



Stakeholder Comments and Response to Urban Expansion Criteria

1. SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE
2 METHODOLOGY		
GROSS DEVELOPABLE AREA		
“Gross developable” land area	Consideration should be made to permit the construction of stormwater management facilities within the rural area.	For the purpose of “gross developable” land calculations it is assumed that stormwater management facilities would be located in the urban expansion lands.
Agricultural Resource Areas	There are likely lands in other designations (including Agricultural Resource Areas) that would ultimately score higher than lands in the General Rural Area or Rural Natural Features designations. Lands designated Agricultural Resource Area should be included in the initial scoring of candidate parcels.	Land required to be protected as part of a Prime Agricultural Area by the Provincial Policy Statement will not be considered unless there are no other suitable candidate lands. This approach is consistent with section 1.1.3.8 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS).
IDENTIFYING CANDIDATE PARCELS		
Insufficient suitable land / threshold score	What is meant by insufficient suitable land? What is the threshold? The scoring seems bias towards transit.	Suitable land is considered land currently designated as General Rural Area or Rural Natural Features that falls within the minimum Transit threshold. Using transit supports the various objectives of the Big Five Moves and the PPS.
Rural Natural Features	Why are lands designated Rural Natural Features not a screening factor for lands being considered for expansion?	Lands designated Rural Natural Features include lands that do not contain significant woodlands and natural heritage linkages. Significant woodlands will be considered and factor into the determination of gross developable area. The presence of natural heritages linkages has been included as a new criteria no. 15. Rural Natural Features will not be a designation in the new Official Plan.
Lands not considered <i>Natural Heritage Linkage</i>	Previous settlement agreement with the Greenspace Alliance requires the City to an consider the impacts	New criteria addressing natural heritage linkage (no. 15) has been added and considers the impacts



1. SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	on the connectivity of the natural heritage system during any future analyses and Official Plan Amendments regarding possible expansion of the urban boundary.	of candidate urban expansion areas on identified natural linkages.
Lands not considered <i>Wetlands</i>	All regulated wetlands, not just Provincially Significant Wetlands, should be excluded from the developable area.	All regulated wetlands will form part of the exclusions (lands not considered) including those regulated by the MVCA.
Bedrock, Sand and Gravel Resource	Is the City considering depleted Bedrock, Sand and Gravel Resource areas as potential expansion areas?	Yes. If the City has evidence that the resource is depleted, the license is to be surrendered and the site is to be rehabilitated by before 2036.
4. MEASUREMENT AND SCORING		
Parcel Centroid	Distance measurements will be to or from the centroid of the parcel being evaluated. Using radial distance favors smaller parcels of land over larger parcels.	<p>In order to deal with this issue we will look at dividing larger parcels into two or more parts in order to be evaluated fairly the remainder of the parcel will be assigned a new centroid from which measurements will be made.</p> <p>The City will consider splitting larger parcels where it is obvious that parcels or part of parcels meet the objectives of the criteria being measured.</p> <p>We will also look at the clustering of parcels. This would result in two scoring “passes” where individual parcels are scored on their own and then a cluster of parcels are considered together reflecting infrastructure efficiencies.</p>
Table 2 – Detailed Evaluation Criteria and Scores		
Engineering (Serviceability)		
1. Water	What is considered a major crossing? (Applies to 1. Water, 2. Wastewater (Sanitary) and 3. Stormwater)	<p>A major crossing includes highway, railway and/or water crossings. This has now been clarified in Table 2.</p> <p>A major water crossing is typically one where Regulatory agencies are likely to require use of</p>



1. SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>trenchless technologies, and/or special design considerations to establish the crossing. Often these conditions exist on permanent flowing watercourses, that include fish and/or other natural habitat. A major water crossing is one that contrasts with other crossings which could be established using open-cut construction methods. Due to the scope of effort involved in evaluating all candidate expansion sites across the City, some judgement will be involved. The intent is to apply the criteria consistently using consistent information and mapping sources</p>
2. Wastewater (Sanitary)	No comments	
3. Stormwater	No comments	
3 a) Stormwater-characteristics and availability of surface water outlets	No comments	
3 b) Stormwater - expected grade raise requirement relative to restrictions and other topographic constraints on drainage.	No comments	
4. Servicing Integration Factor	No comments	
5. Servicing Risk Factors (Serviceability Penalty Factors)	<p>What is the concern with shallow bedrock? Generally speaking building homes on bedrock is not a negative aspect. Cost should not be a factor in development.</p>	<p>Penalties have been included in the Engineering scoring to reflect the fact that, irrespective of the proximity to, and/or residual capacity of an existing trunk system, or outlet, certain site conditions may exist that require a larger scope of engineering effort to place those sites on a level playing field with sites with no such challenges. Some of these conditions include servicing and grading adjacent to / around rural subdivisions on private services and the long-term risk borne by the City should impacts be experienced to homeowners in the rural subdivisions; long-term higher maintenance / replacement costs and/or less flexibility for the City to operate infrastructure in areas of shallow bedrock and/or sensitive clay soils where special</p>



1. SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		design measures are required to overcome grade raise constraints.
<p>Transportation Transportation Master Plan (TMP)</p>	<p>Majority of the points come from transportation, which is based on plans in the current Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The TMP will be updated to reflect the direction of the new OP - so there could be changes to some of the scoring based on new road improvements. Are we to assume that transit plans will remain unchanged?</p>	<p>The current TMP will be used in the scoring of candidate parcels.</p> <p>The addition of rural land to the urban area will necessitate the provision of an urban road network. The City will be responsible for the construction of the new arterial road system and the objective therefore is to minimize the amount of required new arterial roads. As a result, if the City is considering new urban lands it is reasonable to give priority to lands that create less demand for roads and are closest to rapid transit stations.</p> <p>For the purpose of the evaluation it is assumed that the transit plans will remain as shown in the 2013 TMP and including as updated by approved EA's since that time. Consideration of extension to existing or planned rapid transit may be necessary depending on the outcome of the expansion area approval by Council and will be considered as part of the completion of the TMP update.</p>
<p>6. Availability of Rapid Transit</p>	<p>There is a very heavy bias for availability and proximity to rapid transit. What are the levels of service being referenced? Are criteria 6 and 7 redundant?</p>	<p>These criteria support the Five Big Moves direction for the new Official Plan to focus on development and intensification near transit in order to make efficient use of existing and planned City infrastructure, support travel by sustainable modes and reduce vehicle-kilometres travelled (VKT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.</p> <p>Criterion 6 and 7 are not redundant. Criterion 6. Availability of Rapid Transit speak to timing and availability of service. Parcels that have access to existing rapid transit stations score highest. 7. Proximity to nearest Rapid Transit Station (distance). This criteria</p>



1. SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE
		<p>favours parcels that are closer to a rapid transit stations. This is to reflect that transit accessibility by sustainable modes and transit ridership increases with station proximity.</p> <p>Rapid Transit level of service is established through the Multimodal Level of Service (MMLoS) Guidelines. A general description is as follows: LOS A – Separate ROW / Grade separation and LOS B – Median transit lanes or highly effective curb transit lanes with at-grade intersections.</p>
<p>7. Proximity to nearest Rapid Transit Station</p>	<p>If a community has a large park and ride facility available next to the rapid transit, why would the proximity to that lot only be 1.9 km (radially measured). 5 km distance is a comfortable local distance for vehicles and cyclists to go to the park and ride.</p> <p>Parcels within 1.1km deserves the full 12 points. Are any candidate parcels within 0.6km?</p>	<p>This criterion is meant to award the most points to parcels that support travel by sustainable modes and reduce Vehicle-Kilometres Travelled (VKT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The threshold of 1.9km supports these objectives.</p> <p>A 1.9km radius would capture a land area of approximately 1,100ha (by comparison, the Riverside South CDP area is 1,480ha).</p> <p>It is appropriate to award the most points (12 points) to parcels within walking distance 0 to 0.6km of a rapid transit station. The 0.6km radius distance represents 0.8km over roads which is the 10-minute walk and is consistent with the approach previously used to define the boundaries of the six Ottawa Transit Oriented Design (TOD) Plans.</p> <p>There are Candidate parcels captured within 0.6km include those that are located near urban boundary transit terminus stations.</p>
<p>8. Proximity to Jobs</p>	<p>Does this criteria capture all types of jobs, or whether this is meant to evaluate parcels of land in proximity</p>	<p>All existing jobs regardless of location were included with the exception of home-based</p>



1. SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>to designated Mainstreets, Mixed-Use Centre, Employment Land? What is the source of a job data?</p>	<p>businesses. The data for existing jobs came from 2016 Employment Survey. Planned jobs were taken from CDPs and Secondary Plans. Included areas designated for Mixed Use, Commercial and schools.</p> <p>The scoring is based on a how many jobs are located within 8.6 km radial distance from the centroid of the candidate parcels centroid. The parcels are compared ranked in quartiles, top 25% receiving the highest score, etc.</p>
<p>9. Proximity to Convenience Retail</p>	<p>What is meant Convenience Retail Convenience? Retail needs to be better defined. Ignores the reality that an expansion area would have a CDP, and plan for additional retail if it was needed.</p>	<p>This criterion is meant score those sites that on day one will take advantage of existing and current proposed commercial services.</p> <p>Convenience Retail for the purposes of this criteria is defined as a major grocery store with other commercial uses within 100 metres, such as pharmacies, banks, dry cleaners and coffee shops.</p> <p>The data for existing Convenience Retail came from 2016 Employment Survey and active site plan applications will address current proposed commercial services.</p>
<p>10. Distance to Major City Facilities</p>	<p>Are both planned and existing facilities used for this criteria?</p> <p>It is unreasonable that not having a pool disqualifies recreation centres. Swimming is not a compulsory part of recreation. Perhaps the criteria should read 'must have two of the following: pool, outdoor arena etc.</p>	<p>Both planned and existing facilities are included.</p> <p>While we agree that swimming is not a compulsory part of recreation, pool was chosen as a required facility type since our review indicated that facilities that contain a pool are generally larger in scale and have a larger range of activities which distinguished these as major facilities. Major facilities should serve the broader community and provide a mix of uses Reducing the requirements of this category would make most recreational facilities qualify even if not necessarily considered as a major facility.</p>



1. SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE
11. Distance to Emergency Services - Fire	<p>How is 5-minute response time estimated? Is road hierarchy taken into consideration? Are planned community road connections used? Rather than response time the scoring should be based on a 5 km distance to a fire station, which was used for previous urban area expansions.</p>	<p>The scoring is based on estimated response time to a parcel provided by Emergency Services (Fire) using their GIS and data. Distance travelled, road type, as well as other factors are considered. Existing and known planned roads (shown on an approved community design plan) are used.</p> <p>Using the Emergency Services (Fire) response times data provides a more accurate analysis on level of service than simply using a distance to an existing fire station.</p>
12. Potential Arterial Road Upgrades	<p>This criterion is very confusing. The four groups with different points and percentages do not provide enough information to be applied in the evaluation of a parcel.</p> <p>Is this scoring based on the current Transportation Master Plan (TMP) or the updated TMP?</p>	<p>This criterion has been simplified to use only distance to existing urban arterial road system, or to an existing 400 series highway interchange as the measure. The assumption is the further away a parcel is the more arterial road upgrades will be required.</p> <p>The exception is that parcels that are within a 1.9km radius of a rapid transit station, as well as those parcels that front on an existing serviced arterial road are excluded from this criterion (no points lost). This is because these two situations represent locations where urban expansion is preferred – within proximity to rapid transit and along existing serviced roads.</p> <p>The criteria then classifies the remaining candidate parcels into groups. Ranging from shortest to longest distance to an existing or planned upgraded arterial road system, or to an existing or proposed 400 series highway interchange being in the first quartile (least points lost) and those furthest the last quartile (the most points lost).</p>
13. Connectivity	The description makes reference to country lot subdivisions which is	The criterion assessing Conflict with Country lot Subdivisions



1. SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>Criteria 15. Is there redundancy between these two Criteria?</p>	<p>(previously no 15) has been removed as this factor has been addressed under Engineering criterion 5 and criteria 13 Connectivity, both of which address different factors.</p>
<p>14. Conflict with Agricultural Land Uses</p>	<p>The proposed 500m distance for conflict with Agricultural Land Uses seems excessive.</p> <p>Proximity to existing Agricultural designated lands should only be an issue where a candidate parcel is immediately adjacent to it. In that case, a buffer can be designed as part of a Community Design Plan process to recognize the proximity and mitigate potential issues such as dust and odours.</p>	<p>Reflecting the potential impact of minimum distance separation (MDS) from farm operations is important and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement requirements. The distance has been reduced to 250 m from land designated Agriculture Resource Area resulting in a loss of points.</p>
<p>15. Conflict with Country lot Subdivisions (previous criteria – since removed since addressed by other criteria)</p>	<p>Do not believe country lot subdivision incompatible use for an urban expansion.</p> <p>Proximity to a rural estate lot subdivision should not be a negative.</p> <p>The purpose of a separation distance between existing country lot subdivisions and the urban boundary is to mitigate against potential conflicts related to character of the area, light pollution and impacts to groundwater. The perceived conflicts between new urban development and existing country lot subdivisions can generally be mitigated.</p> <p>This appears to be redundant since it is also captured in Criteria 13 – Connectivity</p>	<p>Staff have also reconsidered the merits of this as a stand-alone criterion and have removed this criterion.</p> <p>The impacts of urban servicing and construction, should blasting be required, is picked up by the Engineering (Serviceability) and Connectivity Criteria.</p> <p>Country lot Subdivisions can also provide obstacles to connectivity which are addressed by Criterion 13.</p> <p>The Community Integration (Connectivity) factor also assess whether there are opportunities to integrate the roads systems of new development with the existing rural subdivisions or whether the subdivisions act as a barrier to connectivity.</p> <p>Proximity to urban development near country lot Subdivisions is addressed in Engineering criteria and connectivity.</p>
<p>16.Land Absorption (previous criteria – since removed)</p>	<p>Concern that using 10-year average may not accurately reflect current market and absorption rates for</p>	<p>The Land Absorption criteria looked at approximate years supply of lands in existing</p>



1. SECTION	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	some communities.	greenfield communities across the City. This criterion has been removed.