Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Delete the Rural Resource designation on Conc. 8, Lots 16 and 17 within the Spruce Woods Subdivision from the Environmental Feature overlay on Schedule K.**

**273. West Carleton (Huntley), Conc. 6, Lots 1 and 2 (21)** - Portion of this area includes a draft approved plan of subdivision and an area of future development which has been shown in a conceptual fashion on the subdivision applications.

**Response** - Agree in Part.

**Recommendation** - **Delete the draft approved plan of subdivision in Conc. 6. Lots 1 and 2 and designated Rural Resource on Schedule A from the Environmental features overlay on Schedule K.**



**274. West Carleton (Torbolton), Conc. 5,6 and 7** - Area along Crown Pt. to Constance Bay is already developed and doesn't make sense as Rural Resource.

**Response** - Agree that Rural Resource designation should follow the road.

**Recommendation** - **Revise the area shown on Schedule K as Environmental Feature to follow the road along the shoreline through Conc. 5,6 and 7, West Carleton (Torbolton).**

**275. Gloucester, Conc. 3, Lot 28 (273)** - Concern that the Rural Resource designation has included an old field area traversed by the rail line.

**Response** - Agree that old field area and scrub area fragmented by the rail line can be excluded from the natural unit.

**Recommendation** - **Delete the area of old field in Conc. 3, Lot 28, Gloucester shown as Rural Resource on Schedule A from the Environmental Feature overlay on Schedule K.**

**276. Gloucester, Conc. 6, Part of lots 26 and 27** - An area which was approved for rural industrial use is included in the Rural Resource designation.

**Response** - Agree that industrial use was approved through a site specific, local Official Plan amendment.

**Recommendation** - **Delete the area shown as Rural Resource on Schedule A in that portion of Conc. 6, Lots 26 and 27, Gloucester that has been approved for rural industrial use from the Environmental Features overlay on Schedule K.**

### **General Comments on Section 5 (Introduction)**

**277. Concern about the description of the Natural Environment System (local vs. regional significance)** - Some concern (244,279,109, 310, 305) has been raised that the introduction does not provide a clear description of the basis for natural areas policies and the question of regional versus local significance. Kanata has asked whether Objective 1, pg. 60 refers to regionally significant features. The Conservation Authorities (229) have suggested that the objectives include recognition of linkages beyond the Region, and linkages to systems at the local level.

**Response** - Agree that clarification and additional explanation would be useful.

**Recommendation** - **Change the second paragraph of the introduction (pg. 59) to read as follows:**

**“This requires recognition that the natural environment functions as a system consisting of:**

- Natural areas containing significant features and functions at different scales;
- Ecological linkages, such as stream and woodland corridors, which serve to connect natural areas within and beyond the Region: and
- Ecological processes which function across the region at different scales.

This plan protects the natural environment system by:

- Designating natural areas which are significant at a regional scale as Natural Environment, areas, Provincially Significant Wetlands, and additional areas within the general rural designation where environmental features are to be considered during review of development proposals. These areas have been identified based on a combination of Provincial evaluation procedures, and work completed at the regional level which assessed remaining natural areas in Ottawa-Carleton in a systematic fashion at a regional scale;
- Supporting additional work at the area municipal level to recognise and protect local features, particularly in urban areas where smaller woodlands and natural landscapes may be important for both environmental and social values; and
- Providing for environmentally sensitive development across the region that conserves and enhances woodlands, watercourses, and ecological linkages, and protects general environmental quality.

The protection of this system plays an important role in supporting natural processes and diversity by:

- protecting endangered threatened and rare species;
- maintaining a full range of natural communities in good condition;
- providing for needs of a variety of wildlife including seasonal habitats and linkages;
- supporting groundwater recharge, discharge and storage;
- reducing erosion and sedimentation;
- maintaining and improving surface water quality; and
- improving living environments in urban areas through improvements in air quality, moderation of micro-climates, and maintenance of diversity.”

**278. Concern about general objectives and lack of definitions** - There has been some concern expressed over the general nature of the introduction and the use of expressions that are not defined, such as high quality environment (rural sounding board).

**Response** - The introduction is meant to provide general background, not define terms precisely in terms of policy implications. It is important to provide some explanation for the rationale behind the policies which follow. Traditionally, both the introduction and objectives use general wording which is then defined more precisely through the application of the policies themselves. Some clarification is provided where necessary in the policies and glossary. Finally, some of the general objectives are taken directly from the Community Vision which was approved as a basis for the review.

**Recommendation** - No change.

### **Specific Comments on Section 5.1 (Introduction)**

**279. Section 5.1, Objective 5** - It was suggested (257, 286, 202) that the target of 30% forest cover should be broken down by area with local municipalities inside the greenbelt contributing to attainment of the target. There was also a question on the rationale for the objective as woodland has been increasing lately.

**Response** - There is no “right” percentage from an environmental perspective. 30% has been used by the Province as a threshold beyond which the size of woodland is no longer a component of determining significance and it has also been used as a threshold in some work for enhancing watershed areas. Given that the current cover in RMOC is approx. 28% and, has in fact been increasing particularly on marginal farmland, 30% is a reasonable target. The 30% target was meant to apply at a Regional level and express a general commitment to maintaining tree cover. The establishment of targets at a more local scale would most appropriately be addressed through the tree conservation strategy and efforts of area municipalities as outlined in Section 5.1.2..

**Recommendation** - No change.

### **General Comments on Section 5.2 (General Policies)**

**280. Protection of local and urban woodlands** - Ottawa (109) has commented that the plan contains no policies that will assist area municipalities in the protection and acquisition of woodlands. It was also suggested that local municipalities be allowed to develop their own tree conservation and enhancement strategy. The lack of specific reference to urban forestry issues was also raised as an issue at the FCA Greenspace Forum (319) and submission 173. The FCA (310) recommends that the strategy be developed in co-operation with area municipalities. Cumberland (279) commented that it is contradictory to encourage tree saving strategies but to allow forestry as a permitted use in Natural Environment and Rural resource designations. They suggest that the Region should only deal with tree cover at a general level.

**Response** - Agree in part. The intent of Section 5.2.1, policies 1 and 2 is to encourage and support the development of local strategies. Policy 1 was meant to convey a commitment for Regional Council to adopt a tree conservation strategy and to develop the Regional approach in co-operation with local municipalities. Policy 2 was meant as a statement of support and encouragement for local municipalities to follow through with their own strategies employing tools most appropriate in their municipalities. However, there are some opportunities to strengthen the approach with specific references to the urban forest. With respect to forestry as a permitted use, the policies indicate that it must be in accordance with good forest management practices. Controls on tree cutting would be left primarily to area municipalities as per policy 2.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 5.2.1. by deleting policy 1 and replacing with the following:

- I. **“Prepare and adopt a tree conservation and enhancement strategy in co-operation with the area municipalities, Conservation Authorities, other organisations working with urban forestry or private land forestry, and the development community. This strategy will address:**

- A. role of the Regional Tree Cutting bylaw and assistance to those area municipalities developing tree cutting bylaws under the Municipal Act;
- B. current practices to ensure that enhancement of the urban forest is a priority;
- C. opportunities to promote tree conservation and enhancement in rural and urban areas; and
- D. guidelines for tree conservation and planting requirements in review of development proposals.”;

**Change Section 5.2.1, policy 2 , by replacing the first sentence with the following:**

**“Encourage municipalities to implement those components of the regional strategy, or other tools and approaches as defined in local strategies, most appropriate in their jurisdiction”.**

**281. Support for Stewardship -** A number of comments, including those from West Carleton (163) and other submissions (162, 155, Rural Sounding Board, 262, 133 ) have indicated that landowners have generally taken care of the land in an environmentally responsible fashion and that this should be encouraged and supported to provide some balance for land use policies and regulations. The Conservation Authorities (229) also emphasised the importance of this aspect.

**Response -** Agree in part. While additional policies supporting stewardship and education can be added, the ability to implement these through the planning process is limited. As statements of support and intent from Council, they can be important, particularly during Regional participation in activities such as watershed planning and funding of conservation partners such as the Conservation Authorities.

**Recommendation -** Change the final paragraph of the introduction (middle of pg. 60) to include as the last sentence:

**“The support of stewardship programs at the local level is an example of a measure whereby the above objectives can be effectively achieved”.**

**Add the following as Section 5.2.6:**

**“Council Shall:**

**Support private landowners in their efforts to manage property in a way which maintains or enhances environmental values by, in co-operation with the Conservation Authorities:**

- a) Encouraging publicly funded programs, such as reforestation and stream improvement, to focus on measures which enhance the natural environment system including:
  - increasing connectivity between natural habitat areas;
  - increasing native vegetative cover within and around environmental policy areas; and
  - increasing vegetative cover on steep slopes or adjacent to watercourses.

- b) Encouraging initiatives in the agricultural community to develop environmental farm plans and other programs to support farming practices which maintain or enhance environmental quality;
- c) Making available any information to landowners on natural values;
- d) Pursuing opportunities to combine education and communication on natural values with other regional activities.”

**282. Protection of Fish Habitat** - The Province and the Conservation Authorities has commented that the Draft Plan does not refer clearly to the protection of fish habitat as required under the Fisheries Act and the Provincial Policy Statement. The FCA (310) also suggested that the Fisheries Act be referenced.

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 5.2 by adding the following as Policy 5:

- 5. “Ensure that development does not alter, disrupt or destroy fish habitat, and that there will be no net loss of productive capacity of fish habitat as required in the Fisheries Act. Fish habitat refers to those areas on which fish depend directly or indirectly to carry out their life processes, such as spawning grounds, nursery and rearing areas, and those areas that supply food or allow migration. Development proposals shall be required to demonstrate that they will not have an adverse impact when fish habitat is on or in the vicinity of a site.”; and

Change the preamble to Section 5.4 by adding the phrase “and fish habitat” to the bullet point reading “significant habitat for seasonal wildlife concentrations”.

**283. Monitoring** - The Conservation Authorities (229) have suggested that an objective be included on monitoring. The Ottawa Field Naturalists (313) also emphasise the importance of monitoring and have noted the lack of provisions for long term monitoring.

**Response** - Monitoring is a critical element throughout the plan, and more specific provisions related to this chapter is outlined in Section 5.2.3, Policy 6. More details are being provided in Annex B of this report. Section 5.2.3, Policy 6 does involve monitoring provisions for a number of policies in Chapter 5 so would be better placed in the general section (Section 5.2.7) on environmental monitoring.

**Recommendation** - Move Section 5.2.3, Policy 6 to Section 5.2.7.

**284. Section 5.1 - preservation of old field habitat** - Submission (248) recommends that a specific objective be included to preserve old field habitat.

**Response** - While old field habitats do make an important ecological contribution, designation of specific old field habitats, these areas also require a degree of management such as occasional cutting (as noted in the submission). On private lands, a land use plan does not provide mechanisms to control

this sort of land management. In defining rural designations, some transitional habitat has been included when it is within a natural complex, and the general environmental policies may also address retention of natural vegetation. Finally, where these areas are part of an identified significant wildlife habitat, objectives 1 and 2 could apply.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**285. Use of native species** - Submission (248) has provided several comments related to the use of native species.

**Response** - Agree that an additional statement would serve to enforce this principle.

**Recommendation - Change Section 5.2.1 by adding the following as Policy 7:**

**7. “Promote the use of native species in public projects and private tree planting/conservation plans wherever appropriate.”**

**286. Section 5.2 involves many studies** - Concern has been expressed (108) that this section introduces a number of new studies. It was also suggested that areas for which studies such as Master Drainage plans have been prepared should be exempt from these provisions and that a list of exempt areas could be included.

**Response** - When reviewing development proposals, reference shall be made to any existing studies to meet the requirements of any official plan policies. If they are adequate for the prescribed purposes, no further work will be required. Recent Master Drainage plans that have been accepted as a basis for development would fall into this category.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**287. Section 5.2.1, Policy 1** - Centre Town Community Association (295) recommends that this policy state that a bylaw will be passed to protect trees on private land.

**Response** - Tree cutting bylaws could be a component of a tree conservation and enhancement strategy, but the recent authority to pass these bylaws under the Municipal Act applies to area municipalities. There is currently a Tree Cutting Bylaw at the Regional level, although the limitations in the enabling legislation (Trees Act) reduce its effectiveness. Finally, tree conservation strategies would likely vary across the Region as circumstances and local objectives may be different.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**288. Section 5.2.1, Policy 4** - The Conservation Authorities (229) suggest that this policy clearly indicate the role that vegetated stream corridors play as ecological linkages.

**Response** - Agree

**Recommendation - Change Section 5.2.1, Policy 4 by adding at the end of the policy “ to support the role of these corridors in linking natural areas and maintaining ecological integrity”.**

**289. Section 5.2.1, Policy 5** - Submission (295) also suggests that tree conservation plans must be submitted prior to destruction of existing natural habitat, and that policy 5b) should refer to stands of trees as well as trees.

**Response** - This comment raises the larger issue of site alteration prior to development approval. The passing of tree cutting bylaws by area municipalities is one way of addressing this issue. The timing of studies is also very important and is discussed under Policy 6. Addition of “stands of trees” to the policy dealing with protective measures is appropriate.

**Recommendation - Change Section 5.2.1, Policy 5b) to read “.. for those trees or stands of trees...”.**

**290. Section 5.2.1, Policy 5** - The Ottawa Homebuilders (145) have expressed concern at having to submit a tree conservation/planting plan. Other submissions (313) have indicated general support but posed questions about the detailed process.

**Response** - Preparation of tree conservation/planting plans have been a part of the development process in several areas. They serve the purpose of both addressing a number of environmental objectives by ensuring that as much natural tree cover as possible is integrated into developments. Natural tree cover also tends to increase the value of development and improve the general living environment. These plans also provide a mechanism to ensure that trees that are saved are sustainable over the long term. It will be important to work with the development community in designing a guideline and approach for these plans as a component of the tree conservation and enhancement strategy.

**Recommendation - No change**

**291. Section 5.2.1 Policy 6, Where possible, studies should be integrated** - Concern that this provisions introduces many new study requirements. It is also located in an inappropriate location as it applies to more than protection of vegetative cover (132, 145). Cumberland (279) suggested deletion. There is also concern with the requirement that these should be completed as a first step in the process.

**Response** - Agree that this policy should be relocated to a new section which deals with more general environmental requirements.

This policy does not introduce any new studies. It refers to the types of studies which may be related and our specified in other policies. Suggesting that these studies be integrated is meant to promote cost efficiencies and more integrated analysis and review. Those studies which have a fundamental impact on whether development is feasible (e.g. hydrogeology) will be required as part of a development application. Those that affect the design or intensity may also be required, at least at a

conceptual level, as a component of an application. Other studies may be more appropriate as conditions of approval. The pre-consultation stage is critical so that the specific circumstances can be assessed.

**Recommendation - Revise Section 5.2.1, Policy 6 as follows and move it to a new Section 5.2.7 entitled Environmental Analysis and Monitoring.**

**“Environmental analysis required to support development proposals, such as stormwater management, tree retention/planting, hydrogeology and terrain analysis should, where possible, be combined into a comprehensive study to allow for an integrated review. Where these studies are likely to have an effect on basic components of the development design, and the required information is not available as a result of other studies, they are to be completed as a first step in developing a proposal and should accompany the application. Pre-consultation and review of existing plans and information is a critical component of the process.”**

**292. Section 5.2.2 Policy 1** - The Conservation Authorities have indicated that aquifer management is also an ongoing activity which should be recognised.

**Response** - Agree. This is reflected in many of the policies that follow such as Policy 6 (communal wells) and Section 5.2.3 (Design with nature).

**Recommendation - Add the following sentence to the end of to Section 5.2.2, Policy 1:**

**“Aquifer management will also be addressed during development of watershed and sub-watershed plans”.**

**293. Section 5.2.2, Policies 5, 7, 4** - Cumberland (279) recommends that these policies be deleted as development design is a local matter.

**Response** - While a number of these policies would require co-operation from agencies and area municipalities, the Regional Official Plan is meant to provide direction for the development process. The Region also acts as approval authority in some cases and through the recent transfer of review functions from the Province, needs to incorporate provisions to implement some of the general component of Provincial policy. In general, the response to these provisions has been positive.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**294. Section 5.2.2, Policy 5** - There have been several comments on this component of the policy. There is concern that the “high water mark of the normal channel” is not defined. It was also suggested that inclusion of specific numbers makes the policy too rigid, while the Conservation Authorities (229), support the establishment of a standard. West Carleton (163) suggested a standard of 12m. Cumberland (279) questioned who determines top of bank and indicated that 15m. may be excessive. It was also noted that environmental constraints play an important role in establishing these setbacks (108, 279, 229).



**Response** - Agree in part. The high water mark should be clarified and a specific suggestion was offered by the Conservation Authority and staff have included it in the recommendation. With respect to the inclusion of specific distances, the policy does provide for reduced set backs if they are justified through a sub-watershed or site management plan, or in the case of less significant proposals where these may not be completed, through consultation with the approval authority and the Conservation Authority. In addition, a cross reference to Section 11 is needed.

**Recommendation** - That Section 5.2.2, Policy 5 be amended by replacing high water mark of the normal channel”, with “normal high water mark” and add the following definition to the glossary:

**“Normal High Water Mark**

**The mark made by the action of water under natural conditions on the shore or bank of a waterbody which action has been so common and usual and so long continued that it has created a difference between the character of the vegetation or soil on one side of the mark and the character of the vegetation or soil on the other side of the mark.”**

and adding the following sentence to the end of Section 5.2.2, Policy 5:

**“Minimum setbacks may also be influenced by requirements related to floodplain and geotechnical considerations related to unstable slopes as outlined in Section 11.”**

**295. Section 5.2.3** - The Conservation Authorities have suggested that “design with nature” be defined and have offered their definition of conservation of land as a suggestion. The Homebuilders (145) are concerned with this policy section in that no specific guidelines exist. General support for this section was expressed in a variety of submissions.

**Response** - Agree in part. A definition would be helpful, although the term is used more specifically than conservation of land. Detailed guidelines are not appropriate in an Official Plan document.

**Recommendation** - That the following definition be added to the Glossary:

**“Design with Nature - An approach which utilises natural methods during site design to work with the terrestrial, aquatic, biological characteristics of the site and the relationship between them. These measures may serve to reduce the reliance on technological solutions which may be expensive, energy or management intensive, and less environmentally sensitive. This may include:**

- retention of natural vegetation on slopes to reduce erosion;
- conservation of as many existing trees as feasible ;
- use of appropriate natural infiltration techniques on site to reduce the need for storm water management ponds;
- orientation of streets to maximise opportunities for passive solar heating and reflection of natural contours; and
- protection of natural stream corridors, and incorporation of natural features into open spaces.”

**296. Section 5.2.3, Policy 1** - Rideau (256) has suggested that design with nature by “encouraged, if appropriate” rather than “required, where possible”. West Carleton (163) have suggested additional emphasis on this component combined with less prescriptive policy provisions elsewhere. Several submissions (248, 295, 310, 305) recommended that this language be strengthened to remove qualifications such as where possible and indicate that the measures must be followed. Ottawa (109) has suggested that this should include reference to the building footprint.

**Response** - Intent is to make a strong statement to require the sorts of measures listed wherever possible. All items on the list may not, however, be appropriate in all cases and other factors, such as safety, may take precedence in some situations during public and private projects. Nothing in the policy prevents consideration of the building footprint, however this is a level of detail for which the Region does not generally have approval authority.

**Recommendation - No Change.**

**297. Section 5.2.3, Policy 5** - Centretown Citizens’ Community Association (295) has asked how frequently a State of the Environment Report will be prepared. The Ottawa Field Naturalists (313) have also noted that more detail is needed.

**Response** - The frequency and details would be established through the Terms of Reference which would be approved by Council. The intent would be to design the program to utilise existing monitoring efforts as much as possible. This policy would, however, be more appropriately located in Section 5.2.7. (Environmental Analysis and Monitoring)

**Recommendation - That Section 5.2.3, Policy 5 , be moved to a new Section 5.2.7 called Environmental Analysis and Monitoring.**

### **General Comments on Section 5.3 - Watershed Strategies**

**298. Process and Definitions** - The fundamental approach in this section of the Plan has been supported. However, based on comments from municipalities, agencies, the development community and the Water Quality Committee, there appears to be uncertainty about definitions and the scope of work required. Specific questions were raised as to how this section relates to policies in the current Regional Official Plan and a suggestion made to provide more specific definitions.

**Response** - Partially agree. The terminology has changed to be consistent with the Provincial guidelines on Watershed Management. A stormwater design plan is now called a site management plan and occurs at the time of subdivision or site plan approval. A master drainage plan is now called a sub-watershed plan and is associated with the review and approval of a local or regional official plan amendment. There is no parallel in the current Official Plan to a watershed plan. The watershed plan should occur in advance of developing official plan policies and is more akin to, although broader than, the sort of work undertaken in the Natural Environment Systems Study.

The difference between a watershed plan and a sub-watershed plan is defined by the level of detail in the study. So, for the purposes of our work at the Region, the Jock River watershed may be the appropriate area within which to do a watershed study even though, in another context, it is a sub-watershed of the Rideau River. Therefore, the definition of a watershed plan or a sub-watershed plan is the terms of reference of the study. Section 5.3.1, policy 3 defines a watershed plan. Section 5.3.2, Policy 4 defines a sub-watershed plan and Policy 5.3.3, policy 2 defines a site management plan. Due to the enormous range in issues, topography and circumstances, it would be misleading to provide more detail in the Regional Official Plan.

**Recommendation - That the following definitions be added to the glossary:**

**“Watershed Plan - A plan developed in partnership with municipalities, agencies and residents dealing with broad water management issues in the area of land drained by a particular river and its tributaries. It will provide general direction and objectives for the watershed area, and more specific direction for the preparation on sub-watershed or site management plans. It will include the components outlined in Section 5.3.1.**

**Sub-Watershed Plan - A plan initiated by an area municipality, or identified through a watershed plan, dealing with water management issues in the area drained by a particular river and its tributaries and forming part of a larger watershed. It will provide a greater level of detail than a Watershed Plan including the components identified in Section 5.3.2.**

**Site Management Plan - A plan developed for a particular development proposal in accordance with guidance set out in a sub-watershed plan where that is available. Generally, site management plans will include details on subdivision stormwater management, specific best management practices for stormwater, erosion and siltation control and details for enhancement and rehabilitation of natural features.”**

### **Specific Comments on Section 5.3 - Watershed Strategies**

**299. Section 5.3.1, Policy 3 -** The Conservation Authorities have commented that this policy reads too limiting in that it reads as a complete list of potential partners and contributors to watershed plans.

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation -** Change Section 5.3.1, Policy 2 by adding Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs to the list of participants and conclude the policy with the phrase “and other private and public interests as may be required by the circumstances in a specific watershed. This should include participants in adjacent municipalities when a watershed boundary extends beyond the jurisdiction of the RMOC”.

**300. Preparation and Approval -** Osgoode has asked who will pay for these plans and when, and also expressed concern that area municipalities be involved in the approval process.

**Response -** Watershed Plans will be prepared in partnership with area municipalities. Policy 5 simply establishes the intent for Regional Council to approve the plans. Area municipalities can also go

through a formal adoption process. Each Watershed will be different in terms of the timing and involvement, and funding requirements will reflect the need and issues in the watershed. Watershed plans can involve the examination of existing information by the partners to provide general direction with minimal expense. Sub-watershed plans may involve more technical work but would only be initiated if the need exists, as is the case with Master Drainage plans.

**Recommendation - A No change.**

**301. Ottawa River Watershed Study** - Submissions 305 and 310 suggest that a policy be added to encourage Quebec and Ontario to co-operate on a watershed plan for the Ottawa River.

**Response** - Consideration of the larger drainage basin is important and the consideration of natural units is a basic principle of ecosystem planning.. The most effective approach or mechanism, however, requires more discussion. Nothing in the Draft Plan prevents the Watershed Planning policies to be applied to the Ottawa River Basin, but a specific policy naming the watershed and committing the Region to encouraging a plan for the Basin is premature without more thought and discussion with potential partners.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**302. Section 5.3.1, Policy 4** - The Conservation Authority has noted that there may be watersheds in which the objectives in 5.1 may not be appropriate and that objectives should be refined on a watershed basis with all the partners.

**Response** - The objectives would be appropriate in the majority of cases and should be addressed although specific circumstances will vary from watershed to watershed.

**Recommendation - Replace the phrase “shall be incorporated into” with the phrase “shall be addressed in” in Section 5.3.1, Policy 4.**

**303. Section 5.3.2** - Cumberland comments that storm water management and sub-watershed plans are a local responsibility and should be left at the local level.

**Response** - The policies allow for initiation of s sub-watershed plan at the local level. However, some sub-watersheds, and certainly receiving rivers, do cross municipal boundaries and may deal with regional scale issues. As the approval authority for subdivisions, the Region does have an interest in providing direction for these activities. Finally, the Province has transferred certain responsibilities to the Region and the Regional Plan should reflect Provincial approaches and requirements.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**304. Section 5.3.2, Policy 2b)** - Centretown Citizens’ Community Association (295) recommends that if another party co-ordinates a sub-watershed plan, that this commitment be obtained in writing.

The Conservation Authorities suggest that the door be left open to NGO's or community groups to prepare a sub-watershed plan.

**Response** - This is essentially an implementation issue and while in some cases, a formal agreement may be appropriate, in others, particularly if there is no Regional interest involved, it may not. There would be nothing preventing another group from examining issues on a sub-watershed basis, or playing a central role in an effort co-ordinated through this policy.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**305. Section 5.3.2, Policy 3b)** - The Townships of West Carleton and Goulbourn requested clarification that the term largely undeveloped lands would not apply to small scale proposals and severances. Submission 295 suggests that the conditions of limited development be specified.

**Response** - Agree in part. The intent is not to require a sub-watershed plan for small scale developments or severances, however, a precise definition is not appropriate in that the definition may vary depending on the issues and sensitivity of a watershed.

**Recommendation** - **Revise Section 5.3.2, Policy 3b) (1st sentence) to indicate that sub-watershed plans be undertaken “prior to considering plans for new development areas or subdivisions in locations which are largely undeveloped ...”.**

**306. Section 5.3 - LeBreton Flats** - The following policy is required to reflect the Draft Official Plan Amendment for LeBreton Flats (To be discussed at Planning and Environment Committee on May 13).

**Recommendation** - Add the following policy as Section 5.3.2, Policy 7:

**“A local official plan amendment for LeBreton Flats may be approved only after completion of a plan for managing stormwater within the area included in the amendment is completed to the satisfaction of the City of Ottawa, the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority, the National Capital Commission, and the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.”**

**307. Section 5.3.3** - The Ottawa-Carleton Homebuilders (145) state that the preparation of a site management plan may not be necessary for every subdivision depending on the level of detail in a sub-watershed plan.

**Response** - Do not agree. Site management plans (similar to stormwater design plans) are designed to deal with both a level of detail and some components of development approval, such as erosion control during construction, and storm water management details which have to be tailored to each specific development. The nature of a site management plan will vary depending on the detail included in a sub-watershed plan, but a management plan is needed to identify how the sub-watershed plan recommendations are being applied to an individual development, or to address stormwater plans where there is not sub-watershed plan.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**308. Section 5.3.3, Policy 2 -** Submission 295 recommends integrating this policy with section 5.3.2, Policy 4.

**Response -** The site management plans and sub-watershed plans are integrated in the sense that they are different stages in the same process. However, the specific requirements vary in the level of detail and require different policies.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**309. Section 5.3.3, Policy 2 -** The Conservation Authorities have suggested that erosion and sediment control be referred to in this section, and that Policy 2c) be broadened.

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Section 5.3.3, Policy 2 by adding to the list in the second sentence “erosion and sediment control” and that Policy 2c) be amended as follows: “the quality of water which supports aquatic life and fish habitat is not adversely affected”.**

#### **General Comments on Section 5.4**

**310. Protection of locally significant areas -** A number of comments were made by area municipalities on the subject of locally significant areas and urban features. The City of Ottawa is concerned that the plan does not extend the natural system into the urban environment and has recommended inclusion of the Greenway system on schedule B, and stronger statements in support of efforts of local municipalities to protect locally significant features.

A number of individuals and associations expressed concern that the draft Plan did not include adequate recognition of environmental features in urban areas, or sufficient support for local efforts. (257, 295, 310, 305, 286, 313, 135) Some comments also indicated designation of locally significant features in the plan should be at the request of the area municipality (132). Submission (202) argued for the inclusion of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA's) in general, while (135) referred specifically to the Montford Woods.

**Response -** Agree in part. Additional components addressing the urban system have been added in Chapter 6. General policies dealing with waterway protection, storm drainage and tree conservation strategies apply in urban areas. However, a strengthened section on protection of additional areas identified as a result of further work by area municipalities, such as the City of Ottawa's Natural and Open Spaces Study, would be appropriate. In terms of including an additional designation, Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs), the proposed designations include areas which other plans have referred to as ESAs.

**Recommendation - Replace Section 5.2.1, with the following as a new Section 5.4.7.**

**“Section 5.4.7 - Protection of Other Significant Features.**

**Council Shall:**

- 1. Encourage area municipalities to protect features based on criteria as established in local Official Plans or related policy documents; and**
- 2. Consider inclusion of additional significant features in consultation with area municipalities through amendment to this Plan. This may include additions to environmental designations as outlined in Sections 5.4 or, if necessary, new policies or designations tailored to locally significant features.”**

**311. Greenbelt Designations** - The Qualicum/Graham Park Community Association (116) suggested a separate greenbelt section with the rural landscape areas be included.

**Response** - The natural areas within the greenbelt have been placed in environmental designations. Policies specific to the greenbelt and rural landscapes are included in Section 6.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**312. Greenbelt Connections** - Submission (286) is concerned that the greenbelt not become an island and that “undeveloped rays” should extend beyond the greenbelt

**Response** - Natural areas which connect with the Greenbelt are placed in environmental designations (see Schedule K). In addition, watercourses are protected through both general provisions in Section 5 and River Corridor designations in Section 6.

**Recommendation - No Change.**

**313. Public access to Environmental Areas** - Concern has been expressed that by listing recreational uses as permitted uses in these areas, that public access is implied.

**Response** - Agree. Intent is not to encourage public access to private lands.

**Recommendation - Add the following policy to Section 5.4.1, and Section 5.4.2:**

**“Not allow public use and access to private lands for any purpose, without consent of the landowner”.**

**314. Acquisition beyond statutory designations** - Submission 108 raises the issue of paying for lands required to be set aside beyond the statutory dedications.

**Response** - During the development process, a number of considerations are included and dealt with through negotiation and design provisions. The Provincial Policy Statements do support the protection

of significant features and functions>. This can be accomplished through a number of mechanisms including dedication of hazard lands, creative design concepts, and working with the development community as has occurred in examples such as the Kanata Lakes area.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**315. Section 5.2.4, Policy 1 -** Goulbourn (223) suggests that areas of the Habitat for endangered and threatened species be shown on the schedules. Submission 248 recommends that “significant portions” be defined, and submission 295 suggested that a reference be made to Section 5.1, objective 3 which discusses ecological linkages.

**Response -** This general policy is included to reflect the fact that, under the Endangered Species Act and Provincial Policy, these areas are protected regardless of their designation in the Plan. In addition, these areas may vary over time. The term “significant portions” comes from the Provincial Policy statement. While linkages may be important to these species, this policy is specific to the requirements of the Act and a reference to a general environmental objective is not necessary.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**316. Description of Environmental Impact Statements -** Several comments have been made regarding the use of Environmental Impact Statements. The Province has suggested that they be used more extensively and applied to all components of the Natural Environment System and Adjacent Lands, and that the requirement should be relocated to the general policies in Section 5.2.

Gloucester (244) has commented that more details are required on who reviews EIS, and criteria for acceptance. West Carleton (163) has suggested that reference be made to Issue Summary Papers which have been used effectively to focus subsequent technical work. Cumberland (279) also raised issues related to the process and content of an EIS. The Conservation Authorities (229) also had some suggestions.

**Response -** Agree in part. A number of these concerns would be addressed through development and approval of a technical guideline to provide more detailed direction. However, there is a need to provide some of this direction within the plan itself. In addition, placing these policies in a separate section is appropriate in view of the recommendation that EIS also be used in Environment B areas. Within Environment A areas, development is not permitted and EIS provisions are not necessary. For lands adjacent to Provincially Significant Wetlands (South and East of the Canadian Shield), specific approach was approved by Council through Regional Official Plan Amendment 61 and this approach is reflected in Section 5.6. The issue of adjacent lands is addressed below.

**Recommendation - Replace Section 5.5, policies 5, 6 and 7 with a new Section 5.4.4 as follows:**

**“5.4.4. - Environmental Impact Statements**

**Council Shall:**



- I. **Require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement to demonstrate that a proposed development will not have an adverse impact on significant features and functions in Environment B areas on Schedule A, lands adjacent to Provincially Significant Wetlands, and areas within the Environmental Features overlay on Schedule K;**
- II. **Approve a general Terms of Reference and Guideline for Environmental Impact Statements;**
- III. **Consider reducing an Environmental Impact Statement to a scoped statement if the proposal is:**
  - A. **minor in nature (impact equivalent to a single severance);**
  - B. **located along the edge of a feature;**
  - C. **located in a previously disturbed area; and**
  - D. **located in an area where previous studies are sufficient to provide the necessary technical information to assess a proposal.**

A scoped statement will involve a checklist that can be completed by the applicant in consultation with the RMOC or other approval authority.
- IV. **Require that if the scoped statement indicates that there may be some potential impacts that warrant a more complete review, a full site EIS be prepared.**
- V. **Require that where a full site Environmental Impact Statement is required, the statement be prepared by a qualified professional with expertise in environmental science. The statement will:**
  - A. **define the nature and the boundaries of any significant features on the site;**
  - B. **describe the location, extent, and nature of development;**
  - C. **describe the relationship of these features and functions to the proposed development and adjacent lands; and**
  - D. **demonstrate how and where development can proceed without negative impact on the natural values which make the area significant.**
  - E. **describe any mitigation or compensation proposals designed to alleviate or eliminate impacts.**
- VI. **Require pre-consultation to focus the content and technical work involved in an EIS. All existing background information and mapping available will be made available by the approval authority. For proposals involving extensive land areas or complicated environmental issues, the applicant may wish to prepare and issues summary paper to identify the critical areas in which more work is warranted.”**

**317. Adjacent Land Policies** - The Province has expressed concern that the policies for Environment A, Environment B, and Rural Resource do not include policies related to development on lands adjacent to these features. They have requested that these policies be incorporated as per the Provincial Policy Statement.

**Response - Disagree.** The plan meets the intent of the Provincial Policy and provides adequate protection on adjacent lands through the following measures:

- adjacent lands policies are included for wetlands which tend to be the most sensitive feature in terms of development on adjacent lands, and have precise boundaries that include only the wetland feature;
- the boundaries of Environment B and the Environmental Feature areas on Schedule K (Rural Resource) are designed to include the broader natural complex; and
- outside of these designations, general policies found in Section 5.2 will ensure that development is sensitive to features, such as streams and ecological linkages, which support the environmental features and functions contained with natural areas.

**Recommendation - No change.**

#### **Specific Comments on Section 5.4**

##### **Section 5.4.1 - Natural Environment Areas (A)**

**318. Section 5.4.1, Policy 3d) Forestry uses -** Township of Cumberland (279) and the Ottawa Field Naturalists (313) have concerns with potential forest practices such as clear cutting and suggests that this policy be more restrictive.

**Response -** The policy requires that any forestry be conducted in accordance with good forestry practice. As a land management issue, there is limited ability to address forest practice directly in the land uses planning process. Environment A areas are primarily public lands in which environmental objectives have been given priority. Some additional clarification could be offered.

**Recommendation - Change Section 5.4.1, Policy 3d) as follows:**

**“forestry, conducted in accordance with good forestry practice pursuant to the Forestry Act, Regional Regulatory Code, or as defined in approved forest management plans. Good forestry practice will be done on a sustainable basis which respects significant features and functions in the area”.**

**319. Section 5.4.1, Policy 3f), Section 5.4.2 Policy 3g), Section 5.5, Policy 2f), use of “lots created prior to 1996” -** Several responses (70, 148) expressed concern over the use of 1996 as a date for lots of record which can be built on.

**Response - Agree.**

**Recommendation - Change Section 5.4.1, Policy 3f) and Section 5.4.2 Policy 3g), to replace the reference to prior to 1996 with “from the date of adoption of this plan”.**

**320. Section 5.4.1, Policy 3f) and Section 5.4.2, Policy 3g) -** It was suggested (248, 295) that this policy require that new buildings be constructed outside of the Natural Environment Area. It has also been suggested by the Province and Conservation Authorities that some form of impact statement could be used in these circumstances.

**Response -** This policy recognises the right to build a house on a legally existing lot but suggests that where the opportunity exists, it should be located outside of the environmental area. An Environmental Impact Statement places an additional step and expense on a landowner who has a legal right to construct the dwelling.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**321. Section 5.4.1, Policy 4 -** Cumberland (279) questioned the purpose of this policy, while submission (132) suggested that lot creation should be permitted for agriculturally related uses and single family homes.

**Response -** This policy is included to allow lot creation which facilitates a permitted use such as activities designed to promote education. This could be applied to existing farm operations in terms of agriculturally related severances, but should not be included for general single family dwellings as this would not meet the intent of the policy to prevent further development. Similar comments would apply to agricultural operations in Natural Environment B areas.

**Recommendation - Change Section 5.4.1, Policy 4, and Section 4.5.2, Policy 4 by adding at the end “or for farm-related severances as permitted by Section 7.3”.**

**322. Additional Areas -** Suggestions have been made to add areas to this category to facilitate public acquisition and prevent development. These include:

- City of Kanata suggests that a portion of the South March Highlands be designated Environment A rather than Environment B; and
- Submissions ( 46, 72 ) argue that the Carp Hills should be a Natural Environment A area.

March Rural Community Association (272) has made a more general recommendation that provisions for acquisition be extended beyond Natural Environment A designations.

**Response -** Section 5.4.2, policies 5 and 6 establish a basis for purchasing land in Environment B areas or pursuing alternative methods for protection such as the purchase of conservation easements. As a result, a Natural Environment B designation does not preclude the option of public purchase, but does not commit the Region to purchasing isolated parcels of land. Policies in Natural Environment B areas also provide a mechanism to protect core environmental values and significant features and functions. While both areas are amongst the most significant environmental areas in RMOC, additional commitments for acquisition would require careful consideration in terms of Regional objectives, and a systematic review of additional priorities for acquisition.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**323. Kanata, Marchwood and Lakeside Communities** - City of Kanata has expressed some concern with the delineation of the Natural Environment A areas within the urban boundary. These lands are to be protected and in public ownership under previous agreements with Genstar, but are still in private ownership and the locations are not precise.

**Response** - Specific boundaries can be adjusted without amendment to the plan, although adding an additional area covering Shirley's Brook swamp area and the beaver pond would be appropriate. Given that these lands will be transferred into public ownership, a Natural Environment A designation is appropriate.

**Recommendation** - **Change Schedule B to extend the Natural Environment A designation within the Kanata urban area as shown on revised Schedule B**

**324. Include all areas of Medium and High Significance** - Submission 310 suggests that all areas of medium and high significance that are in public ownership be included.

**Response** - The work completed at a regional scale did identify some areas within the urban area as having high significance and these have largely been recognised. However, in the urban area, other values and levels of significance also play a key role and it has been made clear that the regional analysis of candidate natural areas should not be the sole basis for urban environmental policy, particularly while the City of Ottawa is in the process of competing a major study (NOSS). This concern is addressed to some degree through the addition of Section 5.2.7.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**325. Vincent Massey Park** - The National Capital Commission (258) has requested that the Natural Environment A designation on the woodlands in Vincent Massey Park be amended to reflect the conceptual environmentally significant designation included in the City of Ottawa's Official Plan Amendment. #3

**Response** - Agree that this would reflect the feature more accurately.

**Recommendation** - **Change the limits of the Natural Environment A designation in Vincent Massey Park as shown on revised draft Schedule B.**

**326. Rideau Township, Conc. 4, Lot 23 (34)** - This submission argues that public acquisition is no longer an appropriate strategy, and that his land within the Marlborough Forest is privately owned and with a portion being farmed. He requests a Rural Resource designation.

**Response** - Existing use of the property is permitted in Natural Environment A. To reverse a long standing policy approach in this area and allow a designation with some development potential amidst an area of substantial public ownership and other landowners who have a "no development" designation would set a precedent which would be in conflict the objective of protecting the larger environmental area over the long term.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**327. Section 5.4.1, Policy 3f) -** Submissions 279 and 132 have asked why new agricultural uses are not permitted in Natural Environment A or Natural Environment B designations.

**Response -** Environment A and B designations are primarily environmental areas with environmental objectives. The policy is designed to recognise established agricultural operations which exist and the related farm management practices. Specific decisions related to the farm management practices of established operations are not controlled by the land use planning process.

**Recommendation - No change****General Comment - Section 5.4.2, Natural Environment Areas (B)**

The Natural Environment Areas B category is meant to recognise environmental features in which there is not a commitment to public ownership, but that have been identified by the Province and specifically referred to in the Provincial Policy Statement. The Provincial Policy statement indicates that development may be permitted in these areas if it can be demonstrated that the development will not have a negative impact on the significant features and functions in the area.

**General Comments - Section 5.4.2**

**328. Large lots with no EIS provision, Section 5.4.3 (3), pg. 70 -** Concern that provision for 10 ha. lots and 300 m. frontage does not allow for more flexible and creative development proposals as per the previous policies for Marginal Resource (restricted) (102, 306, 90, 272). Landowners have commented that they accept the environmental designation and previous provisions under Marginal Resource (restricted). Other submissions (28, 102) objected to the lot size and suggested that small lots should generally be allowed along opened road allowances in Environment B areas.

The Province (321) is concerned that by allowing severances without any environmental analysis is contrary to the Provincial Policy Statement which states that development may be permitted in these areas if it can be demonstrated that there is no negative impact on significant features and functions.

West Carleton (163) has suggested that there not be specific lot areas and frontage in the policy, and that the potential for subdivision development be maintained. Kanata (212) has suggested a 2 ha. and 60 m. standard.

**Response -** Agree that a provision to allow for flexible developments, such as clustering any lots in areas which do not contain significant features and functions is reasonable. However, small lot severances without any environmental analysis would not conform to Provincial Policy. Environment B areas have traditionally been recognised as having significant environmental values but further public acquisition and prohibitions on development goes beyond the requirements of Provincial Policy, available resources for acquisition, and is not necessary to protect the environmental values in these areas.

The severance provision was meant to provide a clear level of protection, but have also generated a variety of concerns. To address both the concerns raised by the Provincial Policy Statement and the need for some ability to consider creative proposals, staff suggest that the policies previously applied to a marginal resource restricted be applied to Natural Environment B areas.

**Recommendation - Delete Section 5.4.2, Policy 3e) and replaced it with the following:**

**e) country lot residential development subject to all of the following conditions:**

- a) it can be demonstrated through the completion of an Environmental Impact statement that the development will not have a negative impact on the significant natural features and functions in the area;**
- b) that this environmental impact statement be prepared in accordance with section 5.7.; and**
- c) that the proposed lot can meet all of the other requirements for lot creation in the rural area.**

**329. Relationship with Section 5.6 -** Ottawa (109) has suggested a cross reference to Section 5.6 when referring to wetlands

**Response -** Provincially Significant Wetlands on the Canadian Shield, as per the Provincial Policy statement have been placed in Natural Environment B areas, while those South and East of the Shield are addressed in Section 5.6. A cross reference is not appropriate.

**Recommendation - No change.**

### **Specific Comments on Schedule A**

**330. Kanata, Conc. 4, 5, and 6, Boundaries of Constance Lake Area, (March Township) -** Kanata (212) has requested some minor revisions to the boundaries of the Natural Environment B designation to reflect the boundaries in the local Official Plan which were developed based on the Marginal Resource (Restricted) designation. The March Rural Association (272) has commented that they have members who are familiar with the area and can assist with fine tuning the boundaries. This could be a useful exercise but cannot be pursued immediately given the time between receiving the comment and preparing responses. Section 5.4.2, Policy 2 allows for adjustments to the boundary and this can be examined at a later date.

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change the boundary of the Natural Environment B on designation on Schedule A in lots 16 through 23, Concs. 4, 5, and 6 as requested by the City of Kanata.**

**331. Inclusion of Loch March Golf Course -** Kanata (212) has recommended the exclusion of the area developed for the Loch Marsh Golf Course from the Environment B designation.

**Response -** Agree to remove the area developed for the golf course.

**Recommendation - Change the area developed for the Loch March Golf Course (Conc. 1, Lots 13 and 14, Kanata) from Natural Environment B to General Rural Designation on Schedule A.**

**332. Deletion of Natural Environment B - Area south of the railway line in the South March Highlands** - Kanata (212) has suggested that the area south of the rail line in Lots 10, 11, and 12, Conc. be removed.

**Response** - This area, which is currently Marginal Resource (Restricted) in the Official Plan includes areas identified by Brunton in his study of the Highlands completed for the City in 1994. While it is true that the most pristine area is north of the rail line, there are still areas of significance south of the rail line which warrant an Natural Environment B designation. Changes in the policies as noted above will deal with some of the concerns regarding potential for future development in any areas which are not as significant or can accommodate some development.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**333. Kanata, Conc. 1, Balys and Associates (306)** - Objects to policy provisions that prevent flexible “design with nature” proposals. Request a General Rural designation or at least, provisions that allow for some approaches that protect the environment but do not involve 10 ha. lots.

**Response** - Agree in part. Provisions from the existing Marginal Resource (Restricted) policies are being suggested for Natural Environment B areas which would address the basic concern. General Rural designation would not reflect the environmental values in the area.

**Recommendation - No change in designation.**

**334. Kanata, Conc. 1, Lot 17, Charlebois (90)** - Objects to the new provisions under environment B. He had accepted Marginal Resource (Restricted) provisions and had prepared some initial environmental impact statements to support a development concept.

**Response** - Agree. Suggested modifications in policies for Natural Environment B address the basic concern.

**Recommendation - No change in designation**

**335. West Carleton, Conc. 5, Pt. Lot 19, P. Smith (32)** - Objects to inclusion of property in the Environment B area around the Constance Bay Sand Hills. Had an environmental assessment prepared (Brunton, 1995) that indicated that only a portion of the property exhibited the characteristics that warranted ANSI status and that sensitive development could occur subject to some conditions.

**Response** - The Environment B designation is based on the Provincial boundary for the Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest as per the Provincial Policy Statement. However, by adding provisions similar to the previous Marginal Resource (Restricted) policies, Mr. Smith would have the opportunity

to pursue his development concept and has in fact completed some of the environmental work required. It is our understanding that he plans to enter into pre-consultation on a subdivision proposal and the review of the environmental work completed to date will be a first step.

**Recommendation - No change in designation**

**336. West Carleton (Huntley), Conc. 11, Lot 12** - Objects to Natural Environment B designation as it devalues and limits the use of the property. Region should buy the land at full market value

**Response** - This property is part of the Burnt Lands Area of Natural and Scientific Interest. These areas are evaluated and delineated by the Province. The proposed policy approach meets the Provincial Policy statement and would allow development if it can be demonstrated that there is not an adverse impact on significant features and functions.

**Recommendation - No change in designation.**

**Glossary Additions**

**337. Recommendation - Make the following additions to the Glossary.**

As a result of comments made, a number of definitions should be added to the Glossary to clarify some terms.

**Add definitions for the following terms to the Glossary.**

**“Natural Channel Design - the process by which new or reconstructed stream channels and their associated flood plain riparian systems are designed to be naturally functional, stable healthy, productive, and sustainable.”**

**“Feature - A specific physical area that can be defined by shape, make-up or appearance. Examples include a particular woodland community, or wetland area.”**

**“Function - A natural process that operates within or between areas and involves the movement and exchange of nutrients, energy, or genetic material. Examples include hydrological processes, food webs, animal population dynamics, and surface drainage.”**

**“Ecological Integrity - The general capability of an area to support and maintain the species and communities, and provide the ecological functions, comparable to those of the natural habitats in the area.”**

**“Watercourse - A naturally occurring drainage channel which includes rivers, streams and creeks.”**

**“Ecological Linkage - An area which provides physical continuity between otherwise distinct areas of natural habitat. Landscape elements which may function as linkages include stream corridors, wooded corridors and ravines.”**



### **Errors, Omissions, and Clarifications**

#### **338. Recommendation - Make the following corrections to Section 5.**

That the reference to rivers and streams during the discussion on watershed issues be changed to watercourses.

Section 5.2.1, Policy 2 be amended to read “may include” rather than “will include” to recognise that the policy outlines a list of potential or suggested tools.

Section 5.2.1, Policy 4 be amended to replace “they” with the more precise description “the terms of reference” and adding the phrase “where necessary” after “enhance vegetative cover along stream corridors”

Section 5.2 - Introduction be amended to read “... environmental quality relies more on ongoing environmentally sound planning and development practices than...”.

Section 5.2.2, Policy 2 be amended be adding “ to identify deficiencies and solutions”.

Section 5.2.2, Policy 3 - be amended to include the Conservation Authorities Act as a potential tool and Conservation Authorities as a partner.

Section 5.2.2, Policy 6 be amended to replace the term “prohibitive zoning” with the term “protection from incompatible uses through zoning”.

Section 5.2.2, Policy 7 be revised to read “current standards and practices as documented in an erosion and sediment control plan which is to be provided as a condition of approval and implemented through subdivision or site plan agreements.”

Section 5.2.2, Policy 8 be amended by adding “Watercourse alterations will also be required to meet any other applicable regulations and may require written approval from the Conservation Authority under the ‘Fill, Construction and Alteration to Waterways’ Regulation.”

Section 5.3.2, Policy 1 be amended by adding the phrase “In consultation with the Conservation Authority and local municipality” at the beginning of the policy.

Section 5.3.2, Policy 6 be amended by adding the following to the end of the Policy: “...and encourage other parties to do the same”.

Section 5.3.3, Policy 2 d) be amended to read “natural habitat linkages that are located in or traverse the site are maintained or enhanced”.

Section 5.3.3, Policy 2 be amended to include the phrase “and/or watershed plan” after “... guidance set-out in a sub-watershed plan”.

Section 5.4.2, Policy 2 be amended to read “refined” rather than “interpreted differently”.

**Section 5.5, Policy 2e) be amended to refer to Policy 4 not Policy 5**

**339. Rideau, Conc. 10, Lot 17 ( 270) -** Requests clarification for the West Half of Lot 17 which is general rural on Schedule A, but a portion appears to be Rural Resource on the Black and White maps at the back of the Draft Plan

**Response -** Schedule A is the correct reference. The Rural Resource designation followed the half lot line and the subject property is General Rural

**Recommendation - No change required.**

**340. Gloucester, Conc. RF ,Lot 27 -** Eco-lands Park shown as Natural Environment A rather than Waterfront Open Space

**Recommendation - Change Natural Environment A to Waterfront Open Space on Schedule A in Conc. RF, Lot 27 Gloucester**

**Specific comments on Section 5.6 Provincially Significant Wetlands**

**241.** Some submissions (321,248, 256, 272) raised questions on the text, while a few submissions questioned the wetland designation as applied to their property (52, 118,158, 119).

**Response -** Council on January 22, 1997 adopted amendment 61 to the Regional Official Plan (Regional Official Plan Amendment 61) dealing with the implementation of the Provincially Significant Wetlands policy in Ottawa-Carleton. The amendment is currently before the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing for consideration. A decision on the amendment will be forthcoming. The draft Official Plan could be modified to reflect any changes potentially resulting from a decision on Regional Official Plan Amendment 61. In addition, a process to review specific boundary concerns is being established through Regional Official Plan Amendment 61.

Staff have noted that due to a typographical error that the word “shall” was inadvertently introduced into policy 5.6.1.7f, after the word “approval authorities”. Regional Official Plan Amendment 61 was adopted with the word “Should”.

**Recommendation - Change Policy 7f of Section 5, by replacing the word “shall” in the second sentence with “should”.**

**Comments on Provincially Significant Wetlands Designation on Schedule A**

**342. Cumberland Lot 28 Con. 4 -** Ministry of Natural Resources has advised that the wetland boundary should be adjusted to the north (Robertson 91).

**Response:** Agree. Adjust the wetland boundary as per MNR map.

**Recommendation: Revise the boundary of the Provincially Significant Wetland.**

**343. Petrie Island** - The Wetland designation should be should be revised to reflect the sand dredging operation currently operating. (279)

**Response** - A report entitled A Comparison of the Current Wetland Boundary Mapping for Petrie Islands, and Baie Lafontaine Provincially Significant Wetlands with Mapping Produced Using the Ontario Wetlands Evaluation System, Southern Manual, 3rd Edition, 1993 made recommendations regarding the location of the wetland boundary for Petrie Island and Baie Lafontaine. The report was sent to MNR for review to verify the findings of the study regarding location of the wetland boundary. MNR has verified the changes to the wetland boundary with the exception of the area where sand dredging is occurring. MNR is of the opinion that the area should remain a Provincially Significant since the area where the dredging is occurring was part of the wetland prior to the dredging and would quickly revert back to wetland once the dredging ceases operation.

**Recommendation** - **Revise the boundaries for the Provincially Significant Wetlands for Petrie Island and Baie Lafontaine according to the wetland evaluation with the exception of the area where the sand dredging is occurring where the Provincially Significant Wetland designation will remain.**

### **General Comments on Section 6 - Regional Open Space and Cultural Heritage**

**344. Urban Greenspace** - Numerous briefs commented on the inadequacy or absence of policies and designations to protect greenspace areas, corridors, and parkland in the urban area. The Regional Official Plan should recognize greenspace in the city and its value to urban residents. FCA (Federation of Community Associations) and others made specific recommendations calling for a greenspace designation to include such lands as NILM (National Interest Land Mass) lands, the Ottawa Greenway System and other areas which have been identified in lower tier plans. (107, 109, 117, 120, 121, 122, 124, 131, 139, 196, 202, 243, 248, 266, 286, 295, 305, 310, 319) The NCC (National Capital Commission) and Kanata and individuals suggest another open space designation be introduced for non-water front open space, or rely on local plans to prescribe vocation and use. (258, 212, 124) Another specific suggestion was to incorporate the concepts, objectives and next steps advocated in the RMOC booklet entitled *Planning for the Protection of Greenspace* August 1996 as part of Regional Council's top strategies. (135)

Related comments concerned the need to clarify the roles of each level of government in the protection of urban greenspace, with a suggestion that one over-riding body co-ordinate. (135)

Defining the various terms related to greenspace, open space etc. was also suggested. (248, 258). Setting targets and monitoring greenspace is also important (hectares per person must be set aside in the Regional Official plan for each human being) (135, 319)

**Response** - Agree in principle. Adding a section on urban greenspace (Urban Open Space) will enhance the Regional Official Plan and provide a more complete picture of Ottawa-Carleton. One limitation is that Ottawa's NOSS (Natural Open System Study) is not completed yet and regional staff had hoped to draw from it. Also, other urban municipalities have not yet embarked on similar studies. Nevertheless, staff have taken into account the City of Ottawa Greenway System, The NCC's corridor lands, and other open space designations from local Official Plans and propose to show these lands which are in public ownership or intended to be in public ownership on Schedules I and J. The proposed new policies address the diverse range of existing land uses and characteristics of urban open spaces, ranging from parkway corridors to steep natural ravines

Schedule changes proposed for Schedule I (Regional Open Space Network) show how the various designations in Section 6 and Section 5 work together to create an integrated network.

The elements which will be shown on Schedule I include:

- Urban Open Space designation; and
- Recreational Pathways, Scenic and Entry Routes.

The following elements are shown to illustrate how the various elements create an overall Network of Open Spaces:

- Waterfront Open Space;
- The National Capital Greenbelt; and
- The Central Experimental Farm.

**Recommendations** - a) Change Schedule I by: splitting Schedule I in to two Schedules: I (urban) and J (rural). Schedule I is titled "Regional Open Space Network". It is a schedule of the urban area and shows Recreational Pathways, Scenic Routes, Entry Routes and the Urban Open Space designation. The other elements (Waterfront OpenSpace, the Greenbelt, the Central Experimental Farm and Natural Environment Area 'A' and Wetlands) are shown for illustration purposes only.

b) Add a new Schedule J titled: "Recreational Pathways, Scenic Routes and Entry Routes" for the rural area.

c) Add a new sub-section to Section 6: 6.5 Urban Open Space and renumbering the subsequent sub-sections accordingly:

## **"6.5 URBAN OPEN SPACE**

### **6.5 Urban Open Space**

**The Urban Open Space, Waterfront Open Space and Natural Environment A designations in the urban area are linked by watercourses (to which River Corridors policies apply), Recreational Pathways, and Scenic Routes into a regional open space network as illustrated on Schedule I, Regional Open Space Network. While many of these urban open space corridors already contain existing or planned roads, transitways or underground services, their recreational, environmental, and open space functions remain an important aspect of their contribution to the community. Other smaller corridors and local parks not shown on Schedule I provide linkages and contribute to the quality of life in neighbouring communities."**

**Council shall:**

1. **Define Urban Open Space as the larger open space corridors in urban Ottawa-Carleton, which are in or intended to be in public ownership and are generally available for public use and enjoyment. Transportation and other infrastructure and utilities are permitted within this designation, but the corridors are of sufficient size contain such facilities and also support the features and functions listed in Policy 3 below.**
2. **When reviewing development applications or planning and building infrastructure, maintain the open space character of lands designated Urban Open Space on Schedule I. The boundaries for Urban Open Space may be refined in the context of studies by area municipalities or other agencies or as part of development agreements, consistent with policy 1, without amendment to this Plan.**
3. **Manage Urban Open Space lands in its ownership to:**
  - a) **maintain and enhance natural features and functions through programs such as naturalisation of vegetation;**
  - b) **provide opportunities for recreational pathways in an attractive, green setting; and**
  - c) **enhance Ottawa-Carleton's contribution to the overall green image of the Nation's Capital.**

**345. Lack of Emphasis on Natural Environment** - Several submissions suggested that the objectives and policies disproportionately emphasize human aspects of green and open space, and the river corridors while their ecological and natural environment values are understated. (109, 295, 305, 310). One suggestion is to move Regional Open Space policies right into Section 5 including policies on the National Capital Greenbelt, Central Experimental Farm, and Geological, and Geomorphic Landform Features. (295) Ottawa suggested new policies and revised objectives to address locally significant corridors not identified by the Natural Environment System Study, and to encourage the “identification., protection and restoration of linear corridors for ecological, recreational and transportation reasons.” (109, 310, 305, 295)

**Response** - It is important to consider Section 6 as a complement to the environmental policies in Section 5 which apply throughout the Region. Section 6 addresses the relationship between cultural and natural values in the various settlement areas in the Region. Nevertheless, we agree that Section 6 could be strengthened to emphasize the relationship to the natural environment.

**Recommendation** - **Changes to Section 6 reflecting these general comments are incorporated in the introduction and policies of the various sub-sections.**

**346. Land Acquisition, Management and Access** - Concern has been raised from some in the development community about requirements for land dedication along the rivers and streams, where this might occur above and beyond the 5% requirement.(108, 145).

**Response** - Land dedication to public bodies occur for various situations which can benefit the developer, the future residents, and the public agency. Not all dedications are “imposed” and not all dedications are for just open space purposes. Transfer of land can be through various means including: development control and subdivision agreements, gift or negotiated exchange, conveyance, etc. Provisions in the *Planning Act* such as bonusing, and recent tax incentives also provide opportunities to secure land for public ownership and management. Hazard lands can be dedicated to a public agency, and public access and use can be made of these lands where safety issues are addressed. Other agencies or bodies such as a private land trusts can also have land dedicated to them which may have financial, marketing, and tax benefits for the land developer. There is precedence of these approaches in Ottawa-Carleton. The Official Plan does not need to outline the specifics.

**Recommendation - No Change.**

**347. Public Access to Ottawa River** - March Rural Assoc. suggests that where feasible, access to the riverfront should be assured through facilities held by non-profit institutional owners) such as the Y-camp in rural Kanata) as well as all three levels of governments. (272)

**Response** - While access is accommodated on public Waterfront Open Space land, staff agree in principle to include the Recreation Area Designation, based on the existing Regional Official Plan, to address this issue regarding non-government lands.

**Recommendation** - Change Schedule J by adding “Recreation Area” to the legend as a symbol and including the following areas as Recreation Area: Camp Echon, Camp Woolsey, McLaren’s Landing, Baskin’s Beach, and the Y-Camp; and amend Section 6 by adding a new sub-section 6.6 - Recreational Area, and renumbering the subsequent sub-sections accordingly:

#### “6.6 Recreation Area

**Many areas along the Ottawa River and the Rideau River / Canal outside of the Greenbelt are important open space and recreation areas which are not publicly owned. These areas provide public access and a range of uses and activities to appreciate natural environment resources, the scenic value, the cultural heritage resources, and the recreational potential of the Ottawa River and Rideau River/Canal.**

**The Recreation Area designation enables Council to consider the continuing role of these areas, their relationship to public lands designated Waterfront Open Space, and their contribution to the overall open space network in the rural area. It is important that these areas are not lost to other uses.”**

**Council shall:**

- 1. Designate Recreation Areas on Schedule J and permit the existing uses to continue and where there are existing interpretation, recreation, and natural environment and cultural resource management uses, these may be expanded.**

2. Upon application for a change in designation, consider acquisition of these lands in the context of River Corridor and Waterfront Open Space objectives and polices of this Plan.”

### **Specific Comments on Section 6: Regional Open Space and Cultural Heritage**

**348. Section 6 (Introduction)** - Revise the first word in the introduction from “defining” to “characteristic” (87) The last sentence of paragraph 3 should be amended to add “and provides for urban open space systems” (310, 305)

**Response** - Agree with the first and agree in principle with the second, but suggest alteration since the paragraph is referring to the RMOC’s contribution when working with others. The RMOC is not the only agency that “provides” for open space and there are polices such as River Corridors and Recreation Areas which are also in the rural area.

Further staff also recommends modifications to the introduction to reflect changes to the sub sections that follow, the addition of two designations, and to reflect the general comments discussed earlier.

**Recommendation** - Change the introduction to Section 6.4. In first paragraph replace the second word: “defining” with “characteristic”; and after “built environment” add: “and an overall impression of openspace”;

**In the third paragraph:** adding to the end of the last sentence: “and contribute to a network of open spaces.”;

**In the fourth paragraph:** adding into the second sentence, after “recreation facilities” “in our communities”; replace in the third sentence “river” with: “shoreline arcs and natural areas”; and at the end of the last sentence, adding; “and its contribution to a network of open spaces.”

**At the end of paragraph five:** adding a sentence “The general policies for tree preservation, design with nature, and watershed planning also contribute to a green and healthy urban environment.”;

**In paragraph six, in the first sentence after “scenic” add:” and natural”;**

**At the end, add a new paragraph:**

“The various designations in Section 6, including Waterfront Open Space, Urban Open Space, the National Capital Greenbelt and the Central Experimental Farm, in combination with the natural environment features described in section 5, contribute to a regional open space network and an overall green urban environment. Larger elements, such as Waterfront Open Spaces and Urban Open Spaces, are linked by River Corridors, Recreational Pathways and Scenic Routes. These linear elements contribute to the continuity of open spaces for recreation and the connectivity of natural areas and functions. Together these elements enhance the quality of urban living.”

**349. Section 6.1, Objectives** - Several specific comments and suggested changes to objectives were provided. Many general comments on Section 6 and specific comments on policies would require changes to objectives.

- a) Revise objective 2 for the Greenbelt to protect it from urban development. One suggestion is: “To protect the National Capital Greenbelt *from urban development* and conserve its generally open and rural character *as a defining element* that structures the urban area of Ottawa-Carleton into a main urban area and three urban centres”; (116, 310, 305,124)
- b) Expand objective 5 to recognize the historic value of the Ottawa River, tourism potential and heritage sites development; (163)
- c) Cumberland asked who decides which “scenic values” need to be protected and how this will affect land severances along the Ottawa River and tributaries; and (279)
- d) Objective 5 should address fish and wildlife habitats and ecological functions of the water ways. In some cases these resources may need protection from pathways or water uses. (310, 305)

**Response -**

- a) “Urban development” is a very general term which may be difficult to assess. This suggestion would preclude such “urban development” as: development at the Airport, Park’n Rides, hospital expansion, and water reservoirs/tanks. Other sections of the Plan incorporate the other comment regarding its role as a defining element. (See proposed changes to Section 2.2)
- b) The objective as written embodies these elements. Also there are several points which have been addressed in various policy areas of the Regional Official Plan, including Objective number 3 of this Section.
- c) Many agencies have identified the natural and cultural elements which contribute to the scenic values of the waterways in Ottawa-Carleton. Agencies such as: the RMOC, area municipalities, conservation authorities, NCC, Parks Canada, and heritage organizations, can contribute a diversity of resource to determine scenic values of a landscape. In implementing this objective, policies for 6.3 River Corridors and the policies of Section 3.7.4 (Development in the General Rural Area) would apply.
- d) These objectives and policies must be read in conjunction with other objectives and policies of the plan. Objectives 4, 7, and 11 of Section 5 (Natural Environment) address these issues. Proposed revisions to policies in Section 5 also addresses this.

**Recommendation - Change objective 2 by replacing: “so that it continues to structure” with: “as a defining element that structures”.**

**350. Section 6.1, Objective 6** - Parks Canada suggests adding “navigable historic waterway, and vital component of the Region’s open space system” (236)

**Response -** Generally agree, but prefer the word “network” for consistency.

Further staff also recommends modifications to the objective to reflect changes to the sub sections that follow, the addition of two designations, and to reflect the general comments discussed earlier.



**Recommendation - In Section 6.1, insert a new objective as number 2: “To protect and enhance a network of open spaces which weave through the urban areas, strengthening distinct communities, providing recreational opportunities, enhancing natural and cultural features, and contributing to the connectivity of natural functions in an urban context.”, and renumber the objectives that follow 2-12.**

**Insert at the end of Objective 4 - “ that contributes to the continuity of open space.”;  
In Objective 6 add to the beginning: “Work within the planning process to” and add to the end: “and a navigable historic waterway, and vital component of the open space network in Ottawa-Carleton.”;**

**In Objective, Section 6.1 change: “To conserve” to: “To contribute to the conservation of”.**

**351. Section 6.2 The National Capital Greenbelt (introduction) -** Centretown Citizen’s Community Association suggests amending the third paragraph to read: “The Greenbelt contributes to *the ecology of the area and thus* contributes to the community leisure activities and experiences of the Capital for visitors.” (295)

**Response -** Agreed. Also staff recommends further changes to the introduction to better reflect the Greenbelt’s role in linking urban natural area to the larger natural environment system in the rural area.

**Recommendation - Change Section 6.2:**

- a) **paragraph one of the introduction by adding to the end of the second sentence: “and linking natural environment area in the urban context to the larger system in the rural area of the region beyond the Greenbelt.”; and**
- b) **paragraph three of the introduction by adding: “the ecology of the area and thus...” before the words “contributes to community leisure activities...”**

**352. Section 6.2, Policy 2 -** Gloucester asks why the development provision policies in Section 3.7, General Rural Area and Villages do not apply to Greenbelt Rural? (244)

**Response -** Policy 3 requires infill hamlet development in the Greenbelt to be in accordance with the policies in Section 3.7. Provisions for lot creation (such as severance and subdivision) do not normally apply to federally owned land, and land division by these means are not anticipated in the Greenbelt.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**353. Section 6.2, Policy 4 -** Various briefs strongly disapproved of encouraging expansions and extending regional services to Greenbelt Employment Areas, but agree with permitting continued use of facilities existing on Greenbelt lands. (116, 124, 244, 242, 257, 266, 286,310). The FCA and the Riverside Park Assoc., and others, suggest the policy indicate existing or minor additions to the existing development in these area is being referred to here. (124, 310, 305). This also affects Section 4.5 and 4.1.2. Employment activities of a non-rural nature should be discouraged

in the Greenbelt (257); and high technology employment should be located in research Parks outside, but not in the Greenbelt (286)

**Response** - Greenbelt Employment Areas do not include significant additions to existing areas. To clarify uses, staff propose a new designation “Greenbelt Institutional” to be distinct from “Greenbelt Employment.” Also, policies regarding extension of services will be included in only one section of the Plan (this better reflects the original intent).

**Recommendation - Change policy 4 of Section 6.2 with:**

**“Permit employment activities on lands designated Greenbelt Employment on Schedule B provided that:**

- **the programming, land use, and landscape character of these facilities shall respect the Greenbelt’s rural character and benefit from an extensive open area, isolation, or a rural environment;**
- **activities without special locational requirements, such as office employment, be ancillary and complementary to the primary use, or be accommodated in areas designated for such uses beyond the Greenbelt; and**

**Grounds around such facilities permit activities such as: farming, forestry, conservation, recreation, interpretation and resource management uses.**

**Council may allocate central water and wastewater services required to support these facilities.”;**

**Add anew policy 5 to Section 6.2, and renumber existing policies 5 - 9 accordingly:**

**“Permit institutional, cultural, and recreational facilities and activities, and facilities that support infrastructure (such as Park & Ride lots), on lands designated Greenbelt Institution on Schedule B provided that the programming, land use, and landscape character of these facilities shall respect the Greenbelt’s rural character and benefit from an extensive open area, isolation, or a rural environment;**

**Grounds around such facilities permit activities such as: farming, forestry, conservation, recreation, interpretation and resource management uses.**

**Council may allocate central water and wastewater services required to support these facilities.”;**

**Change Schedule B with a new designation: Greenbelt Institutional with the following sites changed from “Greenbelt Employment” to “Greenbelt Institutional”: DND Connaught; 417/Eagleson Park’n Ride; Queensway-Carleton Hospital; Nepean Sportsplex; Proposed Fallowfield Park’n Ride; Conroy Pit; Regional Detention Centre.**

**354. Section 6.2, Policy 6** - The Airport Authority has objected to the policy requiring extraction of the sand and gravel deposit south of the Airport prior to construction of a second runway or commercial and industrial development. (105)

**Response** - The proviso in the draft policy: “provided that the extraction can be done without compromising the safety of aircraft operations, the natural features and ecological functions of Leitrim wetland and future development opportunities.” and was intended to provide sufficient flexibility. However, to better clarify the intent, staff propose to modify the text.

**Recommendation - Change policy 6 of Section 6.2 by: replacing the phrase “Require that” with “Encourage that”.**

**Comments on Schedule Changes for Section 6.2**

**355.** a) Hunt Club - Nepean opposes the potential development of Greenbelt lands north of the Hunt Club Extension between Cleopatra Drive and Highway 416. Some of this area is designated General Urban Area (88).

b) Queensway Carleton - During the open houses neighbours adjacent to the Queensway Carleton Hospital expressed concern with the Greenbelt Employment designation on Schedule B.

c) On Schedule B, change the designation of lands in the Greenbelt south of Carling and east of the railway, (at Shirley’s Bay Research Centre) from Greenbelt Employment to Natural Environment B. (88)

**Response**

a) These areas are designated as General Urban Area on Schedule B and were not included in the 1996 Greenbelt Master Plan. Due to its fragmentation from the Greenbelt, they no longer contribute the Greenbelt.

b) Agree to some modifications. The hospital could be changed to Greenbelt Institutional and the open area north of the hospital and east of Richmond Rd. should be Greenbelt Rural. This is shown on Schedule B (and the changes recommended above in the recommendation for Section 6.2 Policy 4 and 5).

c) This area is a commercial golf driving range on leased Greenbelt land. It does not have the characteristics to qualify as Natural Environment B. Its designation as Greenbelt Employment was intended to redirect future Communications Canada’s facility requirements away from environmentally sensitive lands designated as Natural Environment B on the northern portion of this agency’s property.

**Recommendation -**

a) **No change.**

b) **On Schedule B, change the Queensway-Carleton Hospital to Greenbelt Institutional designation, and designate the open area north of the hospital and east of Richmond Rd. as Greenbelt Rural.**

c) **No change.**

**356. Section 6.3 River Corridors (Introduction)** - The RVCA would like references to water quality and aquatic habitat. (229) Parks Canada suggest the Rideau Canal should be specifically identified as a cultural heritage feature.(236) West-Carleton suggest expanding the description of the Ottawa River. (163)

**Response -** Agree the suggestions.

**Recommendation - Change Section 6.3 by adding the following sentences after the second sentence of the introduction: “In the past, the Ottawa River served as the principal highway into the Canadian Shield for aboriginal people, explorers, loggers and settlers. Its**

**cultural heritage and natural environment resources and its recreational opportunities contribute to the tourism potential for the communities that line its shore. The Rideau Canal is a national historic site and navigable historic waterway. Its value lies in the combination of historic engineering works and buildings, open spaces, natural features, the canal itself, and adjacent diverse landscapes which together constitute a cultural heritage resource of outstanding national significance.”**

**Make the last line in the introduction a new paragraph, and add a new sentence at the end of this paragraph: “At the same time, the Plan aims to minimize the impact from new development and reduce the impact from existing development on the water quality and on aquatic and shoreline habitats.”**

**357. Section 6.3, Policy 1** - Several comments noted that the policy is difficult to administer without creeks and river corridors identified on Schedules. (87, 108,109, 305,310) Rideau Township is concerned about applying policies to creeks.(256) Cumberland requests clarification on whether these policies or the underlying designation take precedence.(279). Gloucester suggest replacing the reference to creeks or streams with the term “watercourses” since there is no planning definition for them. (244)

**Response** - Agreed. Policies 1 and 2 of Section 6.3 have been re-written to address these and other issues noted below. Because of the small scale of the schedule, identifying where the River Corridors policies apply was too difficult. Instead the recommended polices list or describe where the policies apply. For clarification, these policies are intended to work just like the existing River Corridor policies; namely the more restrictive policies take precedence. Agree to use the term “watercourse”, but use creeks and streams as examples. This will be reflected in the changes to Section 6.3 as described below in

**Recommendation** - See recommendation 360.

**358. Section 6.3, Policy 2** - Reword policy since it appears that the access to shoreline policies apply only to development in Villages and estate subdivisions. Consider adding rural severances abutting the river and creeks in the General Rural Area. (279) Another brief comments that in the rural area, a continuous pathway along the shoreline is problematic and should not be pursued unless full co-operation and consent of land owners and acquired all at once rather than in bits and pieces over time. (132)

**Response** - The policy applies to identified watercourses the urban area, Villages and to development along the Ottawa and Rideau Rivers ( in both the urban and rural areas). A “rural severance” would be considered as a “development proposal” in this policy. The policy has been clarified not to require a pathway along the shoreline in the rural area. Changes to Section 6.3 area described below.

**Recommendation** - See recommendation 360

**359. Section 6.3, Policy 2a and 2b** - A number of comments were received on these subsections. Gloucester is concerned that the inclusion of other watercourses could lead to isolated blocks of small parks and higher maintenance costs. (244). Determination of parklands is a local issue. Allow municipalities to determine locations where access does not make sense and where dedication will not be required.(279, 87, 256). Municipalities may not be able to use parkland dedication to protect shoreline *and* meet active recreation needs of the community. (109) Soften the wording in 2b) to replace “require” with “identify” and eliminate “be reserved.” (244) Clarify to which level of government lands would be conveyed.(109, 224)

**Response** - Substantial changes to these policies are proposed in the recommendation below to address these and other comments. For information, policy 2a) is carried forward from the existing Official Plan. Watercourses where the policies are “required” to apply and where they are “encouraged” have been addressed in the recommendation below. The policy has been qualified in this draft Official Plan not to include hazard lands such as flood plains and steep or unstable slopes based on norms and practices pointed out during informal discussions with area municipalities. With regard to Gloucester’s concern, this policy is intended to support the initiatives taken by area municipalities such as Gloucester in Orléans, and in the South Urban Community.

With regard to conveyance of land in River Corridors, this could be to different public agencies depending on the function, resources and the agency’s mandate. These agencies could include: Conservation Authorities, municipalities, federal agencies, land trust corporations. Parkland dedication is only one type of land which can be secured for public purposes through development agreement.

**Recommendation** - See recommendation 360.

**360. Section 6.3 Policy 2 c) and e)** - Cumberland asked if locations within right-of-way or on road allowances would be an acceptable alternative link between waterfront public lands. (279) Regarding public right-of-way closures abutting the rivers should be “encourage” rather than “require” because road allowances are local. (87, 163, 256, 109,227) RVCA supports the retention of opened and unopened road allowances. (229)

**Response** - Yes, roadways would be acceptable alternative links between publicly accessible waterfront lands. Staff concurs with wording change from “require” to “encourage”. These area reflected in the Recommendation below.

**Recommendation** - Replace the existing policies 1 and 2 in section 6.3 of the draft Official Plan, and renumber the rest of the policies 8-15:

### 6.3

**Council shall:**

- I. **“Apply the policies in this Section as an enhancement of the policies of the underlying designations as shown on Schedules A and B. These designations and policies must be read together.**

- II. When reviewing development proposals for land abutting watercourses, where possible, encourage the transfer of hazard lands (such as flood plain lands, and steep or unstable slopes) along rivers and creeks with sufficient lands for environmental land management to the relevant Conservation Authority or other public agency. These will not be considered part of the public park land dedication under the *Planning Act*.**
- III. Along the Jock, Carp, Mississippi Rivers and Mosquito, Leonard, Bearbrook, Poole and Stevens Creeks in the urban area or in Villages, and along the length of the Ottawa and Rideau Rivers and Canal, establish public access to the shoreline in the following ways:**

  - A. when reviewing development proposals for land abutting the shoreline, require that lands dedicated for public purposes be located at the shoreline (or adjacent to a buffer area of hazard Lands that have been transferred to a public agency) and be accessible from a public road unless there are compelling reasons to the contrary. When acquired, these lands will be subject to the policies for Waterfront Open Space in Section 6.4;**
  - B. encourage area municipalities to retain opened and unopened road allowances to maintain the potential for public access to the shoreline, unless a suitable alternative access exists in the same general area;**
  - C. when designing bridges, or public works at the water edge, or providing input on those designed by other public bodies, ensure that the lands for the facilities are sufficient to provide public access to the shoreline.**
- IV. When reviewing development proposals for land along other watercourses in urban areas, encourage the dedication of lands for public purposes be located at the shoreline (or adjacent to a buffer area of hazard lands that have been transferred to a public agency).**
- V. When reviewing development proposals in the urban area and Villages, along the length of the Ottawa and Rideau Rivers, and along the Jock, Carp, and Mississippi Rivers and Mosquito, Leonard, Bearbrook, Poole and Stevens creeks, ensure that opportunities for a continuous public pathway be reserved along the shoreline. Such opportunity may be secured through: public ownership, conservation easements, public land trust, restrictive covenants, bonusing or other means deemed appropriate on a site by site basis. A possible location for such opportunities is in the setbacks required in policy 5 of Section 5.2.2.**
- VI. Where existing development or sensitive environmental areas separates two or more areas of accessible shoreline, and there is no opportunity for public access or it is environmentally inappropriate, encourage area municipalities to identify alternative linkages back from the shoreline to maintain the continuity of public access.**
- VII. Where public access is not possible, encourage the continuity of land management for natural and cultural values through such means as promotion, education, and through management agreements among private landowners, and agencies such as: the RVCA, Parks Canada, the area municipalities or the Region.”**

**361. Section 6.3, Policy 4 -** FCA and other community associations suggest revisions to include a stronger environmental component. (295, 310, 305) One suggestion is to apply the Watershed policies of Section 5.3 (295). Parks Canada commented that the plan should recognize the potential safety hazard to boaters and shoreline property owners along narrow channels and other congested areas, and acknowledge that restrictions on intensive shoreline land development may be necessary. Parks Canada also adds general support for the policies in clause 4 (236). City of Ottawa suggests an additional qualification to ensure that the natural heritage features along the shoreline are not to be impaired by both land uses and activities such as a pathway system. (109) Cumberland noted that policy 4 c) could be interpreted to preclude the opportunity for a marina (279). Some municipalities prefer these features to be protected in local Official Plans. (163,244).

**Response -** Agree with the FCA suggestion. Watershed policies are general policies in the Regional Official Plan which apply throughout Ottawa-Carleton and do not need to be specifically mentioned. With regard to Parks Canada's concern, the Regional Official Plan includes restrictive policies for shoreline development. Other elements noted are better addressed in the Rideau Canal Management Plan. The intent of these policies was not to preclude a marina. Staff generally agree with Ottawa's comments but policies of this section must be read in conjunction with policies in Section 5. With regard to local Official Plans, staff expect that additional policies may be included to enhance the Regional Official Plan.

**Recommendation -**

**Change policy 4, Section 6.3**

- a) by replacing the first line with: **“Protect and conserve the natural environment and cultural heritage resources, the scenic value and the recreational potential of the Ottawa River and Rideau River/Canal by:”**
- b) by adding to policy 4 c): **“not associated with the river,”** after **“prohibiting land uses”;** and adding **“the natural environment features”** after **“the scenic quality”**.

**362. River Corridor 6.3, policies 5 - 7 regarding Rideau Canal/River -** The requirement for a minimum lot size of 10 hectares and minimum waterfront of 300 metres of waterfront along the rural waterfront of the Rideau Canal/River upstream from Regional Road 6 seems overly restrictive and impractical. (132, 244, 227,249) Parks Canada and RVCA support these policies because there have been significant development pressures and issues in this area in the past. (229, 236). More specifically, Parks Canada supports the policy that encourages more creative higher density development as described in a Parks Canada Study. Reference should be made to this document. (236)

**Response -** These policies in combination do not “preclude development”. Rather, they are intended to guide the pattern of development to better respect the river context and possibly allow greater development potential than conventional approaches. Policy 5 must be read in conjunction with policy 7 which encourages a review and progressive development guidelines as an alternatives to the existing pattern of development. Past policies in the Regional Official Plan for development in the rural area along the Rideau Canal have not been successful in protecting the historic, scenic and environmental context of this designated national historic site. This policy applies principally to a limited number of areas removed from the Agricultural designation under the exiting plan due to a re-evaluation using the LEAR process. The intent of this policy, in

combination with policy 7, is to ensure that development in these newly designated General Rural Areas , along the Rideau River/Canal contributes to the integrity of the national significance of this historic site. These policies do not apply to the many existing lots of record which range from under from 0.4 hectares with the typical lot area ranging from 5.0 to 10 hectare lots.

A reduced minimum lot sizes of 5 hectares and a reduced minimum frontage of 200 metres would give some property owners severance opportunities while still maintaining a low impact on the river corridor.

With regard to Parks Canada's request, staff agree.. This document is an important starting point to implement policy 7 and illustrates the development opportunities of more creative approaches.

**Recommendation -**

**Change Section 6.3, Policy 5 by changing: "10 hectares" to "5 hectares" and "300 metres" to "200 metres";**

**Change Section 6.3 Policy 7 :**

**by adding after "based on" add: " a comprehensive study which recommends", and by removing the words: "draft" before "zoning-bylaws" and "standard" before" subdivision";**

**by replacing policy 7 a): "are proposed by the area municipalities";**

**by adding item 7 d): "Consider the objectives, strategies and recommendations in the 1992 Parks Canada document "Visions of the Future: Land Use Development Scenarios for the Rideau Canal Shoreline."**

**363. Section 6.3, Policy 6 -** Would this policy apply to River Corridors in Kanata? Wording is not clear. (212)

**Response -** No, the policy is intended to modify the special policy 5 for the Rideau River/Canal and does not apply to Kanata.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**364. Section 6.3, Policy 8 -** RVCA asks for recognition of their role regarding river corridor resources. (229), and Cumberland suggests to include tax breaks in the list of examples (276)

**Response -** Agree, but "financial incentives" is a more general term which allow many more financial options and participants.

**Recommendation - Change policy 8 of Section 6.3 by adding: "the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority" after "In co-operation with . . ."; and adding "financial incentives" in the list of examples before "and public education."**

**365. Section 6.3, Policy 9 -** In the absence of an overall strategy to acquire public shoreline, could this tie up development land in the interim? (279)



**Response** - As described in the last sentence of this policy, it is not intended to tie up a development application. This policy would enable Council to act on a land offer by the owner, or when land is proposed for severance of development. It enables council to act decisively and in concert with other agencies in advance of updating / completing of an overall Regional strategy.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**366. Section 6.4, Waterfront Open Space** - City of Ottawa is concerned there is no mechanism specified to demonstrate that the intended use is in keeping with the policies for Waterfront Open Space. (Ottawa has a Municipal Environmental Evaluation Report). They also comment that the protection of waterfront is important for ecological and recreational reasons, regardless of ownership. Publicly-owned waterfront should go on a separate map and a conceptual river corridor-shoreline with special policies indicated on Schedules A and B. (109)

**Response** - Local official plans can have more restrictive policies which conform to the Regional Official Plan policies. Agree it is important that Waterfront Open Space policies, which apply to extensive land areas in public ownership, be read in conjunction with River Corridor policies which apply to land in both private and in public ownership. Ecological aspects related to protection of waterfront are contained in Section 5.

**Recommendation - Add Waterfront Open Space as an information item on Schedule I as per recommendation 344, in addition to maintaining Waterfront Open Space as a designation on Schedules A and B.**

**367. Section 6.4, Policy 3** - National Capital Commission questions whether the policy allows uses such as the Canal Ritz in Waterfront Open Space. Would different policies for the urban and rural area be appropriate? (258) The Centretown Citizens Community Association recommended the following permitted uses be added: “ a) open space and recreational uses which do not adversely affect the natural characteristics of the environment or require or result in landform modifications; b) uses that will help conserve or manage water supplies, or wildlife or other natural features; and c) uses involved in the scientific or educational study of the natural characteristics of the area.” (295)

**Response** - The wording of this policy is intended to allow such uses as a restaurant associated with other recreational services. The opportunity to provide a range of services to the public should be available to urban and rural providers of Waterfront Open Space. Generally agree with the other suggestions which enhance the policies. They have been incorporated in the recommendation below.

**Recommendation - Delete Policy 3 of Section 6.4 and replace it with:**

**“Permit a range of activities and uses within Waterfront Open Space including the following:**

- a) **open air recreation which does not adversely affect the natural environment and cultural heritage characteristics of the area or require or result in landform modifications;**

- b) uses that conserve, interpret and restore elements of the natural and cultural heritage of the waterways;
- c) uses that promote the conservation of the natural values of the lands;
- d) uses involved in the scientific or educational study of the natural or cultural heritage characteristics of the area;
- e) commercial activities and institutional uses which contribute to, or are ancillary to, the above uses.”

**368. Section 6.4, Policy 4 -**

- a) Provide more detail on what is intended by “adequate lands” (108)
- b) This policy is beyond Regional mandate. Open space is both a liability and an asset; the local municipality therefore must be the sole judge of what constitutes community needs. (256)
- c) Replace the first word “Require” with “Encourage” and insert “to” between “RMOC” and “review” (87, 244)

**Response -** a) The Region will work with area municipalities and other partners to assess community needs, and define goals and targets including “adequate lands” to meet the needs of these growing communities.

b) and c) Adopt the recommendation in c), reflecting the consultative intent of the policy. The co-ordination of participants and resources in the spirit of good planning is not beyond the Region’s mandate, as indicated in b). The area municipalities are not the sole provider of public land for recreation and use. Other agencies such as the RVCA, the Region, Parks Canada, and the Province provide lands along the water for public use. The objective is to work together to ensure resources are used effectively and efficiently to meet local and regional needs. An excellent example is the co-operation among seven agencies is the 1996 Long Island River Bend Parklands Master Plan.

**Recommendation - Change Policy 4 of Section 6.4 by replacing “Require that” with “Encourage”, and inserting “to” between “RMOC” and “review”.**

**369. Section 6.4, Policy 4a) Poole Creek flows through Stittsville. (87)**

**Response -** Poole Creek was omitted inadvertently. It will be added to the list of waterways referred to in this policy.

**Recommendation - Change Policy 4a) of Section 6.4 by adding: “and Poole Creek” after the “Carp River”.**

**370. Section 6.4, Policy 5 - Replace “assist’ with “encourage” (244)**

**Response -** The wording in the draft Regional Official Plan is more in keeping with the other policies of this Section, particularly Policy 4, with the proposed revision.

**Recommendation - No change.**

### **Comments relating to Schedule A**

**371.** The Kanata-owned Pinhey Property is a heritage property . It is a sensitive environment and public access to the shore for swimming or boating is not appropriate. This area should not be designated Waterfront Open Space. (212,. 272)

**Response -** Swimming and boating are only one type of permitted use in Waterfront Open Space. The policy also allows interpretation, passive recreation, and conservation activities in this designation. The appropriate mix of uses is best determined on a site-by-site basis.

**Recommendation - No change.**

### **Comments Relating to Schedule B**

**372. -**

- a) Waterfront Open Space designation on Schedule B should not apply to Walter Baker Park since the existing uses do not support the policy. (212)
- b) The Waterfront Open Space designation at Trim and Highway 17 may be an error. (108)
- c) Exclude the War Museum, National Gallery and United States Embassy site from the Waterfront Open Space designation. The policies do not match the land use. (277)
- d) Remove Waterfront Open Space designation on Schedule B from LeBreton Common. The site does not front on the river. (258)
- e) Include the west Bank of the Rideau River, in the City of Ottawa, from Dutchy's Hole to the Queensway as Waterfront Open Space.
- f) Designating the Victoria Island and the Prince of Wales Site as Waterfront Open Space on Schedule B is inappropriate and restrictive.

**Response -** Agree with proposed changes to a), b), c), and d). e) The area south of Dutchy's hole is too small to show on a Regional Schedule as Waterfront Open Space. River Corridor policies in Section 6.3 would address these lands. f) Victoria Island and the Prince of Wales Site were designated Waterfront Open Space in the 1988 Official Plan. Based on Council's direction, to protect designated open space, these sites should remain as Waterfront Open Space.

### **Recommendations for Schedule B (See revised Schedule B attached):**

- a) **Change the designation of Walter Baker Park from Waterfront Open Space to General Urban Area on Schedule B, and add Walter Baker Park as an Urban Open Space designation on Schedule I.**
- b) **Change designation of the property at Trim Road and Highway 17 from Waterfront Open Space to General Urban Area.**
- c) **Change the designation of the institutional area of the War Museum, National Gallery and United States embassy from Waterfront Open Space to Central Area so that the Waterfront Open Space follows the existing open spaces, cliffs and shorelines more closely, and the rest of the area be designated as Central Area.**
- d) **Change the designation of LeBreton Common from Waterfront Open Space to Central Area.**
- e) **No change**
- f) **No change**

### **Clarification and Errors in Section 6.4**

**373. Limitations on Public Access** - Waterfront Open Space includes a wide range of land uses and features which may require limitations on public access, such as the water filtration facilities, derelict industrial properties, stormwater management areas, etc.

**Recommendation - Change Section 6.4 by adding a new policy as Policy 6:**

**“6. Allow limits to public access for safety, security and environmental protection reasons.”**

**374. Schedule B** -- The area in Nepean South over the sewer that crosses the Rideau River, between Winding Way and the Prescott Highway was erroneously included in the Waterfront Open Space designation between Winding Way and the Rideau River.

**Recommendation -- On schedule B, change the designation of the area in Nepean South over the sewer that crosses the Rideau River between Winding Way and the Prescott Highway from Waterfront Open Space to General Urban. (See revised Schedule B attached).**

### **General Comments on Section 6.5 and Section 6.6**

**375.** Centretown Citizen’s Community Association made several recommendations to Section 6.5 Roads as Public Space and 6.6 Scenic Routes and Entry Routes, regarding the planting of trees, shrubs and flowers to increase the open space value of roads. (265)

**Response:** Staff agrees. In several instances the community associations reference to “Trees, shrubs and flowers” will be addressed with the more broadly accepted term “roadside vegetation”. This term includes the more traditional planting of avenue trees, and shrub and flower beds, as well as, more environmentally progressive ecological approaches to the protection existing trees and re-naturalization programs.

#### **Recommendation:**

- a) **Change Section 6.5 Policy 1 a) by after “wider sidewalks” inserting: “street trees” and change “Village mainstreets” to “mainstreets in the urban area and Villages.”**
- b) **Change Section 6.6, Policy 2 a) by after “scenic lookouts,” inserting: “roadside vegetation”.**
- c) **Change Section 6.6, Policy 2 c) by replacing the word “landscaping” with “Streetscaping” and after street lighting add: “roadside vegetation”.**
- d) **Change Section 6.6 Policy 3 b) by replacing “landscaping” with “roadside vegetation”.**

**376. Section 6.6** - Special consideration should be given to including bicycle facilities; reference should be made in this section to focusing on bicycle facilities at key entry points, and to educate visiting motorists in the “Share the Road” etiquette of our region. (310)

The NCC suggested there should be more discussion of the desired character of Entry Routes - the emphasis falls on scenic routes. And although arrows indicate connections of Scenic Routes and Recreational Pathway north across the river, the Outaouais is not mentioned. (258)

**Response** - Staff generally agrees, noting scenic routes are multi-modal roads. Provision for cyclists are outlined in CTN and Recreational Pathway policies and Schedules. “Share the Road” etiquette could be part of the information provided to visitors on entry ways and does not need to be specified in Official Plan Policy. Staff generally agrees with the NCC suggestions. Referring to Entry Routes in policy 2 should put more emphasis on the desired character of these routes. Partnerships with the municipalities in the Outaouais region is recognized in the reference to the Integrated Recreational Pathway study. There is opportunity in the introduction of Section 6.6 Scenic Routes and Entry Routes to refer to the Outaouais.

**Recommendations** - **Change the introduction of Section 6.6 by adding to the end to the sentence “This system of Scenic Routes is under various jurisdictions”, the phrase: “and is part of a complementary network in the Outaouais to create an integrated Capital Region experience.”; followed by the sentence: “Scenic Routes are to be enjoyed by a variety of modes including bus, bike, and in many areas of the network in urban areas and villages, by foot.”;**

**Add to 6.6, policy 2 “and Entry Routes’ after “Scenic Routes”**

**377. Section 6.5, policy 1** -- regarding the lighting of public works (Section 6.10, Policy 2) should be repeated here. (258)

**Response:** The policy applies to all public works by the Region and does not need to be repeated.

**Recommendation: No change**

**378. Section 6.5, policy 1 b)** -- Citizens for Safe Cycling and Dalhousie Community Assoc. suggested further qualifications regarding safety issues in the design and maintenance of roadway elements (190, 303)

**Staff Response** -- Safety is addressed in the following policy 2c).

**Recommendation -- No change**

**379. Section 6.6, Policy 3** -- Clarify who will be expected to provide features such as lay-bys. (87), and who will pay for development and maintenance to achieve your objectives? (108)

**Response** - Various proponents (such as private individuals, agencies and public agencies, etc.) can provide amenities within the right-of-way with permission of the appropriate jurisdiction as per Section 6.6 policy 3. Such amenities could also be provided on lands adjacent to the right-of-way as part of agreements with the landowner through the development review process as per Section 6.6 policy 3. The funding of these elements could be part of the development review agreement or the cost covered by the public or private proponent of these amenities. Co-ordinated implementation should occur as per policy 5.

**Recommendations - No change.****Comments Related to Schedule I:****380. Schedule I:**

- a) Recommend that Dwyer Hill Road not be designated a scenic route. (256)
- b) Several Briefs suggested adding Metcalfe, Kent, Bronson, and Preston as Entry Routes on schedule I (190, 303,305, 310.)
- c) Roads such as 6th Line Road and Riddell Drive are shown as Scenic Routes but are now Kanata roads. The routes seem confusing. (212)

**Response:**

- a) Presently, all rural municipalities and the RMOC are working together to produce a Rural Day Trip Map which will highlight scenic tours and destinations in the rural areas of Ottawa-Carleton. This initiative is being lead by staff from Osgoode and Goulbourn. This initiative implements Policy 5 in Section 6.5 and highlights some of the ways that scenic routes can contribute economic benefits to the community. Agree to delete Dwyer Hill Road.
- b) These roads are addressed by the more general Roads as Public Space policies and do not need to have further policy direction to support them.
- c) Scenic Routes are not just regional Roads. NCC Parkway, Regional roads, local roads, and provincial highways all contribute to the Scenic Network in this Plan. 6th Line Road and Riddell Road are shown as Scenic Route in the 1988 Plan.

**Recommendations:**

- a) **Delete Dwyer Hill Road as a Scenic Route from Schedule I**
- b) **No change**
- c) **No change**

**381. Section 6.7 Recreational Pathways -** Issues raised regarding the funding of pathway and the securing of Rights-of way including:

concerns for who pays for acquisition and maintenance. What protection/compensation is offered to land owners (108); if it is the intention of the Region to have a continuous pathway, then we should do it as a one time undertaking and not acquired it in bits and pieces (132); who would be responsible for the construction cost of pathway links along regional roads? (279); and the plan should provide some cost-sharing agreements where they are not on Regional Roads. (272)

**Response -** The Region is only one of many potential partners who can work together to successfully implement an Integrated Recreational Pathway Network for Ottawa-Carleton. Various partners have different tools and opportunities to contribute to the pathway building process. The Region can at any time acquire land to fulfill any of its Official Plan policies. But limiting the approach to land acquisition by the Region could limit the success and timing of fulfilling this important objective.

The Official Plan is not the best tool to determine cost-sharing or construction responsibility. This would be an issue for the inter-agency Capital Pathway Co-ordination Committee or to be resolved by partners on a project-by-project basis.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**382.** Issues were raised regarding design standards including: how do you protect private property from public access? (108); that most pathways are not wide enough to accommodate both in-line skaters and cyclists. (276)

**Response -** There are many examples of Recreational Pathways in our Region and across North America where public land/private land issues are successfully addressed. The integrated recreational pathway study recognized the conflicts between pathway uses and provides recommended standards to be used by the various partners when implementing the pathway system.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**383.** Concern for the open space character and context of recreational pathways include

- a) Policies for Recreational Pathway should recognize the location of these pathways in natural open spaces as a primary source of their value and require any modifications around these pathways preserve or enhance the natural open space around them. (243)
- b) Section 6.7, Policy 7 -preserves just a strip of continuous asphalt; lack of protection for the scenic corridor and natural surroundings; nothing in the plan would prevent converting the corridors to development. would permit the elimination, (202)

**Response -** The proposed Recreational Pathway Network is much larger than the existing system along NCC parkway and corridors and will be the result of joint efforts of many agencies. Prescriptive standards are not provided. The many participants will follow co-ordinated implementation standards (in guidelines outside of the Official Plan). The many individual participants, circumstances and environments will result in different qualities regarding pathway and the open space context.

Nevertheless, objectives and policies in the draft official plan (and in the changes suggested in this report) do address the open space context for many areas where Recreational Pathways are proposed.

The revised introduction to Section 6 and objectives highlights the role Recreational Pathways play in linking elements in a regional open space network. Objective 4 is enhanced to address open space connectivity of pathways. Waterfront Open Space and Urban Open Space designations, as well as, the Central Experimental Farm, Greenbelt and River Corridor policies in this Plan contributes to a green and open settings along lengths of the Recreational Pathway Network. This can be reinforced for pathways not in these policy areas through changes to the introduction and policies in Section 6.7 recommended below.

**Recommendation -**

- a) In the Introduction of 6.7, after: “Most recreational pathways are off-road” insert: “Where they are not part of larger parks and open spaces, they are intended to be in their own green corridor which enhances the continuity of the open space experience and natural environmental functions.”;
- b) In the second sentence of the introduction after “features” insert: “open spaces”;
- c) Replace policy 3 with: **Protect and enhance the system by placing conditions on the approval of plans of subdivision, plans of condominium, and on severances in and adjacent to the designated corridors to ensure continuity of the Recreational Pathway network within a green and open corridor.**

**384.** Two submissions highlight issues of continuity:

- a) Would the trails in the Marlborough Forest be considered part of the Regional network? (229)
- b) One submission suggest that Gloucester has less pathways than other parts of the region and more planning could be done. (276)

**Response:**

- a) Their are extensive trails in the forest which can be used for walking and cycling. At present their has been no trails in the forest identified in the Integrated Recreational Pathway Study nor in studies by Rideau Township. When resolved, Recreational Pathways can be added to the Official Plan by amendment as per policy 2.
- b) Significant planning for recreational pathways have been done. The 1994 Integrated Network of Recreational Pathway study contributed to the co-ordination of recreational pathways between municipalities and levels of government. The primary pathway elements area reflected in Regional Official Plan Schedules I and J. Gloucester completed a Recreational Pathway/Cycling Network study in 1994.

**Recommendation: No change .**

**385. Section 6.7, Policy 2 -** Citizens for Safe Cycling recommend for clarity, to add: “and accessing the same destinations’ after “general location” and identifying interest groups as facility users and appropriate municipal advisory groups, such as the Regional Cycling Advisory Group (303).

**Staff Response --** Agree.

**Recommendation -** Revise policy 2 by: adding: “and accessing the same destinations’ after “general location” and by adding after interest groups “using these facilities, and appropriate municipal advisory groups, such as the Regional Cycling Advisory Committee.”

**386. Section 6.7, Policy 3:** The placing of conditions on the approval of plans of subdivision in order to ensure a continuous system is too prescriptive. Such conditions should be considered on a site by site basis. (256)



**Response:** - The protection of the system in the Official Plan was one of the recommendation in the original *Integrated Network of Recreational Pathways Study* (page 127) and is among the few tools to secure continuity in the system. Consideration on a site by site basis without an overall strategy has, in the past, created difficulties for the participating partners. The flexibility afforded to partners in Policy 2 must be considered when regarding all policy in this section.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**387. Section 6.7, Policy 4.**

- a) We understand that the Integrated Network of Recreational Pathways study was not adopted by the City of Vanier. (258)
- b) The recreational pathway study was adopted by urban municipalities, yet rural paths are shown. (227)

**Response:**

- a) So noted. It also appears that Rockcliffe Village also did not participate in the study.
- b) Pathway shown on Schedule I in the rural area follow public utility or transportation corridors and Regional Roads and are not shown in the rural community areas. It is hoped that as the various rural area municipalities complete their evaluation of Recreational Pathway opportunities that they may contribute to this plan by amendment.

**Recommendation:**

- a) **In Section 6.7, policy 4, after “. . . was adopted by the urban municipalities”, insert “(except Rockcliffe and Vanier)”.**
- b) **No change**

**388.** a)The Poole Creek Pathway and b) the Rideau Trail should be included on Schedule I and J. (87)

**Response**

- a) Goulbourn did not participate in the Integrated Recreational Pathway Study on which this schedule was based, nor was a supplementary recreational pathway strategy available. Policies enable Goulbourn to contribute pathways to this schedule by amendment. The objective for a continuous pathway along waterways and policies for River Corridors addresses the pathway connections while allowing the community planning details to be resolved by the area municipality.
- b) The Rideau Trail is a trail system provided to a non-government organization through private agreement with landowners. The trail alignment may vary from year to year. The Official Plan does addresses opportunities to sustain the continuity of the Rideau and the Trans-Canada Trails in policy 6.7 #9.

**Recommendations - No change.**

**Errors, Omissions, and Clarifications in Section 6**

**389.** With the addition of Schedule J the Recreational Pathway Network would appear on Schedules I and J.

**Recommendation -- Change all reference in Section 6.7 from “Schedule I” to “Schedules I and J”**

**General Comments on Section 6.8 - Cultural Heritage**

**390.** The Official Plan should define the regional interest, since many of these matters may be construed as local in nature (43)

This section does not clearly specify that the development proposals the Region approves are those it has delegated authority to approve. There should be formal recognition of the fundamental role and jurisdiction of the area municipalities. The co-ordinating role, support and resources the Region may be able to bring to cultural heritage resource management are welcomed. (109)

**Response -** The Region has no interest in assuming activities mandated to area municipalities under the *Heritage Act*, such as designation of heritage properties. The province is seeking opportunities to co-ordinate actions under the *Heritage Act* and *Planning Act*, based on Provincial Policy Statement 2.5.1, “Significant heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes will be conserved”. The Region’s interest is to ensure heritage concerns are addressed in the development process under the *Planning Act* where the Region has approval authority, and to encourage other agencies to adopt similar policies. This is addressed in sufficient detail for Official Plan objectives and policies.

**Recommendation - No change**

**391. Section 6.8, Policy 1 -**

- a) Use “village” rather than “Village”, which has a specific connotation in the plan. (87)
- b) Include the words “monuments and cemeteries” in the definition of cultural heritage resources. (321)
- c) In the policy: “Recognize the need to identify and manage Ottawa-Carleton’s significant cultural resources in a co-ordinated and responsible manner”, what is meant by “manage?” (279)

**Response -** Agree to a) and b). The term “manage” refers to conducting regional affairs to accomplish our cultural heritage resource objective. The policy was not to imply that the RMOC would assume control of local resources. We would work in a co-operative manner as per Section 1.6.

**Recommendation - In Section 6.8, Policy 1 change the word “Village” to “village” and at the end of the list include the words “monuments and cemeteries”.**

**392. Section 6.8, Policy 2 - Changes regarding the Cultural Heritage Master Plan**

- a) Add policies to encourage the protection of historic buildings. (279)
- b) Heritage conservation and inventories should be done at a local municipal level to ensure nothing is left out rather than a “top-down” method. (87)
- c) Suggestion that policy 2, (c), (d) and (e) would be undertaking an “expensive and full blown Master Plan” (87). Another submission supports the need for a Cultural Heritage Master Plan for the Region. (321)
- d) Parks Canada requests they be named in the list of participants (236)
- e) Suggestions regarding clarity for policy 2 are to add the words “include a comprehensive range of” before “existing heritage” in 2 c) and to add a new sub-policy, “2 h) develop mapping for identifying archaeological resource potential areas” (321).

**Response -**

- a) Heritage buildings are included in the definition of cultural heritage resources and conservation is addressed in policies: 7, 8, 9, and 10 of this section.
- b) Staff generally agrees. A cultural heritage inventory would be made through a “bottom up” approach, based on existing inventories and research by such stakeholders as the province, area municipalities, LACACs, museums, federal agencies, and heritage groups, and native-cultural groups. There is an opportunity to create a region-wide inventory which could be managed as part of the RMOC GIS data base and be available to the various stakeholders.
- c) Based on the above input regarding the scope and clarity of policy 2, revised policies are recommended below.
- d) Agree to name Parks Canada
- e) The changes are incorporated below. Rather than calling it a “master plan”, which implies a large study, the term “strategy” is used to indicate a co-ordinated approach which can be implemented over time.

**Recommendation -- Replace policy 2 with the following:**

**“Prepare a Cultural Heritage Strategy to contribute to the conservation of Ottawa-Carleton’s cultural heritage resources early in the development process. The principal components of a Cultural Heritage Strategy will be:**

- a) **a comprehensive built and landscape heritage features database, compiled from existing sources;**
- b) **archaeological resource potential mapping, based on locally relevant criteria;**
- c) **guidelines for resource management and site development in the vicinity of heritage resources.**

**The Strategy will be prepared in co-operation with the area municipalities, the province, the National Capital Commission, Parks Canada, and Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committees and local heritage interest groups and in consultation with the public.**

**393. Section 6.8, Policy 3 - Suggest adding the words, “and/or archaeological potential mapping” after “Cultural Heritage Master Plan” (321).**

**Response --** Agree, but refer to “strategy” rather than “master plan”.

**Recommendation --** Change Section 6.8, Policy 3 by adding the words “and/or archaeological potential mapping” after “Cultural Heritage Strategy”.

### **394. Section 6.8, Policy 4, Archaeological Conditions on Development applications**

- a) The Province suggest that the sidebar be revised to read: “Archaeological Conditions on Development Applications.” (321)
- b) OCHBA is unaware of any standards which exist with respect to this feature. RMOC should identify and map areas that have high archaeological potential. (145). City of Vanier asks for clarification of the application of the policy and determining “where there is clear evidence of some archaeological potential.”(43). What are the “archaeological potential” criteria? (108)
- c) The Province provided alternative wording which should further clarify this policy. (321)

#### **Response -**

- a) Agree.
- b) The 1996 Provincial Policy Statement 2.5.2, has specific policies regarding the conservation of archaeological resources. The review of development proposals for archaeological resource potential is among the planning review activities transferred to regional governments by the province. Many area and regional municipalities have official plan policies regarding archaeological resources including the City of London and Regional Municipality of Waterloo. The potential to come across these resources must be determined before development occurs. An initial screening would apply to all development proposals and public works. Based on the initial screening, further assessment is only required for those where there is clear evidence of some “archaeological potential.” The Official Plan proposes that the RMOC prepare mapping of archaeological potential based on locally relevant criteria. Until this criteria is developed, on its own or as part of an overall Cultural Heritage Strategy, generic provincial criteria should be applied to all development applications. Once complete, the archaeological resource potential mapping could be made available to the general public and the development community.
- c) This wording provided by the Province clarifies the policy and procedure and should address the many issues above.

**Recommendation - Change Section 6.8, policy 4 by  
Add “Archaeological” to the beginning of the sidebar, and replace policy 4 with”**

**“When reviewing and approving development proposals, or undertaking public works, evaluate, or require the area municipality to evaluate, the potential for archaeological resources, based on criteria such as the locale and physical features, knowledge of previous uses, and the presence of known heritage or archaeological sites and cemeteries available through municipal data bases or such agencies as: Ministry of Citizenship, Culture, and Recreation, Parks Canada and the National Capital Commission. If archaeological potential exists, an Archaeological Resource Impact Assessment conducted by an archaeologist licensed under the Ontario Heritage Act is required as a condition of the development approval. Archaeological assessment reports are to:**

- a) be carried out to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation and the approval authority;
- b) include conservation-related recommendations such as documentation, removal and/or preservation in situ for heritage integrity purposes, if significant archaeological resources are discovered on a subject property.”

**395. Section 6.8, Policy 5** - Suggest adding references to actions and consultation regarding the discovery of aboriginal burial sites. (258)

**Response** - The provincial *Cemeteries Act*, referred to in this policy, has provisions for un-marked burial sites including aboriginal burial sites. Specific references other than to the Act could create confusion.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**396. Section 6.8, Policy 6** - Seek the advice of Parks Canada regarding development adjacent to the Rideau Canal which may impact on the cultural heritage value of the canal landscape. (236)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Add a new policy 7 to Section 6.8, “Seek the advice of Parks Canada regarding development adjacent to the Rideau Canal which may impact on the cultural heritage value of the canal landscape.” Re-number the policies that follow.

**397. Section 6.8, Policy 7 b)** - The Province suggests adding the words: “or stewardship” to the end of the sentence. (321)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Add to Policy 6.8, Policy 7 b) the words, “or stewardship”, to the end of the sentence.

**398. Section 6.8, Policies 8 & 10** - Add reference to local official plans (244)

**Response** - Implementation these heritage policies are not dependent on local Official Plans.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**399. Section 6.8, Policy 8** -

- a) Policy 8 a) -- The reference to “landscapes” should be deleted since the Heritage Act only applies to the built environment. (277)

- b) Policy 8 c) -- Remove reference to parkland dedication. (244)
- c) Policy 8 d) -- Add tax incentives under the Heritage Act to the examples of means that area municipalities can use to conserve heritage resources. (279)

**Response -**

- a) Based on discussions with provincial staff, this assumption is incorrect. Landscapes can be designated under Part 5 of the *Heritage Act*. “Cultural Heritage Landscapes” are also referred to in the Provincial Policy Statement.
- b) This is simply a suggested tool recommended in provincial background papers.
- c) Tax incentives are only one of a number of financial incentives which are available directly to area municipalities under the *Heritage Act* and do not need to be mandated in an Official Plan. The emphasis of the Official Plan is to encourage the conservation of cultural heritage resources in land use and development decisions.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**400. Section 6.8, Policy 9 -**

- a) Cumberland suggests that these policies, requiring an impact statement, seem to say almost the same thing as the policies in Section 6.8 Policy 4, which require an assessment of archaeological resource potential. (279)
- b) It would seem that the need for an impact study should be derived from the Cultural Heritage Master Plan. (87)
- c) The Province suggest the sidebar be revised to read, “Built and Landscape Heritage Impact Assessment” (321)
- d) The Province suggests that this policy needs to be clarified with regard to when to “require” and when to “encourage” a heritage impact statement. (321)

**Response -**

- a) Policy 4 outlines the review process to determine if there is a potential to uncover unknown archaeological resources. Policy 9 applies to known cultural heritage resources. Refinement to these policies recommended under Policy 4 and below should help to clarify the application of these policies.
- b) This requirement was based on discussions with MCZCR staff who recommend that a Built and Landscape Heritage Impact Statement be prepared regardless of whether there is (or is not) a Heritage Master Plan. The objective is to address heritage concerns during the development process and determine how development could proceed while protecting the integrity of the resource. When completed, the Master Plan can provide guidance for the impact statements and potentially reduce the scope of work required to complete a statement for various development proposals.
- c) Agree - adopt the Province’s revision to the sidebar.
- d) Agree, the Province’s wording does clarify the policy and address some of the concerns expressed above.

**Recommendation - Change Section 6.8, Policy 9 by: revising the revise sidebar to read, “Built and Landscape Heritage Impact Assessment”, and replacing the existing policy 9 with the following:**

**“For a proposed development that includes or is adjacent to an Ontario Heritage Act designated building, landscape or district, require that the area municipality prepare or request the applicant to prepare a statement of impact. Existing LACACs shall be consulted where appropriate. Similarly, encourage area municipalities to prepare heritage impact statements and ensure LACAC consultation for proposed development that includes or is adjacent to a significant, non-designated building, landscape or district on an inventory.”**

**401. Section 6.8, Policy 10 -**

- a) This is purely a local concern. No Regional Official Plan policy is warranted. (227)
- b) In 10 d) add, “require the documentation *or recording* . . .” (258)

**Response -**

- a) This policy directly implements the Provincial Policy Statement 2.5.1. The Region is complying with the PPS in policy 7 and seeks similar compliance by area municipalities through this policy.
- b) Agree.

**Recommendation - In Section 6.8, Policy 10 d), add “or recording” after “require documentation”**

**General Comments on Section 6.9 - The Central Experimental Farm**

**402.** Applaud recognition of the open space and heritage value of the Central Experimental Farm in the Official Plan (248)

The uses permitted are far too restrictive and does not allow opportunity for changes to adapt to the federal Program Review. (258)

The Central Experimental Farm is Agriculture Canada’s headquarters and reference should be made to its contribution to the scientific and research community. Permitted uses should include office space, storage space and agricultural functions. (309)

No coherent vision that integrates this open space into the ecosystem model. (313)

Encourage the Federal government to work with community groups to retain the Farm (190)

**Response -** The office employment areas, such as the Sir John Carling Building and the laboratories along Carling Avenue, are not included in the designation. They are in the General Urban Area. The Arboretum and the Fletcher Wildlife Demonstration Garden are in the Waterfront Open Space designation. The Museum, its grounds, and display gardens have been included in the proposed Urban Open Space designation. Staff is unaware of any alternate development proposals by Agriculture Canada or the NCC and the Official Policies as written provide consultation opportunities through the Official Plan amendment process.

**Recommendation - Change the introduction to Section 6.9 by replacing “heritage buildings” in the second sentence with: “laboratories, offices, greenhouses and farm buildings”; adding a new sentence: “A great many of these buildings and sites have**

national and local heritage value.” Insert in the last sentence of the introduction “to the scientific and research community and” after “contribute”.

### **General Comments on Section 6.10 Design of Public Works**

**403. Section 6.10, Policy 1** - The Province recommends adding “h) the significant cultural heritage values and attributes.” (321)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Add a new clause to policy 1, in Section 6.10: “h) the significant cultural heritage values and attributes.”

**404.** Comments from the City of Ottawa and the Kanata Arts Advisory Committee, among others, suggest that there is a role for arts and culture which could be addressed in Official Plan policy (109, 310, 306, 280).

**Response** - Section 3.4, Central Area most directly addresses these comments in the introduction, stating “It (the Central Area) is the seat of the federal government, a major tourist destination, and the region’s focal point for employment, retail, entertainment and culture . . .” This is implemented through policies 3.4.2 for the Central Area which addresses, among other things, year-round festivals and events, public open spaces and amenity areas, and locating Major Community Facilities in the Central Area.

In this section, the Region’s contribution to arts and culture is expressed through Official Plan policies for roads as public spaces; built heritage and cultural landscape resources; archaeological resources; and the design of public works. The arts and cultural implications of Objective 10, “To ensure that the RMOC works and structures enhance the quality of the natural and built environment and will be a legacy for future generations”, could be enhanced in a policy in Section 6.10, Design of Public Works.

The Region approved an *Art in Public Spaces Policy* in 1990 as a corporate policy which addresses many of these issues.

**Recommendation** - In Section 6.10, add a new Policy 3:

**“3. When proposing to erect buildings or other structures, consider opportunities to make public art an integral part of the planning and design of these facilities as a means to reflect the diversity of the communities and landscapes in Ottawa-Carleton.”**

### **General Comments on Section 6.11 Geomorphic, Geological and Landform Features**

**405. Section 6.11, Policy 3** - How is this to be implemented? Defer. (244)

Cumberland suggests that “require” may be too strong when the elements are not identified on Schedule G and the extent of the application of the policy is not specified. (279)

The policy seems quite vague and restrictive at the same time. (212)



**Response -** Agree. “Require” is too regulatory, based on the quality of data available.

**Recommendation - In Policy 3. of Section 6.11, replace: “Require that other significant landform features, not identified in Schedule G be retained”, with “Encourage the protection of other significant landform features, not identified in Schedule G.”**

### **Comments on Schedule G**

- a) The Hogs Back Falls is an ANSI, but is not reflected in the Natural Environment B designation on Schedule B. (258)
- b) The natural fault in the Montfort Woods should be identified as a geomorphic, geological and landform feature in Schedule G. It is identified on the Canadian Geological survey map, Surficial Geology of Ottawa. (257)
- c) Include the Cliffe running from Sparks Street past St. Vincent’s Hospital to Primrose. (190)

### **Response -**

- a) Hogs Back Falls is an Earth Science ANSI, not a Life Science ANSI, and Natural Environment B policies do not address this feature.
- b) The map referred to is an inventory map which does not assess significance. The designations in this plan are based on studies commissioned by the Region. Other data can be considered on a site-by-site basis under Section 6.11, Policy 3
- c) Policy 3 of this plan enables such landforms to be considered *if* development were to be proposed.

**Recommendation - No change .**

### **Errors, Omissions, and Clarification in Section 6.11**

**406.** Further clarification of “significance” is required. (Staff)

**Recommendation - Add to the introduction of Section 6.11 as the second sentence: “Many of these features are also provincially significant Earth Science ANSIs.”**

### **Other Schedule Changes Regarding Section 6**

**407. Schedule B -** Montfort Woods, City of Ottawa - One brief recommended assessing the natural and cultural significance of Montfort Woods and to designate it as a Natural Environmental Area or as greenspace in Regional Official Plan. (135)

**Response --** It is not appropriate to designate the Montfort Woods at this time. It is not publicly owned land and does not fit the definition of the open space designations in the Regional Official Plan. The City of Ottawa NOSS work is not complete to provide sufficient evaluation of the property. The general discussion of Section 5.4 addresses the identification and inclusion of other significant features including those identified by area municipalities.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**Comments on Section 7 - Agricultural Resource Areas**

**408. Section 7 -** To avoid any confusion with the provincial land evaluation system for agriculture (Land Evaluation and Area Review) that the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and Rural Affairs is drafting we recommend the introduction to be modified refer to the LEAR as “the Ottawa-Carleton Land Evaluation and Area Review (January , 1997)” (321)

**Response -** Agree to change the title of the evaluation system. The acronym LEAR will continue to be used because it was used extensively during the consultation phase for the Official Plan and the rural residents in Ottawa-Carleton recognise the term LEAR as the agricultural evaluation system that was uses to determine agricultural potential in Ottawa-Carleton.

**Recommendation - Change Section 7 by Deleting the words “Land Evaluation and Area Review (LEAR)” and replace them with “the Ottawa-Carleton Land Evaluation and Area Review (January , 1997)”.**

**409. Section 7.1 -** Add the word “permanent” before “loss to other uses” to allow temporary uses if suitable upon rehabilitation. (132)

**Response -** The effect of the wording change would not be compatible with objective 2 which is “to ensure that uses that would result in conflicts with agricultural operations are not established in productive farming areas.”

**Recommendation - No Change .**

**410. Section 7.1 policy 1a) -** Use the term Agricultural Uses instead of farming and define agricultural uses in the glossary using the definition in the Provincial Policy Statement. (154)

**Response -** Agree. The definition clarifies what is meant by agricultural use.

**Recommendation - Section 7.2 policy 1a) delete the word “farming” and replace it with “Agricultural Uses”. Add to the Glossary:**

**“Agricultural Uses:**

**means the growing of crops, including nursery and horticultural crops; raising of livestock and other animals for food, or fur, including poultry and fish; aquaculture; agro-forestry; maple syrup production; and associated on-farm buildings and structures.”**

**411. Section 7.2 policy 1f) -** Quarries would no longer be permitted even with rehabilitation for agricultural use. Was this a problem in the past? (279)

**Response** - It is very difficult to rehabilitate a quarry back to agricultural use. The establishment of quarry operations results in a permanent loss of agricultural land which is contrary to the objectives for Agricultural Resource Areas.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**412. Section 7.2 Policy 1h)** - Why do additional dwellings after the second have to be a temporary mobile home? Nobody wants to live in a mobile home. (154)

**Response** - This policy is in the 1988 Regional Official Plan. If the third residence is no longer required by the farming operation for farm help then the mobile home can be removed from the farm.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**413. Section 7.2 policy 1h)** - Osgoode Council may wish to be more restrictive. Seeing the removal of temporary uses such as mobile homes (or Granny Flats) is more easily written in policy than done. (227)

**Response** - Agree. Local official may be more restrictive.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**414. Section 7.2 Policy 1e)** - This policy is not needed under permitted uses because the parcel would have to be designated General Rural Area by amendment. (154, 321)

**Response** - Agree. Policy 1e) is not necessary.

**Recommendation** - Delete policy 1e) in Section 7.2. Policies 1 f), g), h) in Section 7.2 be renumbered policies 1 e), f), g) respectively.

**415. Section 7.2 policy 1f)** - The Province recommends adding the words “ and quarries and portable asphalt plants” after the word “pits” in accordance with provincial Policy Statements to recognise and permit portable asphalt plants. (321)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Section 7.2 policy 1f) add the words “ and quarries and portable asphalt plants” after the word “pits”.

**416. Section 7.2 policy 1i)** - The Provincial Policy Statement explicitly limits permitted residential uses in prime agricultural areas to those that are farm related or infilling. The Province

recommends that this subsection be amended to reflect only those uses permitted under the Provincial Policy Statement. (321)

**Response** - The intent of Agricultural Resource Areas policies is to limit residential uses. Policy 1i) refers to residential uses that are permitted in other sections of the official Section 7.3 Farm Related Severances and Section 7.4 Poor Pockets. The term residential development is not compatible with this approach and should be deleted.

**Recommendation** - **Section 7.2 policy 1i) delete the word “development” and replace it with “uses”.**

**417. Section 7.2 policy 1** - Consultation should be undertaken with the Airport before new uses are permitted on agricultural lands within the vicinity of the airport due to bird attraction problems. Certain crops are particularly bothersome. (105)

**Response** - The official plan is not able to control the activities or the range of crops grown in Agricultural Resource Areas. The Airport may wish to initiate an education program to alert the public to the dangers of certain activities in the vicinity of airports.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**418. Section 7.2 policy 2** - Permitted commercial and industrial uses should not be associated with rural resources, local needs or needs of the travelling public or those requiring large land areas. The types uses will vary considerably depending on the proximity of the urban area and facilities and other site specific factors. It is more appropriate to have the uses determined through local planning. (169)

**Response** - The industrial and commercial uses permitted are the same as those permitted in the General Rural Area. The permitted uses are in keeping with the rural area where urban services are not available.

**Recommendation** - **No change to regarding the types of commercial and industrial uses permitted.**

**419. Section 7.2 policy 2a)** - Suggest policy be reworded to “development at interchanges only to occur on parcel existing as of the date of the approval of this plan.” What does this mean? (279)

The policy should be worded so that development would be located in close proximity to the interchange rather than adjacent to the interchange. This would allow for the diversity of shapes and sizes of the landholdings surrounding interchanges. (169)

**Response** - The policy is being changed to allow Highway 416 & 417 interchanges to be designated by local official plan amendment. The policy states that the area to be designated must be immediately adjacent to the interchange. This will avoid leap frogging and the potential for land use conflicts.

**Recommendation - Reword the policy as per Recommendation 422.**

**420. Section 7.2 Policy 2e) -** Change wording “high quality” to “suitable”. (132)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Reword the policy as per Recommendation 422**

**421. Section 7.2 policy 2 -** Add the following new section: “confirmation that the required Ministry of Transportation permits will be available”. (321)

**Response -** In most case the access to the proposed development will be from a Regional Road rather than the Provincial Highway. As a result a Ministry of Transportation permit will not be required.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**422. Section 7.2 policy 2 -** Recommend that the expectations for each interchange be developed locally. The limitations to the rural area may not be appropriate in all circumstances, i.e. Palladium Drive is not the same as Antrim. This would require that there be no Regional Official Plan amendment, but a Local Official Plan amendment. (163, 132)

The policy should be rewritten to allow for certain “appropriate development without requiring a Regional Official Plan amendment. This section appears to be a make work project. (249)

Revise the first sentence and replace it with “Consider permitting commercial and industrial uses only on lands that are adjacent to Highway 416 or 417 interchanges by amendment to this plan. Recommend that policy 1b) be revised to use the wording of the Provincial Policy Statement Sections 2.1.3c) 2 and 3.( 321)

**Response -** Agree that planning at interchange locations is best handled through local official plan amendments. The area municipality would be required to justify the change of use based on community needs. This would be done by local official plan amendment. Agree to add wording from the Provincial Policy Statement regarding study requirements.

**Recommendation - Change Section 7.2, policy 2 by deleting Section 7.2 policy 2 and replace it with the following:**

**2. “Consider local official plan amendments to permit commercial and industrial uses defined in Section 3.7.4 at Highway 416 and Highway 417 interchanges. Council shall require a study demonstrating:**

- a) **that the land designated is immediately adjacent to Highway 416 or 417 interchanges;**
- b) **justification for the need for the use and the size of the area to be designated;**
- c) **that there is no reasonable alternative locations which avoid Agricultural Resource Areas;**

- d) that there no reasonable alternative location in Agricultural Resource Areas with lower capability soils for agriculture;
- e) that adequate water and wastewater services can be provided;
- f) that the permitted uses do not conflict with existing agricultural uses, and meet local needs or the needs of the travelling public, or are related to rural resources that require large tracts of land and are therefore not suitable for a village location;
- g) that suitable design and landscaping will be provided in keeping with the role of Highway 416/417 as entry routes to the Nation's Capital; and
- h) opportunities to provide tourist orientation facilities, wherever feasible."

**423. Section 7.3 Policy 1** - Add the words or spouse after farmer. (132)

**Response** - The provincial policy statement definition for a farm retirement lot means one lot from a farming operation for a full time farmer. There is no reference spouse in the policy statement.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**424. Section 7.3 policy 1a)** - Criteria for retirement severances should be revised as follows:

- add a farmer is defined as someone at retirement age who was farming on January 1, 1994 (the date established in the Provincial Policy Statement);
- change " have worked on a farm in Ontario for at least 20 years" to "have owned and operated a farm in Ontario for at least 20 years";
- policy should define what recently retired means; and
- include reference to Registered Ontario Farmer (154).

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) is more flexible and ties retirement lots to the farmer rather than the land from which a severance is proposed. This approach is not inconsistent with the PPS. How will "recently retired" be consistently applied? (321)

The year 1970 should be replace with the year 1980. The current rules do not allow a legitimate farmer to get a lot to retire on if his father or anyone else had taken one off the lot in the past 27 years. (249)

**Response** - Agree. The policy will be revised to clarify the definition of a farmer. The policy will be revised to change the policy to say that the farmer is not eligible for more than one retirement lot and the reference that no retirement lot had previously been created from the farm since 1970 will be deleted.

**Recommendation** - Reword policy 1a) as follows:

- a) to create one lot for each farmer who was farmer for retirement purposes, provided that the farmer had not previously created a lot for retirement purposes in Ottawa-Carleton. A "farmer" is defined as someone who is at retirement age, was farming on January 1, 1994, and is a Registered Ontario Farmer whose primary occupation consists of working on a farm and has been involved in cropping and/or animal husbandry. The farmer shall own, operate and live on a farm, and shall be retiring or have recently retired from farming (in the last 3 years) at the time of the

**severance application, and have owned and operated a farm in Ontario for at least 20 years.**

**425. Section 7.3 policy 1b) -** Should this policy relate to farm consolidation of adjoining properties? Currently the official plan permits a loophole whereby a farmer can buy a farm down the road and sever off the house. Following this he can apply to get a building permit for a new house on the now vacant parcel. This is starting to be used as yet another way to obtain rural severances. (279)

**Response -** In many cases farmers acquire additional farms parcels that are not adjacent to the main farm operation. In these cases the dwellings on these parcels are surplus to the farm operation. The farmer does not want the expense of carrying the mortgage to purchase a residence or the responsibility of managing (renting) the house not being used for the farm operation. It is suggested that the policy be reworded to better define the term farm consolidation. The area municipality could, through the zoning by-law, not permit new houses on farm parcels. The Regional Official Plan will not require area municipalities to do this.

**Recommendation - Section 7.3 policy 1b) after the word “consolidation” add “Farm consolidation means the acquisition of additional farm parcels to be operated as one farm operation.”**

**426. Section 7.3 policy 1d) -** How will “suitably large” be determined? What guarantee would the policy require that that the proposed operation comes to fruition? Specific lot sizes in a zoning by-law could ensure some consistency in interpretation of Regional policy. (285)  
The Province suggests that this policy could be made more flexible by deleting the words “type of operation proposed” and replacing them with “types of operations common in the area and flexible enough to accommodate future changes in the type and size of agricultural use”. (321)

**Response -** Agree the area municipalities through their zoning by-laws give specific lot sizes for agricultural areas and this would be used to interpret the policy. The Region has not established a minimum lot size for farming operation because there is variation in lot size (and types of farming operation) from municipality to municipality. The rewording proposed by the Province provides a better definition in that it refers to the types of operations common in the area.

**Recommendation - Change Section 7.3 policy 1d) by deleting the words “type of operation proposed” and replace them with “types of operations common in the area and flexible enough to accommodate future changes in the type and size of agricultural use”.**

**427. Section 7.3 policy 1e) -** Prior to 1988 is less restrictive than the date of 1978 established in the Provincial Policy Statement. Request clarification. (285)

**Response -** The date of 1988 was established by Regional Official Plan Amendment 36 that was approved by the Province in 1994.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**428. Section 7.3 policy 2** - The actual interpretation of the policy is requested. (163)

**Response** - The Region will have regard to the Minimum Distance Separation formulae when considering farm related severances.

**Recommendation: No change.**

**429. Section 7.3 policy 3** - A good idea but will the land registry office accept to place such a restriction on title? (279)

**Response** - This policy has been in the West Carleton official plan for a number of years for new lots within area designated Low Priority Agriculture. A covenant has been put on the deed for new lots. No problems have been experienced implementing the policy.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**430. Section 7.4** - Recommend that the uses to be permitted should be reviewed in the local official plan and this section be amended to reflect that intent. (163)

Residential uses should be deleted from this section as non farm residential uses are not permitted in agricultural areas. Are the industrial and commercial uses the same as in Section 7.2 policy 1d). Suggest that the entire section be deleted in its entirety. (321)

**Response** - Agree. The current 1988 Official Plan requires poor pockets to be designated in local official plans. West Carleton Township has designated poor pockets in the local official plan. Provincial policy does not address the issue of poor pockets within Prime Agricultural Areas. Non agricultural uses are not permitted in Prime Agricultural Areas. In order to have regard to provincial policy poor pockets should be designated in an official plan. Poor pockets are non agricultural lands and the official plan policy would allow area municipalities provide more detailed designations within Agricultural Resource Areas subject to criteria in Section 7.4. This is best dealt with at the local level by the area municipalities through local official plan amendment.

**Recommendation - Revise Section 7.4 as per Recommendation 435.**

**431. Section 7.4. policy 1** - The policy should be revised to reference LEAR mapping rather than the Ontario Institute of Agrology. (256)

**Response** - The LEAR evaluation system was used to determine the agricultural potential of parcels of land to identify large areas to be designated Agricultural Resource Area. The LEAR is not an appropriate tool to use to identify poor pockets because the LEAR gives a score for the whole property using four criteria. The LEAR evaluation may not be sensitive enough to identify site specific characteristics that could meet the poor pocket criteria. Provincial policy defines prime agricultural lands as being Class 1, 2 & 3 soils. The poor pockets policy allows limited



development on lands not defined as prime agricultural land. The soil capability maps identify Class 4-7 lands, the LEAR maps do not.

**Recommendation - No change. Continue to refer to soils maps in criteria.**

**432. Section 7.4 Policy 1a) & b:** Make reference to Ontario Institute of Agrology Reports 58 when referring to soils maps prepared by the Ontario Institute of Agrology. (Agricultural Advisory Committee 154)

**Response -** Agree. Reference to Ontario Institute of Pedology Report 58 (for West Carleton, Goulbourn, Kanata, Rideau, Osgoode and Cumberland) and Soils Survey Report 47 (for Gloucester and Nepean) clarifies the source of the information regarding soil capability for agriculture.

**Recommendation - Revise reference to the soils maps as per Recommendation 435.**

**433. Section 7.4 policy 1 -** We need to re-examine the criteria and the requirement to meet all characteristics. (132)

**Response -** Poor pockets are located within prime agricultural lands where the predominant land use is agriculture. The intent of the Agricultural Resource Area designation is to protect lands suitable for agriculture from loss to other uses and to ensure that uses that are not compatible with agricultural operations are not established in productive farming areas. All of the criteria in Section 7.4 are necessary to achieve these objectives.

**Recommendation - No change to requirement to meet all criteria. See Recommendation 435.**

**434. Section 7.4 policy 1f) -** How can a minimum area of 2 hectares be identified on soil maps? (132)

**Response -** Reference to the Ontario Institute of Agrology (OIA) soils maps. The OIA maps ensure that all pockets are evaluated using the same information source. The minimum size of soils units on the soils maps is 8 to 10 hectares. The intent of the poor pockets policy is to identify large areas that cannot be used for agriculture. Allowing residential development on small pockets will fragment good agricultural land and introduce potential conflicting land uses in close proximity to farming operations.

**Recommendation - No change to minimum lot size. See Recommendation 435**

**435. Section 7.4 Policy 1e) -** Allow tree planting to be consistent with policies elsewhere in the plan.

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Section 7.4 by deleting Section 7.4 policy 1 and replace it with:**

1. “Recognise that areas of poor land not in agricultural use exist within Agricultural Resource Areas. Area municipalities may designate areas of poor land to permit severances for residential, and small scale industrial and commercial uses that are directly related to agriculture and that contain all of the following characteristics. The poor pocket:
  - a) has a capability rating for agriculture predominantly of Class 4 or poor as determined from the soils maps of Ottawa-Carleton as shown in Ontario Institute of Pedology Report 58 and Soils Survey Report 47”;
  - b) is large enough to be identified on soils maps of Ottawa-Carleton as shown in Ontario Institute of Pedology Report 58 and Soils Survey Report 47;
  - c) is not being used or capable of being used as part of an adjacent agricultural operation;
  - d) has frontage on a public road which is maintained year round; and
  - e) is sufficiently wooded with trees so that development can be buffered from adjacent farm operations; if sufficient tree cover does not exist local official plans may require tree planting as a condition of development”.

The minimum lot size for poor pockets shall be 2 hectares.

**436. Section 7.5 Policy 1 -** Add to the end of subsection 1 “and sufficient evidence is provided to demonstrate site suitability for private individual services in accordance with policies of Section 10.3.” (229)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Section 7.5 policy 1 by adding “ provided that the lot complies with the *Minimum Distance Formula* and sufficient evidence is provided to demonstrate site suitability for private individual services in accordance with policies of Section 10.3.” after the words “are not more than 100 metres apart”.**

**437. Section 7.5 policy 1 -** Why only between non-farm lots. A cluster is a cluster no matter what kind of house. The MDS has to be respected anyway. Is a retirement lot or a lot created for farm help farm or non-farm? (227)

**Response -** Policy 1 uses the definition for residential infilling in the provincial policy statement. Farm related severances, created for farming operations, are not non-farm lots.

**Recommendation - No change to Section 7.5 policy 1.**

**438. Section 7.5 policy 1 -** Clarify the policy to state if one or more infill lots are contemplated. (87)

**Response -** Policy 1 uses the definition for residential infilling provided in the provincial policy statement. Reference to residential lots (rather than a residential lot) should be added to clarify

the policy in instances where more than one lot could be created under the criteria listed in policy 1.

**Recommendation - Delete Section 7.5 policy 1 and replace it with:**

1. **“Permit residential lots to be created between to existing non-farm residences which are on separated lots of a similar size and which are situated on the same side of the road and are not more than 100 metres apart, provided that the lot complies with the *Minimum Distance Formula* and sufficient evidence is provided to demonstrate site suitability for private individual services in accordance with policies of Section 10.3”**

**439. Section 7.6 -** This is a site plan matter and as such lies within the jurisdiction of the local municipality. (256)

The policy is not needed if an Official Plan amendment is need to change the designation to General Rural Area (279, 154, 321)

Should refer to policy 1 and 2 where allowed locally. (163)

**Response -** Agree the policy is not required. If a official plan amendment is required to change the designation then the policies under Agricultural Resource Area would not apply.

**Recommendation - Delete Section 7.6.**

### **Comments on the Agricultural Resource Area Designation on Schedule A**

**440. Comment -** West Carleton Township requests the Region to undertake alterations to various designations to take into account land ownership patterns and to improve the accuracy of the Agricultural Resource designation based on the previously accepted by the township in its current official plan. (163)

**Response -** The Regional official plan designations for the Agricultural Resource Area designation takes into account the ownership patterns. The LEAR evaluation system was done on a property by property basis. The West Carleton official plan uses the soils maps to define boundaries. The differences between the local official plan designations and those found in the Regional official plan are not significant.

**Recommendation - No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation as shown on Schedule A.**

**441. Comment -** “How to attain a Green Corridor between Stittsville and Kanata” The designation of Agricultural Resource Area lands between Stittsville and Kanata is unrealistic. The land is unique as a corridor connecting two urban areas and the working farms have ceased to exist. The high cost of land makes it impossible for any potential buyer to cover the cost with his agricultural produce. High traffic volume makes the movement of farm vehicles hazardous. Land is now owned by absentee landowners which has caused a deterioration of the land. If the Official

Plan remains unchanged the deterioration will continue and the disappearance of the corridor in favour of development will only be a question of time. Recommendation:

1. permit the partition of land within the corridor into 5 to 10 acre estate lots/hobby farms
2. combine the issue of any building permit with the landowner's obligation to convert a minimum of one third of the property to a forest - as per MNR specifications (14)

**Response -** The area between Stittsville has a soil capability for agriculture of Class 2 and it is being farmed. Class 1, 2 and 3 soils are defined as prime agricultural land by the provincial policy statement for agriculture. The area was identified as having high agricultural potential using the LEAR evaluation system. Based on the evaluation of the agricultural potential, the area is being recommended for designation as Agricultural Resource Area.

**Recommendation - No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**442. Cumberland, Conc. 1 O.F. Lot 28, and Conc. 9, Lot C -** The area immediately east of Cardinal Creek should be changed from Agricultural Resource to General Rural Area. The lands are fragmented by the creek and show a low potential for agriculture on the LEAR evaluation.

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Conc. 1 of Lot 28 and Conc. 9, Lot C Cumberland from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**443. Cumberland, Conc. 5, S pt. Lot 10 -** There is a narrow strip of land designated Agricultural Resource Area between Colonial Road and the area designated Limestone Resource in the draft plan. The area is made up of small parcels that are currently being used for rural industrial purposes. The land is poor potential for agriculture. Request that the property be designated for non-agricultural uses that would enable the property with an existing warehouse to be used for commercial and industrial uses not related to agriculture. (85, 279).

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Cumberland, Conc. 5 & 6 S pt Lot 10, from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**444. Cumberland, Conc. 11, Lot 4 -** The property because of the flat terrain and poor drainage of the clay soils is not viable for agriculture. The soil is only 6 inches deep on top of hard clay. The soil classification does not take this into account. A General Rural Area designation is more appropriate for the property. (10)

**Response -** Ontario Institute of Agrology (1983) maps indicate that the property has a soil capability rating for agriculture of Class 3. (3WD)

The definition of the soil capability is as follows:

Class 3 - Soils in this class have a moderate limitation or combination of lesser limitations which restrict the range of crops or require special conservation practices.

Subclass D - desirable soil structure and/or permeability. The soils are difficult to till, absorb water slowly, or the depth of rooting zone is restricted.

Subclass W - Excess water, other than from flooding, due to poor drainage, high water table, seepage, or run-off from surrounding areas.

Staff at the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food advise that soil depth is taken into account in determining soil capability for agriculture.

Since the area has Class 3 soils, is being farmed and is adjacent to other lands designated Agricultural Resource Area, it is recommended that the property continue to be designated Agricultural Resource Area.

**Recommendation - No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**445. Goulbourn, Conc. 2, pt Lot 25 & Conc. 1, pt lot 24, 25** - In recent years severances have been granted because it was argued that the land was not the agricultural classification. To substantiate the claim Consulting Geotechnical and Environmental Engineers provided the necessary soil reports for one of the properties. The assessment provided concluded that the majority of the property surveyed (pt lot 25 Con. 1) contained Class 6 soils. The Region agreed that the subject lands were marginal and complied with the severance requests. It is requested that the subject lands be designated General Rural Area. (141)

**Response** - According to Ontario Institute of Pedology maps the area has a soil capability of Class 3. (Limitations Pwt). The soils are described as

Class 3 Soils in this class have a moderate limitation or combination of lesser limitations which restrict the range of crops or require special conservation practices.

Limitation P Moderately stony soils (0.1 to 3% of surface) causing some interference with tillage, planting and harvesting. Also applied to stony soils requiring regular stone removal.

Limitation w Occasional wetness generally associated with imperfectly drained soils.

Limitation t Slopes of 3% to 5% not interfering with the use of farm machinery, causing some slight water erosion and/or lack of uniformity in moisture distribution, seed germination and plant growth.

The soils report provided indicated that a cursory review of the agricultural capacity of the soils was done. The report refers to Map 1425A Geological Survey of Canada not the more recent Ontario Institute of Agrology (OIA) Report 58 recognised by OMAFRA. The conclusion that the majority of the site is class 6 is not substantiated by the OIA reports. Much of the area is in agricultural production, the remainder of the area has recently been reforested. The change in designation to General Rural Area would be an intrusion into the larger Agricultural Resource Area south of the village of Richmond and is not supported.

**Recommendation - No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area**

**446. Kanata, Conc. 1, Pt Lot 4, 410 Huntmar Drive** - Due to the small size of the parcel (2 acres) the uses need to be expanded beyond agriculture, the property has outgrown these restrictive limitations. Zoning for the property should be expanded to permit industrial, retail and retail uses etc. and not be restricted to agricultural uses. (84)

**Response** - The 2 acre property is located on the boundary of the Agricultural Resource Area designated in the draft Official Plan. There is flexibility in the Official Plan for boundary interpretation by the City of Kanata to determine the precise boundary of the Agricultural Resource Area. The appropriate zoning for the property and permitted uses will be determined by the City of Kanata.

**Recommendation** - **No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**447. Kanata, Conc. 3, S 1/2 Lot 23** - The east side of the property has been designated Limestone Resource Area and the west side of the property has been designated Agricultural Resource Area. The Limestone Resource designation reduces the viability of the property for long term agricultural use. The area should be designated similar to the adjacent property to the south, General Rural Area. (153)

**Response** - Agree. The Agricultural Resource Area designation is based on the LEAR score for the whole property. It is unlikely that the part of the property that is not designated Limestone Resource Area will be used for agriculture in the long term.

**Recommendation** - **Change Conc. 3, S 1/2 Lot 23 Kanata from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**448. Nepean, Conc. 2 RF, Lot 6** - Why is this property considered to be agricultural land? Most of the area is treed and is not being used for agriculture. (71)

**Response** - The property has a soil capability for agriculture of Class 2. The property is part of a larger area that has prime agricultural land that is being designated Agricultural Resource Area.

**Recommendation** - **No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**449. Osgoode, Conc. 1, Pt S 1/2 Lot 10** - The property is 9 acres in size and has never been farmed and is too small to be considered for agriculture or any industrial or commercial uses related to agriculture. The property is more suited to residential uses.( 81)

**Response** - The property is located in an area where prime agricultural land (class 2 & 3 soils) predominates. The proposed designation for the larger area is Agricultural Resource Area. One of the objectives of this designation is to ensure that uses that would result in conflicts with agricultural operations are not established in productive farming areas. The intent is to limit severances in the Agricultural Resource Area to farm related severances. Since the property is part of a larger agricultural area that is being designated it is not recommended that the designation be changed in this location.

**Recommendation** - **No change to the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**450. Osgoode, Conc. 2, Lot 33 (parcel west of Old Stage Coach Road)** - This small property is located between two roads and is not being used for agriculture. The property is not part of a larger agricultural area. The land to the east is designated General Rural Area. The area to the west is designated Sand and Gravel Resource Area. A General Rural Area designation is more appropriate and is consistent with other designations in the area.( 152)

**Response** - Agree, a General Rural Area designation is more appropriate for the property.

**Recommendation - Change Conc. 2, pt Lot 33 Osgoode from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**451. Osgoode, Conc. 2, N 1/2 Lot 33** - The proposed designation for the property is Agricultural Resource Area. The lands to the east and the west, with the same quality of soil (class 5 according to your maps) are designated General Rural Area. The land is not good for agriculture and will never be used for agriculture. My plans are to develop the property in any way that will help the local economy. (82)

**Response** - The OMAFRA at the request of the Region did a re-evaluation of the soil capability maps for the area south of Osgoode village. The re-evaluation indicates that the property has a soil capability for agriculture of Class 3 and 4 soils. The area to the east of the property has Class 3 soils and it is being recommended that these lands be designated as Agricultural Resource Area not General Rural Area as shown in the draft Regional Official Plan.

**Recommendation - Change Conc. 2, E 1/2 lot 32, 33, 34 Osgoode from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area**

**452. Osgoode, Conc. 3, pt. Lot 33 & 34** - The property is bounded to the west and south by General Rural Area to the north by Provincially significant Wetland and to the east by Agricultural Resource Area. The 20 acre parcel has extensive class 4 conditions. The property is more similar to the land designated General Rural Area than Agricultural Resource Area. (224)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Conc. 3, pt. Lot 33 & 34 Osgoode from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**453. Osgoode, Conc. 4, Lot 8** - The property is a bush lot. The property assessment has changed from farm land to residential effective Jan. 1, 1996. If we are to pay taxes assessed as residential we should be given the choice to remove the lands from the Agricultural Resource Area designation. (103)

**Response** - The property was originally assessed as agricultural land because the predominant use of the land was agriculture (the property qualified for the rebate). The bush portion of the property would receive a very low assessment because it has no value for agriculture. When the owner severed off the agricultural components of the property, the remaining bush lot did not

qualify for the Farm Rebate Program because the land was not being farmed. The property was assessed as residential because a vacant lot had been created on the lands he retained (the bush lot). The property is no longer assessed for agricultural use but as a residential lot. If the owner wishes to maintain the woodlot as a woodlot and qualify for a tax rebate he could contact MNR and enter into the Managed Forest Tax Incentive Program. The lands adjacent to the woodlot are being used for agriculture and are designated Agricultural Resource Area. A change in designation would introduce incompatible uses into an agricultural area.

**Recommendation - No change to the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**454. Osgoode, Conc. 5, pt. Lot 6** - The Township of Osgoode Economic Development Committee made a recommendation to Council to have 12 ha of land set aside for a future shopping centre development. Council recommends that the land be designated for such a use. (227)

**Response** - The area is designated Agricultural Resource Area in the draft official plan. The area has class 4 soils, is on the boundary of the Agricultural Resource Area, and received a low score in the LEAR evaluation. A more appropriate designation for the area may be General Rural Area which would permit the shopping centre use.

**Recommendation - Change Conc. 5, Lots 6 & 7 Osgoode from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**455. Osgoode, Conc. 7 & 8, Lot 24- 27** - The lands south of the village of Metcalfe particularly lots 26, 27 and part of lot 25 are stony and poorly drained and it is suggested they are class 4 soils or worse. They are not economically feasible for agricultural production. The lands should be designated as General Rural Area. This would provide a buffer zone between the village and agriculture to prevent potential conflict. (180)

**Response** - The area has a soils capability for agriculture of Class 3 according to Ontario Institute of Agrology maps. Provincial policy requires official plans to protect prime agricultural areas, areas where prime agricultural land (class 1, 2 & 3 soils) predominate.. Provincial policy does not provide for other uses non-agricultural land that is not being used of agriculture.

**Recommendation - No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**456. Osgoode, Conc. 8, E 1/2 Lot 27** - The definition of a poor pocket is not flexible enough for situations where the entire property has the following characteristics:

1. relatively low agricultural capability (class 3);
2. never has had any agricultural use or at least in the last 50 years;
3. is wooded with mature trees;
4. at least 50% of the surrounding lands have non agricultural usage;
5. has frontage on a public road that is maintained year round; and
6. has a minimum area of 15 ha.



The draft plan addressed some aggregates of these properties with these types of characteristics using the LEAR study, areas of 250 hectares or more were removed from the Agricultural Resource Area designation. No consideration is given to owners in slightly smaller sections of land with poor agricultural potential. All woodlots in the Agricultural Resource Area at a severe risk of being lost through clear cutting. Allowing severances for residential purposes is better than allowing the total woodlot to be destroyed. (217)

**Response** - Provincial policy requires official plans to protect prime agricultural areas, areas where prime agricultural land (class 1, 2 & 3 soils) predominate. The property in question and the surrounding area has a soil capability for agriculture of class 3. Provincial policy does not provide for other uses non-agricultural land that is not being used of agriculture. The draft official plan attempts to provide flexibility on poor pockets of soil where the soil capability rating indicates the property does not have the capability to be used for agriculture (class 4-7).

**Recommendation** - **No change maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation and no change to the policies in Section 7.4.**

**457. Rideau, Conc. 2, pt. lot 21 & 22 (North Gower)** - Proposal to designate 135 acres of land to General Rural Area to accommodate a business park. Propose the designation be changed to General Rural Area to accommodate the business park. (291)

**Response** - The property is designated Business Park in the local official plan (approval was deferred pending justification being provided). The proposal is adjacent to the Highway 416 interchange and a study as required by Section 7.2 policy 2 was provided.

**Recommendation** - **Change Conc. 2, pt. lot 21 & 22 Conc. 2 North Gower from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**458. Rideau, Conc. 2, 3, Lots 23, 24, (North Gower)** - The entire area is covered by trees and rocks. A more appropriate designation is General Rural Area. (249)

**Response** - The area has a soil capability of Class 6. The area is located within a larger agricultural area where class 2 soils predominate. The area is not large enough to be designated as General Rural Area but it would meet the criteria to be designated as a poor pocket in the local official plan.

**Recommendation** - **No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**459. Rideau, Conc. 3, Lot 16 (North Gower)** - The property does not meet the criteria for to be designated Agricultural Resource Area. It has a soil capability for agriculture of class 5, the current land use is residential and the property is 8 1/2 acres which is too small to support a viable agricultural operation. The property should be designated General Rural Area. (Smith 185)

**Response** - The property is located on a small pocket of poor soils within the agricultural area (predominantly Class 2 soils). The area is not large enough to warrant a General Rural Area designation within the Agricultural Resource Area.

**Recommendation** - **No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**460. Rideau, Conc. 8, Lots 4, 5, 6 (North Gower)** - The trees on the property have been cleared and the land is now being farmed. It should be designated Agricultural Resource Area (Information Session)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Change Conc. 8, Lots 4, 5, 6 North Gower from Rural Resource Area to Agricultural Resource Area.**

**461. West Carleton, Conc. I, Lots 16 & 17 (Torbolton)** - The property is class 4 stony land that does not warrant an Agricultural Resource Area designation.(6 ,7)

**Response** - Agree, change boundary of Agricultural Resource Area

**Recommendation** - **Change Conc. I, Lots 16 & 17 Torbolton from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area**

**462. West Carleton, Conc. 1, pt. lot 4 and Conc. 2, pt. Lot 3 (Huntley)** - It is requested that the property be designated General Rural Area to accommodate commercial and industrial uses by amendment to the local official plan. (169, 163)

**Response** - Section 7.2 policy 2 has been revised to allow Agricultural Resource Area lands to be designated for industrial and commercial uses at Highway 416 & 417 interchanges. The policy requires that a study be done by the area municipality to support the local official plan amendment. The area should remain designated Agricultural Resource Area until the study demonstrates that the property should be used for other uses.

**Recommendation** - **No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area.**

**463. West Carleton, Conc. 2, Lot 26 (Fitzroy)** - Request consideration for a General Rural Area designation at a Highway Interchange.

**Response** - It is proposed that Section 7.2 policy 2 be reworded so that the designation of land for industrial and commercial uses would be in local official plans. The policy outlines the type of study that is required for consideration of local official plan amendments. See recommendation 422.

**Recommendation** - **No change to the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**464. West Carleton, Conc. 4, Lots 13, 14, & 15 (Torbolton)** - This small parcel (330 acres) is designated Agricultural Resource Area and the surrounding areas are being designated General Rural Area with the potential for conflicting land uses all around it. In order to ensure the compatibility with the surrounding areas we request a General Rural Area designation. (159, 163)

**Response** - The area has a soil capability for agriculture of Class 3 and most of the area is being actively farmed. Generally land areas of 600 acres or more were considered for designation as Agricultural Resource Area. The area comprises 330 acres considerably smaller than most areas designated in the official plan. The area is bordered on three sides by a General Rural Area designation and the Village boundary of Constance Bay is located to the east.

**Recommendation** - **Change Conc. 4, Lots 13, 14, & 15 Torbolton from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area**

**465. West Carleton, Conc. 4, Lot 24 (Huntley)** - The 5.18 acre parcel was bought 13 years ago as Rural Residential. We want it as General Rural. (2)

**Response** - The property is designated Agricultural Resource Area in the current Regional Official Plan. The 5.18 acre property is within the larger Agricultural Resource Area where Prime Agricultural Land predominates. The designation will not impact existing land uses or zoning that exists for the property.

**Recommendation** - **No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**466. West Carleton, Conc. 7, Lot 18 (Fitzroy)** - Is zoned as Prime Agricultural Land. This is not the proper zoning.(134)

**Response** - The 50 acre property has a soil capability for agriculture of Class 3 and it is located within the larger Agricultural Resource Area where Prime Agricultural Land predominates.

**Recommendation** - **No change. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation.**

**467. West Carleton, Conc. 7, Pt Lot 26 (Fitzroy)** - The property is fragmented by gullies and as a result the property has poor potential for agriculture. The lands should be designated similar to the land to the south, General Rural Area and not Agricultural Resource Area (151)

**Response** - Agree, change boundary of Agricultural Resource Area

**Recommendation** - **Change Conc. 7, Pt Lot 26 Fitzroy from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**468. West Carleton, Conc. 11, E 1/2 Lot 20 (Torbolton)** - The western half of the property is class 4 soils, not good land for agriculture and is fragmented by three residences on the property. A more appropriate designation for the property is General Rural Area the same as the designation of the lands on the other side of the New Town Road. Maintain the Agricultural Resource Area designation on the east half of the property. (164)

**Response** - Agree, change boundary of Agricultural Resource Area on the west half of the property.

**Recommendation** - **Change Conc. 11, pt E 1/2 Lot 20 Torbolton from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

### **General Comments on Section 8 - Mineral Aggregate Resources**

**469. Too Much Limestone Resource** - A general response to the Mineral Resource policies has been that there is too much land designated for this purpose in the draft Regional Official Plan and that due consideration has not been given to quantifying the demand for the resource. The response of too much is particularly strong in the Township of Goulbourn. (1, 87, 99, 163, 197, 198, 199, 203)

**Response** - The Mineral Resource Study did include a projection of demand to 2009, but the area proposed for designation is not related to projected demand times a specific number of years (as was done in the Amendment 31 to the previous Regional Official Plan, which was adopted by Council in 1983). The Province issued its first policy statement on protection of mineral aggregate resources in 1986. A number of Ontario Municipal Board decisions have said that municipalities may not use lack of “need” as a reason to refuse planning permission for pits or quarries, because “need” is established by the Provincial Policy Statement. The 1996 Provincial Policy Statement requires that, “As much of the mineral aggregate resources as is realistically possible will be made available to supply mineral resource needs, as close to markets as possible.” The 1986 Policy Statement required municipalities to identify and protect as much of its mineral aggregate resources” as is realistically possible in the context of the municipality’s other land use planning objectives, to supply local, regional and provincial needs.” This made it clear that protection could not be based solely on projections of the municipality’s needs.

Estimates in the Mineral Resource Study done for Ottawa-Carleton are that the licensed supply of sand and gravel is approximately 50 million tonnes and of limestone is approximately 200 million tonnes. Current and projected aggregate consumption is approximately 10 million tonnes annually, of which 35% is sand and gravel and the remaining 65% is stone. Both estimates of licensed reserves include some material of poor or mediocre quality. Particularly in the case of sand and gravel, another source, *Aggregate Resources of Southern Ontario; A State of the Resource Study*, has estimated that the licensed supply of good quality sand and gravel may be as low as 20 to 25 million tonnes. These figures result in estimates of less than 10 years supply of good quality sand and gravel and approximately 31 years supply of limestone in current licenses.

The designation of a mineral aggregate resource does not force the owner of a property to permit a pit or quarry. Current uses may continue indefinitely. A pit or quarry would only happen if the owner decided to sell or lease the land for that purpose.

Much of Ottawa-Carleton is underlain by limestone deposits. However development which already exists or has planning permission has made extraction of many of these deposits unfeasible. Although the approved Regional Official Plan has Mineral Resource designations, there is almost no protection of unlicensed reserves of the two best limestone formations in Ottawa-Carleton, the Oxford and March formations. The Mineral Resource Study found almost no opportunities to protect additional March formation resources due to the constraints posed by development and wetlands. It is clear that the future availability of mineral aggregate resources cannot be taken for granted. Protection of the resource not only provides for its future availability, but also gives the opportunity to protect those locations which have the least impact.

Mineral resources are a non-renewable resource. It is prudent to protect them to ensure their availability for future generations, rather than only worry about ourselves. However, every proposed Limestone Resource designation and any Sand and Gravel designations where questions were raised has been re-evaluated from the standpoint of the “realistic possibility” of extraction, as discussed in more detail below.

**Recommendation - The designation of Sand and Gravel and Limestone Resource Areas should not be based on projections of demand for a specified time period, instead emphasis should be placed on the “realistic possibility” of extraction.**

**470. Lot Creation in Limestone Resource Areas (Section 8.2, Policy 3) -** Several submissions found this policy too restrictive. One suggested that the policy (which prohibits lot creation in these designations) be changed to allow the severance of existing homes in areas designated Limestone Resource. Another submission suggested that the policy allow a maximum number of severances (maybe up to three), depending on the size of the original property, the location of the lots and other factors, including not hindering accessibility to the mineral resources as a key consideration. Other submissions referred to the inability to sever retirement lots or estate lots. Rideau Township suggested that Limestone Resource policies respect rural development opportunities similar to the General Rural Area except where the RMOC can provide substantive evidence to clearly and unequivocally demonstrate the appropriateness of more restrictive policies. (51, 56, 179, 256, 279)

**Response -** Staff agree that prohibition of all lot creation was too restrictive. Permitting the severance of existing houses may be a reasonable idea, as long as it is not permitted to build another house on the retained parcel, which is then severed and so forth. The policy should also be amended to permit farm-related severances in accordance with the policies of Section 7.3. It has been past practice to permit all farmers to obtain farm-related severances, whether they are in the Agricultural Resource Area designation or some other Plan designation. With regard to the Township of Rideau comment, the need for more restrictive policies in Limestone Resource designations is established by the Provincial Policy Statement, requiring protection of mineral aggregate resources. Development opportunities similar to those in General Rural would permit the creation of uses which would limit the feasibility of future extraction.

**Recommendation - Policy 3 of Section 8.2 be amended as follows:**

**I. Permit the creation of new lots in Sand and Gravel and Limestone Resource Areas only in the following circumstances:**

- A. to sever a lot for a home existing on the date of adoption of this Plan, subject to a condition on title of the retained parcel to prohibit the building of another house; or
- B. for farm-related severances subject to the policies of Section 7.3 of this Plan.

**471. Impact on Water Resources** - Another frequent comment was a strong concern about the potential impact of pits and quarries on water resources. The brief from the Conservation Authorities referred specifically to the fact that many proposed Limestone and Sand and Gravel Resource Areas are contiguous to Provincially Significant Wetlands, especially in West Carleton and Goulbourn. One submission requested Official Plan policy to stipulate maximum depth of any quarry to conform to Provincial regulations, so as to preclude the possibility of rupturing aquifers. It also suggested provisions re liability and insurance coverage. Cumberland commented that some lands may already be zoned. (133, 198, 199, 229, 246, 272, 279)

**Response** - The Mineral Resource study consultant has advised that the impact on water resources can only be adequately studied at the license application and rezoning stage. However in response to these concerns the policy concerning matters to be addressed when considering a rezoning application for a pit or quarry has been made more explicit. The Ministry of Natural Resources, which is responsible for Provincial Policy with regard to both wetlands and mineral aggregate resources, was part of the study team for the Mineral Resources study. Studies would always be required with respect to the impact on adjacent wetlands. If lands are already zoned for a pit or quarry, it is assumed that the responsible authorities were satisfied that adequate studies had been done and impacts would be acceptable. The expanded policy below would apply to future rezoning applications.

The Provincial regulations do not stipulate a maximum depth for quarries. They stipulate the additional technical studies required for a proposal for extraction below the water table. The revised policy recommended below reflects those requirements. An official plan cannot deal with issues of liability and insurance coverage.

**Recommendation - Change Policy 9 of Section 8.2 as follows:**

**Require that area municipalities protect Sand and Gravel and Limestone Resource Areas and permit pits and quarries in accordance with the policies above. Area municipalities shall require an amendment to the zoning by-law prior to the establishment of a pit or quarry. Establishment of any new pit or quarry shall be in accordance with the *Aggregate Resources Act*. Studies and site plans required under the *Aggregate Resources Act* shall be reviewed to ensure that the effects on the natural environment, other resources and existing development are fully considered prior to any rezoning for new or expanded pits and quarries. Such studies shall provide, among other matters, information on:**

- A. noise, dust and vibration necessary to illustrate that MOEE guidelines and criteria will be satisfied;
- B. haul routes, traffic volumes and entrance/exit design necessary to show that the road system can safely and efficiently accommodate the proposed truck traffic;

- C. onsite and nearby environmental features, a description of anticipated impacts and proposed mitigation;
- D. the elevation of the groundwater table on the site and any existing surface water on and surrounding the site, any proposed water diversion, storage and drainage facilities on the site and points of discharge to surface waters. Where extraction is proposed below the groundwater table, an impact assessment shall address the potential effects on the following features, where applicable:
  - 1. water wells;
  - 2. springs;
  - 3. groundwater aquifers;
  - 4. surface watercourses and bodies;
- E. adjacent and nearby land uses and an assessment of the compatibility of the proposed development with existing land uses;
- F. if within an Agricultural Resource Area on Schedule A, the agricultural classification of the proposed site and the proposed agricultural rehabilitation techniques if the site is Class 1,2 or 3 soils and extraction is not below the water table;
- G. the proposed afteruse and rehabilitation.

**472. Quarry Potential** - A number of submissions have objected to the possibility of a quarry in their vicinity. (133, 144, 171, 186, 193, 197, 203, 246)

**Response** - The proposed policies of the draft Official Plan do not create the possibility of a quarry where none existed previously. The approved Regional Official Plan permits pits and quarries in the General Rural Area designation. The policies of the draft Official Plan combine the designation of more Limestone Resource Areas than are designated in the approved Plan with a removal of permission for quarries in the General Rural Area designation. These policies actually reduce the area where quarries are permitted, provide more notice of the possibility of a future quarry to people who consult the Plan, and do more to ensure that a future supply of limestone resources will be available. Although protection of additional resources means that some of the potential supply is long term, once the resource has been extracted, the property may be put to other uses. In the period prior to extraction, the policies permit uses which will not limit the feasibility of future extraction.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**473. Pit and Quarry Licenses** - One submission specifically requested that a schedule be added to the Regional Official Plan showing all licensed pits and quarries within Ottawa-Carleton and also in municipalities adjacent to Regional boundaries. (143)

**Response** - Staff do not recommend that information maps be appended to the Official Plan. However, it is our intention to maintain the information on licensed pits and quarries in Ottawa-Carleton on an ongoing basis, and the map would be available on request.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**474. Comments on Specific Sites** - Many comments were submitted about the suitability of specific proposed Limestone Resource designations.

A frequent comment is that proposed areas are too close to existing development (87, 133, 144). In part this arises from a misinterpretation of the Plan policies (approved or draft). The 450 m and 120 m distances in the Plan policies are **review** distances, not **separation** distances. Development proposals within these radii are reviewed to ensure that the opportunity for aggregate extraction is not limited. In many cases the finding is that the proposed development will not limit the possibility of future extraction and the development is approved. The Mineral Resource Study used **separation** distances of 300 m from village or urban boundaries, subdivisions, and cluster of homes created by severance for Limestone Resource Areas. However, it is not always wise to scale the Limestone Resource Area designation back from the road frontage. The intervening 300 m then is designated General Rural Area. This then suggests the possibility of rural residential where in fact it would not be appropriate.

The adequacy of local roads as aggregate haul routes is also raised in several instances. In some cases with regard to specific properties, the geological information has also been challenged, for example with regard to the depth of overburden or saying that the sand and gravel has already been removed.

**Response** - Gorrell Resource Investigations or the Ministry of Natural Resources was asked to advise on challenges to the mapping of the resource. Planning staff have reviewed each proposed Limestone Resource Area which includes unlicensed property with respect to the following factors:

- watercourses
- transmission lines
- gas pipelines
- existing houses and lots in or within a 450 m radius of a proposed Limestone Resource designation
- distance to nearest Regional road or provincial highway.

Using this information, the proposed Limestone Resource designations have been substantially reduced, from 7535 ha in the February draft to 5118 ha in the Schedule A attached to this report.

It should be noted that some of the increase in designated Limestone and Sand and Gravel Resource between the approved Plan and the draft Plan comes from designating in the draft Plan licensed operations which were not designated in the approved Plan.

**Recommendation - Recommendations for specific areas are presented individually below.**

### **Specific Comments on Section 8 - Mineral Aggregate Resources**



**475. Recycling Uses (Section 8.2, Policy 1f)** - One submission recommended that recycling uses and operations not be permitted in Sand and Gravel and Limestone Resource Areas. Cumberland was the only municipality to comment and they supported the proposed policy. (199, 279)

**Response** - Staff recognize that these uses may not be appropriate in all such areas, but there are sites in Ottawa-Carleton where such uses have been approved already. The policy specifically provides that area municipalities may choose to permit these uses in some sites and not in others in their zoning by-laws.

**Recommendation** - **No change; continue to permit recycling uses.**

**476. House on Lots of Record (Section 8.2, Policy 1g)** - Cumberland questioned why houses are now explicitly permitted in this designation and suggested the wording clarify that the permission applies to lots created prior to adoption of this Plan or a date. West Carleton questioned the reference to the zoning by-law in the policy. (163, 279)

**Response** - The Plan is explicit because the question of ability to build on lots of record became an issue with the wetlands policy and was asked at the various Rural Workshops with respect to other designations of the Plan. This policy is repeated in several designations and always refers to the zoning to make it clear that the Regional Official Plan permission is not intended to permit a house where the local zoning would not.

**Recommendation** - **Change Policy 1 g) to read:**

- A. **“a single family dwelling and accessory buildings on each existing lot fronting on a public road that is maintained year-round, if the lot was created under the *Planning Act* prior to the adoption of this Plan, is permitted in the zoning by-law, and can meet all requirements for private servicing.”**

**477. Section 8.2, Policy 2** - Cumberland found the cross-reference between Policies 1 and 2 unclear, in that it could be interpreted that other non-residential uses associated with a quarry were not permitted.

**Response** - Agree, a clarification is proposed.

**Recommendation** - **Change Policy 2 of Section 8.2 to add a new point**

- A. **“other non-residential uses associated with the above, temporary non-residential uses and recycling uses, provided in all cases that they do not prevent the opening of a quarry. Area municipalities may use zoning by-laws to regulate in which Resource Areas such uses are permitted.”**

**478. Section 8.2, Policies 1b) and 2b)** - The Province requested that the permission for portable asphalt plants contained in the Provincial Policy Statement be made more explicit by inclusion in these policies. (321)

**Response - Agree.**

**Recommendation - Change Section 8.2, Policy 1 b) by adding the words “and portable asphalt plants” after the word “pits” and Policy 2b) by adding the words “and portable asphalt plants” after the word “quarries.”**

**479. Section 8.2, Policies 4 and 5 -** Comments from Goulbourn and Osgoode indicate that policy 4 is difficult to interpret and requires clarification. The Province indicated that the permission for General Rural Area uses after license surrender except in Sand and Gravel Areas entirely surrounded by Agricultural Resource Area did not meet the intent of the Provincial Policy Statement and suggested using the word “predominately” rather than “entirely.” (87, 108, 227, 321)

**Response -** Policies 4 and 5 distinguish between most Sand and Gravel Resource Areas and those few which are surrounded by Agricultural Resource Area. In the first case, once a pit license has been surrendered or technical information has demonstrated that extraction is not feasible, the uses permitted in General Rural Area are permitted, including residential, as long as the possibility of extraction on other lands is not limited. For those Sand and Gravel Resource Areas surrounded by Agricultural Resource Area, there is a concern about the possible introduction of conflicting uses within a farming area. Therefore, the policy limits uses after license surrender to those permitted by the Agricultural Resource policies. These properties would either be required to be rehabilitated to agricultural use, if the site was on prime agricultural land and extraction did not go below the water table, or they would qualify as poor pockets. Staff agree that “predominately” better meets the intent of the Provincial Policy Statement.

The inclusion of a size limit for the Sand and Gravel Resource Areas surrounded by Agricultural Resource Areas was adding unnecessary complexity and confusion to the policy and staff recommend it be deleted.

**Recommendation - Reword policies 4 and 5 in Subsection 8.2 as follows:**

- 4. Once a pit has been exhausted and the license has been surrendered or if technical information demonstrates that the aggregate resources of a particular site are not suitable for exploitation, in Sand and Gravel Resource Areas (other than those predominately surrounded by an Agricultural Resource designation), permit uses in addition to those listed in policy 1 in accordance with the policies of Section 3.7 for General Rural Areas. This may include residential uses provided that it can be demonstrated that the proposed use will not limit the possibility of mineral aggregate extraction from other lands designated Sand and Gravel Resource Area or Limestone Resource Area or from other licensed extraction operations.**
- 5. Once a pit has been exhausted and the license has been surrendered or if technical information demonstrates that the aggregate resources of a particular site are not suitable for exploitation, in Sand and Gravel Resource Areas which are predominately surrounded by an Agricultural Resource designation permit uses in addition to those listed in policy 1 in accordance with the policies of Section 7 for Agricultural Resource**

**Areas, provided that it can be demonstrated that the proposed use will not limit the possibility of mineral aggregate extraction from other lands designated Sand and Gravel Resource Area or Limestone Resource Area or from other licensed extraction operations.**

**480. Agricultural Rehabilitation (Section 8.2)** - The Province found the inclusion of a rehabilitation policy for agricultural use in policy 5 too limited in its application and recommended it be dealt with in a separate policy. Another submission asked how “a hole in the ground could be rehabilitated to agricultural use?” (108, 321)

**Response** - Moving the agricultural rehabilitation requirement to a separate policy will clarify that it also applies to pit licenses in Limestone Resource Areas. Addition of a reference to extraction below the water table will clarify the question of when agricultural rehabilitation is required.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 8.2 by adding a new policy 7 as follows and renumbering accordingly:**

**“7. Where a pit license has been surrendered in the Sand and Gravel or Limestone Resource Areas and the site was on prime agricultural land in the agricultural area, the site shall be rehabilitated for productive agricultural use except where extraction has occurred below the water table.”**

**481. Review of development applications (Policy 7, Section 8.2)** - Cumberland commented that the requirement to prove no impact on possibility of extraction may be onerous. The Province requested that review distances be changed to 500 metres for a quarry and 300 metres for a pit. (279, 321)

**Response** - The policy is reworded such that it is the responsibility of the planning authority to determine the impact on the opportunity to extract aggregates. The review distances of 450 and 120 metres have been used in Ottawa-Carleton for more than a decade with no evidence of a problem, staff do not recommend a change.

**Recommendation** - **Change Policy 7 of Section 8.2 to:**

**“When reviewing applications for non-aggregate development affecting land within 450 metres of a Limestone Resource Area or licensed quarry or within 120 metres of a Sand and Gravel Resource Area or licensed pit, ensure that the opportunity to extract aggregates will not be restricted by the proposed development. Council may impose conditions to ensure adequate buffering or separation.”**

**482. Section 8.2, Policy 8** - The Province suggested the policy could be modified stating that areas outside licensed properties may be zoned for aggregate-related uses, such as asphalt and concrete plants. (321)

**Response** - Staff agree that it would be useful to clarify that on some properties the asphalt and concrete plants may be located outside the area which is licensed. The reference is there to make it clear that municipalities may choose to permit these plants or exclude them on specific sites.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 8.2, Policy 8 by replacing the second sentence with: **“Properties, all or part of which are licensed under the *Aggregate Resources Act*, may also be zoned for aggregate-related uses, such as asphalt and concrete plants.”**

**483. Permission for Underground Storage (Policy 10, Section 8.2)** - The City of Kanata suggested that a Regional Official Plan amendment be required, so that the neighbours can be forewarned and the kind of materials to be stored can be made known.

**Response** - The approved Regional Official Plan permits the utilization of space created by underground mining. However the concern with regard to the type of material to be stored is valid. It is proposed to restrict the permission to storage of non-hazardous substances. A few other wording changes (e.g. change RMO to Regional Council) are also recommended.

**Recommendation** - Change Policy 10 of Section 8.2 to:

**10. Permit the use of space created by underground mining for storage of non-hazardous substances, subject, among any other requirements, to satisfying any concerns of Regional Council relating to waste disposal and to the provision of water, wastewater treatment and transportation.**

**484. Section 8.3, Policy 1** - The Province suggested that the reference to the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines be expanded to include “or other appropriate agency.”

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 8.3, Policy 1 by adding the words “or other appropriate agency” after the word “Mines” in the first line.

**485. Glossary** - The Province has provided definitions of pits, quarries, wayside pits and quarries and a change to the definition of abandoned pits and quarries. (321)

**Response** - Agree, these are useful.

**Recommendation** - Add the following definitions to the Glossary:

**Pit:** land or land under water from which unconsolidated aggregate is being or has been excavated, and that has not been rehabilitated but does not mean land or land under water excavated for a building or other work on the excavation site or in relation to which an order has been made under subsection 1.(3) *Aggregate Resources Act*.

**Quarry:** land or land under water from which consolidated aggregate is being or has been excavated, and that has not been rehabilitated but does not mean land or land under water excavated for a building or other work on the excavation site or in relation to which an order has been made under subsection 1.(3) *Aggregate Resources Act*.

**Wayside pit or quarry:** a pit or quarry for a specific contract of road construction that has been authorized by a permit issued to a Public Authority or any person who has a contract with a Public Authority.

**Abandoned pits and quarries:** Replace the phrase “under the Aggregate Resources Act” with the phrase “at any time after December 31, 1989”.

### **Limestone Resource, Schedule A**

**486. Lands under agricultural production** - Lands currently under agricultural production should not be designated Rural Resource, Sand and Gravel Resource or Limestone Resource. (199)

**Response** - Some lands under agricultural production are in the General Rural designation, the policies of which do not provide protection for either natural or aggregate resources. The policies for the Sand and Gravel and Limestone Resource designations are proposed to be amended to allow farm-related severances, so that farmers within these designations are not disadvantaged.

**Recommendation** - **No change, except for change in lot creation policy recommended above.**

**487. Cumberland, Conc. 1, Lots 12 and 13** - The owner has a dairy farm and requests that the land be designated Agricultural Resource rather than Limestone Resource. (289)

**Response** - This land is part of a larger Limestone Resource designation in both the approved Regional Official Plan and Cumberland’s Rural Official Plan. There are several licensed quarries in the designation, including one in the west half of Lot 13 and another to the south in Lot 14. The Limestone Resource designation permits farming, including farm-related severances (if recommended changes are approved). The use of this property for farming versus quarry is under the control of the property owner.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**488. Gloucester, Conc. 5, Lot 22 (Rideau Front)** - The landowner has submitted a study by Consulting Engineers and Geologists on the quarry potential of this property.

**Response** - Ministry of Natural Resources has advised that the study demonstrates that the formation is not suitable for use in skid-resistant asphalt.

**Recommendation - Delete Limestone Resource designation in Gloucester, Conc. 5, Lot 22 (Rideau Front), as shown on Schedule A attached.**

**489. Gloucester, Conc. 5, Lots 23, 24 and 25 (Rideau Front) -** The owner and operator of this quarry as well as the Ministry of Natural Resources advised that the license includes all of Lot 24. (93, 104, 321)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Limestone Resource designation in Gloucester, Conc. 5, Lot 24 (Rideau Front) to include all of Lot 24, as shown on Schedule A attached.**

**490. Gloucester, Conc. 5, Lots 28 and 29 (Rideau Front) -** The Province asks for technical information why this property should not be Limestone Resource. (321)

**Response -** This area forms part of the South Gloucester woodlot, a natural area of high significance. The draft official plan gives priority to the natural heritage values in this area.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**491. Goulbourn, Conc. 1 and 2, Lots 11 and 12 -** Submissions from residents and the Township of Goulbourn argued that this deposit should not be designated for a variety of reasons, including impact on the Jock River which flows through the site, the impact on existing lots and homes, the quality of the local road and distance from the nearest Regional road, and the one lane bridge over the Jock River. (87, 114, 115, 176, 234, 261)

**Response -** Agree. The site is also fragmented by a hydro transmission line.

**Recommendation - Change Limestone Resource in Goulbourn, Conc. 1 and 2, Lots 11 and 12 to General Rural Area.**

**492. Goulbourn, Conc. 1, Lots 22 and 23 and Rideau, (Marlborough) Conc. 9 and 10, Lots 3 and 4 -** Goulbourn and landowners in and adjacent to the designation advised that this deposit area has a TransCanada pipeline running north-south through the middle of the deposit. (1, 87, 255)

**Response -** The Mineral Resource Study consultant checked with TransCanada Pipeline, who advise that they blast for new pipelines on existing rights-of-way in close proximity to existing pipelines (as close as within 30 feet). This is Oxford formation, one of the best limestone resources in Ottawa-Carleton. Most of the area also scored well in the evaluation of Agricultural Resource Areas. There is an equestrian operation in the centre of the designation, which is considered incompatible with quarries. Staff agree that although a pipeline may not preclude extraction, it will make this location less attractive as a quarry site than other areas designated Limestone Resource. An Agricultural Resource designation will reflect the high agricultural value

of the area, while restricting development so that the long term potential for extracting this aggregate is not compromised.

**Recommendation - Change Limestone Resource designation in Rideau, Conc. 9 and 10, Lots 3 and 4 and in Goulbourn, Conc. 1, Lot 23 to Agricultural Resource and in Goulbourn, Conc. 1, Lot 22 to General Rural Area as shown on Schedule A attached.**

**493. Goulbourn, Conc. 2, Lots 1-5** - Goulbourn requested a revision of the designation to take account of a cluster of seven estate lots in Lots 2 and 3 on Purdy Road. Several landowners also objected to the Limestone Resource designation, but the landowner of the east part of Lot 3 and Lot 4 wishes to extract the sand deposit on his property. (57, 58, 59, 60, 87, 138)

**Response** - Lots 3,4 and 5 of this designation contain a Class 2 sand and gravel deposit as well as the Oxford formation limestone which is the reason for the proposed Limestone Resource designation in Lots 1-5, Con 2 and Lots 1 and 2, Con 3. Staff agree that the cluster of lots along Purdy Road require a scaling back of the proposed designation. The presence of Kings Creek in the northern portion of lots 1, 2 and 3 will also require extraction setbacks. The ownership of Lot 3 is fragmented. There are also severed lots in Lot 1. Retain the Limestone Resource designation in Lots 1 and 2, Conc. 3, but delete elsewhere. Retain Sand and Gravel designation in Lots 3, 4 and 5 as shown on Schedule A attached.

**Recommendation - Change the Limestone Resource designation in Goulbourn, Conc. 1 and 2, Lots 1-5, to retain a Sand and Gravel Resource designation in Lots 3-5, Conc. 2 and a Limestone Resource designation in Lots 1 and 2, Conc. 3, and change the remainder to General Rural Area as shown on Schedule A attached.**

**494. Goulbourn, Conc. 3 and 4, Lots 11-16, Conc. 7 and 8, Lots 12-15, Conc. 9 Lots 6-8, Conc. 10, Lots 6-12, Conc. 11, Lots 10 and 11** - The Province is not persuaded that there are circumstances which substantially preclude the future extraction of mineral resources from these areas and requests that designations be developed in co-operation with Provincial staff. (321)

**Response** - Most of these areas were deleted by regional staff in the step between the Mineral Resource Study Addendum report and the draft Official Plan. These changes reflected the input received during the Rural Workshops in the fall and additional analysis, and in most cases are due to conflicts with existing development. The areas are largely the disputed deferral areas in Goulbourn's local official plan.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**495.** Goulbourn requested that the northern limit of this area be scaled back to create a 450 metre separation from a cluster of five lots. A landowner also provided a map of homes in the vicinity. A quarry could not be screened from the view of Dwyer Hill Road and surrounding neighbours. Residents of a nearby subdivision and other landowners along Dwyer Hill Road also object to the designation. A petition opposing designation of additional Limestone Resource Area along

Dwyer Hill Road in Goulbourn Township contained 140 signatures. (87, 186, 203, 204, 205, 246).

**Response** - Two of the lots in the cluster were not in the original assessment mapping used to evaluate land use conflicts. When adequate separation is provided from these lots, the remainder of the deposit area becomes too small to be worth designating.

**Recommendation** - **Change the Limestone Resource designation in Goulbourn, Conc. 7, Lots 5 and 6 to General Rural Area.**

**496.** Goulbourn advised that the roads adjacent to this deposit are unpaved and unsuitable for an aggregate haul route and that the shortest route to Hwy. 7 would take traffic through Ashton. The extension of the designation into Lot 1 affects an estate lot. It was also suggested that there was some overlap with candidate natural area 325 which was assessed as moderate significance. A landowner also objected strongly to the proposed designation (87, 150).

**Response** - Staff agree to delete the Limestone Resource designation. Because sand pits are also permitted in the General Rural Area designation and this is a Class 3 deposit, they also agree to deletion of the Sand and Gravel designation.

**Recommendation** - **Change the Limestone and Sand and Gravel Resource designations in Goulbourn, Conc. 8, Lots 1, 2 and 3 to General Rural Area.**

**497. Goulbourn, Conc. 9, Lot 1** - Goulbourn requested that this designation be scaled back to ensure a separation of at least 450 metres from the village of Ashton. (87)

**Response** - The designation as shown provides this separation.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**498. Goulbourn, Conc. 9, Lots 3, 4 and 5** - Two landowners objected. One (in Lot 5) provided a map to staff of the private dwellings in the vicinity of the proposed designation as well as the general location of several places (basements, ditching, farm pond) where digging had indicated overburden depths greater than the 1.5 metre depth used in the Mineral Resource Study. Landowners along Dwyer Hill Road in Con 8 also objected to the Limestone Resource designation of lands in the area for reasons which include depletion of quality farm land, impacts on water resources and lowering of local property values. (172, 237, 246)

**Response** - This area is being farmed, but is too small an area to be recommended for designation as Agricultural Resource Area. The geologist has re-assessed the site and confirms that the overburden in the south half of the lots exceeds the 1.5 m overburden depth criterion. The remaining deposit in the northern part of the lots is Oxford formation and is still large enough to meet the economic criteria.



**Recommendation - Change the Limestone Resource designation in Goulbourn, Conc. 9, Lots 3-5 as shown on Schedule A attached.**

**499. Goulbourn, Conc. 9, part Lots 13, 14 and 15** - Goulbourn requested a setback of 450 m from Brownsville along Flewellyn Road. The Township and another submission pointed out that candidate natural areas 304 and 331 in this vicinity had been assessed as of high and moderate significance respectively. One submission states these lands are home to a great blue heron colony and two varieties of Lady Slipper. It was suggested that it should be designated Rural Resource. Another landowner submitted a study on the bedrock on their property, which they felt indicated that it is not a high quality resource. The same submission also opposes a Rural Resource designation for the property. (87, 199, 253)

**Response** - The resource boundaries in the draft official plan do provide a 450 metre separation from Brownsville. Although this area had not been designated previously in the Regional Official Plan, it was previously and is still designated Mineral Resource in Goulbourn's Official Plan. No part of Candidate Natural Area 304 (high significance) south of Fernbank Road has been included in the Limestone Resource designation. Natural Area 331 was rated moderate; it straddles Fernbank Road. Since the northern portion is recommended to be retained in the Limestone Resource designation (part is already licensed), it is recommended that the mineral resource south of Fernbank also be protected, rather than the natural values. Our consultant advises that the study on the specific property confirmed the existence of a mineral resource.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**500. Goulbourn, Conc. 10, Part Lot 1** - This site should not be designated Limestone Resource because it would be impossible to provide any effective screening from Highway 7. It is most appropriate for the types of commercial and industrial uses permitted in General Rural (231).

**Response** - Provincial regulations require setbacks from roads and screening for all pits and quarries. However staff have re-examined the resource mapping and propose a change to the western boundary, so that there is a strip of General Rural along Ashton Station Road.

**Recommendation - Change the western boundary of the Limestone Resource designation in Goulbourn, Conc. 10, Lot 1 as shown on Schedule A, attached.**

**501. Goulbourn, Conc. 10, 11 and 12, Lots 12-15** - This designation overlaps with Candidate Natural Areas 304 and 331, which are assessed at high and moderate significance respectively. These areas should be designated Rural Resource, except for areas which are already licensed. (199) Goulbourn states that there are existing businesses in Lots 14 and 15 which preclude a quarry; these businesses should not be included in the Limestone Resource designation. One submission refers to the large size of the area designated Limestone Resource between Highway 7 and Fernbank Road. Another submission refers to the impacts on Heritage Corners. a subdivision to the west. (87, 137, 197, 199)

**Response** - The general approach taken by staff was to give preference to the Rural Resource designation in cases of overlap with mineral aggregate resources, except where the aggregate resources were already licensed or designated in an approved official plan (or where the candidate natural area was assessed at moderate significance and the aggregate resource was sand and gravel, Oxford or March formation). Staff continue to recommend this approach. Changes are recommended to the east and north boundaries to more precisely reflect the boundaries in the 1988 Regional Official Plan in areas of overlap with Natural Area 304. The businesses along Fernbank Road can continue to be zoned for the existing use. They will be replaced by quarry only if they choose to sell the property.

**Recommendation** - **Change the Limestone Resource designation in Goulbourn, Conc. 10, 11 and 12, Lots 12-15 as shown on Schedule A attached.**

**502. Goulbourn, Conc. 10, Lots 18 and 19** - Goulbourn (87) advised of the presence of a TransCanada pipeline in this area.

**Response** - Staff were aware of the pipeline. In this instance it lies at the western edge of the proposed area, an edge which is also affected by a Provincially Significant Wetland, so that a setback is likely to be required for both these factors. The western portion also overlaps with a natural area of high significance. Staff have also re-examined the setback from existing houses and lots along the south side of Fernbank Road.

**Recommendation** - **Change the Limestone Resource designation in Goulbourn, Conc. 10, Lots 18 and 19 to General Rural as shown on Schedule A attached.**

**503. Goulbourn, Conc. 11, part Lot 14** - The landowner requested a redesignation to General Rural Area. (54)

**Response** - This property is part of a larger Limestone Resource designation which has been designated Mineral Resource in both the Regional and Goulbourn Official Plans for many years. The south part of Lot 14 is already licensed for a quarry.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**504. Kanata, Conc. 3, Lots 22 and 23** - A neighbour (168) objects to the possibility of a quarry, which would not be good for the environment and may cause health problems for people with asthma. Other submissions refer to the proposed designation but do not take a position on it. (Kanata, 272)

**Response** - The possibility of a quarry also exists under the approved Regional Official Plan which permits quarries in the General Rural Area designation. This is the only Limestone Resource designation proposed in the City of Kanata. It is March formation, which produces a special skid resistant asphalt. This is the best opportunity left in Ottawa-Carleton to protect this formation for future extraction.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**505. Rideau, (Marlborough), Conc. 9 and 10, Lots 26, 27 and 28 -** The Province questions why this area is not designated Limestone Resource. (321)

**Response -** This area was not recommended for designation due to the fragmentation of the limestone deposit by wetlands and ownership patterns, as well as the high significance of the natural area.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**506. West Carleton, (Huntley), Conc. 1, Lots 3, 4, 5 and 6 -** A landowner who has 120 hectares (300 acres) in this location has expressed an interest in a Limestone Resource designation. He is interested in doing underground mining and using the space created for storage. (318)

**Response -** The property is designated General Rural Area in the 1988 approved Regional Official Plan. It was a candidate limestone resource area in the Mineral Resource study (Bobcaygeon formation), but was proposed for designation as Rural Resource in the draft official plan, because the natural area was assessed at high significance. Other landowners in the designation have requested a change from Rural Resource to General Rural Area and Agricultural Resource. The discussion of this property in the Rural Resource section of this report recommends that, like other Rural Resource, this property become General Rural on Schedule A and Environmental Feature on Schedule K. Underground mining is permitted in the General Rural Area designation, but quarries are not. The issue of going instead to a Limestone Resource designation requires further consideration, given that it was not evident as a possibility in the draft Regional Official Plan.

**Recommendation - See Recommendation 262.**

**507. West Carleton (Torbolton), Conc. 1, Lots 14 and 15 and West Carleton (Fitzroy), Conc. 12 -** Three landowners in Conc. 1 objected to the proposed designation. One submission questions the need to protect mineral aggregate resources. Another submission says the Limestone Resource designation should not be applied to Lot 15 in either concession, due to the neighbouring wetlands in the Natural Environment Area (B) designation. West Carleton endorsed the requested change to General Rural. (68, 163, 184, 298)

**Response -** This Limestone Resource designation was an error; most of the limestone formation is also part of a candidate natural area which received a high significance assessment.

**Recommendation - Remove the Limestone Resource designation in West Carleton (Torbolton), Conc. 1, Lots 14 and 15 and West Carleton (Fitzroy), Conc. 12 and replace with General Rural Area as shown on Schedule A attached and show on Schedule K as Environmental Feature.**

**508. West Carleton, Conc. 5, Lots 11 and 12 (Huntley)** - The landowners have requested that, apart from the Limestone Resource designation, the balance of the west half of Lot 11 and all of Lot 12 be designated Sand and Gravel Resource. A wayside pit for Highway 417 was located on this property. (95)

**Response** - There is evidence of a sand and gravel resource on this property. However Lots 11 and 12 are included in a natural area considered to have moderate significance. The Limestone Resource designation permits pits, There is sufficient flexibility in the interpretation of official plan boundaries to permit sand and gravel extraction in more of the property, if studies demonstrate that environmental features will not be negatively impacted.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**509. West Carleton (Huntley), Conc. 10, Lots 23 to 27** - Several individuals and a group of affected landowners and neighbours submitted responses asking that the area remain designated General Rural Area rather than Limestone Resource. Their reasons include that the proposed designation would deter investments in either farming or farm-related activities as well as in reforestation. The reforested portion of this land supports a wide variety of plants and animals. There is also concern that quarry operations could seriously affect the water supplies of existing homes and of the surrounding natural environment and agricultural land. There are numerous springs in the area, some of which are dry during the summer. The submissions include a map showing the location of 24 existing residences which are in or within 450 metres of the proposed Limestone Resource Area designation. It is argued that the designation would severely devalue these properties due to the potential for a future quarry and to the restrictions on lot creation associated with the designation. The issue of demand is also raised. Lastly, the submissions point out that they constitute a community and that this designation is counter to Goal 2 in the draft Regional Official Plan (Maintain the desirable characteristics and integrity of established communities in the urban and rural areas of Ottawa-Carleton). One submission is from a resident who has constructed an astronomical observatory (and has discovered four comets), who is concerned about the impacts of light pollution, dust, and vibration on his comet searching and related scientific work. West Carleton generally endorsed these submissions. (50, 92, 133, 144, 163, 171, 240)

**Response** - The boundary between Limestone Resource and Rural Resource should have been drawn approximately down the middle of the concession. Once the eastern half is deleted and the impact on homes along Dwyer Hill and Panmure Roads is taken into account, there is little “realistic possibility” for a quarry.

**Recommendation** - **Change Schedule A by deleting the Limestone Resource designation in West Carleton, Conc. 10, Lots 23-27 and replacing it with a General Rural Area designation. Include the east portion as Environmental Feature on Schedule K.**

**510. West Carleton, Conc. 12, Lot 1** - Landowner is concerned that the policies and proposed designation will restrict their ability to sever a farm retirement lot and two estate lots and objects to the designation. (179)

**Response** - The recommended change with regard to farm-related severances will address the concern with regard to a retirement lot. The property to the west is not proposed for designation because the limestone is not there; the property to the east is not proposed due to fragmentation and conflicts with existing uses. This is a 100 acre property, there is area for all required setbacks and a viable quarry. Whether the property is farmed or quarried is entirely the decision of the property owners.

**Recommendation** - No change.

### **Sand and Gravel Resource Designation**

**511. Goulbourn, Conc. 4, Lots 1, 2 and 3** - Goulbourn (87) requested that the designation be scaled back to create a 120 metre separation from two estate subdivisions.

**Response** - The designation will be scaled back to Lot 3.

**Recommendation** - Change the Sand and Gravel Resource designation in Goulbourn, Conc. 4, Lots 1-3 by replacing the designation in Lots 1 and 2 with General Rural Area, as shown on Schedule A attached.

**512. Goulbourn, Conc. 8, Lots 3 and 4** - Goulbourn (87) advised that the roads adjacent to this deposit are unpaved and unsuitable for an aggregate haul route and that the shortest route to Hwy. 7 would take traffic through Ashton. The extension of the designation into Lot 1 affects an estate lot. A landowner also objected to the proposed designation (150).

**Response** - Staff agree to delete the Limestone Resource designation. Because sand pits are also permitted in the General Rural Area designation and this is a Class 3 deposit, they also agree to deletion of the Sand and Gravel designation.

**Recommendation** - Redesignate to General Rural Area.

**513. Goulbourn, Conc. 8, Lots 21 and 22** - Goulbourn (87) advised that a narrow extension into Lot 21 seemed inappropriate and that the boundary should coincide with the boundary between Lots 21 and 22.

**Response** - Agree. The proposed designation in this area was based on the mapping of existing licenses. Staff have checked this mapping against the site plans in MNR files and corrected any errors. This was a mapping error.\*\*

**Recommendation** - Redesignate portion in Lot 21 to Rural Resource.

**514. Goulbourn, Conc. 8, Lot 22** - An owner of 0.8 ha advises that the mineral resource on his site has been exhausted and he would like a designation which permits rural commercial development. (53)

**Response** - There are two pit licenses in the south half of Lot 22, which together total almost 30 ha. At the scale of the Regional Official Plan schedules, it is not possible to show 0.8 ha parcels. However the policies of the approved and draft Regional Official Plans permit General Rural Area uses in these areas after the resource is exhausted or if extraction is not viable without amendment to the Plan. These uses include rural commercial.

**Recommendation** - No change is required to either the policies or schedule.

**515. Nepean, Conc. 5 RF, part Lot 17** - The landowners (94) have requested that the property continue to be designated Sand and Gravel Resource, as it is already designated in the Regional Official Plan.

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Change the designation in Nepean, Conc. 5 RF, part Lot 17 from Agricultural Resource Area to Sand and Gravel Resource as shown on Schedule A attached.

**516. Osgoode, Conc. 4, Lot 11** - The landowner (61) who is on the east side of old Prescott Road has asked that the designation be corrected, as he is not operating a pit.

**Response** - There is a pit license in Lot 11, Con 4, but is only on the west side of the road. The mapping should not have crossed the road, as the amount of sand deposit on the east side is too small to protect.\*\*

**Recommendation** - Change designation on east side of Old Prescott Road in Lot 11, Con 4, Osgoode from Sand and Gravel Resource Area to General Rural.

**517. Rideau, Conc. A, portions of Lots 8-15, and Conc. 1, Lots 7-10** - Several submissions objected to part or all of the Sand and Gravel designation. Reasons cited include that previous studies had indicated that the quantity and quality of resource was not viable to extract; concerns about increased traffic on First Line Road and about impacts on the water table and wildlife; the proposed designation contradicts recent approvals of severance applications; and it devalues properties by suggesting a pit may be licensed on First Line Road. In addition there are a number of existing homes along First Line Road. Another submission explained the importance of the esker to his dairy operation. (12, 147, 210, 241, 249, 256)

**Response** - The deposit area has been re-examined in detail. This resource is a long narrow esker running north-south in Rideau, which is mapped as Class 1 and Class 3 sand deposits. There are existing pit licenses in Lots 7 and 8, Con 1 and Lot 13, Con A. The designation has been scaled back where it is confirmed that the resource is already depleted, the property is

already too fragmented by severances, or where the area of sand and gravel resource is too small to be economically viable, taking into account required setbacks from existing homes and roads. The rear portion of the properties in Lots 11-13 is poor soils, but were included in the Agricultural Resource designation in order to avoid a small pocket of General Rural with no road frontage between Sand and Gravel and Agricultural Resource designations. With the changes to the Sand and Gravel designation, the rear portions of these lots may also be designated General Rural. Farming is a permitted use in Sand and Gravel Resource Areas. Nothing in the policies forces a farmer to discontinue his farming practices in order to permit a pit.

**Recommendation - Change Sand and Gravel and Agricultural Resource designation in Rideau, Conc. 1, Lots 7-10 and Conc. A, Lots 7-15 to delete Lot 9, Conc. 1, and Lot 11, frontage and back portion of Lot 12, back portion of Lot 13 and frontage of Lot 14, Conc. A and replace with General Rural Area as shown on Schedule A attached.**

### **Errors, Omissions and Clarifications in Section 8**

**518. Recommendation - Make the following corrections to Section 8.**

**West Carleton, Conc. 3, Lot 10, (Huntley)** - This pit is depleted, although the license has not been formally surrendered. There is a draft approved plan of subdivision on the site. The Township and Ministry of Natural Resources agree that it may be shown as General Rural.

**West Carleton, Conc. 5 and 6, Lot 13 (Huntley)** - The pit license in Lot 13, Con 6 was incorrectly shown as Limestone Resource in the February draft Regional Official Plan and has been corrected to a Sand and Gravel designation. The sand deposit east of the pit license (also incorrectly shown as Limestone Resource) was utilized when the TransCanada pipeline was installed.

**West Carleton, Conc. 7, Lots 16 and 17, (Huntley)** - This deposit was incorrectly identified as a Limestone Resource in the February draft Regional Official Plan and has been corrected to a Sand and Gravel designation.

**West Carleton, Conc. 8, Lots 10-13, (Huntley)** - This deposit was incorrectly identified as a Limestone Resource in the February draft Regional Official Plan and has been corrected to a Sand and Gravel designation.

**Pit and Quarry License boundaries** - All license boundaries have been checked against the license site plans at the Ministry of Natural Resources and corrected as required on Schedule A.

The re-examination of all Limestone Resource areas has resulted in recommended changes to the boundaries of the designations in the following locations and the entire deletion of the designation in Osgoode, Conc. 7, Lots 31 and 32, as shown on Schedule A attached.

**Cumberland, Conc. 2, 3, part Lot 13 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to Agricultural Resource Area.**

**Cumberland, Conc. 1, part Lot 14 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**Goulbourn, Conc. 11, Lot 1 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**Goulbourn, Conc. 12, part Lot 3, - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**Osgoode, Conc. 7, Lots 31 and 32 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**Osgoode, Conc. 8, Lot 17 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**Osgoode, Conc. 9, Lot 17 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**Rideau, Conc. 1 (Marl.), part Lots 10 and 11 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**Rideau, Conc. 5 (Marl.), part Lots 27, 28 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**Rideau, Conc. 8 (Marl.), part Lots 25, 26 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**Rideau, Conc. 8 (Marl.), part Lots 3, 4- Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**West Carleton, Conc. 11 (Huntley), part Lots 2, 3 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**West Carleton, Conc. 11, 12 (Huntley), part Lot 5 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

**West Carleton, Conc. 10, 11 (Huntley), part Lot 8 - Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area.**

## **Section 9 - Transportation**

### **General Comments on Section 9 Introduction**

**519. Transportation Vision -** The Official Plan should refer to the Transportation Vision used as a basis for the Transportation Master Plan. (142)

**Response -** Agree.



**Recommendation - Change Section 9 preamble, paragraph 4, sentence 3 to replace the words "The Community Vision for Ottawa-Carleton calls for..." with the words "The Community Vision for Ottawa-Carleton, and the Transportation Vision and supporting principles, call for...."**

**520. Health benefits of non-motorised modes -** Point out that cycling and walking promote good health through exercise. (303)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Section 9 preamble, paragraph 4, sentence 2 to insert the words "healthy and" before the words "environment-friendly".**

**521. Benefits of promoting non-motorised modes -** Add to bullets in paragraph 4: a) global pollution and warming; b) reduced private expenditures; c) transportation equity; d) reduced public expenditures. (310)

**Response -** a) is already addressed; agree to include b), c) and d).

**Recommendation - Change Section 9 preamble, paragraph 4 by deleting the word "and" after the fourth bullet and adding new bullets, as follows:**

- "private and public transportation costs; and
- social inequities related to transportation."

### **General Comments on Section 9.1 - Objectives**

**522. Travel demand targets at screenlines -** Screenline targets should be set according to volume as well as modal share, with auto volumes decreasing annually. (142)

**Response -** Modal shares are the best indicator of travel behaviours, since they avoid problems that may arise from fluctuations in population or employment levels, and remain valid for a given horizon regardless of the accuracy of population or employment forecasts. While the target for automobile use is set to achieve a significant decline on a relative basis, the effects of growth will counteract this change and yield an overall increase in the absolute amount of automobile travel.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**523. New and amended objectives -** a) Insert new Objective 1: "Based on a transit-first priority"; b) insert new Objective 3d: "no new road widening inside the Greenbelt", renumber Objective 3d to 3e and amend to read: "...outside the Greenbelt" (190)

**Response -** a) Disagree, since an equivalent emphasis is placed on transit, cycling and walking ahead of automobile travel. b) The increases in road capacity specified in the plan are those

needed to serve a lower modal share by automobile travel at a lower level of service. Unless modal share objectives are exceeded, the specified road widenings are required.

**Recommendation - No change.**

### **Specific Comments on Section 9.1, Objectives**

**524. Section 9.1, Objective 2c** - Add reduction of auto ownership to this point. (310)

**Response** - Reduced auto ownership is considered to be an outcome of reduced automobile reliance.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**525. Section 9.1, Objective 3d** - The Cities of Ottawa and Gloucester suggest the need for care to ensure that expected increases in peak hour congestion due to the lower quality of service target do not cause diversion of non-local traffic to local streets (109, 244)

**Response** - This concern is recognised. Generally speaking, the use of local roads to assist in the provision of transportation service has not been assumed, and the Regional road system has been sized to provide an adequate level of service. In circumstances where undesirable spillover from Regional to local roads does occur, RMOC will continue to participate in monitoring and addressing specific problems.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**526. Section 9.1, Objective 4a** - The City of Ottawa and others suggest that the pedestrian modal share target is too low and will lead to little improvement to pedestrian facilities or policies, and suggest increasing the target from 10% to 12%. (89, 109, 142, 190, 310)

**Response** - The target as stated is "not less than 10 percent" and is felt to be ambitious in the face of anticipated trends. Over the planning horizon, monitoring will determine if the pedestrian supportive plans and policies are successful in achieving a greater modal share than 10 percent, and if so then any additional measures required to accommodate this pedestrian travel will be addressed.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**527. Section 9.1, Objective 4b** - The City of Ottawa and others suggest that the current cycling modal share of 1.7%, as stated, under-represents the existing situation cycling modal share, and suggest that a target greater than 3% be established. (109, 190, 300, 303, 310)

**Response** - The existing region-wide condition of 1.7% and the target of not less than 3% are seasonally-adjusted figures that specifically address autumn conditions (the time of year at which

the comprehensive 1995 Origin-Destination Survey was taken). They represent the desire to achieve a proportional increase of approximately 75% in travel by bicycle throughout Ottawa-Carleton. It is acknowledged that cycling levels in summer will be significantly greater than in autumn, and appropriate seasonal adjustment factors will be determined to aid in monitoring. Some submissions commented specifically on the variation between the results of the 1995 OD survey and the results of the 1991 Cyclist Profile Survey which cited significantly higher rates for cycling during the "cycling season" -- these differences are considered to result from the different survey designs, sample sizes, method of survey participant selection, geographic coverage and definitions of key terms. Given the rigorous technical approach used in the 1995 OD Survey, the acknowledgement of the influence of seasonal variations on its results, and the commitment to use seasonal adjustment factors in comparing future conditions to the 3% modal share target that has been set, the consultant and staff are satisfied that the modal share targets are founded upon the most reliable and comprehensive travel behaviour information ever collected in the National Capital Region.

**Recommendation - Change Objective 4b of Section 9.1 to read:**

"b) cycling - from 1.7% in 1995 to at least 3% (fall conditions);"

**General Comments on Section 9.2 - Pedestrian Facilities**

**528. RMOC role and objectives** - Plan must include stronger RMOC role and more specific objectives for pedestrian travel; suggest that RMOC should assume responsibility for sidewalks to ensure pedestrian accessibility to public transit (89, 142, 302)

**Response** - While governance issues cannot be addressed through the Official Plan, the desired improvements to pedestrian facilities and services can be achieved within the existing jurisdictional framework. The RMOC is committed to co-operating with area municipalities to improve the quality of service for walking throughout the region. It is felt that the objectives set for pedestrian travel are appropriate for the level of detail generally addressed in the Official Plan.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**529. Local area pedestrian plans** - RMOC should fund and cooperate in conducting pedestrian plans for urban areas and villages by 1999. (142)

**Response** - RMOC will continue to participate in local transportation planning studies where requested. Issues such as the funding of local area studies will be considered in the development of an action plan for Transportation Master Plan implementation.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**530. Access to Transitway stations, and channelised right-turn lanes** - a) Add pathways between Transitway stations and adjacent areas (142). b) Redesign existing pedestrian access to transitway stations to increase accessibility for nearby residential and commercial developments, and c) eliminate existing channelised right-turns where there is high pedestrian usage. (89)

**Response** - Comments a) and b) are addressed by policies elsewhere in the Official Plan, including Sections 3.2, 3.5, 3.6, 4.3.1, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7. Suggestion c) is addressed through the following suggested amendment:

**Recommendation - Add a new Policy 2 to Section 9.2 as follows:**

**"2. Identify and implement opportunities to eliminate intersection design or operational characteristics that are incompatible with safe pedestrian travel."**

**531. Pedestrian travel in Transitway corridors** - a) Add pedestrian walkways in all transitway corridors, and b) lift the ban on pedestrian crossings of the Transitway where paths intersect. (142)

**Response** - a) Section 9.3, Policy 6 deals with the establishment of multi-use pathways in or adjacent to Transitway corridors. Because pedestrians would also be served by these facilities, a similar policy should be added to this section, as below. b) There is no outright ban on pedestrian crossings where paths intersect the Transitway. They have been permitted, and will continue to be permitted, on a selective basis where safety is not compromised.

**Recommendation - Add a new Policy 5 to Section 9.2 as follows:**

**"5. Consider opportunities for and collaborate with others in providing separate multi-use pathways in or adjacent to Transitway corridors."**

### **Specific Comments on Section 9.2 - Pedestrian Facilities**

**532. Section 9.2, Policy 1** - Several municipalities noted that the requirement for sidewalks on local roads serving as transit routes appears to exceed RMOC jurisdiction and should be stated as a guideline to encourage sidewalk provision instead (87, 88, 244). The City of Vanier noted that flexibility should be provided when dealing with existing local roads (43). The City of Kanata requests addition of a schedule showing proposed locations and associated priorities, to assist area municipalities with capital planning. (212) The Township of Cumberland recommends amending to encourage the retrofitting of older streets for the provision of sidewalks. (279) The Township of West Carleton notes that the Regional road policy should be amended to exclude rural areas (163)

**Response** - The requirement for sidewalks on local roads serving transit routes will be maintained, but clarified to apply only to new roads under local jurisdiction. Through the Transportation Master Plan implementation process, RMOC will develop in conjunction with local municipalities a prioritised program of sidewalk improvements on Regional roads. In addition, since virtually all Regional roads in the urban area serve transit routes, the policy should be amended to require sidewalks on both sides of urban Regional roads. Rural Regional roads should be clearly excluded from this policy.

**Recommendation - Replace Policy 1 of Section 9.2 with the following:**

**"1. Ensure the provision of sidewalks:**

- a) on at least one side of all new roads in Business Parks as required by policies in Section 4.4;
- b) on both sides of all other new roads serving transit routes as required by policies for Urban Communities in Section 3.2; and
- c) on both sides of Regional roads in the urban area, except for Regional roads that are within or adjacent to the Greenbelt and abut or connect urban areas, where provision of a sidewalk or pathway on at least one side shall be ensured."

**533. Section 9.2, Policy 2** - Delete "where necessary". Add tilting of sidewalks for stormwater runoff to topics for review. (190)

**Response** - Removal of "where necessary" would not change the policy's meaning. Agree with remainder of comment.

**Recommendation - Replace Policy 2 of Section 9.2 with the following:**

**"2. Review and modify, where necessary, current standards and practices for providing pedestrian facilities such as curb ramp design, sidewalk grading for stormwater drainage, use of turn lanes at intersections and pedestrian crossing timing at signalised intersections, to ensure that they support walking."**

**534. Section 9.2, Policy 4** - Suggest that RMOC establish a winter snow/ice clearance standard for sidewalks, requiring municipalities to provide winter quality equivalent to the rest of the year, with guaranteed mobility for infirm and mobility-impaired persons. (142, 310)

**Response** - The RMOC can work co-operatively with other governments to establish mutually-accepted standards, as suggested by the following amendment.

**Recommendation - Replace Policy 4 of Section 9.2 with the following:**

**"4. Collaborate with other levels of government responsible for the development of standards and practices for winter maintenance of sidewalks and bus stops to promote walking and to optimise the co-ordination of activities and service."**

**535. Section 9.2, Policy 5** - Suggest the following amendments to guidelines: a) permit grade-separated walkways only where an at-grade connection is impossible, and provide specific criteria that would be used to warrant grade separations (142); b) increase sidewalk width with pedestrian volumes (142, 206, 310); c) reduce turning radii where required for pedestrian safety (142, 310, 311); d) set crosswalk widths equal to sidewalk widths and be in line with them on side with widest width (142, 310); e) delete reference to "all modes" in fifth guideline and prioritise safety by walk/bike/bus/auto (142, 310); f) apply barrier-free design to maximise accessibility, particularly in the Central Area (258). Point b) also supported by a second submission, requesting that sidewalk widths increase with pedestrian volumes. (206)

**Response** - a) Disagree, since certain locations may warrant both grade-separated and at-grade connections, and criteria cannot be provided since the factors affecting such a decision vary greatly with location; b) agree with sidewalk width principle and recommend changes, as given

below; c) and d) addressed through Policy 2 and Policy 5f; e) disagree, safety of each transportation system user must be considered equally; f) agree.

**Recommendation - Replace Policy 5a of Section 9.2 and add a new Policy 5i as follows:**

**"5. Apply the following environmental guidelines for pedestrian facilities on Regional roads:**

- a) provide a minimum effective sidewalk width of 2.0 metres with a separation from vehicular traffic in the form of a boulevard of 2.0 m where feasible, and under no circumstances provide an effective sidewalk width of less than 1.5 metres;**
- i) apply barrier-free design principles, as far as is practicable, particularly in the Central Area."**

**536. Section 9.2, Policy 5b -** The Township of Cumberland asks where weather-protected linkages will be required, and who pays for installation and maintenance when municipal lands are involved (279).

**Response -** This policy establishes guidelines rather than requirements. The intent of this policy, in conjunction with policies in Section 4.3, is to minimise pedestrian linkages external to buildings by encouraging development forms that accommodate pedestrian movements within buildings at rapid transit stations.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**537. Section 9.2, Policy 5e -** The City of Ottawa requests that this policy refer to and indicate support for Section 3.4.2, Policy 9 respecting Central Area grade-separation policies (109)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Policy 5e of Section 9.2 by adding the words "(notwithstanding policies respecting grade-separated walkways in the Central Area, as identified in Section 3.4.2)" after the word "only".**

**538. Section 9.2, Policy 5f -** The City of Ottawa notes that this policy should cross-reference Section 3.4.2, Policy 11d respecting the use of channelised right turn lanes and multiple left turn lane configurations (109)

**Response -** Disagree, since the intent here is to express a guideline, rather than to cite specific measures that may be adopted.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**539. Section 9.2, Policy 6 -** Broaden to address private costs as well as public costs. (142)

**Response - Agree.**

**Recommendation - Change Policy 6 of Section 9.2 by adding the words "private and" before the words "public costs of travel choices."**

### **General Comments on Section 9.3 - Cycling Facilities**

**540. Section title -** Change section title to “Cycling” to better reflect that an effective system is more than a network. (303)

**Response -** Agree, with similar changes to Sections 9.2 and 9.5.

**Recommendation -** Change the title of Section 9.2 to “Walking”, change the title of Section 9.3 to “Cycling” and change the title of Section 9.5 to “Regional Roads”.

### **Specific Comments on Section 9.3 - Cycling Facilities**

**541. Section 9.3, Policy 1 -** Support for this policy is conditional upon the identification and approval of first and second priority cycling transportation network projects and costs no later than 3 months after approval of this Plan. (303)

**Response -** The identification of a five-year plan and ten-year objectives for CTN implementation will be dealt with in the development of an action plan for Transportation Master Plan implementation.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**542. Section 9.3, Policy 2 -** The Regional Cycling Advisory Group suggests amending the second half of this policy as follows: "..., provided that the continuity and functionality of the affected network route is maintained by providing alternative provisions to replace the cycling facilities affected by the revision" (214). The City of Gloucester and another submission suggest requiring an Official Plan amendment to amend the CTN, to ensure due public notice and input (244, 303).

**Response -** Agree to the principle of the former suggestion, with simplified wording recommended below. Disagree with the latter suggestion, since not requiring an Official Plan amendment will allow staff to take rapid advantage of opportunities as they present themselves, without needing to follow a cumbersome and costly process.

**Recommendation -** Change Policy 2 of Section 9.3 by replacing the word "continuity" with the words "continuity and functionality".

**543. Section 9.3, Policy 4 -** Must do more than examine practices, by actively resolving problems. (303)

**Response** - Agree, a more proactive policy is appropriate.

**Recommendation** - Replace Policy 4 of Section 9.3 with the following:

**"4. As a priority, identify and modify as required any operational design practices which may impede cycling on roadways, including intersection geometry, location and type of on-street drainage, procedures to minimise and effectively reinstate road cuts, and cyclist safety measures during road construction."**

**544. Section 9.3, Policy 5** - The Regional Cycling Advisory Group suggests amending this policy to replace "Consider" with "Implement, where feasible" (214). Change "consider cycling requirements" to "Ensure that cycling requirements are fully considered". (303)

**Response** - Agree the need for more direct wording, and prefer the second suggestion.

**Recommendation** - Change Policy 5 of Section 9.3 by replacing the words "Consider cycling requirements in:" with the words "Ensure that cycling requirements are fully considered in:"

**545. Section 9.3, Policy 6** - Replace "consider" with "implement" (109). Change "consider" to "develop" (303). Clarify that cycling facilities in or adjacent to Transitway corridors would be an RMOC responsibility, due to their commuter function. (88)

**Response** - Disagree with the first and second comments -- consideration must precede implementation, particularly where RMOC does not have unilateral authority, and not all Transitway corridors would be considered to represent favourable opportunities. Also disagree with the third comment -- an individual municipality is under no obligation to participate, but in certain cases its interests may be served by co-operation, and cycling routes in question may jointly serve a feeder or recreational purpose. In addition, note that "separate cycling facilities" should be changed to "multi-use pathways" to reflect the simultaneous incorporation of pedestrian facilities.

**Recommendation** - Change Policy 6 of Section 9.3 to replace the words "separate cycling facilities" with the words "multi-use pathways".

**546. Section 9.3, Policy 7** - Replace this policy with the three related policy statements from Section 2.3.4 of the Transportation Master Plan. (303)

**Response** - Policy 7 embodies the key principle behind the detailed TMP policies, and is considered to represent a sufficient level of detail for the Official Plan.

**Recommendation** - No change.



**547. Section 9.3, Policy 8** - Several municipalities and others object to the level of detail in this policy (namely to the requirement to provide a specific standard of bicycle parking) and one questioned whether zoning bylaws may require bicycle parking at all. They generally suggest either deleting the policy or replacing it with one that encourages the adoption of standards in municipal zoning bylaws and provides suggested guidelines for specific rates at land uses. (43, 87, 88, 109, 163, 212, 244, 279, 303)

**Response** - Agree with the general substance of comments.

**Recommendation** - **Replace Policy 8 of Section 9.3 with the following:**

**"5. Require the zoning bylaws affecting the Urban Area of Ottawa-Carleton to provide for an appropriate number of bicycle parking spaces at educational, community, retail, recreational and employment land uses, and at residential apartment buildings."**

**548. Section 9.3, Policy 9** - Change "bicycle parking" to "bicycle parking and storage" to reduce theft of bicycle components and thereby attract more people to make combined bicycle/bus trips. (303)

**Response** - Bicycle storage is a high-security form of bicycle parking, and as such is incorporated in this policy.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**549. Section 9.3, Policy 10** - Recommend the addition of "Council supports effective enforcement as a component of a safe transportation system." (303)

**Response** - Agree. Suggested addition is appropriate.

**Recommendation** - **Change Policy 10 of Section 9.3 by adding the words "; also support effective enforcement as a component of a safe transportation system."**

### **General Comments on Section 9.4 - Public Transit**

**550. Transit terminology** - Suggest that definitions be provided for terms such as transit stop, transit station, transitway station and transit route, and that they be used in a consistent manner. (109, 212, 277)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **These and related terms will be added to the Glossary of the Official Plan subsequent to development of a glossary for the Transportation Master Plan and prior to approval of the plans.**

**551. Transit infrastructure as public space** - Suggest an additional policy to respect the environmental and other objectives of the Plan. (229, 311)

**Response** - Agree that such a policy would be consistent with the treatment of this concern in Section 9.5, Policy 6.

**Recommendation** - Add a new Policy 25 to Section 9.4 as follows:

**"25. Recognise the public space function of Regional transit facilities and ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses and landscape character as required by the policies of Section 6.5."**

**Specific Comments on Section 9.4 - Public Transit**

**552. Section 9.4, Policy 1** - Add "at all times and to all sectors of the population". (310)

**Response** - There is no limitation on the scope of this policy.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**553. Section 9.4, Policy 2** - The City of Gloucester suggests rewriting this policy to avoid duplication with earlier sections of the Official Plan, instead committing to focus transit service on these areas (244)

**Response** - This is an extremely important issue and is worthy of reiteration at this location.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**554. Section 9.4, Policy 2** - Suggest adding community cores as priority nodes transit will serve. (310)

**Response** - This policy refers to promotion of employment growth rather than the orientation of transit service.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**555. Section 9.4, Policy 3** - This policy should consider redevelopment as well as new development. (258)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Change Policy 3 of Section 9.4 by adding the words "and redevelopment" after the word "development".

**556. Section 9.4, Policy 4** - Repeats Section 9.2, Policy 4. (279)

**Response** - Disagree, since Section 9.2, Policy 4 addresses only sidewalks and bus stops, while Section 9.4, Policy 4 addresses pedestrian accesses to all transit facilities.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**557. Section 9.4, Policy 5** - Add safety in addition to security.

**Response** - Pedestrian and cyclist safety is comprehensively covered under policies elsewhere in the plan.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**558. Section 9.4, Policy 6** - Provide targets for number of Park and Rides to be developed. (190)

**Response** - **Map 2 of the Transportation Master Plan will be changed to show proposed future Park and Ride locations, to avoid the requirement for an Official Plan amendment to accommodate a location change.**

**Recommendation** - No change.

**559. Section 9.4, Policy 11** - The National Capital Commission proposes inclusion of the Champlain Bridge with other bridges cited for the implementation of transit priority measures, given the conclusions of the JACPAT 1994 Study of Interprovincial Bridges, Phase 2 and the prospective reconstruction of the Champlain Bridge to accommodate high-occupancy vehicles. (258)

**Response** - The introduction of transit priority measures on the Portage and Chaudière Bridges and their approaches is a much more important objective than the same on the Champlain Bridge, since in relative terms the latter could make only a very minor contribution to the resolution of interprovincial transit service problems.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**560. Section 9.4, Policy 15** - Several municipalities or agencies object to the prescriptive nature of this policy, and generally suggest a) that it be amended to allow but not require municipalities to review and amend parking requirements (109, 221, 244, 279). Other submissions supported this policy and recommended: b) expanding it to cover all urban areas with a high level of walking, with requirements reducing further as levels of local trip containment increase; or c) requesting the City of Ottawa to remove all parking requirements for commercial buildings in the Central Area. (89, 142, 206)

**Response** - Disagree with comment a) since the policy provides municipalities with substantial flexibility to determine the most appropriate specific zoning tools within the policy framework.

Agree with the principle of comment b), but consider that it would best be expressed as an encouraged (rather than required) action by municipalities. Comment c) is considered to be too specific. Central Area parking requirements must address a great number of complex issues including the critical importance of Central Area vitality to the achievement of overall transit objectives.

**Recommendation - Add a new Policy 16 immediately after Policy 15 in Section 9.4, as follows:**

**"16. In areas served by transit and having a mix of community services conducive to pedestrian travel, encourage area municipalities to review and amend parking requirements in zoning by-laws to a level which supports transit through the imposition of reduced parking requirements and maximum parking space provisions for developments."**

**561. Section 9.4, Policy 17 -** Add public washrooms and diaper-changing stations at transitway stations. Improve security at future stations by designing visibility from adjacent uses and streets. (142)

**Response -** Washrooms were studied and rejected by RMOC and OC Transpo in a 1995 study that cited high cost, security risks, and little demand or support from focus groups. Security, of which visibility is a fundamental component, is addressed in this policy.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**562. Section 9.4, Policies 20 and 21 -** The City of Nepean comments that protecting for full Transitway grade-separation and technology conversion is unreasonable in suburban areas, and will lead to sterilisation of significant corridors and impacts on the land use pattern needed to support ridership on the eventual transit facility. Revise to apply to existing Transitway corridors and areas inside Greenbelt only -- policy for other areas should focus on transit priority and separation for express buses. (88)

**Response -** Disagree that these policies are unreasonable, but some clarification is needed. Policies to ensure the capability of future grade-separation or rail conversion of rapid transit corridors in suburban areas provide the most effective transportation planning tool for a "greenfield" situation to minimise future transportation infrastructure and its environmental and social impacts in both short and long terms. Implementation of today's Transitway system would have been much simpler and less costly had similar policies been applied, for example, to the then-suburban areas of Alta Vista in Ottawa or Bayshore in Nepean.

It is nearly impossible to introduce a grade-separated facility through a future near-mature community if development incompatible with this future transit arrangement has been permitted to proceed. In such situations, the only practical means to retrofit a grade-separated rapid transit system with acceptable impacts on the then-established community would usually be to introduce a subway system. As the costs of this approach would vastly outweigh the level of transit use that could be generated, and could range from between 10 to 20 times that of a grade-separated

Transitway, it would in reality never be introduced -- leading to a more automobile-oriented community with all of the associated adverse environmental and social impacts.

Where a community is planned from the outset to accommodate a future grade-separated rapid transit system, the corridor protection requirements for grade-separated and non-grade-separated transit systems are essentially identical. Contrary to the suggestion that the policies would sterilise land through the heart of the communities, the reverse opportunity presents itself. Temporary transportation uses, such as parking, may be permitted on protected lands until the transit corridor is required for rapid transit purposes and more intense and transit-supportive development occurs.

Not only will the early identification of the corridor for regional-scale rapid transit provide the opportunity to incrementally introduce transit-supportive developments in the location where the Region will ultimately respond with the required transit services, but it will also provide critical reassurance to potential investors and developers regarding the Region's commitment to providing quality regional transit service as early as possible with incremental upgrades as needed.

Travel throughout the region to employment opportunities in the new urban communities is a prime candidate for improved transit market capture, as quality low-cost transit service can be readily provided by the Transitway and under-utilised non-peak direction bus services. A fundamental requirement for success in this travel market will be that the rapid transit system deliver users directly to employment locations in the town centres. This important aspect of regional travel cannot be overlooked.

**Recommendation - Add a new Policy 22 to Section 9.4, as follows:**

**"22. Develop, in co-operation with area municipalities, implementation plans for rapid transit corridors in the urban centres outside the Greenbelt that provide interim uses at various stages of development, while ensuring both the earliest introduction of quality regional-scale transit service and the ability to upgrade transit facilities to a full grade-separated Transitway on an incremental basis."**

**563. Section 9.4, Policy 22 -** The Ontario Ministry of Transportation indicates that a Queensway high-occupancy vehicle lane through the inner urban area for transit priority purposes can be supported as long as it can be shown to improve the overall transportation system. (321)

**Response -** That is the intent of the policy, which will lead to additional study.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**564. Section 9.4, Policy 23 -** Extend rail rapid transit along the CP line southward to Greenboro Station or further towards the Airport, as well as northward to Hull, since the line is proposed for disposal by the railway and should be retained for rail transit use (235, 244).

**Response -** This comment refers to a separate portion of the same rail line that is proposed for use as a rapid transit corridor from Confederation Heights to the West Transitway. It has not been identified for disposal by the owners, the St. Lawrence and Hudson Railway (a subsidiary of

CP) but has been identified as a section of railway that the owners would be interested in having others operate under terms to be negotiated. In summary, CP wishes the line to remain in operation.

Use of this line south of Heron Road would duplicate the existing Southeast Transitway and its existing no-transfer service to the Airport with a parallel facility, and would not directly serve any land use south of Hunt Club Road. However, beyond the life of the Master Plan the need for an extension to the Southeast Transitway would be triggered by further developments in the South Urban Centre and Leitrim. Section 2.4.4 of the draft Transportation Master Plan acknowledges that this railway corridor would provide the most obvious location for part of such an extension.

Within the life of the Master Plan, a transit crossing to Hull at the location of this railway corridor is too far west of the downtowns to attract any significant level of transit usage. No actions are proposed within either plan to preclude this future possibility.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**565. Section 9.4, Policy 23** - The National Capital Commission suggests that the rationale for the proposed rail transit demonstration project requires further study and discussion, and that the performance evaluation parameters require more precision. (258)

**Response** - Agree, and these matters will be addressed as part of the project.

**Recommendation - No change.**

### **General Comments on Section 9.5 - Regional Roadway Policies**

**566. Priority for maintenance** - Place higher priority on road maintenance and then on new roadway construction. (303)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation - Add new Policy 11 to Section 9.5 as follows:**

**"11. Ensure that the expenditure of funds for the basic maintenance of existing infrastructure shall have a higher priority than the expenditure of funds for new infrastructure."**

### **Specific Comments on Section 9.5 - Regional Roadway Policies**

**567. Section 9.5, Policy 1** - The National Capital Commission suggests the establishment of qualitative and quantitative objectives and targets, and monitoring of progress towards limiting growth in auto use. (258)

**Response** - Quantitative targets for modal shares are set out in Section 9.1. The establishment of more specific objectives, such as a quantified reduction in average trip length, could only be done

in an arbitrary fashion; such goals are nevertheless supported by policies throughout the Official Plan. As discussed in Section 9.8, monitoring activities will be sufficiently broad to describe progress in many aspects of the efforts to constrain the growth of automobile use.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**568. Section 9.5, Policy 2 -** Transportation systems management (TSM) seems to contradict transportation demand management (TDM) objectives, by increasing the capacity for automobile travel. Suggest that TSM should be used to maximise the use of right-of-way by people, not just by automobiles. (142, 310)

**Response -** Agree that this policy should adopt a more multi-modal perspective that also benefits non-auto modes. TSM and TDM strategies are not contradictory, since the goal of TSM is to minimise overall person-delay (including delay to pedestrians and cyclists, thereby supporting modal shift targets) and minimise or defer the need for new road construction.

**Recommendation - Replace Policy 2 of Section 9.5 with the following:**

**"2. Implement transportation system management measures, such as traffic and incident management plans, congestion management strategies, driver advisory systems and traffic control signal plans, to make maximum use of existing facilities, minimise overall person-delay, and improve the level of service provided to pedestrians, cyclists and transit users."**

**569. Section 9.5, Policy 3 -** RMOC should commit funding to assist local municipalities in the design and implementation of neighbourhood traffic management plans to mitigate the direct negative impacts of this reduced level of service policy for Regional roads. (88)

**Response -** This concern is recognised. Generally speaking, the use of local roads to assist in the provision of transportation service has not been assumed, and the Regional road system has been sized to provide an adequate level of service to minimise impacts on adjacent neighbourhoods. In circumstances where undesirable spillover from Regional to local roads does occur, RMOC will continue to participate in monitoring and addressing specific problems. Issues such as funding of local area studies will be considered in the development of an action plan for Transportation Master Plan implementation.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**570. Section 9.5, Policy 4 -** The thrust of this policy is supported. Mention cycling facilities design guidelines here adopted by Council. Input should be sought from all road users. Add section to allow RMOC to push for review change of road engineering standards that disadvantage cyclists or pedestrians. (303)

**Response -** Section 9.3 contains policies that address the consideration of cycling in roadway design standards and practices. Consultation is an integral part of all major road design processes.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**571. Section 9.5, Policy 7** - Comment that use of carpool lanes could increase carpooling rates in employment areas where high levels of transit service are not cost-effective. (109)

**Response** - Carpool lanes have some limited potential to promote ridesharing in selected corridors, but the merits of any facility would have to be proven on a case-by-case basis. The carpooling support measures discussed in this policy are considered to have significantly greater advantages and fewer disadvantages.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**572. Section 9.5, Policy 9** - Several comments were received from individuals and community groups, as well as the City of Ottawa, that recommend deletion of the reference to protecting lands for a future interprovincial bridge at Kettle Island. Submissions cite previous Council positions opposing a Kettle Island Crossing, impacts on residential areas and impacts on businesses in Cumberland and Angers. (100, 109, 111, 136, 146, 225, 228, 257, 267). One community organisation commends the protection of the approach lands and recommends that the location be finalised by 2001. (311)

**Response** - The need for an additional bridge crossing toward the end of the planning period has been confirmed by supporting technical work, based principally upon interprovincial roadway capacity requirements and the need to reduce the impacts of through truck traffic on the Central Area. This policy requires action to protect two crossing locations, but does not preclude the consideration of additional locations -- in fact, federal and provincial Environmental Assessment requirements will require consideration of all reasonable alternatives before a final location can be established. The Kettle Island crossing location has been recommended by the Joint Administrative Committee on Planning and Transportation (JACPAT), and adopted by the Société de transport de l'Outaouais (STO) and the Québec Ministry of Transportation (MTQ) in subsequent major studies. In view of the fact that the provision of the next crossing will be the responsibility of the federal, Québec and Ontario governments, it is the opinion of the consultant and staff that corridors that have been recommended by agencies on either side of the Ottawa River should continue to be recognised in the Official Plan, to ensure protection until a final decision can be made with full technical analysis and public consultation. The Kettle Island corridor should continue to be a candidate for detailed evaluation, along with the Cumberland-Angers corridor and any other that might be identified east of the Central Area.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**573. Section 9.5, Policy 9** - Link the establishment of an interprovincial bridge with removal of truck traffic from the central area and the King Edward Avenue/Rideau/Waller/Nicholas route specifically, and the need to activate funding from all levels of government. (222, 311)



**Response** - Agree that this policy should identify the major needs addressed by a future interprovincial bridge. Construction of interprovincial bridges is a federal and provincial funding matter.

**Recommendation** - Change Policy 9 of Section 9.5 by adding the words, "needed to meet interprovincial roadway capacity requirements over the planning horizon and to reduce the impacts of through truck traffic on the Central Area," to the end of the first sentence.

**574. Section 9.5, Policy 10** - a) The City of Ottawa supports the traffic calming evaluation criteria cited, and suggests that potential impacts on local roadways and neighbourhoods also be considered. and that the policy should place priority on mitigating the impacts of Regional road traffic on residential communities (109). b) The policy should articulate that the purpose of traffic calming is to reduce vehicle speeds and improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Disagree with operational problems as a justification for traffic calming (89). c) Expand reasons to support traffic calming, and suggest that traffic calming should be undertaken when municipalities and local communities request it to enhance liveability, particularly in and adjacent to the Central Area. Encourage development of provincial and national design standards which recognise the green hierarchy and concepts such as traffic calming (190, 310). d) Object to consideration of potential traffic calming impacts on "regional mobility needs" (142). e) Clarify that policy does not imply RMOC intent to implement traffic calming on local roads (244). f) Plan seems to under-emphasise the benefits of traffic calming (41). g) Add "by all modes" after "Regional mobility needs" in point b) (310).

**Response** - a) Agree -- the continued efficiency and integrity of the Regional road system is an important tool in preventing the diversion of regional traffic into local neighbourhoods. b) Agree with first comment. Maintain that operational problems (which usually represent safety problems as well) are valid justification. c) Agree with first comment, as discussed above. Policy does not restrict the source of requests for traffic calming, and allows consideration of traffic calming to occur in response to problems identified by staff, community members or local municipalities. National design standards for traffic calming are currently under development with the participation of RMOC. d) Disagree - "mobility needs" refers to roadway capacity, not simply vehicle speed, and Regional roads do have an accepted role in providing mobility as one component of accessibility, which is a primary objective of the Master Plan. e) No such intent is implied. f) See discussion for b) and c) above. g) Agree.

**Recommendation** - Replace Policy 10 of Section 9.5 with the following:

**"10. Recognise that traffic calming is a possible solution to safety and operational problems stemming from excessive automobile speeds or poor driver behaviour, and may improve the safety of the transportation environment for pedestrians and cyclists as well as motorists. Traffic calming on Regional roads is not appropriate when it would displace traffic to adjacent local roads. In assessing the appropriateness of traffic calming measures on Regional or other roads several factors shall be considered, such as:**

- a) impacts on public safety;
- b) impacts on the functional role of the Regional road in serving regional mobility needs by all modes and providing access to adjacent land uses;
- c) impacts on public and emergency services;

- d) **impacts on adjacent local roadways or neighbourhoods;**
- e) **liability, if any, where accepted design standards are not met; and**
- f) **cost."**

### **General Comments on Section 9.6 - Goods Movement**

**575. Reduction of truck impacts** - Several suggestions were received: a) encourage industrial warehousing in peripheral areas to reduce average truck sizes and resist the widening of urban intersections to accommodate large trucks (89); b) encourage depots at corner stores, charges or permits for loading zones, and central depots to make better use of truck capacities (142); c) establish a maximum allowable truck length, requiring transfer of loads to rail or smaller trucks (190, 310); d) note that truck requirements must not conflict with needs of other road users and residents or businesses along arterial roads (190).

**Response** - Each of these comments addresses the community impacts of goods movement by truck within the urban area. The related issues are highly complex and their resolution could have substantial impacts on the local economy including the costs of goods and services to regional residents. Any progress must involve the community, business and industry. The objective of reducing community impacts is supported, but it is also necessary to realise that RMOC is limited in terms of available policy options. For these reasons, it is not considered appropriate to direct specific solutions through the Master Plan, but improvements to trucking practices are a worthy objective and should be supported.

#### **Recommendation - Replace Policy 4 of Section 9.6 with the following:**

**"4. Encourage industry to explore new technologies and practices that can reduce community impacts, improve goods movement efficiency and enhance regional competitiveness."**

**576. Use of rail for goods movement** - Encourage the transfer of tonnage from road to rail as a strategy to reduce the impact of goods movement on the Regional road system, interprovincial bridges and communities. (222, 311)

**Response** - Agree. This matter is explicitly addressed in the Transportation Master Plan and should be reflected in the Official Plan.

#### **Recommendation - Add a new Policy 7 to Section 9.6 as follows:**

**"7. Encourage the development of inter-modal terminals, such as truck/rail interfaces, to reduce trucking industry impacts by transferring tonnage from road to rail."**

**577. Truck route consultation** - Businesses and neighbourhood communities should have a voice in truck route system development. (222)

**Response** - Agree. This business and community role is addressed explicitly in the Transportation Master Plan, and should be included in the Official Plan.

**Recommendation - Insert a new Policy 3 in Section 9.6 as follows:**

**“3. Consult with the trucking industry, the business community and the public to resolve goods movement issues to the satisfaction of all stakeholders and balance the needs of various road users with the community at large.”**

**Specific Comments on Section 9.6 - Goods Movement**

**578. Section 9.6, Policy 1** - There is no truck route schedule, and the policy is not explicit about which Regional roads are or are not part of the system. (257)

**Response** - The impact of goods movement by truck on residential communities can, in general, be minimised by providing a large number of truck routes. The Official Plan sets out a principle that the Regional road system shall, in general, also represent the truck route system. Because the truck route system is re-examined on an annual basis, it is not appropriate to designate it in an Official Plan schedule that would require regular amendment.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**579. Section 9.6, Policy 2** - Emphasise the removal of trucking restrictions on interprovincial bridges to allow for more alternate truck routes. (222)

**Response** - This issue is outside the direct control of RMOC, since interprovincial bridges are under federal control.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**580. Section 9.6, Policy 3** - a) Policy should require consultation with: the City of Ottawa and the King Edward Avenue Task Force (109); the National Capital Commission and the Communité urbaine de l'Outaouais (311). b) Policy should be expanded to target reduced truck traffic in all community cores, not just the Central Area (142).

**Response** - a) All stakeholders, including those suggested, are covered by the intent of Policy 3. b) The policy was intended to address a major existing problem in the Central Area. No significant evidence is available to indicate a similar problem in other existing community cores, and new communities are planned to avoid this kind of problem

**Recommendation - No change.**

**581. Section 9.6, Policy 3** - The City of Ottawa notes that the Transportation Master Plan policy to implement a trial night-time truck ban on King Edward Avenue is not carried forward to the Draft Official Plan, and asks if it will be undertaken. (109)

**Response** - The Master Plan policy will be implemented if approved by Council, and does not require approval within the context of the Official Plan.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**582. Section 9.6, Policy 3 -** Suggest strengthening objective of reducing truck volumes in the Central Area, to target "the removal of through truck traffic from the Central Area" as supported by the City of Ottawa's Official Plan (109)

**Response -** Agree with intent of comment, but the word "removal" implies an impractical target.

**Recommendation - Replace Policy 3 of Section 9.6 with the following:**

**"3. Actively pursue with other levels of government the minimisation of through truck traffic in the Central Area and particularly on King Edward Avenue."**

**583. Section 9.6, Policy 5 -** Be more specific in the type of data collected, such as growth and type of truck and air cargo movement, noise and air quality impacts and accident data to indicate trucking industry impacts within the region. (222, 311)

**Response -** Agree in general.

**Recommendation - Replace Policy 5 of Section 9.6 with the following:**

**"5. Ensure surveys of goods movement are conducted on a regular basis to quantify demand characteristics, the use of Regional roads, and the impacts of congestion, noise and safety on the community and industry."**

### **General Comments on Section 9.7 - Transportation Terminals**

**584. Section 9.7, Policy 2 -** Replace "encourage" with "ensure" to strengthen direction, and delete "where feasible". (310)

**Response -** Disagree, not within Regional jurisdiction to ensure.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**585. Section 9.7, Policy 3 -** Support a strong emphasis that high-quality transit service must be provided to the airport, train station and bus station. (279)

**Response -** Agree, as expressed in the policy.

**Recommendation - No change.**

### **General Comments on Section 9.8 - Monitoring and Public Awareness**

**586. Monitoring and review of spending priorities** - Large sums of money are to be spent to increase use of non-auto modes without a benchmark for determining success. Defined, flexible review periods should enable redirection of spending if targets are not achieved. (108)

**Response** - This is precisely the intent of Policy 1.

**Recommendation** - No change.

### **General Comments on Section 9.9 - Right-of-Way Protection**

**587. Purpose of right-of-way widenings** - Suggest that right-of-way widenings for Regional roads should be made only to slow traffic and increase pedestrian-friendliness, rather than to widen the travel surface for motorised vehicles (109, 190).

**Response** - Agree in part. In the Central Area, the widenings are directed almost entirely to improve pedestrian facilities. Elsewhere, widenings are to accommodate all modes.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**588. Transitway right-of-way protection** - Feel that RMOC has no authority to take lands for Transitway, except through the site plan control process. The Official Plan should suggest a way to provide compensation (79).

**Response** - As described in the preamble to Section 9.9, the *Planning Act* does not require RMOC to compensate for land takings for public transit rights-of-way.

**Recommendation** - No change.

### **Specific Comments on Section 9.9 - Right-of-Way Protection**

**589. Section 9.9, paragraph 2, sentence 2** - "Right-of-way" should be plural (279)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Change sentence 2 by replacing "right-of-way" with "rights-of-way".

**590. Section 9.9, Policy 2i** - Clarify: a) whether additional 4 m is extra above requirement stated in Table 11 and Schedules C2, D2; b) whether "Regional-Scale" applies only to retail uses; (c) whether "community facilities" refers to "Major Community Facilities", and if not then it should be defined in the Glossary (109)

**Response** - (a) Yes. (b) Yes. (c) No. This policy is intended to identify generic types of land uses which may be affected so no specific definition can be provided.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**591. Section 9.9, Policy 3** - Cycle paths in abandoned railway rights-of-way should be explicitly protected (303). Designate abandoned railway right-of-ways as multi-modal transportation corridors and incorporate cycling and walking trails for suburban commuters. (258)

**Response** - The Cycling Transportation Network protects designated routes in specific railway corridors, and Section 9.9, Policy 6 also addresses this concern.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**592. Section 9.9, Table 10** - Feel unfairly treated by road widenings on Trim Road [sic? - Tenth Line/Regional Road 47 probably intended] and Innes Road. Plan should suggest how developers can be compensated for land to be taken for unequal widenings (79)

**Response** - The *Planning Act* does not require RMOC to compensate landowners for lands taken for unequal widenings.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**593. Section 9.9, Table 11** - On 9 October 1996 RMOC Council approved the transfer of Queen Street, Gladstone Avenue (Bronson to Elgin) and Stewart Street (Waller to King Edward) to the City of Ottawa. (109)

**Response** - Agree, Table 11 should not show these roads.

**Recommendation - Change Table 11 of Section 9.9 to remove noted streets.**

**Specific Comments on :**

**Schedule C1 - Future Urban Regional Roads Plan**

**Schedule C2 - Urban Regional Roads Rights-of-Way Protection Policy Plan**

**Schedule D1 - Future Rural Regional Roads Plan**

**Schedule D2 - Rural Regional Roads Rights-of-Way Protection Policy Plan**

**594. Future Regional roads** - The City of Gloucester suggests the designation of Bowesville Road and Limebank Road (both south of Armstrong) as future Regional roads due to anticipated traffic demands from the south -- the City may not be able to rationalise their continued role as through routes if they remain local roads. Also request clarification that RMOC intent is not to remove Regional designation of Anderson Road (Russell to Innes) before provision of an alternative route, since that would impose a liability on local roads to deal with regional traffic (244)

**Response** - In agreement with this comment, Schedules C1 and D1 will designate Bowesville Road and Limebank Road as future Regional Roads as far south as Regional Road 8. Schedule D2 indicates that by 2021, Anderson Road will cease to be of Regional interest. The timing of Regional road designation removal is not necessarily linked to the provision of an "alternative" route, however completion of the Innes-Walkley-Base Line-Russell connection would likely be an important factor in the decision.

**Recommendation - Change Schedules C1 and D1 to designate Bowesville Road and Limebank Road as future Regional roads as far south as Regional Road 8.**

**595. Future Regional roads** - Township of Goulbourn suggests that an oversight was made in not identifying Huntmar Road extension to Hazeldean Road as a Regional road to relieve long-term growth constraints in Stittsville. Benefits include the most direct linkage between Stittsville and Corel Centre Transitway terminus; linkage between two Regional roads; direct access from Stittsville to 417 interchange; alleviation of traffic problems on Bryanston Gate (John Street) resulting from Corel Centre. Also suggest addition of Fernbank Road between Main Street and Eagleson Road as a Regional facility, and a major arterial road along east side of Stittsville (87). Support the inclusion of Huntmar extension on the schedule, and the maintenance of Fernbank as a Regional road (283). Huntmar road should be extended to include the Camvest lands. (263)

**Response** - Without additional development in the vicinity of the Corel Centre, the Huntmar Road extension is not justified as a Regional facility by 2021. However, the Township is not prevented from completing it as a local road. The West Transitway will not extend west of Terry Fox Drive over the life of the Official Plan, so no terminus is envisioned at the Corel Centre. Fernbank Road cannot be justified as a Regional facility at 2021.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**596. Future Regional roads** - The Ontario Ministry of Transportation favours the retention of the Outer Transportation Corridor and the Champagne Corridor as, respectively, conceptual and future Regional roads as per their designations in the current Official Plan, until related Ministry studies can be completed over the next few years. (321)

**Response** - No Regional need for these roads was identified in the supporting work for the Transportation Master Plan. Should future studies result in a need being identified, it is possible to amend the Official Plan at that time.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**597. Urban versus rural Regional roads** - The Township of Goulbourn wishes to have Hazeldean Road and Main Street in Stittsville identified as "urban Regional roads" (87)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Schedules C1 and C2 accordingly.**

**598. Hope Side Road extension** - The City of Nepean wishes to see Schedules C1 and D1 revised to include consideration of West Hunt Club to Richmond/Moodie as alternatives to Hope Side Road extension. Revise Schedules C1 and C2 to realign Greenbank south of Strandherd, Woodroffe south of Strandherd, and Jockvale north of Jock River according to proposals in South Nepean Amendment No. 7 (88)

**Response** - There is no current intention to remove the identified alternative routes to the Hope Side Road extension from the Regional road system, and they may remain as Regional Roads. Therefore, they are not truly "alternatives" to the Hope Side Road extension. The proposed revisions to bring the Master Plan into accordance with the South Nepean Amendment No. 7 are premature and will be considered when full documentation supporting the Amendment is received.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**599. Alert Road alignment** - Extension of Bowesville road from Leitrim to Lester - the Alert Road alignment is not available from the Department of National Defence, having been closed for safety reasons. (105)

**Response** - The precise alignment for this link will require further negotiation for the acquisition of a right-of-way adjacent to the railway corridor. Alert Road is not an attractive long-term alignment.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**600. Potential interprovincial bridge crossing at Cumberland-Angers** - Cumberland-Angers bridge crossing should be shown conceptually on Schedule C1. (279)

**Response** - It is not appropriate to indicate a conceptual interprovincial crossing until a preferred corridor has been selected subsequent to further study.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**601. Urban area designation** - Suggest investigation of 416 interchange with Hope Side Road with MTO (212)

**Response** - MTO has advised that the spacing between interchanges at West Hunt Club Road and Fallowfield is insufficient to safely accommodate an additional interchange.

**Recommendation** - No change.



**602. Rights-of-way protection** - The NCC suggests that widenings of Hunt Club Road and Richmond Road west of Highway 416 are not needed. (258)

**Response** - Until the Hope Side Road extension is confirmed as the preferred alternative for a facility to increase capacity in the corridor, it is appropriate to identify additional right-of-way requirements on the existing Regional roads.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**603. River Road right-of-way** - Confirm no right-of-way widening of River Road on the airport side as past part of the Official Plan. (105)

**Response** - Due to the curvilinear nature of the existing alignment, the possibility of requiring airport lands cannot be precluded at this time.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**604. Innes Road right-of-way** - Innes Rd east of Trim Rd. should be at least 34 m, because it connects 40 m Trim Rd and 46 m Frank Kenny Rd. (279)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Change Schedule C2 accordingly.

### **Errors, Omissions, and Clarifications on Schedule C1 - Future Urban Regional Roads Plan**

**605. Recommendation** - Make the following corrections to Section 9

- **Terry Fox, Campeau north to existing Terry Fox** - Change to "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"; corridor subject to further study
- **Hope Side Road, Moodie to West Hunt Club** - Extend limits of "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"; error
- **Waller, Besserer to Rideau** - Add "existing Regional Road"; omission per current OP
- **Jeanne D'Arc, Tenth Line to Trim** - Delete "proposed Regional Road"; error
- **Tenth Line, north of Hwy 17 to Jeanne D'Arc** - Delete "existing Regional Road"; error
- **Trim, north of Hwy 17 to Jeanne D'Arc** - Delete "proposed Regional Road"; error
- **Mer Bleue, Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Ext. to Navan Rd.** - Add "proposed Regional Road"; omission per current OP
- **Navan Rd. at Orléans Blvd.** - Realign; clarification
- **Bronson, Albert to Queen** - Delete "existing Regional Road"; error
- **Bowesville Extension, Armstrong to Airport Parkway** - Change to "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"; corridor subject to further study
- **Trim/Frank Kenny Connection, Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension to Frank Kenny** - Add "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"; corridor subject to further study

- **Former Hwy 17, Hwy 417 to 100m east of Trim** - Add "existing Regional Road"; update, transfer from MTO
- **Former Hwy 31, Albion to urban boundary** - Add "existing Regional Road"; update, transfer from MTO
- **Former Hwy 16, Fisher to urban boundary** - Add "existing Regional Road"; update, pending transfer from MTO

### Errors, Omissions and Clarifications on Schedule C2 - Urban Regional Roads Rights-of-Way Protection Policy Plan

#### **606. Recommendation - Make the following corrections to Section 9**

- **Hope Side Rd., Eagleson to Richmond** - Change from 34m to 40m; error, change per current OP
- **Eagleson, Hope Side Rd. to urban boundary** - Change from 30m to 34m; error, change per current OP
- **Moodie, Richmond to urban boundary** - Add 34m; error, add per current OP
- **Fallowfield, Cedarview to Woodroffe** - Change from 40m to 45m, unequal widening; error, show per ESR
- **Airport Parkway** - Change from 44m to 40m; show 40m pending study (Airport Parkway Twinning ESR)
- **Russell, Gregoire to Base Line** - Change from 30m to 34m; revise to provide consistency on RR 26
- **Rideau, Sussex to King Edward** - Change from 26m to 30m; error, change per current OP
- **Waller, Besserer to Rideau** - Add 20m; revise from current OP 23m
- **Lebreton Flats** - Change Booth from 40m to 28m and 34m, add Wellington, Portage to Hill, 23m; update Booth consistent with Lebreton Flats OP amendment, current OP 30m on Wellington not required
- **Merivale, Caldwell to Kirkwood** - Change from 30 to 34m; revise consistent with existing road type and section to the south
- **Fisher, Dynes to Baseline** - Change from 30 to 26m; revise consistent with Fisher south of Dynes
- **Woodroffe, Baseline to Adirondack** - Change from 26m to 34m; error, change per current OP
- **Woodroffe, Shoppers City W. to Baseline** - Show both connections at 40m; error, change per current OP
- **Former Hwy 31 Albion to urban boundary** - Add 40m; update, transfer from MTO
- **Former Hwy 16, Fisher to urban boundary** - Add 40m; update, pending transfer from MTO
- **Former Hwy 17, Hwy 417 to 100m east of Trim** - Indicate ECP - "existing corridor to be protected"; update, transfer from MTO
- **Lester, Albion to Alert and Uplands, Alert to Breadner** - Change from 30m to 34; show 34m pending study (Bowesville Extension ESR)
- **Hunt Club east of Conroy** - Remove unequal widening; no longer applies
- **Rural "sight triangles"** - Remove all in urban area; application questioned and will be resolved later pending detailed review

### Errors, Omissions and Clarifications on Schedule D1 - Future Rural Regional Roads Plan

#### 607. Recommendation - Make the following corrections to Section 9

- **Terry Fox (RR 61), Campeau north to existing Terry Fox** - Change to "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"; corridor subject to further study
- **Hope Side Rd. Extension, Moodie (RR 11) to West Hunt Club (RR 32)** - Change to "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"; corridor subject to further study
- **Bowesville Extension, Armstrong to Airport Parkway** - Change to "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"; corridor subject to further study
- **Trim/Frank Kenny Connection, Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension to Frank Kenny** - Add "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"; corridor subject to further study
- **Mer Bleue, Navan Rd. (RR 28) to urban boundary** - Add "proposed Regional Road"; error, add per current OP
- **Former Hwy 44, Highway 17 to Regional boundary** - Add "existing Regional Road" (RR 49); update, transfer from MTO
- **Former Hwy 31, urban boundary to Mitch Owens (RR 8)** - Add "existing Regional Road" (RR 85); update, transfer from MTO
- **Former Hwy 16, urban boundary to Hwy 416** - Add "existing Regional Road" (RR 73); update, pending transfer from MTO
- **Hwy 17 in West Carleton** - Show proposed realignment; verbal request from public

### Errors and Omissions on Schedule D2 - Rural Regional Roads Rights-of-Way Protection Policy Plan

- **Hope Side Rd. (RR 86), Eagleson (RR 49) to Richmond (RR 59)** - Change from 34m to 40m; error, change per current OP
- **Fallowfield (RR 12), Eagleson (RR 49) to Richmond (RR 59)** - Change from 30m to 34m; error, change per current OP
- **Egleson (RR 49), Hope Side Rd. (RR 59) to Fallowfield (RR 12)** - Change from 30m to 34m; error, change per current OP
- **Moodie (RR 11), urban boundary to Fallowfield (RR 12)** - Add 34m; error, change per current OP
- **Bankfield (RR 8), Former Hwy 16 (RR 85) to Rideau Valley (RR 13)** - Change from 30m to 34m; error, change per current OP
- **Mitch Owens (RR 8), River Rd. (RR 19) to Former Hwy 31 (RR 85)** - Change from 30m to 34m; error, change per current OP
- **Russell (RR 26), Gregoire to Base Line (RR 43)** - Change from 30m to 34m; revise to provide consistency on RR 26
- **Former Hwy 44 (RR 49), Highway 17 to Regional boundary** - Add 40m; update, transfer from MTO
- **Former Hwy 31 (RR 85), urban boundary to Mitch Owens (RR 8)** - Add 40m; update, transfer from MTO
- **Former Hwy 16 (RR 73), urban boundary to Hwy 416** - Add 40m north of Mitch Owens (RR 8), 30m south of Mitch Owens; update, pending transfer from MTO

- **Former Hwy 7203 (RR 117), and Former Highway 15 (RR 118)** - Add 40m; update, transfer from MTO, note RR 118 owned with McNabb
- **Bankfield (RR 8), Hwy 416 to Former Hwy 16 (RR 73)** - Change from 30m to 34m; revise to extend 34m protection to Hwy 416 interchange

### **Specific Comments on Schedule E - Transit Network**

**608. Legend and base mapping** - Correct colour of rail corridor and transit priority lines in legend to light grey. Note error in route of CP rail corridor at Confederation Heights. (110)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - **Change Schedule E accordingly.**

**609. Rapid transit stations** - The City of Ottawa wishes to have rapid transit station locations identified to enable local municipalities to carry out their planning in accordance with regional objectives (109)

**Response** - Agree with the need to provide this information. However, it will be provided on Map 2 of the Transportation Master Plan to avoid the need for cost and delay associated with Official Plan amendment processes should a change in location be required.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**610. Transit Network** - Transitway is not intended to extend southerly on Regional Rd 57 from Highway 17. Remove. (279)

**Response** - Depiction on Schedule E recognises the need to link with Regional Road 34 (St. Joseph Boulevard) and does not imply any extension further south. This is identical to Schedule E of the existing Official Plan.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**611. Transit Network** - Show the extension of the Cumberland Transitway through the area south of Innes to Trim Road, as per current plan. EA work is ongoing. (279)

**Response** - Agree. This was an inadvertent omission.

**Recommendation** - **Change Schedule E accordingly.**

### **Errors and Omissions on Schedule E - Transit Network**

**612. Recommendation** - **Make the following corrections to Section 9**

- **Hwy 417 from SW Transitway to Eagleson Rd** - Realign "Future Rapid Transit Corridor - Location Defined" north of Hwy 417; error, change to show correct corridor
- **Hwy 417 between Terry Fox and Huntmar** - Change to "Future Rapid Transit Corridor - Location Undefined"; error, corridor subject to further study
- **Bathgate/City Park from Montreal to Blair Station** - Extend "Transit Priority" limits; omission, revise per TMP Transit Priority report
- **Bronson from Albert/Slater to Wellington** - Add "Transit Priority"; omission
- **Blair between Highway 417 and Innes** - Add "Transit Priority"; revision to include transit priority option
- **Rail line Southeast from Train Station to "Rapid Transit Corridor - Location Undefined"** - Show only one future corridor in this area, i.e. show "Future Rapid Transit Corridor - Location Undefined"; change for illustrative purposes, change to show representative corridor, change does not imply reduced options

### **Specific Comments on Schedule F: Cycling Transportation Network**

**613. Cycling link identification** - The City of Ottawa suggests showing the following as "Cycling facility - maintained by other jurisdiction": Stewart Street, Wilbrod Street, Percy Street, Bay Street, Lancaster Road, St. Laurent Boulevard (Russell to Walkley) (109). The Regional Cycling Advisory Group recommends identifying names of all relevant road sections (i.e., Stewart, Wilbrod, move Richmond to Byron). Should show all of existing and proposed Terry Fox. Should contain all roads in the agreed CTN which are under RMOC jurisdiction, including all routes on 1994 CTN schedule as secondary routes: Hawthorne (Hunt Club - Walkley), Blair (Innes to Baseline), Sussex (St. Patrick to Rockcliffe Driveway), Smyth (Alta Vista to Othello), Coventry/Belfast (Hardy to Tremblay), Merivale (Hunt Club to River), Gladstone (Parkdale to Cartier), Sunnyside. (214)

**Response** - Some of the mentioned routes (e.g., Stewart, Wilbrod, Percy and Bay) are indeed designated as part of the Regional Cycling Transportation Network (CTN) as "maintained by other jurisdiction" but were not illustrated exactly due to the scale of the map. Considering the longer term, the Smyth/Alta Vista Parkway/Walkley link is preferred to the suggested Smyth/Lancaster link. Sufficient coverage on a regional scale is provided without the addition of St. Laurent Boulevard (Russell to Walkley) to the network at this time. The existing and proposed Terry Fox Drive is situated at the edge of the urban area; for the foreseeable future service to newly developing areas to the east will be provided by other designated routes. Merivale Road (Hunt Club to Meadowlands) was incorrectly illustrated on the draft Schedule F; it should have shown the section of Merivale south of Hunt Club. Secondary routes identified on the 1994 CTN schedule provided continuity for local municipality cycling networks. In order to emphasise the regional priorities for cycling network development, secondary routes have not been shown on Schedule F. Instead, a note has been included to say: "Cycling facilities on any Regional road may be required for continuity of local cycling routes."

**Recommendation** - Change Schedule F to show bicycle routes in precise detail wherever possible, and to identify and name all Regional roads that are part of the recommended CTN. Wherever possible, name every illustrated link under local municipal jurisdiction

that forms part of the Regional CTN. Provide the following note: "Not all local road names are indicated on this Schedule". Show Sunnyside (Bank to Bronson) as "Cycling facility (other jurisdiction)" and Merivale (Hunt Club to Fallowfield) as "Cycling facility (RMOC jurisdiction)".

**614. Hunt Club Road/Richmond Road cycling route** - The Hunt Club Road/Richmond Road cycling route should be moved to the Hope Side Road extension alignment, as shown on Schedule C1. (258)

**Response** - This may be done if and when the Hope Side Road is confirmed as the preferred right-of-way.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**615. Orléans cycling routes** - Extension of cycling route along Jeanne d'Arc Blvd. through Chatelaine village and then along the North Service Road should be shown as a facility under other jurisdiction. The location of the North Service Road shown should more closely reflect the actual location. (279)

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Change Schedule F accordingly.

**616. Cycling routes** - Include St. Patrick from Mackenzie to Alexandra Bridge on the schedule - this is a primary route on the cycling transportation network. Also include Sussex from Rideau Street to the Ottawa/Rockcliffe boundary; Hawthorne from Hunt Club to Walkley; Merivale between Meadowlands and Baseline. (303)

**Response** - Schedule F contains primary cycling routes; other (secondary) routes, more local in nature, are not shown on the schedule. Policy 2 under section 2.3.2 ensures the harmonisation of the Cycling Transportation Network with other cycling networks in the region.

**Recommendation** - Change Schedule F to include St. Patrick, otherwise no change.

**617. Interprovincial bridges** - Remove the Portage and Chaudière bridges from Schedule F, they are federal bridges not designed to accommodate cyclists. (277)

**Response** - Schedule F is a plan of cycling routes where adequate facilities are to be in place by 2021. Where routes shown are under the jurisdiction of others, the Region will continue to work co-operatively with all parties to implement cycling facilities. The routes shown on the referenced bridges are correctly indicated to be under the jurisdiction of others.

**Recommendation** - No change.

## **Errors, Omissions and Clarifications on Schedule F: Cycling Transportation Network**

### **618. Recommendation - Make the following corrections to Section 9**

- **Scissons, Richmond north to Path** - Delete "others" facility, considered redundant as a "primary" route given nearby "primary" route
- **Eagleson Road, south of Hope Side Rd** - Delete "RMOC" facility, logical termination of CTN
- **Merivale, Viewmount to Hunt Club** - Delete "RMOC" facility, error since not "primary" CTN route
- **Hope Side Road, Eagleson to Richmond** - Add "RMOC" facility, per TMP
- **Alexandria Bridge, Murray to Provincial. boundary** - Add "others" facility, omission per CTN
- **Tenth Line, north of Hwy 17** - Change to "others" facility ; error, jurisdiction not consistent with Schedule C1
- **Jeanne D'Arc, Champlain to Trim Road** - Change to "others" facility; error, jurisdiction not consistent with Schedule C1
- **Trim, Hwy 17 to Jeanne D'Arc** - Change to "others" facility; error, jurisdiction not consistent with Schedule C1
- **Orléans, St Joseph to Jeanne D'Arc** - Change to "others" facility; error, jurisdiction not consistent with Schedule C1
- **Cleroux, Blackburn Hamlet Bypass to Innes** - Add "others" facility; omission per CTN
- **St Joseph east of Trim** - Add "RMOC" facility, extend to Cumberland; revision to "terminate" arrowhead now shown on CTN
- **Moodie, Carling to Corkstown** - Add "path"; revision to show link provided by existing path
- **Walkley, Conroy to St Laurent** - Add "RMOC" facility; revision to add a more direct connection
- **St. Laurent, Conroy to Walkley** - Delete "others" facility; revision to become secondary

### **General Comments on Section 10 - Environmental Services**

**619. Section 10.1.1** - Agree with the Regional Council's objectives for water and wastewater system, subject to clarification. Examples of the clarification required include "objective 9 would need to be considered within the context of objective 1" and "objective 11 is supported if the system of data management chosen is compatible with the one the City of Ottawa has developed". (109).

**Response** - This section states that all of the objectives need to be considered in balance with one another. The development of a uniform system of data management must be prepared in consultation with the area municipalities to be effective.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**620. Section 10.1.1** - Regional Council approved an amended principle in the Regional Development Strategy calling for improvements to ‘reduce’ infiltration that reduces sanitary sewer capacity and raises servicing costs. This principle is not carried over into the objectives dealing with water and wastewater servicing that refer to ‘minimizing’ infiltration. Policies 9 and 13 should be changed. (244)

**Response** - Council’s amended principle reads, “Implement a comprehensive strategy, to reduce, over time, the amount and the significant effect of wet weather flows on the capacity of the wastewater system.”

Objective 9, reads “To minimize wastewater flows through flow management techniques such as reducing infiltration.” This objective does carry over Council’s Principles from the Regional Development Strategy.

Objective 13 addresses all wastewater system overflows, including overflows resulting from combined sewer flows. By implementing this objective as written, we will in effect be a reduction in wastewater system overflows.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**621. Section 10.1.2, Policies 2 to 4** - The Wastewater Master Plan provides a framework that should be developed jointly by the Region and the area municipalities. Policies 2 to 4 should provide some reference to consultation with the area municipalities being part of the monitoring and modification processes. (109)

**Response** - The RMOC would always seek to consult with the area municipalities on joint issues related to water and wastewater infrastructure planning. In particular, the wastewater system for which a major share is owned and operated by the area municipalities. This is a component of system wide infrastructure planning.

**Recommendation - Change Section 10.1.1 by adding the following objective 16,  
“16. To take a system wide approach to water and wastewater infrastructure planning.”  
In addition change Section 10.1.2 by adding the following policy:  
“Plan for water and wastewater servicing in consultation with area municipalities.”**

**622. Section 10.1.2, Policy 6** - The policy does not specify the base time from which this policy would be initiated or whether capacity for 1,000 jobs would have to be maintained constantly. The policy does not indicate whether vacant office space in Ottawa would be included in the major Urban Centres, the selected Greenbelt locations or neither (109).

**Response** - The policy would take effect at the time the plan is approved. To be effective, the capacity should be available constantly. The Urban Centres referred to in the policy are the urban areas outside the Greenbelt; locations inside the Greenbelt are not detailed in the policy but would include some locations in the City of Ottawa.

**Recommendation - Change Section 10.1.2, Policy 6 by replacing it with the following:  
“Assist in maintaining an adequate supply of serviced land for economic development, by reserving sufficient water and wastewater capacity for new development/redevelopment**



**proposals, which would directly create at least 1,000 jobs in designated employment areas, in each Urban Centre and at selected locations inside the Greenbelt.”**

**623. Section 10.1.2, Policy 9** - This is a good idea as a means to make effective use of capacity, but there are no criteria on which to carry out the reassessment or to guide in making decisions on reallocation. It is recommended that this section be revised to clarify these issues (88). This policy requires clarification of its intent. It is unclear at what point capacity is committed to a proposal. (87) Current draft approvals should be grandfathered. This policy should be amended or deleted. (108)

**Response** - We agree that the Policy should be clarified. This Policy would not be effective if the draft approvals were grandfathered as we would not have the ability to make the best use of capacity in our existing water and wastewater systems.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 10.1.2, Policy 9 by replacing the second sentence with “Once capacity has been committed through the draft approval of a plan of subdivision or condominium, it will be held for a period of three years. The capacity will be reviewed in the third year to determine whether or not the capacity should remain allocated to the development or be reallocated elsewhere.”**

**624. Section 10.1.2, Policy 10** - Does this policy provide the necessary flexibility to enable services to be oversized for demand beyond the 2021 time period if the value of over-sizing can be logically justified. (279)

**Response** - This policy states that decisions on oversizing must be based on a number of factors of which one factor is the consideration of future development potential of the designated urban land not required for the planning period.

**Recommendation** - **No change.**

**625. Section 10.1.3, Policy 4** - This policy would prohibit infills in areas such as Heart’s Desire, Winding Way/ Rideau Glen and the Glens community. It is recommended that this section be revised to provide flexibility for dealing with local issues in existing communities. (88) This policy could ban the construction of wells as heat sinks for heating and cooling. Such wells would not draw down, pollute (other than thermally) nor discharge water (305). The policy would not allow the construction of replacement wells and should be amended to say shall not permit the construction of new wells in the Urban area unless a previous well exists. (314).

**Response** - Generally agree. The Policy needs clarification.

**Recommendation** - **Change Section 10.1.3 , Policy 4, by adding after “Urban Area”, “except as permitted under Section 2.4.1, Policy 9, to replace an existing well or as used as part of a closed loop heat pump system.”**

**626. Section 10.1.3, Policy 5** - Optimization before expansion is a logical impossibility. Inconsistent with other policies related to maintaining capacities for future development. The wording is more consistent with an objective than a policy (244)

**Response** - It is always good planning to look at ways to get the most out of the current infrastructure before a decision is made to extend or upgrade.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**627. Section 10.1.4, Policy 2** - A number of clarifications are requested for the flow management program. (109, 244) This policy should be applied to the village of Munster as a means to eliminate extraneous flow. (207)

**Response** - There is some direction given as to the components of a flow management program. More detail can be found in the Wastewater Master Plan. Complete details of the flow management plan will be worked out in consultation with the area municipalities.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 10.1.4, Policy 2 by adding “in consultation with the area municipalities” after “RMOC infrastructure”.

**628. Section 10.1.4, Policy 3** - The policy is not clearly written; clarifications are required. (109, 145, 244, 108)

**Response** - The policy is intended to apply as a short term “bridging” policy pending the implementation of a number of infrastructure components, e.g. the three major wastewater pipe diversions, and the overall flow management program. The policy applies to sewer systems where there are known constraints in the system.

**Recommendation** - Replace Section 10.1.4 ,Policy 3 with the following:

**“Provide opportunity for new development to proceed in areas where the wastewater system is constrained, by removing flows from the wastewater system. This will be accomplished through a flow removal program and shall be implemented in co-ordination with the corresponding area municipalities, designed to compliment the system wide flow management program in Policy 2.”**

**629. Section 10.2** - What percentage of the wastewater system would be under Regional jurisdiction. What is the impact on operating costs. (108)

**Response** - This Section reflects the works required to be added to the wastewater system to accommodate growth. The percentage of the works under Regional jurisdiction would remain the same as the area municipalities would have to expand their systems at the same time and in a similar manner.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**630. Section 10.2.2, Policy 2 (c)** - It may be desirable to approve the project regardless of party responsible for construction (244)

**Response** - A Regionally Significant Work for the wastewater system would be part of the proposed works of the Regional Corporation. This policy is intended to allow area municipalities to build such a works with the approval of Regional Council.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**631. Section 10.2.2, Table 12** - Are the Central Storage Tunnel and Regulators Regionally Significant Works? (109, 305) It is recommended that Table 12 be clarified to exclude the Jock River Collector Sewer. This sewer only serves the City of Nepean. It is intended to design and build this collector in stages to support growth as required using funds already being collected for that purpose. (88) A sanitary trunk line to Munster is not noted as a work of Regional Significance, although it meets the criteria outlined in section 10.2.1, Policy 2. (207)

**Response** - The Central Storage Tunnel and Regulators and the Jock River Collector all meet the criteria for Works of Regional Significance. The village of Munster has undergone a Schedule C, Class Environmental Assessment for which the recommended servicing strategy was expansion of the existing sewage lagoon and spray irrigation system and therefore a sanitary trunk line is not included in the draft Official Plan.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 10.2.2, Table 12 by adding “Central Storage Tunnel and Regulators”.

**632. Section 10.3** - If a communal system proposal means an expansion to a village, will it be considered? (108)

**Response** - An expansion to a village for communal or central servicing would require an amendment to this Plan.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**633. Section 10.3.1** - The objectives for the rural area should be equivalent to those in the urban area. In particular section 10.1.1 policies 9,13,14 and 15 should be reflected here. (207) FKZ Investments is seeking clarification on whether an expansion to the village limits of Dunrobin and servicing for the village has been addressed in the regional Official Plan Review. (252) Laren Holdings requests confirmation that the proposed OP will not prevent their development as submitted to the communal services working group. (126)

**Response** - Agree that the objectives for water and wastewater in the rural area should be expanded.

Village boundaries were based on the boundaries delineated in local Official Plans. Expansions to village boundaries including addressing village wide servicing would require a comprehensive study.

Section 10.3.3, Policy 3, states the requirement for rural development proposals to use either private or communal and/or central, not both, unless there is a compelling reason to the contrary. The village of Richmond is serviced with a forcemain for wastewater and would be an area that a mix of private and central would be permitted to continue.

**Recommendation - Change Section 10.3.1, by adding the following objectives:**

- **To optimize the use of existing infrastructure to the extent possible.**
- **To ensure quality potable water in communal systems to meet or be better than all federal and provincial health guidelines, standards and regulations.**
- **To ensure a sufficient quantity of potable water in communal systems to meet the priority needs of existing and future generations.**
- **To promote demand management principles through a water efficiency strategy.**
- **To minimize wastewater flows through flow management techniques such as reducing infiltration.**
- **To minimize wastewater system overflows to the extent practical and in consideration of the current MOEE policies.**
- **To minimize property damage and risks to public and overall environmental health.**
- **To implement pollution prevention measures at sources where practical.**

**634. Section 10.3.2, Policy 4** - It is recommended that this be amended to be required before approval is given not as a result. There is no ability to eliminate the lot after it is created (163).

**Response** - This issue was considered in the drafting of this Policy. The problem that arises with this approach is that wells would have to be pre-drilled on every property. As often the lot is not built on for some time, there would be a need to seal the well for safety in particular the chance that contaminants could enter into the groundwater through this conduit.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**635. Section 10.3.2, Policy 5** - An added reference in policy 5 to a 40 lot limit on sub-division approval appears arbitrary and unnecessary. The findings of required hydrogeological studies based on the site conditions can be used to establish phasing for development that will ensure proper monitoring of the impact of development on the groundwater in the area. The policy should be modified accordingly (244)

**Response** - This is an existing Policy in the current OP. A new line has been added which details the implementation which would not preclude phasing moving forward at a reasonable pace.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**636. Section 10.3.3 to Section 10.3.8** - There will be an ongoing need to review these policies in light of changing provincial policies and roles.(244)

**Response - Agree.**

**Recommendation - No change.**

**637. Section 10.3.3 to Section 10.3.5 -** Clarify these policies with section 3.7 to ensure that 5 units or less can be approved without requiring site specific zoning amendments. (279)

**Response -** Changes have been made to Section 3.7 to clarify the wording. Communal systems for multiple unit development require a site specific zoning by-law amendment (Section 10.3.4). Communal systems for 2 to 5 units do not require a site specific zoning by-law amendment (Section 10.3.5).

**Recommendation - See recommendation for Section 3.7.3, Policy 7.**

**638. Section 10.3.3, Policy 1 (c)** Regular communal systems should be considered as well as innovative ones (321).

**Response -** The concept of having some experience with demonstration projects was to learn better and more cost effective ways of providing communal services in the rural area. Having said this, the range of innovative projects seen to date is limited.

**Recommendation - Change Section 10.3.3 Policy 1(c) by replacing it with the following: “a plan of subdivision within a village may be considered on the basis of public communal systems. Change Section 10.3.6 by removing the terms, ‘as demonstration projects’ or ‘as a demonstration project without amendment to this plan’. Change Section 10.3.6 (d) by deleting everything after ‘Wastewater Systems’ and adding ‘ and the design and construction of communal systems including warranty periods shall be to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of environment and Transportation’. Change Section 10.3.6 by deleting Policy 3.**

**639. Section 10.3.3, Policy 2 -** Schedule H does not correctly represent the location of the Munster well or lagoon. (207)

**Response -** The representation of the well and lagoon on Schedule H is intended to generally show the location of these facilities.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**640. Sections 10.3.4 to 10.3.6 -** Is there a possibility that the policies as written could lead to new villages in the rural area? (305) There should be no private ownership of communal systems. (321)

**Response** - The intention of this Section is not to create new villages which is the focus of Policies 1 (e) and (f). However the policy could be further strengthened in this area.

There are instances where private ownership of communal systems is more practical and cost effective to own and operate. The Region is acknowledging the need to enter into agreements to ensure the long term safe operation of these systems.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 10.3.6, Policy 1(a) by deleting “or condominium” and by adding after subdivision, “within a village or a country lot subdivision as defined in Section 3.7.4, Policy 2”. Change Section 10.3.4 by adding “and condominiums” after “Multiple Unit Development”. Change Section 10.3.3 Policy 1 (a) by adding “and condominiums” after “mobile home park”. Change Section 10.3.4 by adding “Private” at the beginning of the title and “and Condominiums” at the end of the title.

**641. Section 10.3.6** - This section should be simplified to permit communal services subject to the appropriate approvals being in place. This section does not refer to local plans being required to permit communally serviced developments. Also the requirement for the proponent to enter into a legal agreement with the Region appears missing. These items should be added. (127)

**Response** - Generally agree. This is consistent with comments on Section 10.3.3 in this report removing the need for the communal services to be demonstration projects. Reference to local official plans is unnecessary. As part of the development approval process the developer would be required to enter into an agreement.

**Recommendation** - No additional change.

**642. Section 10.3.6 Communal Services as Demonstration Projects** - Limited to residential and industrial. Recommend that commercial be considered as well (163).

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 10.3.6 by adding after “residential” in the first sentence.

**643. Section 10.3.6, Policy 1 (b)** - The policy should be rewritten to allow a combination of central and communal services. An example is Richmond (87).

**Response** - Agree.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 10.3.6, Policy 1 (b) by adding “or a combination of communal and central” after “communally”.

**644. Section 10.3.6, Policy 1 (e)** - The concept of rural character of landscapes seems rather ambiguous. (87) The minimum lot size of .25 ha. should not only be applied to villages, but to areas where communal services are an option. (108)

**Response** - This intent of this policy was to ensure that the character of the rural area both inside and outside villages was maintained.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**645. Section 10.3.7 Communal or Central Services to Remedy a Health Problem -**

In Table 14 it is noted that the number of units permitted by Carlsbad Springs Water Supply has to be modified to conform to the latest Regional Official Plan Amendment now under review. More importantly, the South Gloucester Village, recently designated by the City Pursuant to the present Regional Policies, has been removed as a “Village” in Table 13. It is requested that this be re-instituted as a “Village” to maintain the consistent policy. (244) Recommend that the table be deleted (163, 244, 279). The table should be replaced with a set of policies to allow the Region to utilize information from monitoring to better utilize the capacity of the system, in accordance with the objectives of the Plan, subject to no increase being approved without a local planning process to demonstrate need, distribution, timing, continued character of the village, type of uses to be permitted etc., through a Local Official Plan Amendment. (163) A new clause should be incorporated into the plan to recognize a potential increase in defined capacity based on the findings of the Manotick Servicing Options Study and/ or based on the Water/ Wastewater Master Plan. (256)

**Response** - Agree to modify this section. The number of units for Carlsbad Springs will reflect the recent OPA as well as any other servicing capacities that require updating. The South Gloucester watermain extension capacity is now shown in Table 14 which includes rural serviced areas some of which may be parts of villages. Proposed changes to the policies in this Section clarify there is no need for an Official Plan Amendment to amend servicing capacities in Tables 13 and 14 if additional capacity can be demonstrated. At the time that the draft Water and Wastewater Master Plans were being prepared, the Manotick Servicing Options Study was underway. During the analyses for the Water and Wastewater Master Plans, however, potential implications for servicing Manotick from the central system were assessed. Due to the timing of the completion of the Servicing Study no recommendations have been made.

**Recommendation** - Change Section 10.3.7, Policy 2 by adding an additional sentence at the end of the Policy as follows:

**“No Official Plan amendment will be required to amend the servicing capacity on Tables 13 and 14, if additional capacity can be demonstrated.”**

**Change Table 13 by changing the total capacity in dwelling units for Notre-Dame-des-Champs from “145” to “155”.**

**Change Table 14 by changing the total capacity in dwelling units for the Central Manotick water extension from “ 200; and 43,100 square meters of non residential floor space.” to “300 and 34,600 square metres of non residential floor space”.**

**Change Table 14 by changing the total capacity in dwelling units for the Carlsbad Springs Water Supply Service from “ 596” to “731”.**

**646. Section 10.3.8, Policy 2** - This Policy should be amended to reflect Regional commitments to providing trunk services to Manotick.

**Response** - During the study of capacity requirements for the West Rideau Collector Phase V, potential future capacity requirements for Manotick as well as other areas were assessed to detail the design requirements for the Collector. The West Rideau Collector has been shown in budget forecasts however there was never any Council approved commitment to Manotick for sanitary sewer capacity.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**647. Section 10.4** - Only 4 solid waste facilities are shown on Schedule A, the 5th is shown on Schedule B. (305)

**Response** - Yes, this is true. One of the solid waste disposal sites is in the urban area and is on Schedule B.

**Recommendation** - Change the introduction of Section 10.4 to add a reference to Schedule B after Schedule A.

**648. Section 10.4.2 Policy on Establishing a new Solid Waste Disposal Facility** -

It is requested that Policy 2 include in the list of supporting studies the review of area municipal policies, including that of the local Official Plan (109). It is important that studies be conducted for any waste disposal site or recycling facility within an 8 kilometer reference point of the MacDonald-Cartier airport's reference point. (105)

**Response** - The reference to the airport will be added. There is no need to refer to local official plans when a Regional Official Plan is required.

**Recommendation** - Change the Section 10.4.2, Policy 2 by adding the following:

“g) a review of potential impacts and mitigation measures related to air traffic.”

**649. Section 10.5.2** The City of Ottawa has not recognized snow disposal facilities as a land use. It is currently reviewing the matter. (109). The way this policy reads, every site receiving snow would have to be zoned. Re-word the policy to exempt small private snow dumps which are used seasonally for a small amount of storage. (279) It is recommended that this section be revised to act as a guideline for local implementation. (88) This policy may prove too restrictive for winter snow operations. Zoning by-laws deal mostly with buildings and structures; not all snow disposal facilities have buildings or structures. It is requested that this policy be deleted. (212). The rationale stated for a policy to require control of snow disposal sites is protection of sewers from potential pollution. The concern is the ‘requirement’ for specific zoning of these sites based on environmental assessment review. The requirement to use a specific method of control is too arbitrary. Control of the uses should be left to the local municipalities affected.



(244) Is it an offense for an owner of several properties to dump it at another without a zoning change? How can this be enforced?(305)

**Response** - There are several issues addressed in the comments. This response addresses the comments in the order received.

- Staff are aware that the City of Ottawa is currently reviewing this matter.
- The policies recognize that snow disposal facilities include those lands on which snow is placed after being brought to the site from elsewhere and not just the movement of snow on a site. If , on a small site, snow was just moved from one place to another on the same site, the site would not be considered a snow disposal facility for the purposes of this plan.
- The City of Nepean is essentially following this approach today. We do not see the benefit in making these policies a guideline.
  - There are other land uses on which there are no buildings or structures such as the agricultural designation. Staff consider this an appropriate land use.
  - One of the key objectives in this section is the protection of environmental health. There are many environmental regulations that currently apply to snow disposal facilities. These policies will ensure compliance with the legislation.
  - Regardless of ownership, if snow is brought from one site to another, the site to which the snow has been brought would be defined as a snow disposal site and would require a site specific zoning. Enforcement would vary by municipality.

**Recommendation - No change.**

### **Errors, Omissions and Clarifications in Section 10**

**650. Recommendation - Make the following corrections to Section 10.**

**Section 10.1.2, Policy 8 - change the reference to Policy 8 in Section 2.4 to Policy 9 in Section 2.4. (244)**

**Section 10.3.4, Policy 1(c), delete the last sentence.**

**Section 10.3.5, add to the beginning of the title, the word “Private”.**

**Section 10.3.5, Policy 1 (b), delete “Conservation Authority” at the end of the Policy and add “approving authority of the Part VII Program under the Environmental Protection Act.”**

**Section 10.3.6, add at the beginning of the title the word “Public”.**

**Section 10.3.7, add at the beginning of the title the word “Public”.**

**Section 10.3.8, add at the beginning of the title the word “Public”, and replace “for Major Extensions or Installations” with “on a Large Scale”, and add clause d) (relocated from Section 3.7.3) “d) include policies to ensure lot creation outside of the Village is kept to a minimum.”**

**Section 10.5, the reference to the Municipal Strategy for Abatement in the preamble should be deleted and replaced with the Sewer Use Control Program. It is this program which requires industries to control their discharges to the sanitary and storm sewers.**

**Section 10.5, the total of facilities noted in the preamble is not accurate and will change over time. The wording should be changed from five facilities to snow disposal facilities.**

**Glossary, change the definition of “Communal Services” by adding after “systems” “not part of the central services”.**

**Add the following definitions for infiltration, extraneous flow, optimize, demand management strategy, water efficiency strategy, flow management program and performance based standards to the Glossary of the Official Plan prior to approval.**

### **Comments on Section 11 - Development Constraints**

**651. Section 11.1, Objective 1 - Is air pollution covered under this policy? (310)**

The development constraint also needs protection from development because of the environmental impact. (229)

**Response -** Air pollution is not a constraint identified in Section 11. Agree. Revise the wording of Objective 1.

**Recommendation - Change Section 11.1 Objective 1 to read:**

- 1. “To permit only those developments, in areas affected by development constraints, which do not endanger property or the health or safety of occupants on or off site and do not have an adverse environmental impact.”**

**Section 11.2 - Do dwellings in flood plains become non-conforming? (310)**

**Response -** Policy 11.2 policy 4 affects new development. Existing dwelling are not non-conforming.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**652. Section 11.2 Policy 5 - This section should make reference to the fact that “Fill and Construction and Alteration to Waterways” are administered by Conservation Authorities. (229)**

**Response -** Agree. Add reference that “Fill and Construction and Alteration to Waterways” are administered by Conservation Authorities.

**Recommendation - Change Section 11.2 Policy 5 by adding after the words “ Fill and Construction and Alteration to Waterways regulations ”add “administered by the Conservation Authorities”.**

**653. Section 11.2 Policy 5d) -** Could be subject to interpretation as to what defines safe. Reference should be made to the Conservation Authorities in this regard. (229)

**Response -** Section 11.2 policy 10 “seek the advice of the Conservation Authority in implementing these policies”, contains the reference to the Conservation Authorities in interpreting policy 5d).

**Recommendation - No change.**

**654. Section 11.3 Policy 1 -** A more appropriate wording is suggested for policy 1 regarding unstable slopes. “For the purposes of this study, unstable slopes are considered to be those indicated to have a factor of safety of 1.5 or less in *Slope Stability Study of RMOC (Ontario Misc. Paper MP 68)* ... or more recent studies”. (229)

**Response -** The Slope Stability Study of RMOC (Ontario Misc. Paper MP 68) indicates that slopes of 1.5 or more require routine geotechnical investigation. These slopes are also shown on Schedule G. The more recent studies are not referred in policy 1 because the information is not shown on Schedule G. Policy 2 refers to the fact that these policies apply to areas where the constraint is present but is not designated on Schedule G. Agree that reference should be made to “The Slope Stability Study of RMOC (Ontario Misc. Paper MP 68)” or more recent studies.

**Recommendation - Change Section 11.2 policy 1 by adding “(Ontario Misc. Paper MP 68)” after the words “The Slope Stability Study of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton”.**

**655. Section 11.3 policy 5 -** The word in the third line should be deleted. If there is any doubt about whether or not an area is affected by unstable soils or bedrock, the applicant should be required to provide this information. (229)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Change Section 11.3 policy 5 by deleting the words “consider requiring” and replace them with “require”.**

**656. Section 11.4 policy 2 -** Clarification required as to whether such sites would be required on all development sites or only where there was evidence of potential contamination. (43, 244)  
Will an ESA be required for all development applications, including site plans and severances etc.? Such a study should only be required on significant development proposals such as subdivisions and large scale development where there is greater risk of impact. (279)

**Response -** The phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment is required for all development applications to indicate whether or not there is a potential for contamination of the site based on a review of previous land uses on the area. If contamination is suspected further study is required

to address potential human health and safety concerns and demonstrate that the site can be rehabilitated.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**657. Section 11.4 Policy 5** - Depending on the results of the Phase 2 ESA with respect to whether the site can be cleaned, the Region may want to consider requiring a record of site condition that has been signed by MOEE prior to certain planning approvals. For example if the site can be cleaned, the record of condition should be requested prior to final approval of the plan of subdivision/condominium or in the case of an official plan amendment, prior to development or other planning approvals. If the Phase 2 ESA indicates that the site may be difficult to clean, the Region may want to withhold establishing the principle of development until they receive the record of site condition. The record of site condition contains the information about the clean up of the site. (321)

**Response** - Agree that these steps may be taken to implement Section 11.4 Policy 5. The policy is written in a general way that allows for the approval authority to follow the principles and procedures contained in the MOEE *Guidelines for Use at Contaminated Sites*. The principles and procedures followed for the site will depend on the results of the Phase 2 ESA.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**658. Section 11.4 New Policy** - Revise Section 11.4 to reflect draft Regional Official Plan amendment 66 policies for Lebreton Flats. (Staff)

**Response** - Add a new policy to reflect the May 13 discussion at Planning and Environment Committee regarding Amendment 66, Lebreton Flats.

**Recommendation - Add a new policy after policy 5 as follows:**

**5. “In order to implement policy 3 above with respect to Lebreton Flats, a Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) as described in the MOEE *Guidelines for Use at Contaminated Sites 1996* shall be completed for the entire area (save for lands under existing road beds which cannot be tested) prior to the approval of the initial application for development on Lebreton, in the form of an application for subdivision, severance, site plan or zoning.”**

**659. Section 11.4 policy 6** - Remove the words “in co-operation ... and Energy in the first sentence. Municipalities may not have the resources to provide the Region with much information or material as the case may be. (244)

There should be an inventory created of currently known contaminated sites. (310)

**Response** - The intent of Policy 6 “in co-operation” means that the Region would consult the other municipalities and agencies to share information sources and develop a terms of reference for the study that would satisfy the needs of all interested parties. It is recognised that the

commitment to the study will depend upon the resources and the priorities of other agencies and municipalities.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**Comments on Section 11.6.1 - Airport Noise**

**660. Section 11.6.1** - Policy formulation with respect to restrictions and conditions on residential development adjacent to airports be deferred until the Ottawa- Macdonald-Cartier International Airport Authority and the Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Association have completed discussions on the application of the provincial policy on land use in the proximity of airports (145, A letter of 9 Apr., 105, 274, 108). The designation of the “Airport Vicinity Development Zone” on Schedule G is premature until such time as new airport noise mapping is released. (145, 108, 274)

The proposed policies related to the proposed Airport Vicinity Development Zone ought to be amended to reflect the recently amended Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), (189, 108, 244). The suggestion proposed that the flexibility of the PPS be introduced that allows for infill development and limited redevelopment in the vicinity of airports.

**Response** - Staff agree to incorporate the wording of the Provincial Policy Statement, released on 1 Feb. 97. The draft Official Plan policies were prepared before the new provincial policy was promulgated and is based on the federal guidelines as expressed in *Land Use in the Vicinity of Airports*, 7th Edition as amended to May 1, 1996, published by Transport Canada. The proposed Airport Vicinity Development zone shown on Schedule G for the Ottawa airport is a combination of the 1994 NEF and 2000 NEP noise contours, and various constraint areas associated with the operation of the Ottawa airport, such as obstacle limitation surfaces, the Ottawa Airport Zoning Regulations and the protection of telecommunications and electronic systems, as contained within *Ottawa- Macdonald-Cartier Airport Protection Plan*, published by Transport Canada, Dec. 1994.

While staff can appreciate that new aircraft noise contours may be developed in the future, in order to implement the provincial policy and in exercising Council’s development approval authority, the current approved noise contours and the Provincial Policy Statement must be considered, therefore Schedule G ought to be adopted and modified to include a similar designation for the Carp airport and the proposed airport noise policies be adopted as modified by the recommendations in this report. The draft plan Schedule G did not show the Carp Airport Vicinity Development Zone.

**Recommendation - Replace policy 4 of Section 11.6.1, and add a new policy 5:**

**“4. “New residential development and other sensitive land uses will not be permitted in the Airport Vicinity Development Zones on Schedule G above 30 NEF/NEP, as set out on maps (as revised from time to time) approved by Transport Canada notwithstanding policy 3; but redevelopment of existing residential uses and other sensitive land uses or infilling of residential land uses may be considered above 30 NEF/NEP if it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the long term function of the airport ”.**

**5. Council shall seek the advice of the Airport Authority in implementing policy 4.”**

**661. Section 11.6.1, policy 3** - The terms “noise control feasibility study” and “detailed noise control study” ought to be defined (244, 108).

**Response** - Staff agree, these terms will be defined in an expanded Glossary.

**Recommendation** - Add the following definitions to the Glossary.

**“Noise Control Feasibility Study** - is a technical study which evaluates the ability of the development proposal to achieve Council’s noise objectives based on preliminary data. If noise mitigation is feasible for the site then residential development could be appropriate.

**Detailed Noise Control Study-** is a study which is generally a result of conditional approval. The purpose of the detailed study is to assess all noise sources affecting the proposed lands and includes details of assessment methods, results and recommendations for control measures. The study would be based on the proposed grading plans and reflect the details of the buildings if known at the time of approval.”

**662. Section 11.6.1, policy 3a)** - The noise contour lines do not follow ownership or recognizable ground features and may lead to problems where some lands are only partly within the 30-35 contour (108).

**Response** - Staff agree that the noise contours do not follow property ownership or follow physical features, it is staff’s view that the polices as proposed would allow some flexibility in determining compatible land use in proximity to the airport.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**663. Section 11.6.1, policy 3b)** - It was requested that extensions to a draft approved subdivision in the airport noise zones not require new studies on airport noise (274, 79).

**Response** - It is not unusual for new conditions to be included before final plan registration and for draft plans where approval has lapsed but formal lapsing has not occurred. A requirement for noise impact assessment studies and for noise mitigation measures as recommended in these noise studies would be an appropriate condition of approval.

**Recommendation-** No change.

**664. Section 11.6.1, policy 3c)** - Some questioned the need for a (detailed) noise control study in advance of draft approval of plans of subdivision (108); and also that the policy will be difficult to implement through zoning by-laws, as there are no legislative provisions requiring such agreements as conditions of approval. (109) Another commented that the noise associated with aircraft while complex, ought to consider the cumulative effect of noise from all sources such as roads, railways and transitways (310).

**Response -** The suggestion is that the detailed noise control study be prepared after or as a condition of draft approval, rather than before draft plan approval. As long as the preliminary study (called the noise control feasibility study) is prepared at the outset as part of the initial review of the development proposal then the suggestion is reasonable. Agree to delete reference to zoning by-laws. With respect to the second comment, the detailed noise control study as described in Policy 11.6.1.3c, mentions that the purpose of this study is “to assess all noise sources affecting the proposed lands”. This would include the cumulative effect of all sources of noise impacting a proposed development site.

**Recommendation -** Change Policy 11.6.1. 3 c) by deleting the words “prior to” and replacing it with: “a condition of draft plan approval”; and deleting the words “zoning by-laws” at the end of the first sentence .

**665. Section 11.6.1, policy 4 -** It is suggested that some implementation guidance be given regarding applications at various stages of the approval process (108,79, 88).

**Response -** The application of the provincial noise policy to development applications would generally be governed by the implementation provisions of the Provincial Policy Statement and the Planning Act. This approach is no different than in any other policy area of provincial interest. A distinction for aircraft noise as a stand-alone policy in the Regional Official Plan is not necessary.

**Recommendation -** See recommendation 660 for new policies 4 and 5.

### **General Comments on Section 11.6.2 -Noise**

**666. Traffic Noise** - Policy seems to be focused on how to control impacts of noise from various sources rather than reducing traffic levels and therefore noise generated on certain roads (258).

**Response** - Traffic and road noise are inter-linked, while the point is a good one the solution is complicated. The policies of the Official Plan and Transportation Master Plan propose strategies to deal with the relationship between transportation and land use.

**Recommendation** - No change.

**667. Transportation Committee Motion** - At the meeting of Transportation Committee on 17 October 1995, Councillor Legendre raised the following traffic noise issue for a response from staff:

“Within the context of the Official Plan Review, that staff propose a schedule of averaged noise levels over appropriate time frames which can reasonably be expected in various situations.”

**Response** - The equivalent sound pressure level,  $Leq$ , is the prime descriptor used in assessing most types of sounds heard in a community. The equivalent sound pressure level provides an average of a series of noise events over a specific period of time.

The current standard method of assessing traffic noise applies to two time periods only, a daytime level reflecting the daytime situation over 16 hours, 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., and a nighttime situation over 8 hours, 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. These noise levels are referred to as  $Leq_{16hr}$  and  $Leq_{8hr}$  respectively.

When calculating traffic noise, a number of parameters are involved including the amount of traffic, percentage trucks, traffic speed, road gradient, distance between source and receiver, etc.

When calculating  $Leq_{16hr}$ , the average hourly traffic volume between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. is the primary parameter and, as approx. 90% of the daily traffic on the Regional Road system occurs during that time, the resultant noise level is assessed on approx. 5.5% of the daily traffic.

The peak hour volume is a possible alternative base for the assessment of traffic noise. There are two predominant traffic peaks during the day, a.m. and p.m., each of which generally represent approx. 10% of the total daily traffic. Were traffic noise to be based on the peak hour traffic volume, or shorter periods (e.g. half hour) within the peak hour, the resultant noise level would be approx. 3 dBA higher than if the average hourly volume were used.

Thus, the standard of 55 dBA based on an average hourly traffic volume is equivalent to approx. 58 dBA when the peak hour traffic volume is assumed as the base.

**Recommendation** - Change the first bullet point in paragraph 1 of Section 11.6.2 to read: “55 dBA (decibels on a weighted scale) or less between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. (equivalent to approx. 58 dBA averaged over the peak hours).”; and Replace the first sentence of Policy 1 to read:



**“Establish Leq 55 dBA (equivalent to approx. 58 dBA averaged over the peak hours) or less and Leq 50 dBA.or less...”**

**Specific comments on Section 11.6.2: Polices for Rail, Road and Transit Noise**

**668. Section 11.6.2 (Introduction)** These policies only address noise issues arising from road, rail and transit. As worded, the policy deals only with residential development and the means to buffer it from noise impacts (88). Recommend that direction be provided on overall community design and the location of alternate land uses adjacent to these facilities as another means to reduce the impacts of noise.

**Response -** Staff agree that a variety of noise measures may be employed to meet the noise level objectives. Such measures may include spatial separation from the noise source, and at the community level, encouraging noise-sensitive uses to locate away from areas likely to receive more than acceptable noise levels as proposed under 11.6.2.2. The proposed detailed polices (1.6.2.3) are directed at the development proponent which requires that alternatives to acoustic barriers be considered to address visual aesthetics which could include the orientation of buildings and outdoor living areas. It should be noted that the objectives and policies for healthy and sustainable urban communities (Section 3) speak to community planning.

**Recommendation - No change.**

**669. Section 11.6.2, policy 4(c)** Questioned why a detailed noise control study is proposed to be required prior to draft approval of a plan of subdivision (108).

**Response -** Similar to the issue raised regarding aircraft noise, as long as the noise control feasibility study is completed and be considered as part of the initial submission, then the detailed noise control study could be required as a condition of draft approval and be completed and any mitigation recommendations secured by way of agreement as a condition of final approval.

**Recommendation - Change Policy 4(a) of Section 11.6.2 by deleting the phrase “prior to” and replacing it with: “as a condition of draft approval.**

**Comments on Schedule G**

**670. Comment -** There is new flood plain mapping for Steven Creek and the Rideau River between Kars Bridge and Burritts Rapids. Watts Creek and Kizell Drain also have flood plain mapping. Schedule G should be amended accordingly. (229)

**Response -** Agree however the new flood plain mapping for the Rideau River is not available yet. Section 11.2 policy 3 states that to determine the extent of the flood hazards maps delineating the flood plain prepared by the Conservation Authorities will be consulted. When the new flood plain mapping for the Rideau River is available, the new maps will be used to determine the extent of the flood hazard.

**Recommendation - Change Schedule G to show the revised Flood Plain for Steven Creek. Add flood plain mapping for Watts Creek and Kizell Drain.**

**671. Comment -** There is a lack of clarity on Schedule G where there is a overlap in designation such as Flood Plain and Organic Soils. The schedule is difficult to read. Perhaps larger versions of the schedule won't have this problem. (229)

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation -** Revise Schedule A to show both Organic Soils and Flood Plain in areas where they overlap.

**672. Aircraft Vicinity Development Zones -** Should be shown for Carp Airport.

**Response -** Agree.

**Recommendation - Designate "Aircraft Vicinity Development Zone" on Schedule G.**

**673. Osgoode, Conc. 4, W 1/2 Lot 1 & 2 -** There appears to be a designation on Schedule G on the exiting developed area. We are puzzled by the designation and request its removal. (292)

**Response -** The area is designated Organic Soils on Schedule. A review of the air photos indicates that the wet area (shown as Organic Soils on Schedule G) does not extend into the area that has already been developed.

**Recommendation - No change to the Organic Soils on Schedule G.**

**674. Ottawa, Conc. 1 O.F, Lots 24, 25 etc. -** Schedule G should be amended to include the steep slopes running east from the Aviation Parkway through Montfort Woods as identified on the "Canadian Geological Survey Map 1506A, Surficial Geology of Ottawa. The natural fault in the Montfort Woods should be identified as a "geomorphic, geological and landform feature". (257)

**Response -** The source of the slope stability information shown on Schedule G is Ontario Geological Survey Miscellaneous Paper 68 "Slope Stability of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton Ontario, Canada" 1976 which delineated area of potential slope failure. The area in question was not identified in the study and is not designated on Schedule G. The plan does (Section 11.3 policy 2) recognise there may be other areas where unstable soils and unstable bedrock may be present. The Environmental Constraints polices apply in these circumstances as well.

**Recommendation - No change to Schedule G.**

**Errors, Omissions, and Clarifications in Section 11**

**675. Recommendation - Make the following corrections to Section 11.**

**Add to the last sentence in paragraph 2 of the introduction to Section 11.6.2 the phrase “site layout” before the word “setbacks.”**

**Similarly, add “site layout” to policy 3 of Section 11.6.2 immediately after the words “may include” in the second sentence.**

**Add the word “compatible” before “set of noise control guidelines” in the third sentence of paragraph 3 of the introduction to Section 11.6.2**

INDEX OF SUBMISSIONS

<u>SUBMISSION NO.</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>CATEGORY</u>
1	W. W. Johnston	Rural Landowner
1	Mr. William Parks	Rural Landowner
2	Mr. David J. Smith	Rural Landowner
3	Mr. Andrew Baldwin	Rural Landowner
4	Mr. Harold Higginson	Rural Landowner
5	Mr. Newill	Rural Landowner
6	Mr. Delmer Wilson	Rural Landowner
7	Mr. John Poole	Rural Landowner
8	Mr. Jeff Davis	Rural Landowner
9	D. Laidlaw	Rural Landowner
10	Mr. Marcel Bisson	Rural Landowner
11	Mr. & Mrs. William Whelan	Rural Landowner
12	Mr. Vilmars Rasa	Rural Landowner
12	Mr. Arnold C. Rice	Rural Landowner
12	Mr. William J. Seabrook	Rural Landowner
12	Mr. James Slattery	Rural Landowner
12	Mr. David Wright	Rural Landowner
13	Mrs. Ruth H. Curry	Rural Landowner
14	Andre Hauschild	Rural Landowner
15	Mr. Brian Carry	Rural Landowner
16	Kingdon Holdings Ltd.	Developer
17	Mr. Russell Craig	Rural Landowner
18	Mr. Frank Argue	Rural Landowner
19	Eric & Anne Wimberley	Rural Landowner
20	Mr. Herb Campbell	Rural Landowner
21	Deerwood Estates Partnership	Developer
22	Mr. Robert J. Higgins	Rural Landowner
23	Mr. Joseph Sladic	Rural Landowner
24	Mr. Ross Nicholson	Rural Landowner
25	Mr. Stephen P. O'Connor	Individual
26	Mr. Keith Langley	Rural Landowner
27	Mr. & Mrs. Dave Forsyth	Rural Landowner
28	Mr. Vern Rampton	Rural Landowner
29	Wilson, Prockiw Barristers & Solicitors	Rural Landowner
30	Angela & Bryon Tyler	Rural Landowner
31	Mr. David Underwood	Rural Landowner
32	Farley, Smith and Murray Surveying Ltd.	Developer
33	Mr. Nick Gulis	Rural Landowner
34	Mr. Brian Kinsella	Rural Landowner
35	Mr. Andrew Renia	Individual
36	Carolyn Robertson	Individual
37	Mr. Ken Charlebois	Urban Landowner

38	Mrs. Phyllis Thatcher	Individual
39	Matthew & Cheryl Clark	Rural Landowner
40	Mr. Mike O'Connell	Individual
41	Don Lockwood	Rural Landowner
42	Ms. Maria K. Sell	Rural Landowner
43	City of Vanier	Municipalities
44	Mr. Stephen Musy	Rural Landowner
45	Mr. Carl Killeen	Rural Landowner
46	Ms. Ann Simpson	Individual
47	Mr. Len Russell	Individual
48	Mr. Frank Marchington	Rural Landowner
49	Mr. Robert Lytle	Rural Landowner
50	Mr. Graham Hudson	Rural Landowner
51	Arn Snyder	Rural Landowner
52	Mr. T. P. Voroley	Rural Landowner
53	Mr. Tajammul Khan	Rural Landowner
54	Mr. Clarence Madhosingh	Rural Landowner
55	Mr. Ken Foulds	Rural Landowner
56	Mr. Steve Berry	Rural Landowner
57	Mr. Ken Purdy	Rural Landowner
58	Mr. Leonard W. Purdy	Rural Landowner
59	Mr. Joseph L. Purdy	Rural Landowner
60	Mr. Kenneth Brennan	Rural Landowner
61	Mr. J. G. Herbert	Rural Landowner
62	City of Ottawa	Municipalities
63	City of Ottawa	Municipalities
64	City of Ottawa	Municipalities
65	Mr. William Davidson	Developer
66	Mr. Sid Bradley	Rural Landowner
67	Ms. Grace Bell	Individual
68	A.T. and Marilyn Hansen	Rural Landowner
69	Mr. Robert Glendinning	Individual
70	David & Judith Wall	Rural Landowner
71	Mr. Lino Simioni	Rural Landowner
72	Mr. Mark Riley	Individual
73	Mr. Burt Collins	Individual
74	H. E. Alter	Rural Landowner
75	M.L. McKay	Rural Landowner
76	Mr. Vlado Pollak	Rural Landowner
77	Mr. John Charania	Rural Landowner
78	Mr. Chris Cummins	Rural Landowner
79	Urbandale Corporation	Developer
80	Mr. Duncan Campbell	Urban Landowner
81	Mr. Paul Kelly	Rural Landowner
82	Dr. Louis DiRaimo	Rural Landowner
83	Donald & Lorraine Halchuk	Developer
84	Mr. Wayne Patterson	Rural Landowner
85	Leo & Stella Rouble	Rural Landowner

86	Mr. Douglas Dods	Business Owner
87	Township of Goulbourn	Municipalities
88	City of Nepean	Municipalities
89	Dianne Holmes	Regional Councillor
90	Mr. Ronald Charlebois	Developer
91	Corelean Robertson	Rural Landowner
92	Mr. Owen Colton	Rural Landowner
93	Armbro Construction Limited	Business Owner
94	Russell & Eleanor McKay	Rural Landowner
95	Revtor Company Limited	Rural Landowner
96	Mark & Michelle Bainbridge	Rural Landowner
97	Anonymous	
98	Anonymous	
99	Anonymous	Rural Landowner
100	Anonymous	Urban Landowner
101	Mr. Mike Bell	Rural Landowner
102	Ms. Tallulah Macvean	Rural Landowner
103	Mr. Donald H. Rine	Rural Landowner
104	United Aggregates Ltd.	Business Owner
105	Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport Authority	Agencies
106	Mr. William Shaw	Rural Landowner
107	Ms. Mary M. Nash	Community Asso.
108	D.W. Kennedy Consulting Ltd.	Consultant
109	City of Ottawa	Municipalities
110	Lois Smith	Individual
111	R.E. Williams	Individual
112	Genstar Development Company	Developer
113	Lithwick Corp	Developer
114	Bob & Liz Metcalfe	Rural Landowner
115	Mr. Tamba Dhar	Rural Landowner
116	Qualicum/Graham Park	Community Asso.
117	Mr. Murray McComb	Urban Landowner
118	Mr. Henry Benoit	Rural Landowner
119	Ms. Barbara Rotar	Rural Landowner
120	Mr. Bob W. Hosler	Individual
121	Ms. Janet Belzile	Individual
122	Ms. Jane Berlin	Individual
123	Ms. Loraine Saumure	Rural Landowner
124	Alex Cullen	Regional Councillor
125	Chief Justice Brian Dickson (Retired)	Rural Landowner
126	Mr. Paul Kruyne	Rural Landowner
127	Simmering & Associates Ltd.	Developer
128	Centretown Citizens Ottawa Corp.	Special Interest Group
129	Mr. Jean Paul Lemay	Rural Landowner
130	Mr. Weldon Birch	Rural Landowner
131	Chris Rhodes	Individual
132	Robert van den Ham	Regional Councillor

133	Mr. Robert A. Broomfield	Rural Landowner
134	Mr. Barry Cavanagh	Rural Landowner
135	Mr. Al Crosby	Individual
136	Dianne McCormack	Individual
137	Anonymous	Rural Landowner
138	Pat and Mary Timmins	Rural Landowner
139	Alta Vista Community Association	Community Asso.
140	Mr. Leo Brown	Rural Landowner
141	Mr. Charles D. Foster	Rural Landowner
142	Ottawalk	Special Interest Group
143	Betty Hill	Regional Councillor
144	Mr. Don Wiles	Rural Landowner
145	Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Asso.	Developer
146	Hoi and Julia Tsao	Urban Landowner
147	Ms. Ann Deugo	Rural Landowner
148	Dwight and Connie Johnson	Rural Landowner
148	Mr. Gordon Mulligan	Rural Landowner
149	History Dept. Carleton University	Institutional
150	Bonnie L. Brown	Rural Landowner
151	Ms. Diane Penney	Rural Landowner
152	Pat Chojnacki	Rural Landowner
153	Mr. Mark Foley	Rural Landowner
154	Agricultural Advisory Committee	Special Interest Group
155	Mr. Daniel Raymond	Rural Landowner
156	Terrace Corporation	Developer
157	Mr. Dale Argue	Rural Landowner
158	Dr. George W. Sander	Rural Landowner
159	Mr. Yash Paul Lamba	Rural Landowner
160	Walker, Nott, Dragicevic	Business Owner
161	Kanata Rural Conservation Group	Special Interest Group
162	Mr. Arthur Bickerstaff	Rural Landowner
163	Township of West Carleton	Municipalities
164	Mr. Dale Murphy	Rural Landowner
165	Arnold Faintuck & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant
166	Mr. William (Bill) Coady	Rural Landowner
167	Mrs. Lilli Smith	Rural Landowner
168	Mr. Ronald Walker	Rural Landowner
169	J.L. Richards & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant
170	Mr. Glenn Falls	Rural Landowner
171	Mr. Rolf Meier	Rural Landowner
172	Jack and Susan McCoy	Rural Landowner
173	Mr. Seaton Findlay	Urban Landowner
174	Mr. William S. Davidson	Rural Landowner
175	Wilson, Prockiw Barristers & Solicitors	Rural Landowner
176	Gisele and Murray MacDonald	Rural Landowner
177	Bruce B. MacNabb, Ltd.	Consultant
178	Ms. Rina Petrelli	Rural Landowner
179	Ms. Mary-Ellen Kennedy	Rural Landowner

180	T.G. Otto	Rural Landowner
181	Mr. Eric Mussell	Rural Landowner
182	Paul and Grace Mussell	Rural Landowner
183	Anna and Clarence Mussell	Rural Landowner
184	J.A. Carruthers	Rural Landowner
185	Mr. Philip Smith	Rural Landowner
186	Charlene and Craig Bagshaw	Rural Landowner
186	Dan DesRoches & Lori Bustard DesRoches	Rural Landowner
186	Marc Pinault & Lise Hetu Pinault	Rural Landowner
187	Arnprior Region Federation of Agriculture	Agencies
188	Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant
189	Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant
190	Dalhousie Community Association	Community Asso.
191	Mr. Ken Valcamp	Rural Landowner
192	Kanata Rural Conservation Group	Community Asso.
193	Mr. Gordon Pike	Rural Landowner
194	Mr. John J. Beaton	Urban Landowner
195	Mr. Dan Howard	Individual
196	Alice and John MacLaurin	Urban Landowner
197	Dr. Richard W. Macmillan	Rural Landowner
198	Mr. Ivan Flockton	Rural Landowner
199	North West Goulbourn Community Asso.	Community Asso.
200	H.W. Gow & J. Mathieu	Individual
201	Mr. Donald R. Borden	Rural Landowner
202	Copeland Park Community Alliance	Community Asso.
203	Community Petition	Rural Landowner
204	Richard and Henry Hobbs	Rural Landowner
205	Bernie & Georgette St. John	Rural Landowner
206	Mr. David Gladstone	Individual
207	Sherry and Gary Belding	Rural Landowner
208	A.F. & H.A. Baskin	Rural Landowner
209	Community Petition	Rural Landowner
210	Mr. John B. Wilson	Rural Landowner
211	City of Kanata	Municipalities
212	City of Kanata	Municipalities
213	Glabar Park Community Alliance	Community Asso.
214	Regional Cycling Advisory Group	Special Interest Group
215	Gary & Connie Bazil	Rural Landowner
216	Santo Zacconi	Rural Landowner
217	Ms. Vivian R. Catling	Rural Landowner
218	Mr. Waldo Hordichuk	Rural Landowner
219	Association of Rural Property Owners	Special Interest Group
220	Mr. J. Ray Bell	Rural Landowner
221	Byward Market BIA	Business Group
222	Rideau Street BIA	Business Group
223	Township of Goulbourn	Municipalities
224	Ronald & Tina Clarke	Rural Landowner



225	Manor Park Community Asso.	Community Asso.
226	R.H. Kilburn	Rural Landowner
227	Township of Osgoode	Municipalities
228	Communities Before Bridges	Special Interest Group
229	Rideau Valley Conservation Authority	Agencies
230	Tartan Development Corp	Developer
231	J.L. Richards & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant
232	Transport 2000	Agencies
233	Tina Cockram & Stephen Farrell	Rural Landowner
234	Robert Grant & Laurel Schock	Rural Landowner
235	Transport Concepts	Special Interest Group
236	Parks Canada	Agencies
237	David & Margaret Thorsell	Rural Landowner
238	R & D Berube	Rural Landowner
239	Mr. & Mrs. Sandy Keir	Rural Landowner
240	Mr. John R. Cavanagh	Rural Landowner
241	Mr. John van Riel	Rural Landowner
242	R. Favrin	Urban Landowner
243	Save the Pinecrest Creek Corridor Committee	Special Interest Group
244	City of Gloucester	Municipalities
245	Mr. Rob Shaver	Rural Landowner
246	Lori-Ann Morley	Rural Landowner
246	Mr. Ernie Simpson	Rural Landowner
246	Mr. Randy Simpson	Rural Landowner
247	Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Business Group
248	Christine Hanrahan	Urban Landowner
249	Don Stephenson	Municipal Councillor
250	Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade	Business Group
251	Mr. Fred Zlepzig	Rural Landowner
252	Connelly-McManus Engineering Ltd	Consultant
253	Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd.	Consultant
254	Joan & Glenn Ilott	Rural Landowner
255	Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd	Consultant
256	Township of Rideau	Municipalities
257	Rosalind Riseborough	Urban Landowner
258	National Capital Commission	Agencies
259	National Capital Commission	Agencies
260	Bernadine J. Harris	Rural Landowner
261	Myrna Bush	Rural Landowner
262	Donald R. Baskin	Rural Landowner
263	R.G. Essiambre & Asso.	Consultant
264	David McNicoll	Urban Landowner
265	Sommerset Heights BIA	Business Group
266	Gail Stewart & Others	Special Interest Group
267	Mr. Derek Chase	Urban Landowner
268	Mr. Richard Bendall	Rural Landowner
269	Glebe Community Asso.	Community Asso.

270	Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Rural Landowner
271	Bank Street Promenade	Business Group
272	March Rural Community Asso	Community Asso.
273	Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Rural Landowner
274	Richcraft Quality Home Bldrs	Developer
275	John & Norma Richardson	Rural Landowner
276	Sylvie Morissette	Individual
277	Public Works & Gov't Services Canada	Agencies
278	The Planning Partnership	Consultant
279	Township of Cumberland	Municipalities
280	Kanata Arts Advisory Cttee	Special Interest Group
281	Mr. Gordon Semple	Rural Landowner
282	Mr. Derek Oudit	Individual
283	Novatech Engineering Consultants Ltd	Consultant
284	Mr. Frank Argue	Developer
285	Terry & Danny MacHardy	Rural Landowner
286	Barbara Barr	Urban Landowner
287	Bruce & Karen Geddes	Rural Landowner
288	Laurie Curtis	Rural Landowner
289	Mr. Henri Joly	Rural Landowner
290	Mr. Scott Toll	Rural Landowner
291	Pri-Tec Int'l Inc	Consultant
292	D.R. Barker & Asso Ltd	Consultant
293	Somerset Village BIA	Business Group
294	Mr. Hugh Gribbon	Individual
295	Centretown Citizens' Community Asso.	Community Asso.
296	The Regional Group	Consultant
297	Farano Green	Consultant
298	Irv & Shirley Cockwell	Rural Landowner
299	Mr. Jack MacLaren	Rural Landowner
300	Mr. Graydon Patterson	Individual
301	Ottawa Cycling Advisory Group	Special Interest Group
302	Ottawa Pedestrian Advisory Group	Special Interest Group
303	Citizens for Safe Cycling	Special Interest Group
304	Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority	Agencies
305	Riverside Park Community Asso.	Community Asso.
306	Balys & Associates Inc	Rural Landowner
307	Arthur & Mary Van Gaal	Rural Landowner
308	Oliver, Mangione, McCalla	Consultant
309	Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada	Agencies
310	Federation of Citizens' Asso.	Community Asso.
311	King Edward Ave Task Force	Community Asso.
312	Mr. Jim Armstrong	Individual
313	Ottawa Field-Naturalists' Club	Special Interest Group
314	Mr. Al Crosby	Urban Landowner
315	Relocatable Homes Ltd	Rural Landowner
316	Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing	Agencies
317	Action Sandy Hill	Community Asso.

318	Robert & Huguette Copeland	Rural Landowner
319	Federation of Citizens' Asso	Community Asso.
320	Fairlawn Sod (Ottawa)	Rural Landowner
321	Ministry of Municipal Affairs & Housing	Agencies

<u>NAME</u>	<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>SUBMISSION NO.</u>
Action Sandy Hill	Community Association	317
Agricultural Advisory Committee	Special Interest Group	154
Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada	Agencies	309
Alta Vista Community Association	Community Association	139
H. E. Alter	Rural Landowner	74
Anonymous		97
Anonymous		98
Anonymous	Rural Landowner	99
Anonymous	Rural Landowner	137
Anonymous	Urban Landowner	100
Mr. Dale Argue	Rural Landowner	157
Mr. Frank Argue	Developer	284
Mr. Frank Argue	Rural Landowner	18
Armbro Construction Limited	Business Owner	93
Mr. Jim Armstrong	Individual	312
Arnold Faintuck & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant	165
Arnprior Region Federation of Agriculture	Agencies	187
Association of Rural Property Owners	Special Interest Group	219
Charlene and Craig Bagshaw	Rural Landowner	186
Mark & Michelle Bainbridge	Rural Landowner	96
Mr. Andrew Baldwin	Rural Landowner	3
Balys & Associates Inc	Rural Landowner	306
Bank Street Promenade	Business Group	271
Barbara Barr	Urban Landowner	86
A.F. & H.A. Baskin	Rural Landowner	208
Donald R. Baskin	Rural Landowner	262
Gary & Connie Bazil	Rural Landowner	215
Mr. John J. Beaton	Urban Landowner	194
Sherry and Gary Belding	Rural Landowner	207
Ms. Grace Bell	Individual	67
Mr. J. Ray Bell	Rural Landowner	220
Mr. Mike Bell	Rural Landowner	101
Ms. Janet Belzile	Individual	121
Mr. Richard Bendall	Rural Landowner	268
Mr. Henry Benoit	Rural Landowner	118
Ms. Jane Berlin	Individual	122
Mr. Steve Berry	Rural Landowner	56
R & D Berube	Rural Landowner	238
Mr. Arthur Bickerstaff	Rural Landowner	162
Mr. Weldon Birch	Rural Landowner	130
Mr. Marcel Bisson	Rural Landowner	10
Mr. Donald R. Borden	Rural Landowner	201
Mr. Sid Bradley	Rural Landowner	66
Mr. Kenneth Brennan	Rural Landowner	60
Mr. Robert A. Broomfield	Rural Landowner	133
Bonnie L. Brown	Rural Landowner	150

Mr. Leo Brown	Rural Landowner	140
Myrna Bush	Rural Landowner	261
Byward Market BIA	Business Group	221
Mr. Duncan Campbell	Urban Landowner	80
Mr. Herb Campbell	Rural Landowner	20
J.A. Carruthers	Rural Landowner	184
Mr. Brian Carry	Rural Landowner	15
Ms. Vivian R. Catling	Rural Landowner	217
Mr. Barry Cavanagh	Rural Landowner	134
Mr. John R. Cavanagh	Rural Landowner	240
Centretown Citizens Ottawa Corporation	Special Interest Group	128
Centretown Citizens' Community Asso.	Community Association	295
Mr. John Charania	Rural Landowner	77
Mr. Ken Charlebois	Urban Landowner	37
Mr. Ronald Charlebois	Developer	90
Mr. Derek Chase	Urban Landowner	267
Pat Chojnacki	Rural Landowner	152
Citizens for Safe Cycling	Special Interest Group	303
City of Gloucester	Municipalities	244
City of Kanata	Municipalities	211
City of Kanata	Municipalities	212
City of Nepean	Municipalities	88
City of Ottawa	Municipalities	62
City of Ottawa	Municipalities	63
City of Ottawa	Municipalities	64
City of Ottawa	Municipalities	109
City of Vanier	Municipalities	43
Matthew & Cheryl Clark	Rural Landowner	39
Ronald & Tina Clarke	Rural Landowner	224
Mr. William (Bill) Coady	Rural Landowner	166
Irv & Shirley Cockwell	Rural Landowner	298
Mr. Burt Collins	Individual	73
Mr. Owen Colton	Rural Landowner	92
Communities Before Bridges	Special Interest Group	228
Community Petition	Rural Landowner	203
Community Petition	Rural Landowner	209
Connelly-McManus Engineering Ltd	Consultant	252
Copeland Park Community Alliance	Community Association	202
Robert & Huguette Copeland	Rural Landowner	318
Mr. Russell Craig	Rural Landowner	17
Mr. Al Crosby	Individual	135
Mr. Al Crosby	Urban Landowner	314
Alex Cullen	Regional Councillor	124
Mr. Chris Cummins	Rural Landowner	78
Mrs. Ruth H. Curry	Rural Landowner	13
Laurie Curtis	Rural Landowner	288
D.R. Barker & Asso Ltd	Consultant	292
D.W. Kennedy Consulting Ltd.	Consultant	108

Dalhousie Community Association	Community Association	190
Mr. William Davidson	Developer	65
Mr. William S. Davidson	Rural Landowner	174
Mr. Jeff Davis	Rural Landowner	8
Deerwood Estates Partnership	Developer	21
Dan DesRoches & Lori Bustard DesRoches	Rural Landowner	186
Ms. Ann Deugo	Rural Landowner	147
Mr. Tamba Dhar	Rural Landowner	115
Chief Justice Brian Dickson (Retired)	Rural Landowner	125
Dr. Louis DiRaimo	Rural Landowner	82
Mr. Douglas Dods	Business Owner	86
Fairlawn Sod (Ottawa)	Rural Landowner	320
Mr. Glenn Falls	Rural Landowner	170
Farano Green	Consultant	297
Farley, Smith and Murray Surveying Ltd.	Developer	32
R. Favrin	Urban Landowner	242
Federation of Citizens' Asso	Community Association	319
Federation of Citizens' Asso.	Community Association	310
Mr. Seaton Findlay	Urban Landowner	173
Mr. Ivan Flockton	Rural Landowner	198
Mr. Mark Foley	Rural Landowner	153
Mr. & Mrs. Dave Forsyth	Rural Landowner	27
Mr. Charles D. Foster	Rural Landowner	141
Mr. Ken Foulds	Rural Landowner	55
Gail Stewart & Others	Special Interest Group	266
Bruce & Karen Geddes	Rural Landowner	287
Genstar Development Company	Developer	112
Glabar Park Community Alliance	Community Association	213
Mr. David Gladstone	Individual	206
Glebe Community Association	Community Association	269
Mr. Robert Glendinning	Individual	6
Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Business Group	247
Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Rural Landowner	270
Gowling, Strathy & Henderson	Rural Landowner	273
Mr. Hugh Gribbon	Individual	294
Mr. Nick Gulis	Rural Landowner	33
H.W. Gow & J. Mathieu	Individual	200
Donald & Lorraine Halchuk	Developer	83
Christine Hanrahan	Urban Landowner	248
A.T. and Marilyn Hansen	Rural Landowner	68
Bernadine J. Harris	Rural Landowner	260
Andre Hauschild	Rural Landowner	14
Mr. J. G. Herbert	Rural Landowner	61
Mr. Robert J. Higgins	Rural Landowner	22
Mr. Harold Higginson	Rural Landowner	4
Betty Hill	Regional Councillor	143
History Dept. Carleton University	Institutional	149
Richard and Henry Hobbs	Rural Landowner	204

Dianne Holmes	Regional Councillor	89
Mr. Waldo Hordichuk	Rural Landowner	218
Mr. Bob W. Hosler	Individual	120
Mr. Dan Howard	Individual	195
Mr. Graham Hudson	Rural Landowner	50
Joan & Glenn Ilott	Rural Landowner	254
J.L. Richards & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant	169
J.L. Richards & Asso. Ltd.	Consultant	231
Dwight and Connie Johnson	Rural Landowner	148
W. W. Johnston	Rural Landowner	1
Mr. Henri Joly	Rural Landowner	289
Kanata Arts Advisory Cttee	Special Interest Group	280
Kanata Rural Conservation Group	Community Association	192
Kanata Rural Conservation Group	Special Interest Group	161
Mr. & Mrs. Sandy Keir	Rural Landowner	239
Mr. Paul Kelly	Rural Landowner	81
Ms. Mary-Ellen Kennedy	Rural Landowner	179
Mr. Tajammul Khan	Rural Landowner	53
R.H. Kilburn	Rural Landowner	225
Mr. Carl Killeen	Rural Landowner	45
King Edward Ave Task Force	Community Association	311
Kingdon Holdings Ltd.	Developer	16
Mr. Brian Kinsella	Rural Landowner	34
Mr. Paul Kruyne	Rural Landowner	126
D. Laidlaw	Rural Landowner	9
Mr. Yash Paul Lamba	Rural Landowner	159
Mr. Keith Langley	Rural Landowner	26
Mr. Jean Paul Lemay	Rural Landowner	129
Lithwick Corporation	Developer	113
Don Lockwood	Rural Landowner	41
Mr. Robert Lytle	Rural Landowner	49
Gisele and Murray MacDonald	Rural Landowner	176
Terry & Danny MacHardy	Rural Landowner	285
Mr. Jack MacLaren	Rural Landowner	299
Alice and John MacLaurin	Urban Landowner	196
Dr. Richard W. Macmillan	Rural Landowner	197
Bruce B. MacNabb, Ltd.	Consultant	177
Ms. Tallulah Macvean	Rural Landowner	102
Mr. Clarence Madhosingh	Rural Landowner	54
Manor Park Community Asso.	Community Association	225
March Rural Community Asso.	Community Association	272
Mr. Frank Marchington	Rural Landowner	48
Mr. Murray McComb	Urban Landowner	117
Dianne McCormack	Individual	36
Jack and Susan McCoy	Rural Landowner	172
M.L. McKay	Rural Landowner	75
Russell & Eleanor McKay	Rural Landowner	94
David McNicoll	Urban Landowner	264

Mr. Rolf Meier	Rural Landowner	171
Bob & Liz Metcalfe	Rural Landowner	114
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Agencies	321
Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority	Agencies	304
Sylvie Morissette	Individual	276
Lori-Ann Morley	Rural Landowner	246
Mr. Gordon Mulligan	Rural Landowner	148
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	Agencies	316
Mr. Dale Murphy	Rural Landowner	164
Anna and Clarence Mussell	Rural Landowner	183
Mr. Eric Mussell	Rural Landowner	181
Paul and Grace Mussell	Rural Landowner	182
Mr. Stephen Musy	Rural Landowner	44
Ms. Mary M. Nash	Community Association	107
National Capital Commission	Agencies	258
National Capital Commission	Agencies	259
Mr. Newill	Rural Landowner	5
Mr. Ross Nicholson	Rural Landowner	24
North West Goulbourn Community Asso.	Community Association	199
Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant	188
Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant	189
Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant	255
Novatech Engineering Consultants	Consultant	283
Novatech Engineering Consultants.	Consultant	253
Mr. Mike O'Connell	Individual	40
Mr. Stephen P. O'Connor	Individual	25
Oliver, Mangione, McCalla	Consultant	308
Ottawa Cycling Advisory Group	Special Interest Group	301
Ottawa Field-Naturalists' Club	Special Interest Group	313
Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier Int'l Airport Authority	Agencies	105
Ottawa Pedestrian Advisory Group	Special Interest Group	302
Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade	Business Group	250
Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Asso.	Developer	145
Ottawalk	Special Interest Group	142
T.G. Otto	Rural Landowner	180
Mr. Derek Oudit	Individual	282
Parks Canada	Agencies	236
Mr. William Parks	Rural Landowner	1
Mr. Graydon Patterson	Individual	300
Mr. Wayne Patterson	Rural Landowner	84
Ms. Diane Penney	Rural Landowner	151
Ms. Rina Petrelli	Rural Landowner	178
Mr. Gordon Pike	Rural Landowner	193
Marc Pinault & Lise Hetu Pinault	Rural Landowner	186
Mr. Vlado Pollak	Rural Landowner	76
Mr. John Poole	Rural Landowner	7
Pri-Tec Int'l Inc	Consultant	291



Public Works & Gov't. Services Canada	Agencies	277
Mr. Joseph L. Purdy	Rural Landowner	59
Mr. Ken Purdy	Rural Landowner	57
Mr. Leonard W. Purdy	Rural Landowner	58
Qualicum/Graham Park	Community Association	116
R.G. Essiambre & Asso.	Consultant	263
Mr. Vern Rampton	Rural Landowner	28
Mr. Vilmars Rasa	Rural Landowner	12
Mr. Daniel Raymond	Rural Landowner	155
Regional Cycling Advisory Group	Special Interest Group	214
Relocatable Homes Ltd.	Rural Landowner	315
Mr. Andrew Renia	Individual	35
Revtor Company Limited	Rural Landowner	95
Chris Rhodes	Individual	131
Mr. Arnold C. Rice	Rural Landowner	12
John & Norma Richardson	Rural Landowner	275
Richcraft Quality Home Bldrs	Developer	274
Rideau Street BIA	Business Group	222
Rideau Valley Conservation Authority	Agencies	229
Mr. Mark Riley	Individual	72
Mr. Donald H. Rine	Rural Landowner	103
Rosalind Riseborough	Urban Landowner	257
Riverside Park Community Asso.	Community Association	305
Robert Grant & Laurel Schock	Rural Landowner	234
Carolyn Robertson	Individual	36
Corelean Robertson	Rural Landowner	91
Ms. Barbara Rotar	Rural Landowner	119
Leo & Stella Rouble	Rural Landowner	85
Mr. Len Russell	Individual	47
Dr. George W. Sander	Rural Landowner	158
Ms. Loraine Saumure	Rural Landowner	123
Save the Pinecrest Creek Corridor Cttee	Special Interest Group	243
Mr. William J. Seabrook	Rural Landowner	12
Ms. Maria K. Sell	Rural Landowner	42
Mr. Gordon Semple	Rural Landowner	281
Mr. Rob Shaver	Rural Landowner	245
Mr. William Shaw	Rural Landowner	106
Mr. Lino Simioni	Rural Landowner	71
Simmering & Associates Ltd	Developer	127
Ms. Ann Simpson	Individual	46
Mr. Ernie Simpson	Rural Landowner	246
Mr. Randy Simpson	Rural Landowner	246
Mr. Joseph Sladic	Rural Landowner	23
Mr. James Slattery	Rural Landowner	12
Mr. David J. Smith	Rural Landowner	2
Mrs. Lilli Smith	Rural Landowner	167
Lois Smith	Individual	110
Mr. Philip Smith	Rural Landowner	185

Arn Snyder	Rural Landowner	51
Somerset Village BIA	Business Group	293
Sommerset Heights BIA	Business Group	265
Bernie & Georgette St. John	Rural Landowner	205
Don Stephenson	Municipal Councillor	249
Tartan Development Corp	Developer	230
Terrace Corporation	Developer	156
Mrs. Phyllis Thatcher	Individual	38
The Planning Partnership	Consultant	278
The Regional Group	Consultant	296
David & Margaret Thorsell	Rural Landowner	237
Pat and Mary Timmins	Rural Landowner	138
Tina Cockram & Stephen Farrell	Rural Landowner	233
Mr. Scott Toll	Rural Landowner	290
Township of Cumberland	Municipalities	279
Township of Goulbourn	Municipalities	87
Township of Goulbourn	Municipalities	223
Township of Osgoode	Municipalities	227
Township of Rideau	Municipalities	256
Township of West Carleton	Municipalities	163
Transport 2000	Agencies	232
Transport Concepts	Special Interest Group	235
Hoi and Julia Tsao	Urban Landowner	146
Angela & Bryon Tyler	Rural Landowner	30
Mr. David Underwood	Rural Landowner	31
United Aggregates Ltd.	Business Owner	104
Urbandale Corporation	Developer	79
Mr. Ken Valcamp	Rural Landowner	191
Robert van den Ham	Regional Councillor	132
Arthur & Mary Van Gaal	Rural Landowner	307
Mr. John van Riel	Rural Landowner	241
Mr. T. P. Voroley	Rural Landowner	52
Walker, Nott, Dragicevic	Business Owner	160
Mr. Ronald Walker	Rural Landowner	168
David & Judith Wall	Rural Landowner	70
Mr. & Mrs. William Whelan	Rural Landowner	11
Mr. Don Wiles	Rural Landowner	144
R.E. Williams	Individual	111
Mr. Delmer Wilson	Rural Landowner	6
Mr. John B. Wilson	Rural Landowner	210
Wilson, Prockiw Barristers & Solicitors	Rural Landowner	29
Wilson, Prockiw Barristers & Solicitors	Rural Landowner	175
Eric & Anne Wimberley	Rural Landowner	19
Mr. David Wright	Rural Landowner	12
Santo Zacconi	Rural Landowner	216
Mr. Fred Zlepzig	Rural Landowner	251

## OFFICIAL PLAN MONITORING PROGRAM

<b>Major Subject</b>	<b>Monitoring Items and Activities</b>
<b>Demographics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population by sex by age by geographic area</li> <li>• Number of dwelling units by type by geographic areas</li> <li>• Employment by type by geographic area</li> <li>• Demographic trends</li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vacancy rate</li> <li>• Demolition of residential units</li> <li>• Potential supply of residential units</li> <li>• Affordable housing/ownership and rental prices</li> <li>• Social housing</li> <li>• Conversion of rental units</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vacant residential land inventory</li> <li>• Land use , survey, building permits</li> <li>• Vacant industrial land use inventory</li> <li>• Rural land use survey</li> </ul>
<b>Environmental Services</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wastewater flow and water consumption</li> <li>• Water and wastewater capacity</li> <li>• Water and wastewater capacity allocation</li> <li>• Water and wastewater infrastructure requirements, including phasing</li> <li>• Diversion of household waste</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vegetative cover by amount and type</li> <li>• Vegetative cover along watercourses</li> <li>• Surface water quality</li> <li>• Development in areas with environmental designations by location and size</li> <li>• Status of species</li> </ul>

<b>Major Subject</b>	<b>Monitoring Items and Activities</b>
<b>Open Space and Cultural Heritage</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Losses and gains in hectares of open space, by area</li> <li>● Improvements/opportunities lost along Scenic Routes</li> <li>● Losses and gains in hectares of waterfront open space, by area</li> <li>● Archaeological resources preserved or lost, by type</li> </ul>
<b>Rural Development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Rural lot creation</li> <li>● Agricultural activity</li> <li>● Number and location of licensed extraction operations/operators</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Transportation system usage and modal shares (auto, transit, cycling, walking)</li> <li>● Transportation network performance</li> <li>● Goods movement activity</li> <li>● Parking supply and cost</li> <li>● Infrastructure requirements, including phasing</li> </ul>
<b>Community Vision</b>	<p>Drawing from the indicators above, how does the Regional Official Plan implement the Community Vision for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Preserving, protecting, enhancing green , clean natural environment</li> <li>● A strong and diverse economic base</li> <li>● Safe public places</li> <li>● Highest possible standards of health</li> <li>● Building prosperity and eliminating poverty</li> <li>● Providing access to community resources</li> <li>● Fostering multi-culturalism</li> <li>● Engaging residents in important issues as partners</li> <li>● Ensuring an open, accountable, efficient, innovative government</li> <li>● Valuing rural communities' lifestyles</li> <li>● Protecting natural resources, agriculture, and environmentally sensitive lands</li> <li>● Supporting the Central Area as a vibrant, attractive mix of economic and cultural activity</li> <li>● Ensuring urban communities are built on a human scale</li> </ul>

## Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule A

<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE</b>
Cumberland	Lot 10 Conc. 5	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 28 Con 1 Lot C Conc. 8	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 10 Con. 5, 6	Change from Agricultural Resource Area and Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 9 Conc. 7 & 8	Change from Rural Resource Area to Agricultural Resource Area
	Lot 21 Conc. 1, 3	Change from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area.
	Lot 27 Conc. 4	Revise Provincially Significant Wetland boundary
	Lot 6 Conc. 1 O.F.	Change from Provincially Significant Wetland to General Rural Area
	Lots 2-8 Conc. O. F.	Change from Natural Environment Area 'A' To General Rural Area
	Lot 27 Conc. 1	Revise Natural Environment 'A' boundary
	Lot 22 Conc. 9	Revise Natural Environment Area 'A' boundary
	Lot 27, 28 Conc. 6 & 7	Revise General Rural Area boundary to match industrial park in LOP
Gloucester	Lot 4 Conc. 11	Revise Urban boundary on lot line between lots 3 & 4
	Villages	Revise Village boundaries for Cumberland, Sarsfield, Navan, Vars
	Lot 7, 8 Conc. 6	Change from Sand and Gravel Resource Area to Limestone Resource Area
	Pt. Lot 13 Conc. 2, 3	Change from Limestone Resource Area to Agricultural Resource Area
	Pt Lot 14 Conc. 1	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 24 Conc. 5	Change from Rural Resource Area to Limestone Resource Area
	Lot 22 Conc. 5	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	pt. Lot 24, 25 Conc. 5	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Goulbourn	Lot 25 Conc. 9
Villages		Revise Village boundary for Richmond
Lot 11, 12, 13 Conc. 1, 2		Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
Lot 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Conc. 2		Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
Lot 4, 5 Conc. 1		Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area and Agricultural Resource Area
Lot 5, 6 Conc. 7		Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
Lot 2, 3 Conc. 8		Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area

## Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule A

	Part Lots 3, 4, 5 Conc. 9	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Pt. Lot 1 Conc. 10	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Pt. Lot 12 Conc. 10	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 18, 19 Conc. 10	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 15 Conc. 11	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 1 Conc. 11	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Pt. Lot 3 Conc. 12	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Pt. Lot 14 Conc. 12	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 1, 2 Conc. 4	Change from Sand and Gravel Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 3, 4 Conc. 8	Change from Sand and Gravel Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 21 Conc. 8	Change from Sand and Gravel Resource Area to General Rural Area
<b>Kanata</b>	Lot 23 Conc. 3	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 11 Conc. 4	Change from Urban Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 27 Conc. 3	Change from Village to General Rural Area
<b>Nepean</b>	Lot 7, 8 Conc. 2	Change from Waterfront Open Space to General Rural Area
	Lot 1 Con. 2	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to Village
	Lot 17 Conc. 5	Change from General Rural Area to Sand and Gravel Resource Area
<b>Osgoode</b>	Lots 31, 32, 33 Conc. B.F.	Change from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area
	SE pt Lot 14 Conc. 9	Change from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area
	E 1/2 Lot 32,33,34 Conc. 2	Change from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area
	Lot 33 Conc.2	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 6, 7 Conc. 5	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural
	pt Lot 34, 35 Conc. 3	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lots 31, 32 Conc. 7	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 17 Conc. 8	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 17 Conc. 9	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	pt. Lot 14 Conc. 6	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Pt. Lot 11 Conc. 4	Change from Sand and Gravel Resource Area to General Rural Area

## Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule A

<b>Rideau</b>	Lot 4-6 Conc. 8 North Gower	Change Rural Resource to Agricultural Resource
	Lot 27 Conc. 1 North Gower	Revise Provincially Significant Wetland boundary
	Lot 21, 22 Conc. 2 North Gower	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 9 Conc. 1 North Gower	Change from Sand and Gravel Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 11 Conc. A North Gower Pt. Lot 12 Conc. A North Gower	Change from Sand and Gravel Resource Area and Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 13 Conc. A North Gower	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 14 Conc. A North Gower	Change from Sand and Gravel Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Pt. Lot 10, 11 Conc. 1 Marl.	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Pt. Lot 27, 28 Conc. 5 Marl.	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 25, 26 Conc. 8 Marlborough	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 3, 4 Conc. 8 Marlborough	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural Area
	James Island, Rideau River	Designate as General Rural Area
<b>West Carleton</b>	E 1/2 Lot 20 Conc. 10 Fitzroy	Change from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area
	Lot 16, 17 Conc. 1 Torbolton	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	E 1/2 lot 20 Conc. 11 Torbolton	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	S 1/2 lot 26 Conc. 7 Huntley	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 13, 14, 15 Conc. 4 Torbolton	Change from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area
	Lot 16, 17 Con 7 Huntley	Change from Limestone Resource Area to Sand and Gravel Resource Area
	Lot 13 Con 5, 6 Huntley	Change from Limestone Resource Area to Sand and Gravel Resource Area
	Lot 10-13 Con 8 Huntley	Change from Limestone Resource Area to Sand and Gravel Resource Area
	Pt. Lot 1, 2 Conc. 4 Huntley	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural
	Pt . Lot 2, 3 Conc. 11 Huntley	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural
	Pt Lot 5 Conc. 11, 12	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural
	Pt Lot 8 Conc. 10, 11	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural
	Lot 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 Conc. 10 Huntley	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural
	Lot 15 Conc. 12 Fitzroy	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural
	Lot 14, 15 Conc. 1 Torbolton	Change from Limestone Resource Area to General Rural

Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule A

Schedule A	Legend	note for villages (precise boundaries shall be designated in local official plans)



## Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule C1

<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE</b>
Cumberland	Trim Road	Change from Waterfront Open Space to General Urban Area
Cumberland	Petrie Island	Revise Boundary of Provincially Significant Wetland
Gloucester	Greenbelt	Change from Greenbelt Employment to Greenbelt Institutional
Gloucester	Ecolands Park	Change Environment A to Waterfront Open Space
Goulbourn	Fringewood South Business Parl	Change from Business Park to General Urban Area
Goulbourn	Stittsville North Business Park	Change from General Rural Area to Business Park
Goulbourn	Lot 25 Con. 9	Add General Urban Area
Kanata	Marchwood/Kanata Lakes	Revise boundaries of Natural Environment Area A
Kanata	Terry Fox South of Hwy 417	Revise Town Centre Boundaries
Kanata	Walter Baker Park	Change form Waterfront Open Space To General Urban
Kanata	Kanata North	Delete General Urban Area (as per ROPA 41)
Nepean	South Urban Centre	Revise boundary of Waterfront Open Space
Nepean	Queensway Carleton Hospital	Revise boundary of Greenbelt Employment Area
Nepean	Greenbelt	Change from Greenbelt Employment to Greenbelt Institutional
Ottawa	Central Area	Revise Boundary to reflect City of Ottawa OP and ROPA 66 (Lebreton Flats)
Ottawa	Confederation Heights	Change from Waterfront Open Space to Natural Environment Area 'A'
Ottawa	Health Sciences Complex West	Change from General Urban Area to Business Park
Ottawa	South Walkley Business Park	Change (60 m) from Business Park to General Urban Area
	Legend	Add the words South Urban Centre before Future Expansion

## Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule DI

	<b>LOCATION/ITEM</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
1	Terry Fox, Campeau north to existing Terry Fox	change to "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"	corridor subject to further study
2	Hope Side Road, Moodie to West Hunt Club	extend limits of "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"	error
3	Waller, Besserer to Rideau	add "existing Regional Road"	omission, add per current OP
4	Jeanne D'Arc, Tenth Line to Trim	delete "proposed Regional Road"	error
5	Tenth Line, north of Hwy 17 to Jeanne D'Arc	delete "existing Regional Road"	error
6	Trim, north of Hwy 17 to Jeanne D'Arc	delete "proposed Regional Road"	error
7	Mer Bleue, Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Ext. to Navan Rd.	add "proposed Regional Road"	omission, add per current OP
8	Navan Rd. at Orleans Blvd.	realign	clarification
9	Bronson, Albert to Queen	delete "existing Regional Road"	error
10	Bowesville Extension, Armstrong to Airport Parkway	change to "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"	corridor subject to further study
11	Trim/Frank Kenny Connection, Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension to Frank Kenny	add "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"	corridor subject to further study
12	Former Hwy 17, Hwy 417 to 500m east of Trim	add "existing Regional Road"	update, transfer from MTO
13	Former Hwy 31, Albion to urban boundary	add "existing Regional Road"	update, transfer from MTO
14	Former Hwy 16, Fisher to urban boundary	add "existing Regional Road"	update, pending transfer from MTO
15	Bowesville, Armstrong to urban boundary	add "proposed Regional Road"	(244), add per current OP
16	Limebank, Armstrong to urban boundary	add "proposed Regional Road"	(244), add per current OP
17	Stittsville	show Regional Roads	(87)

## Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule D1

	<b>LOCATION/ITEM</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
1	Hope Side Rd., Eagleson to Richmond	change from 34m to 40m	error, change per current OP
2	Eagleson, Hope Side Rd. to urban boundary	change from 30m to 34m	error, change per current OP
3	Moodie, Richmond to urban boundary	add 34m	error, add per current OP
4	Fallowfield, Cedarview to Woodroffe	change from 40m to 45m, unequal widening	error, show per ESR
5	Airport Parkway	change from 44m to 40m	show 40m pending study (Airport Parkway Twinning ESR)
6	Russell, Gregoire to Base Line	change from 30m to 34m	revise to provide consistency on RR 26
7	Rideau, Sussex to King Edward	change from 26m to 30m	error, change per current OP
8	Waller, Besserer to Rideau	add 20m	revise from current OP 23m
9	Lebreton Flats	change Booth from 40m to 28m and 34m, add Wellington, Portage to Hill, 23m	update Booth consistent with Lebreton Flats OP amendment, current OP 30m on Wellington not required
10	Merivale, Caldwell to Kirkwood	change from 30 to 34m	revise consistent with existing road type and section to the south
11	Fisher, Dynes to Baseline	change from 30 to 26	revise consistent with Fisher south of Dynes
12	Woodroffe, Baseline to Adirondack	change from 26m to 34m	error, change per current OP
13	Woodroffe, Shoppers City W. to Baseline	show both connections at 40m	error, change per current OP
14	Former Hwy 31 Albion to urban boundary	add 40m	update, transfer from MTO
15	Former Hwy 16, Fisher to urban boundary	add 40m	update, pending transfer from MTO
16	Former Hwy 17, Hwy 417 to 500m east of Trim	indicate ECP - "existing corridor to be protected"	update, transfer from MTO
17	Innes, Trim to Frank Kenny	change from 30m to 34	(279), show 34m pending study (Trim/Frank Kenny ESR)
18	Lester, Albion to Alert and Uplands, Alert to Breadner	change from 30m to 34	show 34m pending study (Bowesville Extension ESR)
19	Hunt Club east of Conroy	remove unequal widening	no longer applies
20	Rural "sight triangles"	remove all in urban area	application questioned, discuss

## Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule D1

	<b>LOCATION/ITEM</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
21	Stittsville	show Regional Roads	in text and/or add later pending detailed review (87)

## Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule D2

	<b>LOCATION/ITEM</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
1	Terry Fox (RR 61), Campeau north to existing Terry Fox	change to "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"	corridor subject to further study
2	Hope Side Rd. Extension, Moodie (RR 11) to West Hunt Club (RR 32)	change to "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"	corridor subject to further study
3	Bowesville Extension, Armstrong to Airport Parkway	change to "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"	corridor subject to further study
4	Trim/Frank Kenny Connection, Blackburn Hamlet Bypass Extension to Frank Kenny	add "proposed Regional Road - location undefined"	corridor subject to further study
5	Mer Bleue, Navan Rd. (RR 28) to urban boundary	add "proposed Regional Road"	error, add per current OP
6	Former Hwy 44, Highway 17 to Regional boundary	add "existing Regional Road" (RR 49)	update, transfer from MTO
7	Former Hwy 31, urban boundary to Mitch Owens (RR 8)	add "existing Regional Road" (RR 85)	update, transfer from MTO
8	Former Hwy 16, urban boundary to Hwy 416	add "existing Regional Road" (RR 73)	update, pending transfer from MTO
9	Hwy 17 in West Carleton	show proposed realignment	verbal request from public
10	Bowesville, urban boundary to Mitch Owens (RR 8)	add "proposed Regional Road"	(244), add per current OP
11	Limebank, urban boundary to Mitch Owens (RR 8)	add "proposed Regional Road"	(244), add per current OP

## Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule E

	<b>LOCATION/ITEM</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
1	Hope Side Rd. (RR 86), Eagleson (RR 49) to Richmond (RR 59)	change from 34m to 40m	error, change per current OP
2	Fallowfield (RR 12), Eagleson (RR 49) to Richmond (RR 59)	change from 30m to 34m	error, change per current OP
3	Egleson (RR 49), Hope Side Rd. (RR 59) to Fallowfield (RR 12)	change from 30m to 34m	error, change per current OP
4	Moodie (RR 11), urban boundary to Fallowfield (RR 12)	add 34m	error, change per current OP
5	Bankfield (RR 8), Former Hwy 16 (RR 85) to Rideau Valley (RR 13)	change from 30m to 34m	error, change per current OP
6	Mitch Owens (RR 8), River Rd. (RR 19) to Former Hwy 31 (RR 85)	change from 30m to 34m	error, change per current OP
7	Russell (RR 26), Gregoire to Base Line (RR 43)	change from 30m to 34m	revise to provide consistency on RR 26
8	Former Hwy 44 (RR 49), Highway 17 to Regional boundary	add 40m	update, transfer from MTO
9	Former Hwy 31 (RR 85), urban boundary to Mitch Owens (RR 8)	add 40m	update, transfer from MTO
10	Former Hwy 16 (RR 73), urban boundary to Hwy 416	add 40m north of Mitch Owens (RR 8), 30m south of Mitch Owens	update, pending transfer from MTO
11	Former Hwy 7203 (RR 117), and Former Highway 15 (RR 118)	add 40m	update, transfer from MTO, note RR 118 owned with McNabb
12	Bankfield (RR 8), Hwy 416 to Former Hwy 16 (RR 73)	change from 30m to 34m	revise to extend 34m protection to Hwy 416 interchange
13	Innes (RR 30) Trim (RR 57) to Frank Kenny	change from 30m to 34m	(279) show 34m pending study (Trim/Frank Kenny ESR)

## Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule F

	<b>LOCATION/ITEM</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
1	Hwy 417 from SW Transitway to Eagleson Rd	realign "Future Rapid Transit Corridor - Location Defined" north of Hwy 417	error, change to show correct corridor
2	Hwy 417 between Terry Fox and Huntmar	change to "Future Rapid Transit Corridor - Location Undefined"	error, corridor subject to further study
3	Bathgate/City Park from Montreal to Blair Station	extend "Transit Priority" limits	omission, revise per TMP Transit Priority report
4	Bronson from Albert/Slater to Wellington	add "Transit Priority"	omission
5	Blair between Highway 417 and Innes	add "Transit Priority"	revise to include transit priority option
6	rail line Southeast from Train Station to "Rapid Transit Corridor - Location Undefined"	show only one future corridor in this area, i.e. show "Future Rapid Transit Corridor - Location Undefined"	change for illustrative purposes, change to show representative corridor, change does <u>not</u> imply reduced options
7	"Cumberland Transitway" from Navan Road (approx.) to Trim	add "Future Rapid Transit Corridor - Location Defined"	(279), omission
8	CP rail line at Confederation Heights	realign	(110), error

## Annex D Summary of Changes to Schedule F

	<b>LOCATION/ITEM</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
1	Scissons, Richmond north to Path	delete "others" facility	revise, considered redundant as a "primary" route given nearby "primary" route
2	Eagleson Road, south of Hope Side Rd	delete "RMOC" facility	error, logical termination of CTN
3	Merivale, Viewmount to Hunt Club	delete "RMOC" facility	error, not "primary" CTN route
4	Merivale, Hunt Club to Hwy 16	add "RMOC" facility	(303), omission, add per CTN
5	Hope Side Road, Eagleson to Richmond	add "RMOC" facility	add per TMP
6	Richmond Road, New Orchard to Churchill	delete "RMOC" facility on Richmond, add "others" facility on Byron, change east limit from Churchill to Roosevelt	(214), error, change per CTN
7	Alexandria Bridge, Murray to Provincial. boundary	add "others" facility	omission, add per CTN
8	Tenth Line, north of Hwy 17	change to "others" facility	error, change so jurisdiction consistent with Schedule C1
9	Jeanne D'arc, Champlain to Trim Road	change to "others" facility	error, change so jurisdiction consistent with Schedule C1
10	Trim, Hwy 17 to Jeanne D'arc	change to "others" facility	error, change so jurisdiction consistent with Schedule C1
11	Orleans, St Joseph to Jeanne D'arc	change to "others" facility	error, change so jurisdiction consistent with Schedule C1
12	Cleroux, Blackburn Hamlet Bypass to Innes	add "others" facility	omission, add per CTN
13	St Joseph east of Trim	add "RMOC" facility, extend to Cumberland	revise to "terminate" arrowhead now shown on CTN
14	Sunnyside, Bronson to Bank	add "others" facility	(214), add per CTN
15	Bay/Percy, Wilbrod/Stewart, etc.	clarify links	(214), clarification
16	Moodie, Carling to Corkstown	add "path"	revise to show link provided by existing path
17	Walkley, Conroy to St Laurent	add "RMOC" facility	revise to add a more direct connection, see 18
18	St. Laurent, Conroy to Walkley	delete "others" facility	revise to become secondary