

Document 3 – Resolution of Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Comments

Please note that Ministry of Municipal Affairs provided comments referencing the November 2020 draft, at a point when Official Plan policy numbers had changed. Changes made to any text are referred to in the right-most column using current draft policy sections references.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Comments, Proposed Revisions, and City of Ottawa Amendment or Response						
Item	OP Policy Number (November 2020)	Comments/Concerns	Related Ministries	Reference to Planning Act, PPS or Provincial Plan Section or Policy	Ministry-Proposed Revision	Draft Policy text for Public Open House (September 2021) Accepted and/or modified MMAH text by City of Ottawa Staff
1.	2.2.2(3) 2.2.2(7)	The draft Official Plan does not appear to have policies related to corridor protection to support economic development. For additional information on this subject, staff may wish to refer to MTO's "Freight Supportive Guidelines" as it finalizes the draft Official Plan and operationalizes corridor protection policies through its Transportation Master Plan and subsequent projects and undertakings.	MTO	PPS 1.6.8.2 PPS 1.6.8.3	It is recommended to include a new policy in either section 2.2.2(3) or 2.2.2(7), or within section 4.1.6 of the draft Official Plan addressing corridor protection. An example of the policy reads as follows: <i>"Major goods movement facilities and corridors that support strategic freight, storage and logistics locations shall be protected for the long term. New development proposed on adjacent lands to existing or planned corridors and transportation facilities should be compatible with, and supportive of, the long-term purposes of the corridor and should be designed to avoid, mitigate or minimize negative impacts on and from the corridor and transportation facilities."</i>	2.2.2(8) Major goods movement facilities and corridors that support strategic freight, storage and logistics locations shall be protected for the long term. Land in strategic locations with proximity and access to provincial 400 series highways is required in both the urban and rural areas to accommodate industrial, warehousing and logistic type uses. These types of uses need larger separation distances from residential uses and require access to a highway interchange. Likewise, new development proposed on adjacent lands to existing or planned corridors and transportation facilities should be supportive of, and not conflict with, the long-term purposes of the corridor by mitigating or minimizing negative impacts. These sites should be protected for this use provided they are not on lands designated Agricultural Resource Area.
2.	3.1 5) e)	This policy states that lands adjacent to, or within 200 metres from a Mineral Resource Overlay, are excluded from consideration for new or additional urban area or new or additional village area. It is recommended for adjacent lands to be at least 500 metres from the boundary of bedrock deposits and at least 300 metres from the boundary of sand and gravel deposits. A 200 metre setback is not sufficient to protect either high potential aggregate resources or existing pits and quarries from incompatible land uses associated with urban areas or villages.	MNRF	MNRF's Non-Renewable Resources Training Manual to support implementing PPS policy section 2.5	It is recommended for policy 3.1.5(e) to be revised as follows: e) That lands adjacent to or within 200 500 metres from a Mineral Resource Overlay due to being a bedrock aggregate resource deposit are excluded from consideration, and lands adjacent to or within 300 metres from a Mineral Resource Overlay due to being a sand and/or gravel aggregate resource deposit are excluded from consideration;	3.1(5) The identification of new or additional urban area, and new or additional village area, may only occur through a comprehensive review in accordance with the <i>Planning Act</i> and <i>Provincial Policy Statement</i> . Evaluation of lands for potential expansion of the settlement area may include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following considerations: a) That there are insufficient opportunities within the urban area and villages to accommodate a 15-year supply of market-based residential development; b) That there are insufficient opportunities within the City to accommodate projected employment and other land uses; c) The required components of municipal infrastructure that are planned or available, have sufficient capacity, are financially viable over their life cycle and protect health, safety and the natural environment. For the purposes of this policy, financial life cycle viability shall include the relative scale of the costs associated with any new or additional area to be serviced, any required system upgrades to provide the required capacity and the inclusion of operations, maintenance and replacement costs post-development; d) That lands designated Agricultural Resource Area are excluded from consideration;

					<p>e) Exclusion of lands within or in proximity to the Mineral Resource Overlay are excluded from consideration, and within 300 metres from a Mineral Resource Overlay due to being a sand and/or gravel aggregate resource deposit are excluded from consideration;</p> <p>f) That lands designated as part of a natural heritage system are excluded;</p> <p>g) That lands with proximity and access to a provincial 400-series highway, including future interchange access, be reserved for Industrial and Logistics uses and that any residential development adjacent to such lands incorporate any appropriate proximity-mitigation measures or features deemed necessary solely within the residential portion of development;</p> <p>h) That lands containing or in proximity to major facilities, as defined in the <i>Provincial Policy Statement</i>, are avoided. The appropriate distances from major facilities shall consider the adverse impacts of odour, noise and other contaminants to future sensitive uses in order to minimize risk to health and safety and ensure the long-term viability of the major facility;</p> <p>i) That new village lands prioritize locations that provide the best access by sustainable transportation modes to facilities and services, such as schools, neighbourhood facilities, parks, a variety of housing and job opportunities and where connections to municipal water and wastewater services already exist or can be efficiently provided; and</p> <p>j) The consideration of any other effect the new or additional lands would have on the ability to achieve the policies of this Plan.</p>	
3.	4.1.3(3)	This policy recognizes the importance of Highway 174 and the importance of protecting this transportation infrastructure. In order to be consistent with PPS 1.6.8.1, it would be beneficial for similar protections to be afforded to the provincial highway infrastructure.	MTO	MTO Guidelines for Municipal Official Plan Preparation and Review (s.3.1) to support implementing PPS 1.6.8.1	<p>It is recommended for the policy to be revised by including the new paragraphs follows:</p> <p>“3) The City recognizes the role of Highway 174 as an important city freeway and rural arterial roadway. Therefore, new accesses from individual properties along this roadway will generally not be permitted, particularly when shared or joint access, or alternative road access points are possible. In the long term, public streets and private driveways that currently access Highway 174 may be subject to consolidation or relocation of access points if roadway modifications or development of affected properties occurs at some future date.</p> <p><i>In addition to all the applicable municipal requirements, all proposed development located adjacent to and in the vicinity of a provincial highway within MTO's permit control area under the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act (PTHIA) will also be subject to MTO approval. Direct access will be discouraged and often prohibited.”</i></p>	<p>4.1.3 (3)</p> <p>The City recognizes the role of Ottawa Road 174 as an important commuting corridor that has limited access. Therefore, new accesses from individual properties along this roadway will generally not be permitted, particularly when shared or joint access, or alternative road access points are possible. In the long term, public streets and private driveways that currently access Ottawa Road 174 may be subject to consolidation or relocation of access points if roadway modifications or development of affected properties occurs at some future date. In addition to all the applicable municipal requirements, all proposed development located adjacent to and in the vicinity of a provincial highway within MTO's permit control area under the <i>Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act</i> (PTHIA) will also be subject to MTO approval. Direct access will be discouraged and often prohibited.</p>

Document 3 – Resolution of Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Comments

4.	4.1.6(6)	<p>As you are aware, any decisions regarding the infrastructure related to provincial Highways 417, 416, 7 and 17 are of MTO's sole jurisdiction. Interchanges are part of "planned corridors" (as set in PPS 1.6.8.3 and defined in the PPS) and are designed using technical design standards and protected for their long-term use. This policy of the draft Official Plan suggests that alterations can be made to the footprint of interchanges which may contravene the PPS as it states development adjacent to existing or planned corridors must be compatible with and supportive of the corridor (not the other way around).</p> <p>There are ways to enhance connectivity without adversely impacting interchange footprints. Shrinking interchange footprint may create other points of conflict for vulnerable users as well as increasing congestion and other operational issues that can lead to reduced pedestrian and cyclist safety.</p> <p>MTO staff wish to work with the City of Ottawa to find solutions regarding connectivity without negatively impacting the function of provincial highway infrastructure.</p>	MTO	PPS 1.6.8.1 PPS 1.6.8.3	<p>It is recommended to revise this policy as follows:</p> <p>For grade-separated provincial highway interchanges corridors within the urban area, particularly close to transit stations, the City shall work, in collaboration with the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) as appropriate, to reduce the overall interchange footprint, enhance connectivity and facilities for multi-modal travel and support efficient uses of land and transportation structures infrastructure that provide the necessary traffic functions, while allowing for other uses better aligned with the strategic directions of the Official Plan.</p>	<p>4.1.6(4) For grade-separated highway interchanges within the urban area, particularly close to transit stations, the City shall work, in collaboration with the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) as appropriate, to reduce the overall interchange footprint, provide safe, protected Active Transportation facilities at highway crossings (including across ramps), enhance connectivity and facilities for multi-modal travel and support efficient uses of land and transportation structures that provide the necessary traffic functions while allowing for other uses better aligned with the strategic directions of the Official Plan.</p>
5.	4.1.6(7)	<p>MTO staff appreciate the impact of Highway 417 expansions on the City. However, the challenges of maintaining or changing highway infrastructure follow existing processes under the <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i> and such concerns are addressed on a project by project basis. This policy may create an unnecessary point of contention between the MTO and the City and as such, should be removed.</p> <p>It is noted that highway widening was required during Stage 1 for the Ottawa Light Rail Transit and work is underway to finalize designs around the Highway 417 ramps right of way, as part of Stage 2 (e.g. around Pinecrest and Moodie stations). Retaining this policy could have unintended consequences for future transit planning work near Highway 417 and other provincial highways.</p>	MTO	PPS- multiple sections related to transportation	<p>It is recommended to delete policy 4.1.6(7) in its entirety.</p> <p>Should the City wish to retain this policy, it is kindly requested to connect with MMAH so that further discussions may take place on appropriate policy wording that does not potentially impact provincial mandates.</p>	<p>4.1.6(5) The City and the MTO will utilize the Environmental Assessment process to address the City's concerns and interests regarding provincial highway infrastructure improvements. Notwithstanding provincial jurisdiction and control as they pertain to the highways and right-of-way, the City will not support further widenings of Highway 417 in the Downtown Core and Inner Urban Transects beyond the works that the MTO has already identified as of the date of the adoption of this Plan. Furthermore, while the City recognizes the benefits of the Rapid Bridge Replacement technique, the City will encourage the MTO to minimize project impacts that result in the permanent removal of buildings and that any residual lands declared surplus to MTO needs be made available for redevelopment.</p>
6.	4.2	<p>It is recommended that the introductory paragraph of Section 4.2 of the draft Official Plan be revised to align with PPS policy direction on the adequate provision of housing.</p> <p>Section 1.4.3, b) 1. of the PPS makes specific reference to the provision of</p>	MMAH	PPS Part IV PPS 1.4.3 PPS Definitions "affordable	<p>It is recommended for the introductory paragraph of Section 4.2 of the draft Official Plan to be revised as follows:</p> <p>"4.2 Housing</p> <p>Adequate, safe and affordable housing makes</p>	<p>4.2 (Introduction) Adequate, safe and affordable housing makes Ottawa a good place to live and do business. Housing that meets needs across ages, incomes and backgrounds and supports accessibility needs is a key requirement for health and well-being as well as attracting and retaining highly skilled labour and new</p>

	<p>housing opportunities for residents with special needs requirements. It is recommended for this section to be revised to reflect the need for housing for residents with special needs.</p> <p>Section 6.0 of the PPS indicates that in the case of rental housing, affordable housing means the least expensive of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or 2) A unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area. It may be important to include this additional definition as provincial affordable housing programs referenced in the Housing and Homelessness Plan typically rely on the average market rent (AMR) definition. The province requires affordable rent to be 80% of AMR for new units to be eligible to receive provincial funding, and units must be at or below AMR to be eligible for provincial rent subsidies. <p>It is recommended for this policy to make reference to the city's long-term financial plan for housing which will align the PPS vision (Part IV) that <i>"land use patterns... support the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term"</i>.</p> <p>Section 6.0 of the PPS includes a definition for "low to moderate income households". The draft Official Plan refers to both "low and moderate income" and also "households under the 60th income percentile." Clarity should be provided that the terms utilized are one in the same.</p> <p>The introductory paragraph makes reference to "density bonusing" as a tool to support the achievement of affordable housing. The City should consider the reference to this discretionary 'tool' as it has changed to "community benefit charges" through recent reform (Bill 197) to section 37 the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p>		<p>" and "low to moderate income households" s. 37 of the <i>Planning Act</i></p>	<p>Ottawa a good place to live and do business. Housing that meets needs across ages, incomes, and backgrounds, and supports accessibility needs is a key requirement to the health and well-being of current and future residents.</p> <p>Affordable housing is defined by the Provincial Policy Statement as housing for which a low and moderate-income household pays no more than 30% of the household's gross annual income for home ownership or rental housing, or a unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area. Low to moderate income households are those with incomes in the lowest 60 percent of the income distribution for the regional market area. The Official Plan will continue to coordinate with and support the goals of the Ten-year Housing and Homelessness Plan, and the Long-Term Financial Plan for Housing Services, as amended from time to time. The City will promote the achievement of affordable housing for low and moderate income households by providing a toolkit of planning incentives and direct supports, including but not limited to: density bonusing section 37 benefits; density transfer; deferral or waiving of fees and charges; alternative development standards; land; more flexible zoning that allows for a greater number of units within the permitted built form envelope; and application processing priority."</p>	<p>businesses.</p> <p>Healthy communities include a variety of housing types.</p> <p>Market-based housing is the housing available in the City as a result of houses being sold by existing owners and housing that is constructed in new communities. As the City grows and changes with a larger population, more different types of housing will be needed. This includes housing units of different sizes and forms, some of which might not be common in Ottawa today.</p> <p>Affordable housing is defined by the <i>Provincial Policy Statement</i> as housing for which a low and moderate-income household pays no more than 30 per cent of the household's gross annual income for home ownership or rental housing, or a unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area. Low to moderate income households are those with incomes in the lowest 60 per cent of the income distribution for the regional market area. This Plan considers affordable housing to include everything within the Province's definition of the term but goes beyond it to recognize the particular circumstances and challenges of Ottawa's housing market and policy goals.</p> <p>The Official Plan strives to facilitate a diversity of housing options for both private ownership and rental. The City will promote a range of affordable and market-rate housing by providing a toolkit of planning incentives and direct supports that allows for a greater number of units within the permitted built form envelope; and application processing priority.</p> <p>The Official Plan will continue to coordinate with and support the goals of the Ten-year Housing and Homelessness Plan and the Long-Term Financial Plan for Housing Services, as amended from time to time. The City will promote the achievement of affordable housing for low and moderate income households and individuals by providing a toolkit of planning incentives and direct supports, including but not limited to: section 37 benefits; density transfer; deferral or waiving of fees and charges; alternative development standards; land; inclusionary zoning; more flexible zoning that allows for a greater number of units within the permitted built form envelope; and application processing priority.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

Document 3 – Resolution of Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Comments

7.	4.2.1(1)	This policy discusses the City’s efforts in providing a range and supply of housing to meet projected needs. However, there appears to be a policy omission with respect to the City maintaining land with servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a three year supply of residential units, as per PPS 1.4.1 b).	MMAH	PPS 1.4.1 b)	It is recommended to insert a new bullet point e) in the section stating: “e) The City shall maintain at all times where new development is to occur, land with servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a three year supply of residential units available through lands suitably zoned to facilitate regeneration and land in draft approved and registered plans.”	4.2.1(1) A diverse range of flexible and context-sensitive housing options in all areas of the City shall be provided through the Zoning By-law, by: a) Primarily regulating the density, built form, height, massing and design of residential development, rather than regulating through restrictions on building typology; b) Promoting diversity in unit sizes, densities and tenure options within neighbourhoods including diversity in bedroom count availability; c) Permitting a range of housing options across all neighbourhoods to provide the widest possible range of price, occupancy arrangements and tenure; d) Establishing development standards for residential uses, appropriately balancing the value to the public interest of such standards against the effects on housing affordability; and e) The City shall maintain, at all times, land with servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a three year supply of residential units available through lands suitably zoned to facilitate intensification and land in draft approved and registered plans.
8.	4.2.2	Although the City has developed policies facilitating the development of a wide array of housing typology that may assist in increasing the affordable housing supply, there does not appear to be a policy explicitly identifying an affordable housing target which the City is to establish and implement, as described in PPS 1.4.3 a).	MMAH	PPS 1.4.3 a) PPS 1.2.1 h)	It is recommended to insert a new policy as subsection (3) to this section identifying an affordable housing target which the City hopes to achieve in implementing the Official Plan. The affordable housing target should align with information and details contained in the City’s Housing and Homelessness Plan.	4.2.2(4) In accordance with the City’s 10-Year Housing and Homelessness Plan, the City shall set a target that 10 per cent to 15 per cent of all new residential units be affordable. Of all affordable units, 65 per cent are to be targeted to households whose needs fall within the definition of deep affordability, and the remaining 35 per cent are to be targeted to households whose needs fall within the definition of market-affordability.
9.	4.2.4(1)(b) 4.2.4(2)(d)	This policy states that the City will not impose separation distances or caps to unreasonably limit the opportunity to locate housing intended to serve vulnerable populations. It is not appropriate to impose any limitations to the development of such housing. Further information may be found in the document “In The Zone: Housing, Human Rights and Municipal Planning” found at the following link: http://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/zone-housing-human-rights-and-municipal-planning	MMAH	PPS 4.4 Section 35 of the <i>Planning Act</i>	1. It is recommended for policy 4.2.4(1)(b) to be revised as follows: b) Further to (a), the City shall not establish restrictions, including minimum separation distances or caps, whose effect is to unreasonably limit the opportunity to provide such housing forms. 2. It is recommended for policy 4.2.4(2)(d) to be revised as follows: d) Not establish restrictions, including minimum separation distances or caps, whose effect is to unreasonably limit the opportunity to provide such shelter and housing forms.	4.2.4(1) The City recognizes that many individuals may not constitute nor form part of a household and may rely on long-term housing other than the traditional dwelling unit. The City shall enable the provision of housing options for such individuals through the implementing Zoning By-law, as follows: a) Permitting, in any zone where residential uses are permitted, alternative, cooperative or shared accommodation housing forms serving individuals for whom an entire dwelling unit is unnecessary, unaffordable or inappropriate including: i) Rooming houses; ii) Retirement homes; iii) Residential care facilities; iv) Purpose-built student housing; v) Group homes; and vi) Other long-term housing forms that serve the needs of individuals not forming part of a household. b) Further to Policy a), the City shall not establish restrictions, including minimum separation distances or caps, whose effect is to limit the opportunity to provide such housing

						<p>forms.</p> <p>2) The City recognizes emergency and transitional shelters and transitional supportive housing as a key component of the housing continuum, which shall, through the Zoning By-law:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Permit emergency shelters and transitional shelters as a permitted use in all urban designations and zones; b) Permit emergency shelters and transitional shelters as an accessory or ancillary use to all institutional land uses; and c) Not establish restrictions, including minimum separation distances or caps, whose effect is to limit the opportunity to provide such shelter and housing forms.
10.	4.2.4(5)	<p>This policy can be bolstered to more closely align with section 1.2.1(h) of the PPS as it relates the correlation between planning and Housing and Homelessness Plans.</p> <p>Also, it is recommended for the policy to be revised to recognize the distinction between section 16(4) and 16(5) of the <i>Planning Act</i>, whereby section 16(4) provides direction for Official Plan policies for prescribed municipalities and section 16(5) provides direction for Official Plan policies for municipalities that have not been prescribed. As the City of Ottawa is currently not prescribed, the use of Inclusionary Zoning provisions is limited to protected major transit station areas, and areas which the Minister has ordered a Community Planning Permit System be established. It is kindly reminded that any future OPA to enact Inclusionary Zoning policies must include goals and objectives sought by the Inclusionary Zoning policies (as well as procedures and measures aimed at obtaining the goals/objectives) and must be informed by an assessment report.</p>	MMAH	PPS 1.2.1(h) Section 16 of the <i>Planning Act</i>	<p>It is recommended for policy 4.2.4(5) to be revised as follows:</p> <p>“5) The City shall, as a priority measure, implement Inclusionary Zoning as provided by 16(4), 16(5) and 35.2 of the <i>Planning Act</i> as a mechanism to meet the affordable housing goals identified in the <i>Ten year Housing and Homelessness Plan</i> through a future amendment to this plan.”</p>	<p>4.2.5(1) The City shall, as a priority measure, implement Inclusionary Zoning as provided by Sections 16(4), 16(5) and 35.2 of the <i>Planning Act</i> as a mechanism to contribute towards meeting the affordable housing goals identified in the Ten year Housing and Homelessness Plan through a future amendment to this Plan.</p>
11.	4.7.2(7)(b)	<p>PPS 1.6.6.5(b) outlines that partial services shall only be permitted within settlement areas to allow for infilling <u>and minor rounding out of existing development on partial services provided that site conditions are suitable for the long-term provisions of such services with no negative impacts.</u></p> <p>The underlined portion of the PPS policy above has been omitted from the policy addressing the provision of partial services for the purposes of minor rounding out, and that the provision of partial services must be on site conditions suitable for the long term provision of such services with no negative impacts.</p>	MECP	PPS 1.6.6.5 b) PPS definition “negative impacts”	<p>It is recommended to revise this policy to read as follows:</p> <p>b) Within the urban area and in villages where development on partial services already exists and the proposal constitutes minor infill or minor rounding out provided that site conditions are suitable for the long-term provision of such services with no negative impacts.</p>	<p>4.7.2(6) Partial Services shall be considered only in the following circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Where servicing is necessary to address failed individual on-site sewage services and individual on-site water services in existing development; or b) Within the Urban area and in Villages where development on partial services already exists and the proposal constitutes minor infill or minor rounding out provided that site conditions are suitable for the long-term provision of such services with no negative impacts; or c) Where an approved study addresses the potential for further aquifer contamination by private septic system effluent caused by indiscriminate water use or poor septic practices; or d) To service existing development in the Village of Manotick;

Document 3 – Resolution of Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Comments

						<p>or</p> <p>e) The City may study the feasibility of extending water service to the existing Carp Road corridor through a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment to be entirely funded by the benefiting landowners, and extend the public service area for water provided the system can be proven to work without extraordinary operational costs and that the extension can be fully paid for by the benefitting landowners;</p> <p>or</p> <p>f) The City may consider a site-specific Official Plan amendment to revise the Public Service Area to connect water service to employment or institutional lots adjacent to the existing water distribution system provided significant water usage is not part of any industrial process, there are no extraordinary operating implications and provided the connection can be fully paid for by the benefitting landowner.</p>
12.	4.8(1) 5.6.3	<p>These policies provide protection to the City's natural heritagesystem and natural heritage features, as outlined in PPS 2.1. However, PPS 2.1.9 indicates that <i>"nothing in policy 2.1 is intended to limit the ability of agricultural uses to continue."</i></p> <p>The draft Official Plan policies are silent with respect to recognizing 1) the continuation of existing agricultural operations within the City's significant natural heritage featuresand 2) outside significant natural heritage features consideringnew or expanding agricultural uses within the City's natural heritage system (e.g., linkages) as they can function as "working landscapes" that enable ecological functions to continue.</p>	OMAFRA	PPS 2.1.9 PPS 2.1.3 PPS definition "natural heritage system"	<p>It is recommended for a new subsection 4.8.1(10) to be inserted in the draftOfficial Plan addressing how PPS 2.1.9 will be implemented.</p> <p>If deemed appropriate, the City may wish to include the new policy withinsection 5.6.3 of the Official Plan.</p>	<p>5.6.4.1(7)</p> <p>Nothing in the City's natural heritage policies is intended to limit the ability of agricultural uses to continue.</p>
13.	4.8.1(6)	<p>A no net loss approach with respect to forests and wetlands isproposed in the draft Official Plan.</p> <p>No net loss means no loss in total area or ecosystem servicesas assessed in a landscape context over appropriate spatial and time scales. This approach would not be considered consistent with PPS 2.1.4 with respect to significant wetlands. It is recommended to clarify the policy to indicate that this approach may only be considered for wetlands that have benevaluated and deemed not provincially significant.</p> <p>Further, for development and site alteration to occur within significant woodlands and on adjacent lands, the PPS requiresdemonstration of no negative impact on the natural feature or</p>	MNRF	PPS 2.1.4 PPS 2.1.5 PPS 2.1.8	<p>It is recommended for the policy to be revised as follows:</p> <p>6) Development or site alteration shall take a no net loss approach with respectto evaluated wetlands deemed not provincially significant and forest cover in the rural area. Mechanisms for achieving no net loss include land use planning, development processes, acquisition and conservation of land, and support for voluntary, private land conservation and stewardship. Development and site alteration is prohibited in provincially significant wetlands.</p> <p>With respect to significant woodlands, more information is requested on how ano net loss approach to development and site alteration is consistent with the PPS.</p>	<p>4.8.1(5)</p> <p>The City shall take a no net loss approach with respect to evaluated wetlands deemed not provincially significant and forest cover outside the urban area and designated villages. Mechanisms for achieving no net loss include land use planning, development processes, acquisition and conservation of land and support for voluntary, private land conservation and stewardship. Development and site alteration is prohibited in provincially significant wetlands.</p>

Document 3 – Resolution of Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Comments

		their ecological functions. It is unclear if the implementation of a no net loss approach is consistent with the PPS.				
14.	4.11	This section addresses “Generally Permitted Uses” across the city. The draft Official Plan appears to be silent on permitting wayside pits and quarries, portable asphalt plants and portable concrete plants used on public authority contracts without the need for an official amendment, rezoning, or community planning permit under the <i>Planning Act</i> in all areas, except those areas of existing development or particular environmental sensitivity which have been determined to be incompatible with extraction and associated activities. It would be appropriate for these policies to be under Generally Permitted Uses.	MNRF	PPS 2.5.5.1	It is recommended to insert a new subsection (7) in this section of the draft Official Plan to address wayside pits and quarries, portable asphalt plants, and portable concrete plants as outlined in PPS 2.5.5.	4.11(9) (New) Wayside Pits and Quarries 9) Wayside pits and quarries, portable asphalt plants and portable concrete plants used on public authority contracts are permitted in all designations on Schedule A and the B-Series of schedules except: Natural Environment Areas, and Significant Wetlands, or on Flood Plains shown on Schedule C15 or where environmental sensitivities have been determined to be incompatible with extraction and associated activities.
15.	5.6.2	The two Aggregate Overlays and associated policies in the draft Official Plan protect known mineral aggregate deposits of good quantity and quality for future extraction. However, the area within these overlays reflect some but not all of the significant sand and gravel and bedrock deposits identified in the Aggregate Resources Inventory Paper 191 for the City of Ottawa. PPS policy 2.5.1 states that mineral aggregate resources shall be protected and, where provincial information is available, these resources be identified. Further PPS policy 2.5.2.1 requires that as much of the mineral aggregate resources as is realistically possible shall be made available as close to markets as possible. The intent of this policy is to protect these resources and keep available for use, as much resource as possible for a long-term resource supply while taking into account other planning objectives. It is unclear how the amount of deposits protected within the aggregate overlays reflect this balance between long-term supply and other planning matters.	MNRF	PPS 2.5.1 PPS 2.5.2.1	Additional information is requested to understand how the City prioritized the protection of the mineral aggregate deposits identified within the aggregate overlays and how this amount of aggregate will provide a long-term resource supply. Staff of MMAH and MNRF would be pleased to meet with city staff to discuss this comment in greater detail.	Commitment for future study retained in workplan Annex.
16.	5.6.2.1(6)	This policy permits pits and quarries as an interim use in the Agricultural Resource Area outside of the overlay areas, subject to lands being rehabilitated to an agricultural condition. However, this policy does not fully address the policy direction provided in PPS Policy 2.5.4.1 as it relates to rehabilitation of lands in prime agricultural areas.	MNRF	PPS 2.5.4.1	It is requested for this policy to be revised as follows: 6) Aggregate extraction may be permitted as an interim use in the Agricultural Resource Area outside of the mineral aggregate overlay subject to the lands being rehabilitated to an agricultural condition, with soils of equivalent or better quality than prior to the extraction, as shall be	5.6.3.1(7) Aggregate extraction may be permitted as an interim use in the Agricultural Resource Area outside of the mineral aggregate overlay subject to the lands being rehabilitated to an agricultural condition, with soils of equivalent or better quality than prior to the extraction, as shall be documented prior to the commencement of aggregate extraction operations. Rehabilitation to agriculture will be the first priority.

					documented prior to the commencement of aggregate extraction operations. Complete rehabilitation to an agricultural condition is not required within prime agricultural areas where there is a substantial quantity of mineral aggregate resources below the water table warranting extraction, or the depth of planned extraction in a quarry makes restoration of pre-extraction agricultural capability unfeasible.	Nevertheless, complete agricultural rehabilitation may not be required where: a) There is a substantial quantity of mineral aggregate resources below the water table warranting extraction; b) The depth of the planned extraction makes restoration of pre-extraction agricultural capability unfeasible; c) Hydrogeological investigations demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City that agricultural rehabilitation is not desirable due to groundwater protection requirements; and d) The City, has determined a suitable alternative post-extractive use in conformity with the policies in this Plan.
17.	5.6.3.1	<p>Policies in other sections of the draft Official Plan require that development and site alteration within 120 metres of the boundary of a Significant Wetland or the boundary of a Natural Environment Area must demonstrate no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecosystem services within the area.</p> <p>There appears to be no policy, however, to require demonstration of no negative impact on significant natural heritage features and fish habitat with respect to development and site alteration on adjacent lands outside of the Significant Wetland and Natural Environment Area sub-designations.</p>	MNRF	PPS 2.1.8 PPS definition “adjacent lands” and “negative impacts” and MNRF’s natural heritage reference manual	<p>It is recommended for a new policy to be inserted as subsection 5.6.3.1(5) to read as follows:</p> <p>“5) Development and site alteration shall be prohibited on adjacent lands (120 metres) to the significant natural heritage features and areas within the Natural Heritage Feature Overlay 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 on their ecological functions.”</p>	<p>5.6.4.1(4) Development or site alteration proposed in or adjacent to natural heritage features shall be supported by an environmental impact study prepared in accordance with the City’s guidelines.</p>
18.	6.1.2(2)	<p>This section makes reference to Table 9 of the draft Official Plan which provides the minimum people/jobs per hectare planned to be accommodated in each PMTSA, as required by clause (a) of subsection 16(15) of the <i>Planning Act</i>. However, the requirements of clause (c) in this subsection has been omitted from the draft Official Plan, which requires municipalities to have Official Plan policies identifying the minimum densities authorized with respect to buildings and structures on lands within each PMTSA.</p>	MMAH	<i>Planning Act</i>	<p>It is recommended to include policies (or information described in a table or schedule) in the draft Official Plan outlining the minimum densities with respect to buildings on lands within each PMTSA. MMAH staff would be pleased to have a dialogue on how this can be achieved.</p>	<p>6.1.2(4) The minimum building heights and lot coverage requirements within PMTSAs except as specified by a Secondary Plan, are as follows: a) Within 300 metre radius or 400 m walking distance, whichever is greatest, of an existing or planned rapid transit station, not less than 4 storeys with a minimum lot coverage of 70 per cent; and b) Outside the area described by a) not less than 2 storeys with a minimum lot coverage of 70 per cent.</p>
19.	7.3(1)(e)	<p>This policy provides protection to Urban Natural Features by requiring proponents of development to demonstrate that development and/or site alteration within 30 metres of such features shall have no negative impacts on the feature or its ecosystem services.</p> <p>Although these lands are publicly owned urban natural areas managed for conservation or passive leisure uses, it is possible for some of these lands to be deemed a provincially significant natural heritage feature as described in PPS 2.1.4 and PPS 2.1.5, which have adjacent lands of 120 metres as</p>	MNRF	PPS 2.1.8	<p>It is recommended for the policy to be revised as follows:</p> <p>e) Development and site alteration within 30 m of the boundary of an Urban Natural Feature must demonstrate no negative impacts on the natural features within the area or their ecosystem services. Where the Urban Natural Feature is deemed to be a provincially significant natural heritage feature as described in the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, development and site alteration within 120 metres of the boundary of the feature must demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts on the natural feature or its ecological functions.</p>	<p>5.6.4.1(4) Development or site alteration proposed in or adjacent to natural heritage features shall be supported by an environmental impact study prepared in accordance with the City’s guidelines.</p>

Document 3 – Resolution of Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Comments

		opposed to 30 metres.				
20.	7.3(3)(i)	<p>The City is encouraged to protect both Regionally and Locally Significant Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs). MNRF has a role, including a consulting role, with respect to identifying and amending the boundaries of <u>all</u> ANSIs. It is recommended for the policy to be revised to reflect that MNRF's role is not limited to provincially-identified ANSIs only.</p> <p>It is also recommended to clarify which Ministry is being referred to within this policy (Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry).</p>	MNRF	<p>PPS 2.1.5 PPS definition "Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest" as supported by the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (s.4.3)</p>	<p>It is recommended to revise policy 7.3(3)(i) as follows:</p> <p>i) The City may adjust the boundaries of Natural Environment Areas to reflect their features and functions based on new information as it is obtained. Where boundary adjustments impact Provincial Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, the agreement of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry shall be required; and</p>	<p>7.3(3) The Natural Environment Areas designation protects larger natural areas with multiple, overlapping natural heritage features and functions. The following shall apply:</p> <p>a) Development lot line adjustments and site alteration are prohibited in Natural Environment Areas;</p> <p>b) Permitted uses in Natural Environment Areas are: passive open spaces; scientific, educational, or conservation uses associated with the natural features; agricultural operations established prior to May 2003; forestry as defined in the <i>Forestry Act</i>; and renewable energy generation as outlined in Subsection 4.11, subject to demonstration that the use will not compromise the character, form and ecological functions of the area;</p> <p>c) The City may permit amenities and small-scale commercial operations as ancillary or temporary uses in Natural Environment Areas for the purpose of supporting more intensive public use and equitable public access, subject to zoning and/or site plan;</p> <p>d) The City shall permit a single-detached dwelling and accessory buildings on an existing lot of record, which has open, maintained, public road frontage. The building shall be subject to site plan control. Where new construction occurs on a lot that lies partially within the boundaries of a designated area, the new construction and on-site servicing shall be located outside the boundary of the area to the greatest extent possible on the lot and disturbance of the natural area will be minimized;</p> <p>e) Development and site alteration within 120 metres of the boundary of a Natural Environment Area must demonstrate no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecosystem services within the area;</p> <p>f) Where Natural Environment Areas are privately owned, public use and access to these lands for any purpose requires the consent of the owner;</p> <p>g) Where land designated Natural Environment Area is privately owned, the City shall acquire the land at the request of the landowner, in keeping with the City's acquisition policies;</p> <p>h) The City may lease portions of Natural Environment Areas to another party for a permitted use, having regard for the interests of adjacent landowners and in accordance with other objectives and policies in this section;</p> <p>i) The City may adjust the boundaries of Natural Environment Areas to reflect their features and functions based on new information as it is obtained. Where boundary adjustments</p>

						<p>impact areas of natural and scientific interest, the agreement of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry shall be required; and</p> <p>j) Natural Environment Areas do not form part of parkland dedication.</p>
21.	9	<p>1. The draft Official Plan only indicates that MDS is applicable to three development scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In section 3.4(8) with respect to the re-location of country lot subdivisions; In section 9.2.3(3)(h) with respect to lot creation in the Rural Countryside; and In section 12.2(1)(d) with respect to the development or revision of an existing secondary plan. <p>It is not clear that MDS will apply to other <i>Planning Act</i> approvals (such as Official Plan/Zoning amendments, lot creation) across the range of Rural designations. It is recommended that a policy be added to ensure that MDS is applied to the range of development scenarios and locations that would trigger MDS. Further guidance can be found in OMAFRA's MDS Implementation Guidelines (publication 853) at the following link: http://www.omafra.gov.on.ca/english/nm/buildev/MDSAODA.pdf.</p> <p>The draft Official Plan does not provide a policy direction in the municipal application of MDS where options/flexibility exists. More specifically, the draft Official Plan does not articulate how MDS will be applied for 'MDS I setbacks from surrounding livestock facilities on different lots than the residence surplus to a farming operation proposed to be severed' (Guideline # 9), or 'MDS I setbacks for agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses' (Guideline #35).</p>	OMAFRA	PPS 1.5.5.8	<p>1. It is recommended for a new policy 9.1.1(4) to be inserted in the draft Official Plan to read as follows: "4) New land uses, including the creation of lots, and new or expanding livestock facilities, shall comply with the minimum distance separation formulae."</p> <p>2. It is recommended that a position as to how MDS will be applied in these situations be clarified through introduction of a new policy within this section of the draft Official Plan, otherwise, it should be noted that the default position identified in the MDS Guidelines will apply.</p> <p>Further guidance to assist with the development of local MDS policies can be found in Section 8.1 'Incorporating this MDS Document into Local Planning Documents' of the MDS Guideline document. Detailed information on Guideline # 9 (referred to as Option B) and Guideline #35 (referred to as Option C) can be found in Section 8.1, beginning on page 95.</p>	<p>City Planning Staff do not believe a reference to the guidelines are necessary as they will be followed by default. The Plan makes no reference to the criteria for triggering any provincial guidelines.</p>
22.	9.1.2(1) 9.1.2(2)	<p>These sections of the draft Official Plan (including associated definition for on-farm diversified uses) help ensure that agricultural uses and on-farm diversified uses are permitted, as appropriate. It is</p>	OMAFRA	PPS Definition of "agriculture-related uses"	<p>It is recommended to revise these policies to ensure the criteria identified in the PPS definition for "agriculture-related uses" are incorporated.</p> <p>The City is encouraged to also revise policy</p>	<p>9.1.2 City Planning Staff do not believe a reference to the guidelines are necessary as they will be followed by default. The Plan makes no reference to the criteria for triggering any provincial guidelines.</p>

Document 3 – Resolution of Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Comments

		<p>noted that the term “agriculture-related use” is not defined in the draft Official Plan whereas it is defined in the PPS.</p> <p>As currently drafted, the policies do not ensure that the additional criteria applicable to agricultural-related uses set in the PPS will be applied.</p>			<p>9.1.2(2) so that it references the provincial guidelines to communicate the suite of criteria that are to be applied when proposals for such uses are evaluated.</p> <p>It is also recommended to include a definition of agriculture-related use in the draft Official Plan as defined in the PPS.</p>	<p>Section 13 Table 9 - Terms Defined by the Provincial Policy Statement Used in the Official Plan – was created to identify PPS terms, which includes ‘Agriculture-Related Uses’</p>
23.	9.1.3(3) 9.1.3(5)	<p>Section 9.1.3(5) outlines that lot line adjustments will be considered when addressing surplus dwellings resulting from a farm consolidation. As written, the policy proposes a framework that may not align with PPS 2.3.4.2.</p> <p>Additionally, while the policies related to consents involving a residence surplus to a farming operation incorporate some of the associated criteria as found in PPS 2.3.4.1.c), the opportunity to consider these types of consents is only available when the dwelling is habitable (as per the PPS definition of residence surplus to a farming operation) and when the new lot is limited to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use and appropriate sewage and water services. While there are no concerns with the policy to minimize the loss of agricultural land, the policy should be revised to indicate that the lot size for the surplus dwelling arising out of farm consolidation is to be kept to a minimum size regardless of whether the subject area is comprised of agricultural land.</p>	OMAFRA	<p>PPS 2.3.4.1 c) PPS 2.3.4.2 PPS definitions “residence surplus to a farming operation” and “legal or technical reasons”</p>	<p>Policy 9.1.3(3) addresses lot line adjustments, whereas policy 9.1.3(5) discusses utilizing lot line adjustments to sever surplus residential buildings resulting from farm consolidation. It is recommended that policies related to lot line adjustments and policies related to consents involving residences surplus to a farming operation be dealt with separately. As legal or technical reasons are not defined in the draft Official Plan, revisions to policy 9.1.3(3) are required to clarify that boundary adjustments are to be minor in nature and that no new lot be created, as described in the PPS definition for “legal and technical reasons”.</p> <p>With respect to policy 9.1.3(5), it is requested for revisions to be made to clarify that the subject dwelling be habitable and that the associated lot be kept to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use and associated sewage and water services.</p>	<p>9.1.3 2) Lot line adjustments are permitted on lands designated as Agricultural Resource Area for legal or technical reasons only.</p> <p>3) Lot creation is prohibited unless all of the following are met: a) The new lot contains an existing habitable dwelling made surplus through farm consolidation; b) As a condition of severance, the retained lands are zoned to prohibit residential uses; c) The severed lot is of a size that minimizes the loss of agricultural land; d) The new lot can be adequately serviced; e) Where the new lot may only contain buildings or structures including a dwelling unit that are accessory or secondary to the principal residential use; and f) Where only one lot may be created.</p>
24.	9.2.3(3)	<p>This policy provides criteria to be met when considering residential lot creation in the rural area that would be serviced on private water and wastewater infrastructure. However, the reference to the requirements of PPS 1.6.6.6 appears to have been omitted.</p> <p>PPS 1.6.6.6 outlines that lot creation may only be permitted by approval authorities only if there is confirmation of sufficient reserve sewage system and reserve water system capacity within municipal sewage services and municipal water services or private communal sewage services and private communal water services. The determination of sufficient reserve capacity shall include treatment capacity for hauled sewage from private communal sewage services and individual on-site sewage services.</p>	MECP	PPS 1.6.6.6	<p>It is recommended to insert a new bullet point 9.2.3(3)(v) addressing the requirement of confirmation of capacity at municipal treatment facilities when considering rural lot creation. An example may be as follows:</p> <p>“v) Confirmation of sufficient reserve sewage system capacity and/or reserve water system capacity within municipal water and/or sewage services, or private communal water and/or sewage services.”</p>	<p>There is no municipal treatment facility to consider during rural lot creation as they are all privately serviced.</p> <p>9.2.3(3) Lot creation for the purpose of a residential use is prohibited except where all of the following are met: a) A maximum of two lots can be created from any lot in existence on May 14, 2003; b) The retained lands shall have a minimum of 10 hectares unless the lot is within a historical settlement; c) The severed lot shall be a minimum of 0.8 hectares and may be required to be larger to ensure it can be adequately serviced in a way that will not adversely affect the quality and quantity of groundwater or safe operation of wastewater systems on adjacent lots; d) The lot has frontage on a public road and shall not access a provincial highway. Where the lot has frontage on an arterial road and a collector or local road, the proposed lot shall not be accessed from the arterial road; e) The lot(s) shall observe required setbacks from, and not impact lands identified for mineral aggregates and shall meet policies related to mineral extraction reserves and</p>

						<p>operations;</p> <p>f) Where a lot that is within a historical settlement, the following conditions apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Both the severed and retained lots shall be consistent in size with adjacent lots, but shall not be less than 0.4 hectares; ii) The creation of the lot(s) shall not extend the historical settlement area in length, width, or depth; and iii) The proposed lot(s) shall be adequately serviced without adversely impacting existing private services on adjacent lots; and <p>g) All development on the lot shall be restricted to areas away from mature vegetation or natural features, and a development agreement may be required as a condition of severance to ensure the protection of these natural features.</p>
25.	10.1.1(7)	<p>PPS 3.1.2 d) states that development and site alteration is not permitted within a floodway. However, as written, this policy outright indicates that site alteration <i>is</i> permitted subject to the approval of the Conservation Authority. It is recognized there may be circumstances where site alteration is necessary, and therefore providing some flexibility, in appropriate circumstances, may be warranted.</p> <p>The policy could be interpreted to mean that the issuance of a Conservation Authority permit under the <i>Conservation Authorities Act</i> is a test of <i>Planning Act</i> approval. The principle of development is established first through the <i>Planning Act</i> and is not dependent on other legislation. A <i>Conservation Authorities Act</i> approval should not automatically create an approval under the Official Plan or PPS.</p>	CAs	PPS 3.1.2	It is recommended to replace the word “is” with “may be”.	<p>10.1.1(2)</p> <p>Notwithstanding Policy 1), development and site alteration may be permitted if it has been demonstrated that the site has safe access appropriate for the nature of the development and the natural hazard. In such cases, the following may be permitted:</p>
26.	10.1.4(2)	<p>This policy states that applications for site plan, plan of subdivision, condominium and consent will be examined by the City utilizing criteria set in subsections (a)-(c) that evaluate suitability of soils, potential for adverse environmental effects, hazards, and public safety during emergencies.</p> <p>In order to ensure that matters of provincial interest are protected, it is recommended for the set of criteria in this policy to apply to the review of all <i>Planning Act</i> applications.</p>	CAs	PPS 3.1 PPS definition “development” ss. 3(5) of the <i>Planning Act</i>	<p>It is recommended for the first paragraph of this policy to be revised as follows:</p> <p>2) Notwithstanding Policy 1 above, for uses other than those listed in Policy 1, the City shall review applications for site plan, plan of subdivision, condominium and consent, all <i>Planning Act</i> applications using the following criteria:</p>	<p>10.1.4</p> <p>2) Development shall not be permitted to locate in areas with unstable soils or unstable bedrock where the use is an institutional use, essential emergency service or is associated with the disposal, manufacture, treatment or storage of hazardous substances as identified in provincial policy or provides outdoor industrial storage.</p> <p>3) Notwithstanding Policies 1 and 2) above, for uses other than those listed in Policy 2), the City shall review all development using the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There is sufficient soils and engineering information (obtained using established standards and procedures) to confirm that the site is suitable or can be made suitable for development;

						<p>b) Alterations to the site shall not cause adverse environmental effects, create a new hazard or aggravate an existing hazard elsewhere; and</p> <p>c) People and vehicles have a way of safely entering and exiting the area during emergencies or following an erosion event.</p>
27.	10.1.4(2)(a)	This policy suggests that development can proceed if the proposed site is suitable, or can be made suitable for development to occur, when considering development proposals on unstable soils or bedrock. While this may be true in certain instances, it should be noted that PPS 3.1.1c) is clear that efforts should be made to direct development away from such areas, which does not appear to be emphasized in the draft Official Plan.	CAs	PPS 3.1.1c) PPS definition of "hazardous sites"	<p>It is recommended for a new policy 10.1.4(1) to be inserted in the draft Official Plan to read as follows:</p> <p>"1) Development shall generally be directed to areas outside of unstable soils or bedrock."</p> <p>And for the subsequent policies to be renumbered accordingly.</p>	<p>10.1.4(1)</p> <p>1) Development shall generally be directed to areas outside of unstable soils or bedrock as defined as a Hazardous Site in the PPS.</p>
28.	10.1.5(1)	This policy outlines that development shall not be permitted within hazardous forest types for wildland fire unless the development conforms to Provincial wildland fire assessment and mitigation standards. Although this policy is accurate, it should be noted that the first emphasis of PPS 3.1.8 is for development to be generally directed away from such areas.	MNRF	PPS 3.1.8	<p>It is recommended for policy 10.1.5(1) to be revised as follows:</p> <p>1) Development shall generally be directed to areas outside of lands that are unsafe for development due to the presence of hazardous forest types for wildland fire. Development may however shall not be permitted within hazardous forest types for wildland fire, if it is demonstrated unless that the proposed development conforms to Provincial wildland fire assessment and mitigation standards.</p>	<p>10.1.5(1)</p> <p>Development shall generally be directed to areas outside of lands that are unsafe for development due to the presence of hazardous forest types for wildland fire. Development may however be permitted within hazardous forest types for wildland fire, if it is demonstrated that the proposed development conforms to provincial wildland fire assessment and mitigation standards.</p>
29.	10.1.7	The draft Official Plan does not appear to have policies to address the use of land on closed landfills. PPS 3.2.2 indicates that "sites with contaminants in land or water shall be assessed and remediated as necessary prior to any activity on the site associated with the proposed use such that there will be no adverse effects."	MECP	PPS 3.2.2	<p>It is recommended to insert a new subsection 9) in this policy section to read as follows:</p> <p>"9) The Environmental Protection Act requires that no use be made of land or land covered by water which has been used for the disposal of waste within a period of twenty-five years from the year in which such land ceased to be used unless the approval of the Minister of the Environment, Conservation, and Parks (or its successor) for the proposed use has been given."</p>	<p>10.1.7</p> <p>8) No development is permitted on land or land covered by water which has been used for the disposal of waste unless:</p> <p>a) Twenty-five years have elapsed from the point the lands ceased to be an operating waste disposal site; or</p> <p>b) The approval of the Minister of the Environment, Conservation, and Parks (or its successor) has been given for the proposed use.</p> <p>9) Development on a non-operating waste disposal site that satisfies Policy 8) above, or within 250 metres of a non-operating waste disposal site (e.g., old closed landfills) is subject to the requirements stipulated in Subsection 10.1.6. Development within 500 metres of a non-operating waste disposal site shall also demonstrate that there is no risk to human health and safety from landfill gas.</p>

Document 3 – Resolution of Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Comments

30.	10.1.9	This policy addresses human-made hazards, however it appears that abandoned oil and gas (petroleum) hazards havenot been addressed as part of the policy These hazards are identified as human-made hazards in PPS 3.2.1 whereby it is outlined that development on, abutting, or adjacent to such hazards may only be permitted if rehabilitation or other measures to address and mitigate known or suspected hazards are under way or have been completed.	MNRF	PPS 3.2.1	It is recommended that the title for Section 10.1.9 be revised as follows: “10.9 Abandoned mineral and mineral aggregate mining operations, andabandoned petroleum resource operations ” It is also recommended to insert a new subsection 10.1.9(4) to read as follows: “4) No development or site alteration should occur within a minimum 75metres of an abandoned well.”	10.1.10(4) No development or site alteration should occur within a minimum 75 metres of an abandoned petroleum resource operation.
31.	11.4	This section describes the City’s public notification and consultation procedures. Section 1.2.2 of the PPS provides direction for planning authorities to engage with Indigenous communities and coordinate on land use planning matters. It is noted that the draft Official Plan does not include informationabout consulting with Indigenous communities when projects may have an adverse impact on Indigenous and treaty rights, thus triggering the duty to consult.	MMAH	PPS 1.2.2	It is recommended for a new subsection 11.4(4) be inserted in this policy section to address consultation with Indigenous communities. As noted in MMAH’s covering letter to these comments, the City should engage with relevant Indigenous communities which will help inform the development of appropriate policies with respect to Indigenous consultation.	11.4(5) Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development is committed to an ongoing dialogue with the Algonquin Anishinabe Host Nation as well as with Urban First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples. The City of Ottawa recognizes the important nature of these relationships and the invaluable contributions that Indigenous communities provide when discussing land use policies. These conversations must continue, and we acknowledge that an open dialogue cannot include strict deadlines. Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development remains committed to working with Indigenous communities throughout and beyond the New Official Plan project and amending policies when necessary.
32.	ScheduleC13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only unstable slopes appear to be depicted under environmental constraints. The Ministry of Energy, Northern Development and Mines has released a map identifying areas of karst potential across Southern Ontario. As noted in a previous comment, these hazardous sites of known andpotential unstable bedrock are not acknowledged in the draft Official Plan. A link to the document may be viewed at http://www.geologyontario.mndm.gov.on.ca/mndmfiles/pub/d ata/imaging/GRS005/karst-map.pdf 2. The schedules of the draft Official Plan do not identify wherethe flooding hazard policies are applicable. It is understood that the details of the flood plain boundaries will be includedwithin the Zoning By-law as an overlay, however it would bebeneficial to identify at a broad scale where the policies apply within the City, including any areas utilizing the two- zone flood concept. 3. While the draft Official Plan contains appropriate policies related to hazardous forest types for wildland fire, there does not appear to be any schedules depicting areas of potential 	ENDM CA s MNRF	PPS 3.1.1 c) PPS 3.1.2 d) PPS 3.1.8	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is recommended to revise policy 10.1.4(1) to indicate that the City will also utilize the provincial karst mapping as a resource in considering development applications, and to revise Schedule C13 to identify areas susceptible to karst formation based on available and current provincial data. 2. It is recommended for Schedule C13 to identify areas of flood potential andhazard so that it is clear where the policies of the Official Plan associated with such areas apply. 3. It is recommended for Schedule C13 to be revised to depict areas susceptible to wildland fire in accordance with data produced by the MNRF. Alternatively, the City may wish to depict this information on a new Schedule C14. 	10.1.4 (Preamble) Unstable soils such as sensitive marine clays and organic soils, and unstable bedrock, associated with karst topography, are potential hazardous sites in Ottawa. In areas with sensitive marine clays, where there are deep valleys or embankments, there is a risk of large-scale retrogressive landslides. Schedule C15 – Environmental Constraints identifies lands affected by unstable slopes and organic soils. The schedule is not exhaustive and does not show all lands characterized by unstable slopes. Development proponents may be required to undertake necessary studies as part of the development review and approvals process to delineate the extent of these natural hazards.

		wildland fire mapping which is available. MNRF has produced generalized wildland fire hazard mapping to support municipal planning authorities. This mapping is a starting point for a more detailed wildland fire assessment. The data set, "Fire – Potential Hazardous Forest Types for Wildland Fire" is available through the Ontario Geospatial Data Exchange (OGDE) or by using Ontario GeoHub. The City is encouraged to include available mapping of hazardous forest types in the Official Plan.				
33.	Schedule C17	<p>The City should be satisfied that any lands proposed to be included in the expanded urban boundary are supported in the context of all relevant policies of the PPS 2020, which may include coordinating land use planning and infrastructure decisions, as well as ensuring that development occurs in a manner that protects public health and safety, as well as the environment.</p> <p>For instance, the location of the "Tewin Lands" does not appear to align with the City's goal of a 15-minute community or being within 2.5 linear kilometre distance (1.9km radius) of any rapid transit. It is noted that these lands are distant from any LRT stations invested by the City and Province. Additionally, due to the proximity of the "Tewin Lands" to Highway 417, future pressures on the highway (including for new interchanges) may result to accommodate the growth projected in the area. The City must be satisfied that the development is supported by the necessary infrastructure and are an efficient and cost-effective use of existing or planned infrastructure.</p> <p>Further, certain lands that the City is proposing to add to the urban boundary have the potential presence of natural hazards (e.g. flooding). The City should evaluate how these hazards may affect the City's plans to accommodate forecasted growth in these areas, as well as ensuring that any development and associated impacts of development (e.g., stormwater management) does not exacerbate existing</p>	MTO MMAH CAs	PPS 1.1.3.8 PPS 3.1.1 PPS 3.1.2	Upon consideration of which lands are to be added to the urban boundary to accommodate projected needs, the City should be satisfied that the most suitable lands have been selected when evaluated against the policies expressed in the PPS 2020.	Comment noted. Council provided clear direction in this regard and cost-efficient infrastructure will be a key consideration. The Tewin lands avoids Agricultural Resource Area lands (1.1.3.8c) and protects natural areas and will direct development to areas outside of hazardous lands or floodplains (3.1.1 and 3.1.2). Tewin will be planned as a transit oriented community and as a complete 15 minute community that achieves the 5 Big Moves of the Official Plan.

Document 3 – Resolution of Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Comments

		hazards that may pose threats to public health and safety, or the environment.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--