

Document 3 – Consultation Details

The comments received below, were a result of feedback received from:

1) Public Circulation

Public circulation occurred on April 17, 2025, and comments were requested by May 15, 2025. The circulation included all Councillors, all registered community organizations, the FCA, GOHBA, and other stakeholders.

2) Meetings with Community Associations and Organizations

All community associations whose secondary plans were being considered for amendments were contacted directly and an offered an opportunity to meet with City staff to discuss the proposed amendments. One or more meetings were held with members of the following community associations:

- Alta Vista Community Association
- Faircrest Heights Community Association
- Old Ottawa East Community Association
- Centretown Citizens Community Association
- Lowertown Community Association
- Rockcliffe Park Community Association
- Stittsville Village Association

Staff also met with the following organizations:

- Federation of Citizens' Associations (FCA)
- Greater Ottawa Homebuilders Association (GOHBA)
- Greenspace Alliance
- Stittsville Mainstreet Steering Committee

3) Open House

An Open house was held Monday June 2, whereby the public had an opportunity to review and ask questions on the proposed amendments.

Public Comments

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs)	MTSA boundaries are too broad and extend too far into neighbourhoods	MTSA boundaries were established using an approximately 800-metre walking distance from the transit station.
	MTSAs should not be applied to areas where high levels of intensification are not anticipated, such as the Greenbelt or low-density neighbourhoods	The boundaries of MTSAs include all developable land within an 800-metre walking distance of the station, regardless of whether the lands are suitable for high densities. Inclusion of a property within an MTSA does not mean high densities will be permitted. Undevelopable or restricted areas such as the Ottawa River or the NCC Greenbelt are not included within the MTSA.
	The boundaries of MTSAs should reflect actual walkability, including considerations for topography and barriers to pedestrians	To ensure a consistent application of boundaries, an 800-metre walking distance was used for each MTSA. There are many factors that impact walkability, including topography, quality of pedestrian infrastructure, road crossings, among others. An objective measurement of walking distance along the pedestrian network was used to determine the MTSA boundaries.
	There are too many MTSAs identified, and the City should consider reducing the number of MTSAs.	The Provincial Planning Statement requires that municipalities delineate MTSAs surrounding all higher-order transit stations or stops.
	MTSAs should be planned for complete community needs (e.g. shops, schools, parks), and not just density.	Two of the cross-cutting issues of the Official Plan are 15-minute neighbourhoods and healthy and inclusive communities. The Official Plan policies relating to these two issues aim to create complete, walkable communities with a full range of services and amenities, especially in proximity to transit.
	City should proactively plan for active transportation infrastructure upgrades in MTSAs.	A policy is proposed to encourage active transportation improvements within MTSAs, however, the precise timing and prioritization of those projects is determined by the Transportation Master Plan. Secondary Plans around transit stations also aim to identify mobility improvements to increase access to the surrounding neighbourhoods.
	MTSA density targets should be phased in to reflect a more gradual approach to density.	The achievement of the density targets in MTSAs will occur over time. Development within MTSAs can happen at a gradual rate to achieve the overall ridership target.
Strategic Growth Areas	The PPS encourages density in strategic growth areas rather than prescribing it.	The Official Plan currently assigns minimum density targets the Hubs and Mainstreets. The amendments propose to continue carrying the current approach forward as a way to express the roles of these designations as strategic growth areas.
	Strategic growth areas should be limited to areas with frequent or rapid transit.	While some strategic growth areas, such as Hubs, are intended to increase density surrounding existing higher-order transit, other strategic growth areas, such as Minor Corridors, are intended to permit densities that could support future frequent transit service. Feedback has been received for transit improvements from the current state. The identification of these routes as Corridors furthers the objective of signaling where transit improvements should be reviewed so that we can improve services in the future.

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
	Corridors should not all be treated the same; some Corridors are less suitable for intensification than others.	Corridors have different policies depending on the transect within which they are located. For example, Corridors in the Inner Urban transect permit greater heights than those in the Suburban transect.
Public Engagement	The OPA process has been rushed without meaningful consultation, and more time should have been provided for communities to provide feedback.	All municipal planning decisions must be consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS), and with the new PPS coming into effect in October 2024, it was necessary for Ottawa to update its Official Plan in a timely manner to reflect the new policies in relation to settlement area expansion, employment area conversions, and residential permissions on agricultural lands. Staff have consulted with multiple stakeholders, community associations, and industry and in some cases on multiple occasions. Staff also acknowledge the efforts of some community associations to host staff as part of their regular scheduled meetings and prioritize the formation of their comments for staff to consider within the project timelines.
	Secondary plan amendments should be removed from this OPA due to a lack of fulsome community consultation.	Staff have complied with all the requirements for public consultation stipulated in the <i>Planning Act</i> and in the Official Plan. Staff have met with many community associations, in some cases multiple times and have been flexible with timelines for feedback submissions. Staff appreciate the efforts of community associations to provide their fulsome comments.
	Overreach in Intensification Goals. While some level of intensification is necessary, the scale currently being proposed and implemented far exceeds what was initially set out in the OP. Can we look at slowing this down? Can we possibly phase this in, so we can adapt and adjust targets in line with what changes are occurring?	Staff propose carrying forward the existing minimum density targets for Hubs, Mainstreets, and Neighbourhoods to implement the strategic growth areas. The target densities of most MTSA's are also achieved with the existing minimum density targets. Where the minimum densities of MTSA's cannot be achieved with existing minimum densities or building heights, staff propose amendments to achieve these targets over time. The achievement of minimum densities occur are phased in as they occur on a project by project basis.
Environment and Infrastructure	Intensification is not adequately protecting greenspace and tree canopy.	Development must still comply with the Tree Protection By-law, which protects mature trees and trees on City property. Additionally, medium- and high-density development is required to convey parkland or contribute cash-in-lieu of parkland, which is then used by the City to acquire or improve public parks and greenspace.
	Increases to permitted heights and densities should reflect existing infrastructure capacity.	The Official Plan sets out the direction for Ottawa's growth, and the related master plans implement that direction, including the Infrastructure Master Plan and the Transportation Master Plan.
	Limiting access to cars, puts additional pressure on residents not well served by rapid transit	The proposed amendments to not require parking within a PMTSA, which is proposed to be labelled as a Protected Hub through these amendments, reflect <i>Planning Act</i> requirements under subsection 16(22).

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
Urban and Village Area Boundary Expansions	Object to the removal of Section 3.4, Policy 8 which permits the transfer of a country lot subdivision to a more appropriate location (Known as the swap policy)	Through the consultation process staff have received feedback on the overall benefits of retaining the policy to better locate existing unbuilt country lot subdivisions. With the establishment of a new process for settlement area expansions, this policy, is modified to reflect a transfer of privately serviced lots to privately serviced lots.
Alta Vista – Faircrest Heights – Riverview Park Secondary Plan	Six storey permissions along Pleasant Park, Kilborn, and Smyth are not appropriate.	Pleasant Park and Kilborn are designated Minor Corridors in the Official Plan, and Smyth is designated a Mainstreet Corridor. Volume 1 of the Official Plan permits heights up to six storeys on Minor Corridors in the Outer Urban Transect, and heights up to 40 storeys on Mainstreet Corridors with a right-of-way width greater than 30 metres. The proposed heights are in-line with the permitted heights of these corridors as strategic growth areas in Volume 1 of the Official Plan and are required to achieve the minimum density targets of the Pleasant Park MTSA.
	The proposed height increases will pose a risk to the neighbourhood's tree canopy, greenspace and have an environmental impact.	Development must still comply with the Tree Protection By-law, which protects mature trees and trees on City property. Additionally, medium- and high-density development is required to convey parkland or contribute cash-in-lieu of parkland, which is then used by the City to acquire or improve public parks and greenspace. The height increases are maximums and lower heights may be built, particularly due to market attractiveness for 6-storey buildings without elevators. The development permissions are required to achieve the minimum density requirements of the Pleasant Park MTSA.
	Applying six storey permissions to Pleasant Park, Kilborn, and Smyth but leaving the permissions along Alta Vista Drive unchanged does not make sense.	Pleasant Park, Kilborn, and Smyth are designated as Corridors in the Official Plan, whereas Alta Vista Drive is not. To be consistent with the application of the Minor Corridor designation as strategic growth area and the overall intent of the secondary plan staff are not proposing Alta Vista to be a Minor Corridor.

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
	<p>The steep topography in Alta Vista impedes walkability to the transit stations, which should be reflected in the MTSA boundaries.</p>	<p>The proposal will create awkward corridors where within a reduced MTSA boundary heights would be permitted to 6-storeys, then the next segment between the MTSA boundary and the secondary plan boundary, height permissions are reduced to 4-storeys, then the ext segment outside of the secondary plan, the height permissions are increased again to 6-storeys with the Minor Corridor designation from Volume 1 of the Official Plan. Staff are of the opinion that a cohesive and consistent height along the corridor is a preferred planned outcome.</p> <p>Staff also reviewed the grade changes from the Pleasant Park transit station where the steeper slope occurs mainly in a east-west direction The gradients of Pleasant Park Road and Smyth Road are between 2.2 per cent to 4.5 percent. A 4.5 per cent grade is considered to be a “gentle slope”. The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) targets a 1:20 slope or 5 per cent grade on the sidewalk, which is within the “gentle slope” category.</p> <p>However, regardless of the results of the road grades in the secondary plan, staff are of the opinion that a consistent height along the corridor produces a more rationale implementation of the strategic growth area, rather than the potential for a mid-segment lower height.</p>
	<p>Staff should examine some of the publicly-owned properties in the area to see whether they can bear a greater share of the intensification and reduce the heights required elsewhere.</p> <p>Rapid intensification that diminishes aesthetics, green space, and livability puts Ottawa at risk of becoming a patchwork of architectural standards, high rises towering over family homes, undermining Ottawa’s Identity as a National Capital.</p>	<p>1245 Kilborn Place is a relative large site within the proposed Pleasant Park MTSA and the secondary plan and could allow for context-sensitive high-rise development. The site is a City-owned and is being considered for affordable housing development. Planning staff are recommending a height maximum of 27 storeys with transition to lower heights in proximity to a low-rise neighbourhood for this property consistent with the policies to prioritize affordable housing and transition provisions of the Official Plan. The 27-storey permissions on the site providing significant density potential for the MTSA, contributes to the achievement of the MTSA minimum density targets.</p> <p>Various properties noted for consideration, where not within the Pleasant Park MTSA. Staff acknowledge the comment and note that the proposed amendments implement the PPS that are applied in a more consistent manner. Staff note that planning instruments including the Official Plan do not control the rapidity of intensification and is entirely borne from the housing market.</p>
	<p>Amendments to this secondary plan are long overdue, but there is still a need for much more housing in the neighbourhood.</p>	<p>The scope of these amendments were to plan for the density targets for the MTSAs and to ensure consistency with the intensification policies in Volume 1 of the Official Plan. Any increases to permissions beyond that scope were not considered.</p>

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
Central and East Downtown Core Secondary Plan	Increases to permitted density should be commensurate with increases to greenspace and public amenities.	<p>Increases to greenspace and public amenities are more aligned to construction vis-à-vis other areas and projects rather than permissions as it is not possible to accurately forecast how much development will occur where at the property level.</p> <p>Medium- and high-density development is required to convey parkland or contribute cash-in-lieu of parkland, which is then used by the City to acquire or improve public parks and greenspace. Additionally, any increases in densities and the potential to increase construction within an area will be considered in the appropriate master plans, such as the Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan.</p>
	Height permissions should carefully consider the potential impact on the heritage attributes of Centretown.	Staff acknowledge this concern and have removed or reduced many of the proposed height increases to the west of Kent Street due to potential heritage impacts.
	Heights of up to nine storeys on quiet residential streets like Cooper Street are not appropriate and should be reduced.	Staff acknowledge the feedback and have removed the proposed height increases on Cooper Street as it is not a strategic growth area.
	The City should seek ways to encourage development proponents to actually build when their applications are approved instead of sitting on the land.	The City can only approve applications; it cannot force a landowner to build a proposed building.
	The removal of the FSI requirements in the Uptown Rideau Character Area could result in development with massing that strays from the intent of the secondary plan policies.	Staff acknowledge the feedback and have removed the amendments to the FSI policies in the Uptown Rideau Character Area.
	It is great that the City is increasing development permissions in the Centretown area, however the City should consider spreading the density more broadly instead of concentrating it along Corridors.	The intent of the Official Plan Amendment is to consistently apply designations as strategic growth areas. The role of the Neighbourhood designations is to provide opportunities for new ground-oriented built-forms with larger dwellings rather than taller built-forms with smaller dwellings to assist with the role of intensification to manage growth.
	There should be consideration for permitting a greater mix of non-residential uses across the secondary plan area to increase the availability of services and amenities for residents.	Staff are proposing policies that provide for greater flexibility for neighbourhood-serving uses in the secondary plan.
Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan	There should be no height increases to the Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan.	The permitted heights in the Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan are not consistent with the general intent of the Corridor designations in Volume 1 of the Official Plan as a strategic growth area.
	<p>Heights of six storeys on Lees Avenue and Main Street south of Clegg are not appropriate.</p> <p>Staff should analyze whether 6 storeys is possible on shallower lots (e.g, Lees and Main Street south of Clegg). The ultimate ROWs should be used in the analysis.</p>	Staff acknowledge the feedback and have reduced the proposed height increases along Lees Avenue and Main Street south of Clegg to four storeys due to their lot depth and consistency with the application of the angular plane to the adjacent neighbourhood. Staff utilized angular plane analysis and considering the ultimate ROWS in that analysis.

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
	<p>There needs to be consideration for how buildings would ensure compatibility with the existing neighbourhood context.</p> <p>Concern with lack of transitions for taller buildings, concern that existing transition policies and guidelines are not being respected</p>	<p>The secondary plan includes policies relating to transition and context-appropriate development. No significant changes are proposed to these policies, and some policy amendments are added to ensure appropriate transitions are included in new development.</p>
	<p>Consider removing Mainstreet Corridor on B2 from area south of Clegg</p>	<p>Staff recommend retaining the Mainstreet Corridor along this segment for the consideration of its mobility role and potential for transit improvements to the benefit of existing and future residents. The built-form of the adjacent properties is only one consideration of a Mainstreet designation.</p>
	<p>The proposed heights on Main Street should be greater, with reduced setbacks across the entire neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Staff recommend heights up to 9-storeys along Main Street to be consistent with the transition policies in the Official Plan.</p>
	<p>Images should be added to the secondary plan illustrating a stepped building envelope that can provide sufficient transition to adjacent areas.</p> <p>Concern with removing references to TM zone. There is an image in the TM zone that should be carried forward and referenced in the new ZBL, or embedded within the SP</p>	<p>Feedback staff have received from the development industry is that stepped building envelopes are not typically developed due to their higher construction costs.</p> <p>Staff propose amendments to note the successor of the TM zone in the new Zoning By-law.</p>
Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan	<p>Concern that there is an inconsistency between the Ontario Heritage Act and the proposed changes in height. Concern that the proposed changes will result in loss of character.</p>	<p>The proposed heritage policies must be achieved, and other heritage policies continue to apply. Staff recommend a direction that balances the Official Plan and PPS through the proposed amendments. Staff are of the opinion that there is no inconsistency. Rather, the policies work together to mitigate any potential impacts.</p>
	<p>Concern about why the proposed 6-storey permissions extend north beyond Oakhill further to Juliana. The height permissions in this portion should be lower.</p>	<p>The extents are based on boundaries of the strategic growth areas, being the Beechwood Mainstreet Corridor and Hemlock Minor Corridor.</p>
	<p>Concern for the policy changes regarding additional dwelling units, and the potential loss of greenspace due to the creation of additional dwelling units.</p>	<p>The proposed policies implement the requirements under the <i>Planning Act</i>. Bill 23 requires municipalities to permit additional residential dwellings where a single-detached, semi-detached, or rowhouse is permitted on a municipally serviced lot.</p>
	<p>Request to have 8.5m height limits imposed based on language in the draft Zoning By-law</p>	<p>This request does not relate to the implementation of the PPS and is outside the scope of the Official Plan Amendment.</p>

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
	Concern about draft zoning changes.	This is outside the scope of this report. Staff provided information on how to provide feedback on the new Zoning By-law. The proposed amendments are not shown in the zoning by-law. If they are approved, they will be incorporated into draft 3 of the new Zoning By-law.
Stittsville Main Street Secondary Plan	The increased density applied broadly to Stittsville Main Street is not appropriate as there is a lack of infrastructure to support it.	The infrastructure required to support any increases to the permitted densities in the secondary plan area will be identified and planned for accordingly through the necessary master plans.
	Increased density would be more appropriate if it was allocated to the proper precincts in the secondary plan.	Staff acknowledge this feedback and after reviewing the context of the Stittsville Main Street precincts recommend maximum height permissions of moderate high-rise buildings 10 to 18 storeys in the Crossing Bridge precinct. The taller heights are recommended to be located on larger lots and closer to the main street with the lower heights when in proximity to an adjacent low-rise neighbourhood and/or smaller lot.
	The proposed height increases are neglecting and diminishing the intent of the secondary plan and the community design plan.	Staff are recommending an approach that is consistent with the strategic growth area policies in Volume 1 of the Official Plan, while retaining the remaining secondary plan policies so as to preserve its intent by increasing maximum height permission in the Crossing Bridge precinct to 10 to 18 storeys.
	Greater heights will only enable developers to request even larger increases over the height permissions.	The City cannot prohibit developers from making an application for an Official Plan amendment and applications for the same heights may be made today without the proposed amendments. <i>Planning Act</i> applications will continue to be evaluated against the policies of the secondary plan, Volume 1 of the Official Plan, and the Provincial Planning Statement.
Various Comments on matters not relevant to PPS Consistency	<p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider environmental studies relating to noise attenuation, specifically as it relates to the impact of Ottawa International Airport • In regard to housing expansion, there must be more creativity in height, style, and materials • Highlight the importance of vibrant public spaces and parks, and to design urban and suburban centres that are engaging and easily accessible 	Staff did not consider these comments in the review of this Official Plan Amendment but did forward them on to other staff for their consideration

Development Industry Comments

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
Settlement Area Expansions	Updates to population, housing, and employment projections should be permitted outside of comprehensive reviews if it is demonstrated that there is insufficient land available according to PPS requirements and other OP policies.	<p>The recommended amendments intend for the consideration of settlement area expansion applications if there are less than 15-years of residential land supply as required by the PPS in between Official Plan updates.</p> <p>Updates to projections through the 5-year Official Plan update cycle so that a single set of growth projections provides consistency and alignment with updates to the relevant master plans.</p>
	The criteria for expansion to settlement areas must not "go beyond" the minimum standards of the PPS if this creates a conflict. Specifically, the province allows for expansion onto lower priority agricultural lands per Section 2.3.2 of the PPS.	The proposed amendments to exclude agricultural lands from consideration of a settlement area expansion does not conflict with the PPS. The consideration of agricultural lands is not a minimum standard but rather a maximum standard as criteria to consider all the potential candidate areas. In this instance a conflict would occur if the policy instead permitted the consideration of settlement expansion on higher priority agricultural land without considering lower priority alternatives or specialty crop areas.
	The boundary indicated on OP schedules for the Natural Heritage System is subjective and based on large scale "potential" mapping; boundaries may not reflect what should be protected. Any portion of the system within an expansion area should be subject to site-specific study which may result in minor and major changes to the boundary.	Staff acknowledge the feedback and recommend a minor wording change to this amendment to address this concern.
	Future growth through expansion should be permitted in the influence area of the Sand and Gravel Resource Overlay and the Bedrock Resource Overlay where supported by a study that demonstrates there will be no impact or any impact may be mitigated.	Staff acknowledge the feedback and recommended revisions that reflect the ability to demonstrate there would be no conflict consistent with the current policies for the applicable aggregate overlays.
	It is arbitrary to reserve all lands adjacent to highways for logistic and employment areas without being designated as so. Reserving lands for future employment area should be supported by a comprehensive study. Further, this reads as though it is incumbent on residential developers to implement 100% of the mitigation, even if the potential employment lands are vacant, and even if the future industrial lots are sufficiently large to accommodate buffering. How is required mitigation to be determined in the absence of knowledge of what may be proposed on future employment lands.	<p>The intent of the circulated policy was around highway interchanges as the language speaks to highway access.</p> <p>Staff acknowledge the feedback and have included revisions through the applicable recommended policy to clarify lands around highway interchanges should be reserved how the extent of that area would be evaluated.</p> <p>As per section 2.8.1 policy 3 of the PPS, mitigation is required within 300 metres of an <i>employment area</i>, which includes the candidate development areas.</p>

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
		Staff are proposing changes to the proposed amendment to address this concern.
	It is unreasonable to require all costs for off-site infrastructure to be funded by the developer where they may be DC eligible.	Section 2.3.2 policy 1b) notes the consideration of sufficient capacity in existing or planned infrastructure. If required off-site infrastructure is required for a candidate expansion area does not exist or is not planned the candidate area is not eligible as an expansion area. However this policy permits the consideration for unplanned small-scale infrastructure projects to be considered as planned if they are funded by the developer. Otherwise an update to the infrastructure or transportation master plan is required for there to be planned capacity.
	It is not appropriate to apply Tewin study or expansion policies to other future expansion areas. The Tewin expansion policies were negotiated specifically for that application and were agreed to by the applicant.	The proposed policy does not apply Tewin policies to future expansion areas. Rather, it gives the flexibility for the City to establish similar policies that may be applicable to a new settlement area, of which Tewin is an example of.
	The deletion of the country lot subdivision land swap policy removes the rights of property owners to transfer a country lot plan of subdivision in the rural area without the need for an OPA for settlement area expansion. This policy should not be deleted as it disincentivizes relocating country lot subdivisions to more appropriate locations (i.e. a village) which would reduce fragmentation of the rural area as is directed by the PPS.	Staff acknowledge the feedback and the benefits of the policy to encourage the relocation of grandfathered country lot subdivisions contiguous to villages or other country lot subdivisions to create a cluster. Staff recommend revisions so that relocated subdivisions only occur on private individual services/
	The OP should permit amendments to the boundaries of transects/overlays on a site-specific basis. This may be beneficial in instances through further study, such as for land swap or refining aggregate/landfill impact assessment setbacks.	Staff recommend maintaining the current approach of not amending transect boundaries on a site-specific basis.
Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs)	Seeing that an MTSA is not a designation, the development requirements should be covered in the underlying designations.	The recommended amendments include the suggested approach.
	The removal of the specific walking distance measurement for Hubs could lead to differing opinions.	Hubs are designation with a defined boundary. The policy provides context to how the extent of the Hub is determined. The precise extent of each Hub designation will be determined in the new Zoning By-law.
	The radius for allowing greater building heights should simply match that of the MTSAs (i.e. 500- to 800-metre radius), given the intent of this policy area is to maximize the number of potential transit users that are within walking distance of the station. Further, what is the purpose of the additional criteria beyond proximity to transit when additional height can be	Staff are no longer recommending amendments to this policy.

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
	requested in a MTSA? Proximity to transit was the only consideration when it referred to PMTSAs.	
Employment Areas	New Policy 3.1 9) for Lands with proximity to a goods movement highway interchange including future interchanges, are protected for future Industrial and Logistics uses has the effect of sterilizing lands adjacent to highways and areas of possible interchanges, without a planning analysis,	<p>Staff does not consider the use of “sterilizes” lands as an accurate characterization of the policy, which would imply no development opportunities, which is not the intent or outcome, particularly when references are made for future Industrial and Logistics development. The policy reserves lands at strategic locations for employment areas and is consistent with PPS Sections 2.8.1. and 2.8.2 with regards to protecting and planning for employment areas over the long-term.</p> <p>Staff recommend revisions to the policy to clarify the policy is intended to apply to a highway interchange rather than a highway corridor and the objectives that a review of such lands should achieve to determine the extent of the area for future Industrial and Logistics. Such a review to determine the extent of the area may occur through a Section 26 Official Plan update or a settlement area expansion application.</p>
	The policies regarding compatibility between sensitive uses and employment areas should not be more restrictive in the absence of new Provincial D-Series Guidelines.	The recommended policies are consistent with the PPS with regards to sensitive uses in employment areas.
	The criteria listed for removal of lands from an industrial/employment area are subjective and may be difficult to demonstrate, for example, “suitability of lands” or “ability of existing/future uses to obtain an ECA”.	The recommended revisions are consistent with the PPS objectives to demonstrate the conversion would not negatively impact the overall viability of the employment area and the plan, protect, and preserve employment areas for current and <u>future</u> uses.
	A policy should be added to the Mixed Industrial designations specifying whether the Corridor or Mixed Industrial designation supersedes in the event of an overlap.	The new Zoning By-law will determine underlying zoning that will mostly be based on existing uses and the context of lot pattern, such as frontage onto a Corridor vs rear-lot conditions within an industrial subdivision.
	Consider how a standalone research and development use fits into the list of permitted uses in employment areas and modify accordingly.	Staff recommend revisions to research and development uses that are consistent with the PPS for such uses within employment areas.
	Consider how removal of lands designated Mixed Industrial from the overall employment area might affect projections and supply of available lands.	The role that the Mixed Industrial designation will play for the supply of available industrial lands will occur through the upcoming Official Plan growth projections update.
	In developing new strategies to proactively identify, recognize and conserve properties or built heritage resources, it must be ensured that all information, including an inventory, is publicly accessible and kept up to date.	These comments have been passed along to Heritage staff for their future consideration.

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
Heritage	Proposed addition of policies for Agricultural System Approach is premature at this time but rather this addition should only be made after Provincial guidance applicable to the Ottawa area is provided.	There are sufficient existing policies in the PPS, guidelines, and tools to begin the formation of an Agricultural System Approach. It is incumbent on the Province to finalize and publish these tools to support the PPS they issued last fall since all planning decisions must be consistent with the PPS. The City can amend and add to this section through future updates as more details from the Province becomes available
Agricultural System Approach	The agricultural systems approach is fundamental change to the OP which should be paused for further consultation. The changes proposed essentially designate the entire rural area, regardless of designation, as protected for the agricultural system.	This is not a fundamental change to the Official Plan, and is required by the PPS to be incorporated into Official Plan policies. The agricultural system is a term defined by the PPS, and these policies reflect that definition. These policies do not limit the ability for a change of use in the agricultural system, rather, it establishes a requirement for an agricultural impact assessment in certain cases to provide staff the ability to assess the potential impacts of a development application on the agricultural system.
	There are significant implications in including lands in the Rural Countryside designation as part of the Agricultural System. The policies must not limit ability to change use of rural lands for non-agricultural purposes despite being part of the Agricultural System.	These policies do not limit the ability for a change of use in the agricultural system, rather, it establishes a requirement for an agricultural impact assessment in certain cases to provide staff the ability to assess the potential impacts of a development application on the agricultural system.
	“Agricultural production” should be defined in terms of size, scale, primary use, etc.	A definition of agricultural production is not necessary as there are additional permissions or prohibitions associated with “lands used for agricultural production”. The City will use its discretion in determining whether lands could be constituted as “in agricultural production” at the time of an application or through the terms of reference for agricultural impact assessments..
	The requirement for an Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) for any new or expanding non-agricultural use in the Rural Countryside designation, if the land is currently used for agriculture or is in proximity to lands used for agriculture, should be removed. This affects the rights of rural landowners (beyond standard MDS requirements) to potentially sterilize the lands for a variety of uses.	This is not a requirement, but rather gives the City the ability to request an agricultural impact assessment in these cases if the City deems it appropriate.
	The implementing AIA Terms of Reference must be very clear about which circumstances on a site-specific basis would require an AIA. Further, providing sole discretion to the City for any other circumstance where an AIA may be required is broad and subjective.	Staff will consider this comment in the development of the terms of reference.
	9.1.1 Policy 2) conflates a boundary expansion application with a LEAR study, which is different.	Staff have proposed changes to original proposal of policy 2) and other policies to add clarity that LEAR or area specific assessment is not a removal land within a prime

Category	Comments Received	Staff Response
	<p>There should be ability for private landowners to apply to remove land from the Agricultural Resource Area through LEAR assessment on a site-by-site basis. The PPS allows for removal of land from prime agricultural areas through a private application including for settlement area expansions. This is in recognition that not all lands within prime agricultural areas are considered “prime agricultural lands”. This policy should be rewritten to avoid inconsistency with new permissions for private landowners to apply for settlement area expansions.</p>	<p>agricultural area but an assessment on whether lands should be within a prime agricultural area based on new information</p>
<p>Agricultural Resource Areas</p>	<p>The addition of studies that could be required as part of a complete application is not required in order to be consistent with the PPS. The change is also premature pending Bill 17 which states the Province will direct what studies may be requested, and Bill 17 proposes that this OP change will be moot.</p>	<p>Staff acknowledge that amendments to section 11.8 related to planning studies is not an implementation of the PPS. However, staff recommend amending this section of the Official Plan to be more consistent with the related sections in the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p>
<p>Implementation Policies</p>	<p>New Policy Section 11.6 18) should include reference to a possible village expansion</p>	<p>Staff note that Policy 18) is in relation to transect boundaries. Villages and Rural Countryside are both within the Rural Transect. A potential village boundary expansion occurs within the Rural Transect and any decisions in relation to the village boundary expansion results in no change to the Rural Transect.</p>