

DEVELOPMENT & PROPERTY
DEPARTMENT



9 INTERNATIONAL DRIVE
PEMBROKE, ON, CANADA
K8A 6W5
(613) 735-3204 or (613) 735-0091
Toll Free: 1-800-273-0183
FAX: (613) 735-2492
www.countyofrenfrew.on.ca

June 11, 2014

Local Municipalities

Dear Sir or Madam:

RE: Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2014

Please find attached an excerpt from the April 15, 2014 Planning Division report to the Development & Property Committee regarding the new PPS.

Please be advised that we are attempting to schedule a date with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) for an information session centering around the changes to the PPS. If we are able to confirm a session with the MMAH, the date and time will follow under separate cover.

Yours Truly,

Mayor Robert Sweet, Chair
Development and Property Committee
County of Renfrew

Encl.

EXCERPT FROM PLANNING DIVISION REPORT
Prepared by: Charles Cheesman, Manager of Planning Services
Prepared for: Development & Property Committee
April 15, 2014

INFORMATION

1. The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)

(A) Introduction

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) is the statement of the government's policies on land use planning. It applies province-wide and provides policy direction on land use planning.

It includes policies on key issues that affect our communities, such as:

- the use and management of land and infrastructure
- protection of the environment and resources
- ensuring appropriate opportunities for employment and residential development, including support for a mix of uses.

The Province has delegated to local governments (upper and lower-tier) the approval authority for certain planning matters under the *Planning Act*. Municipalities are required to use the PPS to develop their official plans and to guide and inform decisions on planning matters. The PPS is issued under section 3 of the *Planning Act* and all decisions made by the approval authorities affecting land use planning matters "shall be consistent with" the Provincial Policy Statement.

On February 24, 2014, the Province released the new 2014 PPS. The new PPS applies to all decisions in respect to the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter made on or after April 30, 2014. Applications that are already submitted or are soon to be submitted are subject to the new PPS.

Planning Staff attended a Municipal Training Session on the 2014 PPS organized by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) on April 1, 2014 in Perth, Ontario, which helped to clarify some of the issues around the new PPS.

The Province considers the 2014 PPS an enhancement of the 2005 PPS and not a radical departure from the current policies. In some respects this is true (and is why there are no transition provisions for planning applications from the current PPS to the new one). The 2014 PPS continues to direct growth and development to cities, towns, villages and hamlets, to preserve rural lands for resource uses (agriculture, aggregate, forestry and mining) and to protect natural heritage features (woodlands, valleylands, wetlands, wildlife habitats, etc).

For Renfrew County, however, the map of the ecoregions in the 2014 PPS has now been changed to include a part of our County. Depending on the final natural heritage areas that are determined to be significant, this could have implications for planning in Renfrew County. Within identified natural heritage areas Environmental Impact Studies

would be required to support development proposals that would not have been required under the 2005 PPS. This is covered in (C) (2) below.

Moreover, in the 2014 PPS the definition of natural heritage systems has been enhanced to include not only the features themselves but also their linkages between them, thus taking in even more land affected by these policies.

According to the Province one of the key themes of the 2014 PPS is that it responds to the needs of rural communities.

To meet the needs of rural communities the 2014 PPS adds considerable new language to the Rural Areas in Municipalities section (1.1.4). While this language includes new wording such as “Rural areas are important to the economic success of the Province and our quality of life” time will tell how the policies will actually play out on the landscape. Much will depend on the implementation through the County of Renfrew Official Plan Review.

To assist readers in understanding some of the policies of the 2014 PPS that affect rural planning in Ontario, in particular those policies which have been added or revised since the 2005 PPS, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing released a draft document entitled “An Introduction to the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014: Rural Ontario” (February 2014).

This document is very revealing because it explains the Ontario Government’s thinking on the new policies and is particularly helpful in understanding the new or enhanced rural policies.

A new section (1.1.4.2) in the PPS states:

“In rural areas, rural settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted.”

The document goes on to say that, *“Having growth and development focused on existing settlement areas helps support the efficient use of infrastructure and services which is good land use planning practice.”* If a municipality does not have a settlement area, growth and development is still permitted in rural areas, according to the document, since the 2014 PPS allows developments related to the management or use of natural resources, resource-based recreational uses and limited amount of residential development.

The full flavour of the Government’s thinking is best captured in this direct quote from the document (Page 107):

The need to effectively manage development on rural lands is an important issue for rural municipalities. Scattered areas of residential development outside rural settlement areas can cause significant problems, including servicing and environmental issues, and difficulty in providing residents with efficient and cost-effective access to services such as education and medical services. Increasingly, the costs of dispersed development are creating fiscal challenges for municipalities. In contrast, more compact areas are yielding benefits such as more efficient use of infrastructure and lower maintenance costs, job opportunities closer to home and walkable communities to name a few.

Rural municipalities can take steps to avoid issues related to the costs of scattered development and ensure development has access to a range of services, such as directing residential development to rural settlement areas and on land serviced by public roads.

The document also includes a number of practical scenarios as a way of explaining and applying some of the new policies with the 2014 PPS. One of the scenarios is *Scenario 2: Limited Residential Development with Rural Areas*. This scenario was built around a hypothetical rural municipality with little historic growth that was undertaking a five year review of its official plan and wanted to ensure that it had sufficient lands available to grow and develop over the 20 year planning horizon.

The analysis outlined various policy approaches that other Ontario municipalities have taken to limit residential development on rural land which include identifying a 'cap' on the number of lots that can be created on rural lands on an annual basis and identifying the number of lots that can be created from a parent parcel of land as of a certain date.

Other considerations in this scenario are quoted below:

The appropriate provision of infrastructure is another key consideration for permitting limited residential development on rural lands. Policy 1.1.5.5 of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 states that "development shall be appropriate to the infrastructure which is planned or available, and avoid the need for the unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion of this infrastructure." The costs of providing and maintaining public roadways and other infrastructure and services (such as fire and police) to more dispersed rural development therefore also need to be taken into account.

Dispersed rural development can also take away some of the long-term ecological functions of natural heritage systems, for example by taking away an important linkage between natural heritage features.

The comments below highlight the main changes in a "pros and cons" format according to their perceived impact on Renfrew County. We have also indicated whether these changes will take effect immediately (i.e. April 30, 2014) or whether they will be implemented through the Official Plan Five Year Review. Words in *italics* are taken directly from the 2014 PPS.

(B) Effects of 2014 PPS on Renfrew County – Pros

- (1) Section 1.1.3.8 – Settlement areas may be identified or expanded only through a comprehensive review (2005 PPS). **(Implementation Process – April 30, 2014 and Official Plan Review)**

The 2014 PPS provides an enhanced definition of comprehensive review by stating that, in undertaking a comprehensive review, *the level of detail of the assessment should correspond with the complexity and scale of the settlement boundary of the development proposal.*

Thus, a comprehensive review for the expansion of Osceola would not have to be as detailed one for the expansion of Oshawa. However, expansions to settlement areas on private services are only permitted for infilling and minor rounding out of development. This same restriction already applies in the 2005 PPS to settlement areas on partial services.

- (2) Section 1.1.5.2 b) – On rural lands, permitted uses in the 2005 PPS already include “resource based recreation” uses but this term has been enhanced to include *recreational dwellings*. **(Implementation Process – April 30, 2014 and Official Plan Review)**

It is our understanding that the undefined term “*recreational dwellings*” would include new residential development in a rural area associated with ski slopes, race tracks, golf courses, waterfront etc. This clarification is a positive for Renfrew County.

- (3) Section 1.6.7.4 – Promoting a land use pattern, density and mix of uses which support *current and future use of transit and active transportation*. **(Implementation Process - Official Plan Review)**

This emphasis in the new PPS on active transportation in Section 1.6.7.4 and other sections aligns well with the County’s Active Transportation Strategy which will include the incorporation of active transportation policies in the County of Renfrew Official Plan.

- (4) Section 2.3.2 – Planning authorities shall designate *prime agricultural areas* and specialty crop areas. **(Implementation Process - Official Plan Review)**

This should be beneficial to the protection of prime agricultural areas.

- (5) Section 2.3.3.1 – Permitted uses in prime agricultural areas include agriculture uses, agriculture-related uses, and *on-farm diversified uses*. **(Implementation Process – April 30, 2014 and Official Plan review)**

The amended policy provides additional flexibility in agricultural areas regarding agriculture-related uses permitted on farms. *On-farm diversified uses means uses that are secondary to the principal agricultural use of the property, and are limited in area. On-farm diversified uses include, but are not limited to, home occupations, home industries, agri-tourism uses and uses that produce value-added agriculture products.* New proposals for these uses would require a Zoning By-law Amendment until the Comprehensive Zoning By-laws are updated.

Also, the definition of “agriculture-related uses”, which are farm-related commercial and farm-related industrial uses, has been enhanced in the 2014 PPS by deleting reference to “small scale” in the definition and by making them directly related to support farm operations (plural) in the area and not just a farm operation (singular). The definition has been enhanced also to state that these uses *provide direct products and/or services to farm operations as a primary activity.* The effect is to provide flexibility for larger agriculture-related uses to service the broader farming community.

- (7) Section 2.3.4.1 c) – A residence surplus to a farming operation as a result of farm consolidation is still permitted *provided that the new lot will be limited to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use and appropriate sewage and water services* **(Implementation Process – April 30, 2014 and Official Plan Review)**

This should be beneficial to the protection of prime agricultural areas.

(C) Effects of 2014 PPS on Renfrew County – Cons

- (1) Section 1.1.5.2 c) (2005 and 2014 PPS) – On rural lands, permitted uses include *limited residential development* **(Implementation Process - Official Plan Review)**

This is one of the policies of the PPS that the Province is relying on to request that the severance policy in the County of Renfrew Official Plan be amended to say that development outside settlement areas in excess of three lots should proceed by plan of subdivision.

- (2) Section 2.1.3 – *Natural heritage systems shall be identified in Ecoregions 6E and 7E, recognizing that natural heritage systems will vary in size and form in settlement areas, rural areas, and prime agricultural areas.* **(Implementation Process - Official Plan Review)**

The definition of Natural Heritage System has been enhanced to mean a system made up of natural heritage features and areas *and linkages intended to provide connectivity (at the regional or site level) and support natural processes and ecosystems.*

Natural Heritage Features are defined in the 2005 PPS as significant wetlands, fish habitat, significant woodlands, significant valleylands, significant wildlife habitat, habitat of endangered and threatened species and Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI).

The PPS map of the ecoregions has been changed. A copy of the map is tabled for Council's information. The policies to protect natural heritage systems, which include wildlife habitat (deer yards, moose yards), fish habitat (spawning areas), woodlands and valleylands, now apply to significant areas of Renfrew County. Areas affected are along the Ottawa River from Arnprior to Petawawa and include the Townships of McNab/Braeside, Horton, Admaston/Bromley, Whitewater, Laurentian Valley, and North Algona Wilberforce.

MNR has provided a working map illustrating the various natural heritage feature areas to be protected within the Ecoregions. Development is not permitted within these natural heritage feature areas or on adjacent lands (generally within 120 metres) to these areas, unless there is an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) demonstrating that the proposed development will not have a negative impact on the features or their ecological function.

The full impact of the new PPS policy and map change is the inclusion of parts of Renfrew County in these Ecoregions and the need to protect not only the natural heritage features but the linkages as well. In addition, the Province would like us to map these features and linkages in the rest of Renfrew County as well.

(D) Effects of 2014 PPS on Renfrew County – To Be Determined

- (1) Section 1.1.1 (and other sections) – Promotes *development and land use patterns that conserve biodiversity and consider the impacts of changing climate.* **(Implementation Process – Official Plan review)**

Biodiversity and climate change are new undefined terms in the PPS.

- (2) Section 1.1.1 – Healthy, livable and safe communities are sustained by accommodating an appropriate range and mix of residential uses (*including second units, affordable housing and housing for older persons*). **(Implementation Process - Official Plan Review)**

Note that Section 16(3) of the Planning Act requires Official Plans to contain policies permitting second dwelling units and that sections 17(36.1) and (36.2) of the Planning Act do not permit the appeal of these policies except at the time of five year reviews.

- (3) Section 1.1.5.7 – *Opportunities to support a diversified rural economy should be promoted by protecting agriculture and other resource-related uses and directing non-related development to areas where it will minimize constraints on these uses.* **(Implementation Process - Official Plan Review)**

This policy, contained in the Rural Lands in Municipalities section of the PPS, limits residential uses in rural areas. The main uses of rural lands are for resource uses (aggregate, forestry, mining, agriculture).

- (4) Section 1.6.1 a) - Planning for infrastructure, *electricity generator facilities and transmission and distribution system* and public service facilities shall be *coordinated and integrated with land use planning so that they are financially viable over their life cycle, which may be demonstrated through asset management planning.* **(Implementation Process - Official Plan Review)**

This policy will potentially allow municipalities to require developers to prepare a report on the financial viability of the infrastructure a municipality may acquire as a result of a development (e.g. new roads) and tie this report into the municipality's asset management plan.

- (5) Section 1.6.6.4 – Individual on-site water and sewage services may be used provided that site conditions are suitable for the long-term provisions of such services *with no negative impacts.* **(Implementation Process – April 30, 2014 and Official Plan Review)**

Negative impact is already defined in the 2005 PPS as the degradation to the water quality and quantity of water due to single, multiple or successive development (which includes lot creation).

However, the definition of *negative impacts* has been enhanced in the new PPS to state that negative impact *should be assessed through environmental studies including hydrogeological or water quality impact assessments, in accordance with provincial standards.*

At the April 1st, 2014 Municipal Training Session we were advised by an official of the Ministry of Environment that this policy is not a requirement for a hydrogeological study for every severed lot on private services. Rather, it is intended to give decision makers the flexibility to require such studies in situations where they are deemed appropriate.

This is a policy that could be implemented now, without an Official Plan update, but it is also recommended that the County Official Plan Review include policies and criteria on this matter.

- (6) Section 2.1.7 – Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in habitat of endangered species and threatened species, *except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements.* **(Implementation Process – April 30, 2014 and Official Plan Review)**

Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species is defined in the 2005 PPS as regulated habitat approved by MNR, or an area on which the species depends, directly or indirectly, to carry on its life processes, including life processes such as reproduction, rearing, hibernation, migration or feeding, as approved by the MNR.

The revised PPS policy is now in-line with the Endangered Species Act (ESA) which will assist in the review of planning applications. Land use planning decision makers do not have the authority to designate or amend endangered species habitat. Development is still prohibited in protected areas unless an approval is granted from MNR (permit process; registry for certain species).

We have been advised by the MMAH and MNR that provincial comments on planning applications affected by endangered and threatened species will be limited to interpretation of endangered and threatened species occurrence details, information on habitat regulations, recommended methodology for assessment of habitat, and advice on potential options to avoid impacts to protected habitat. These changes and the slight modifications to the PPS will, it is hoped, provide some flexibility during the review of planning applications and a faster processing time by MNR.

- (7) Section 2.2.1 g) – Planning authorities shall protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of water by *ensuring consideration for environmental lake capacity, where applicable.* **(Implementation Process – April 30, 2014 and Official Plan Review)**

The advice we were given by MOE on this enhanced policy is similar to the advice we were given on 1.6.6.4 regarding demonstration of no negative impacts; namely, the requirement for additional information on studies regarding environmental lake capacity is at the discretion of decision makers based on the merits of the situation.

- (8) Section 2.3.1 – Prime agricultural areas are areas where prime agricultural lands predominate. Specialty crop areas shall be given the highest priority for protection, followed by *Canada Land Inventory Class 1, 2 and 3 lands and any associated Class 4 through 7 lands within the prime agricultural area*, in this order of priority. **(Implementation Process – April 30, 2014 and Official Plan Review)**

The policy provides clarity regarding land that is considered to be part of the “prime agricultural area” which includes “pockets” of lower quality classes of land which should also be protected.

- (9) Section 2.3.5.1 – *Planning Authorities may only exclude land from prime agricultural areas for expansion of a settlement area.* **(Implementation Process – April 30, 2014 and Official Plan Review)**

In the 2005 PPS, section 2.3.5.1 permitted the removal of lands from prime agricultural areas for purposes other than settlement expansion (such as lands for limited non-residential uses). These exceptions have now been removed. However, in the 2014 PPS these other uses are still **permitted** in prime agricultural areas.

- (10) Section 3.1.8 – *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 in lands with hazardous forest types for wildland fire where the risk is mitigated in accordance with wildland fire assessment and mitigation standards.* **(Implementation Process - Official Plan Review)**

The Province is developing additional support material related to this policy, including generalized fire hazard spatial data/mapping.

Until more information and mapping is provided by the Province, it is difficult at this time to assess the effects on Renfrew County.

Summary of Changes in the 2014 PPS and their Effects on Renfrew County

| 2014 PPS | Effects on Renfrew County |
|---|--|
| 4.1 – The new PPS applies to all decisions in respect to the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter made on or after April 30, 2014. | The new PPS applies to any application where a decision is made after April 30. This means that applications that are already submitted or are soon to be submitted may be subject to the new PPS. |
| 1.1.1(h) – promoting land use patterns that conserve biodiversity and consider the impacts of a changing climate | Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| 1.1.3.2 – land use patterns within settlement areas are to support active transportation and are freight-supportive | Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| 1.1.3.2(b) land use patterns within settlement areas are to provide opportunities for intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated | Appears to provide flexibility to meet local conditions – to be reviewed through the 5-year OP update |
| 1.1.3.3 – intensification and redevelopment should be promoted where this can be accommodated | Appears to provide flexibility |
| 1.1.3.5 – Establish and implement minimum targets for intensification and redevelopment within built-up areas, based on local conditions | Appears to provide flexibility to meet local conditions – to be reviewed through the 5-year OP update |
| 1.1.3.8 – requires comprehensive review for a settlement area boundary expansion – definition of comprehensive review now includes the level of detail of the assessment should correspond with the complexity and scale of the settlement boundary or development proposal | Appears to provide flexibility on the requirements of a study to expand a rural settlement area. |
| 1.1.4 – Preamble – Greater focus on balancing “rural assets” to “environmental protection” | Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| 1.1.4.1 – rural areas should be supported by: c) accommodating an appropriate mix of housing in rural settlement areas; d) encourage conservation and redevelopment of existing rural housing stock on rural lands | To be implemented through the Official Plan Review. This may limit lot creation by means of plans of subdivision and consent applications outside of hamlets, villages and other settlement areas. |
| 1.1.4.2 – In rural areas, rural settlement areas should be the focus of growth and development | Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| 1.1.4.4 – growth and development may be directed to rural lands where a municipality does not have a settlement area | Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| 1.1.5.2(b) - On rural lands, permitted uses include resource-based recreational uses including recreational dwellings | There is no definition of recreational dwelling – Through the Official Plan review the County will try to have this policy applied to areas such as golf courses, the Calabogie track, ski hills, and lakeshore development. |
| Limited residential development is still included but not defined. | |

Summary of Changes in the 2014 PPS and their Effects on Renfrew County

| 2014 PPS | Effects on Renfrew County |
|--|---|
| | <p>"Limited residential" is still permitted, but given the reading of policy 1.1.4.1 and 1.1.4.2, this appears to be very limited.</p> |
| <p>1.1.5.7 – support a diversified rural economy by protecting agricultural and other resource-related uses and directing non-related development to areas where it will minimize constraints on these uses</p> | <p>Further direction to limit residential in rural areas. Predominate use of rural lands should be use of resources (aggregate, forestry, mining, agriculture)</p> |
| <p>1.2.2 – Planning authorities are encourage to coordinate planning matters with aboriginal communities</p> | <p>The County currently does not consult with the aboriginal communities on private land developments. The Province may direct that municipalities consult with aboriginal communities for all/some development proposals.</p> |
| <p>1.2.6 – Land Use Compatibility Major facilities and sensitive land uses should be planned to ensure they are appropriately designed, buffered and/or separated from each other to prevent or mitigate adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety, and to ensure the long-term viability of major facilities</p> | <p>Implement through the Official Plan Review</p> |
| <p>Major facilities defined to include: pipelines, industrial, transportation (highway, airport, rail), sewage treatment, resource extraction.</p> | |
| <p>1.3.1 – Encourages compatible mixed-use employment use development</p> | <p>Implement through the Official Plan Review</p> |
| <p>1.3.2.3 – protect employment areas in proximity to major goods movement facilities and corridors</p> | <p>Implement through the Official Plan Review</p> |
| <p>1.6.2 – Planning authorities should promote green infrastructure to complement infrastructure Definition of green infrastructure include: natural heritage features and systems, parklands, stormwater management, urban forests, natural channels, permeable surfaces and green roofs</p> | <p>Implement through the Official Plan Review</p> |
| <p>1.6.6.4 – Individual on-site water and sewage services may be used provided that site conditions are suitable for the long-term provisions of such services with no negative impacts Negative impacts is defined in the PPS as the degradation to the quality and quantity of water due to single, multiple or successive development. Negative impacts should be assessed through environmental studies</p> | <p>This policy is to be implemented to all decisions as of April 30, 2014. Through the Official Plan Review criteria will be established to provide further guidance when a hydrogeological study will be required. Until the OP is updated, staff will have to make a judgment when to apply this policy. Criteria to consider could include the size of the proposed lot and surrounding land uses (i.e. density of surrounding residential uses, industrial uses, or a use such as septage spreading).</p> |

Summary of Changes in the 2014 PPS and their Effects on Renfrew County

| 2014 PPS including hydrogeological or water quality impact assessments, in accordance with provincial standards. | Effects on Renfrew County |
|--|---|
| Development is defined to include the creation of a new lot, construction of buildings, or a change in land use | |
| 1.6.6.4 – Also includes that individual on-site services may only be used in settlement areas <i>for infilling and minor rounding out of existing development</i> | Expansions to rural settlement areas without full services limited to infilling and minor rounding out of existing development. |
| <p>1.6.6.6 – Planning authorities may allow lot creation only if there is confirmation of sufficient reserve sewage system capacity shall include treatment capacity for hauled sewage from individual on-site sewage services.</p> <p>Definition of Reserve Sewage System is: Reserved capacity for individual on-site sewage services is considered sufficient if the hauled sewage from the development can be treated and land-applied (<i>nutrient management act</i>) or disposed of at approved sites (Environmental Protection Act), but not by land-applying untreated hauled sewage.</p> | <p>The County provided comments on this section for the draft PPS. We said at the time:</p> <p>We are concerned about the intent and implications of this change and a concern that this change could be directed more forcefully at land division committees and other planning authorities to restrict rural severances on private septic systems unless there is sufficient reserve sewage capacity. We have great concerns with this since there has been very little action on addressing this province-wide issue concerning the land application of untreated, hauled sewage.</p> <p>That, given that the land application of untreated, hauled sewage is a lawful activity and the industry standard, this section be deleted and development be allowed to continue on private services; further, that the definition of 'reserve sewage system capacity' in the current PPS be amended to delete reference to the land application of untreated, hauled sewage; further, that any change in the legislation on the land application of untreated, hauled sewage be made only after consultation with affected parties and municipalities; finally, that, if the land application of untreated, hauled sewage is to be prohibited, the</p> |

Summary of Changes in the 2014 PPS and their Effects on Renfrew County

| 2014 PPS | Effects on Renfrew County |
|---|--|
| | Province provide workable alternatives, together with appropriate funding, that would allow continued development on private services. |
| <p>1.6.6.7 – Stormwater Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - prevent contaminant loads - Minimize changes in water balance and erosion - not increase risks to health and safety and property damage - maximize the function of vegetative and pervious surfaces - promote stormwater management best practices | Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| 1.6.7.5 – Transportation and land use considerations shall be integrated at all stages of the planning process | Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| 1.6.10.1 – Planning authorities should consider the implications of development and land use patterns on waste generation, management and diversion. | Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| <p>1.6.11 – Planning authorities should provide opportunities for the development of energy supply to meet current and projected needs. Planning authorities should promote renewable energy systems where feasible in accordance with provincial and federal requirements</p> | <p>County Comments on draft PPS:</p> <p>The Green Energy Act provides a province-led, coordinated approvals framework for renewable energy projects and exempts these projects from Planning Act approval including documents such as official plans and zoning by-laws. This section of the PPS appears to contradict the Green Energy Act by requiring municipalities to encourage opportunities for renewable energy projects. Since municipalities have been removed from the approvals process, they should not be required to implement policies to encourage opportunities for renewable energy projects.</p> |
| <p>2.1.3 – Natural heritage systems shall be identified in Ecoregions 6E & 7E – recognizing that natural heritage systems will vary in size and form in settlement areas, rural areas, and prime agricultural areas.</p> <p>Natural Heritage System defined as: a system made up of natural heritage features and areas and linkages intended to provide connectivity</p> | <p>The PPS map of the ecoregions has been changed. The policies to protect natural heritage systems, which include wildlife habitat (deer yards, moose yards), fish habitat (spawning areas), woodlands and valleylands, now apply to significant areas of Renfrew County. Areas affected are along the Ottawa River from Arnprior to Petawawa and impact the Townships of McNab/Braeside, Horton,</p> |

Summary of Changes in the 2014 PPS and their Effects on Renfrew County

| 2014 PPS (at the regional or site level) and support natural processes and ecosystems. | Effects on Renfrew County |
|--|---|
| <p>Natural Heritage Features defined as: significant wetlands, fish habitat, significant woodlands, significant valleylands, significant wildlife habitat, habitat of endangered and threatened species, ANSI</p> <p>Wildlife habitat is defined as: where plants, animals and other organisms live and find adequate amounts of food, water, shelter and space needed to sustain their populations. Specific wildlife habitats of concern include areas where species concentrate at vulnerable points in the annual or lifecycle; and areas which are important to migratory or non-migratory species.</p> <p>Woodlands defined as: treed areas that provide environmental and economic benefits to both the private landowner and general public, such as erosion control, hydrological and nutrient cycling, provision of clean air and long-term storage of carbon, provision of wildlife habitat, outdoor recreational opportunities, and the sustainable harvest of a wide range of woodland products. Woodlands include treed areas, woodlots or forested areas and vary in their level of significance to the local, regional and provincial levels. Woodlands may be delineated according to the forestry act definition or the provinces Ecological Land Classification system definition for "forest".</p> | <p>Admaston/Bromely, Whitewater, Laurentian Valley, and North Algona Wilberforce</p> <p>MNR has provided a map illustrating the areas to be protected. Development is not permitted within these identified areas or on lands adjacent (generally within 120 m) to these areas, unless there is an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) demonstrating that the proposed development will not have a negative impact on the feature or their ecological function.</p> <p>Implant through the Official Plan Review.</p> |
| <p>2.1.7 – Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in habitat of endangered species and threatened species, except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements</p> <p>Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species is defined as: Regulated habitat approved by MNR, or an area on which the species depends, directly or indirectly, to carry on its life processes, including life processes such as reproduction, rearing, hibernation, migration or feeding, as approved by the MNR.</p> | <p>This is now in-line with the ESA. Planning decision makers do not have the authority to designate or amend endangered species habitat. Development is prohibited in these areas, unless an approval is granted from MNR (permit process, registry for certain species).</p> |

Summary of Changes in the 2014 PPS and their Effects on Renfrew County

| 2014 PPS | Effects on Renfrew County |
|---|---|
| 2.2.1(d) – Protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of water by maintaining linkages and related functions among ground water features, hydrologic functions, natural heritage features and areas and surface water features including shoreline areas | Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| 2.2.1(g) - Protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of water by ensuring consideration for environmental lake capacity | Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| 2.3.1 – Prime agricultural areas are areas where prime agricultural lands predominate. Class 1, 2 and 3 lands and any associated class 4-7 lands within the prime agricultural area | PPS enhancement of definition to recognize that Class 4-7 lands may be included in prime agricultural areas. Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| <p>2.3.3.1 – Permitted uses in prime agricultural areas include agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, and on-farm diversified uses.</p> <p>Agriculture-related uses is defined as: farm related commercial and industrial uses that are directly related to farm operations in the area, support agriculture, benefit from being in close proximity to farm operations, and provide direct products and/or services to farm operations as a primary activity</p> <p>On-farm diversified uses are defined as: uses that are secondary to the principal agricultural use of the property and are limited in area. On farm diversified uses include, but are not limited to, home occupations, home industries, agri-tourism uses and uses that produce value-added agricultural products</p> | Provides additional flexibility in agricultural areas – Implement through the Official Plan Review |
| 2.3.5 – Planning Authorities may only exclude land from prime agricultural areas for expansion of a settlement area | |
| <p>2.4 – Mineral resources shall be protected for long-term use. Mineral deposits shall be identified and development and activities in or adjacent to these areas that would preclude or hinder the establishment of new operations or access to the resources is only permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - resource use would not be feasible; - or the proposed land use or development serves a greater long-term public interest; -and issues of public health, public safety, and environmental impact are | The province has identified many areas of mineral resources which would prohibit any other development within those identified areas |

Summary of Changes in the 2014 PPS and their Effects on Renfrew County

| 2014 PPS addressed | Effects on Renfrew County |
|--|--|
| <p>2.5 Mineral aggregate – resources shall be protected for long-term use and where provincial information is available, deposits of mineral aggregate resources shall be identified</p> <p>Deposit of mineral aggregate is defined as: an area of identified mineral aggregate resources, as delineated in Aggregate Resource Inventory Papers or comprehensive studies prepared using evaluation procedures established by the Province for surficial and bedrock resources, as amended from time to time, that has a sufficient quantity and quality to warrant present or future extraction.</p> <p>High quality is defined as: means primary and secondary sand and gravel resources and bedrock resources as defined in the Aggregate Resource Inventory Papers (ARIP).</p> | <p>The ARIP mapping of primary and secondary aggregate resources are supposed to be protected from incompatible land uses</p> |
| <p>3.1.3 – Natural Hazards – Planning authorities shall consider the potential impacts of climate change that may increase the risk associated with natural hazards</p> | <p>Implement through the Official Plan Review</p> |
| <p>3.1.8 – 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 in lands with hazardous forest types for wildland fire where the risk is mitigated in accordance with wildland fire assessment and mitigation standards.</p> <p>Hazardous forest types for wildland fire is defined as: forest types assessed as being associated with the risk of high to extreme wildland fire using risk assessment tools established by the MNR</p> <p>Wildland fire assessment and mitigation standards is defined as: the combination of risk assessment tools and environmentally appropriate mitigation measures identified by the MNR to be incorporated into the design, construction and/or modification of buildings, structures, properties and/or communities to reduce the risk to public safety</p> | <p>The Province is developing additional support material related to this policy including generalized fire hazard spatial data/mapping. Until more information and mapping is provided by the Province, it is deficient at this time to assess the effects on Renfrew County.</p> |

Summary of Changes in the 2014 PPS and their Effects on Renfrew County

| 2014 PPS | Effects on Renfrew County |
|--|---|
| <p><i>infrastructure and property from wildland fire.</i></p> <p>There are many policies that have not changed from the 2005 PPS. The County Official Plan was approved before the 2005 PPS and has not yet been updated to conform. There are many policies in the 2005 and now 2014 PPS that will need to be implemented in the updated County Plan. Many of these relate to the importance of a coordinated approach to planning matters across lower and upper-tier municipal boundaries and the role of the upper-tier regarding allocation of population, employment, and housing.</p> | <p>Implement through the Official Plan Review</p> |

