1. OPENING OF MEETING

2. AGENDA
   2.1. Added Items
   2.2. Approval of Agenda

3. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST WITH REASONS

4. MINUTES
   4.2. Business arising from Minutes

5. DELEGATIONS
   5.1. 2:00 p.m. Charles Jakl re trailer agreement 111440 11th Line

6. PUBLIC MEETING (S) 4:00 p.m.
   6.1. Notice of Application - Concession B, West Part Lot 1
       6.1.1. Plan of Subdivision Application S2/14
       6.1.2. Rezoning Application Z3/14

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
   7.1. ATV By-Law
   7.2. Town of Mono Resolution of support Autism Behavior Therapies
   7.3. Rural Economic Development program resolution of support
       7.3.1. Township of Southgate
       7.3.2. Town of Shelburne

8. COUNTY COUNCIL BUSINESS
   8.1. County agenda - Public Meeting Agenda September 8, 2016
       http://www.dufferincounty.ca/government/council-and-committee-meetings/county-council
   8.2. County Council - Regular Agenda September 8, 2016
       http://www.dufferincounty.ca/government/council-and-committee-meetings/county-council
   8.3. MMM Group – Reports dated August, 2016
       8.3.1. Growth Plan Memo
       8.3.2. Greenbelt Plan
       8.3.3. Niagara Escarpment
       8.3.4. Oak Ridges Moraine
       8.3.5. Update Review Draft comment letter
   8.4. County Council minutes September 7, 2016.pdf
   8.5. Other
9. **PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT**
   9.1. Director of Public Works Report(s)
   9.2. Resolution re-allocation of funds re 2016 Budget for Works Yard paving
   9.3. OGRA Conference February 26 – March 1, 2016
   9.4. Other

10. **BILLS AND ACCOUNTS**
    10.1. Roads
    10.2. General

11. **PLANNING DEPARTMENT**
    11.1. Development Update(s)
    11.2. Source Water Protection
    11.2.1. Proposed Source Water Protection Signs resolution
    11.3. Town of Erin Notice of Public Meeting re OPA # 7
    11.4. Other

12. **COMMITTEES**
    12.1. Grand River Conservation
    12.1.1. GRCA Tree Thinning Elora Cataract Trail way
    12.2. Credit Valley Conservation Media Releases
    12.3. Upper Grand Watershed Committee Minutes February 25, 2016
    12.4. Groves Hospital Foundation 2016 Donor Appreciation Event October 13
    12.5. Other

13. **GENERAL BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE**
    13.1. OMEX Correspondence to Township of Amaranth and Press Release
    13.2. Township of Carlow/Mayo re Bill 171 Waste Collection Vehicles and Snow Plows
    13.3. Ministry of Energy re Door to Door Energy Contracts
    13.4. Other

14. **NEW BUSINESS**
    14.1. Added items (if any)
    14.2. Santa Claus Parade request for support
    14.3. Police Service Board – Motion to dissolve
    14.4. Other

15. **CLOSED MEETING(S)**

16. **BY-LAWS**

    Notice of Intention to pass the following By-Laws:
    16.1. All -terrain vehicles on Municipal Roads
    16.2. Other

17. **BULLETINS AN INFORMATION**
    17.1. Other

18. **CONFIRMING BY-LAW**

19. **ADJOURMENT**
    19.1. Next meeting **Wednesday** October 12, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.
The Council of the Township of East Garafraxa held a regular meeting of Council at the Administration Office, Laurel ON at 2:00 p.m. on August 16, 2016. Councillors Lenora Banfield, Fran Pinkney, Tom Nevills and Deputy Mayor John Stirk were in attendance with Mayor Guy Gardhouse presiding. Susan M. Stone, CAO/Clerk-Treasurer, Karen Canivet, Deputy Clerk; Dave Menary, Director of Public Works and Christine Gervais, Planner (for Planning) were also in attendance.

1. OPENING OF MEETING

2. AGENDA
   2.1. Added Items – None at this time.
   2.2. Approval of Agenda – as circulated.

3. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST WITH REASONS
   3.1. None at this time

4. MINUTES
   4.2. Business arising from Minutes – none.

5. DELEGATIONS
   5.1. 2:00 p.m. Jeff Wilker, Thomson Rogers -Closed Meeting was held pursuant to Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001 as amended for the following: A proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality or local board; Litigation of potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board; and, advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose.

   5.2. 4:00 p.m. Adrian Maes, Van Harten Surveying re OMB Appeal Con. 12, E. Pt. Lot 2 Mr. Maes attended to request Council’s support to use Township Solicitor and Staff, and provided a deposit. Motion to support applicant at the Ontario Municipal Board, subject to satisfactory financial arrangements.

6. PUBLIC MEETING (S)
   6.1. None at this time

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
   7.1. ATV By-Law report (at meeting)
       Sample by-laws from neighboring municipalities were provided to Council and following discussion, Staff were directed to prepare a by-law for the next meeting, to include hours of operation.

8. COUNTY COUNCIL BUSINESS
   8.1. County agenda
   8.2. SWIFT Media Release– Rural Internet funding award
   8.2.1. County Media Release
   8.3. Waste awards
   8.4. Draft Budget Presentation
   http://www.dufferincounty.ca/files/content-pdf/2017-budget-presention.pdf
   8.5. Integrity Commissioner
   8.5.1. Draft agreement
   8.5.2. Form
   8.6. September 7 Joint Council Meeting reminder
       Mayor Gardhouse reported on County matters. Joint meeting to review Integrity Commissioner Draft agreement and following that is Official Plan review.

9. PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
   9.1. Director of Public Works Report(s)
   9.1.1. Rubber Tire Loader discussion regarding motor issue.
9.1.2. 17th Line Paving is complete, with exception of a repair to be done shortly. Discussion regarding line painting. Council in favour of painting a solid line.

9.1.3. Drainage work will take place at the Township yard and will be resurfaced with asphalt.

9.1.4. Mayor Gardhouse has been approached by Orangeville and County regarding County Road 23 downloading. Improvements will be required.

9.2. Other

10. BILLS AND ACCOUNTS
Motion to approve as circulated.

10.1. Roads
10.2. General

11. PLANNING DEPARTMENT

11.1. Consent Application B1/16 – see Delegation 5.2
   11.1.1. Appellant Form
   11.1.2. OMB Acknowledgement

11.2. Bryan Hostrawser Barn extension – 171 nutrient units requires Council approval over 150 Nutrient units. Motion to approve carried. Discussion on reviewing this policy during Official Plan review.

11.3. Official Plan Amendment Number 4
   11.3.1. Ontario Municipal Board Decision June 27, 2016
   11.3.2. Ontario Municipal Board Decision June 16, 2016
   11.3.3. Wellings Planning Report

Wellings’ report dated August 5, 2016, indicates a Special Council Meeting as a starting meeting, followed by a Statutory Public Meeting, which will include a draft Official Plan. A Special Council Meeting requires a 45 day circulation - notice to be published once a week for two consecutive weeks, 30 days in advance. Discussion regarding timing of Council input for the Official Plan. Council indicated that the meeting be held in November, not October due to the timing, and that the meeting should be held at 7:00 p.m. Motion to proceed with Special Meeting and that the date change to November be indicated accordingly.

11.4. Permission for trailer – 111440 11th Line
Request to live in trailer while building new house. Motion to approve subject to agreement and building permit.

11.5. Tri County Aggregate
   11.5.1. Tri County acknowledgement re meeting
   11.5.2. Resident Correspondence

Joint meeting to be held September 7 to review report.

11.7. Ontario Municipal Board Review

11.8. Nature’s Landing West request re Vacant Lots Owned by Township
Discussion regarding the vacant lots and request for a park. Staff instructed to prepare a report regarding the property and provide a map to Council, including surrounding subdivisions.

11.9. Other
   11.9.1. Development Update on RSSB was provided by Jeff Wilker, Township Solicitor. Site Plan agreement could include County servicing agreement. Technical sign off on some matters still required.
   11.9.2. Public Meeting will be held for the Milone Subdivision at the next meeting of Council, September 13, 2016.
   11.9.3. Preconsultation meeting held for Business Park Industrial Park on Concession A East Part Lot 7.
   11.9.4. Discussion regarding Employment land development and reviewing uses in Employment areas during Official Plan review.

12. COMMITTEES

12.1. Grand River Conservation
   12.1.1. August 2016 Current
   12.1.2. Precautions at Belwood
12.1.3. Further water conservation Grand River watershed

12.2. Credit Valley Conservation Media Release
12.3. Dufferin OPP Q2 report
12.4. Provincial Offences Administration Q2 report
12.5. Other
   12.5.1. County Wide Fire Ban has been lifted.

13. GENERAL BUSINESS AND CORRESPONDENCE
13.1. Conservation Ontario
   13.1.1. Summary Report
   13.1.2. Full EBR Report - Link
       September 9, 2016 on deadline on commenting on EBR. Draft Amaranth motion provided.

13.2. EBR Environment Bill of Rights Ontario
13.3. Wellington Dufferin Health Unit 2015 report
13.4. Central West LHIN Community Care Funding
13.5. Report re 4H Trip
13.6. Town of Mono
   13.6.1. Appointment of new Planner
   13.6.2. Support of IBI Services resolution – motion of support for next meeting
13.7. Rural Economic Development (RED) - motion of support for next meeting
   13.7.1. Town of Kenora
   13.7.2. Township of South Stormont
   13.7.3. Municipality of Southgate
13.8. Town of Kenora Door to Door Sales
13.9. Municipality of Meaford Rural Schools Funding
13.10. Quinte West Taxation Impact on Campgrounds
13.11. Perth County re Climate Change Action Plan and Natural Gas Cap
13.13. TAPMO Meeting September 12
13.15. Other

14. NEW BUSINESS
14.1. Added items (if any)
14.3. Lions Club Flag Request – Partner with Amaranth
14.5. ROMA Program – Mayor Gardhouse will attend through County. Council to decide whether to attend OGRA or ROMA
14.6. Canada 150 Funding- forward to Orton Community Association and Lions club
14.7. Peel Dufferin Plowing Match September 1 – Mayor Gardhouse to reply.
14.8. Other
   14.8.1. Flag pole on Marsville Hall building to be replaced. Lions Club to look after.
   14.8.2. No cooking should be occurring at the hall due to Fire regulations
   14.8.3. Orton Community Association’s use of the Pavilion was discussed. Staff to review insurance and lease provisions.

15. CLOSED MEETING(S)
15.1. Advice that is subject to Solicitor Client Privilege
15.2. A proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality or local board
15.3. Litigation or potential litigation, including communications necessary for that purpose

16. BY-LAWS
Notice of Intention to pass the following By-Laws:
16.1. Other

17. BULLETINS AN INFORMATION
17.1. Other

18. CONFIRMING BY-LAW
   By-Law 19-2016 carried.

19. ADJOURMENT
19.1. Next meeting September 13, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.

The following resolutions were passed:

MOVED BY BANFIELD, SECONDED BY PINKNEY
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda be approved as circulated. CARRIED.

MOVED BY NEVILLS, SECONDED BY STIRK
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the minutes of the regular Council Meeting held June 21, 2016 be adopted as circulated. CARRIED.

MOVED BY NEVILLS, SECONDED BY STIRK
BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council move to a Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, as amended for the following reason(s):

: A proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality or local board
: Litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board
: Advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose CARRIED.

MOVED BY PINKNEY, SECONDED BY BANFIELD
BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council do now rise and report from Closed Meeting, and resume regular business. CARRIED.

MOVED BY NEVILLS, SECONDED BY BANFIELD
BE IT RESOLVED THAT Township Council accepts the report of the Township Solicitor with respect to Greenwood OMB Litigation and directs him, together with the CAO, to proceed accordingly. CARRIED.

MOVED BY PINKNEY, SECONDED BY BANFIELD
BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council receive the Appeal of Consent Application B1/16 and instruct staff to forward to the Ontario Municipal Board. CARRIED.

MOVED BY STIRK, SECONDED BY NEVILLS
BE IT RESOLVED THAT Whereas Lesley Hughes applied for a consent under File No, B-1/16 which Township Council approved; And Whereas Chris O’Brien-Curtin has appealed the consent to the Ontario Municipal Board for hearing and determination;

And Whereas Lesley Hughes has requested that Township Council authorize the attendance and participation at the hearing by the Township Planner and the Township Solicitor in support of Council’s decision granting the consent;

Now Therefore, Township Council so authorizes the Township Planner and Township Solicitor to attend and call the Township case at the hearing, subject to satisfactory financial arrangements being made with the Township Treasurer by Lesley Hughes so that pursuant to standard Township municipal practice the applicant is responsible for covering all costs incurred by the Township in preparing for and attending the hearing. CARRIED.

MOVED BY PINKNEY, SECONDED BY BANFIELD
BE IT RESOLVED THAT The Planning Report of Wellings Planning Consultants Inc., dated August 5, 2016 regarding Phase Two of the Township of East Garafraxa Official Plan Review be received;

AND THAT Staff be authorized to continue with the Phase Two Official Plan review process, including setting a schedule for public process in 2016/2017 in accordance with section 17 and 26 of the Planning Act.
AND FURTHER THAT a copy of this report be forwarded to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) and Dufferin County.

MOVED BY BANFIELD, SECONDED BY PINKNEY

BE IT RESOLVED THAT In accordance with Official Plan Section 7.1 Agricultural Livestock Operations, and pursuant to Site Plan Control By-law 8-2007, Council hereby approve Site Plan for Bryho Farms Inc. for Chicken Barn expansion at Concession 9, West Part Lot 22.

CARRIED.

MOVED BY NEVILLS, SECONDED BY STIRK

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council grant permission for a Trailer on Concession 11, East part Lot 8 for a period of 1 year, while new house being built subject to the owners entering into an agreement, payment of deposit and fees, and obtaining building permit.

CARRIED.

MOVED BY BANFIELD, SECONDED BY NEVILLS

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Bills and Accounts be paid in the amount of:
General $1,185,944.75
Roads $ 736,269.67

CARRIED.

MOVED BY PINKNEY, SECONDED BY BANFIELD

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council do accept the 2016 Municipal Insurance renewal for the Ostic Group / Cowan Insurance in the amount of $66,046.28 plus applicable taxes.

CARRIED.

MOVED BY STIRK, SECONDED BY NEVILLS

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council hereby authorize the lease of a new Postage machine per proposal dated August 16, 2016 from Pitney Bowes, for a 5 year lease to be shared with the Township of Amaranth.

CARRIED.

MOVED BY BANFIELD, SECONDED BY PINKNEY

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Leave be given to introduce a by-law to confirm the regular meeting of Council of the Township of East Garafraxa for August 16, 2016 and that it be given the necessary readings and be passed and numbers 19-2016.

CARRIED.

MOVED BY STIRK, SECONDED BY NEVILLS

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council now adjourn to meet again Tuesday, September 13, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. for regular meeting, or at the call of the Mayor.

CARRIED.

____________________________________                 _________________________________
Susan M. Stone, CAO/Clerk                 Guy Gardhouse, Mayor
Dear Mr. Jakl

Your request regarding attendance at the September 13\textsuperscript{th} Council meeting has been forwarded to me for response.

I will put you on the agenda for 2:00 p.m. at which time you can discuss amending your Trailer Agreement to allow you to use a full size trailer/motor home instead of the camper trailer, due to winter conditions. The Agreement will set out similar conditions as the one you have already signed, and will require the same fees and security; however, the condition about ceasing occupancy within a year will now have to read that removal of the trailer is also required.

With respect to your application for a Garden Suite, please note that this is not a primary use, and therefore, it is premature for the application to go forward until such time as you have built your new home and are occupying same, and have removed the existing house pursuant to your Demolition Permit.

Development Charges are set pursuant to Bylaw 23-2014, and applies to all residential development of all lands, buildings and structures within the Corporate limits of the Corporation of the Township of East Garafraxa. Section 3 c) of Part II states that Subsection (2) shall not apply to lands where a dwelling unit that existed and was used on the lands within 36 months of the enactment of the bylaw is being replaced. You would have to provide evidence that the existing house was used as a residence within that timeframe in order to be exempt.

If you have any further questions, please contact either Christine or myself.

Sue

\textit{Susan M. Stone, A.M.C.T.  
CAO/Clerk-Treasurer  
Township of Amaranth  
Township of East Garafraxa  
suestone@amaranth-eastgary.ca  
519-941-1007 ext. 227}

\textit{Christine Gervais, MCIP, RPP, Township Planner  
Township of Amaranth & Township of East Garafraxa  
Tel.: 519-941-1007 | Email: cgervais@amaranth-eastgary.ca}

From: Charlie Jakl \mailto{eilrahcjakl@gmail.com}
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 3:16 PM
To: Christine Gervais \mailto{cgervais@amaranth-eastgary.ca}
Subject: Hey Christine Meeting September 13 and my request attached.

Hey Christine I did a letter asking counsel about my concerns can you take a minute and read it and I would ask that you bring the request for the granny suite to the meeting. I am going take the day off to be there to answer any questions they might have and then I can have any input on it all. Please notify them that I will be there. I hope that we can move forward on all this. You did say that if I would have started earlier on the project I wouldn't be running into any issues like I am having, I agree, but unfortunately I was not able to purchase the property till July 28th and that's the first unavoidable delay. Can you email me the time the meeting starts and where it is would be.
Thank you again for all your help
NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF COMPLETE APPLICATIONS & NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING FOR A PROPOSED ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT AND DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION

A Public Meeting will be held at the Administration Office, to consider the following applications for an amendment to the Township of East Garafraxa Zoning By-Law and Draft Plan of Subdivision.

Application Numbers: Z3/14 and S2/14
Subdivision File 22T-142514

Council Meeting: September 13, 2016 at Administration Office 374028 6th Line, Amaranth, at 4:00pm

Owner: 1266952 Ontario Limited

Applicant: Mathews Planning & Management Ltd./ Dave Mathews

Location: Concession B, West Part Lot 1  
Area: 24 hectares (60 acres)

Purpose: To develop a proposed estate residential subdivision consisting of 12 residential lots, an internal road, a park and open space block.

PUBLIC MEETING: You are entitled to attend this public hearing in person to express your views about the proposed Zoning By-law amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision or you may be represented by counsel for that purpose. If you wish to make written comments, they may be forwarded to the Clerk-Treasurer at the address shown above. A copy of the applications and supporting documents are available for review at the Administration Office, during regular office hours.

FAILURE TO ATTEND HEARING: If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Council of Township of East Garafraxa in respect of the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment or Draft Plan of Subdivision before Council gives or refuses to give approval to the application(s), the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the Township of East Garafraxa to the Ontario Municipal Board.

If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Council of the Township of East Garafraxa in respect to of the Zoning By-Law amendment or Draft Plan of Subdivision before the Council gives or refuses to give approval to the application(s), the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

DECISION: If you wish to be notified of the Decision in respect of Zoning By-law amendment or Draft Plan of Subdivision, you must submit a written request to the Township of East Garafraxa. This will also entitle you to be advised of a possible Ontario Municipal Board Hearing. If you wish to appeal to the OMB, a copy of an appeal form is available from the OMB website at www.omb.gov.on.ca. The form must be submitted to the municipality or approval authority within the allotted 20 day period, with applicable fee by certified cheque or money order.

For illustration purposes only. This is not a plan of survey.

Dated: August 24, 2016
Susan M. Stone, AMCT
CAO/Clerk – Treasurer
TOWNSHIP OF EAST GARAFRAXA
1. Application Information

- **Name of owner(s).** An owner's authorization is required in Section 17.1, if applicant is not the owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of owner(s)</th>
<th>Home telephone</th>
<th>Business telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1266952 Ontario Limited</td>
<td>519-217-6946</td>
<td>519-217-6946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Postal code</th>
<th>Fax no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Brookhaven Crescent, East Garafraxa</td>
<td>L9W 7L9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **E-mail address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-mail address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sdmilone@rogers.com">sdmilone@rogers.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Agent/Applicant - Name of the person to be contacted about the application, if different than the owner. (This may be a person or firm acting on behalf of the owner.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of contact person</th>
<th>Home telephone</th>
<th>Business telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Matthews MCIP,RPP</td>
<td>416-565-7480</td>
<td>905-274-1047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Postal code</th>
<th>Fax no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1470 Hurontario Street, Mississauga ON</td>
<td>L5G 3H4</td>
<td>905-274-1337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **E-mail address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-mail address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mattplan@pathcom.com">mattplan@pathcom.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Name of owner(s) of the sub-surface rights if different from the surface rights owner(s)

same as owner

2. Description/Location of the Subject Land (complete applicable boxes in section 2.1)

- **Upper-Tier/District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County of Dufferin</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Former municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Garafraxa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Geographic township**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concession number(s)</th>
<th>Lot number(s)</th>
<th>Registered plan no.</th>
<th>Lot(s)/block(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'B'</td>
<td>Part of Lot 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Reference plan no.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part number(s)</th>
<th>Parcel number(s)</th>
<th>Name of street/road</th>
<th>Street no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'A' Line</td>
<td></td>
<td>471045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Are there any easements or restrictive covenants affecting the subject land?**

Yes ☐ No ☑

If yes, describe each easement(s) or covenant(s) and its effect. Use a separate page if necessary.

3. Designation of Lands / Current and Proposed Land Use

- **Name of the official plan**

  Township of East Garafraxa Official Plan

- **The current designation(s) of the subject land in the applicable official plan(s)**

  Single-lot

  Lower-tier Estate Residential

  Upper-tier N/A

  Planning board
3.2 What is the present zoning, if any, of the subject land?  
Rural

3.3 If the land is covered by a Minister's Zoning Order (MZO), what is the regulation number?  
NO

3.4 If the land is covered by a MZO, what uses are permitted by the order?  
NO

3.5 What is the current use of the subject land?  
Residential Dwelling and Aircraft Hanger (now Vacant)

3.6 What are the surrounding land uses?  
West  Existing Estate Residential and Estate Residential under construction
North  Existing Estate Residential and Environmentally Sensitive lands
South  Vacant (designated for Estate Residential use (OP)

3.7 Check whether this application is for approval of:  
Plan of Subdivision or Condominium Description.

Indicate below the type of condominium proposed.  
Standard Amalgamations Vacant Land Phased Common Elements Leasehold

3.8 Complete Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Land Use</th>
<th>Number of Units or Dwellings</th>
<th>Number of Lots and/or Blocks on the Draft Plan</th>
<th>Area (ha.)</th>
<th>Density (Units/Dwellings per ha.)</th>
<th>Number of Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Dетached</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>3.13 uph(gross)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi detached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Reserve</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWM Pond</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/Den/Reserves</td>
<td>nll</td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>nll</td>
<td>nll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Road</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Complete only if for approval of condominium description
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### Previous/Former Uses of Site and Adjacent Land (History)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Has there been an industrial or commercial use, or an orchard, on the subject land or adjacent land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, specify the uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong> (former owner created private airstrip)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Has the grading of the subject land been changed by adding earth or other material(s)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong> (former owner created private airstrip)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Has a gas station been located on the subject land or adjacent land at any time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Has there been petroleum or other fuel stored on the subject land or adjacent land?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong> (2 x 910 litre oil storage tanks for heating oil (see Ph. 1 ESA))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13 Is there reason to believe the subject land may have been contaminated by former uses on the site or adjacent site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14 What information did you use to determine the answers to the above questions on former uses?</td>
<td>Previous owner and Phase 1 ESA Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.15** If yes to any of (3.9), (3.10), (3.11), (3.12), or (3.13), an inventory of previous uses of the subject land or, if appropriate, of the adjacent land(s), is needed.

Is the inventory of previous uses attached? Yes [No] Not necessary

**3.16** If yes to (3.9), (3.10), (3.11), (3.12), (3.13) or (3.14), was an Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) conducted under the Environmental Assessment Act or has a Record of Site Condition (RSC) been filed? Refer to Appendix 2.

**Yes** No If no, why not? Explain on a separate page, if necessary.

**Phase 1 ESA Attached**

### 4. Consultation with the Planning Approval Authority / Municipality / Planning Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Has there been consultation with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) prior to submitting this application?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong> If yes, and if known, indicate the file number file # not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Have you consulted with the municipality/planning board on the application's conformity to the official plan?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, attach a letter/documentation from the municipality/planning board on the proposal's conformity to the official plan. Attached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Have you discussed with the municipality/planning board the official plan 'submission requirements for a plan of subdivision/completion?'</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Have you provided with this application a list, together with the related materials, of the submission requirements identified in the official plan? (All materials required in the official plan for complete application must be provided when submitting an application.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong> No Attached If no, why not? Please explain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of supporting studies in attached Planning Justification Report
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5. Additional Information for Condominium Applications Only

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. General information for all types of condominium</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Has a site plan for the proposed condominium been approved?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Has a site plan agreement been entered into?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Has a building permit for the proposed condominium been issued?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Has construction of the development started?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 If construction is completed, indicate the date of completion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Is the building currently occupied?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Is this a conversion of a building containing rental residential units?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, indicate the number of units to be converted, ________ units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 Has the municipality approved the conversion?</td>
<td>Attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, attach a council resolution to this effect from the municipality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Information specific to each type of condominium apart from the standard condominium

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.9 Amalgamations (where two or more corporations may amalgamate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include the following with your application: a plan showing the relationship of the condominiums to be amalgamated; the ministry file numbers; the approval dates; and any other relevant information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10 Vacant Land (condominium in which each owner may decide what type of structure, if any, will be built on his or her lot.) This kind of development may, for example, be suitable for a mobile home development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include information on the proposed servicing and the status of required permits, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.11 Phased (condominium development which will allow a single condominium to be built in phases.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a summary outline of the number of units and common elements to be developed in each specific phase and any common elements that would be available in subsequent phases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.12 Common Elements (condominium with the following features: the common elements are defined; the land is not divided into units; the homes could be freehold; facilities such as a recreational centre or roads and sewers could be common elements.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a map showing the freehold properties outside the specific condominium site. Identify common elements and property ownerships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.13 Leasehold (condominium where the initial term of the lease of the land must be from 40-99 years and the leasehold unit owner could sell the unit without the consent of the landlord.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a separate page, provide information on what happens at the end of the lease period. Include dates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Provincial Plans

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Is the subject land for the proposed development located within an area of land designated in any provincial plan (Example: Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, the Greenbelt Plan, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, the Parkway Belt West Plan, the Niagara Escarpment Plan, or the Central Pickering Development Plan)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 If yes, identify which provincial plan(s) and explain the current designation(s) of the subject land(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Attached Planning Justification Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 If yes, does the proposal conform/not conflict with the policies contained in the provincial plan(s)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please explain. Attach a separate page, if necessary. Submit a copy of a planning report, if applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Justification Report enclosed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Is the subject land the subject of a proposed amendment to a provincial plan?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what is the applicable provincial plan? Specify the file number and status of the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7. Status of Current and Other Applications under the Planning Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Has the subject land ever been the subject of a planning application, including applications before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), for approval of either: Amendment to the Official Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If yes and if known, indicate i) file number and ii) status of the application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan of Subdivision</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If yes and if known, indicate i) file number and ii) status of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If yes and if known, indicate i) file number and ii) status of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If yes and if known, indicate i) file number and ii) status of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning By-law Amendment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If yes and if known, indicate i) file number and ii) status of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If yes and if known, indicate i) file number and ii) status of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister's Zoning Order Amendment and the Ontario Regulation number</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If yes and if known, indicate i) file number, and ii) status of the request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Please provide list(s) of the relevant applications on a separate page and attach it to this form. For those applications before the OMB, provide the OMB file number and the status of appeal.

8. Provincial Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Is the proposed development consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) issued under subsection 3(1) of the Planning Act?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(See Appendix 2 for more information on the PPS.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Explain how the application is consistent with the PPS. Attach a separate page if necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td>See enclosed Planning Justification Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Has a site assessment been carried out by a qualified person to determine if natural heritage features exist on or within 120 metres of the subject property?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Have any studies been completed to assess the impacts of the proposed development on any existing natural heritage features and adjacent lands?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.5 Table B is a checklist (not a substitute for the PPS) to assist in identifying areas of provincial interest that may apply to your application. Please check the appropriate boxes in Table B in Appendix 1.

The last column is additional information associated with each feature or development circumstance that may be needed to process an application. Applicants are encouraged to submit supporting documentation with the application.

9. Housing Affordability

9.1 For applications that include permanent housing, complete Table C – Housing Affordability.

For each type of housing and unit size, complete the rest of the row. If lots are to be sold as vacant lots, indicate the lot frontage.

Information should be based on the best information available at the time of application. If additional space is needed, attach a separate page.

### Table C – Housing Affordability

For example: semi-detached – 10 units; 1000 sq. ft./3.5 metres, $140,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Unit Size and/or Lot Frontage</th>
<th>Estimated Selling Price/Rent</th>
<th>Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) Average Price /Rent for Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Detached</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Varies 30m–36m</td>
<td>+/- $50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lhen/Semi-detached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row or townhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types or multiples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2 What is the municipality/planning board’s minimum target, or provincial target established in a provincial plan, for the provision of housing which is affordable to low and moderate income households? No known targets

9.3 What is the municipality/planning board’s development standards for residential intensification, redevelopment and new residential development? Incorporated in Twp. zoning by-law

9.4 Explain how the proposed development would assist in:

i) achieving the municipality/planning board’s targets for residential intensification and redevelopment; and

ii) implementing the municipality/planning board’s development standards and policies for residential intensification and redevelopment.

Attach a separate page if necessary.

See attached Planning Justification Report

9.5 Is there any other information that may relate to the affordability of the proposed housing or the type of housing needs served by the proposal? Yes [ ] No [X] If yes, please explain in Section 15.1 or attach a separate page.
10. Archaeology

10.1 Does the subject land contain any known archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential? Yes No
   If yes, does the plan propose to develop lands within the subject lands that contain:
     o known archaeological resources? Yes No
     o areas of archaeological potential? Yes No

10.2 If yes to 10.1, the following reports must be prepared:
   a) an archaeological assessment that is prepared by a person who holds a licence that is effective with respect to the subject land and
      issued under Part 6 (Conservation of Resources of Archaeological Value) of the Ontario Heritage Act; and
   b) a conservation plan for any archaeological resources identified in the assessment.

   Titles of reports:
   Archaeological Assessment
   Amick Consultants Limited (June 2013)
   (enclosed)

10.3 Are the reports attached? Yes No If no, discuss the reasons with the regional MSO.

Notes: 1. Archaeological resources include artifacts, archaeological sites and marine archaeological site. Refer to the PPS for the definition.
        2. Areas of archaeological potential means areas with the likelihood to contain archaeological resources. Refer to the PPS for the definition.

11. Servicing

11.1 Indicate in a) and b) below the proposed type of servicing for the subject land. Select from Table D the appropriate type of servicing. Provide/attach a separate page with the names of the relevant servicing information and/or reports indicated in Table D and as requested in c) below.

   a) In Table D, select the relevant boxes in the right column.
      Indicate the proposed type of sewage disposal system – whether sewage disposal will be provided to the subject land by a publicly owned and operated sanitary sewage system, a privately owned and operated individual or communal septic system, or other means?
      Privately owned individual septic systems

   b) In Table D, select the relevant boxes in the right column.
      Indicate the proposed type of water supply system – whether water will be provided to the subject land by a publicly owned and operated piped water system, a privately owned and operated individual or communal well, a lake or other water body or other means?
      Privately owned and operated individual wells

   c) Provide a list of available servicing reports/information Attached
   d) Have these reports been submitted with your application? Yes No
      Indicate on the list the reports that are included with the application. Included

11.2 Hauled Sewage
   If development is proposed on a privately owned and operated individual or communal septic system, provide confirmation that there is adequate reserve sewage treatment capacity for hauled sewage resulting from the proposed development. Refer to Table D below.

11.3 Is there municipal support for the allocation of uncommitted reserve servicing capacity to the subject application?
   Sewage Yes No
   Water Yes No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Servicing</th>
<th>Reports/Information Required [select appropriate boxes where applicable]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewage Disposal</td>
<td>a) Publicly owned and operated sanitary sewage system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Applicants must provide evidence in their application that there is municipal confirmation of sufficient uncommitted reserve sewage system capacity to service the development at the time of draft approval. The reserve sewage system capacity shall also include treatment capacity for hauled sewage from individual on-site sewage systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Public communal septic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Development of five or more lots/units would require a servicing options report¹ and a hydrogeological report².</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Development of less than five lots/units and generating effluent of more than 4,500 litres per day would require a servicing options report¹ and a hydrogeological report².</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Privately owned and operated individual septic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Development of five or more lots/units would require a servicing options report¹ and a hydrogeological report².</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Development of less than five lots/units and generating effluent of more than 4,500 litres per day would require a servicing options report¹ and a hydrogeological report².</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Privately owned and operated communal septic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Development of less than five lots/units and generating effluent of 4,500 litres or less per day would require a hydrogeological report². Hydrogeological Report enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be described by applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauled Sewage</td>
<td>□ If development is proposed on privately owned and operated individual or communal septic systems, applicant must provide evidence in the application showing either:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ i) Municipal confirmation of sufficient uncommitted reserve sewage system capacity, at the time of draft approval, for treatment of septage resulting from the proposed development, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ ii) Confirmation (i.e., letter) from a commercial enterprise (private provider) for hauled sewage (septage) indicating that capacity is available, at the time of draft approval, to accommodate the specific proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>a) Publicly owned and operated piped water system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants must provide evidence in their application that there is municipal confirmation of sufficient reserve water system capacity to service the development at the time of draft approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Privately owned and operated individual well(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ A communal or individual well system for the development of more than five lots/units would require a servicing options report¹ and a hydrogeological report². Hydrogeological Report enclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Privately owned and operated communal well(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Lake or other water body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Permit to Take Water may be required. Contact your regional Municipal Services Office for guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be described by applicant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. To facilitate review of the application - submit a letter from the municipality to show concurrence (or not) with the recommendations in the servicing options report.
2. Before undertaking a hydrogeological report, consult with MMAH about the assessment required given the nature and location of the proposal. Where communal services are proposed (water and/or sewage), ownership of these services must be assumed by the municipality or a public body through a signed letter of acceptance.

Other notes: See attached Appendix 2 for more information.

- To facilitate review of the application, submit a letter from the local health unit indicating that the site is developable and could accommodate the proposal.
- A Building Permit is required for septic systems under Part B of the Building Code.
- A certificate of approval is required from the Ministry of the Environment for sewage systems generating more than 10,000 litres of effluent per day.
- Permit to Take Water is required for water taking of more than 50,000 litres of surface and/or ground water per day.
- Servicing projects that require a Class EA under the Environmental Assessment Act should be discussed early with your regional Municipal Services Office and the Ministry of the Environment office.
- Satisfying policy requirements comes first; technical studies and any other requirements are to assist in meeting the policy.
12. Access

12.1 Indicate below in a) and b) the proposed access to the subject land. Note the information that may be required, as indicated in Table E below.

- a) The proposed road access would be by: Provincial highway, Municipal road maintained all year.

- b) Is water access proposed? Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, on a separate page, describe the parking and docking facilities to be used, and the approximate distance of these facilities from the subject land and the nearest public road access. Attached.

13. Stormwater Management/Drainage

13.1 Indicate in a) below the proposed type of stormwater management for the subject land. Functional Servicing/Stormwater Report enclosed.

- a) The proposed stormwater management would be by: Sewers, Ditches, Swales, Other.

- b) Is the stormwater management report attached? Yes ☐ No ☐ If not attached as a separate report, in what report can it be found?

14. Garbage Disposal

14.1 Describe the available or proposed garbage disposal for the proposed development.

Municipal collection.

---

Table E – Road/Water Access and Stormwater Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Reports /Information Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Sewers</td>
<td>i) A stormwater management plan is recommended, and should be prepared concurrently with any hydro-geological report for submission with the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Ditches, c) Swales, d) Other</td>
<td>ii) A stormwater management plan may be needed prior to final approval of a plan of subdivision or prior to site plan approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Provincial highway</td>
<td>Application to MTO for an Access Permit should be made prior to submitting this application (See Appendix 2). An Access Permit is required from MTO prior to commencing development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Municipal or other public road maintained all year</td>
<td>Detailed road alignment and access will be confirmed when the development application is made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Municipal road maintained seasonally</td>
<td>Subdivision or condominium development is not usually permitted on seasonally maintained roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Right of way</td>
<td>Access by right of ways and private roads are not usually permitted, except as part of a condominium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Access</td>
<td>A letter is required from the owner(s) of a commercially operated parking and docking facility indicating that capacity is available to accommodate the specific proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Other Information

15.1 Is there any other information that may be useful to the ministry in reviewing this development proposal (e.g., information relating to housing affordability, requirements and policies in the municipal official plan, or efforts made to resolve outstanding objections or concerns by area resident(s), the municipality, other)?  NO

If so, explain below or attach a separate page with this information.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

15.2 The original or certified copy of any other information and materials, as required by the official plan of the municipality/planning board, must be provided with this application.

________________________________________________________________________

15.3 Where applicable and relevant information is available in a planning report submitted to council, or in a technical study/report(s) prepared for the proposal, please provide the name, section and page number if you have referenced the study/report(s) in any of the questions above.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

16. Affidavit or Sworn Declaration

I, __________ DAVID MATTHEWS __________ of the CITY OF MISSISSAUGA __________

(name) (municipality)

in the province of ONTARIO, make oath and say (or solemnly declare) that the

information required under Schedule 1 to Ontario Regulation 544/06 and provided by the applicant in this

application is accurate, and that the information contained in the documents that accompany this application is accurate.

Sworn (or declared) before me at the City of Mississauga in the Region of Peel __________

(lower-tier municipality) (upper-tier municipality)

on this __________ 17th day of July __________ 2014 __________

Brian David Johnston, a Commissioner, etc.
Regional Municipality of Peel, for
Matthews Planning & Management Ltd.
Expires February 15, 2015.
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17. **Authorizations**

If the applicant is not the owner of the land that is the subject of this application, the written authorization of the owner that the applicant is authorized to make the application must be included with this form or the authorization set out below must be completed.

**17.1 Authorization of Owner for Agent to Make the Application**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1266952 Ontario Limited</th>
<th>am the owner of the land that is the subject of this application for approval of a plan of subdivision (or condominium description) and authorize MATTHEWS PLANNING &amp; MANAGEMENT LTD. to make this application on my behalf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Signature of Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2014</td>
<td>S. Milone ASO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the applicant is not the owner of the land that is the subject of this application, complete the authorization of the owner concerning personal information set out below.

**17.2 Authorization of Owner for Agent to Provide Personal Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1266952 Ontario Limited</th>
<th>am the owner of the land that is the subject of this application for approval of a plan of subdivision (or condominium description) and for the purposes of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. I authorize MATTHEWS PLANNING &amp; MANAGEMENT LTD. as my agent for this application, to provide any of my personal information that will be included in this application or collected during the processing of the application.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Signature of Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2014</td>
<td>S. Milone ASO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **Consent of the Owner**

Complete the consent of the owner concerning personal information set out below.

**Consent of the Owner to the Use and Disclosure of Personal Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1266952 Ontario Limited</th>
<th>am the owner of the land that is the subject of this application for approval of a plan of subdivision (or condominium description) and for the purposes of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. I authorize and consent to the use by, or the disclosure to, any person or public body of any personal information that is collected under the authority of the Planning Act for the purposes of processing this application.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Signature of Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2014</td>
<td>S. Milone ASO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. **Submission of Application**

- Date of application to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

---

20. **Applicant’s Checklist:**

   Have you remembered to:

   i) Attach:

   - Eight copies of the completed application form? (ensure you have a copy for yourself)
   - Twelve copies, at a minimum, of the draft plan?
   - Twelve copies of the draft plan on 8½” x 11” paper?
   - Eight copies each of the reports as indicated in the application form?
   - The required fee, either a certified cheque or money order, payable to the Minister of Finance?

   ii) Check that the application form is signed and dated by the owner/agent?

   **Note:** Submission of digital report(s)/electronic copies is encouraged but this does not replace the ministry’s requirement for hard copies.

   **Forward Complete Application to:**

   - Municipal Services Office of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
   - Please see the attached map for geographic areas of coverage for each Municipal Services Office (MSO). Refer to Page 1 for the address of each MSO.
APPENDIX 1

Table B below is a checklist (not a substitute for the PPS) to assist in identifying areas of provincial interest that may apply to your application. Please check (✓) the appropriate boxes in Table B, where applicable.

The last column is additional information associated with each feature or development circumstance which may be needed to process an application.

Applicants are encouraged to submit supporting documentation with the application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Circumstances OR Feature of Interest to the Province</th>
<th>a) If a feature/land use, is it on site or within 500 metres? OR b) If a development circumstance, does it apply?</th>
<th>If a feature/land use, specify distance from site (in metres)</th>
<th>Additional information that may be needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 industry(^3)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>If sensitive land use is proposed within 70 m from the boundary lines, a noise/odour/particulate study will be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2 industry(^3)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>If sensitive land use is proposed within 300 m from the boundary lines, a noise/odour/particulate study or other studies will be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3 industry(^3)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>If sensitive land use is proposed within 1000 m from the boundary lines, an assessment of the full range of impacts and mitigation measures will be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill site(s); closed/active landfill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>If sensitive land use is proposed, and if within 500 m of the perimeter of the fill area, studies including leachate and groundwater impacts, noise, methane gas control, odour, vermin and other impacts will be needed. The proponent may also be requested to provide other information such as age and size of landfill site; type of waste disposed on site; projected life of site; size of buffer area; amount of truck traffic per day, etc. If proposal is on a closed landfill that is 25 years old or less, approval under Section 48 of the Environmental Protection Act is required and should be obtained prior to any Planning Act approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sewage treatment plant and waste stabilization pond | N/A | | Need for a noise/odour/feasibility study if the proposal is for a sensitive land use and the property line is within:
- 100 m from the periphery of the noise/odour-producing source structure of a sewage treatment plant (STP) producing less than 500 cubic metres of effluent per day; or
- 150 m from the periphery of the noise/odour-producing source structure of a STP producing greater than 25,000 cubic metres of effluent per day; or
- 400 m from the boundary line of a waste stabilization pond. |
| Provincial highway | N/A | | Consult with the Ministry of Transportation in order to assess whether direct access to the provincial highway will be permitted. If so, permits will be required for all proposed buildings/land use and entrances within the permit control area in accordance with the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act. If the proposal is located in proximity to a provincial highway, a traffic impact study and a stormwater management report would be required by the Ministry of Transportation. |
| Development | a) If a feature/land use, is it on site or | | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstances OR Features of Interest to the Province</th>
<th>within 500 metres? OR b) If a development circumstance, does it apply?</th>
<th>specify distance from site (in metres)</th>
<th>Additional information that may be needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airports where Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) or Noise Exposure Projection (NEP) greater than 30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>If the proposal is to redevelop existing residential uses and other sensitive land uses, or infill of residential and other sensitive land uses in areas above 30 NEP/NEP, assess feasibility of proposal by demonstrating no negative impacts on the long-term function of the airport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active railway lines and major highways</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>A noise feasibility study may be needed to determine possible noise impacts and appropriate mitigation measures if sensitive land use is proposed within: • 500 m of a main railway line or of any provincial highway; • 250 m of a secondary railway; • 100 m of other railways or a freeway right of way; and • 50 m of a provincial highway right-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity generating station, hydro transformers, railway yards, etc.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>If a sensitive land use is proposed, and if within 1000 metres, a noise study may be needed to determine possible noise impacts and appropriate mitigation measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High voltage electric transmission line</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Consult the appropriate electric power service/utility for required buffer/separation distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, other infrastructure, utility and hydro corridors</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>For all corridors, demonstrate that the proposed development in planned corridors would not preclude or negatively affect the use of the corridor for the purpose(s) for which it was identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural operations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>If development is proposed outside of a settlement area, it must comply with the Minimum Distance Separation Formulea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral mining operations and petroleum resource operations and known petroleum resources</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>If within 1000 m, demonstrate that development and activities would: • not preclude or hinder the expansion of existing operations, or their continued use, or establishment of new resource operations, or access to the resources; • not be incompatible for reasons of public health, public safety or environmental impacts; OR • serve a greater long-term public interest if the resource use is not feasible, and • address issues of public health, public safety and environmental impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral aggregate operations, and known deposits of mineral aggregate resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If a sensitive land use is proposed, a feasibility study is needed to determine noise, dust/particulate and hydrogeology if within: • 1000 m of the property boundary line (or licensed area) of any land designated for or an existing pit, or • 1000 m of the property boundary line (or licensed area) of any land designated for or an existing quarry. If within 1000 m of a known deposit of sand and gravel or a bedrock resource, the applicant needs to demonstrate that development and activities would: • not preclude or hinder the expansion of existing operations, or their continued use, or establishment of new resource operations or access to the resources; • not be incompatible for reasons of public health, public safety or environmental impacts; or • serve a greater long-term public interest if the resource use is not feasible, and • address issues of public health, public safety and environmental impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development Circumstances OR Features of Interest a) If a feature/land use, is it on site or within 500 metres? OR b) If a development, specify distance from site (in metres) | Additional information that may be needed |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>to the Province</th>
<th>circumstance, does it apply?</th>
<th>metres</th>
<th>Development and site alteration are not permitted in these features. Are any significant wetlands, significant coastal wetlands or unevaluated wetlands present on the subject lands or within 120 m? Are any known significant habitats present on the subject lands or within 50 m? Has there been preliminary site assessment to identify whether potentially significant habitats are present?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant wetlands in Ecoregions 5E, 6E and 7E; Significant coastal wetlands; Significant habitat of endangered species and threatened species</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development and site alterations are not permitted in the feature, unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions. Are any significant wetlands, significant coastal wetlands or unevaluated wetlands present on the subject lands or within 120 m?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant wetlands in the Canadian Shield north of Ecoregions 5E, 6E and 7E</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development and site alteration are not permitted in the feature unless no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions have been demonstrated. Are any significant woodlands, significant valleylands, significant wildlife habitat, and Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs) on the subject lands or within 50 m? If yes to the above, an environmental impact study may be needed. Consult with the regional Municipal Services Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant woodlands and valleylands south and east of the Canadian Shield; Significant wildlife habitat; Significant Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development and site alteration are not permitted in fish habitat except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements. Is any fish habitat on the subject lands or within 15 m? Is any lake trout lake on the subject lands or within 30 m? If yes to the above, an environmental impact study may be needed. Consult with Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing early in the planning proposal stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development and site alteration are not permitted on adjacent lands to natural heritage features unless: the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated; and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent lands to natural heritage features and areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development and site alteration are restricted in or near sensitive surface water features and sensitive groundwater features. Demonstrate suitable mitigation measures and/or alternative development approaches to protect, improve or restore sensitive surface water features, sensitive groundwater features and their hydrologic functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive surface water features and sensitive groundwater features</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>For all plans of subdivision/condominium proposals, a stormwater management plan or an assessment is generally required to determine potential impacts on water quality and quantity. If the proposal is adjacent to a water body such as a lake or stream, wetland, spring, or ground water recharge area, an impact assessment on the water body may be needed. Development adjacent to a lake trout lake must address other requirements. Consult with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing early in the planning stage. The province has particular interests in lake trout lakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality and quantity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Information that may be needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* See Attached technical reports by Dougan & Associates and Terraprobe regarding above matters
| **Cultural heritage and archaeology** | **Assessment attached** | Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved; adverse impacts on these resources are to be mitigated. Development and site alteration shall only be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential if significant archaeological resources have been conserved by removal and documentation, or by preservation on site. Where significant archaeological resources must be preserved on site, only development and site alteration which maintain the heritage integrity of the site may be permitted. Development and site alteration may be permitted on adjacent lands to protected heritage property if it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved. Mitigation measures and/or alternative development approaches may be required in order to conserve the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property affected by proposed adjacent development or site alteration. |
| **Human-made hazards**¹ including mine hazards, mineral aggregate operations and high forest fire hazards | N/A | Development proposed on abutting or adjacent to lands affected by mine hazards, oil, gas and oil and gas hazards, or former mineral mining operations, mineral aggregate operations, or petroleum resource operations may be permitted only if rehabilitation measures to address and mitigate known or suspected hazards are under-way or have been completed. Are the subject lands on or within 75 m of existing un-decommissioned oil and gas works? Are the subject lands on or within 1000 m of a salt solution mining well? Are the subject lands within 300 m of an abandoned pit or 500 m of an abandoned quarry? Demonstrate how the hazard(e) will be addressed. |
| **Mine hazards, former mining operations, or rehabilitated and abandoned mine sites** | N/A | If proposal is on, adjacent to, or within 1000 m of mine hazards, former mining operations, rehabilitated mine sites, abandoned mine sites, or AMIS identified sites, progressive and final rehabilitation will be required to accommodate subsequent land uses. All work must be completed to the satisfaction of the province. |
| **Non-operating mine site within 1000 metres** | N/A | Was the mine rehabilitated? Have potential impacts been addressed? If within 1000 m, demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines that the mine has been rehabilitated OR all potential impacts have been investigated and mitigated. |
| **Rehabilitated and abandoned mine sites** | N/A | If proposal is on, adjacent to, or within 1000 m, consult with the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines. Progressive and final rehabilitation will be required to accommodate subsequent land uses. |
| **Contaminated sites** | No Contamination (Phase 1 ESA attached) | To determine potential soil contamination, there is a need for a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) as per applicable regulation of the Ministry of the Environment. A Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment is needed if the site has potential for soil contamination. Remediation of contaminated sites shall be undertaken, as necessary, prior to any activity on the site(s) associated with any proposed new sensitive use such that there will be no adverse effects. A Record of Site Condition (RSC) is required where a more sensitive use is proposed. Refer to Appendix 2 for more information. Consult with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing on your specific proposal. |

| **Development Circumstances OR Features of Interest to the Province** | **a) If a feature/land use, is it on site or within 500 metres? OR b) If a development circumstance, does it apply?** | **If a feature/land use, specify distance from site (in metres)** |
| **Development Circumstances OR Features of Interest to the Province** | **a) If a feature/land use, is it on site or within 500 metres? OR b) If a development circumstance, does it apply?** | **If a feature/land use, specify distance from site (in metres)** |
| **Development Circumstances OR Features of Interest to the Province** | **a) If a feature/land use, is it on site or within 500 metres? OR b) If a development circumstance, does it apply?** | **If a feature/land use, specify distance from site (in metres)** |
| **Development Circumstances OR Features of Interest to the Province** | **a) If a feature/land use, is it on site or within 500 metres? OR b) If a development circumstance, does it apply?** | **If a feature/land use, specify distance from site (in metres)** |
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| Natural Hazards | NO Hazards | Development should generally be directed to areas outside of hazardous lands and hazardous sites.  

Is your development proposal within:

- a dynamic beach hazard?
- the defined portions of the one hundred year flood level along the connecting channels of the Great Lakes?
- areas that would be inaccessible as a result of flooding, erosion, or dynamic beach hazards and a floodway?

Is your proposal subject to limited exceptions such as:

- safe access appropriate for the nature of the development and the natural hazard?
- special policy area?
- uses which by their nature must locate in the floodway?

Where development is permitted in portions of hazardous lands and hazardous sites not subject to the above prohibitions, flood-proofing, protection works standards and access standards must be adhered to. In addition, vehicles and people need to have a way to safely enter and exit the area, hazards cannot be created or aggravated and there can be no adverse environmental impacts.

Are the subject lands within or partially within:

1) hazardous lands adjacent to the shorelines of the Great Lakes - St. Lawrence River System and large inland lakes (includes flooding, erosion and dynamic beach hazards)?
2) hazardous lands adjacent to river, stream and small inland lake systems (includes flooding and erosion hazards)?
3) hazardous sites (includes unstable soils and unstable bedrock)?
4) a special policy area shown in an approved official plan?
5) the flood fringe in an area subject to the two zone concept of floodplain management?

If your proposal is in a hazardous area, demonstrate how the hazards will be avoided, or where appropriate, addressed through standards and procedures such as flood-proofing and protection works.

| Crown lands" | N/A | Consult your local regional Municipal Services Office as the first point of contact for assistance in dealing with planning issues relating to proposals requiring the acquisition or use of Crown lands.

Contact the Ministry of Natural Resources District Office regarding the actual acquisition or use of Crown lands.

Notes:

1. Class 1 Industry - small scale, self-contained plant, no outside storage, low probability of fugitive emissions and day/night operations only.
2. Class 2 Industry - medium scale processing and manufacturing with outdoor storage, periodic output of emissions, shift operations and daytime truck traffic.
3. Class 3 Industry - indicate if within 1000 metres; processing and manufacturing with frequent and intense off-site impacts and a high probability of fugitive emissions.
4. Hazardous Sites - property or lands that could be unsafe for development or alteration due to naturally occurring hazard. These hazards may include unstable soils (sensitive marine clays - Leda, organic soils) or unstable bedrock (Kasut topography). Other hazards - "abandoned pits and quarries": pits and quarries for which a licence or permit was never in force at any time after December 31, 1989.
5. Certain areas of Crown lands are identified by the Ministry of Natural Resources as being of special interest such as lake access points. Distances quoted in Table B above are approximate and are intended for your guidance in assessing your application.
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Appendix 2

Some General Requirements for Development Applications
Where MMAH is the Approval Authority

Planning Application Fees

Fees are required for permit(s) and certificate(s) of approval and set by individual permitting agencies. There is also an application processing fee for plans of subdivision/condominium to be submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (a certified cheque or money order payable to the Minister of Finance) at the time of submission of the application. Please see the attached Fee Schedule for more details.

Early Consultation

Prior to formally submitting an application, the applicant and/or agent(s) are strongly encouraged to contact staff of the regional Municipal Services Office (MSO) of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) to discuss the development proposal. Early consultation is highly beneficial, as the applicant can review the proposal with ministry staff and discuss what supporting documents and information may be required. Please contact your local Municipal Services Office (MSO) to discuss your proposed development. (Refer to Page 1 for office locations).

"Conformity to/does not conflict with" Provincial Plans:

There are several provincial plans such as the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Greenbelt Plan, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, Central Pickering Development Plan, Parkway Belt West Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan. Planning and development applications must conform/not conflict with the policies in provincial plans.

Consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS):

The Provincial Policy Statement provides policy direction on matters relating to land use planning and is intended to protect provincial interests. The Planning Act requires that decisions affecting planning matters "shall be consistent with" the PPS which supports a comprehensive, integrated and long-term approach to planning in Ontario, and recognizes linkages among policy areas. The PPS is intended to be read in its entirety and the relevant policies are to be applied to each situation. For more information, visit the Ministry website: www.mah.gov.on.ca.

Conformity to Official Plan

Assessment/review of a plan of subdivision/condominium is based on land use planning legislation, policies and principles and potential social, economic and environmental impacts. A major consideration is conformity to the official plan policies. Applicants are advised to determine if the proposed development is in conformity with official plan policies by discussing the proposal with Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and/or the relevant municipality/planning board.

Some Commonly Required Permits and Approvals:

Part 8 Permit/Certificate of Approval for Sewage System

Plans of subdivision/condominium proposed on small, private sewage servicing systems, generating 10,000 or less litres of effluent per day on one lot, require a Part 8 Permit under the Building Code issued by either the local municipality, public health unit (HU) or area conservation authority (CA) where it exists and there is no health unit. The municipality, local health unit or conservation authority administers Part 8 of the Building Code that sets out the standards for locating accepted kinds of sewage/septic systems on a lot. Prior to issuing a permit, the health unit would inspect the property, may stake the septic system site and recommend to the planning approval authority whether a servicing options report and/or a hydrogeological report is required.

Plans of subdivision/condominium proposed on larger sewage systems that generate more than 10,000 litres of effluent per day on one lot would require a Certificate of Approval from the Ministry of Environment (MOE) under the Ontario Water Resources Act. Some larger private or communal sewage treatment systems are also subject to the Environmental Assessment Act (generally where there is a surface water discharge).

If servicing works associated with the proposed development are subject to the provisions of the Environmental Assessment Act, the notice of public meeting for the EA application should follow the "Integration with the Planning Act" process and state that the public meeting would address the requirements of both the Planning Act and the Environmental Assessment Act. For more information on larger private or communal sewage treatment systems, contact your regional Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Municipal Services Office.

Communal Systems

Communal septic systems for the development of five or more lots/units would require a servicing options and hydrogeological report. Communal septic systems proposed for the development of less than five lots/units and generating effluent of more than 4,500 litres
per day would need a servicing options and a hydrogeological report.

Communal well systems for the development of more than five lots/units would need a servicing options and a hydrogeological report. Communal well systems for non-residential development may need a hydrogeological report.

Where communal services are proposed (water and/or sewage), need for confirmation, through a signed letter of acceptance, that the municipality or other public body would assume ownership and maintenance of these systems.

Proposal for Servicing: if the project requires a Class EA under the Environmental Assessment Act, contact your regional Municipal Services Office and Ministry of the Environment to discuss the proposal.

Entrance Permits:

Any plan of subdivision/condominium that is in close proximity to a provincial highway or has the potential to impact upon a provincial highway, would require entrance permit from the Ministry of Transportation issued under the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act. Contact your local Ministry of Transportation office to obtain information on permit requirements.

Record of Site Condition (RSC) for Contaminated Sites

Proposals for sensitive land uses on sites with potential soil contamination would require the completion of an environmental site assessment (ESA) by a qualified person to determine the extent of contamination and to recommend actions for site remediation.

A change in activity regardless of the zoning could also trigger the need for an RSC as applicable law under the Building Code. A RSC is required when changing from Industrial, commercial or community use to a more sensitive land use, such as residences or schools. For more information on contaminated sites, refer to Ontario Regulation 153/04 (Records of Site Condition - Part XV.1) made under the Environmental Protection Act and Ontario Brownfields website at www.on.ca/brownfields or contact your local Ministry of the Environment.

Permit for Alteration to Shoreline

If a proposal has potential to impact fish habitat or cause alteration to a shoreline, a permit would be required prior to any site alteration(s) or erecting of structures. Permits would be required from a local conservation authority or, if there is no conservation authority, the Ministry of Natural Resources. Applicants are advised to discuss their proposal with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing or the municipality/planning board. You may be directed to contact your local conservation authority or the Ministry of Natural Resources office, as required, prior to making a formal application under the Planning Act.

Work Permit under the Public Lands Act

In accordance with Public Lands Act regulation 453/96, work permits from the Ministry of Natural Resources are required for the construction of trails, roads, water crossings and structures that would be located on any public lands under the administration and control of the Ministry of Natural Resources. The same regulation also requires work permits for filling, dredging, removal of aquatic vegetation, and structures occupying over 15 sq. meters of a shore land.

"Shore lands" include the beds of most navigable waters which are normally Crown owned, as well as adjacent private shore lands if they are contiguous with Crown owned lands. Therefore, a work permit is required from the Ministry of Natural Resources for 'in water' work on most navigable waters, as well as any adjoining private shore lines.

Permit to Take Water

Section 34 of the Ontario Water Resources Act provides that "no person shall take more than a total of 59,000 litres of water in a day" for wells or surface water supply without a permit issued by a Director of the Ministry of the Environment. Applicants must fulfill related conditions of draft approval prior to obtaining any environmental approvals (Certificate of Approval, Permit to Take Water, etc.). Please refer to Section 34 of the Ontario Water Resources Act or contact your local Ministry of Environment for more details.

Disponible en français
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## Application for Amendment to Zoning By-Law

Under Section 34 of the Planning Act

Property Roll Number 2201-000-003-15200

### Completeness of the Application

The information in this form must be provided by the applicant with the appropriate fee. If the information and fee are not provided, the application will be returned or refused for further consideration until the information and fee have been provided.

Section 6, Sworn Affidavit, must be signed by all owners in front of a commissioner, or Sections 7.1 and 7.2 must be completed by the property owner if an agent is making this application on their behalf.

### Submission of the Application

- 1 copy of the completed application form and 1 copy of the sketch are required by the Township.
- Application Fee $750.00 Deposit $1,000.00
- Measurement to be in metric units.

If you have any questions please contact the Municipal Office:

Township of East Garafraxa
R.R. # 3 Orton, Ontario L0N 1N0
Telephone (519) 928-5298 or 941-1007
Fax (519) 941-1802

---

### Please Print and Complete or (✓) Appropriate Box(es)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Applicant and Ownership Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Name of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266952 Ontario Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Brookhaven Crescent, East Garafraxa, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Name of Owner(s) If different from the applicant an owner's authorization is required in Section 7.1, if the applicant is not the owner.同为 当前</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the person who is to be contacted about the application, if different than the applicant (this may be a person or firm acting on behalf of the applicant).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Contact Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEWS PLANNING &amp; MANAGEMENT LTD. (David Matthews MCIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Any Mortgages, Charges, or other encumbrances in respect of the subject land: No Mortgages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Location and Description of the Subject Land

2.1 County: Dufferin

Municipality: Township of East Garafraxa

Concession Number

'B'

Lol

Part of Lot 1

Registered Plan/Lot(s) / Block(s)

Reference Plan No.

Part Number(s)

Street/Road: 'A' Line

Street/Emergency No.

471045

Width of street/road ____ m

☐ Municipal year round maintained road

☒ County Road

☐ Seasonal or private road

Frontage (m)

307.84

Entire Property

307.84

Affected Area (if amendment does not affect entire property)

Depth (m)

800.73

667.75

Area (hectares)

25.2 ha

10.88 ha

3. Zoning and Official Plan Information

3.1 Current zoning of the subject:

Rural

3.2 Proposed Zoning:

Site specific Estate Residential, Open Space and Environmental Protection

3.3 Related Applications under the Planning Act, if any:

Subdivision application being filed concurrently with MMAR - file number not yet assigned

3.4 Has subject lands ever been subject of an Application under the Planning Act?

File #: No

Status:

File #: Status:

3.5 Nature & Extent of the proposed zoning

- Modification of various ER zone regulations in accordance with draft zoning by-law attached

3.6 Purpose/Reason why the rezoning is requested:

- to facilitate development in accordance with related draft plan of subdivision

3.7 Current Official Plan Designation:

Estate Residential

3.8 Provide an explanation of how the application conforms to the Official Plan

- Planning Justification Report attached details the manner in which the proposal conforms with the Official Plan.
4 Consistency with Policy Documents

4.1 Does this application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alter the boundary of a settlement area?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a new settlement area?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove lands from an employment area?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, provide details of any Official Plan or Official Plan Amendment.

4.2 Are the subject lands in an area where conditional zoning may apply? ☑ yes ☑ no

If yes, provide details of how this application conforms to Official Plan conditional zoning policies.

4.3 Is the proposed application consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and any other Policy Statements issued under subsection 3(1) of the Planning Act:

☑ yes Planning Justification Report attached

☐ no

David Matthews, MCIP, RPP

Name of individual having knowledge of the policy statements. A report may be required to accompany this application and support the above statement of consistency.

4.4 Are the subject lands within the Greenbelt Plan area ☑ yes ☑ no

4.5 Are the subject lands within the Greater Golden Horseshoe Growth Plan area

☑ yes

☐ no

4.6 Does the proposed application conform to or does not conflict with the Provincial Plans, including the Greenbelt Plan and Growth Plan:

☑ yes

☐ no

David Matthews, MCIP, RPP

Name of individual having knowledge of the plans. A report may be required to accompany this application and support the above statement of consistency.
## 5. Land Use

### 5.1 Date property acquired
- August 2012

### 5.2 Existing Use
- vacant (formerly residential)

### 5.3 Proposed Use
- Estate Residential, Open Space and Environmental Protection

### 5.4 Existing and Proposed buildings and structures (complete chart for each existing and proposed building or structure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of building or structure</th>
<th>Setbacks (m)</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Dimensions (m x m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Date of Construction or proposed construction</th>
<th>Time use has continued (for existing buildings and structures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF dwelling &amp; attached structure</td>
<td>Existing: 43; Proposed: 758</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>varies by-law (see plan)</td>
<td>3000 sq m min. lot area</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 SF Residential Lots</td>
<td>Existing: 10; Proposed: 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.5 Environmental

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Sewage Disposal</th>
<th>Storm Drainage</th>
<th>Tile Drainage</th>
<th>Biosolids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Well</td>
<td>Private Septic</td>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal Well</td>
<td>Communal System</td>
<td>Ditches</td>
<td>yes, please mark on site plan location of tile runs</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Well</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Swales</td>
<td>yes, please mark on site plan location and timing of applications</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the proposed development produce greater than 4500 litres of effluent per day?  yes  no

If yes, attach a servicing options report and hydro geological report. attached.

### 5.6 Agriculture
- N/A

Are lands part of Nutrient Management Plan?  N/A

- no  yes, please provide plan number _________ and date approved by OMAFRA __________

Are there any livestock facilities within 500 metres of the subject lands?  no  yes

If yes, complete the following for each farm operation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal type</th>
<th>Barn dimensions of all barns capable of housing livestock</th>
<th>Number of tillable hectares of farm land</th>
<th>Type of Manure storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal type</th>
<th>Barn dimensions of all barns capable of housing livestock</th>
<th>Number of tillable hectares of farm land</th>
<th>Type of Manure storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 5.7 Statement of Requirements: Please complete the following chart (By-law 60-2004): no Requirements: (Office Use)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Area (hectares)</th>
<th>Frontage (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 ha</td>
<td>60 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (distance between front lot line and building or structure) (m)</td>
<td>30 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (m)</td>
<td>15 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard (m)</td>
<td>6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Side Yard (m)</td>
<td>30 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (m)</td>
<td>10.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage (building footprint as % lot area)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Size (m²)</td>
<td>180 sq m min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping (% of lot area)</td>
<td>No standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Sketch** *(Plan of Subdivision attached)*

6.1 The application shall be accompanied by a sketch showing the following: *(Please Use Metric Units)*

- the boundaries and dimensions of the subject land.
- the location, size and type of all existing and proposed buildings and structures on the subject land, indicating the distance of the buildings or structures from the front yard lot line, rear yard lot line and side yard lot lines.
- the approximate location of all natural and artificial features on the subject land and on land that is adjacent to the subject land that may affect the application. Examples include buildings, railways, roads, watercourses, drainage ditches, river or stream banks, wetlands, wooded areas, wells and septic tanks.
- the current use on land that is adjacent to the subject land.
- the location width and name of any road within or abutting the subject land, indicating whether it is an unopened road allowance, a public travelled road, a private road or a right of way.
- the location and nature of any easement affecting the subject land.
Affidavit, Sworn Declaration and Authorizations

7.1 Affidavit or Sworn Declaration.

I, David Matthews of the City of Mississauga in the Region of Peel make and say (or solemnly declare) that the information contained in this application is true and that the information contained in the documents that accompany this application is true.

Sworn (or declared) before me at the City of Mississauga in the Region of Peel this 17th day of July 2014.

Commissioner of Oaths

Brian David Johnston, a Commissioner, etc.
Regional Municipality of Peel, for Matthews Planning & Management Ltd.
Expires February 15, 2015.

Applicant

7.2 If the applicant is not the owner of the land that is the subject of this application, the written authorization of the owner that the applicant is authorized to make the application must be included with this form or the authorization set out below must be completed.

I, 1266952 Ontario Limited, am the owner of the land that is the subject of this application and I authorize Matthews Planning & Management Ltd. to make this application on my behalf.

Date

July 17, 2014

Signature of Owner

7.3 If the applicant is not the owner of the land that is the subject of this application, complete the authorization of the owner concerning personal information set out below.

I, 1266952 Ontario Limited, am the owner of the land that is the subject of this application and for the purposes of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, I authorize Matthews Planning & Management Ltd. my agent for this application, to provide any of my personal information that will be included in this application or collected during the processing of the application.

Date

July 17, 2014

Signature of Owner

7.4 Permission to Enter

I, 1266952 Ontario Limited, am the owner of the land that is the subject of this application and I authorize Township staff or their representative to enter my property for the purposes of evaluating this application.

Date

July 17, 2014

Signature of Owner

8. Consent of the Owner

8.1 Complete the consent of the owner concerning personal information set out below.

Consent of the Owner to the Use and Disclosure of Personal Information

I, 1266952 Ontario Limited, am the owner of land that is the subject of this application and for the purposes of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, I authorize and consent to the use by or the disclosure to any person or public body of any personal information that is collected under the authority of the Planning Act for the purposes of processing this application.

Date

July 17, 2014

Signature of Owner
BEING A BY-LAW TO PERMIT ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLES ON MUNICIPAL ROADS

WHEREAS the Highway Traffic Act, R.S.O. 1990, Section 191.8, subsection (3), chapter H.8, as amended, provides that the Council of a municipality may pass by-laws;

a) Permitting the operation of off-road vehicles, with three or more wheels and low pressure bearing tires on any highway within the municipality that is under the jurisdiction of the municipality or on any part or parts of such highways;

b) Prescribing a lower rate of speed for off-road vehicles by regulation on any highway within the municipality that is under its jurisdiction, or any part or parts of such highway;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the Township of East Garafraxa enacts as follows:

1. Definitions:

In this by-law, "All Terrain Vehicles" means an off-road vehicle that:

a) has four wheels, the tires of all of which are in contact with the ground;

b) has steering handlebars;

c) has a seat that is designed to be straddled by the driver, and

d) is designed to carry a driver only and no passengers

with the following:

"All Terrain Vehicle" means an off-road vehicle that:

a) has four wheels, the tires of which are all in contact with the ground;

b) has steering handlebars;

c) has a seat that is designed to be straddled by the driver; and

d) is designed to carry:

(i) a driver only and no passengers, or

(ii) a driver and only one passenger, if the vehicle

(A) has one passenger seat that is designed to be straddled by the passenger while sitting facing forward behind the driver; and

(B) is equipped with footrests for the passenger that are separate from the footrests for the driver.

"Multi-Purpose Off-Highway Utility Vehicle" means an off-road vehicle that:

a) has four or more wheels, the tires of which are all in contact with the ground;

b) has a steering wheel for steering control;

c) has seats that are not designed to be straddled;

d) has a minimum cargo capacity of 159 kilograms.

"Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle" means an off-road vehicle that:

a) has four or more wheels, the tires of which are all in contact with the ground;

b) has a steering wheel for steering control;

c) has seats that are not designed to be straddled; and

d) has an engine displacement equal to or less than 1,000 cubic centimeters.

"Municipality" means the Corporation of the Township of East Garafraxa.

"Highway" includes any open and maintained road allowance under the sole jurisdiction of the Corporation of the Township of East Garafraxa, including common and public highway, street, avenue, parkway, driveway, square, place, bridge, viaduct or trestle, any part of which is intended for or used by the general public for the passage of vehicles and includes the area between the lateral property lines, thereof.
"Settlement Areas" shall include the communities of Marsville and Orton.

"Built Up Areas" shall include any estate subdivision.

"Low Pressure Bearing Tires" means a wide, balloon-type tire with a rounded cross section and no distinct shoulder area and that is designed to operate with inflation pressure of no greater than 70KPA (10psi)

"Off Road Vehicle" means an off-road vehicle within the meaning of the Off-Road Vehicles Act, as amended.

"Seat Belt Assembly" means an off-road vehicle within the meaning of the Off-Road Vehicles Act, as amended/

II. General Regulations of All-Terrain Vehicles on Highways:

1. An All-Terrain Vehicle shall not be operated on highways unless it meets the equipment requirements of Section 7 to 15 of O. Reg. 316/03 and it is operated in accordance with Sections 16 to 24 of O.Reg 316/03 made under the Highway Traffic Act.

2. The All-Terrain Vehicle shall not be driven at a rate of speed greater than:
   a) 20 kilometres per hour, if the speed limit established under the Highway Traffic Act or by Municipal By-law for that part of the highway is not greater than 50 kilometres per hour, or
   b) 50 kilometres per hour, if the speed limit established under the Highway Traffic or by Municipal By-law for that part of the highway is greater than 50 kilometers per hour.

3. Off-Road Vehicles with four wheels and low pressure bearing tires shall be permitted on all municipal roads within the Township of East Garafraxa under and in accordance with Ontario Regulation 316/03 made under the Highway Traffic Act and the Off Roads Vehicles Act as amended.

4. No person shall park or ride an all-terrain vehicle on any sidewalk within the Township of East Garafraxa, on Township owned lands, and in built up areas/settlements areas.

5. No person shall operate an all-terrain vehicle except between one half hour after sunrise to one half hour before sunset.

6. No person shall operate an All-Terrain Vehicle in such a manner as to disturb or distort the natural environment including fish habitats, property and any flora or fauna.

7. Any person who contravenes any of the provision of this By-law is guilty of an offence and upon conviction is liable to a fine provided for under the Highway Traffic Act and/or the Provincial Offences Act.

8. The exemptions set out in Ontario Regulation 316/03 and Ontario Regulation 135/15, as amended from time to time, regarding the operation of off-road vehicles on highways shall apply to this By-Law and the permission granted thereunder.

9. If a court of competent jurisdiction declares any provision, or part of a provision, of this by-law to be invalid, or to be of no force and effect, it is the intention of council in enacting this by-law that each and every provision of this by-law authorized by-law be applied and enforced in accordance with its terms and to the extent possible according to the law.

10. The provisions of the by-law shall come into force and take effect on the final passing hereof.

BY-LAW READ A FIRST AND SECOND TIME THIS 13TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2016
BY-LAW READ A THIRD TIME AND PASSED THIS 13TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2016

______________________________   ________________________________
Susan M Stone, Clerk                   Guy Guardhouse, Mayor
July 6, 2016

John Telfer, CAO/Clerk  
Town of Shelburne  
jtelfer@shelburne.ca

Denise Holmes, Clerk/Treasurer  
Township of Melancthon  
dholmes@melancthontownship.ca

Dear Mr. Telfer and Ms. Holmes,

RE: Autism Behaviour Therapies

Town of Mono Council reviewed your recent resolutions regarding Intensive Behaviour Intervention and Applied Behaviour Analysis for children with autism. The following resolution was passed:

Resolution #15-10-2016

THAT Town of Mono Council support resolutions by the Town of Shelburne and the Township of Melancthon calling on the province to restore Intensive Behaviour Intervention Services.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Mark Early, MCIP, RPP, CMO  
CAO/Clerk

[Address]

C.  Premier Kathleen Wynne  
Minister of Children and Youth Services, Michael Coteau  
Dufferin-Caledon MPP, Sylvia Jones  
Dufferin Municipalities
July 14, 2016

Municipality of South Dundas
34 Ottawa Street PO Box 740
Morrisburg, ON K0C 1X0

To whom it may concern,

Re: Rural Economic Development Program

Please be advised that the Council of the Township of Southgate passed the following resolution on May 4, 2016:

Moved by Mayor Fosbrooke, seconded by Councillor Woodbury;
Be it resolved that the Township of Southgate support and endorse the enclosed resolution of the Municipality of South Dundas; and
That this resolution be circulated to all Ontario Municipalities, the Minister of Economic Development, Employment, and Infrastructure, and the Minister of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs. Carried. No. 395-16

A copy of the original resolution from South Dundas is included for your reference. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact our office.

Kind regards,

Raylene Martell
Municipal Clerk

Cc: All Ontario Municipalities
Minister of Economic Development, Employment & Infrastructure
Minister of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs
MOVED BY [Signature]  
SECONDED BY [Signature]  
DATE April 19, 2016

WHERE AS in the 2016 Ontario Budget, the government of Ontario has suspended current intake of applications to the Rural Economic Development program and has indicated that it plans to integrate the program into the Jobs and Prosperity Fund.

WHERE AS the Jobs and Prosperity Fund is narrowly focused and is restricted to private sector organizations and industry partners, which prevents access to funding for rural municipalities and others who formerly benefitted from the Rural Economic Development Program. The emphasis on large projects that meet either of minimum $5 million or $10 million in eligible project costs thresholds, will significantly restrict benefits from this fund.

WHERE AS in contrast, the Rural Economic Development Program supported a number of capacity building projects including but not limited ‘Business Retention and Expansion’ and ‘Downtown Revitalization’ projects and Economic Development Strategic Planning projects for small rural municipalities who were looking to improve their local economy. Also of note is that because the Jobs and Prosperity Fund is not specifically designated for rural areas, that funds from this program will likely favour more urban areas of the province.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE Council of the Municipality of South Dundas asks the government of Ontario to reconsider the suspension of and the integration of the Rural Economic Development Program into the Jobs and Prosperity Fund with the view to ensuring that Rural Economic Development Program stays as an intricate funding program of the Province that will support capacity building and foster economic growth in rural municipalities in Ontario.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this resolution be circulated to all municipal and regional councils in Ontario requesting that they endorse and support this resolution and communicate their support to the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs.

☐ CARRIED  ☐ DEFEATED  ☐ DEFERRED

______________________________
MAYOR

Recorded Vote:

Mayor Delegarde
Deputy Mayor Locke
Councillor St. Pierre
Councillor Ewing
Councillor Mellan
July 11, 2016

Mr. Walter Benatto
407 Olde Village Lane
Shelburne, ON L9V 3A4

Dear Mr. Benotto:

I want to make you aware of the proposed changes to the make-up and quantity of Grant Review Teams across the province. Please find attached a letter to the CEO of the Ontario Trillium Foundation, Andrea Cohen Barrak. I called on the Trillium Board to “stop pursuing the ‘regionally based model’ and improve the process for filling vacancies to ensure local representation is maintained.”

If you agree, I would ask you to email or write to the Ontario Trillium Foundation to join the growing voices across Ontario who are calling for the board to reconsider their strategy. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me at 1-800-265-1603 or email at sylvia.jonesco@pc.ola.org.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Jones, MPP
Dufferin-Caledon
June 30th, 2016

Andrea Cohen Barrak, CEO
Ontario Trillium Foundation,
BY EMAIL ONLY TO: corpoffice@otf.ca

RE: Regionalization of Ontario Trillium Foundation’s Grant Catchment Areas

Dear Ms. Cohen Barrack:

I am writing to you regarding Trillium Grant Review Teams (GRT) and the proposed changes to “regionalization.” As you know I am a strong proponent of the Trillium model. I see the value that Trillium grants have brought to local communities in Dufferin-Caledon and have encouraged people to volunteer with local GRTs. You are also aware both the Halton-Peel and Waterloo-Wellington-Dufferin Trillium GRTs have numerous vacancies. Only thirteen of nineteen review team positions are filled in Waterloo-Wellington-Dufferin, while seventeen of twenty positions are filled in Halton-Peel. Despite these vacancies there is only one member in the regional GRT for the Town of Caledon.

As you know, Trillium GRTs play an important role in the grant approval process by providing local knowledge and insight in order to ensure that grants meet a community’s needs. However, these vacancies are not empty due to lack of qualified candidates. In fact, I am aware of numerous well qualified individuals who are willing to serve, but have been waiting for over a year to hear back about their application.

This lack of action to fill GRT vacancies is even more concerning given that representation will be further minimized if the proposed changes occur. As you know the regionalization proposal for the Ontario Trillium Foundation (OTF) includes a plan to greatly increase the size of grant catchment areas. The proposed action is precisely the opposite of what communities need. Communities, like Caledon and Dufferin need more local representation on GRTs, not to be further diluted as part of a larger regional catchment.

I am calling on you and your board to stop pursuing the “regionally based model”, and improve the process for filling vacancies to ensure local representation is maintained. I am pleased to discuss this issue with you further, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Jones, MPP
Dufferin-Caledon
TOWN OF SHELBURNE
COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Date: August 22, 2016

Moved by: Benotto
Seconded by: Sample

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Shelburne Council is opposed to the proposed changes of the makeup and quantity of Grant Review Teams that the Trillium Board is pursuing;

AND is calling on the Board to improve the process for filling vacancies to ensure local representation;

AND FURTHER THAT a copy of this motion be forwarded to Sylvia Jones, and all other Dufferin County municipalities seeking their support.

CARRIED: K. Bennington

Requested Vote to be recorded [ ] Yes [ ] No

Mayor Bennington [ ] Yea [ ] Nay
Councillor Benotto [ ] Yea [ ] Nay
Councillor Chambers [ ] Yea [ ] Nay
Deputy Mayor Dunlop [ ] Yea [ ] Nay
Councillor Egan [ ] Yea [ ] Nay
Councillor Mills [ ] Yea [ ] Nay
Councillor Sample [ ] Yea [ ] Nay
The Government of Ontario is undertaking a coordinated review of its land use planning documents. The province has released the following documents for review and comment:

- Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2016;
- Proposed Greenbelt Plan, 2016;
- Proposed Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, 2016; and
- Proposed Niagara Escarpment Plan, 2016.

The review began in 2015 through an extensive public consultation process. The Province has since reviewed and considered all feedback received, and as an outcome, has proposed a series of changes to the four planning documents. At this time, the Province is seeking feedback on the proposed changes by October 31, 2016.

This memo provides a review of the proposed changes to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and highlights the impacts the proposed changes may have on the Dufferin County Official Plan (DCOP), and land use planning in the County.

Subject to further consultations with the local municipalities and Councils, it is recommended that the County formalize comments on the Proposed Plans for submission to the province by September 30th, 2016.

1.0 Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2016

This section provides a detailed review of the changes identified in the proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2016. For ease of reference, included at the end of each section is a summary that highlights the key issues and proposed policy changes, and the potential impact to the County.

The proposed revisions to the Growth Plan introduce a number of new policies and directions that are intended to support growth and foster the development of compact, vibrant communities. This is to be achieved through increased intensification, promoting transit, facilitating the movement of goods, protecting and enhancing employment areas, infrastructure management, supporting agriculture, and protecting and enhancing the Greenbelt and natural heritage systems. The following review describes the proposed policy changes, and identifies key issues/County impacts, or matters where comments on behalf of the County are recommended, in the context of the themes identified by the Province. The Province’s Land Use Review themes include:

- Building Complete Communities;
- Integrating Infrastructure;
- Supporting Agriculture;
- Protecting Natural Heritage and Water;
- Addressing Climate Change; and
- Improving Plan Implementation.
1.1 Building Complete Communities

The Growth Plan has introduced new policies and refined existing ones to ensure the development of complete communities that are healthy and safe. Policy changes are intended to make better use of land and infrastructure by directing growth to settlement areas and prioritizing intensification in built-up areas with a focus on strategic growth areas. To this end, the Plan focuses on strategic growth areas, including urban growth centres and major transit station areas, as well as brownfield sites and greyfields, in order to focus investment in transit and other infrastructure and public service facilities to support growth.

1.1.1 Managing Growth

Policy 2.2.1.2d) establishes that population and employment growth will be accommodated by, among other things, directing growth to locations within settlement areas with existing and planned public service facilities, and by focusing growth in areas with existing or planned transit, with a priority on higher order transit (Policy 2.2.1.2e) and generally away from hazardous lands (Policy 2.2.1.2j). Growth will also be accommodated by providing convenient multimodal access to intra- and inter-municipal transit, giving priority to connections between residents and jobs (Policy 2.2.1.2g).

1.1.2 Supporting the Achievement of Complete Communities

The proposed Growth Plan introduces new policies to support the achievement of complete communities including:

- featuring a diverse mix of land uses, including residential and employment uses, and convenient access to local stores, services and public service facilities (Policy 2.2.1.3a);
- providing for a diverse range and mix of housing, including secondary suites and affordable housing (Policy 2.2.1.3b);
- supporting overall quality of life through the planning and provision of transportation options, compact built form, public service facilities that are accessible by active transportation and transit, convenient access to local, healthy foods, and the provision of parks, trails and recreation facilities (Policy 2.2.1.3.d);
- mitigating climate change impacts, building resilience, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and contributing towards the achievement of net-zero communities (Policy 2.2.1.3e);
- integrating green infrastructure and low impact development (Policy 2.2.1.3.f); and
- ensuring high quality built form and publicly-accessible open spaces that are safe and accessible and create an attractive and vibrant public realm (Policy 2.2.1.3.g).

1.1.3 Developing an Integrated Approach to Planning and Growth Management

New policies have been introduced that require upper- and single-tier municipalities to develop an integrated approach to planning and managing growth, which will be implemented through a municipal comprehensive review and other supporting documents. The approach is to be based off of forecasted growth established by the Growth Plan (Policy 2.2.1.4.a), and must consider the entire existing supply of land designated for development within the municipality (Policy 2.2.1.4.b). The approach should identify a hierarchy of settlement areas, or areas within settlement areas, where forecasted growth to the horizon of the Growth Plan (2041) will be accommodated, in consideration of:

- strategic growth areas;
- the amount of growth that can be accommodated in built-up areas, and existing designated greenfield areas based on an assessment of land needs; and
• integrated planning for infrastructure and public service facilities that take into account full life cycle costs and cost-covering options (Policy 2.2.1.4.c i-iii).

The approach should identify areas where development is to be prohibited (Policy 2.2.1.4.d), and upper-tiers should provide direction for lower tier municipalities on how to implement (Policy 2.2.1.4.e).

The Minister will establish a methodology for assessing land needs to accommodate forecasted growth and implement the Growth Plan (Policy 2.2.1.5), and upper- and single tier municipalities in the outer ring will, in consultation with lower-tier municipalities where applicable, identify any excess lands in official plans, and prohibit development on all excess lands to the horizon of the plan (2041) (Policy 2.2.1.6).

The Table 2 provides a comparison of population and employment forecasts found in the Dufferin County Official Plan to those found in Schedule 3 of the Proposed Growth Plan.

### Table 2: Population and Employment Forecasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>2036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufferin County</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Growth Plan (Schedule 3)</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed Growth Plan does not include any changes to the population and growth forecasts to the County to the year 2041. The County’s population is still forecasted to grow to 85,000 persons and 32,000 employees by 2041. The County would be responsible for the allocation of the forecasted growth to each of the local municipalities, which would be assessed at the next comprehensive review.

The growth forecasts to 2041 are to be applied at the time of the next municipal comprehensive review, for planning and managing growth. The proposed changes may allow the County to designate lands for development beyond a 20-year planning horizon.

#### 1.1.4 Built Up Areas

The proposed Growth Plan establishes that the built boundary is to be delineated in official plans (Policy 2.2.2.1), and maintains that the minimum intensification target contained in the applicable upper- or single tier official plan that is approved and in effect as of an effective date yet to be determined, will apply until the time of the next municipal comprehensive review (Policy 2.2.2.2). At that time, upper- and single-tier municipalities are intended to increase their minimum intensification targets so that 60% of all residential development occurring annually will occur within the built-up area (Policy 2.2.2.3). For upper- or single-tier municipalities located within the outer ring that do not have an urban growth centre, Council may still request an alternative minimum intensification target at the time of a municipal comprehensive review (Policy 2.2.2.4a), and the Minister may permit an alternative minimum intensification target based on the built-up area characteristics (Policy 2.2.2.4b). The Proposed Growth Plan also establishes that, when planning for the intensification of built up areas, municipalities will (Policy 2.2.2.5a-c):

- identify the appropriate type and scale of development in strategic growth areas;
- provide appropriate transition of built form to adjacent areas; and
- ensure the development of high quality urban form and public open space.
The Table 3 provides a comparison of the alternative minimum intensification targets found in the Dufferin County Official Plan to those found in Section 2.2.3 of the existing Growth Plan and Section 2.2.2 of the proposed Growth Plan.

Table 3: Minimum Intensification Target Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Intensification Target</th>
<th>Dufferin County Overall</th>
<th>Grand Valley (Urban Settlement Area)</th>
<th>Orangeville</th>
<th>Shelburne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Intensification Target</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Growth Plan In Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Growth Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the Dufferin County Land Needs Update (DCLNU), July 2016, the County’s Urban Settlement Areas are currently facing challenges in achieving the current minimum intensification targets. Shelburne has insufficient built boundary supply to meet projected demand. Orangeville also likely has insufficient intensification opportunities to 2031. Their built boundary supply is anticipated to be depleted around 2023 and 2026 respectively. Grand Valley may exhaust its built boundary supply around 2031. As of 2016, Orangeville has 1,056 units of built boundary supply available, while Shelburne has 131 units, and Grand Valley has 166 units.

1.1.5 Employment

The Proposed Growth Plan introduces a number of new employment policies intended to strengthen the protection of employment lands. The Plan establishes that economic development and competitiveness will be promoted through:

- more efficient use of existing employment areas and vacant and underutilized employment lands, and increasing employment densities where appropriate;
- improved transit connectivity to areas with high employment densities; and
- through the integration and alignment of land use planning and economic development goals and strategies to retain and attract investment and employment (Policy 2.2.5.1a-c).

Suitable lands within settlement areas that are adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, major goods movement facilities and corridors, including major highway interchanges, are to be identified as prime employment areas. Upper- and single-tier municipalities may also identify other existing employment areas within settlement areas as prime employment areas, where appropriate (Policy 2.2.5.3). Prime employment areas are to be identified and designated in official plans, and protected for appropriate employment uses over the long term, strictly prohibiting certain uses (Policy 2.2.5.5a). These areas will also be protected by planning for freight supportive land use patterns (Policy 2.2.5.5b). In addition to areas identified by municipalities, The Minister may identify other prime employment areas (Policy 2.2.5.4).

Employment areas within settlement areas that are not considered “prime”, are to be designated and planned in a manner that directs permitted commercial uses to locations that support active transportation and are serviced by transit, where available. In addition, employment lands will prohibit residential land uses, and limit other sensitive land uses to preserve the use of these lands for uses that require those locations. Lastly, employment lands are to be integrated with adjacent non-employment areas where appropriate, to develop mixed use areas and innovation hubs (Policy 2.2.5.6a-c).
Employment areas are defined in the PPS, 2014, as “areas designated in an official plan for clusters of business and economic activities that include, but are not limited to, manufacturing, warehousing, offices and associated retail and ancillary facilities”. In comparison, prime employment areas are defined in the Proposed Growth Plan as “areas of employment within settlement areas that are designated in an official plan and protected over the long-term for uses that are land extensive or have low employment densities and require these locations, including manufacturing, warehousing and logistics and appropriate associated uses and ancillary facilities”.

Requirements for the conversion of employment areas have been modified in the proposed Growth Plan. As per the Plan, the conversion of prime employment areas to employment areas, or lands within employment areas to non-employment area uses will require a municipal comprehensive review. The most notable change is that the conversion of prime employment areas to non-employment areas is prohibited (Policy 2.2.5.8). In other instances, the review will need to demonstrate that:

- there is a need for the conversion;
- the lands are not required for the employment purposes for which they were designated over the horizon of the Plan;
- the municipality will maintain sufficient employment lands to accommodate forecasted employment growth to the horizon of the Plan;
- the proposed use will not adversely affect the overall viability of employment area (“prime” or otherwise), or the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets and other policies of the Plan; and
- there is adequate infrastructure and public service facilities (existing or planned) to accommodate the proposed use (Policy 2.2.5.7a-e).

The proposed Growth Plan establishes that major office and appropriate major institutional development will be directed to urban growth centres, major transit station areas, or other strategic growth areas with existing or planned frequent transit service. Also, a new policy directs that existing office parks should be supported through: the improvement of connectivity with transit and active transportation networks; the provision of an appropriate mix of amenities and open space to serve the workforce; the encouragement of intensification of employment uses; and the appropriate use of transportation demand management strategies (Policy 2.2.5.10). Surface parking is to be minimized in favour of developing active transportation networks and facilitating transit supportive built form (Policy 2.2.5.11).

1.1.6 Housing

The proposed Growth Plan updates existing housing policy by establishing that upper- and single-tier municipalities, in consultation with lower-tier municipalities, the Province and other appropriate stakeholders, will develop a housing strategy that:

- aligns with the required policies of the Housing Services Act, 2011;
- identifies policies for official plans, including affordable housing targets, and policies that promote affordable ownership housing and rental housing; and
- plans and provides for a diverse range of housing types and densities, including secondary suites (Policy 2.2.6.1a-c).

In addition, new housing policy provides clarification on the requirements to provide for a range and mix of housing types and densities in order to accommodate forecasted growth, achieve the minimum intensification and density targets, and achieve complete communities through housing diversity (Policy 2.2.6.2a-d).
The proposed policy changes reinforce policy changes in the Planning Act regarding secondary suites, and will require official plan policies that align with the Housing Services Act, 2011 to facilitate the development of a diverse range of housing types, including the creation of units.

1.1.7 New Density Targets for Designated Greenfield Areas

New density targets for designated greenfield areas are established by the Proposed Growth Plan. The Plan notes that the minimum density target would be increased from 50 to 80 residents and jobs per hectare. As per Policy 2.2.7.3a-c, the target is to be measured over the entire designated greenfield area of each upper- and single-tier municipality, excluding:

- natural heritage features and areas, natural heritage systems and floodplains, provided development is prohibited in these areas;
- rights-of-way for:
  - electricity transmission lines;
  - energy transmission pipelines;
  - freeways, as defined by and mapped as part of the Ontario Road Network; and
  - railways; and
- prime employment areas that have been designated in official plans in accordance with policy 2.2.5.5.

It is important to note, that the proposed changes specifically exclude prime employment areas from the calculation, which are more land intensive, and less intensive in terms of jobs per hectare. We understand this is part of the Province’s rationale in increasing the greenfield density targets so substantially. However, no other basis has been articulated for the increase in density, but would require a greater mix of more intensive housing types.

It is our understanding that the new density target applies immediately upon provincial approval of the growth plan across the entire “designated greenfield area” including areas already approved or built. In practice, the 80 residents and jobs per hectare target would require municipalities to overcompensate at higher densities in order to achieve an average of 80 residents and jobs per hectare due to communities that have applied the current lower targets. This could potentially result in the highest densities being directed to the urban periphery in areas that would not typically be supported by transit and adequate servicing to achieve those higher densities.

Upper- or single-tier municipalities that are located in the outer ring and that do not have a growth centre can request, through Council, an alternative minimum density target for the designated greenfield area at the time of each municipal comprehensive review (Policy 2.2.7.4a). In addition, the Minister can permit an alternative minimum density target based on the characteristics of the municipality and adjacent communities (Policy 2.2.7.4b). The existing approved alternative greenfield density targets in the DCOP would remain valid until such time as the County’s next municipal comprehensive review, and at that time, revised alternative minimum greenfield density targets would need to be assessed, and requested of the Minister if appropriate. If no request is made, or the Minister does not permit an alternative target, then the minimum intensification and density targets established in the proposed Growth Plan would apply (Policy 5.2.5.5).

Table 4 provides a comparison of the minimum greenfield density targets in the Dufferin County Official Plan (Section 3.4.3) to those found in Section 2.2.7 of the existing Growth Plan and Section 2.2.7 of the Proposed Growth Plan.
### Table 4 Minimum Greenfield Density Target Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Density Target</th>
<th>Dufferin County Overall</th>
<th>Grand Valley (Urban Settlement Area)</th>
<th>Orangeville</th>
<th>Shelburne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Residents and jobs combined per hectare)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Current Growth Plan | 50 |
| Proposed Growth Plan | 80 |

Modelling undertaken for the Dufferin County Land Needs Update considered and applied the County’s Official Plan minimum density targets. Regarding residential densities, the DCLNU notes that, in the case of Orangeville, the Town has a residential density of 85 residents per net hectare based on a ‘persons per unit’ (PPU) ratio of 1.83. Shelburne has a residential density in the order of 50 residents per net hectare, based on a unit per net hectare density of 25 and PPU of 2.0. Grand Valley has a residential density in the order of 50 residents per hectare based on a unit per net hectare density of 18 and a projected PPU of 2.78. The County overall is achieving a greenfield residential density of 60 residents per net hectare, based on a unit per net hectare density of 27.3 and a PPU of 2.23.

Non-residential density targets for Orangeville, Shelburne and Grand Valley are calculated at 36.6, 34.4 and 34.4 jobs per net hectare. The County-wide average is calculated as 34.1 jobs per net hectare. These calculations exclude Population Related Employment jobs diverted to existing buildings. Inclusion of diverted jobs would raise the actual combined density closer to 43 jobs per net hectare in Orangeville, 39 in Shelburne and Grand Valley. The County-wide average would be adjusted to 39 jobs per net hectare. Inclusion of No Fixed Place of Work employment would raise the average density further.

Achieving a greenfield density target of 80 residents and jobs per hectare would require substantially higher densities than what is currently being achieved, particularly for Grand Valley and Shelburne (i.e., nearly double).

#### 1.1.8 Settlement Area Boundary Expansion

The proposed Growth Plan introduces new criteria for assessing the feasibility of a settlement area boundary expansion. As per the Plan, a settlement area boundary expansion can only occur as part of a municipal comprehensive review where it has been demonstrated that, based on minimum intensification and density targets as well as a land needs assessment, sufficient opportunities to accommodate forecasted growth are not available, either through intensification or in designated greenfield areas. In addition, the expansion would have to make sufficient lands available, but not exceed the horizon of the Plan (to 2041) and minimize land consumption. Lastly, the timing of the expansion and the phasing of development within the designated greenfield area are not to adversely affect the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets of the Plan (Policy 2.2.8.1a-c).

In cases where a settlement area boundary expansion is deemed to be necessary and justified, the feasibility of the expansion is to be determined through a municipal comprehensive review. The proposed Plan identifies new and revised criteria for determining the most appropriate location of the expansion including (Policy 2.2.8.2a-m):

- The availability existing or planned infrastructure and public services facilities to support proposed growth;
The financial viability over the life cycle of the infrastructure and public facilities;
The completion of water and wastewater master plans, informed by watershed planning, to protect water quality and quantity, and to service growth and development in a manner that would not exceed the assimilative capacity of the receiving water body;
The completion of stormwater master plans, informed by watershed planning to address flood risk vulnerability;
The avoidance, where possible, of key hydrological areas, natural heritage systems, and prime agricultural area, and the minimization of impacts on the agricultural system;
Where prime agricultural areas cannot be avoided, an agricultural impact assessment will be used to determine the location of the expansion based on minimizing and mitigating the impact on the agricultural system, and evaluating alternative locations across the upper- or single-tier municipality while ensuring that:
  o lands do not compromise specialty crop areas;
  o there are no reasonable alternatives to avoid prime agricultural areas; and
  o there are no reasonable alternatives on lower priority agricultural lands in prime agricultural areas.
The avoidance of impacts on agricultural operations and on agricultural support network. Where avoidance is not possible, impacts are to be minimized and adequately mitigated as per an agricultural impact assessment;
The completion of an environmental assessment for new or expanded services for settlement areas that receive their water from or discharge their sewage to inland lakes, rivers or groundwater, where the assessment has identified how expanded water and wastewater treatment capacity would be addressed in fiscally and environmentally sustainable manner;
The settlement area to be expanded is in compliance with the minimum distance separation formulae
Additional specific tests for settlement areas within the Protected Countryside in the Greenbelt area including:
  o The settlement area to be expanded is identified in the greenbelt Plan as a Town/Village
  o The proposed expansion would be modest in size;
  o The proposed expansion would be serviced by municipal water and wastewater systems; and
  o The prohibition of expansion into the Natural Heritage System that has been identified in the Greenbelt Plan.

It is important to note that the proposed changes would require that settlement areas that receive water or discharge their sewage to inland lakes, rivers or groundwater, would require the completion of an environmental assessment to demonstrate the feasibility of a settlement area expansion, and aligns with a completed water and wastewater master plan. The County would need to work closely with local municipalities in this regard as the County does not have jurisdiction over water and wastewater facilities.

The proposed Growth Plan provides new direction to municipalities in the outer ring to identify and manage any excess lands that will not be required for growth to 2041. Upper- and single-tier municipalities in the outer ring that have identified excess lands in their Official Plan, in accordance with the policies of the Growth Plan, can undertake a settlement area boundary expansion as part of a municipal comprehensive review. The Review must demonstrate that all requirements for managing excess lands are satisfied. This would include demonstrating that the settlement area to be expanded has been identified as a primary focus for growth in and will be both contiguous to the existing settlement area boundary and entirely identified as designated greenfield area (Policy 2.2.8.3a). In addition, the municipal comprehensive review would be required to demonstrate that the overall quantum of excess lands are reduced by re-designation to remove development permissions which must be reflected in lower applicable lower-tier official plans (Policy 2.2.8.3b). Development must be
prohibited on all excess lands, including lands that will become excess lands as a result of the proposed expansion, and, where appropriate, a municipality must demonstrate that it has used additional tools to reduce the land that is available for development (Policy 2.2.8.3c,d).

1.1.9 Rural Areas

The proposed Growth Plan refines and clarifies the rules for development on rural lands. New policies recognize existing employment areas on rural lands and clarify the parameters for resource-based recreational uses. Existing employment areas on rural lands outside of settlement areas with approved zoning or designation in an official plan as of June 16, 2006 continue to be permitted. Expansions to these existing employment areas may be permitted only if such an expansion is necessary to support the immediate needs of existing businesses, and if compatible with the surrounding uses (Policy 2.2.9.5).

The updated Plan permits some development on rural lands outside of settlement areas if such development is necessary for the management or use of resources, resource based recreational uses, or other rural land uses that are not appropriate in settlement areas (Policy 2.2.9.3). Additionally, new multiple lots or units for residential development may be allowed on rural lands in site specific locations with approved zoning or designation in an official plan that permitted such development as of June 16, 2006 (Policy 2.2.9.6).

The Plan also limits resource-based recreational uses to tourism-related and recreational uses that are compatible with the scale, character and capacity of the resource and the surrounding rural landscape. This may include commercial uses intended to serve the needs of visitors, and resource-based recreational dwellings for seasonal accommodation, where appropriate (Policy 2.2.9.4a,b).

Where public service facilities are located in rural settlement areas, these are to be co-located and integrated in community hubs. Priority is to be given to maintaining and adapting existing public service facilities in community hubs, where feasible, to ensure such facilities adequately meet the needs of the community (Policy 2.2.9.2).

Key Issues:

Growth Forecasts

- The proposed growth forecasts to the County to 2041 have not been revised. The proposed changes allow the County to allocate growth to the planning horizon year of 2041 (beyond the current 20-year planning horizon). Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to provide direction to local municipalities on implementing an integrated approach to planning and managing growth, with a greater emphasis on defining a settlement area hierarchy for directing growth to strategic growth areas (i.e., nodes and corridors identified by the municipality of the Province to be the focus of intensification and higher density compact built forms).

Intensification Targets

- It is recommended that the County provide comments and recommendations to the Province regarding the proposed minimum intensification targets. The minimum intensification targets contained in the County Official Plan that is approved and in effect will apply until the time of the next municipal comprehensive review. As Dufferin County is within the outer ring and does not have an urban growth centre, the proposed policies require that at the time of each MCR the County would need to revisit and if required, request alternative minimum intensification targets. If no request is made, or the Minister does not permit an alternative target, the minimum
intensification and density targets in the Growth Plan will apply. Since the urban settlement areas are currently experiencing challenges in achieving the current intensification targets, an increase in the minimum intensification target will pose and even greater challenge and the County will need to justify reduced intensification targets at the time of the next County Official Plan comprehensive review.

- It is recommended that the County provide comments regarding the challenges that the urban settlement areas have in promoting intensification/redevelopment, given the economic realities, and lack of opportunities for intensification. To this end, greater flexibility should be considered. In addition, the proposed intensification targets may alter the character of settlement areas due to changes in built forms required to meet intensification targets. This would be particularly pronounced in areas where housing is predominately lower density built forms.

Greenfield Density Targets

- It is recommended that the County provide comments and recommendations to the Province regarding the proposed minimum greenfield density targets, and the challenges that the urban settlement areas may have in achieving these densities. The proposed policies require that at the time of each MCR the County would need to request alternative minimum intensification targets. If no request is made, or the Minister does not permit an alternative target, the minimum intensification and density targets in the Growth Plan will apply.

- It is recommended that the County seek further clarification from the Province regarding how the minimum density target of 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare over the planning horizon to 2041 is to be measured, evaluated, or “phased in”. The application of the density target across the entire “designated greenfield area” would require even greater densities to compensate for greenfield areas that have already been developed or approved at the lower greenfield density targets. Consideration could be given to updating the built boundary to reflect the existing greenfield areas that have since been developed. Furthermore, increasing greenfield densities further on the periphery of the settlement areas, will result in more intensive development that is further removed from the urban core areas, and likely less accessible with respect to transit and public services and amenities.

Employment Areas

- It is recommended that the County provide comment concerning the definition of prime employment areas, given that the proposed definition may limit office uses within these areas. It is recommended that the definition of prime employment areas provide greater flexibility to accommodate stand-alone office uses.

- It is noted that not including prime employment areas in the greenfield density target calculations is desirable, given the land intensive nature of these uses, however, consideration may be given to recommending that all employment areas be excluded from the minimum greenfield density calculations.

- Further clarification should be sought as to whether the County Official Plan would be required to designate prime employment areas and employment areas, or whether they may only be designated in the local official plans.

- Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to provide more stringent requirements for the protection of employment lands, the requirements for the conversion of prime employment and employment lands, and potentially the designation of prime employment and
employment areas in the County Official Plan.

Settlement Area Boundary Expansions

- Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to adopt the expanded requirements for determining feasibility of a settlement area boundary expansion, and to provide direction to local municipalities regarding the methodology established by the Minister for assessing the need for a settlement area boundary expansion. The Province is expected to develop the methodology by 2018.

- At the time of its next municipal comprehensive review, the County will need to undertake a review of its land inventory to identify any excess lands on a County-wide basis. Amendments to the County Official Plan may be required to prohibit the development of any lands identified as ‘excess’. Settlement area expansions may only be considered where the overall quantum of excess lands in the County has been reduced, which may involve the removal of existing development permissions. Comments may be expressed that the prohibition of development on ‘excess lands’ should be optional.

1.2 Integrating Infrastructure

The proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe introduces clearer direction for municipalities to take an integrated approach to land use and infrastructure planning. For the most part the Plan retains existing policy directions for supporting growth through infrastructure. However, in some cases policies are updated and clarified.

1.2.1 Integrated Planning

The proposed Growth Plan emphasizes the importance of coordinating infrastructure planning, land use planning and infrastructure investment (Policy 3.2.1.1). Planning for new or expanded infrastructure is to be undertaken in an integrated manner that makes use of evaluations of long-range, scenario-based land use planning and financial planning. It will also be supported by infrastructure master plans, asset management plans, community energy plans, watershed planning and environmental assessments, and other relevant studies. Infrastructure planning will leverage investment to direct growth and development in a manner that, among other policies of the Plan, achieves minimum intensification and density targets. It will also provide sufficient infrastructure capacity in strategic growth areas, while ensuring that the full life cycle costs of the infrastructure required to service growth is identified, and that options for covering those costs over the long term are developed. Lastly, infrastructure planning will need to consider the impacts of a changing climate (Policy 3.2.1.2a-d).

The Plan introduces new policy to link infrastructure investments to facilitate higher-density development in strategic growth areas. To this end, municipalities are to use infrastructure investment and other implementation tools and mechanisms to facilitate intensification and higher density development in strategic growth areas. Priority is to be given to infrastructure investments made by the Province that support the policies and schedules of the proposed Growth Plan (Policy 3.2.1.3).

1.2.2 Moving Goods and People
The proposed Growth Plan introduces general policies requiring that any design, refurbishment or reconstruction of existing and planned street networks adopt a complete streets approach that ensures the needs and safety of all road users are considered and accommodated (Policy 3.2.2.3). Municipal transportation demand management policies are intended to (Policy 3.2.2.4a-d):

- reduce trip distance and time;
- increase the modal share of alternatives to automobiles, which may include settling modal share targets;
- prioritize active transportation, transit and goods movement over single occupant automobiles;
- and target significant trip generator.

Transit planning decisions and investments are to prioritize areas with existing or planned higher residential and employment densities to optimize return on investment along with the efficiency and viability of existing and planned transit services, and must now contribute to the provincial greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets (Policy 3.2.3.2a,g).

Municipalities are to work with transit operators, the Province, Metrolinx where applicable, and each other to support transit service integration within and across municipal boundaries (Policy 3.2.3.3), and ensure that active transportation networks are comprehensive and integrated into transportation planning. These networks are to be safe and comfortable, and provide continuous linkages between strategic growth areas, adjacent neighbourhoods, key trip generators and transit stations, and should include dedicated lane space for cyclists on major street networks, where feasible, or other safe and convenient alternatives (Policy 3.2.3.4a,b).

The proposed Growth Plan has also updated goods movement policies to align with PPS 2014 and Ontario’s Freight-supportive Guidelines (2016). To this end, the principle priority of highway investment will be to link major goods movement facilities and corridors with international gateways and prime employment areas to facilitate efficient goods movement (Policy 3.2.4.1). Corridors for moving goods are to be improved, and municipalities are to work with the Province, agencies and transportation services providers to promote and better integrate multimodal goods movement and freight supportive land use and transportation system planning (Policy 3.2.4.2b,c). Municipalities are also to provide for the establishment of priority routes for goods movement in and out of prime employment areas and other areas of significant commercial activity, with alternate routes provided that connect to the provincial network (Policy 3.2.4.3).

### 1.2.3 Infrastructure Corridors

The proposed Growth Plan provides new policy direction related to infrastructure corridors. These policies encourage the co-location of linear infrastructure and seek to ensure that existing and planned corridors will be protected in accordance with PPS, 2014 (Policy 3.2.5.1a,b). Where applicable, municipalities are to demonstrate, through an environmental assessment, informed by an agricultural impact assessment or equivalent, that any impacts to the agricultural system have been avoided or, where not possible, minimized and mitigated to the extent feasible (Policy 3.2.5.1c). Similarly, though an environmental assessment, it must be demonstrated that any impacts to key natural heritage features in natural heritage systems, key hydrological features and key hydrologic areas have been avoided or, where not possible, minimized and mitigated to the extent possible (Policy 3.2.5.1c). For existing or planned corridors, municipalities are to consider increased opportunities for moving people and goods by rail, along with separation of modes within corridors, and provide opportunities for inter-modal linkages (Policy 3.2.5.1e). Land use designations along planned corridors are to support the policies of the Growth Plan in particular policies related to the direction of development to settlement areas (Policy 3.2.5.2).
1.2.4 Water and Wastewater Servicing

The updated Growth Plan introduces new policies requiring comprehensive master planning (or equivalent) for water and wastewater and for stormwater management, informed by watershed planning. Municipal water and wastewater systems and private communal water and wastewater systems will be planned, designed, constructed and expanded in accordance with the preparation of a comprehensive water or wastewater master plan or equivalent, informed by watershed planning. Such plans will be prepared to (Policy 3.2.6.2c):

- demonstrate that the system will no negatively impact the quantity and quality of ground and surface water;
- identify the preferred option for servicing growth and development, subject to the hierarchy of services provided in policies 1.6.6.2 – 1.6.6.5 of the PPS 2014, which must not exceed the assimilative capacity of the effluent receiver and available water supply for servicing and ecological needs; and
- identify the full life cycle costs of the system and develop options to pay for these costs over the long term.

For settlement areas that are serviced by rivers, inland lakes and groundwater, municipalities will not be permitted to extend water or wastewater services from Great Lake sources unless a newly introduced series of requirements are met. The extension of water or wastewater services from a Great Lakes source would only be permitted to service growth allocated to a settlement area within an urban growth centre (3.2.6.3b), which are not identified in the County.

1.2.5 Stormwater Management

The proposed Growth Plan requires municipalities to develop stormwater master plans or equivalent for serviced settlement areas. Such plans are to be informed by watershed planning and must examine the cumulative environmental impact of stormwater from existing and planned development, including an assessment of how extreme weather events will exacerbate these impacts (3.2.7.1a,b). Master plans are to incorporate appropriate low impact development and green infrastructure, must identify the need for stormwater retrofits where appropriate, and must identify the full life cycle costs of the stormwater infrastructure, including maintenance costs and options for covering costs over the long term (3.2.7.1c-e). Master plans must also include an implementation and a maintenance plan (3.2.7.1f).

The proposed Plan also introduce new policies related to stormwater management for large-scale development proposal proceeding by way of secondary plans, plans of subdivision, vacant land plans of condominium and proposals for resort development. The Plan requires that such developments be supported by a stormwater management plan or equivalent, that: is informed by a subwatershed plan or equivalent; uses an integrated approach that includes low impact development and green infrastructure; establishes planning, design and construction practices to minimize vegetation removal, grading and soil compaction, sediment erosion and impervious surfaces; and aligns with the stormwater master plan for the settlement area (Policy 3.2.7.2a-d).

1.2.6 Public Service Facilities

The proposed Growth Plan changes the defined term “community infrastructure” to “public service facilities” to align with PPS 2014. As per the proposed Growth Plan policies, planning for public service facilities will be coordinated with land use planning and investment, and facilities and services are to be co-located in community hubs and integrated in order to promote cost-effectiveness (3.2.8.1 and 3.2.8.2). The maintenance and adaptation of existing public service facilities and spaces as community
hubs is to be prioritized in order to meet community needs, and to optimize the long-term viability of public investments (3.2.8.3). Any existing public service facilities that are in the vicinity of strategic growth areas and are easily accessible by active transportation and transit should be considered as preferred locations for community hubs (3.2.8.4). Similarly, in locating new public service facilities, preference should be given to sites that are easily accessible by active transportation and transit (Policy 3.2.8.5).

Key Issues:

- Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to incorporate policies and provide direction to local municipalities for developing options for full life cycle cost recovery of infrastructure over the long term.

- Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to incorporate policies and provide direction to local municipalities on the consideration of the impacts that changing climate may have infrastructure planning.

- Once the County has identified prime employment areas (if required to do so), new transportation policies will need to be introduced that prioritize highway investment in a manner that links those prime employment areas to major goods movement facilities and corridors. Additionally, priority routes for goods movement in and out of prime employment areas and other areas of significant commercial activity will need to be identified, along with alternate routes that connect to the provincial network.

- Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to incorporate new policies that promote the co-location of linear infrastructure and protect existing and planned infrastructure corridors.

- Dufferin County will need to work with lower-tier municipalities to assist in the preparation of water, wastewater and stormwater master plans that are informed by watershed planning.

- Amendment to the County Official Plan may be required to introduce new policies that promote the prioritization of maintaining and adapting existing public service facilities and spaces as community hubs. Municipal official plans may provide policy direction on the identification and the preferred locations for community hubs, consisting of existing public service facilities in the vicinity of strategic growth areas and are easily accessible by active transportation and transit.

1.3 Supporting Agricultural

The proposed Growth Plan establishes that the Province will identify and map the agricultural system for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Policy 4.2.6.1). The agricultural system would include prime agricultural areas, specialty crop areas and rural lands, as an agricultural support network (Policy 4.2.6.2). Land use compatibility will be promoted where agricultural uses and non-agricultural uses interface, in order to minimize and mitigate the impacts on the agricultural system (Policy 4.2.6.3). New policy will require that the geographic continuity of the agricultural land base, and the functional and economic connections to the agricultural support network be maintained and enhanced (Policy 4.2.6.4). Retaining existing lots of record for agricultural uses is encouraged, and the use of these lots for non-agricultural uses is discouraged (Policy 4.2.6.5). Municipalities would be encouraged to implement strategies and other approaches to sustain and enhance the agricultural system and the
long-term economic prosperity and viability of the agri-food sector, including the maintenance and improvement of the agricultural support network. This is to be achieved through (Policy 4.2.6.6a-e): 

- the provision of opportunities to support local food, urban and near-urban agriculture, and promoting the sustainability of agricultural, agri-food and agri-product businesses through protecting agricultural resources and minimizing land use conflicts;
- considering the agricultural support network in planning decisions to protect or enhance critical agricultural assets. Where negative impacts on the agricultural system are unavoidable, they will be assessed and mitigated to the extent feasible;
- undertaking long-term planning for agriculture, integrating agricultural economic development, infrastructure, goods movement and freight considerations with land use planning;
- preparing regional agri-food strategies or establishing or consulting with agricultural advisory committees or liaison officers; and
- maintaining, improving and providing opportunities for agriculture-supportive infrastructure both on and off farms.

**Key Issues:**

- It is recommended that the County comment on the policies that direct the Province to identify the agricultural system for the GGH, which is anticipated to be undertaken by 2018. The County and local municipalities should have a proactive role in identifying the agricultural system and agricultural support network.

- Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to provide direction to local municipalities on the implementation of strategies and approaches to sustain and enhance the agricultural system, and promote the long-term economic prosperity and viability of the agri-food sector.

### 1.4 Protecting Natural Heritage and Water

The proposed Growth Plan introduces new policies for the identification and protection of water resource systems, natural heritage systems and the agricultural system. The new policies align with the Greenbelt Plan, and generally establish greenbelt-level protections for natural heritage systems beyond the Greenbelt. While the Province will take the lead in mapping those areas, municipalities will be required to plan for and protect them through their municipal official plans. The Plan also places greater importance on the protection of cultural heritage resources and mineral aggregate resources.

#### 1.4.1 Water Resource Systems

Municipalities, in partnership with conservation authorities, are to undertake watershed planning in order to provide a comprehensive, integrated and long-term approach for the protection, improvement or restoration of the quantity and quality of water within the watershed (Policy 4.2.1.1). Municipalities will also be required to identify water resource systems, and apply appropriate designations and policies in official plans to provide for the long term protection of key hydrologic features, key hydrologic areas and their functions (Policy 4.2.1.2). Any decision regarding allocation of growth and planning for water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure is to be informed by watershed planning. Where decisions pertain to settlement area boundary expansion and secondary plans for designated greenfield areas, these are to be informed by a subwatershed plan or equivalent (Policy 4.2.1.3).
1.4.2 Natural Heritage Systems

The proposed Growth Plan directs municipalities to consider natural heritage features and areas in a comprehensive, integrated and long-term approach, in order to maintain, restore and enhance their diversity and connectivity, and their long term ecological function (Policy 4.2.2.1). The Province will map natural heritage systems and municipal official plans will incorporate the systems, and apply appropriate designations and policies to maintain, restore or improve the diversity and connectivity of the system, and the long term hydrological functions of the features and areas (Policy 4.2.2.2). Municipalities will be able to refine the boundaries of natural heritage systems in a manner that is consistent with the proposed Growth Plan (Policy 4.2.2.3). Within the identified natural heritage system, a full range of existing and new agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses, and normal farm practices are permitted, subject to policies in the Growth Plan (Policy 4.2.2.4a).

Additionally, any proposal for development or site alteration within the natural heritage system will need to demonstrate that (Policy 4.2.2.4b):

- That there will be no negative impacts on key hydrological features or key natural heritage features or functions;
- Connectivity for the movement of plants and animals along the natural heritage system, and between key natural heritage features and key hydrological features located within 240 metres of each other will be maintained and, where possible enhanced;
- The removal of other natural features not identified as key natural heritage features should be avoided, and the features should be incorporated into the planning and design of proposed uses were possible;
- The disturbed area of the site, including building and structures, will not exceed 25 percent (40 per cent for golf courses) of the total developable area;
- The impervious surface will not exceed 10% of the total developable area;
- Uses will be planned to optimize the compatibility of the project with the natural surroundings; and
- At least 30 per cent of the total developable area of the site will remain or be returned to natural self-sustaining vegetation, except where specified in accordance with Growth Plan policies.

The proposed plan establishes that new buildings structures for agricultural uses, agriculture related uses, and on-farm diversified uses are not subject to Policy 4.2.2.4b, but are subject to the policies for key natural heritage features, key hydrological features and adjacent lands (Policy 4.2.2.4c). Based on an environmental impact study, an official plan may establish alternative standards for development within the natural heritage system outside of the key natural heritage features, key hydrological features and associated vegetation protection zones, as long as the alternative standards maintain, restore or enhance the diversity and connectivity of the system, and the long-term ecological or hydrological functions of the features (Policy 4.2.2.4d). In cases where policy 4.2.2.4 does not apply, as per policy 4.2.2.2, municipalities will establish policies and designations to ensure that the connectivity, diversity and functions of the natural heritage features and areas will be maintained, restored or enhanced.

1.4.3 Key Hydrologic Features and Areas, and Key Natural Heritage Features

The proposed Growth Plan introduces new policies for key hydrologic features and key hydrologic areas that establish criteria for development and site alteration outside settlement areas. As per Policy 4.2.3.1, development or site alteration is not permitted in key hydrological features or key natural heritage features with the exception of: (Policy 4.2.3.1a-f):

- forest, fish, and wildlife management;
- conservation and flood or erosion control projects, under certain circumstances
activities that create or maintain infrastructure authorized under an environmental assessment process;
mineral aggregate operations and wayside pits and quarries;
existing uses subject to specific criteria; and
small scale structures for recreational uses where measures are taken to minimize uses.

Large scale development within key hydrologic areas proceeding by way of secondary plans, plans of subdivision and vacant land plans of condominium, and resort development may be permitted if it is demonstrated that hydrological functions will be protected, and water quality and quantity will be maintained, improved or restored. In significant groundwater recharge areas, pre-development infiltration on site will be maintained, improved or restored (Policy 4.2.3.2a). The quality of water infiltrating a site in highly vulnerable aquifers will be maintained (Policy 4.2.3.2b). Also, the quality and quantity of water in significant water contribution areas is to be protected (Policy 4.2.3.2c). Within settlement area boundaries, the above-noted policies do not apply.

1.4.4 Lands Adjacent to Key Hydrologic Features and Key Natural Heritage Features

The proposed Growth Plan introduces new policies requiring proposals for development or site alteration within 120 metres of a key natural heritage feature or key hydrological feature to undergo a hydrological evaluation that identifies a vegetation protection zone. Vegetation protection zones applied to key hydrological features, fish habitats and significant woodlands will be no less than 30 metres wide (Policy 4.2.4.1). The hydrological evaluation is intended to identify any additional restrictions that are to be applied before, during and after development to protect hydrological and ecological functions (Policy 4.2.4.2).

Certain exceptions for requiring a natural heritage evaluation within 120 metres of a key natural heritage feature or key hydrologic feature are provided in policy 4.2.4.4.

Policies related to lands adjacent to key hydrological features and key natural heritage features do not apply to key hydrological or key natural features that are within a settlement area boundary, or key natural heritage features that are outside a settlement area boundary but are not in the identified natural heritage system (Policy 4.2.4.6a-c).

1.4.5 Cultural Heritage Resources

The proposed Growth Plan introduces revised policies related to cultural heritage resources requiring that these resources be conserved in accordance with policies in the PPS, 2014, particularly in strategic growth areas (Policy 4.2.7.1). In addition, municipalities are directed to work with stakeholders and First Nations and Métis communities, for the identification, wise use and management of cultural heritage resources, through official plan policies and strategies (Policy 4.2.7.2). Municipalities are encouraged to prepare and consider archeological management plans and municipal cultural plans in their decision-making (Policy 4.2.7.3).

1.4.6 Mineral Aggregate Resources

The Proposed Growth Plan includes new and expanded policies for mineral aggregate operations within the natural heritage system, which are similar to those within the Protected Countryside area in the current Greenbelt Plan.

As per new policies proposed in the Growth Plan update, municipalities will develop and implement official plan policies and other strategies to conserve mineral aggregate resources. Such strategies will
include the recovery and recycling of manufactured materials derived from mineral aggregate resources for reuse, and the wise use of mineral aggregate resources, including utilization or extraction of on-site mineral aggregate resources prior to development occurring (Policy 4.2.8.2a,b).

New policies for mineral aggregate operations and wayside pits and quarries require that these not be permitted within key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features such as significant wetlands, habitat of endangered species and threatened species, and significant woodlands except under specific conditions (Policy 4.2.8.3a). Growth Plan policy will also require that an application for a new mineral aggregate operation or new wayside pit and quarry only be permitted in key natural features and key hydrologic features and any vegetation protection zones associated with such features where an application can demonstrate how the water resource system will be protected or enhanced; and that the relevant official plan policies have been addressed and that they will be met by the operation (Policy 4.2.8.3b). All applications for a new mineral aggregate operation will be required to demonstrate the following (Policy 4.2.8.3c):

- How connectivity between key hydrologic features and key natural heritage features will be maintained before, during and after the extraction of mineral aggregate resources;
- How the operator could immediately replace any habitat that would be lost from the site with equivalent habitat on another part of the site or on adjacent lands; and
- How the water resource system will be protected or enhanced.

An expansion to an existing mineral aggregate operation may only be approved within the identified natural heritage system, inclusive of key hydrological features and key natural heritage features, and in associated vegetation protection zones, if the decision to approve the expansion is consistent with PPS, 2014, and satisfies the rehabilitation requirements established in 4.2.8 of the proposed Growth Plan (Policy 4.2.8.3d).

New policy would also require that, in prime agricultural areas, applications for new mineral aggregate operations be supported by an agricultural impact assessment and, where possible, maintain or improve connectivity of the agricultural system (Policy 4.2.8.4).

New policies have also been introduced to guide operators in undertaking the rehabilitation of mineral aggregate operation sites. When undertaking rehabilitation, the disturbed area of the site is to be rehabilitated to a state of equal or greater ecological value, and long term ecological integrity is to be maintained or restored, and to the extent possible, improved (Policy 4.2.8.5a). Additionally, if there are key hydrologic features or key natural heritage features on a site, or if those features existed at the time of the application, the health, diversity and size of these key hydrologic features and key natural heritage features will be maintained, restored, or where possible, enhanced. Also, any permitted extraction of mineral aggregate resources that occurs in a feature will be completed, and the area rehabilitated, as early as possible in the life of the operation (Policy 4.2.8.5b). Any aquatic areas that remain after extraction are to be rehabilitated to aquatic enhancement in a manner that meets the intent of Policy 4.2.8.5b. Where rehabilitation occurs outside of the identified natural heritage system, final rehabilitation is to appropriately reflect the long-term land use of the general area. In prime agricultural areas, on prime agricultural land, the site will be rehabilitated back to an agricultural condition in accordance with PPS, 2014.

The proposed Growth Plan establishes that final rehabilitation for new mineral aggregate operations in the identified natural heritage system will be subject to additional requirements (Policy 4.2.8.6). Where there is no underwater extraction, an amount of land equal to that under natural vegetated cover prior to extraction, and no less than 35 per cent of the land subject to each license in the natural heritage system, is to be rehabilitated to forest cover. Where there is underwater extraction no less than 35 per cent of the non-aquatic portion of the land subject to each license in the natural heritage system is to be rehabilitated to forest cover. Lastly, rehabilitation will be implemented so that connectivity between
the key hydrologic features and the key natural heritage features on the site and on adjacent lands will be maintained and restored, and to the extent possible improved.

### 1.4.7 Conservation Policies

The proposed Growth Plan promotes the identification of new opportunities for energy from waste (Policy 4.2.9.1d(i)). In addition, municipalities are encouraged to develop strategies for soil reuse and to integrate sustainable soil management practices into planning approvals (Policy 4.2.9.2), and to use best practices for the management of excess soil and fill generated during any development or site alteration, including infrastructure development (Policy 4.2.9.3).

**Key Issues:**

- It is recommended that the County comment on policies that direct the Province to map natural heritage systems, which is anticipated to be undertaken by 2018. The County and local municipalities should have a proactive role in identifying the natural heritage systems. Further discussion is warranted as to the timing to undertake the County NHSS in relation to the Province’s intent to map natural heritage systems.

- Policies for vegetation protection zones and natural heritage evaluations in relation to key natural heritage features or key hydrologic features should be integrated into the County Official Plan, and provide direction to local municipalities.

- The County should, in partnership with Conservation Authorities and local municipalities, undertake integrated and comprehensive watershed planning.

- The County Official Plan will be required to provide direction to local municipalities for identifying water resource systems, and apply appropriate designations and policies in official plans to provide for the long term protection of key hydrologic features, key hydrologic areas and their functions.

- The County Official Plan will be required to provide direction on the permitted uses within identified natural heritage systems, including existing and new agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses, and normal farm practices.

- The County Official Plan will be required to incorporate new policies for key hydrologic features and key hydrologic areas that establish criteria for development and site alteration outside settlement areas.

- The County Official Plan will be required to incorporate policies requiring proposals for development or site alteration in proximity to key natural heritage feature or key hydrological feature to undertake a hydrological evaluation for the identification of appropriate vegetation protection zones.

- The County Official Plan will be required to provide direction for local municipalities in the development and implementation of local official plan policies and other strategies to conserve mineral aggregate resources. The amendment should include appropriate policies to restrict mineral aggregate operations and wayside pits and quarries from within key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features except under specific conditions, and require applications for new mineral aggregate operations within prime agricultural areas to be supported by an agricultural impact assessment.
The County Official Plan will be required to incorporate policies to promote the identification of new opportunities for energy from waste, and to encourage the development of strategies for soil reuse and sustainable soil management practices.

1.5 Addressing Climate Change

The proposed Growth Plan introduces new policy requiring upper-tier and single-tier municipalities to develop official plan policies to identify actions that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and address climate change adaptation goals, aligned with the Ontario Climate Change Strategy, 2015 and Action Plan (Policy 4.2.10.1).

1.5.1 Inventories, Targets, Monitoring and Reporting

Additionally, municipalities are encouraged to develop strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to improve resilience to climate change through land use planning and planning for infrastructure. Municipalities will also be encouraged to develop greenhouse gas inventories for transportation, buildings, waste management and municipal operations. Lastly, municipalities will be encouraged to establish interim and long-term greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that support provincial targets and reflect the goal of net-zero communities. These targets should be monitored, and progress should be reported (Policy 4.2.10.2).

1.5.2 Resilient Infrastructure

The proposed Growth Plan establishes that infrastructure vulnerabilities are to be assessed by municipalities, which will identify priority actions and investments to increase infrastructure resilience and adapt to a changing climate. This will be undertaken as part of municipal asset management planning (Policy 3.2.1.4).

Key Issues:

- The County Official Plan will be required to implement policy that promotes the identification of actions aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions and addressing climate change adaptation goals, in alignment with the Ontario Climate Change Strategy, 2015 and Action Plan.

- The County should provide guidance to local municipalities through amendments to the County Official Plan for the development of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to improve resilience to climate change through land use planning and planning for infrastructure.

- The County Official Plan will be required to incorporate policies and provide direction to local municipalities for the development of greenhouse gas inventories for transportation, buildings, waste management and municipal operations.

- The County should provide direction to local municipalities, through a County Official Plan amendment, for the establishment of interim and long-term greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that support provincial targets and reflect the goal of net-zero communities. New Policy should also provide guidance on monitoring and reporting.

- The County Official Plan should require that municipal asset management planning assess infrastructure vulnerabilities, and identify priority actions and investments for increasing...
infrastructure resilience and climate change adaptation.

1.6 Improving Plan Implementation

For the most part, the existing policy directions for implementation and interpretation would be retained in the proposed Growth Plan. Some policies have been updated and clarified to provide additional direction.

1.6.1 Co-ordination

The Plan establishes that upper-tier municipalities, in consultation with lower-tier municipalities will, through a municipal comprehensive review, provide policy direction to implement the policies of the Plan, including the identification of minimum targets for lower-tier municipalities, minimum density targets for strategic growth areas in accordance with the Plan, and minimum density targets for designated greenfield areas, and allocating forecasted growth to the horizon of the Plan (2041) to the lower-tier municipalities (Policy 5.2.3.2a-d).

In cases where lower-tier official plans are not updated to implement the proposed Growth Plan in a timely or appropriate manner, upper-tier municipalities are encouraged to take action in accordance with the Planning Act (Policy 5.2.3.4).

The proposed Growth Plan introduces new policies to encourage planning authorities to co-ordinate planning matters with First Nations and Métis communities, and encourage municipalities to build constructive, cooperative relationships and to facilitate knowledge sharing in growth management and land use planning processes (Policy 5.2.3.6 and Policy 5.2.3.7).

1.6.2 Growth Forecasts

The proposed Growth Plan establishes that all upper- and single-tier municipalities are to apply the growth forecasts established by the Plan over its planning horizon (to 2041) at the time of their next municipal comprehensive review (Policy 5.2.4.1). Until the forecasts are applied and are in effect, population and employment forecasts established in upper- or single-tier official plans are to remain in effect (Policy 5.2.4.2). As previously noted, the growth forecasts for Dufferin County have not been revised in the proposed Growth Plan.

1.6.3 Targets

The minimum intensification and density targets proposed in the updated Growth Plan are considered minimum standards and municipalities are encouraged to go beyond those targets where appropriate (Policy 5.2.5.1). Minimum intensification targets are to be measured across all lands within the relevant area, including any lands subject to more than one target (Policy 5.2.5.2). The Plan notes that where alternative targets (i.e., minimum intensification and greenfield targets) have been permitted by the Minister, these minimum targets will continue to apply until the time of a municipal comprehensive review and must be revisited at that time. If no request is made, or the Minister does not permit an alternative target, the minimum targets set forth in the proposed Growth Plan would apply (Policy 5.2.5.5).

1.6.4 Performance Indicators and Monitoring

The Plan introduces new policies that would support the establishment of a comprehensive monitoring program for the Greater Golden Horseshoe by requiring municipalities to monitor and report on the
implementation of the Plan’s policies within their municipality in accordance with reporting requirements, data standards and any other guidelines that may be issued by the Minister (Policy 5.2.6.2). Municipalities, along with conservation authorities, may be required to provide data and information to the Minister for the purpose of monitoring implementation (Policy 5.2.6.3).

1.6.5 Schedules and Appendices

The proposed Growth Plan introduces new policy that would require that all Schedules in the Plan, including the forecasts contained in Schedule 3 be reviewed (and potentially revised) by the Minister at least every five years (Policy 5.2.7.1). In addition, Schedule 3 has been revised to only include one set of 2031 forecasts (i.e., the 2031B forecasts).

1.6.6 Proposed Timeframe for Implementation

The Official Plan of a municipality is to be brought into conformity with the Growth Plan within five years of the Growth Plan coming into effect, allowing for synchronization with timeframes for implementation of the revised Greenbelt Plan, the revised Oak Ridges Moraine Plan.

Key Issues:

- We understand that the Minister is considering a review of the existing transition regulation for the Growth Plan (O.Reg 311/06) to remove any provisions that are no longer needed and clarify provisions where required. Currently, the proposed changes to the plan would be “effective immediately”, coming into force on the date the Growth Plan, 2016, if approved, would take effect. It is recommended that the County seek clarification on how “effective immediately” will work as a transition policy.

- Additionally, any matter that had been initiated, but where no decision had been made prior to the effective date of the Growth Plan, 2016, if approved, would be subject to the policies of the Growth Plan, 2016.
The Government of Ontario is undertaking a coordinated review of its land use planning documents. The province has released the following documents for review and comment:

- Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2016;
- Proposed Greenbelt Plan, 2016;
- Proposed Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, 2016; and
- Proposed Niagara Escarpment Plan, 2016.

The review began in 2015 through an extensive public consultation process. The Province has since reviewed and considered all feedback received, and as an outcome, has proposed a series of changes to the four planning documents. At this time, the Province is seeking feedback on the proposed changes by October 31, 2016.

This memo provides a review of the proposed changes to the Greenbelt Plan, and highlights the impacts the proposed changes may have on the Dufferin County Official Plan (DCOP), and land use planning in the County.

Subject to further consultations with the local municipalities and Councils, it is recommended that the County formalize comments on the Proposed Plans for submission to the province by October 31, 2016.

**Dufferin County Official Plan Context**

Within Dufferin County, the municipalities of East Garafraxa, Amaranth, Mono and Orangeville are impacted by the Greenbelt Plan. The Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) and Oak Ridges Moraine Plan (ORM) are also included in the Greenbelt Plan, and subject to the policies of those respective Plans. The Dufferin County Official Plan (DCOP), Section 2.1 includes high level policies with respect to the implementation of the Greenbelt Plan. The DCOP refers to the Greenbelt Plan for determination as to whether or not lands are affected by the designations and policies of the Greenbelt Plan. Local municipal official plans are required to identify the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside Area and the Natural Heritage System and incorporate more detailed policies and development criteria to meet the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan, as such, the DCOP does not provide detailed land use policies related to the NEP Area. Schedule A to the DCOP identifies the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside Area.

**1.0 Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016**

This section provides a detailed review of the changes identified in the proposed Greenbelt Plan, 2016. For ease of reference, included at the end of each section is a summary that highlights the key issues and proposed policy changes, and the potential impact to the County.
The proposed revisions to the Greenbelt Plan introduce a number of new policies and directions that are intended to protect important ecological, hydrological and agricultural systems, agricultural lands, rural areas and specialty crop areas. In addition, the three provincial plans serve as an essential component of the provincial strategy to control urban expansion. The following review describes the proposed policy changes, and identifies key issues/County impacts, or matters where comments on behalf of the County are recommended, in the context of the themes identified by the Province. The Province’s Land Use Review themes include:

- Building Complete Communities;
- Integrating Infrastructure;
- Supporting Agriculture;
- Protecting Natural Heritage and Water;
- Addressing Climate Change; and
- Improving Plan Implementation.

### 1.1 Building Complete Communities

The proposed Greenbelt Plan includes a number of new policies and provides clarifications to existing ones. It also introduces new concepts such as building resilience to and mitigating climate change, developing complete communities, as well as community hubs.

#### 1.1.1 Protected Countryside Goals

The proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces new policies for settlement areas to promote and support the development of complete communities that promote and enhance health and well-being, are economically and environmentally sustainable and are developed in a manner that supports the long term goal of becoming net-zero communities (Policy 1.2.2.4c). Additionally, settlement areas are to serve as centres for the development of community hubs where compatible services are co-located to meet local needs in locations that are convenient and are accessible by active transportation, and where possible, transit (Policy 1.2.2.4d).

#### 1.1.2 Community Hubs

New policies from the Growth Plan are reinforced through new supporting policies in the Greenbelt Plan which direct municipalities to facilitate the development of community hubs and to collaborate with the service planning, funding and delivery sectors to facilitate the co-ordination and planning of community hubs and other public service facilities (Policy 3.4.2.3). As per Policy 3.4.2.2a-d, municipalities are to incorporate policies in their official plans to facilitate the development of community hubs that:

- enable the co-location of public services to promote cost-effectiveness and service integration;
- facilitate access through locations served by a range of transportation options including active transportation and, where available, transit;
- give priority to existing public service facilities within settlement areas as the preferred location, where appropriate; and
- enable the adaptive reuse of existing facilities and spaces in settlement areas, where appropriate.

Additionally, the Greenbelt Plan provides new direction to maintain and adapt public service facilities as community hubs in rural lands, where feasible (Policy 3.1.4.9).
1.1.3 Town/Village and Hamlet Policies

The proposed Greenbelt Plan removes a policy from the current Greenbelt plan which allowed the minor rounding out of Hamlet boundaries outside of specialty crop areas at the time of municipal conformity (formerly Policy 3.4.3.2). Limited growth is to be permitted within Hamlets through intensification and infill.

In addition, the proposed Plan revises the settlement area boundary expansion policies for Towns and Villages, in conjunction with Policy 2.2.8 of the proposed Growth Plan, to allow upper or single-tier municipalities to consider expansion of settlement area boundaries as part of a municipal comprehensive review under the Growth Plan (3.4.3.3). This would allow the County to consider modest expansions of settlement areas within the Protected Countryside. Previously such modest expansions were only permitted at the time of the 10-year review of the Greenbelt Plan. As a result, the Province is providing greater flexibility and a policy framework for the County to consider settlement area expansions through a municipal comprehensive review.

Along with standard municipal comprehensive review requirements, additional requirements must be met to allow a settlement area boundary expansion within the Protected Countryside in the Greenbelt Area. These requirements have been moved from the Greenbelt Plan to the Growth Plan and include:

- the settlement area to be expanded is identified in the Greenbelt Plan as a Town/Village;
- the proposed expansion would be modest in size;
- the proposed expansion would be serviced by municipal water and wastewater systems; and
- expansion into the Natural Heritage System that has been identified in the Greenbelt Plan is prohibited. (Growth Plan Policy 2.2.8m)

1.1.4 Conserving Cultural Heritage Resources

The proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces new policies to encourage opportunities for cultural heritage conservation in closer alignment with Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 policies. The Plan includes a new policy that would require significant cultural heritage resources, built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archeology resources to be conserved (Policy 4.4.1). Additionally, Planning authorities would be required to work with stakeholders and consider the interests of First Nations and Métis communities in conserving cultural heritage resources through official plan policies and strategies (Policy 4.4.2). Lastly, the proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces new policy that would encourage municipalities to consider the Greenbelt’s vision and goals in preparing archeological management plans and municipal cultural plans for consideration in their decision making (Policy 4.4.3)

**Key Issues:**

- It is recommended that the County provide a comment regarding the proposed policies for settlement area expansion, noting that it would be supportive of considering expansions through a municipal comprehensive review rather than through the Greenbelt Plan Review process, as this provides municipalities with greater flexibility. Consideration should be given to accommodating settlement area boundary refinements for hamlets and settlements not serviced with full municipal services.

- Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to incorporate policies to facilitate the planning and development of community hubs and other public services that enable co-location, facilitate access, and enable adaptive reuse.
• Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to promote the maintenance and adaptation of public service facilities as community hubs in rural lands.

• Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to encourage local municipalities to prepare archeological management plans and municipal cultural plans for consideration in decision making.

1.2 Integrating Infrastructure

The proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces new policies that mirror policies in the proposed Growth Plan, establishing that municipalities should plan for infrastructure and land use in an integrated fashion, in order to ensure that maximum value is obtained from existing infrastructure, that new infrastructure investments support growth planning and environmental objectives, and that the most cost-effective and sustainable infrastructure alternatives are identified (Policy 4.2.1.4). In addition, integrated decision-making for infrastructure and land use planning is to be coordinated among upper, single and lower-tier municipalities to maximize efficiencies and achieve desired planning outcomes aligned with provincial plans (Policy 4.2.1.5).

New policy also establishes that new or expanding infrastructure is to avoid speciality crop areas and other prime agricultural areas, in that order of priority, unless need has been demonstrated, and it has been established that there is no reasonable alternative, and where infrastructure crosses specialty crop areas and prime agricultural areas, an agricultural impact assessment would need to be undertaken (Policy 4.2.1.2f,g).

1.2.1 Sewage and Water Infrastructure, Stormwater Management and Resilient Infrastructure

The proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces new policies that largely defer to the proposed Growth Plan for policy direction in regard to sewage and water infrastructure, and stormwater management and resilient infrastructure (Policies 4.2.2.1 and 4.2.3.1). Municipalities are also to assess infrastructure vulnerability within Towns/Villages in accordance with Growth Plan (Policy 4.2.3.2).

Key Issues:

• Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to provide guidance to local municipalities regarding the integration and coordination of decision-making for infrastructure and land use planning.

• Amendments to the County Official Plan will be required to ensure expanding infrastructure avoids prime agricultural areas, except where necessary, and to require an agricultural impact assessment where infrastructure crosses these areas.
1.3 Supporting Agricultural

Policy 3.1.1 of the proposed Greenbelt Plan refines the Agricultural System which is identified as having two components: the land base and the Agricultural Support Network. The Agricultural System builds on the existing agricultural land base protection of specialty crop areas, prime agricultural areas and rural lands. The Agricultural Support Network consists of infrastructure, services and assets that support the viability of the agri-food sector (Policy 3.1.1). In addition, new policy in the proposed Plan introduces direction that would require the Province, in collaboration with municipalities, to undertake an exercise to provide consistent identification, mapping and protection of the Agricultural System across the Greater Golden Horseshoe, building on the existing Agricultural System mapping. This is further discussed in Section 1.6 of this memo.

1.3.1 Specialty Crop Areas, Prime Agricultural Areas and Rural Lands Policies

The updated Greenbelt Plan provides revised policies that would permit more on-farm diversified uses with the intent of aligning Greenbelt policy more closely with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014. On-farm diversified uses include, but are not limited to home occupations, home industries, agri-tourism uses, and uses that produce value-added agricultural products. Criteria for these uses are to be based on provincial Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas. New policies note that on lands within the specialty crop area of the Protected Countryside, prime agricultural areas and rural lands, a full range of agricultural, agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses are supported and permitted. Proposed agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses are to be compatible with and not hinder surrounding agricultural operations. Criteria for those uses are to be based on provincial Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas (Policies 3.1.2.1, 3.1.3.1, 3.1.4.2).

Municipalities are encouraged to retain existing lots of record for agricultural uses and discourage non-agricultural uses where appropriate (Policy 4.5.2). In specialty crop and prime agricultural areas, only very limited non-agricultural uses are permitted, and may only be permitted after the completion of an agricultural impact assessment (Policies 3.1.2.2, 3.1.3.3, 4.3.2.4). In the case of non-agricultural uses on rural lands, the completion of an agricultural impact assessment should be considered (Policy 3.1.4.4).

New policies promoting land use compatibility are introduced, establishing that, where agricultural uses and non-agricultural uses interface, adverse impacts on the agricultural system are to be avoided, or if avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated (Policies 3.1.2.5, 3.1.3.5, 3.1.4.7). In addition, new proposed policy establishes that geographical continuity of the agricultural land base is to be maintained and enhanced, along with functional connections to the Agricultural Support Network (Policies 3.1.2.6, 3.1.3.6, 3.1.4.8).

New policies are also introduced in the proposed Plan establishing that a natural heritage evaluation or hydrologic evaluation is not required for new buildings and structures for agricultural, agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses located within 120 metres of a key natural heritage feature and/or key hydrologic feature, provided the features and their functions are protected from the impacts of the proposed building or structure, subject to a series of requirements (Policy 3.2.5.8).

1.3.2 Agricultural Support Network

The proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces a new section of policies related to the Agricultural Support Network. The new policies encourage municipalities to implement strategies and approaches to sustain and enhance the Agricultural System and the long-term economic prosperity and viability of the agri-
food sector, including the maintenance and improvement of the Agricultural Support Network (Policy 3.1.5.a-e). This is to be achieved by:

- Providing opportunities to support local food, urban and near-urban agriculture;
- Promoting the sustainability of agricultural, agri-food and agri-product businesses through the protection of agricultural resources, and the minimization of land use conflicts;
- Considering the Agricultural Support Network in planning decisions to protect or enhance critical agricultural assets. Where negative impacts on the Agricultural Support Network are unavoidable, these are to be assessed and, to the extent feasible, mitigated;
- Undertaking long-term planning for agriculture, integrating agricultural economic development, infrastructure, goods movement and freight considerations with land use planning;
- Preparing regional agri-food strategies or establishing and/or consulting with agricultural advisory committees, or liaison officers; and
- Providing opportunities for agriculture-supportive infrastructure both on and off farms.

1.3.3 Preventing Trespass from Nearby Parkland, Open Space and Trails

The Proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces new policy to encourage the adoption of measures to prevent trespassing from nearby parkland, open spaces and trails. These measures are to be incorporated into strategic planning activities that identify, plan for and protect these resources (Policy 3.3.1).

Key Issues:

- An amendment to the County Official Plan will be required to expand the applicability of an agricultural impact assessment for non-agricultural development in prime agricultural areas and rural lands. An agricultural impact assessment policy will also be required to address applications for new mineral aggregate operations proposed in prime agricultural areas. Additionally, agricultural impact assessments would explicitly also be required in additional circumstances such as settlement area boundary expansions proposed into prime agricultural areas. Where non-agricultural uses are proposed in rural lands, the completion of an agricultural impact assessment is to be considered.

- An amendment to the County Official Plan will be required to include policies that promote the geographical continuity, maintenance and enhancement of the agricultural land base along with the functional connections to the Agricultural Support Network.

1.4 Protecting Natural Heritage and Water

1.4.1 Natural Heritage System Policies

The proposed changes to the Natural System section of the Greenbelt Plan largely consist of reorganizing and revising existing policy direction. However, in some instances, new concepts are proposed for addition.

Revised policies would permit more on-farm diversified uses within the natural heritage system (e.g. agri-tourism uses) (Policy 3.2.2.1). In addition, new development or site alteration in the Natural Heritage System would have to demonstrate, among other things, the compatibility of the project with the natural surrounding (Policy 3.2.2.3f).
1.4.2 Water Resources System Policies

The proposed Greenbelt Plan provides an updated definition of the term Water Resource System to include key hydrologic areas, in addition to ground and surface water features (Policy 3.2.1). It also provides revised policy requiring “watershed planning”, instead of encouraging it, to inform decisions on growth, development, settlement boundary expansions and planning for water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure. Municipalities together with conservation authorities are to ensure that watershed planning is completed (Policy 3.2.3.2). Watershed plans and watershed management approaches are to be integrated with watershed planning and management in the Niagara Escarpment Plan, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Policy 3.2.3.3).

The Plan also introduces new policy requiring that, prior to the approval of settlement area boundary expansions, secondary plans and resort development, a subwatershed plan or equivalent will be required in order to guide planning and development decisions (Policy 3.2.3.5).

1.4.3 Key Hydrologic Areas

The proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces new policy requiring municipalities to identify and protect key hydrologic areas which include significant groundwater recharge areas, highly vulnerable aquifers, and significant surface water contribution areas (Policy 5.3).

The proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces new policies requiring that various criteria be met where major development is proposed within a key hydrologic area in Protected Countryside areas, in order to protect, improve or restore the “hydrologic functions” of these areas. Major development is defined in the Greenbelt Plan as development consisting of the creation of four or more lots, the construction of a building or buildings with a ground floor area of 500m\(^2\) or more; or the establishment of a major recreational use. Major development would need to be consistent with the criteria set out in the relevant watershed or subwatershed plan (Policy 3.2.4.1). In significant groundwater recharge areas, predevelopment infiltration on a site would need to be maintained, improved or restored, while in highly valuable aquifers, the quality of water infiltrating the site would need to be maintained. In significant water contribution areas, the quality and quantity of water, including baseflow, is to be protected.

1.4.4 Key Natural Features and Key Hydrologic Features Policies

New policies are introduced in the proposed Greenbelt Plan to clarify under what circumstances development is exempt from the requirement to undertake a natural heritage or hydrologic evaluation. Policy 3.2.5.6 notes that a proposal for new development or site alteration within the Natural Heritage System, where the only key natural heritage feature is the habitat of endangered species and threatened species, is not subject to the requirement for a natural heritage evaluation or a hydrological evaluation. Similarly, as noted previously in Section 1.3.1, a natural heritage evaluation or hydrologic evaluation is not required for new buildings and structures for agricultural, agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses located within 120 metres of a key natural heritage feature and/or key hydrologic feature, provided the features and their functions are protected from the impacts of the proposed building or structure, subject to a series of requirements (Policy 3.2.5.8). The requirements include:

a) Maintaining a 30 metre vegetation protection zone, along with the key natural heritage feature and/or key hydrologic feature;

b) Maintaining, and where feasible, improving connectivity between key natural heritage features and/or key hydrologic features;
c) Locating the new building or structure away from the key natural heritage feature and/or key hydrologic feature to the maximum extent possible, and where possible clustering with existing buildings or structures;

d) Pursuing best management practices to protect and/or restore key natural heritage features and/or key hydrologic features and functions;

e) Ensuring measures are put in place, especially for stormwater management and erosion control so that potential impacts of the building or structure on the key natural heritage and/or key hydrologic features and functions are mitigated, before, during and after construction; and

f) The municipality or other approval authority has also considered the following in relation to determining any potential impacts of the proposal:
   
i. the nature and purpose of the building or structure;
   
ii. The size and scale of the building or structure, including where appropriate, the cumulative impact of existing development;
   
iii. The site characteristic such as topography; and
   
iv. The sensitivity of the adjacent key natural heritage feature(s) and/or key hydrologic feature.

The proposed Greenbelt Plan clarifies polices related to the conditions within which expansion of buildings and structures within key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features and their associated vegetation protection zones can occur. The Plan establishes that expansions or alterations to existing buildings and structures for agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses and residential dwellings, may be considered within key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features and their associated vegetation protection zones, if it is demonstrated that:

a) There is no alternative, and the expansion or alteration in the feature is minimized and in the vegetation protection zone and is directed away from the feature to the maximum extent possible; and

b) The impact of the expansion or alteration on the feature and its functions is minimized and mitigated to the maximum extent possible.

1.4.5 Excess Soil

The proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces new policies to encourage municipalities to develop soil re-use strategies as a component of growth management planning. Additionally, municipalities are to integrate sustainable soil management practices into planning approvals (Policy 3.4.2.6). Municipalities and industry are also to use best practices for the management of excess soil and fill generated during development and site alteration to ensure that:

a. Any excess soil or fill is re-used on-site or locally, to the maximum extent possible; and

b. Fill received at a site will not cause an adverse effect with regard to the current or proposed use of the property or the natural environment.

1.4.6 Growing the Greenbelt

The proposed Greenbelt Plan adds new policy establishing that many of the external connections shown on Schedules 1, 2 and 4 at the time of the Plan’s approval in 2005 have been added to the Greenbelt Plan as Urban River Valley areas, and are subject to the Urban River Valley Area policies of the Plan (Policies 3.2.6, 5.7.1.3). Twenty one major watercourses between the Greenbelt and Lake Ontario and associated coastal wetlands are proposed to be added as Urban River Valley areas. The Urban River Valley areas do not directly impact the County of Dufferin.
Additionally, the proposed Plan introduces new policy to allow amendments to the Greenbelt Plan outside of the 10 year review for the purpose of, among other exceptions, extending the Greenbelt Plan policy coverage to lands which may be added to the Greenbelt. This includes areas added as protected Countryside or Urban River Valley (Policy 5.7.1).

The proposed Plan also introduces a new policy that would support the Province in leading a process, working with municipalities, conservation authorities and other key stakeholders, to identify potential areas (with a focus on areas of ecological and hydrological significance where urbanization should not occur) to be added to the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt. Where such areas are identified, the Minister of Municipal Affairs may initiate amendments to the Greenbelt boundary regulation and Greenbelt Plan to grow the Greenbelt (Policy 5.7.1.2);

The proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces new policy establishing that the Province will consider requests from municipalities to grow the Greenbelt using the Protected Countryside and/or Urban River Valley designations. In considering municipal requests, the Province is to guide its decision-making on the basis of the following criteria:

- Providing supportive council resolutions;
- Demonstrating how the proposed lands connect physically or functionally to the Greenbelt; and
- Demonstrating that a proposal would complement the Growth Plan and support other related provincial initiatives such as the Great Lakes Strategy and Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan.

Additionally, the Province will consider requests from municipalities to add privately owned lands to areas designated as Urban River Valley in cases where a municipality has endorsed, by resolution, the request of a property owner for their lands to be added to the Greenbelt. The policy also enables the Minister to initiate amendments to the Greenbelt boundary regulation and Greenbelt Plan in order to grow the Greenbelt based on a review of municipal submissions and the above-noted criteria.

In June 2016, the Province met with representatives of the County and Conservation Authorities to discuss and review hydrologic feature and area data as part of the process to grow the Greenbelt Plan. The County will continue to work with the province in this regard, and to better understand any future proposals to modify the extent of the Greenbelt Plan.

**Key Issues:**

- It is recommended that the County comment on policies that direct the Province to map natural heritage systems, which is anticipated to be undertaken by 2018. The County and local municipalities should have a proactive role in identifying the natural heritage systems. Further discussion is warranted as to the timing to undertake the County NHSS in relation to the Province’s intent to map natural heritage systems.

- The County Official Plan will be required to incorporate new policies that establish criteria for new development and site alteration outside of the Natural Heritage System.

- The County Official Plan will be required to incorporate new policies to identify and protect key hydrologic areas.

- The County Official Plan will be required to provide direction to local municipalities for identifying water resource systems, and apply appropriate designations and policies in official plans to provide for the long term protection of key hydrologic features, key hydrologic areas.
and their functions.

- The County should, in partnership with Conservation Authorities and local municipalities, undertake integrated and comprehensive watershed planning.

- The County Official Plan will be required to incorporate new policies requiring the development of a subwatershed plan or equivalent prior to the approval of settlement area boundary expansions, secondary plans and resort development.

- The County Official Plan will be required to incorporate new policies for key hydrologic features and key hydrologic areas that establish criteria for major development.

- An amendment to the County Official Plan will be required to clarify under what circumstances development is exempt from the requirement to undertake a natural heritage or hydrologic evaluation.

- The County Official Plan will be required to incorporate policy that clarifies the conditions within which expansion or alteration of buildings and structures for agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses and residential dwellings within key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features and their associated vegetation protection zones are permitted.

- The County Official Plan will be required to incorporate policies to encourage the development of strategies for soil reuse and sustainable soil management practices.

- The County will continue to monitor and provide input into the province’s process for considering expansions to the Greenbelt Plan, and consult with local municipalities in this regard.

1.5 Responding to Climate Change

A new climate change sub-section has been added to the Protected Countryside Goals section in the proposed Greenbelt Plan. The new policies found in the sub-section are intended to promote the integration of climate change considerations into planning and managing the Agricultural System, Natural Heritage System, and Water Resources System in order to improve resilience and protect carbon sequestration potential, recognizing that the Natural Heritage System is also a component of green infrastructure. The new policies also promote the integration of climate change considerations into the planning and managing of growth, by incorporating techniques to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in resilient settlement areas and infrastructure within the greenbelt (Policy 1.2.2.6). In addition, new Protected Countryside goals and policies for settlement areas are intended to promote the development of complete communities that have a long-term goal of becoming net-zero communities (Policy 3.4.1).

The proposed Greenbelt Plan establishes new policy that defers to the Growth Plan for policy direction that would require municipalities to integrate climate change considerations into planning and managing growth within settlements (Policy 3.4.2.4).
• The County should provide guidance to local municipalities through amendments to the County Official Plan for the development of strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to improve resilience to climate change through land use planning and planning for infrastructure.

1.6 Improving Plan Implementation

New policy has been included in the proposed Greenbelt Plan which establishes that the Province, in collaboration with the municipalities, will undertake an exercise to provide consistent identification, mapping and protection of the Agricultural System across the GGH. Within the Protected Countryside, upper-tier and single-tier municipalities are to refine their official plan mapping to bring prime agricultural areas, specialty crop areas, and rural lands into conformity with provincial mapping through municipal comprehensive review under the Growth Plan. These refinements are only to be carried out where there are inconsistencies of municipal boundaries or discrepancies between provincial and municipal mapping that are significant. Municipalities are also to continue to retain existing designations for prime agricultural areas within the Protected Countryside (Policy 5.3).

The proposed Plan establishes that municipalities are expected to provide policies to maintain and enhance the Agricultural Support Network and to identify the physical location of elements in the Agricultural Support Network in collaboration with the Province (Policy 5.3).

The Plan also makes provisions for allowing decision makers on planning applications to adopt policies that are more stringent than the requirements of the Plan, to the extent that doing so would not conflict with any of the policies or objectives of the proposed Greenbelt Plan. With the exception of the lot creation policies, official plans and zoning by-laws are not to contain provisions that are more restrictive than the policies of sections 3.1 and 4.3.2 of the proposed Greenbelt Plan as they apply to agricultural uses and mineral aggregate resources respectively (Policy 5.3).

1.6.1 Monitoring / Performance Measures

The proposed Greenbelt Plan provides updated policies for monitoring implementation and performance measures to support the establishment of a comprehensive monitoring program. As per the Plan, the Province, in consultation with municipalities, other public bodies and stakeholders is to develop a set of performance indicators which will be used to measure the effectiveness of the policies in the proposed Greenbelt Plan. The Province will also be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the Plan, including reviewing performance indicators concurrent with any review of the Plan.

Municipalities will have the responsibility of monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Plan’s policies within their municipality, in accordance with any data standards and any other guidelines established by the Province.

Lastly, the Province may require municipalities to provide data and information to the Province to demonstrate progress made towards the implementation of the Greenbelt Plan.

Key Issues:

• It is recommended that the County comment on the policies that direct the Province to identify the Agricultural System for the GGH, which is anticipated to be undertaken by 2018. The
County and local municipalities should have a proactive role in identifying the agricultural system and agricultural support network.

- At the time of its next municipal comprehensive review, the County will be required to refine their Official Plan mapping to bring prime agricultural areas, specialty crop areas, and rural lands into conformity with provincial mapping.

- An amendment to the County Official Plan will be required to integrate policies that promote the maintenance and enhancement of the Agricultural Support Network, and to identify the physical location of elements in the Agricultural Support Network in collaboration with the Province.
The Government of Ontario is undertaking a coordinated review of its land use planning documents. The province has released the following documents for review and comment:

- Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2016;
- Proposed Greenbelt Plan, 2016;
- Proposed Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, 2016; and
- Proposed Niagara Escarpment Plan, 2016.

The review began in 2015, through an extensive public consultation process. The Province has since reviewed and considered all feedback received, and as an outcome, has proposed a series of changes to the four planning documents. At this time, the Province is seeking feedback on the proposed changes by October 31, 2016.

This memo provides a review of the proposed changes to the Niagara Escarpment Plan, 2016, and highlights the impacts the proposed changes may have on the Dufferin County Official Plan (DCOP), and land use planning in the County.

Subject to further consultations with the local municipalities and Councils, it is recommended that the County formalize comments on the Proposed Plans for submission to the province by September 30th, 2016.

**Dufferin County Official Plan Context**

Within Dufferin County, the municipalities of Mono, Mulmur and Melancthon are impacted by the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) and/or the Niagara Escarpment Development Control Area. The Dufferin County Official Plan (DCOP), Section 2.3, includes high level policies with respect to the implementation of the NEP. The DCOP refers to the NEP for determination as to whether or not lands are affected by the designations and policies of the NEP. Local municipal official plans are required to incorporate more detailed policies and development criteria to meet the requirements of the NEP, as such, the DCOP does not provide detailed land use policies related to the NEP Area. Schedule A to the DCOP identifies the NEP Area designations and the extent of the Niagara Escarpment Development Control Area.

**1.0 Proposed Niagara Escarpment Plan 2016**

This section provides a detailed review of the changes identified in the proposed Niagara Escarpment Plan, 2016 (NEP). For ease of reference, included at the end of each section is a summary that highlights the key issues and proposed policy changes, and the potential impact to the County.

The proposed revisions to the NEP introduce a number of new policies and directions that are intended to: introduce new policy areas to reflect provincial priorities; harmonize the plans with each other and with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), and clarify linkages to other policy areas; strengthen the plan and clarify policy intent; and address implementation issues. The following review describes the
proposed policy changes, and identifies key issues/County impacts, or matters where comments on behalf of the County are recommended, in the context of the themes identified by the Province.

1.1 Building Complete Communities

1.1.1 Part 1 - Land Use Designations

Sections 1.6.1.3, 1.7.5.3 were introduced to incorporate the concept of community hubs/needs into minor urban and urban areas. The new policies promote the co-location of compatible public services to address local community needs in convenient locations that are accessible by walking, cycling and public transit, where available.

1.1.2 Part 1 – Permitted Uses

Sections 1.5.3, 1.8.3, 1.9.3 were revised to include secondary dwelling units as permitted uses in certain areas to enable planning for complete communities. The NEP now includes secondary dwellings in the Minor Urban Centre, Urban Area and Escarpment Recreation Areas, while still maintaining the overall environment first Purpose and Objectives of the NEP.

1.1.3 Part 2 – General Development Criteria

Section 2.2.8 introduces the addition of general development criteria related to second-dwelling units. The following provisions now apply to secondary dwelling units:

a) a single secondary dwelling unit may be permitted per existing lot of record;
b) notwithstanding the above, a secondary dwelling unit shall not be permitted on an existing lot of record where there is more than one single dwelling, including any dwelling approved under Part 2.2.4 b) of this Plan;
c) the secondary dwelling unit shall be contained entirely within a single dwelling or in an addition to a single dwelling and shall not be permitted in a detached accessory facility;
d) the floor area of a secondary dwelling unit shall be proportionate in size to the single dwelling and shall have minimal negative impact on the Escarpment environment;
e) where municipal official plan policies permit secondary dwelling units, the municipal standards (e.g., lot size, parking requirements, maximum floor area, licencing) shall be met, and adequate municipal servicing shall be available to accommodate the secondary dwelling unit (including septic and water), to the satisfaction of the municipality
f) and the implementing authority;
g) secondary dwelling units shall not be permitted in a group home or a single dwelling containing a bed and breakfast; and
h) a home occupation or home industry shall not be permitted within a secondary dwelling unit.

1.1.4 Policy Themes

Section 2.11 (formerly Section 2.13) was revised to update terminology and clarify the policy approach related to Recreation. Policy 2.11.2 was added to clarify that in Escarpment Natural Areas and Escarpment Protection Areas, permitted recreation uses shall require minimal modification of the existing natural, topographic and landscape features, shall not require the building of major structures and shall have no negative impact on the Escarpment environment.

Section 2.13 was introduced to include new development criteria proposed to clarify historic policy intent to protect scenic resources of the Niagara Escarpment. Policy 2.13.1 was added to require development to ensure the protection of the scenic resources of the Escarpment.
1.1.5 Part 3 - The Niagara Escarpment Park and Open Space System

Section 3.1.6 was revised to focus more on environmental impacts which in turn provides for enhanced flexibility for recreational activities and infrastructure while protecting the Escarpment. Policy 3.1.6.9 was introduced to clarify that the establishment of a new trail within a Nature Reserve or Nature Reserve Zone as defined in Parts 3.1.4 and 3.1.5 respectively may be permitted, in consultation with the Niagara Escarpment Commission and Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.

Section 3.2.3 was introduced to designate the Bruce Trail portion as a footpath only.

Key Issues:

Permitted Uses

- Amendments to the local municipal Official Plans may be required to include language regarding the relationship secondary dwelling units and complete communities.

Policy Themes - Tourism and Recreation, Scenic Resources and Landform Conservation

- The County Official Plan may be required to align its Tourism and Recreation policies (DCOP Section 3.6.3) with the updated terminology from Section 2.11 of the proposed NEP. New policies for compatibility with the Escarpment environment and community character of the area should be introduced.

- Amendments to the local municipal Official Plans may be required to introduce development criteria related to Scenic Resources and Landform Conservation.

The Niagara Escarpment Park and Open Space System

- It is recommended that the County Official Plan include language which supports the Bruce Trail for pedestrian use only.

1.2 Supporting Agriculture

1.2.1 Part 1 – Permitted Uses

Sections 1.3.3.2, 1.4.3.2, 1.5.3.2, 1.8.3.15, 1.9.3.1 were revised / introduced to enhance agricultural viability. The NEP now proposes the incorporation of agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses (as defined in the PPS, 2014) in Escarpment Natural Areas, Escarpment Protection Areas, Escarpment Rural Areas, Escarpment Recreation Areas, and Mineral Resource Extraction Areas.

1.2.2 Appendix 2 – Definitions – ‘Agricultural Purposes Only’

The definition of ‘Agricultural Purposes Only’ in Appendix 2 has been revised to address agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses as permitted, with exceptions.
1.2.3  Part 2 – Policy Themes

Sections 2.8.6 and 2.8.7 were introduced to align ‘Agriculture’ with the approaches set out in the PPS and other provincial plans which protect and promote agricultural viability. New policies have been included to provide additional support to agricultural viability and to provide an opportunity to allow a greater range of commercial uses related to agriculture, as well as to clarify the policies related to severances and farm dwellings. Policy 2.8.6 j) states the land supporting an agriculture-related use shall not be severed from a farm lot exclusively for the purposes of the agriculture-related use. The definitions relating to agriculture have also been updated to provide better alignment with the definitions in the PPS, 2014 and the other provincial land use plans.

**Key Issues:**

- DCOP Section 4.2.1.e) promotes a diverse, innovative and economically strong agricultural industry and associated activities by enhancing their capacity to contribute to the economy by accommodating a range of agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified use. Local municipal Official Plans may require updates to align with the changes proposed with respect to Agriculture.

1.3  Protecting Natural Heritage and Water

1.3.1  Introduction

The Introduction was revised to acknowledge the significance of Indigenous culture and histories within the NEP Area, the significance of the Escarpment environment to provide ecosystems services and to help address and mitigate the effects of climate change. Corresponding language has also been included throughout the plan.

Sections 2.7.1 and 2.7.2 were added to introduce the concept of a landscape approach to natural heritage protection and identify the component parts of a Natural Heritage System within the NEP Area. The objective is to ensure that development affecting natural heritage features will have no negative impacts on the features or their functions, or on the supporting hydrologic features and functions, in order to maintain the diversity and connectivity of the broader Natural System.

1.3.2  Part 2 – Policy Themes

Water Resources policies were revised to clarify permitted uses and Development Criteria for development that is located within or adjacent to wetlands and other hydrologic features, and/or impacts quantity and quality of water resources. Updated policies also ensure that the hydrologic functions of these features are also protected, as set out in the Greenbelt Plan.

Natural Heritage policies were revised to introduce a systems based approach to the protection of natural heritage as well as key natural heritage features as set out in the Greenbelt Plan. Sections 2.7.1 and 2.7.2 were newly added to introduce the concept of a landscape approach to natural heritage protection and identify the component parts of a Natural Heritage System within the NEP Area. Policy 2.7.1 a) requires that the diversity and connectivity between key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features located within 240 metres of each other is maintained, or where possible, enhanced for the movement of native plants and animals across the landscape.
Infrastructure policies were revised to better coordinate with other provincial plans, and to address new policy approaches to water resources, natural heritage, agriculture and green infrastructure as defined in the PPS, 2014.

**Key Issues:**

**Introduction**

- Amendments to the County Official Plan and local municipal official plans may be required to highlight the significance of Indigenous culture and histories within the NEP area and the significance of the Escarpment environment to provide ecosystems services and to help address and mitigate the effects of climate change.

**Policy Themes - Water Resources, Natural Heritage and Infrastructure**

- Official Plan objectives related to Water Resources, Natural Heritage and Infrastructure need to align with the policy themes identified in 4.3.2.

1.4 Providing Infrastructure

1.4.1 Part 1 – Land Use Designations

Section 1.7.5.9 was revised to clarify urban areas criteria for development and growth related to natural heritage, water resources, cultural heritage, scenic resources and agricultural systems. The revised policy notes that growth and development in Urban Areas is to be compatible with and provide for: the protection of the Escarpment environment; the protection of natural heritage features and functions; the protection of hydrologic features and functions; the protection of agricultural lands, including prime agricultural areas and specialty crop areas; the conservation or restoration of cultural heritage resources; considerations for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and improved resilience to the impacts of a changing climate; sustainable use of water resources for ecological and servicing needs; and compliance with the targets, criteria and recommendations of applicable water, wastewater and stormwater master plans, approved watershed planning and/or subwatershed plan in land use planning.

1.4.2 Part 1 – Permitted Uses

The proposed NEP was revised to remove the term ‘Incidental Uses’ used throughout the Plan and incorporate incidental uses into the definitions of ‘Accessory Uses’ and ‘Accessory Facilities’ to provide clarity and consistency to Plan policies.

1.4.3 Part 2 - Existing Uses

Development Criteria in Part 2.3 and the definition of Existing Uses were revised to provide greater policy clarity regarding the approach to considering changes of use or expansions of such uses.

1.4.4 Part 2 - Development Criteria – Introduction

Section 2.1 was revised to clarify that all development criteria are to be considered with respect to any development proposal and that development criteria represent minimum standards for assessing the
conformity of local official plans, secondary plans and, where applicable, zoning bylaws and for administering site-plan control approvals.

**Key Issues:**

**Land Use Designations**

- Local municipal official plans will need to align with the policies related to growth and development in urban areas of the NEP in Section 1.7.5.9.

**Existing Uses**

- DCOP Section 8.6.9 notes that “where Provincial Plans include existing use and/or prohibition policies, such policies or prohibitions will take precedence over this Plan and the local municipal official plan policies with respect to existing uses.” Revisions to the DCOP, however, should be considered to achieve the same level of flexibility noted in NEP Section 2.1, in that the development criteria of the NEP provide minimum standards.

### 1.5 Mainstreaming Climate Change

#### 1.5.1 Part 1 – Land Use Designations:

Descriptions of Escarpment Natural Area, Escarpment Protection Area, Minor Urban Centres and Escarpment Recreation Areas were modified / introduced to acknowledge the NEP’s role in addressing climate change.

#### 1.5.2 Part 2 – General Development Criteria:

Section 2.2 was revised to provide for the addition of development criteria consistent with PPS requirements and climate change considerations. Changes to the NEP were made to encourage green infrastructure, strengthen policies for stormwater management, consider risks associated with natural hazards and promote development patterns that facilitate intensification, energy conservation, transportation efficiency, improved air quality, and reduced greenhouse emissions. The proposed policies assist in the maintenance or enhancement of natural areas and rural land use patterns as a means of mitigating the effects of climate change.

#### 1.5.3 Part 3 - The Niagara Escarpment Park and Open Space System:

New language was introduced in Section 3 to support the identification of NEPOSS’s role in securing and protecting significant Escarpment features and scenic landscapes, and to acknowledge the role of NEPOSS in helping to mitigate the effects of climate change.

**Key Issues:**

**Climate Change**

- Refinements or the inclusion of policies in local municipal official plans may be re required to include policies to mitigate the impacts of climate change.
1.6 Plan Implementation

1.6.1 Introduction:

The Introduction was revised to clarify the relationship between the NEP and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Greenbelt Plan, and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan as well as the PPS. The Introduction was also revised to include additions regarding legislative authority, how to read a provincial plan and how to read the Niagara Escarpment Plan, in line with amendments proposed for the Growth Plan. Lastly, the Introduction was revised to include performance indicators and monitoring with language proposed for the Greenbelt and Growth Plans.

1.6.2 Part 1 – Land Use Policies:

Section 1 was revised to include new language to encourage engagement of First Nations and Métis communities early in the Plan amendment process; considerations for amendments for new mineral resource extraction areas have been moved to the Plan Amendment section (previously in Escarpment Rural Area section) for clarity; and updates to language to modernize and align with other provincial plans and regulatory processes (i.e., Aggregate Resources Act).

Section 1.2.2 was introduced to include considerations of amendments for new mineral resource extraction areas in addition to Plan Amendment policies outlined in Section 1.2.1. In evaluating applications for amendments to the Niagara Escarpment Plan to redesignate Escarpment Rural Area to Mineral Resource Extraction Area, protection of key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features, cultural heritage resources, scenic resources, and adjacent escarpment related designations and landforms are to be considered.

1.6.3 Part 1 – Permitted Uses:

The NEP was updated throughout to reflect modern terminology and policy areas such as cultural heritage which has been incorporated throughout the plan. Policies 1.2.2.3.a.iii, 1.3.1, 1.4.1.4, 1.5.1.3, 1.6.1.4, 16.8.9.e were revised to include provisions for cultural heritage.

Section 1.9.3 was revised for the removal of ‘After Uses’ in Mineral Resource Extraction Areas to clarify permitted uses are the uses permitted and requirement of re-designation to a non-MREA land-use designation once the licence under the Aggregate Resources Act has been surrendered.

1.6.4 Part 1 – New Lots:

Policies related to New Lots were revised to modernize terminology and confirm policy intent. Section 1.9.4 was revised to clarify that new lots are discouraged within Mineral Resource Extraction Areas and any new lot created within a Mineral Resource Extraction Area shall require an amendment to the NEP.

1.6.5 Part 2 – General Development Criteria:

Section 2.2 was revised for the removal of certain general development criteria which was viewed as being redundant. Updated terminology and policy approaches were included for consistency with other provincial plans. For example, Policy 2.2.6 which included provision for the design of subdivisions, condominiums or other similar forms of residential lot ownership within Urban Areas, Minor Urban...
Centres and Escarpment Recreation Areas, was deleted due to its redundancy with Sections 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8.

1.6.6 Part 2 – Policy Themes:

Section 2.9 was revised to update terminology and amended policy approach for Mineral Aggregate Resources to better align with the Aggregate Resources Act, and to address new policy approaches. These changes have been proposed to support improvements to the rehabilitation of pits and quarries, to control fill activity and encourage compatible after uses including adding land to the Niagara Escarpment Parks and Open Space System.

Section 2.10 was revised to update terminology and clarify the policy approach for Cultural Heritage so that it is consistent with the PPS.

1.6.7 Part 3 - The Niagara Escarpment Park and Open Space System:

New language was included in Section 3.1 to set out the roles and responsibilities of the NEC, the MNRF and NEPOSS agencies. Section 3.1.2.1 introduces the Niagara Escarpment Parks and Open Space System Council and its role within NEPOSS. The NEPOSS Council is comprised of representatives from NEPOSS agencies (Public agencies/bodies and approved conservation organizations that own/manage land within NEPOSS) and intended to advance NEPOSS objectives. The Council is to provide advice to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry and the Niagara Escarpment Commission on NEPOSS policies, programs and issues.

Section 3.1.5.1 was introduced to set out the approval process for Parks and Open Spaces Management Plans. It is noted that the development of zone mapping and zone policies is required for orderly planning, compatible development and effective management of a park or open space to recognize that every park or open space includes a particular combination of significant natural heritage resources and cultural heritage resources and potential or existing development. Management Plans, prepared by NEPOSS agencies, will guide zone policies and mapping for long-term protection, development and management of the park or open space. Section 3.1.5.1.2 notes that zone policies developed through the Master/Management planning process take precedence over Land Use Designations in the Niagara Escarpment Plan, once a Master/Management Plan is approved.

Key Issues:

Policy Themes – Cultural Heritage

- Cultural heritages policies in the DCOP and local municipal official plans may require updates to be more consistent with NEP Section 2.10.

The Niagara Escarpment Park and Open Space System

- Will need to understand the County and local municipal role in the preparation and implementation of Parks and Open Spaces Management Plans.
1.7 Site Specific Urban Use / Boundary Amendments

Proposals for changes to urban boundaries and/or urban uses within the Niagara Escarpment Plan generally fall under one of the following three categories in order to be considered by the MNRF and the NEC as part of the co-ordinated review:

1. Proposal for an urban boundary expansion: these would include proposed boundary expansions to Urban Areas, Minor Urban Centres, or Escarpment Recreation Areas.
2. Proposals for site-specific urban or recreational uses: these would include proposals to establish a new urban use, or to significantly expand an existing use.
3. Requests for urban servicing in non-urban areas: these would include proposals to extend urban services to non-urban areas based on health and environmental concerns, or to support existing uses (as defined in the Niagara Escarpment Plan) that require urban services.

The following table summarizes two requests specific to Dufferin County which have been submitted and are being considered during the Co-ordinated Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proponent</th>
<th>Subject Lands</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Existing NEP Designation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2222699 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>933158 Airport Road, Town of Mono, Dufferin County Part Lots 1-3, Concession 7</td>
<td>Change designation to Escarpment Recreation Area to permit use of property for water sports activities on existing 15 ha lake, winter sports (skating, cross country skiing and snowshoeing), health and recreation retreat centre (3-storey lodge and cabins), barn for 10 horses. The property is 82.62 ha in size.</td>
<td>Escarpment Natural Area Escarpment Protection Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine River Institute</td>
<td>606060 River Road Part Lots 12 &amp; 13, Concession 3, West of Hurontario Township of Mulmur Dufferin County</td>
<td>To construct a 540 m² (6000 sq. ft.) dormitory on a 79.6 ha lot. The adolescent treatment centre is considered an Existing Use in the NEP, and has previously maximized its allowable expansion under Part 2.3 of the NEP. The proponent requires additional space to meet Pine River Institute program needs.</td>
<td>Escarpment Natural Area Escarpment Protection Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 Niagara Escarpment Plan Land Use Designation Mapping Updates

The Proposed NEP also proposes changes to its land use designation maps. In the updated maps, the application of designation criteria has not changed; however, terminology has been amended to update the language of the existing Land Use Designation Criteria and definitions using modern standards and Provincial terminology (e.g., Provincially Significant Wetlands).

The land use designation maps have been updated by applying the latest data, studies, Geographic Information System (GIS) data and imagery. In Dufferin County, there are changes in the delineation of Escarpment Natural Areas, Escarpment Protection Areas, and Escarpment Rural Areas as summarized in the table below. The Proposed NEP proposes a 17% increase in the extent of the Escarpment Natural Areas designations, with corresponding decreases in the extent of the Escarpment Protection Areas and Escarpment Rural Areas within the County. It has been suggested that these revisions are a result of changes over time on the landscape (e.g. natural succession) resulting in
increased significance of these features and areas, and updates to boundaries of significant features and areas (e.g. ANSIs and wetlands).

Table 1 – Land Use Designation Comparison (Dufferin County)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Area (ha)</th>
<th>Proposed Area (ha)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escarpment Natural Area</td>
<td>5,294</td>
<td>8,705</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escarpment Protection Area</td>
<td>9,791</td>
<td>7,745</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escarpment Rural Area</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resource Extraction Area</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escarpment Recreation Area</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,230</td>
<td>19,230</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current and updated land use designation maps specific to Dufferin County are shown below. Areas circled in red identify significant changes in designation between old and new mapping.
Key Issues:

- The extent of the Escarpment Natural Area designation is proposed to increase substantially. Furthermore, in other instances the Escarpment Rural designation is being replaced with the Escarpment Protection Area. The restrictive nature of the Escarpment Natural Area and Escarpment Protection Area designation, coupled with the proposed changes, could have an...
impact on future land uses.

- It is recommended that the local municipalities undertake a more detailed review of the proposed land use designation changes and the implications on land uses within these areas.

### 1.9 Additions of Land to the Niagara Escarpment Plan

In March 2014, the Niagara Escarpment Commission endorsed the following set of criteria to be used to consider the addition of lands to the NEP Area as part of the Co-ordinated Land Use Planning Review:

1. Lands to be included in the Niagara Escarpment Planning Area must but the existing the NEP Area.
2. The proposed NEP Area addition must conform to three or more of the following attributes:
   a. Contains Escarpment brow, toe, slope, secondary scarp, or outlier;
   b. Contains a significant Escarpment-related landform (e.g. moraine, karst) as defined in the NEP;
   c. Constitutes part of a Provincial Park, nature preserve, Conservation Area or similar public holding that is only partially within the NEP Area;
   d. Includes portions of Escarpment-related natural heritage features that are partially outside of the NEP boundary and are essential to maintaining the ecological integrity of the entire natural heritage feature. These lands would include Provincial and Regional Life Science Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs), Significant Woodlands, Provicially or Locally Significant Wetlands (PSW or LSW), headwaters, waterfalls and environmentally sensitive areas (ESA);
   e. The lands have been assigned a high scenic value (i.e., those ranked as attractive, very attractive, or outstanding) in the Niagara Escarpment Landscape Evaluation Studies; or
   f. Contains an Escarpment-related cultural heritage feature (e.g. lime kiln, mill) as defined in the NEP.

In a separate document the NEC is recommending ten areas for land additions for a total of 7,886 ha within Dufferin County. The lands proposed for addition are located primarily in the Township of Mulmur and lands within Melancthon (Horning’s Mills area). Evaluated areas recommended for addition to the NEP Area are outlined in green as shown on Map 5.

The proposed additions do not form part of the Proposed NEP. The additions are being proposed at this time by the Commission and no decision has been made on any expansion of the area covered by the NEP. The proposed additions are part of the current consultation and comments and input will be reported back to the Province for consideration. Land Use Designations pertaining to the proposed additions have not yet been applied.
The following table summarizes the recommended land additions to the NEP Area as identified above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject Lands</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rationale (criteria met)</th>
<th>County Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| D3  | Violet Hills Wetland Complex        | Lot 1, Concession 2, EHS Part Lots 2&3, Concession 2, EHS Lots 1 – 3, Concession 3, EHS Part Lots 4&5, Concession 3, EHS Mulmur Township | 488 ha| 1. Lands are within the original NE Planning Area  
2b. Contain an Escarpment-related feature (Primrose-Boyne Valley Earth Science ANSI - provincial)  
2d. Contains large portion of Violet Hills PSW (other portions partially within the NEP Area). Approximately 68 ha of PSW and 24 ha of unevaluated wetland.  
2e. Lands have a scenic rating of “attractive” and “low.” | Significant groundwater recharge area, and is a highly vulnerable aquifer. |
| D4  | Horning’s Mills Development Control Area | Lots 11 – 17, Conc 1 Part Lots 12 -16, Conc 2                                      | 705 ha| 1. Lands are within the original NE Planning Area  
2a. Escarpment brow | Significant groundwater recharge area, and is a highly |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject Lands</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rationale (criteria met)</th>
<th>County Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melancthon Township</td>
<td></td>
<td>2d. Contains a portion of Terra Nova PSW; Horning’s Mill waterfall</td>
<td>vulnerable aquifer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2e. Lands have a scenic rating of outstanding, attractive and average.</td>
<td>NB Lands are in Development Control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2f. Horning’s Mills historic mill/hydroelectric generating station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Horning’s Mill Escarpment Brow</td>
<td>Part Lots 16 – 20, Conc 3 West of Hurontario Mulmur Part Lots 18 &amp; 19, Conc 1 Melancthon Township</td>
<td>265 ha</td>
<td>1. Lands are within the original NE Planning Area 2a. Escarpment brow 2d. Contains portions of Terra Nova PSW (approx. 20 ha), the Pine River headwaters 2e. Lands have a scenic ranking of attractive.</td>
<td>Significant groundwater recharge area, and is a highly vulnerable aquifer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Lavender Escarpment Brow</td>
<td>Lots 31 &amp; 32, Conc 1 West of Hurontario Mulmur Township</td>
<td>149 ha</td>
<td>1. Lands are within the original NE Planning Area 2a. Escarpment brow 2d. Unevaluated wetland &gt;5 ha that is contiguous with unevaluated wetland in the NEP Area. Also: portion of Lavender Swamp LSW partially within NEP Area. 2e. Lands have a scenic ranking of attractive</td>
<td>Significant groundwater recharge area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Lavender Falls Life Science ANSI</td>
<td>Lot 32, Conc 1 Part Lot 31, Conc 1 Melancthon Part Lots 1 – 3, Conc 1 Nottawasaga Simcoe County</td>
<td>292 ha</td>
<td>1. Lands are within the original NE Planning Area 2a. Escarpment brow 2d. Provincial Life Science ANSI; Also Noisy River; unevaluated wetland &gt;5 ha</td>
<td>Significant groundwater recharge area, and is a highly vulnerable aquifer. Lavender mill is now a private residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>Boyne River Escarpment Valley</td>
<td>Lots 3 – 7, Conc 3 West of Hurontario Mulmur Lots 1 – 4, Conc 2 Part Lot 5, Conc 2 Part Lots 1 -3, Conc 1 West of Hurontario Mulmur Township</td>
<td>491 ha</td>
<td>1. Lands are within the original NE Planning Area 2a. Escarpment Brow 2c. Boyne Valley Provincial Park partially outside of existing NEP Area. 2d. Unevaluated wetland. Headwaters of Boyne River. Portion of the Boyne Valley Life Science ANSI – provincial. 2e. Lands have a scenic rating of very</td>
<td>Significant groundwater recharge area, and is a highly vulnerable aquifer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Subject Lands</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Rationale (criteria met)</td>
<td>County Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Pine River Escarpment Toe</td>
<td>Part Lots 19 &amp; 20, Conc 2 Lots 21 &amp; 22, Conc 2 Part Lot 20, Conc 3 Lots 21-23, Conc 3 East of Hurontario Mulmur Township</td>
<td>517 ha</td>
<td>1. Lands are within the original NE Planning Area 2a. Escarpment Toe 2b. Pine River Valley Earth Science ANSI (Provincial) 2d. Terra Nova PSW 2e. Lands have a scenic rating of outstanding, very attractive, attractive and average</td>
<td>Significant groundwater recharge area, and is a highly vulnerable aquifer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>Lisle Creek Escarpment Toe</td>
<td>Mulmur Township</td>
<td>169 ha</td>
<td>1. Lands are within the original NE Planning Area 2a. Escarpment Toe 2d. Unevaluated wetland &gt;5 ha partially outside the NEP Area; Lisle Creek headwaters (tributary of Pine River) 2e. Lands have a scenic rating of very attractive, attractive and average</td>
<td>Significant groundwater recharge area, and is a highly vulnerable aquifer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>Terra Nova Forests Life Science ANSI</td>
<td>Mulmur Township</td>
<td>1629 ha</td>
<td>1. Lands are within the original NE Planning Area 2b. Pine River Valley Earth Science ANSI (Provincial) 2d. Terra Nova PSW; Terra Nova Forest Life Science ANSI (Provincial) 2e. Lands have a scenic rating of outstanding, very attractive, attractive and average</td>
<td>Significant groundwater recharge area, and is a highly vulnerable aquifer. Identified as a Rural Settlement Area with land designated for future residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>Mulmur Hills Outlier</td>
<td>Mulmur Township</td>
<td>2032 ha</td>
<td>1. Lands are within the original NE Planning Area 2a. Mulmur Hills Outlier 2d. Headwaters of Pine River; unevaluated wetland &gt;5 ha. 2e. Lands have a scenic rating of very attractive, attractive and average</td>
<td>Significant groundwater recharge area, and is a highly vulnerable aquifer. Mansfield Ski club is an established recreational center with growth aspirations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Issues:

- As identified by the Township of Mulmur, there is very limited growth potential available in the Township, and the Township have expressed concerns that the NEP expansion, as proposed, will have a significant impact on growth opportunities in the Township. Terra Nova (D13) has been identified as a Rural Settlement Area with land designated for future residential development. The Mansfield Ski club located within Area D14 is an established recreational center with growth aspirations. Furthermore, the proposed addition of D4 would encompass the community settlement area of Horning’s Mills, Township of Melancthon, within the NEP Area.

- As per Section 5.0 of the County Official Plan, the County and local municipalities encourage the protection and enhancement, where possible, of natural heritage features and functions and the protection and conservation of water resources. The DCOP supports the preparation of a County-wide Natural Heritage System Strategy to support the overall diversity and interconnectivity of the natural heritage features and areas. Further, the Proposed Growth Plan provides a policy basis for the Province to identify a Natural Heritage System.

- The expansion of the NEP area would place an additional level of review and permitting requirements on the additional lands. The DCOP and local municipal official plan policies afford protection to natural areas, features and functions, in accordance with Provincial policy. As such, there is concern that these areas already have planning policies that would afford them the necessary protection to ensure that they would be protected in an appropriate manner, and the inclusion of additional lands within the NEP is not required to ensure they are appropriately protected while balancing growth needs within the Township, particularly as it relates to Terra Nova and Mansfield, in the Township of Mulmur, and Horning’s Mills, Township of Melancthon.

- Land Use designations for the proposed additional lands have not yet been applied, and further information on the proposed Land Use designations would be required to assess the impact of the proposed additions on the local municipalities.
The Government of Ontario is undertaking a coordinated review of its land use planning documents. The province has released the following documents for review and comment:

- Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2016;
- Proposed Greenbelt Plan, 2016;
- Proposed Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, 2016; and
- Proposed Niagara Escarpment Plan, 2016.

The review began in 2015, through an extensive public consultation process. The Province has since reviewed and considered all feedback received, and as an outcome, has proposed a series of changes to the four planning documents. At this time, the Province is seeking feedback on the proposed changes by October 31, 2016.

This memo provides a review of the proposed changes to the Proposed Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, 2016, and highlights the impacts the proposed changes may have on the Dufferin County Official Plan (DCOP), and land use planning in the County.

Subject to further consultations with the local municipalities and Councils, it is recommended that the County formalize comments on the Proposed Plans for submission to the province by September 30th, 2016.

Dufferin County Official Plan Context

Within Dufferin County, a portion of lands within the southeast corner of the Town of Mono is impacted by the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). The Dufferin County Official Plan (DCOP), Section 2.2, includes high level policies with respect to the implementation of the ORMCP. The DCOP refers to the ORMCP for determination as to whether or not lands are affected by the designations and policies of the ORMCP. The Town of Mono Official Plan is required to incorporate more detailed policies and development criteria to meet the requirements of the ORMCP as such, the DCOP does not provide detailed land use policies related to the ORMCP Area. Schedule A to the DCOP identifies the OCRMP Area designations and the extent of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conversation Plan Area. No settlement areas are located within the ORMCP in the Town of Mono, as such, while various plan amendments related to settlement areas are identified, they are not applicable to the County.

1.0 Proposed Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan 2016

This section provides a detailed review of the changes identified in the proposed Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). For ease of reference, included at the end of each section is a summary that highlights the key issues and proposed policy changes, and the potential impact to the County.

The proposed ORMCP includes changes to introduction and implementation sections (non-regulatory sections), which provide an explanation of the ORMCP and some additional information that is not
found in the *Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act*, 2001 or the Minister’s regulation that establishes the Plan.

1.1 Building Complete Communities

1.1.1 Complete Communities

Section 18(1)(0.a) was introduced to create a new purpose for ORMCP Settlement Areas in support of the development of complete communities. Convenient access to an appropriate mix of employment, transportation options and local services and a full range of housing and public service facilities is encouraged through this new policy.

1.1.2 Community Hubs

Sections 18(2)(c.1 through c.4) were introduced to promote the locating of two or more compatible public services in one building or place” to the list of Settlement Area objectives to encourage the development of community hubs and ensure they are accessible to local residents by walking, cycling and, where available, public transit. Section 13(1) was also added to create a new purpose for the Countryside Area designation and encourage the development of community hubs in rural areas through the promotion and protection of agricultural and other rural land uses and normal farm practices.

1.1.3 Settlement Area Boundary Expansions

The Implementation Section was updated to provide a description of how changing or refining the boundaries of Settlement Areas could be considered as part of a municipal comprehensive review by an upper-tier or single-tier municipality and not just at the time of a 10-year review of the ORMCP.

Sections 15(1) 4 and (2) from the previous plan were removed so that minor rounding out of Rural Settlement boundaries not be allowed.

1.1.4 Conserving Cultural Heritage Resources

Sections 11(2)(a.1), 12(2)(a.1), 13(2)(g.1), and 18(1)(c.3) were added to introduce wording for the conservation of cultural heritage resources for the Nature Core Area, Natural Linkage Area, Countryside Area and Settlement Area designations.

**Key Issues:**

Conserving Cultural Heritage Resources
- Natural Core Area, Natural Linkage Area, Countryside Area and Settlement Area designations identified in the Official Plan will need to promote objectives of conserving cultural heritage resources.

1.2 Supporting Agriculture

1.2.1 Agricultural Viability

Proposed changes related to agriculture are intended to better align with PPS, 2014 and the proposed changes to the Greenbelt Plan.
A number of definitions were updated in Section 3(1) as a part of the proposed Plan update. The definition of ‘Agricultural Uses’ was updated to include value-retaining facilities used for minimal processing e.g. cleaning, grading, drying, sorting, atmosphere controlled storage, bulk packaging. The definition of ‘Agriculture-Related Uses’ was also updated to allow for more flexibility in scale, such as grain dryers to service the broader farming community, to help bring the Plan into closer alignment with the policies of the PPS, 2014. Agriculture-related uses are required to be compatible with and not hinder surrounding agricultural operations. Lastly, the term ‘On-Farm Diversified Uses’ was introduced to help bring the Plan into closer alignment with the policies of the PPS, 2014. On-farm diversified uses are required to be compatible with and not hinder surrounding agricultural operations. Home occupation, agri-tourism uses and value added product were also added as components of on-farm diversified uses.

The permitted uses in the Natural Core Area, Natural Linkage Area and Countryside Area designations were updated for closer alignment with the PPS, 2014 to include:

- On-farm diversified uses in prime agricultural areas within the Natural Core Area designation (Sections 11(3) and (4));
- On-farm diversified uses and agriculture-related uses in prime agricultural areas within the Natural Linkage Area designation (Sections 12(3) and (4)); and
- On-farm diversified uses throughout the Countryside Area designation. These would not be limited to prime agricultural areas (Section 13(3)).

Section 32 was revised to delete farm retirement lot policies to align with lot creation policies of the Greenbelt Plan and PPS, 2014, and include severance policies to permit a severance for a surplus dwelling resulting from a farm consolidation, subject to conditions. A new policy was added to Section 32 to permit the severance of two or more lots for agricultural uses, provided the severed and retained lots are at least 100 acres, to align with Greenbelt policy for prime agricultural areas.

Sections 22(4), 22(5), 26(4.1) and 26(4.2) were added to clarify that buildings and structures for agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses within 120 metres of a key natural heritage feature or a key hydrologic feature would be exempt from the requirement to undertake a natural heritage or hydrologic evaluation, subject to criteria, while still ensuring ecological impacts are minimized. Section 26(4.2) notes that the municipality or approval authority must consider the following when determining the potential impacts of the proposal:

- the nature and purpose of the building or structure,
- the size and scale of the building or structure, including where appropriate, the cumulative impact of existing development,
- the site characteristic such as topography, and
- the sensitivity of the adjacent key hydrologic feature.

1.2.2 Impacts on Agriculture

Section 41(2.1) was added to require applications for infrastructure projects located in prime agricultural areas to demonstrate the need for the project, that there is no reasonable alternative and complete an agricultural impact assessment demonstrating that impacts to the prime agricultural area would be avoided or mitigated.

Section 38(5) was added to require proposals for new or expanded major recreational uses to demonstrate that impacts on surrounding agricultural operations and lands would be considered and avoided or mitigated to the extent possible.
Sections 39(2) and 39(3) were revised to discourage trespassing onto farm properties adjacent to the Oak Ridges Moraine trail system and require the siting of trails away from prime agricultural areas and agricultural operations as much as possible.

**Key Issues:**

**Agricultural Viability**
- Definitions for ‘Agricultural Uses’, ‘Agriculture-Related Uses’ and ‘On-Farm Diversified Uses’ all need to be updated to reflect the updated definitions in Section 3(1).
- The permitted uses in the Natural Core Area, Natural Linkage Area and Countryside Area designations will need to be updated to reflect Sections 11(3), 11(4), 12(3), 12(4), and 13(3).
- The proposed changes clarify that buildings and structures for agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses within 120 metres of a key natural heritage feature or a key hydrologic feature would be exempt from the requirement to undertake a natural heritage or hydrologic evaluation, subject to criteria, while still ensuring ecological impacts are minimized.

**Impacts on Agriculture**
- The siting of trails should be encouraged away from prime agricultural areas and agricultural operations.
- The County and the Town of Mono will be responsible for the review of agricultural impact assessments for applications in or on land in a prime agricultural areas.

1.3 Protecting Natural Heritage and Water

1.3.1 Wastewater Assimilative Capacity

Section 24(8) was revised to add to the list of conditions that applications for major development must meet to require demonstration of sufficient assimilative capacity to deal with the sewage from the development.

Section 24(3) was revised to add to the requirements for watershed plans to include an evaluation of assimilative capacity of the watershed to deal with sewage from surrounding areas, and to include an environmental monitoring plan based on a minimum of five years of monitoring.

1.3.2 Movement of Excess Soil

Section 36.1 was added to require municipalities and industry to use best practices to ensure that excess soil is re-used, either on-site or locally, to the maximum extent possible and that soil received at a site will not cause an adverse effect on the current or proposed uses of the property or the natural environment.
Key Issues:

Wastewater Assimilative Capacity

- Conditions that applications for major development must meet are revised to require demonstration of sufficient assimilative capacity to deal with the sewage from the development.
- Watershed plans are required to include an evaluation of assimilative capacity of the watershed to deal with sewage from surrounding areas.

Movement of Excess Soil

- Best practices must be used to ensure that excess soil is re-used, either on-site or locally, to the maximum extent possible and that soil received at a site will not cause an adverse effect on the current or proposed uses of the property or the natural environment.

1.4 Providing Infrastructure

1.4.1 Integrated Planning

Section 41(1.1) was added to require municipalities to ensure that land use planning is coordinated with infrastructure planning and investment.

Section 41(1.2) was added to require new infrastructure and upgrades/extensions to existing infrastructure to be supported by appropriate studies, such as infrastructure master plans, land use and financial scenarios and watershed studies, that demonstrate:

- the infrastructure will be financially feasible and sustainable over the long term;
- adequate water supply and assimilative capacity is available; and
- stormwater management will be addressed at appropriate scales.

Key Issues:

Integrated Planning

- The County is required to ensure that land use planning is coordinated with infrastructure planning and investment in local municipalities.
- New infrastructure and upgrades/extensions to existing infrastructure are to be supported by appropriate studies, such as infrastructure master plans, land use and financial scenarios and watershed studies.

1.5 Responding to Climate Change

Section 11(1), 12(1) and 13(1) were revised to add “protection of natural areas to mitigate and reduce the impacts of climate change” as a purpose of the Natural Core Area, Natural Linkage Area, and Countryside Area designations.

Section 12(2) was revised to add “contributing to a regional network of green infrastructure” as an objective for the Natural Linkage Area designation.

Section 24(3) was revised to update the minimum requirements for watershed plans to include an assessment of climate change impacts on sewage, water and stormwater management systems.

Section 25(2) was revised to update the policy for water budgets and conservation plans to require an assessment of impacts from climate change that may result from changes in precipitation patterns. Part III s.25(2)
Section 41(1.2) was added to create a new policy that would require new infrastructure and upgrades/extensions to existing infrastructure to be supported by studies that demonstrate:

- green infrastructure will be utilised; and
- greenhouse gas emissions reductions and adaptation to climate change impacts have been addressed.

Sections 45(0.1) and (0.2) were added to create a new policy that would require municipalities to develop stormwater master plans for Settlement Areas that would be:

- informed by watershed studies
- incorporate green infrastructure elements
- identify opportunities for stormwater retrofits where appropriate.

Section 46(4) was added to ensure that every municipality retrofit existing stormwater management works where necessary and feasible.

Policies 46(1) and 46(2) were revised to update the requirements for stormwater management plans submitted with major development applications to minimize disruption of natural drainage patterns, address climate change impacts, minimize reliance on end-of-pipe controls and increase the municipality’s capacity to adapt to climate change.

**Key Issues:**

- Refinements or the inclusion of local municipal official plan policies may be required to include policies to mitigate the impacts of climate change.

### 1.6 Plan Implementation

#### 1.6.1 Aligning Definitions Across Plans

Definitions of the following terms were updated to align with all provincial land use plans and PPS:

- Development and site alteration
- Infrastructure
- Green Infrastructure
- Partial services
- Habitat of endangered and threatened species
- Wildlife habitat
- Bed and breakfast establishment

#### 1.6.2 Clean Water Act/Nutrient Management Act

Section 28(3) was added to clarify that wellhead protection policies in s. 28(1) and (2) do not apply to agricultural lands if the owner or operator is in compliance with all standards established under the *Nutrient Management Act, 2002* and any applicable requirement under the *Clean Water Act, 2006*.

Section 29(1.1) was added to clarify that areas of high aquifer vulnerability policies in s.29(1) do not apply to agricultural lands if the owner or operator is in compliance with all standards established under the *Nutrient Management Act, 2002*. 
1.6.3 Mineral Aggregate Operations in Natural Linkage Areas

Section 35(3) was revised to clarify that the 1.25 km of undisturbed area that mineral aggregate operations are currently required to maintain in Natural Linkage Areas could also contain adjacent portions of Natural Core Areas.

1.6.4 Performance Indicators and Monitoring

The Implementation Section was updated to support data collection and monitoring to measure the effectiveness of the Plan by introducing municipal reporting requirements. Municipalities are expected to monitor and report on the implementation of this Plan’s policies within their municipality, in accordance with any data standards and any other guidelines that may be issued by the Province. The Province may require municipalities to provide information and/or data to the Province to demonstrate progress made towards the implementation of this Plan.

1.6.5 Schedules

The ‘Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Land Use Designation Map’ was updated to show Settlement Area boundaries to reflect the latest municipal official plan schedules, capturing transitioned matters and providing consistency across the provincial plans.

**Key Issues:**

Aligning Definitions Across Plans
- Updated definitions for consistency across the Plans.

Clean Water Act/Nutrient Management Act
- Wellhead protection policies identified in 28(3) do not apply to any agricultural land if the owner or operator of the agricultural operation complies with all the standards established under the Nutrient Management Act, 2002 and any applicable requirement under the Clean Water Act, 2006.

Performance Indicators and Monitoring
- The Town of Mono may be required to provide information and/or data to the Province to demonstrate progress made towards the implementation of proposed ORMCP.

Schedules
- Mapping for ORMCP designations within Dufferin County remains unchanged.
Based on the four Background Information memos prepared, the following outlines draft comments to the Province on the four Proposed Provincial Plans. The deadline for comments has now been extended to October 31, 2016.

DRAFT COMMENT LETTER FOR DISCUSSION

Land Use Planning Review
Ministry of Municipal Affairs
Ontario Growth Secretariat
777 Bay Street, Suite 425 (4th floor)
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5

Subject: Comments on the Coordinated Land Use Planning Review

The County of Dufferin is pleased to submit the following comments in relation to the province’s Coordinated Land Use Planning Review. Specifically, these comments relate to the following proposed plans, as they apply to the County of Dufferin:

- Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2016;
- Proposed Greenbelt Plan, 2016;
- Proposed Niagara Escarpment Plan, 2016; and

As you are aware, the first Dufferin County Official Plan was approved by the province in March 2015, and provides an upper-tier planning framework for managing growth and development in the County, for the County’s eight local municipalities. In July 2016, the County of Dufferin undertook a Land Needs Update (DCLNU) to assist in informing the County’s review of ongoing local municipal official plan reviews. The findings of the DCLNU have been used to inform our comments on the Proposed Growth Plan, 2016.

The County’s comments were endorsed by County Council on ______________, 2016, and highlight the key issues and comments which have an impact on planning within the County and its local municipalities. The County’s review of the Proposed Provincial Plans included consultation with the local municipalities, including an all Councils workshop on September 7, 2016, to assist in formalizing these comments. While these comments are intended to reflect County-wide comments on the proposed plans, we also note that the local municipalities are encouraged to submit further comments for consideration.

We appreciate the province’s efforts to provide improved consistency and coordination amongst the four provincial plans, as well as the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS), which should result in improved implementation of provincial policy.
We wish to thank the province for the opportunity to provide comments and their consideration of these comments on the Proposed Plans, and look forward to future opportunities to participate in this important endeavour.

## 1.0 Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2016

The proposed revisions to the Growth Plan introduce a number of new policies and directions that are intended to support growth and foster the development of compact, vibrant communities. This is to be achieved through increased intensification, promoting transit, facilitating the movement of goods, protecting and enhancing employment areas, infrastructure management, supporting agriculture, and protecting and enhancing the Greenbelt and natural heritage systems. The following section outlines the County’s key comments with respect to the Proposed Growth Plan, 2016.

### 1.1 Growth Forecasts

We note that the proposed Schedule 3 growth forecasts for the County to 2041 have not been revised. The County of Dufferin is forecasted to accommodate 85,000 persons and 32,000 jobs to 2041. The County supports the proposed changes that allow the County to allocate growth to the planning horizon year of 2041 (beyond the current 20-year planning horizon). The ability to allocate growth to 2041 is an improvement and will better assist in aligning growth management decisions with infrastructure planning.

The County continues to experience challenges in the allocation of the forecasted growth to the local municipalities, primarily due to servicing constraints in the County’s three urban settlement areas of Orangeville, Shelburne and Grand Valley. At this time, the County has been unable to allocate 3,057 persons and 4,000 jobs to 2036; it is anticipated that this future reserved allocation will be further increased to 2041. However, in light of the Town of Shelburne’s ongoing MCR, the County is looking to allocate a portion of this future reserved population and employment allocation to the Town.

The County continues to have concerns with respect to the amount of employment growth forecasted to the County, and the ability of the County to actually achieve the forecasted employment growth. The County anticipates challenges in maintaining the current job to population ratio over the planning horizon.

### 1.2 Intensification Targets

The County is not supportive of increasing the overall minimum intensification target to 60% of all residential development occurring annually within the built-up area. As an outcome of the County’s Growth Management Strategy, 2009, the province approved an overall target of 40% for the County, and alternative intensification targets for the urban settlement areas, which include: Grand Valley: 12%; Shelburne: 38% and Orangeville: 50%.

We understand that the approved alternative minimum intensification targets contained in the County Official Plan will apply until the time of the next Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). As Dufferin County is within the outer ring and does not have an urban growth centre, the proposed policies require that at the time of each MCR the County would need to revisit and, if required, request alternative minimum intensification targets. If no request is made, or the Minister does not permit an alternative target, the minimum intensification targets in the Growth Plan will apply.

Based on the Dufferin County Land Needs Update (DCLNU), July 2016, the County’s urban settlement areas are currently facing challenges in achieving the current minimum intensification targets. These challenges relate to achieving more modest intensification/redevelopment, the smaller urban and less
intensive character of the County’s urban settlement areas, the economic realities, and the lack of available opportunities for redevelopment/intensification. At present Shelburne and Orangeville have insufficient residential built boundary supply (intensification opportunities) to 2031. Their built boundary supply is anticipated to be depleted around 2023 and 2026 respectively. Grand Valley may exhaust its built boundary supply around 2031. Unless additional built boundary supply could be added, such as through selected employment land conversions, Orangeville and Shelburne would require reduced intensification targets of approximately 33% and 31% respectively to extend their built boundary intensification supply to 2031. As of 2016, Orangeville has 1,056 units of built boundary supply available, while Shelburne has 131 units, and Grand Valley has 166 units.

As the urban settlement areas are currently experiencing challenges in achieving the current intensification targets, an increase to the overall minimum intensification target will pose an even greater challenge, and the County and local municipalities will need to justify substantially reduced intensification targets at the time of the next County Official Plan MCR.

Applying the same intensification target to all municipalities is not reflective of the character and challenges facing each individual municipality. To this end, greater flexibility should be considered. In addition, striving to achieve the proposed intensification targets would alter the character of settlement areas due to changes in built forms and densities required to meet the intensification targets. This would be particularly pronounced in areas where housing is predominately lower density built forms. Consideration should be given to establishing a lower overall intensification target for municipalities within the outer ring, while maintaining their ability to seek alternative minimum intensification targets.

### 1.3 Designated Greenfield Area Density Targets

The County is not supportive of increasing the overall minimum designated greenfield density target to 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare (rj/ha). As an outcome of the County’s Growth Management Strategy, 2009, the province approved an overall alternative target of 44 rj/ha for the County, and for the urban settlement areas, which include: Grand Valley: 44 rj/ha; Shelburne: 41 rj/ha and Orangeville: 46 rj/ha.

We understand that the approved alternative designated greenfield area targets contained in the County Official Plan will apply until the time of the next County MCR. However, at the time of the next MCR the County would need to revisit and if required, request alternative minimum intensification targets. If no request is made, or the Minister does not permit an alternative target, the minimum density targets in the Growth Plan will apply.

Modelling undertaken for the DCLNU considered and applied the County’s Official Plan minimum density targets. All County modelling for the Update has been undertaken on the basis of estimated net residential densities which exclude lands affected by environmental considerations as well as site servicing and road networks.

In consultation with the local municipalities, the DCLNU concluded that:

In terms of average greenfield **residential** densities:

- Orangeville is achieving 85 residents per net hectares (based on a projected ‘persons per unit’ (PPU) ratio of 1.83 for the period between 2016 and 2031);
- Shelburne is achieving 50 residents per net hectare (based on a unit per net hectare density of 25 and a projected average PPU of 2.0 for the period between 2016 and 2031);
- Grand Valley is achieving 50 residents per hectare (based on a unit per net hectare density of 18 and a projected PPU of 2.78 for the period between 2016 and 2031); and
• The County is achieving 60 residents per net hectare (based on a unit per net hectare density of 27.3 and a projected PPU of 2.23 for the period between 2016 and 2031).

In terms of average greenfield non-residential densities, Orangeville, Shelburne and Grand Valley are only achieving 36.6, 34.4 and 34.4 jobs per net hectare, respectively. The County-wide average is calculated as 34.1 jobs per net hectare.

When factoring in the combined residential and employment densities, the overall greenfield density targets would be decreased much further. In light of the above analysis, the County would not be able to achieve the proposed minimum designated greenfield density target of 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare. Applying the same greenfield area density target to all the local municipalities is not reflective of the character and challenges facing each individual municipality. To this end, greater flexibility should be considered. Achieving a greenfield density target of 80 residents and jobs per hectare would require substantially higher densities than what is currently being achieved, particularly for Grand Valley and Shelburne (i.e., nearly double). The County has concerns regarding the challenges that the local municipalities would face in achieving a density target of 80 rj/ha, and how this would impact the character and built form of the greenfield areas, which would be developed at nearly double the existing densities. Consideration should be given to establishing a lower overall greenfield area density target for municipalities within the outer ring, while maintaining their ability to seek alternative minimum greenfield area density targets.

Further clarification is required as to how the minimum density target of 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare over the planning horizon to 2041 is to be measured, evaluated, or "phased in". The urban settlement areas have very limited uncommitted greenfield areas remaining and apply the density target across the entire “designated greenfield area” would require much greater densities in the uncommitted greenfield areas to compensate for greenfield areas that have already been developed or approved at the lower greenfield density targets. Furthermore, increasing greenfield densities on uncommitted greenfield areas on the periphery of the settlement areas, will result in more intensive development that is further removed from the downtown core areas, and likely less accessible with respect to transit, public services and amenities. Consideration could be given to updating the built boundary to reflect the existing greenfield areas that have since been developed or are subject to ongoing planning applications.

Although the County’s alternative greenfield area density targets would apply until the time of the next MCR, clarification is required on the application of the revised targets to planning initiatives and development applications in process.

1.4 Employment Areas

The County supports the proposed policies to strengthen the protection for employment areas. The Proposed Growth Plan distinguishes between prime employment and employment areas. Further clarification is required as to whether the County would be required to designate prime employment areas and employment areas in the County Official Plan, or whether they only need to be designated in the local official plans. Currently, the DCOP does not designate employment areas, but defers to local municipal official plans for designating employment lands.

Clarification of the definition of prime employment areas is required, as the proposed definition may inadvertently limit office uses within these areas. It is recommended that the definition of prime employment areas provide greater flexibility to accommodate stand-alone office uses.

It is noted that not including prime employment areas in the greenfield density target calculations is desirable, given the land intensive nature of these uses, however, consideration should be given to
excluding all employment areas from the minimum greenfield area density targets, as it is often difficult
to anticipate the type and nature of the employment uses that may locate in employment areas.

The implementation of the proposed policies pertaining to employment areas and employment land
conversions requires further consideration, and how these policies are to be implemented in light of
ongoing planning initiatives and planning applications.

1.5 Settlement Area Boundary Expansions / “Excess Lands”

The proposed Growth Plan provides new direction to upper-tier municipalities in the outer ring to
identify and manage any “excess lands” that will not be required for growth to 2041, by prohibiting
development on all excess lands.

The County is not supportive of proposed changes that would require the prohibition of development on
lands that are identified as excess lands, and this should be an optional component to the settlement
area expansion policies. The County is concerned that the de-designation of excess lands in other
local municipalities (not directly affected by a proposed settlement area expansion in another
municipality) will have substantial impacts on the growth opportunities of other local municipalities.
Municipalities are already guided by and planning to achieve the growth forecasts and allocations to
the local municipalities. There is concern that the excess lands policy is not appropriately applied on a
County-wide basis, but may be better implemented within each individual municipality at a local
municipal level. Furthermore, the County is concerned of the legal ramifications that may be
associated with de-designating lands or restricting existing development permissions or entitlement,
and should not be put in a position to legally defend any such challenges.

Finally, the County understands that the province will be developing a methodology for assessing land
needs to accommodate growth, and looks forward to reviewing and commenting on the proposed
methodology.

1.6 Supporting Agricultural

The proposed Growth Plan establishes that the Province will identify and map the agricultural system
for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Policy 4.2.6.1). The agricultural system would include prime
agricultural areas, specialty crop areas and rural lands, as well as an agricultural support network
(Policy 4.2.6.2). Further details regarding the province’s identification and mapping of the agricultural
system will be required to better understand what is trying to be achieved through this exercise as
current mapping of the agricultural and rural areas is based on mapping already provided by the
province. In this regard, it is recommended that the County and local municipalities should have a
proactive role in identifying the agricultural system and agricultural support network.

The County supports the proposed policy amendments to improve the viability of agriculture and the
agri-food sector through greater flexibility in the types of agriculture, agriculture-related and on-farm
diversified uses that are permitted as a component to the agricultural system and agricultural support
network.

1.7 Protecting Natural Heritage and Water

The County supports the proposed Growth Plan policies which direct municipalities to consider natural
heritage features and areas in a comprehensive, integrated and long-term approach, in order to
maintain, restore and enhance their diversity and connectivity, and their long term ecological function
(Policy 4.2.2.1). The province proposes to map natural heritage systems and municipal official plans
will be required to incorporate the systems, and apply appropriate designations and policies to
maintain, restore or improve the diversity and connectivity of the system, and the long term hydrological functions of the features and areas (Policy 4.2.2.2).

Further details regarding the province’s identification and mapping of the natural heritage system will be required to better understand the extent of the province’s natural heritage system. It is the County’s recommendation that any such provincial natural heritage system be based on features and areas of a provincial significance and defer to the local municipalities, in consultation with conservation authorities to provide flexibility in mapping more detailed natural heritage systems at a County and local level. The delineation of any natural heritage system should be augmented by supporting policies which contemplate refinement and flexibility at the County and local level. Furthermore, existing agricultural and rural uses should not be negatively impacted or further restricted by a natural heritage system framework. The County and local municipalities should have a proactive role in identifying and mapping the natural heritage system.

The County is currently undertaking a work program to develop a County-wide natural heritage system in support of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014, which will provide input into any provincial mapping of the natural heritage system.

1.8 Implementation

As the County already has approved alternative greenfield density targets and alternative intensification targets for the three urban settlement areas, we understand that these targets (as well as the existing growth forecasts) will continue to apply until the time of the next County Official Plan review. The County supports the implementation policies with respect to maintaining the existing minimum intensification and greenfield density targets, and the County’s ability to request alternative targets at the time of the County’s next Official Plan MCR.

The County is also supportive of the proposed changes that allow the County to allocate growth to the planning horizon year of 2041 (beyond the current 20-year planning horizon), at the time of the next MCR.

Notwithstanding the above, it is our understanding that the proposed Growth Plan changes would be “effective immediately”, coming into force on the date the Growth Plan is approved. This often poses challenges for municipalities in implementing the policies, in the absence of County and local municipal official plan policies being revised and updated through conformity amendments. For example, the delineation of prime employment areas and employment areas would need to be first undertaken in order to implement the proposed Growth Plan policies. In this regard, it is the County’s recommendation, that the Growth Plan policies should not come into force and effect until such time as the County’s Official Plan conformity amendments are approved and in effect.

Prior to the proposed Growth Plan and the County undertaking a MCR and conformity exercise, it is recommended that supporting work and methodology (i.e., growth forecast methodology, natural heritage system mapping, and agricultural system mapping) be completed by the province in consultation with municipalities to ensure a comprehensive and integrated planning framework is in place, prior to implementing the proposed Growth Plan.

2.0 Proposed Greenbelt Plan, 2016

2.1 Settlement Area Expansions

The County is supportive of proposed policy changes to allow upper and single tier municipalities to consider expansions to settlement area boundaries for settlements within the Greenbelt Plan, at the
Speciﬁc criteria for settlement area expansions are provided in the Growth Plan (S. 2.2.8), speciﬁc matters related to the Greenbelt Plan include: that the settlement area to be expanded is identiﬁed in the Greenbelt Plan as a Town/Village (m) i.; the proposed expansion would be serviced by municipal water and wastewater systems (m) iii.; and expansion into the Natural Heritage System that has been identiﬁed in the Greenbelt Plan is prohibited (m) iv.). These policies are overly restrictive and greater ﬂexibility should be provided which may contemplate minor expansions for Hamlets, settlements on partial services and any additional detailed natural heritage investigations that may result in a more reﬁned Natural Heritage System, than currently identiﬁed in the Greenbelt Plan. As such, the County recommends revisions to these criteria to provide greater ﬂexibility in considering minor boundary adjustments through a MCR.

We understand that the proposed Greenbelt Plan removes the policy that would permit the minor rounding out of Hamlet boundaries at the time of municipal conformity, as settlement area boundary expansions would now be subject to the Growth Plan policies pertaining to settlement area boundary expansions (S. 2.2.8). However, as noted above, this policy should provide greater ﬂexibility to accommodate minor boundary adjustments to Hamlets.

2.2 Natural Heritage System and Agricultural System

The comments provided above in relation to the proposed Growth Plan for the province to identify and map a natural heritage system and agricultural system are also applicable in the context of the proposed Greenbelt Plan.

2.3 Growing the Greenbelt

The proposed Greenbelt Plan also introduces a new policy that would support the province in leading a process, working with municipalities, conservation authorities and other key stakeholders, to identify potential areas (with a focus on areas of ecological and hydrological signiﬁcance where urbanization should not occur) to be added to the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt. Where such areas are identiﬁed, the Minister of Municipal Affairs may initiate amendments to the Greenbelt boundary regulation and Greenbelt Plan to grow the Greenbelt (Policy 5.7.1.2).

The proposed Greenbelt Plan introduces a new policy establishing that the Province will consider requests from municipalities to grow the Greenbelt with the Protected Countryside and/or Urban River Valley designations. In considering municipal requests, the Province is to guide its decision-making on the basis of the following criteria:

- Providing supportive council resolutions;
- Demonstrating how the proposed lands connect physically or functionally to the Greenbelt; and
- Demonstrating that a proposal would complement the Growth Plan and support other related provincial initiatives such as the Great Lakes Strategy and Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan.

In June 2016, the Province met with representatives of the County and Conservation Authorities to discuss and review hydrologic feature and area data as part of the process to grow the Greenbelt Plan. The County looks forward to continuing to work with the province in this regard, and to better understand any future proposals to modify the extent of the Greenbelt Plan. Furthermore, we would recommend that consultation with the local municipalities potentially impacted by any proposed additions to the Greenbelt Plan be engaged directly.
3.0 Proposed Niagara Escarpment Plan, 2016

3.1 Land Use Designation Mapping Updates

The Proposed NEP includes substantive changes to the land use designations to reflect more recent data, studies and mapping. In Dufferin County, there are changes in the delineation of Escarpment Natural Areas, Escarpment Protection Areas, and Escarpment Rural Areas. The Proposed NEP proposes a 17% increase in the extent of the Escarpment Natural Areas designations, with corresponding decreases in the extent of the Escarpment Protection Areas and Escarpment Rural Areas within the County. The extent of the Escarpment Natural Area designation is proposed to increase substantially. Furthermore, in other instances the Escarpment Rural designation is being replaced with the Escarpment Protection Area. The restrictive nature of the Escarpment Natural Area and Escarpment Protection Area designation, coupled with the proposed changes, are anticipated to have a significant impact on future land uses within these designations.

Local municipalities impacted by the revised land use designations are encouraged to submit more detailed comments on the proposed land use designations and the implications on land uses within these areas.

3.2 Addition of Lands to the Niagara Escarpment Plan

In March 2014, the Niagara Escarpment Commission endorsed criteria to be used to consider the addition of lands to the NEP Area as part of the Co-ordinated Land Use Planning Review. In a separate document the NEC is recommending ten areas for land additions for a total of 7,886 ha within Dufferin County. The lands proposed for addition are located primarily in the Township of Mulmur and lands within Melancthon (Horning’s Mills area). Evaluated areas recommended for addition to the NEP Area are outlined in green as shown on Map 5.

We understand that the proposed additions do not form part of the Proposed NEP, however, the additions are being proposed at this time by the Commission and no decision has been made on any expansion of the area covered by the NEP. Furthermore, land use designations for the proposed additional lands have not yet been applied, and further information on the proposed land use designations would be required to assess the impact of the proposed additions on the local municipalities.
As identified by the Township of Mulmur, there is very limited growth potential available in the Township, and the Township has expressed concerns that the NEP expansion, as proposed, will have a significant impact on growth opportunities in the Township. Terra Nova (D13) has been identified as a Rural Settlement Area with land designated for future residential development. The Mansfield Ski club located within Area D14 is an established recreational center with growth aspirations. Furthermore, the proposed addition of D4 would encompass the community settlement area of Horning’s Mills, Township of Melancthon, within the NEP Area.

The expansion of the NEP area would place an additional level of review and permitting requirements on the additional lands. The existing provincial policies, DCOP and local municipal official plan policies afford protection to natural areas, features and functions, in accordance with Provincial policy. As such, there is concern that these areas already have planning policies that would afford them the necessary protection to ensure that they would be protected in an appropriate manner, and the inclusion of additional lands within the NEP is not required to ensure they are appropriately protected while balancing growth needs within the Township, particularly as it relates to Terra Nova and Mansfield, in the Township of Mulmur, and Horning’s Mills, Township of Melancthon.

In light of the above, the County is not supportive of the addition of the proposed lands to the NEP as it relates to Terra Nova (D 13), Mulmur Hills (D 14), and the Horning’s Mills Development Control Area.
Further details regarding the proposed land use designations within the other additional lands are also required to better understand the potential land use impacts.

Local municipalities impacted by the proposed additional lands are encouraged to submit more detailed comments on the proposed additions and the implications on land uses and development within these areas.

4.0 Proposed Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, 2016

Within Dufferin County, a small portion of lands within the southeast corner of the Town of Mono are impacted by the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). The County is supportive of the proposed regulation changes to improve coordination amongst the provincial plans and provide better alignment with the PPS, 2014 policies. At this time, the County does not have comments on the proposed changes to the ORMCP.

5.0 Conclusion

We appreciate the province’s efforts to provide improved consistency and coordination amongst the four provincial plans, as well as the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS), which should result in improved implementation of provincial policy.

We wish to thank the province for the opportunity to provide comments and their consideration of these comments on the Proposed Plans, and look forward to future opportunities to participate in this important endeavour.

Respectfully submitted by:

The Corporation of the County of Dufferin

Laura Ryan
County Warden
ALL COUNCIL JOINT WORKSHOP
Wednesday, September 7, 2016, 6:00 p.m.
Monora Park Pavilion
500 Monora Park Road, Mono

Council Members Present:
Township of Amaranth
Mayor Don Maclver
Deputy Mayor Jane Aultman
Councillor Heather Foster
Councillor Chris Gerritts
Councillor Gail Little

Township of East Garafraxa
Mayor Guy Gardhouse
Deputy Mayor John Stirk
Councillor Lenora Banfield
Councillor Tom Nevills
Councillor Frances Pinkney

Town of Grand Valley
Mayor Steve Soloman

Township of Melancthon
Mayor Darren White
Deputy Mayor Janice Elliott
Councillor Dave Besley
Councillor Wayne Hannon

Town of Mono
Mayor Laura Ryan
Deputy Mayor Ken McGhee
Councillor Ralph Manktelow
Councillor Sharon Martin
Councillor Fred Nix

Township of Mulmur
Mayor Paul Mills
Deputy Mayor Earl Hawkins
Councillor Janet Horner
Councillor Keith Lowry

Town of Orangeville
Mayor Jeremy Williams
Councillor Sylvia Bradley
Councillor Nick Garisto
Councillor Don Kidd
Councillor Scott Wilson
Warden Ryan welcomed everyone to the all Council Joint Workshop.

**Presentation – Municipal Ethics Update**

Mr. Guy Giorno, Integrity Commissioner for the County of Dufferin and several area municipalities, provided information regarding the role of the integrity commissioner.

**Presentation – Provincial Coordinated Land Use Planning Review**


During the facilitated discussion, members discussed the following proposed comments:

*Proposed Comments – Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horeshoe*

Intensification Targets:
• The County is not supportive of increasing the overall minimum intensification target to 60% of all residential development occurring annually within the built-up area.
• Applying the same intensification target to all municipalities is not reflective of the individual character and challenges.
• Consideration should be provided for lower intensification targets for municipalities in the outer-ring.

Greenfield Density Targets:
• The County is not supportive of increasing the overall minimum designated greenfield density target to 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare.
• Consideration should be given to establishing a lower overall greenfield area density target for municipalities within the outer ring, while maintaining their ability to seek alternative minimum greenfield area density targets.
• Require further clarification as to how the minimum density target is to be measured, evaluated, or “phased in” (consider updating the built boundary).
• Clarification is required on the application of the revised targets to planning initiatives and development applications in process.

Employment Areas:
• Clarification is required as to whether the County Official Plan would be required to designate prime employment areas and employment areas, or whether they only need to be designated in the local official plans (employment areas not currently designated in the DCOP).
• Clarification of the definition of prime employment areas is required, as the proposed definition may inadvertently limit office uses within these areas. More flexibility should be considered.
• Consideration should be given to excluding all employment areas from the minimum greenfield area density targets.
• Implementation of employment area policies requires further consideration in view of ongoing planning initiatives.

Settlement Area Boundary Expansion/Excess Lands:
• The County is not supportive of proposed changes that would require the prohibition of development on excess lands (should be optional).
• Concern that de-designation of “excess lands” in one local municipality will impact growth opportunities in another local municipalities.
• Concern over legal implications of prohibiting development on lands with existing development permissions or entitlements.
• Not appropriately applied on a County-wide basis but may be better implemented within each individual municipality at a local municipal level.

Supporting Agriculture:
• Further details regarding the province’s identification and mapping of the agricultural system will be required to better understand what is trying to be achieved through this exercise as current mapping of the agricultural and rural areas is based on mapping already provided by the province.
• The County and local municipalities should have a proactive role in identifying the agricultural system and agricultural support network.

Natural Heritage:
• Further details regarding the province’s identification and mapping of the natural heritage system will be required to better understand the extent of the province’s natural heritage system.
• A provincial natural heritage system should be based on key features and areas of a provincial significance and defer to local municipalities, in consultation with conservation authorities to provide flexibility in mapping more detailed natural heritage systems at a County and local level.
• The delineation of any natural heritage system should be augmented by supporting policies which contemplate refinement and flexibility at the County and local level.
• The County and local municipalities should have a proactive role in identifying and mapping the natural heritage system.

Implementation:
• The County recommends that the Growth Plan should not come into force and effect until such time as the County’s Official Plan conformity amendments are approved and in effect.
• Prior to the proposed Growth Plan and the County undertaking a MCR and conformity exercise, it is recommended that supporting work and methodology (i.e., growth forecast methodology, natural heritage system mapping, and agricultural system mapping) be completed by the province in consultation with municipalities to ensure a comprehensive planning framework is in place, prior to implementing the proposed Growth Plan.

Proposed Comments – Greenbelt Plan
Settlement Area Expansions:
• The County is supportive of proposed policy changes to allow upper and single tier municipalities to consider expansions to settlement area boundaries for settlements within the Greenbelt Plan, at the time of a MCR.
• Policies for expansion in Greenbelt are overly restrictive and greater flexibility should be provided (i.e., consider boundary adjustments for Hamlets and areas not serviced by municipal water and wastewater services).

Growing the Greenbelt:
• Recommend that the County and local municipalities potentially impacted by any proposed additions to the Greenbelt Plan be engaged directly by the Province for further consultation on any proposed expansions.

Proposed Comments- Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP)
Land Use Designation Mapping Updates
• The restrictive nature of the Escarpment Natural Area and Escarpment Protection Area designation, may have a significant impact on future land uses within these designations.
• Local municipalities impacted by the revised land use designations are encouraged to review the implications on land uses within these areas and submit more detailed comments.
• County is not supportive of the proposed changes until further consultation has been undertaken, including more detailed mapping, to better understand the proposed changes.

Addition of Lands to NEP:
• County is not supportive of the proposed addition of lands until further consultation has been undertaken, including more detailed mapping, to better understand the proposed changes.
• Impacted municipalities are encouraged to submit more detailed comments to the Province regarding the implications on land uses and development.

All members of Councils were provided worksheets and asked to identify and confirm the key issues and impact that require comment from the County. A meeting of the local Planners to coordinate and finalize the comments has been scheduled for mid-September. The final comments will go to the October County Council meeting for endorsement and then will be submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs by the deadline of October 31, 2016.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned 8:30 p.m.
August 30, 2016

Attention: Mayor & Members of Council

Re: OGRA Conference, February 26 – March 1, 2017, Fairmont Royal York Hotel

OGRA has received numerous letters from municipalities endorsing a resolution from the Township of South-West Oxford regarding ROMA’s decision to end the OGRA/ROMA Combined Conference partnership. OGRA would like to take a moment to set the record straight.

The OGRA Board of Directors was surprised and disappointed by ROMA’s unilateral decision to revert back to running a separate conference, thus ending a very productive, 17 year partnership that served Ontario municipalities well. The Combined Conference was a major success that strengthened both organizations. OGRA remains open to re-establish the Combined Conference partnership with ROMA because that is the best way for both organizations to serve their municipal members.

That said, we also want to take a moment to assure you that the 2017 OGRA Conference will continue to offer a diverse cutting edge program for our delegates. We can confirm that:

- A number of world class keynote speakers have confirmed their attendance;
- The concurrent sessions will cover the wide spectrum of municipal issues and will continue to be both thought-provoking and applicable to OGRA’s municipal members;
- For the third consecutive year, OGRA will convene the Small Town Forum;
- OGRA’s Emerging Municipal Leaders Forum will also be held for the third straight year;
- OGRA intends to hold a Ministers’ Forum and are in discussions with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs regarding the scheduling of delegations during the
• conference. The fact that the OGRA Conference will be held later in February when the legislature is sitting, will no doubt facilitate Provincial participation;
• The trade show will be substantially enhanced;
• Additional meals will be included in the basic registration fee; and
• Registration fees will be unchanged from 2016 rates.

Should you or any members of your council have any questions, I would encourage you to contact us.

On behalf of the OGRA Board of Directors, we hope to see you at the 2017 OGRA Conference in Toronto, February 26th – March 1st, 2017.

Regards,

[Signature]

J. W. Tiernay
Executive Director
### Accounts Payable

**ROAD BILLS & ACCOUNTS APPROVED SEPT 13, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Vendor Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Invoice Number</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Invoice Date</th>
<th>Entry Date</th>
<th>Chq Nb</th>
<th>Item Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Department Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Item Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-0163</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION SERVICES</td>
<td>99,633.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Report Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99,633.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


| Roads | $36,376.90 |

**TOTAL ROADS BILLS & ACCOUNTS APPROVED SEPT 13, 2016**

<p>| $136,010.09 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Vendor Number</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Invoice Number</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Invoice Date</th>
<th>Entry Date</th>
<th>Chq Nb</th>
<th>Item Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Vendor Number</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Invoice Number</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Invoice Date</th>
<th>Entry Date</th>
<th>Chq Nb</th>
<th>Item Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-0119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHRP LOANS REC/DEVELOPMENT DEPOSITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,056.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCOUNTS PAYABLE &amp; ACCRUED CHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,071.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL GOVERNMENT REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,650.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,186.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROTECTION TO PERSONS/PROPERTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66,540.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>317.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HEALTH SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,073.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RECREATIONAL &amp; COMMUNITY SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,754.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-0168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNING &amp; DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,722.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Total: 184,375.12

Gross Payroll - August, 2016, Pay Period 31-35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>$23,182.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL</td>
<td>$4,600.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL GENERAL BILLS & ACCOUNTS APPROVED SEPT 13, 2016** $212,157.73
TOWN OF ERIN
NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING
File: OPA # 7

TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, as amended, the Town of Erin will hold a public meeting to present and receive public input regarding a proposed amendment to the Town of Erin Official Plan on:

September 13, 2016
Erin Municipal Office
Council Chamber
5684 Trafalgar Road
6:30 p.m.

Location of the Subject Land
The Subject land is the Town of Erin, and therefore a key map is not provided with this notice.

The Purpose and Effect of the Application
The purpose and effect of the proposed Official Plan Amendment is to update the Towns Official Plan policies on Community Improvement by:

a) Broadening the matters that may be considered in identifying community improvement project areas to include the remediation of brownfields, improving the energy efficiency of buildings, providing affordable housing and other environmental, social or community development reasons that have been identified by Council;

b) Removing Community Improvement Areas from the land use schedules of the Official Plan; and

c) Updating terminology, adding definitions and making housekeeping changes related to the above.

Oral or Written Submissions
Any person or public body is entitled to attend the public meeting and make written or oral submissions in support of or in opposition to the proposed Official Plan Amendment. Written comments should be copied to both the County of Wellington and the Town Clerk at the addresses shown below.

Power of OMB to Dismiss Appeals
If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Town of Erin before the proposed Official Plan amendment is adopted, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the Town of Erin to the Ontario Municipal Board.

If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting, or make written submissions to the Town of Erin before the proposed Official Plan amendment is adopted, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to do so.
Request for Notice of Decision
If you wish to be notified of the adoption of the proposed Official Plan Amendment (OPA # 7) you must make a written request to the Clerk at the address provided below.

Additional Information relating to the proposed Official Plan Amendment is available for review during regular business hours at the County of Wellington office located at, 74 Woolwich Street, Guelph, Ontario, N1H 3T9, or by contacting Jameson Pickard, Planner (519.837.2600 x2300) between 8:30 am and 4:00 pm weekdays.

Dated at the
Town of Erin
This 12th day of August, 2016

Dina Lundy, Clerk
Town of Erin
5684 Trafalgar Road
RR2 Hillsburgh, ON
N0B 1Z0

T 519.855.4407
F 519.855.4821
Tree thinning could impact part of Elora Cataract Trailway
Sept. 12 to 23

Crews will be thinning trees in a 10-hectare plantation forest near the Elora Cataract Trailway from Monday, Sept. 12 to Friday, Sept. 23.

The work will be carried out near the section of the trailway that is north of Wellington Road 18 and west of 4th Line. For the most part, the trail will remain open, however trail users should be aware that heavy equipment and trucks will occasionally cross the trail. As necessary, parts of the trail in the immediate vicinity will be closed for an hour or two, while dead and declining trees next to the trail are removed. While the work is underway, signs will be posted notifying the public, and trail users are asked to obey all signage and use extra caution when they are in the area.

The work is part of the GRCA’s long-term management program to convert pine plantations into more natural forests. A plantation contractor will harvest trees marked for removal. This will improve forest health and create more varied habitats for a greater mixture of plant, animal and bird species. Thinning is scheduled during the fall in order to avoid disrupting the spring and summer nesting seasons.

Routine forest thinning is scheduled periodically to provide growing space to the healthiest trees, allow for hardwood trees to seed naturally and to improve the general health of the plantation.

The contractor will remove most of the felled trees however some logs and branches will be left on the forest floor to decompose and replenish the soil.

All work will be done in accordance with sustainable forest management guidelines set out in the GRCA’s Watershed Forest Plan.
Peel Farmers are keeping their Soils Under Cover
Golden Horseshoe – Summer 2016
The Peel Rural Water Quality Program recognizes this and offers grants to eligible farmers to grow cover crops to reduce erosion of soil, assist with the management of soil fertility, control pests and disease and protect groundwater by promoting nitrogen fixation. [Contributor: Mark Eastman]

Canadian, U.S. mayors scramble to stop diversion of water from Great Lakes
CBC News – August 22, 2016
A group of mayors from Canada and the U.S. is trying to challenge a recent decision allowing an American city to draw water from the Great Lakes, arguing that it sets a dangerous precedent.

Activists urge province to deny Nestle water-taking permit
CTV News – August 21, 2016
Environmentalists are urging the Ontario government against renewing one of Nestle’s water-taking permits in a southwestern Ontario town, saying "water should be for life, not for profit." Also The Weather Network

Gilmor vs. Goliath: Conservation groups seek to overturn precedent-setting court decision allowing family to build home
Orangeville Banner – August 18, 2016
A precedent-setting court decision that could affect anyone in the province owning property in environmentally protected areas is currently making its way through the Ontario Court of Appeals.

Conservation authorities trying to lure Pokémon Go players to their parks
CBC News – August 18, 2016
Local conservation authorities are putting calls out to Pokémon Go players in the hopes that the game draws more people to explore their green spaces.

Bald eagles soar back, but return may be fragile
CBC News – August 17, 2016
Bald eagles have made a comeback in southern Ontario over the last decade after dying out because of the pesticide DDT, but the magnificent birds are not out of the woods when it comes to long-term survival.

Freeze urban boundaries for two years, says Greenbelt group
Toronto Star – August 17, 2016
Friends of the Greenbelt Foundation says population projections should be updated before sprawl expands.

Planning For Change
NOVAE res Urbis – August 17, 2016
Anticipating population growth and transit investment Mississauga is exploring significant land use changes in a number of its neighbourhoods.

Forecast Update Needed
NOVAE res Urbis – August 17, 2016
When the Growth Plan was enacted it introduced a change in the way municipalities were to grow across the Greater Golden Horseshoe—denser and less spread out. A new report suggests a flawed implementation process could undermine its goals and recommends a freeze on boundary expansions until the numbers have been confirmed with the 2016 census data.

The August 17 Issue of NOVAE res Urbis (NRU) can be found [here](#).

**Prioritizing Public Access**  [PDF](#) [Pages 1-8]

NOVAE res Urbis – August 10, 2016

Mississauga’s waterfront community is experiencing a significant increase in development activity. Driven by two large redevelopment projects, the city is leveraging this activity to increase public access to its waterfront.

**Caledon Expresses Concern**  [PDF](#) [Pages 3-4]

NOVAE res Urbis – August 10, 2016

Concerned that the impacts of the proposed amendments to the Growth Plan are not yet fully understood, the Town of Caledon is asking the province to extend the deadline for comments on the coordinated review to the end of the year.

The August 10 Issue of NOVAE res Urbis (NRU) can be found [here](#).

**More activity last week on West Nile Virus front in Peel**

Caledon Citizen – August 10, 2016

Six mosquito pools in the region tested positive last week for West Nile Virus (WNV), but none of them are in Caledon.

Peel Public Health reported five of those pools were in Brampton and the other was in Mississauga.

**Planting to protect Silver Creek**

Caledon Citizen – August 10, 2016

Volunteers are urged to put their green thumbs to work and join Ontario Nature and the Credit Valley Conservation Youth Corps at Willoughby Nature Reserve this coming Wednesday (Aug. 17) to help plant native species along Silver Creek.

**Tracing dye in the West Credit**  [PDF]

Erin Advocate – August 10, 2016

A section of the West Credit River in Erin will be tinted pink for a few hours late next week as part of the Wastewater Environmental Assessment.
Nature-lovers upset by Toronto and Region Conservation Authority decision to drain Scarborough wetland
Scarborough Mirror – August 30, 2016
TRCA says earth berm along Reesor Wetland was in danger of collapsing. By draining a wetland in Scarborough’s Rouge Park this spring, the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority fatally disrupted the lives of birds and amphibians living there, local naturalists say.

Water-Climate Change Nexus on Agenda at World Water Week 2016 in Stockholm
August 27, 2016
World Water Week is taking place August 28- September 2 in Stockholm, Sweden where more than 3,000 participants from 120 countries will dive...

No WNV-positive mosquito pools found in Caledon
Caledon Citizen – August 26, 2016
Peel Public health reports there were 11 mosquito pools that tested positive for West Nile Virus (WNV) the week ending Aug. 13, but none of them were in Caledon.

Ontario mulling water-taking permit changes
The Mississauga News – August 24, 2016
TORONTO — Bottled water companies in Ontario may soon have to pay more and take less water as public outcry over revelations that the province charges them just $3.71 for every million litres triggered a government review. Also in Mississauga News

Struggling cap-and-trade auctions threaten Ontario’s $8B climate change plan
Ottawa Sun – August 23, 2016
The cap-and-trade program Ontario’s set to join next year is having big trouble in California and Quebec, and it could mean Ontario’s much-heralded $8.3-billion Climate Change Action Plan has far less money to spend in reality.

Canada 'missed the boat' on climate-change economy
The Mississauga News – August 23, 2016
VANCOUVER — Canada "has missed the boat" when it comes to developing renewable energy resources that would mitigate the impact of global warming and its impact on human health, a leading medical expert says.
Peel Farmers are keeping their Soils Under Cover  PDF
Golden Horseshoe – Summer 2016
The Peel Rural Water Quality Program recognizes this and offers grants to eligible farmers to grow cover crops to reduce erosion of soil, assist with the management of soil fertility, control pests and disease and protect groundwater by promoting nitrogen fixation. [Contributor: Mark Eastman]

Canadian, U.S. mayors scramble to stop diversion of water from Great Lakes
CBC News – August 22, 2016
A group of mayors from Canada and the U.S. is trying to challenge a recent decision allowing an American city to draw water from the Great Lakes, arguing that it sets a dangerous precedent.

Activists urge province to deny Nestle water-taking permit
CTV News – August 21, 2016
Environmentalists are urging the Ontario government against renewing one of Nestle's water-taking permits in a southwestern Ontario town, saying "water should be for life, not for profit." Also The Weather Network

Gilmor vs. Goliath: Conservation groups seek to overturn precedent-setting court decision allowing family to build home
Orangeville Banner – August 18, 2016
A precedent-setting court decision that could affect anyone in the province owning property in environmentally protected areas is currently making its way through the Ontario Court of Appeals.

Conservation authorities trying to lure Pokémon Go players to their parks
CBC News – August 18, 2016
Local conservation authorities are putting calls out to Pokémon Go players in the hopes that the game draws more people to explore their green spaces.

Bald eagles soar back, but return may be fragile
CBC News – August 17, 2016
Bald eagles have made a comeback in southern Ontario over the last decade after dying out because of the pesticide DDT, but the magnificent birds are not out of the woods when it comes to long-term survival.

Freeze urban boundaries for two years, says Greenbelt group
Toronto Star – August 17, 2016
Friends of the Greenbelt Foundation says population projections should be updated before sprawl expands.

Planning For Change  PDF [Pages 1, 5-6]
NOVAE res Urbis – August 17, 2016
Anticipating population growth and transit investment Mississauga is exploring significant land use changes in a number of its neighbourhoods.

Forecast Update Needed  PDF [Pages 1, 8]
NOVAE res Urbis – August 17, 2016
When the Growth Plan was enacted it introduced a change in the way municipalities were to grow across the Greater Golden Horseshoe—denser and less spread out. A new report suggests a flawed implementation process could undermine its goals and recommends a freeze on boundary expansions until the numbers have been confirmed with the 2016 census data.

The August 17 Issue of NOVAE res Urbis (NRU) can be found [here](#)

Prioritizing Public Access
NOVAE res Urbis – August 10, 2016
Mississauga’s waterfront community is experiencing a significant increase in development activity. Driven by two large redevelopment projects, the city is leveraging this activity to increase public access to its waterfront.

Caledon Expresses Concern
NOVAE res Urbis – August 10, 2016
Concerned that the impacts of the proposed amendments to the Growth Plan are not yet fully understood, the Town of Caledon is asking the province to extend the deadline for comments on the coordinated review to the end of the year.

The August 10 Issue of NOVAE res Urbis (NRU) can be found [here](#)

More activity last week on West Nile Virus front in Peel
Caledon Citizen – August 10, 2016
Six mosquito pools in the region tested positive last week for West Nile Virus (WNV), but none of them are in Caledon.
Peel Public Health reported five of those pools were in Brampton and the other was in Mississauga.

Planting to protect Silver Creek
Caledon Citizen – August 10, 2016
Volunteers are urged to put their green thumbs to work and join Ontario Nature and the Credit Valley Conservation Youth Corps at Willoughby Nature Reserve this coming Wednesday (Aug. 17) to help plant native species along Silver Creek.

Tracing dye in the West Credit
Erin Advocate – August 10, 2016
A section of the West Credit River in Erin will be tinted pink for a few hours late next week as part of the Wastewater Environmental Assessment.
Chairperson Jane Aultman, Dave Bennett, Nancy Davy, Mark Anderson, Guy Gardhouse, Pat Salter, John Ince, Peter Turrell, Chris Winder, Christine Gordon, Lenora Banfield, Chris Gerrits and Doreen Still Secretary were all present for this meeting.

1. **Call to Order/Pecuniary/Conflict of Interest.**
   Chairperson Jane Aultman called the meeting to order and asked if there were any pecuniary or other conflicts of interest. None were declared at this time.

2. **Added Agenda Items**
   There was nothing added to the agenda.

3. **Approval of Agenda**
   The agenda was reviewed and the following motion was passed:

   #2016-02-01
   MOVED BY JOHN INCE
   SECONDED BY PAT SALTER
   BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda dated February 25th, 2016 be approved as circulated. “CARRIED”

4. **Minute Approval**
   The minutes were reviewed and the following motion was passed:

   #2016-02-02
   MOVED BY CHRISTINE GORDON
   SECONDED BY JOHN INCE
   BE IT RESOLVED THAT the minutes of November 26th, 2015 meeting be approved as circulated. “CARRIED”

5. **New Business**

   Rural Water Quality Program for Dufferin was discuss and Jane Aultman, Guy Gardhouse along with a representative's of the Grand River Conservation will be meeting to discuss funding programs and projects in the Upper Grand and a listing of what is available. This will be presented to Dufferin County for the 2017 budget.
6. Committee Orientation

Mark Anderson attended this meeting and provided a presentation of Watershed-Wide Wastewater Optimization Program which will form part of these minutes.

7. Deputation-none

8. Board Discussion & Correspondence

a) Peat mining and fill in regulated lands this is huge issue in Amaranth. There was a request that a GRCA representative come to the Amaranth Council meeting to discuss. This item will be left on the agenda for May meeting under pending items.

9. Pending Items

   a) Fill By-Law
   New legislation is in the process and this item will be on May agenda for further discussion.

   b) Proposal to Extend Zone R South End of Luther Marsh
   Dave Bennett and MNR are still working on this project and something should be decided by spring. This item will be on the May 23rd agenda for further discussion.

9. Adjournment & Next Meeting Date

#2016-02-03
MOVED BY JOHN INCE
SECONDED BY PAT SALTER
BE IT RESOLVED THAT we do now adjourn this meeting of the board to meet again on May 26, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. or at the call of the Chairperson.

"CARRIED"

Chairperson – Jane Aultman
Secretary – Doreen Still
Groves Hospital Foundation Cordially Invites You to Attend Our 2016 Donor Appreciation Event

On Thursday, October 13th, 2016 at 5:30pm
At the Elora Community Centre Hall: 21 David Street West, Elora

Reception to be followed by an evening of gratitude, entertainment, hor d'oeuvres, and wine

Featuring a performance by our Musical Guests for the evening:

The Elora Festival Singers

New Groves Hospital Project schematic drawings will be available for viewing and Building & Planning Staff will be available to answer any questions

Groves Hospital Foundation’s 2016 Donor Appreciation Event has been graciously sponsored by:

Meridian Credit Union

Please RSVP to Bonnie Bois at (519) 843-2010 ext. 3268 or bonnie@grovesfoundation.com by October 3rd, 2016
August 24, 2016

Susan Stone  
Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk-Treasurer  
Township of Amaranth  
374028 6th Line, RR 7  
Orangeville, ON L9W 2Z3

Dear Susan,

The Township of Amaranth was a member of Ontario Municipal Insurance Exchange for the period between 2004 and 2008. It has been our pleasure to serve you and the team at the Township.

Please find attached the press release issued on Thursday, August 11th, 2016 which is self-explanatory.

While OMEX will not be writing new business for the coming year, the team at OMEX will continue to serve you and all existing subscribers and former members as always, and will be available to respond to any inquiries you might have.

The Board of Directors have made the courageous decision to suspend the underwriting operations of OMEX at a time when OMEX is in a strong financial position. The leadership is totally committed to the concept of “sharing” Municipal exposures. In the next few months, the OMEX team will work on developing a “new and improved” product which serves municipalities.

We look forward to working with you again with a suite of products and services which will better suit municipal exposures and needs.

Sincerely,

[Signature]  

Nahla Hanna  
President & Attorney in Fact

Attachment
The Ontario Municipal Insurance Exchange (OMEX) announced on Thursday that it will suspend Reciprocal underwriting operations effective immediately “to allow it time to fully assess the needs of Ontario municipalities with a view to redesigning its products to better service the needs of its future members.”

As a result of this decision, OMEX will immediately cease to write renewal business for the remainder of 2016, and will not pursue new business, OMEX said in a press release. Existing members are being advised to seek coverage from alternate insurers.

All “in-force” policies will continue until their natural expiry, and OMEX will continue to serve all existing and former members “as well as responding to all existing claims, and all new claims as appropriate,” the release said.

OMEX said that the decision is part of a strategy to redesign the Municipal Reciprocal to more effectively address the emerging needs of its future members.

“While it is regrettable that OMEX has had to take this step in its evolution, management is committed to invest the time and energy required to remodel the Reciprocal, with the full support of its board of directors,” the release said. “It has also taken this strategic step at a time when the
finances of OMEX are very strong, enabling it to discharge all financial obligations as they arise. Other than the fact that OMEX will have no new or renewal premium for the next year, it will be ‘business as usual.’

While OMEX remains committed to the original concept of sharing risk and expertise between members of the Reciprocal, it has struggled in recent years to grow in an extremely soft insurance market and a highly competitive business environment, the insurer reported. “This low pricing environment, combined with the impact of joint & several liability on municipal claim settlements has made it difficult to offer sustainable pricing while still addressing the municipalities’ concern about retro assessments.”

OMEX will work with its reinsurers during the underwriting hiatus to address these issues in all future potential product offerings.

OMEX is a not-for-profit insurer dedicated solely to providing insurance to Ontario municipalities since 1989. It is a member-governed alternative to the conventional insurance market.
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The Honourable Steven Del Duca
Minister of Transportation
Unit 3 5100 Rutherford Road
Woodbridge, Ontario
L4H 2J2

Dear Minister Del Duca:

I am writing today to urgently request your support regarding Bill 171, Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Waste Collection Vehicles and Snow Plows), 2016.

The Council of the Township of Carlow/Mayo considers this Bill to be an important initiative that will save lives and ensure that workers whose jobs take place in roadways are made safer.

The following quotation from the Milestones Magazine highlights the concerns in our municipality:

“For many of these workers, their workplace is a vehicle and the edge of the road where there is increased risk from careless and distracted drivers and rear end collisions. The increased risk, resultant injuries and fatalities that are associated with this kind of work are a problem across North America. This Bill would bring Ontario in line with other jurisdictions that have already protected similar workers.” OGRA MILESTONES Spring/Summer 2016

We strongly agree with the above quoted statement as our operators have been involved in motor vehicle accidents due to the inattention and distraction of the public.

Our operators should be treated the same as the O.P.P., EMS and Fire because we also provide essential service to the public.

Yours truly,

Bonnie Adams
Reeve of the Township of Carlow/Mayo

Copy – All Ontario Municipalities
September 8, 2016

Township of East Garafraxa
C/O Municipal Administration Office
374028 6th Line
Amaranth, ON
L9W 0M6

To Mayor & Council:

Thank you for the generous donations you have given us in the past. We have so many great plans for our next Santa Claus Parade, and we have such a great reputation for putting on a really well-attended community event. In the last past few years, we have added some great additions to our event, including a Video Dance Party. We formally ask that you donate $200.00 again this year to cover our costs.

Thank you for considering our request. We appreciate all donations in order that it can be the very best Christmas event for our Community.

Could you please have the cheque payable to: The Grand Valley & District Santa Claus Parade Committee.

Yours Truly,
SANTA CLAUS PARADE COMMITTEE

[Signature]
Sarah Culshaw
Secretary-Treasurer

:sc
THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF NEEBING

BY-LAW NUMBER 2015-01

Being a by-law to repeal By-law 988-2013, which established a Police Services Board, and By-law 998-2013, which appointed members to that Board.

Recitals:

1. Subsections 10(2), (4) and 27(1) of the Police Services Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.15, as amended, require municipalities to establish police services boards if they have entered into an agreement with the Ontario Provincial Police to provide policing services in the municipality.

2. The Municipality of Neebing had entered into an agreement with the Ontario Provincial Police to provide policing services in the municipality and required a police services board. That contract has been terminated, so the police services board is no longer necessary.

ACCORDINGLY THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF NEEBING ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Repeal: By-law 988-2013, which created a Police Services Board for the Municipality of Neebing, is repealed.

2. Repeal: By-law 998-2013, which appointed representatives to the Police Services Board for the Municipality of Neebing, is repealed.

3. Effective Date: This By-law takes effect retroactively as of January 1st, 2015.

ENACTED AND PASSED IN COUNCIL this 14th day of January, 2015, as witnessed by the Corporate seal of the Corporation and the hands of its duly authorized Officers.

THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF NEEBING

[Signatures of Mayor and Solicitor Clerk]

Read for a first and second time this 14th day of January, 2015.

Read for a third time and finally passed this this 14th day of January, 2015.
THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF EAST GARAFRAXA

BY-LAW NO. ________________

BEING A BY-LAW TO PERMIT ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLES ON MUNICIPAL ROADS

WHEREAS the Highway Traffic Act, R.S.O. 1990, Section 191.8, subsection (3), chapter H.8, as amended, provides that the Council of a municipality may pass by-laws;

a) Permitting the operation of off-road vehicles, with three or more wheels and low pressure bearing tires on any highway within the municipality that is under the jurisdiction of the municipality or on any part or parts of such highways;

b) Prescribing a lower rate of speed for off-road vehicles by regulation on any highway within the municipality that is under its jurisdiction, or any part or parts of such highway;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the Township of East Garafraxa enacts as follows:

1. Definitions:

In this by-law, "All Terrain Vehicles” means an off-road vehicle that:

a) has four wheels, the tires of which are in contact with the ground
b) has steering handlebars
c) has a seat that is designed to be straddled by the driver, and
d) is designed to carry a driver only and no passengers

with the following:

"All Terrain Vehicle" means an off-road vehicle that:

a) has four wheels, the tires of which are all in contact with the ground;
b) has steering handlebars;
c) has a seat that is designed to be straddled by the driver; and
d) is designed to carry:
   (i) a driver only and no passengers, or
   (ii) a driver and only one passenger, if the vehicle
      (A) has one passenger seat that is designed to be straddled by the passenger while sitting facing forward behind the driver; and
      (B) is equipped with footrests for the passenger that are separate from the footrests for the driver.

"Multi-Purpose Off-Highway Utility Vehicle” means an off-road vehicle that:

a) has four or more wheels, the tires of which are all in contact with the ground;
b) has a steering wheel for steering control;
c) has seats that are not designed to be straddled;
d) has a minimum cargo capacity of 159 kilograms.

"Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle” means an off-road vehicle that:

a) has four or more wheels, the tires of which are all in contact with the ground;
b) has a steering wheel for steering control;
c) has seats that are not designed to be straddled; and
 d) has an engine displacement equal to or less than 1,000 cubic centimeters.

"Municipality” means the Corporation of the Township of East Garafraxa.

"Highway” includes any open and maintained road allowance under the sole jurisdiction of the Corporation of the Township of East Garafraxa, including common and public highway, street, avenue, parkway, driveway, square, place, bridge, viaduct or trestle, any part of which is intended for or used by the general public for the passage of vehicles and includes the area between the lateral property lines, thereof.
"Settlement Areas" shall include the communities of Marsvile and Orton.

"Built Up Areas" shall include any estate subdivision.

"Low Pressure Bearing Tires" means a wide, balloon-type tire with a rounded cross section and no distinct shoulder area and that is designed to operate with inflation pressure of no greater than 70KPA (10psi)

"Off Road Vehicle" means an off-road vehicle within the meaning of the Off-Road Vehicles Act, as amended.

"Seat Belt Assembly" means an off-road vehicle within the meaning of the Off-Road Vehicles Act, as amended.

II. General Regulations of All-Terrain Vehicles on Highways:

1. An All-Terrain Vehicle shall not be operated on highways unless it meets the equipment requirements of Section 7 to 15 of 0, Reg. 316/03 and it is operated in accordance with Sections 16 to 24 of O.Reg 316/03 made under the Highway Traffic Act.

2. The All-Terrain Vehicle shall not be driven at a rate of speed greater than:
   a) 20 kilometres per hour, if the speed limit established under the Highway Traffic Act or by Municipal By-law for that part of the highway is not greater than 50 kilometres per hour, or
   b) 50 kilometres per hour, if the speed limit established under the Highway Traffic or by Municipal By-law for that part of the highway is greater than 50 kilometres per hour.

3. Off-Road Vehicles with four wheels and low pressure bearing tires shall be permitted on all municipal roads within the Township of East Garafraxa under and in accordance with Ontario Regulation 316/03 made under the Highway Traffic Act and the Off Roads Vehicles Act as amended.

4. No person shall park or ride an all terrain vehicle on any sidewalk within the Township of East Garafraxa, on Township owned lands, and in built up areas/settlements areas.

5. No person shall operate an all terrain vehicle except between one half hour after sunrise to one half hour before sunset.

6. No person shall operate an All-Terrain Vehicle in such a manner as to disturb or distort the natural environment including fish habitats, property and any flora or fauna.

7. Any person who contravenes any of the provision of this By-law is guilty of an offence and upon conviction is liable to a fine provided for under the Highway Traffic Act and/or the Provincial Offences Act.

8. The exemptions set out in Ontario Regulation 316/03 and Ontario Regulation 135/15, as amended from time to time, regarding the operation of off-road vehicles on highways shall apply to this By-Law and the permission granted thereunder.

9. If a court of competent jurisdiction declares any provision, or part of a provision, of this by-law to be invalid, or to be of no force and effect, it is the intention of council in enacting this by-law that each and every provision of this by-law authorized by-law be applied and enforced in accordance with its terms and to the extent possible according to the law.

10. The provisions of the by-law shall come into force and take effect on the final passing hereof.

BY-LAW READ A FIRST AND SECOND TIME THIS 13TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2016
BY-LAW READ A THIRD TIME AND PASSED THIS 13TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2016

Susan M Stone, Clerk

Guy Guardhouse, Mayor