

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

**Official Plan Amendment - General**

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
49	ZAKEM, Steven Aird & Berlis	Should section 2.3.1, on page 13 of the proposed Official Plan Amendment reference 2036 rather than 2031?	<b>Staff does not recommend any changes to the proposed Official Plan Amendment as a result of this submission.</b>  The target in the Transportation Master Plan is to achieve this objective by 2031 and to generally exceed the target beyond 2031.
66	BRAYTON, Tina Hydro One Distribution	No Comments	<b>No Action Required</b>
67	DUQUETTE, Benoit Conseil des écoles publiques de l'Est de l'Ontario	No comments	<b>No Action Required</b>
68	GREER, Tom Parks Canada	No comments but requests notice of decision	<b>Added to notification List</b>
69	KIRKHAM, Mary Country of Lanark	Requests notice of decision	<b>Added to notification List</b>
70	MACMILLAN, Cindy Ottawa Catholic School Board	No objections. However, the re-designation of employment lands to residential uses may have a significant impact on our school attendance boundaries and new school construction priorities. Requests notice of decision.	<b>Added to notification List</b>
71	MELINZ, Ursula Soloway Wright	With the approval of the proposed Official Plan Amendment the Greater Ottawa Home Builders Association (GOHBA) has an outstanding appeal on OPA 150 and requests the City re-engage in discussions in order to	<b>Legal Services will re-engage in discussions with the appellants.</b>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		conclude the policy appeal.	
72	RITCHIE, Scott Hydro Ottawa	No comments upon the substance of the Amendment but indicated that Certain conditions apply to new development. Also land identified in a number of the schedules fall outside Hydro Ottawa's service territory.	<b>No Action Required</b> Hydro One was also circulated the amendment .
73	SADLER, Allison Enbridge Gas Distribution	Enbridge Gas Distribution does not object to the proposed application(s) but reserves the right to amend or remove development conditions.	<b>No Action Required</b>
74	SCOTT, Mike Ontario Stone, Sand & Gravel Association.	<p>Request to be included in the stake holder discussion of Significant Woodland policies. Request that the woodland mapping be available before the policies are finalised.</p> <p>Also concerned that there are significant updates to the OP while the Aggregate mapping process is not moving forward. The lack of updated aggregate mapping creates a void whereby important, unconstrained close to market aggregate resources are not identified and protected in accordance with the PPS. OSSGA wishes to meet with the City and have a discussion about this process and hopefully come to some understanding about timing for this important work.</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b> OSSGA is aware that the Aggregate Resource Study was completed and accepted by Council and the Province in 2013.</p> <p>The 2013 report indicated that a significant bedrock resource amount (about 125 years) is already protected under the Official Plan. In addition a very large supply (about 64 years) of sand and gravel resources are also mapped and protected under the Official Plan. Adding additional bedrock resources was considered unrealistic. The City has also identified that a specific hydrological / hydrogeological study was necessary prior to evaluating any additional sand and gravel deposits. These conclusions were accepted by Council as part of OPA 150 and approved by the Province.</p> <p>In early 2016 the Province announced that they had withdrawn support for the 2013 Aggregate Resources Inventory Plan (ARIP 191) that formed the basis of the City's review. The Province confirmed there are limitations and problems with</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			<p>the existing data and the Province is beginning work on a large scale study of geological resources in eastern Ontario that should conclude in 5 to 10 years. This project will improve the reliability of resource mapping in the Province. OSSGA was made aware of this in March 2016 and it was confirmed to them in August 2016 that further aggregate resource study could not proceed.</p> <p>OPA 150 did include an additional policy to establish a stakeholder committee to contribute to aggregate resource mapping prior to the next Official Plan review. This policy is the subject of an appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board. There is some question therefore whether the stakeholder committee and resource review can be undertaken until the appeal has been heard. Nevertheless staff do not agree that there is a void in mapping that requires immediate resolution because there is an adequate supply of resources are already mapped and protected.</p>
75	WINTERS, Greg Novatech	It is inappropriate to delay the review and addition of growth related projects until the review of the Infrastructure Master Plan in 2022. Recommend that the City consider the projects now as part of the interim DC-Bylaw update in 2017.	<p><b>Staff does not recommend any changes to the proposed Official Plan Amendment as a result of this submission.</b></p> <p>In order to be consistent with the goal of seeking a reduction in the non-transit components of the overall development charge, the City agreed as part of the settlement of Phase 1 OMB appeals involving GOHBA and BOMA that no new growth-related, capital projects would be added in 2017. The interim DC-By-law in 2017 is for transit without any new capital projects added and involves implementing a forward looking 10-year level of service for transit instead of the previous requirement of a 10-year historical level of service, which was changed by the Province in 2015.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	Staff Response
76	YOUNG, Angela Township of McNab/Braeside	No comments but request to be notified	<b>Added to notification List</b>
77	ZACHARIAUS, Joan Rogers	Rogers has no concerns or objections	<b>No Action Required</b>
81	BOIS, Karolyn Conseil desEcoles Catholiques du Centre- est	No comments	<b>No Action Required</b>
82	LEBLANC, Mathieu South Nation Conservation	No comments	<b>No Action Required</b>
88	CROSSAN, Sean Orléans Chamber of Commerce	One of the recommendations from the Ottawa Employment Land Review is enhanced marketing of employment lands in the city. Have funds been allocated in the 2017 budget to address the recommendation of enhanced marketing?	<b>The submission does not affect the Official Plan Amendment.</b>  Including a marketing strategy for employment lands is to be reviewed as part of the Economic Development Services branch work plan. It fits within the Economic Development Strategy and the establishment of priorities within the branch. The timing associated with such a review would occur after the permanent Director of Economic Development has been hired.

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

**LEAR and Agriculture Resource Area (AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE AREA)**

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	Staff Response
1	AKROUCHE, Ghassan	Owns land at 5536 Downey Road. The LEAR update that has been completed by the City scores my property at 111 points, well below the threshold of 125 points. Based on this score, it is evident that this property should not continue to be designated "Agriculture Resource A Rural Area".	<b>Staff Agrees that these four adjoining parcels fall below the LEAR threshold and meet the criteria for removal. Staff recommends that the lands be re-designated to General Rural Area as shown on Schedule R 18 included in Motion (1) "Official Plan Amendment 2016 - 5536 Downey Road (Response to Submission 1)"</b>
2	BENNET, Wendy	Owns land at 6980 Mansfield Rd and which also has frontage on Bleeks Road. The land scores below the LEAR threshold score of 125 due to poorer quality soils but the land is grouped with a number of other parcels in the Agricultural Resource Area. Approximately 70% of the property is bush land and the balance fronting Mansfield Rd receives drainage from the adjacent land. The property is cut by drainage ditch. Due to the water issues cropping is often only possible late in the year and is often impossible. Requests that this parcel be removed from the Agricultural Resource Area.	<b>Staff does not recommend the removal of this land from the Agricultural Resource Area</b>  This parcel is located toward the western end of the Agricultural Resource Area identified in 1997 LEAR and confirmed by the LEAR update. Because land is so variable it is inevitable that there are pockets of poorer land included in the City's Agricultural Resource Area and it is not the City's practice to remove isolated parcels from these Areas. In this case the land south of Bleeks Road is General Rural Area. Wherever possible the City defines Agricultural Resource Areas by clear boundaries preferably roads water courses or terrain, such as escarpments. Removal of this land has the effect of fragmenting the Agricultural Resource Area and isolating the better land to the West.
3	BERTRAND, Jean & Laura	While reading material on LEAR, I found that the previous plan from 1997 was criticized for not taking certain things into consideration. Well I am finding that this plan is also flawed in that it does not take into consideration the high cost of making the land viable, if it is not in the first place. For example, spending \$30,000 on tile drains makes a	<b>No Action Required</b>  Staff have requested property information from the writer but nothing has been received.

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		<p>small parcel very costly to put into operation and therefore is not financially viable. I would appreciate that you count our household as opposed to the rezoning plan.</p>	
4	BROPHY, Catherine	<p>Ms Brophy argues that her 15 acres on Twin Elm Road is not used for agriculture but has been classed with that designation for many years. The land is not tillable – it is a bush lot.</p>	<p><b>Staff recommend no change in designation</b></p> <p>The frontage of Ms Brophy’s land on Twin Elm Road is treed as she indicates. However approximately 50 % of the land is actively farmed by her family that own the adjoining property to the rear of her lot. Ms Brophy’s land is located within the large agricultural area between the Village of Richmond and Hwy 416. The small pocket of trees on her land and some lots to the west of her property is not sufficiently large enough to warrant removal for the Agricultural area.</p>
5	BROUGHTON, Rox, Cabot and Sheila	<p>Own two parcels of land at 515 Didsbury Road between Terry Fox Drive and the Carp River in Kanata. They are concerned that the LEAR scoring has overstated the property scoring due to what they believe was double counting. They also challenge the surrounding use factor because the land is within 500m of urban residential development and do not consider that the points attributed to soils represent the true soil productivity of the land.</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b></p> <p>The land lies to the west of Terry Fox Drive and the Carp River. Staff confirmed the LEAR scoring for these parcels as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parcel 045100620 has a size of 31.5 HA and has a LEAR score of 157 points</li> <li>• Parcel 045100618 has a size of 21.8 HA and has a LEAR Score of 51 points.</li> </ul> <p>Staff have confirmed the LEAR scores for these properties. The new LEAR system does not consider the proximity of residential development in the urban area and in villages into the assessment of adjacent conflicting uses when scoring land.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
6	BROUSSEAU, Mike	Mr Brousseau requests that his property located at 4188 Boyd Road Vernon be reclassified from Agriculture to Rural. The LEAR score of his land is 120 which is below the threshold and the land has not been farmed for 30 years. The Porteous drain has fragmented his property and there is no access to the parcel from Boyd road through a ditch.	<p><b>No Action Required</b></p> <p>Mr Brousseau’s land is part of the triangle of land created by the southern boundary of the Village of Vernon, the southern half of this triangle is farmed and has a LEAR score of over 145. The 1997 LEAR addressed this unique situation by choosing the village boundary as the limit of the Agricultural Resource Area to preserve integrity of the farmland within this triangle of land. Staff recommend that the existing boundary of the Agricultural area should remain as the Village boundary in this case.</p>
7	CARRARA, Julie FoTenn	Acting for 2156533 Ontario Inc who owns land at 5850 Fernbank Road and which is comprised of two parcels that have LEAR scores of 165 and 168. The subject lands are designated Agricultural Resource Area in the Official Plan. Lands located to the immediate west are designated General Rural Area and the Urban area. The land north of Fernbank Road is urban. The landowners have hired an agrologist to conduct a site-specific analysis of their lands. The landowners feel as though insufficient time has been provided to review the 2016 LEAR results and to evaluate the subject lands with respect to the re-designation criteria contained within Document 10- Ottawa LEAR Implementation, which was released less than one week ago. We respectfully request that City Staff consider the re-designation of the subject lands, should the results of the review by an independent agrologist support re-designation.	<p><b>No Action Required</b></p> <p>No Agricultural Impact Assessment Study has been received to support this request. Once received, it will be reviewed to confirm if a change in designation might be warranted. This can be considered after Council has made a decision on the Amendment on a site specific basis.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
8	CARRARA, Julie FoTenn	<p>Acting for 2356349 Ontario Inc who owns 49 hectares of land located just south of the urban boundary of the Riverside South Community. The northern half of the subject property is currently designated General Urban Area and is located within the Riverside South Community Design Plan (CDP) area. The southern half of the subject property is designated Agricultural Resource Area and received a LEAR score of 172 in Volume 2 of the City's 2016 analysis. Lands designated General Rural Area, which have been developed with rural residential lots, are located to the immediate west (abutting River Road). The landowners have hired an agrologist to conduct a site-specific analysis of their lands and preliminary results indicate that the LEAR score for the lands could be lower than indicated in Volume 2 of the LEAR report.</p> <p>The preliminary results of the agrologist's review note that non-farm land uses (rural residential subdivisions) are located to the west of the subject property and half of the subject property is already located within the Urban Boundary. Further, the agrologist noted that the proximity of non-farm land uses and the Urban Area increases the potential for conflicts to arise between farm and non-farm land uses, which in turn reduces the agricultural priority of the subject property. Using Rideau Road as the boundary of the Agricultural Resource Area designation would create a more easily definable and recognizable boundary that would separate the non-farm uses from adjacent prime agricultural lands.</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b></p> <p>No Agricultural Impact Assessment Study has been received to support this request. Once received, it will be reviewed to confirm if a change in designation might be warranted. This can be considered after Council has made a decision on the Amendment on a site specific basis.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
9	CARRARA, Julie FoTenn	Client has 1.5 ha of land at 6385 Third Line Road. The property abuts a General Rural Area just north of the Village of North Gower and received a LEAR score of 105. The land is partly treed and is not farmed. The request is that this small parcel, which is well defined by roads on three sides, be added to the existing General Rural Area to the south.	<b>Staff Agree and propose that this parcel identified on Schedule R 19 included in Motion (2) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 - 6385 Third Line Road (Response to Submission 9)” be re-designated to General Rural Area</b>
10	CHINKIWSKY, Michael	Owns land at 3329 9 <sup>th</sup> Line Rd. and considers that the land should not be considered as part of the Agricultural Resource Area. This is due to shallow soils and glacial deposits on part of the land that make working and tile drainage impossible.	<b>Staff does not recommend the removal of this land from the Agricultural Resource Area</b>  This parcel is located in the middle of a large Agricultural Resource Area identified in 1997 LEAR and confirmed by the LEAR update. Because land is so variable it is inevitable that there are pockets of poorer land included in the City’s Agricultural Resource Area and it is not the City’s practice to remove isolated parcels from these Areas. Mr Chinkiwsky has not demonstrated that his land was part of a much larger area of land (250 ha or more) that does not meet the City’s LEAR threshold criteria.
11	CHOWN, Murray Novatech	Represents the owners of 4 Lots on Moodie Drive south of Fallowfield Rd. the request for re-designation from Agricultural Resource Area to Rural Employment Area. The request was supported by an Agricultural impact Assessment Study demonstrating that the properties have LEAR scores of 72, 82, 0 and 90; all scores are well below the new LEAR threshold of 125.	<b>Staff Agree - See Motion (12) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Lands west of the Highway 416 and Fallowfield Road interchange (Response to Submissions 11 and 57)”</b>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	Staff Response
13	CHOWN, Murray Novatech	<p>Provided comments on two New polices in proposed by the Official Plan</p> <p>1. Agriculture Resource Area – Policy 2: This new policy only allows “removal of land from an Agricultural Resource Area designation if that land is required for the expansion of a settlement area...” This policy prevents anyone from completing an assessment of their land and bringing an application for an OPA to change the designation of property from “Agricultural Resource Area” to “General Rural Area”. I do not believe the City has any basis for denying a property owner the right to bring such an application.</p> <p>2. Rural Employment Area – Policy 3 Why would the City force a land owner to go through the subdivision process if creating more than three lots along an existing public road? The Planning Act is clear that lots can be created by severance if a plan of subdivision is not considered necessary. If no new public road is being created, why would the City force a landowner to go through the incredibly lengthy and expensive process of a subdivision application?</p>	<p><b>1. Staff considers that this policy requires more consideration and will not be pursued as part of this Amendment. Proposed Policy 2 in Section 3.7.3 of the Draft Official Plan Amendment will be removed by Staff Motion (3) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 - Deleting Policy 3.7.3.2 from the proposed Agricultural Resource Area policies (Response to Submissions 13, 49 &amp; 86)”</b></p> <p><b>2. Staff Agree and Policy 3 in Section 3.7.5 be removed by Staff Motion (4) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Deleting Policy 3 from the proposed new Section 3.7.3 Rural Employment Area policies (Response to Submission 13)”</b></p>
14	CHOWN, Murray Novatech	<p>For the property at 5504 Spratt Road owned by Jack Watson. The request is that the Spratt road property be re-designated to General Rural because it abuts a general rural area and has a LEAR score below the threshold established by the City’s LEAR system. This request is supported by an Agricultural Impact Assessment undertaken by Coleville and also relying upon information</p>	<p><b>Staff have reviewed the Coleville Assessment and agree that the designation of the land should be changed as shown on Schedule R20 in staff Motion (5) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – 5504 Spratt Road and 5220, 5230 Mitch Owens Road (Response to Submissions 14 and 47)” from Agricultural Resource Area to a General Rural Area.</b></p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		provided by an earlier Dillon report.	
15	CHOWN, Murray Novatech Engineering	Submitted a request for the addition of a new policy in the Official Plan to permit the creation of residential lots in the Agricultural Resource Area where there are already clusters of residential lots. The request is based upon a request for a severance for Edith Wheeler, who owns land on Viewbank road	<p><b>Staff does not support this proposed policy change as it is inconsistent with the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement.</b></p> <p>The Provincial Policy Statement is clear in the limitations it places on the creation of new residential lots in the Agricultural Resource Area. The policy proposed by Novatech would apply city-wide and not just to Edith Wheeler’s property.</p>
16	CLARK, Robert Clark Consulting Services	<p>Retained by Mr. Bassam Als who owns land at 8744 Mitch Owens Road. These lands are located at the edge of an Agricultural Resource Area. It is our opinion that the designation of these lands should be changed to General Rural Area. This change reflects the current residential use and is justified for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current use of the lands and the adjacent lands is non-farm residential</li> <li>• The adjacent uses to the north and east are non-farm uses</li> <li>• The adjacent agricultural uses to the south and west are crop land and do not include uses which would be incompatible with the existing and proposed non-farm uses on the subject lands</li> <li>• The soils in the area proposed to be changed from Agricultural Resource Area are poorer agricultural soils.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Staff recommends no change to the designation of the land.</b></p> <p>Despite the fact that the land is treed this property has a LEAR Score of 128. This area was one of the areas reviewed by staff for potential removal. At the time of inspection the trees on the farmland immediately abutting this property were being cleared which reflects the capability of the land.</p> <p>The parcel scores above the threshold and the Agricultural boundary in this location is Mitch Owens Rd. Staff do not recommend the removal of this land from that larger Agricultural area.</p>
17	COOTE, Dick	Mr Coote owns two properties 6853 and 7070 Mansfield Road and has no issue with LEAR evaluation of the second of these properties, but he considers the first as incorrectly evaluated “...	<p><b>Staff recommends no change to the designation of either of these properties.</b></p> <p>Half of Mr Coote’s first parcel and all of his second</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		<p>because it is based on the soil map (The Soils of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, Schut and Wilson, 1987), which is incorrect. The problem is that the soil polygon labelled G1-I1, Grenville and Ironside sandy loam, should have been mapped as F1, Farmington sandy loam, similar to the mapping at the farm at # 7070. I am hoping that this error will be corrected during the re-mapping of the soils of this area, started by OMAFRA this fall. The soil capability rating of Farmington is 5R, rather than the 2pt assigned to Grenville. The result of this error is that the LE Soil for this parcel should be 80 or less (weighted soil capability points <math>\leq 5.7</math>), rather than the 102 (weighted SC points = 7.28) it has been assigned. The whole parcel has been incorrectly given a LEAR rating of 152, rather than approximately 130 or less, which would be more correct.</p> <p>I am a soil scientist and former leader of the Soil Survey of Canada, and I am very familiar with soils, soil survey and soil mapping. I have been farming these two parcels for many years, and know that there is almost nowhere on the farm at #6853 Mansfield Road where there is more than 50 cm depth of soil. In many places in the fields it is impossible to plow the soil without the plow running directly along the top of the bedrock. In fact, the laneway that runs north-south through the farm is largely "paved" by exposed limestone bedrock."</p>	<p>parcel of land have been designated Agricultural resource area since 1997. The draft Official Plan amendment does not propose to change this. The City will pursue the classification of the soils identified by My Coote with the Provincial Team undertaking the soils sampling in the City.</p>
18	DOLAN, Shirley Carleton Landowners Association (CLA)	<p>Ms Dolan is a member of the CLA and states that many CLA members are farmers or rural property owners. The CLA strongly in favour of protecting rural land for agriculture. We would though, like to see some flexibility in the Official Plan Amendment</p>	<p><b>Staff does not agree with the CLA requests and no changes to the Official Plan are recommended</b></p> <p>1. The Provincial Policy Statement recognises</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		<p>2016 which would allow exceptions to the broad designation of Agricultural Resource Area.</p> <p>The CLA provided two recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure that there is more granularities in the designations, e.g. areas of wooded lands, aggregates, or similar areas unsuited to agriculture are not included in the Agricultural Resource Areas.</li> <li>2. Allow some flexibility in the Official Plan so that there is the potential for a property owner to have a parcel of land evaluated by an agronomist and if found to be unsuited to agriculture, to permit severance.</li> </ol>	<p>that within prime agricultural areas there will be pockets of poorer land. Were these poorer lands exceed 250 ha in size they can and have been excluded from the Agricultural area. While smaller poor pockets were at one time recognised the province no longer permits them to be considered. The Provincial intent is to protect large agricultural areas from fragmentation (severances etc.) and land uses that will conflict with farm operations in the long run.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Provincial Policy Statement only permits residential lot creation for a residence made surplus to a farming operation as a result of a farm consolidation. The City's Official Plan policies are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement in this regard.</li> </ol>
19	DREW, Ian	<p>Mr Drew's submissions concerns 3396 Stagecoach which he purchased 4 years ago.</p> <p>The property is almost 100 acres with residential development potential at the west end and it has a deposit of sand and gravel at the east end that I have had tested and would be suitable for septic systems. Our family has owned the 200 acres to the north of this property for 30 years. On this property to the north we have a 50 acre licensed pit that I currently operate. The sand reserve we have is almost gone. As our sand reserves are getting depleted we had hoped to apply for pit license at the east end of 3396 Stagecoach. With this new change that the city is forcing upon us, this would be much harder to achieve.</p>	<p><b>Staff Agree and propose that Schedule R9 be revised as shown in Motion (6) "Official Plan Amendment 2016 – 3396 Stagecoach Road (Response to Submission 19)".</b></p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		As far as this property being prime agricultural land, I strongly disagree. I was a dairy farmer for my first 26 years of my life and I am now 50 years old and I still have some cash crops. I know what good farm land is and this is not prime. It is more like a class 4 or 5 land. I strongly object to my land being changed to agriculture resource area.	
20	DUDAS, Georges	Owns the land at 5523 Clayton Road. He requests that the zoning remain on his property as per Official Plan Schedule A dated February 1997. He considers the General Rural Area designation to be more appropriate for the land.	<b>Staff Agree that Schedule R13 be modified as shown attached to Staff Motion (7) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – 5523 Clayton Road (Response to Submission 20)” in order to align the proposed Agricultural Resource Area designation with the current Agricultural zoning on the land.</b>
21	FARANDA, Tony	7465, 7535 Mansfield Road Objects to the proposed re-designation of the subject lands, given that the soils are rocky and shallow, and are un-tillable.	<b>No Action Required</b> Schedule R6 has already been revised to remove the northern half of the subject lands from those areas proposed to be re-designated from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area.
22	FOLEY, Mark &Janet	Mohr’s Road Galetta the Foleys submitted an Agricultural Impact Assessment undertaken on this property by Coleville in 2014. The soil class information provided by that report was input into the City’s LEAR system. The Agricultural Impact Assessment data demonstrated that almost 50% of this property is CLI class 1 soil and returned a LEAR score of 155. This is higher than that determined by the soil information provided by the Province.	<b>No action required</b>  The Foleys have not expressed any objection to the LEAR or the current designation of their land.
23	GINN, Doug	Owns Land at 4077 Dunrobin Road west of the Village of Constance Bay. He objects to the City’s amendment to change the land to Agricultural	<b>Staff Agree to the designation remaining General Rural Area and propose deleting Schedule R2 in its entirety through Motion (8)</b>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		Resource Area. He is currently operating an Artist's Studio and has been planning to expand the studio next year. This has been a long-term plan and was a consideration when the land was purchased 15 years ago. Under the new zoning we would be restricted from using our property for an artist's studio and it would also restrict future development and other uses of our property. We were hoping that at some point in time we would be able sever off our front field. The rezoning would also adversely affect other properties in the area. The soil samples in the area may also be misleading because of a high water table the fields remain too wet to work until late June making it difficult to use for farming.	<p><b>“Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Lands in the vicinity of the intersection of Kilmaurs Side Road and Dunrobin Road (Response to Submissions 23, 31, 34, 38, 39, 40 &amp; 41)”.</b></p> <p>Staff agree to the area around Mr Ginn's property remaining General Rural. A review of the LEAR scores and topography of the parcels located along Dunrobin Road suggests that an Agricultural Resource Area designation is not appropriate. The higher scoring land east of Dunrobin road is not large enough to comprise an independent Agricultural Resource Area.</p>
24	GOODING, Ron	There is currently no agricultural development on this land I wish to query the designation assigned here. I also wish to respectfully point out that a significant percentage of this land is designated as "significant wetlands" and therefore wish to question the high LEAR total score of 131 assigned to the property. I would be grateful if you would kindly review the LEAR assessment on the basis of my observations as I am anxious to avoid any restrictions that may be imposed on this land's future use as a result of the 2016 LEAR revision.	<p><b>No Action Required</b></p> <p>The property is located in the General Rural Area and is partially impacted by provincially significant wetland. While the LEAR score is 131 points the land is isolated and not a candidate for an Agricultural Resource Area designation.</p>
25	JARVIS, Brandon	As I mentioned, the land at 4711 Rockdale Road is currently Designated General Rural Area in the City of Ottawa Official Plan and has been since January 31, 2005. The Draft Official Plan amendment proposes that this land be	<p><b>Staff Agree that this land is already designated General Rural Area and therefore staff propose that Schedule R12 be amended as shown in Motion (9) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – 4711 Rockdale Road (Response to Submission</b></p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		redesignated from Agricultural Resource Area. I'm sure this is a mix-up that will be corrected at the City's end.	<b>25)" to no longer include the land at 4711 Rockdale Road.</b>
26	KOENIGER, John	Owns land in lot 36 Concession 6 Osgoode which is on the south east corner of Dalmeny and Campbellcroft Roads. The property scores below the LEAR threshold score and the land to the north of Dalmeny Road is designated General Rural Area. Requests that his land also be designated General Rural Area.	<p><b>Staff does not recommend the removal of this land from the Agricultural Resource Area</b></p> <p>Because land is so variable it is inevitable that there are pockets of poorer land included in the City's Agricultural Resource Area. It is not the City's practice to remove isolated parcels from these Areas.</p> <p>Wherever possible the City defines Agricultural Resource Areas by clear boundaries preferably roads, watercourses or terrain, such as escarpments. In this situation Dalmeny Road forms the logical boundary for the Agricultural Resource Area. The land surrounding this property meets the criteria for retention in the Agricultural Resource Area.</p>
27	LAGOIS, Herb	Mr Lagois owns a property at 5921 Prince of Wales Drive which is in the Agricultural Resource Area. The land is zoned Rural Commercial and limited to only permit the offices of a general contractor. Mr Lagois would like to develop the land and asks if the property can be exempted to allow other uses.	<p><b>No Action Required.</b></p> <p>The Agricultural Resource Area designation permits a variety of on-farm and agriculturally-related uses. The Provincial Policy Statement also permits non-agricultural uses where it can be demonstrated that the use can only locate in the Agricultural Resource Area and that the least important Agricultural lands are to be used. Mr. Lagois would need to make an application with the</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			appropriate supporting information.
28	MACLEAN, Lisa & James	<p>7192 Fallowfield Rd and 2240 Conley Road Please explain why this area of the City is receiving a new designation when much better farm acreages are being developed as subdivisions and commercial use. What of this point of this administrative effort? Is the city trying to block the sale of existing farms for residential development in this specific area?</p> <p>Please also explain the impact of the proposed new LEAR score on property ownership and resale.</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b> The property located at 2240 Conley Road is not affected by the proposed amendments.</p> <p>The MacLeans were advised that the two properties identified do not rate a high LEAR score but the larger farms around these properties do score sufficiently high to be included in the Agricultural Resource Area. When these areas are identified many smaller parcels are captured in the area also. This is the case with the parcel located at 7192 Fallowfield Road.</p> <p>Both properties are just over 1 ha in size. They are recognized residential lots and will remain as such. The value of these lots would be governed by the residential market. The property located at 2240 Conley Road is not affected by the proposed amendments.</p>
29	MAYO, Dan	<p>Owns a property at 718 Oak Creek Road Carp. Mr Mayo believes that the 139 LEAR points assigned to his land is too high. A majority of the property is in trees and several acres are tied up with the Bradley Creek. A large second driveway put in by the former owner Mitel Corporation bifurcates the property. One field is a stony hill, another is low and wet. The more agricultural area is further north on Oak Creek Road. The southern end of this Road is developing other uses. He advises that under West Carleton Township the property was zoned as RU and he asks that City return the property to RU.</p>	<p><b>No Action required</b></p> <p>Based upon the soil information available to the City the soils north of Bradley’s Creek are CLI Class 2 which is the largest part of Mr Mayo’s land. He does not provide more detailed soils study confirming his information. Examination of the December 2000 consolidated West Carleton Official Plan shows this land as “Agriculture -high priority”. This designation was carried into the new City Official Plan in 2003.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
30	MCCANNELL, Laurie	Supports the protection provided by the Agricultural Resource Area north of Vars particularly protection for treed areas. Encourages the planting of more trees.	<b>No Action Required</b>
31	MCKINLAY, Doug	Owns land at 4089 Dunrobin Rd Constance Bay his property has a LEAR score of 91 and does not meet the threshold established by the City's LEAR system. Approximately 12 of my 21 acres at the back is dense forest area. The house, septic bed, road, buildings, ponds, ridge, ravines, and lawn area (with trees), make up another 5 acres at the front, for a total of about 17 acres that is not at all suitable for agriculture use. The remaining 4 acres, in the middle, is a relatively open area, with about 25 younger trees scattered over it. It is a mix of sand and Leda clay, and is not very suitable for agricultural use. Not sure how my LEAR score was achieved.	<b>Staff Agree to the designation remaining General Rural Area and propose deleting Schedule R2 in its entirety through Motion (8) "Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Lands in the vicinity of the intersection of Kilmaurs Side Road and Dunrobin Road (Response to Submissions 23, 31, 34, 38, 39, 40 &amp; 41)".</b>
32	MCMILLAN, Ann	I am in agreement with leaving my property (6882 Fallowfield Rd) with its original designation. It is cedar swamp/wetland, with acid and skimpy soil and is certainly not agricultural. I'd also like to request a copy of the Council's decision when it is made, to confirm that no change has taken place.	<b>No Action Required</b> Ms McMillan's property is designated General Rural Area and there are no changes proposed for this land.
33	MELINZ, Ursula Soloway Wright	Submitting on behalf of Minto Greenfield GP Inc. and Minto Communities Inc.  Minto has several concerns regarding the methodology applied and its potential effects on the City of Ottawa's designation of lands as an Agricultural Resource Area("ARA"). 1. Land Evaluation (LE) component, the new methodology assigns a relatively high ranking	<b>No Action Required</b>  1. and 2. The <i>Guide to the Land Evaluation and Area Review (LEAR) System for Agriculture</i> issued by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food in 2002 provides a scoring system for the various classes of soils which the City has adopted in the proposed LEAR. The <i>Guide</i> indicates, that

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		<p>to Class 4, 5 and 6 lands as compared to that of Class 1, 2 and 3 lands. Although lower class lands are assigned a lower ranking than higher class lands, the relative difference has been minimized. This is not consistent with the policies of the PPS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The City used the Provincial Field Crop points scoring system. Minto submits that the Hoffman index is more appropriate.</li> <li>3. Current methodology does not consider the economic feasibility of farming activities on Ag Land</li> <li>4. The Area Review component is problematic and the weighting of the components does not reflect the weighting approved by the LEAR Advisory Committee.</li> <li>5. The province recommends scoring surrounding land use based upon the percentage of surrounding lands used for agriculture. The method adopted by the committee is impractical and can aid in the inclusion of lower priority lands.</li> <li>6. The City has lowered the threshold score from 130 to 125 which risks capturing lands that are not viable for agriculture.</li> </ol> <p>The province is updating its soil mapping now and believes that is it premature for conclusions to be made about the designation of land until that work is completed.</p> <p>The final report was rushed and based upon weak or incorrect information or criteria.</p> <p>Minto requests that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The city reinstate the 130 threshold score of the 1997 LEAR</li> </ol>	<p>the “Field Crop Points for CLI Classes 1 to 6 represent the minimum assigned point values for each individual soil class.”</p> <p>The LEAR Working group agreed to use this scoring system.</p> <p>Since Receipt of Minto’s submissions, staff have confirmed with staff of the Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs that the Field crop points in the <i>Guidelines</i> are minimums and should not be lowered.</p> <p>The Provincial Policy Statement identifies Soil Classes 1-3 as prime but says nothing about specific weighting given to different classes of soils.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The Working Group did not decide to include a factor that specifically considered “economic feasibility”.</li> <li>4. In the minutes of May 19, 2016, the Group considered and approved the weighting of the AR factors, however at the end of the meeting the minutes state the following, “4) <i>Next meeting - Confirm weighting of AR factors, given that the surrounding use factor has been worked on by the Committee after the May 19 meeting.</i>”</li> </ol> <p>All Subsequent modeling used the 1997 weighting for the AR factors .The Working Group did not revisit the weighting issue or confirm the earlier decision. The Working Group at its meeting on September 14, 2016 approved the LEAR system proposed by staff,</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		<p>b. Replace the provincial scoring of the soil classes with the Hoffman Productivity index</p> <p>c. Replace the surrounding use factor with conflicting land uses including settlement areas</p> <p>d. Reinstate the weighting system approved by the LEAR Advisory Committee.</p>	<p>which included the new AR factors but used the 1997 LEAR weighting for the AR factors.</p> <p>5. The Ministry had no objection to the approach to the Surrounding Use factor used in the proposed LEAR and agreed to by the Working Group.</p> <p>6. The bulk of the land comprised of Class 1, 2, and 3 soils and having ongoing agriculture is found on lots with LEAR scores above the threshold of 125. While agriculture is present in varying proportions across most of the range of LEAR scores it is more concentrated in parcels with LEAR values above 125. At this threshold, the steady presence of Class 1, 2 and 3 soils is also obvious. For these reasons, properties with LEAR scores greater than 125 were reviewed as potential candidates for inclusion as part of the Agricultural Resource Area.</p> <p>The use of threshold set at 65% may have been the basis for the selection of 130 as the threshold in the O-C LEAR in 1997. However, there was no recorded basis for choosing this as a threshold. It is recognized that other LEAR systems use a range of thresholds ranging from approximately 48% to 82% of the maximum LEAR score, with a number that use a threshold of 65% of the maximum LEAR score.</p> <p>The new LEAR is different to the O-C LEAR, and the threshold score needed to be determined on the basis of the new system, Staff did this by determining how the LEAR scores represent the presence of Class 1, 2, and 3 soils and land that is</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			<p>being used for Agriculture. These two elements are the basis of the <i>prime agricultural areas</i> defined in the Provincial Policy Statement. The resulting threshold of 125 represents 62.5% of the total potential LEAR score of 200.</p> <p>The City has been instructed by the Ontario Municipal Board to proceed with the LEAR. The City was advised to use the soils information that is currently available from the province.</p> <p>In response to the requests by Minto:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. On the basis of the statistical analyses contained in the LEAR report, staff are of the opinion that the threshold score of 125 points best represents Class 1, 2, and 3 soils that are that are in agriculture.</li> <li>b. The Province considers the Provincial Field Crop Points in the Guide as minimums.</li> <li>c. The Ministry has indicated the approach used for the Surrounding Use factor in the LEAR system approved by the Working Group on September 14, 2016 is acceptable. The Working group evaluated a potential Fourth AR factor that reflected proximity to a Settlement boundary but did not pursue the factor to the final LEAR.</li> <li>e. The Working group adopted the Staff recommended LEAR and the associated weighting of factors on September 14, 2016.</li> </ul> <p>The Ministry has accepted the City's Revised</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			LEAR system.
34	MOKHTAR	This was an enquiry about a property on Kilmaur's Side Rd. Later identified as 1187 Kilmaur's Side Rd. It was being changed to Agricultural Resource Area as part of the Staff recommendation.	<b>Staff Agree to the designation remaining General Rural Area and propose deleting Schedule R2 in its entirety through Motion (8) "Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Lands in the vicinity of the intersection of Kilmaurs Side Road and Dunrobin Road (Response to Submissions 23, 31, 34, 38, 39, 40 &amp; 41)".</b>
35	MOORE, Glendon	Owns a property on the corner of Joy Side Rd. and Ottawa Street, south west of the Village of Richmond. Mr Moore requests that his land be re-designated General Rural Area because the land is fully treed and is not suitable for agricultural production.	<b>Staff does not recommend the removal of this land from the Agricultural Resource Area</b>  This parcel scores above the threshold LEAR Score despite the fact that the land is used as a pine plantation. Wherever possible the City defines Agricultural Resource Areas by clear boundaries preferably roads water courses or terrain, such as escarpments. In this situation the Agricultural Resource Area boundary follows Ottawa Street and Joy Side Rd. The Agricultural Resource Area designation and the accompanying zoning permit forestry.
36	O'ROURKE, Gloria	Owns Land at 7651 Mansfield Road and when the 1997 LEAR was completed this property did not exist and was part of farm land. Now, this is only a 2 acre piece of land with a house on it which is not being farmed. Therefore the change of land zoning to agricultural should not apply to me at this property due to its size and use.	<b>No Action Required</b> This land is part of a much larger area that the City is considering for inclusion as an Agricultural Resource Area.  Notwithstanding that, re-designation of the land as an Agricultural Resource Area will not affect the use as a residential lot. There are many such residential lots within the Agricultural Resource

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			Areas in the city.
37	PERKINS, Julie	Agrees with the staff recommendation that her property at 5030 McNeely Road Navan be re-designated to General Rural Area.	<b>No Action Required</b>
38	RITCHIE, Penny and Cliff	Objecting to re-designation of 4171 Dunrobin Road, Woodlawn, from General Rural area to Agricultural Resource Area.	<b>Staff Agree to the designation remaining General Rural Area and propose deleting Schedule R2 in its entirety through Motion (8) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Lands in the vicinity of the intersection of Kilmaurs Side Road and Dunrobin Road (Response to Submissions 23, 31, 34, 38, 39, 40 &amp; 41)”.</b>
39	ROLLAND, Gail and Steve	Object to the re-designation of 4051 Dunrobin Road from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area because it will reduce the value of their property and they will not be able to get a severance to build a smaller dwelling for their retirement.	<b>Staff Agree to the designation remaining General Rural Area and propose deleting Schedule R2 in its entirety through Motion (8) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Lands in the vicinity of the intersection of Kilmaurs Side Road and Dunrobin Road (Response to Submissions 23, 31, 34, 38, 39, 40 &amp; 41)”.</b>
40	SCOTT, Dan LaBarge Weinstein LLP for John and Margaret Styles	I am writing on behalf of John Styles and Margaret Styles. They have received letters from you dated October 27, 2016 in relation to the City of Ottawa’s Official Plan, the 2016 Land Evaluation and Area Review (LEAR) and the potential impact to three parcels of land owned by Mr. Styles and Mrs. Styles (though not jointly). In addition, Mrs. Styles received a letter in relation to the draft Official Plan Amendment and proposed changes to the designation of her land. Mr. Styles did not receive a similar letter with respect to his land. The Styles’ properties are located at 3222 Diamondview Road, Carp Road (between the	<b>Staff Agree to the designation remaining General Rural Area and propose deleting Schedule R2 in its entirety through Motion (8) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Lands in the vicinity of the intersection of Kilmaurs Side Road and Dunrobin Road (Response to Submissions 23, 31, 34, 38, 39, 40 &amp; 41)”.</b>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		<p>Thomas Dolan Parkway and Baird Side Road and abutting the Diamondview Road property) and 4131 Dunrobin Road. It appears that the only parcel that will be potentially impact is 4131 Dunrobin Road which is proposed to lose its current General Rural Area designation in favour of Agricultural Resource Area. Can you please confirm that that is the only impact on the above-noted properties?</p> <p>Please be advised that Mr. Styles and Mrs. Styles are strongly opposed to the change in designation of the relevant property. They understand that there will be a public meeting tomorrow (Nov. 22) but they will be unable to attend. Please confirm what steps Mr. and Mrs. Styles need to take in order to: (a) ensure that they continue to be informed of all steps that may be taken in relation to either of the above-noted files; and (b) preserve any right that they may have to appeal any decision to the OMB (or other relevant authority).</p>	
41	SMITH, Helen	<p>4138 Dunrobin Road and 451 Constance Bay Road (referred to as 0 Constance Road in the submission) Opposes re-designation from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area.</p>	<p><b>Staff Agree to the designation remaining General Rural Area and propose deleting Schedule R2 in its entirety through Motion (8) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Lands in the vicinity of the intersection of Kilmaurs Side Road and Dunrobin Road (Response to Submissions 23, 31, 34, 38, 39, 40 &amp; 41)”.</b></p>
42	STAPLEDON, Sandra for McMurtry, Brenda	<p>Linda Loop (corner of Thomas A. Dolan Parkway and John Shaw Road) Mrs. McMurtry is requesting the Planning Committee allow severance on this site specific area. As discussed with Mr. Finlay, D.G. Belfie Planning &amp; Development Consulting Ltd. Have</p>	<p><b>Staff Agree and propose that a new policy be added to the Official Plan through Motion (10) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Lands in the vicinity of the intersection of Thomas A. Dolan Parkway and John Shaw Road (Response to Submission 42)”.</b></p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		<p>indicated the conflicting zoning of this property i.e. the zoning doesn't allow agricultural uses, only residential uses. However the Official Plan designation doesn't allow residential uses, only agricultural uses. Mrs. McMurtry's goal is to attain severance with residential zoning to allow for infill on this property.</p>	<p>The plan of subdivision located along Linda Loop, at the corner of Thomas A. Dolan Parkway and John Shaw Road, is zoned RR – Rural Residential and is located within an Agricultural Resource Area designation. Policies for the Agricultural Resource Area permit Residential uses on exiting lots. Lot creation for new residential uses is not permitted. The property owner wishes to subdivide the remaining undeveloped Block within the subdivision, however the policies for the Agricultural Resource Area designation will not permit severances to occur. A new policy is required to permit the severance of one lot with a minimum lot size of 0.8 ha.</p>
43	SWAITA, George	<p>The LEAR scores received on my three properties                      1 ) 5635 Innes Road - LEAR score 132                      2 ) 5930 Innes Road - LEAR Score 138                      3 ) Unaddressed parcel - LEAR SCORE 142                      The subject lands are designated Agricultural Resource Area in the Official Plan. The properties are very close to the current East Urban Boundary.</p> <p>I have hired an agrologist to conduct a site-specific analysis of my lands. Also, I have hired a planner to review the LEAR results and inform on future action to be taken. I feel as though insufficient time has been provided to review the 2016 LEAR results and to evaluate the lands with respect to the re-designation criteria contained within Document 10 - Ottawa LEAR Implementation which was released less than one week ago.</p>	<p><b>No Action required</b></p> <p>The lands located at 5635 Innes Road, 5930 Innes Road and an unaddressed parcel on Trim Road received scores higher than 125 and are already located within an Agricultural Resource Area designation. Provincial policy does not support removal of isolated parcels of land from an agricultural designation, as this contributes to the fragmentation of farm land and undermines the intent of the designation. Staff recommend that the existing Agricultural Resource Area designation remain.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		<p>I respectfully request that City Staff consider the re-designation of the subject lands should the results of the review by an independent agrologist support re-designation. The final results of this review may not be available for several weeks.</p>	
44	TALBOT, Céline	<p>2217 Trim Road in Orleans                      After reading the existing and proposed definitions of the General Rural Area, we want to let you know that we do not agree with the proposed changes to the definition of the General Rural Area.                      When I read the proposed definition I am not clear as to the meaning and impact of the changes. For example, the existing one in item a. states <i>“machine and truck repair shops”</i> and the proposed one states <i>“farm equipment repair shops”</i>.                       What is the difference and what impact does it have? For item b., who would want to have such uses right beside their residence?</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b>                      The land located at 2217 Trim Road is proposed to be redesignated from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area. Adjacent lands, which include a large school site, low density residential and industrial uses, interspersed with small parcels of farm land, are also proposed to be redesignated from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area. The affected lands are located in the vicinity of the intersection of Trim Road and Innes Road and are adjacent to the urban boundary.                       The re-designation, if approved, will ultimately result in a Rural Residential zone being applied to the residential property at 2217 Trim Road. As the lands surrounding the existing residential uses are the location of an institutional use or lands that will remain in the Agricultural Resource Area designation, the re-designation will not result in changes in land use that will affect the subject lands.                       With regards to the proposed changes to the General Rural Area permissions the amendment seeks to allow agriculture related industrial and commercial uses within the General Rural Area and focus non-agricultural related industrial and commercial uses in Rural Employment Areas and within Villages.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			<p>In the cited example, the difference between the existing example of “machine and truck repair shops” and the proposed example of “farm equipment repair shops” is that truck repair shops service machinery beyond agricultural equipment and would be better located to Rural Employment Areas where their location to the highway allows for broader access, while a farm equipment dealer (such as a John Deere dealership) could still locate throughout the General Rural Area to support agricultural uses.</p> <p>For item b relating to noxious uses the existing permission has the potential to have more conflicts with adjacent residences throughout the General Rural Area. Such uses are then recommended to be located within Rural Employment Areas to reduce the potential of conflicts with existing residences.</p>
45	TASSÉ, Lorraine and Marcel	<p>Owens land at 2229 Trim Road</p> <p>-Concerned that the change of designation to General Rural Area will affect the ability to have a home-based business, such as a Daycare, a Beauty Salon, a Technician Shop, etc or that these would be limited to farm Equipment and supply centres related to agriculture and/or restaurants, gas station, motel, places of worship, retail of up to 300 square metres.</p> <p>Also concerned that the policy changes to Section 3.7.2 General Rural Area, 5. b, will permit industrial and commercial uses such as repair shops, nurseries, sand and gravel pits and underground mining, restaurant, gas station. That</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b></p> <p>The land located at 2229 Trim Road is proposed to be redesignated from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area. The surrounding lands, which include a large school site, low density residential and industrial uses, interspersed with small parcels of farm land, are also proposed to be redesignated from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area. These lands are located in the vicinity of the intersection of Trim Road and Innes Road and are adjacent to the urban boundary.</p> <p>The re-designation, if approved, will ultimately result in a Rural Residential zone being applied to</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		<p>these uses may be encouraged near their home.</p> <p>They ask that the section 3.7.2, 5b about noxious uses be kept in the Official Plan Amendment 2016, in order to protect the homeowners of the General Rural Area.</p>	<p>the residential property at 2229 Trim Road. As the lands surrounding the existing residential uses are the location of an institutional use or lands that will remain in the Agricultural Resource Area designation, the re-designation will not result in changes in land use that will affect the subject lands.</p> <p>A home-based business is permitted in any zone that permits a residential use, such as the Rural Residential zone. The proposed re-designation will not affect whether a home-based business may be established.</p> <p>With regards to the proposed changes to the General Rural Area permissions the amendment seeks to consider only agricultural-related industrial and commercial uses and convenience uses such as a restaurant, convenience store or gas station in the General Rural Area through a Zoning By-law Amendment. The recommendation would reduce the number of potential conflicts with adjacent residential uses.</p> <p>The removal of noxious uses to be considered as a potential permission through a Zoning By-law Amendment offers more protection to homeowners in the General Rural Area. The recommendation would require such uses to be considered through an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment.</p>
46	THEBERGE, Joey	3875 Barnsdale Road Requesting re-designation from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area to make better use of these lands which abut a roadway, that abuts lands inside the urban boundary, given: the soil does not retain nutrients;	<p><b>Staff does not recommend the removal of this land from the Agricultural Resource Area</b></p> <p>The subject land is located at the northerly edge of an Agricultural Resource Area designation.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		the lands scored less than 125; the changes already undertaken in the Barrhaven South CDP; the lands are bounded by Barnsdale, Viewbank and Greenbank Road.	Wherever possible the City defines Agricultural Resource Areas by clear boundaries, preferably roads, water courses or terrain, such as escarpments. In this situation Barnsdale Road forms the logical boundary for the Agricultural Resource Area. The land surrounding this property meets the criteria for inclusion.
47	WAGAR, Barrett Lloyd Phillips Consulting	In reviewing Official Plan Amendment 2016, we have discovered that the lands known municipally as 5220 Mitch Owens Road and 5230 Mitch Owens Road (both owned by Drummond's Gas) have not been chosen for re-designation in Schedule A of the Official Plan. We wish to request that these lands be added to the list of rural lands to be considered for re-designation at the upcoming Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee meeting on November 24, 2016.	<b>Staff agree that the lands be redesignated General Rural Area as shown on revised Schedule R20 in staff Motion (5) "Official Plan Amendment 2016 – 5504 Spratt Road and 5220, 5230 Mitch Owens Road (Response to Submissions 14 and 47)".</b>  The subject lands are located at the intersection of Mitch Owens Road and River Road, east of Manotick, and are zoned Rural Commercial Subzone 1, exception [387r]. These lands form part of a node of commercial uses on the north and south sides of this intersection. It is proposed to redesignate 5220, 5230 Mitch Owens Road from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area together with the commercially zoned lands on the north side of the intersection, to recognize the existing commercial uses on these lands which are in close proximity to the General Rural Area designation on the west side of River Road.
48	WILSON, Bill KRP Properties	I am writing with regards to the letter sent out to us October 27th. I am wondering if this review would result in any change to the agriculture use class designation for any land. Our land at 1513 Kilmaur's Side Road is considered Class 1 agriculture land. I just wondered if there is any	<b>No Action Required</b>  The subject lands are located in the Agricultural Resource Area designation. No changes are proposed to the designation of these lands.

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	Staff Response
		chance that could change.	
49	ZAKEM, Steve Aird & Berlis	<p>Commented on policy changes in the text to the Official Plan Amendment particularly:</p> <p>Page. 22 – Policy 2a- this is similar to draft woodlands policies; what are :”other physical, social or and (sp? Typo? ) economic criteria established for the expansion area”??</p> <p>Page. 22 – Policy 2a and b – I think, as drafted, the language is off-side to the PPS; no reference to ‘reasonable alternatives; and it provides an ‘out’ to a landowner by allowing them to do a site-specific agricultural impact study.</p> <p>This potentially undermines the purpose/intent of the City-wide LEAR study which was to identify broad areas for agricultural designation.</p> <p>PPS2014/s.1.1.3.8c) states in prime agricultural areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the lands do not comprise specialty crop areas;</li> <li>2. alternative locations have been evaluated, and               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. there are no reasonable alternatives which avoid prime agricultural areas; and</li> <li>ii. there are no reasonable alternatives on lower priority agricultural lands in prime agricultural areas;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b>Staff considers that this policy requires more consideration and will not be pursued as part of this Amendment. Proposed Policy 2 in Section 3.7.3 of the Draft Official Plan Amendment will be deleted by Motion (3) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 - Deleting Policy 3.7.3.2 from the proposed Agricultural Resource Area policies (Response to Submissions 13, 49 &amp; 86)”.</b></p>
79	FLOWERS, MARK Mattamy Homes	The submission refers to Mattamy’s Official Plan amendment application for re-designation of lands in the Wall Road area from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area. Further details are	<p><b>Staff do not support the re-designation of the Wall Road lands as part of the Official Plan Amendment 2016</b></p> <p><b>For further details, please see response for</b></p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		provided in Submission 83.	<b>Submission 83.</b>
80	MASSEY, Gilbert	Opposes the re-designation of 7594 Mansfield Road from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area.	<p><b>No Action Required</b></p> <p>The subject lands received a score of 155 points and form part of a larger area of lands having scores over 125 points along Mansfield and Fallowfield Roads between Munster Road and Conley Road.</p>
83	CHADDER, Tim JL Richards	<p>Acting for Minto, Mattamy and other owners for properties north of Wall road between Tenth Line and Trim Roads, Cumberland.</p> <p>The City has received an application for Official Plan amendment to redesignate approx 250 ha of land from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area. The submission includes an Agricultural Impact Assessment prepared by Coleville Consulting, engineering and economic evaluations done by others.</p> <p>The application requests the change in designation based on the premise that the land does not meet the threshold LEAR scores under the City's existing LEAR system. The rationale concludes that the LEAR score should reflect the downgrading of the soil capability, by two soil classes, due to the cost of tile draining the land.</p>	<p><b>Staff do not support the re-designation of the Wall Road lands as part of the Official Plan Amendment 2016</b></p> <p>While this is an application under the 1997 LEAR Staff have also reviewed the merits of the application using the proposed LEAR and as part of the Proposed Official Plan Amendment 2016.</p> <p>Under the proposed LEAR the bulk of the land scores over 135 which suggest the land should remain part of the Agricultural Resource Area.</p> <p>The City engaged AgPlan to peer review this Application and requested comments from the Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs. Both disagree with the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Colville's assessment. They consider that the rationale provided for the downgrading of the soils is a function of a limited interpretation of current economic feasibility and uses an argument rejected by OMAFRA. AgPlan's review concludes that "...there is insufficient information to support the removal of the Minto lands from the prime agricultural designation and the LEAR model appropriately includes those Minto lands as having higher agricultural value".</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			<p>The City will also be required to address the active application based on the policies in place when the application was submitted which would include the 1997 LEAR.</p>
84	GAUDET, Maurice Upton Developments Inc.	<p>Upton Developments Inc. own land west of Rideau Valley Drive just north of the Village of Kars. They are offering the City of Ottawa 3.02 acres of land between Rideau Valley Drive and the Rideau River if the City agrees to re-zone their 232.9 acres of land west of Rideau Valley Drive to permit Estate Lots.</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b> The Upton land over time has been allowed to return to scrub but is mostly class 2 soils and has a LEAR score of 134. Rideau Valley Drive is the boundary between the land to the east developed for housing and a golf course and the land to the west that is all Agricultural Resource Area. There is no reason to change the designation of this land.</p>
85	THOMPSON, Adam Novatech Engineering	<p>Represent the owners of 805 Rideau Road and 4975 Spratt Road that comprise 80.5 acres of land located between Rideau Road and the southern limits of the Riverside South Community. Novatech submits that the changes to the scoring factor related to the proximity of sensitive land uses and in particular the Urban Boundary results in the potential for land use conflicts where residential development abuts Agriculture.</p> <p>The subject lands are likely to become less attractive for crop production as Riverside expands due to complaints of noise, dust and odours from residents. To reduce the potential for conflict the City should consider Rideau Road as the boundary for the Agricultural resource Area.</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b> These lands all have a LEAR score above 165. Novatech has not submitted an Agricultural Impact Assessment to substantiate their request that this land should be removed from the Agricultural Resource Area designation.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
86	DERUYTER, NEAL MHBC Planning	MHBC is concerned that the changed policies for the Agricultural Resource Area may have the effect of prohibiting Aggregate extraction within Agricultural Areas.	<b>Staff considers that this policy requires more consideration and will not be pursued as part of this Amendment. Proposed Policy 2 in Section 3.7.3 of the Draft Official Plan Amendment will be removed by Staff Motion (3) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 - Deleting Policy 3.7.3.2 from the proposed Agricultural Resource Area policies (Response to Submissions 13, 49 &amp; 86)”.</b>
89	AHANGARAN, Hasan	2535 Munster Road Objects to the proposed re-designation of the subject lands, given that the soils are rocky and shallow, and are un-tillable.	<b>No Action Required</b> Schedule R6 has already been revised to remove the northern half of the subject lands from those areas proposed to be re-designated from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area.
90	GRAHAM, ROSS	7597 Mansfield Road Objects to the proposed re-designation of the subject lands.	<b>No Action Required</b> Schedule R6 has already been revised to remove the northern half of the subject lands from those areas proposed to be re-designated from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area.
91	MARTIN, Richard	7393 Mansfield Road Objects to re-designation of the subject lands to Agricultural Resource Area as the soils are rocky.	<b>No Action Required</b> This parcel received a LEAR score of 144 and is part of a larger area that is proposed to be re-designated to Agricultural Resource Area.
92	MASSEY, Paul	7535 Mansfield Road Objects to the re-designation of the subject lands to Agricultural Resource Area, given that the soils are shallow and un-tillable.	<b>No Action Required</b> Schedule R6 has already been revised to remove the northern half of the subject lands from those areas proposed to be re-designated from General Rural Area to Agricultural Resource Area.

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
93	SCOUTEN, Tricia Ed Scouten	<p>Harbison and Proven Line Road The subject lands are comprised of five parcels, approximately 208 ha in area. The lands are designated Agricultural Resource Area however they score below 125. Requesting re-designation from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.</p> <p>Dobson Lane adjacent to Richmond Village The property owner does not agree with the LEAR score of 169, given that the soils are rocky and shallow, making it impossible to tile drain. OMAFRA has been granted permission to take soil samples. The soil test results will more accurately reflect the limitations of the soils on the subject lands.</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b> The Harbison and Proven Line lands score below 125 due to organic soils but are still farmed. The area of the subject lands does not meet the required 250 ha minimum recommended by the Ministry Guidelines. These lands do not adjoin a General Rural Area. These lands scored low in 1997 but were not re-designated General Rural Area.</p> <p>The Dobson Lane lands are adjacent to Richmond Village. Staff recommends waiting for the soil test results before considering re-designation of the lands.</p>
94	MCCAFFREY, Connie On behalf of Margareta Droogh	<p>2989 Tenth Line Road The property owner disagrees with the LEAR scores for the subject lands, which ranged between 135 and 145.</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b> These lands are located in an Agricultural Resource Area designation. No changes are proposed to the designation of these lands.</p>
95	GREEN, Terrence On behalf of the Israr Family	<p>7129 Fallowfield Road The property owner submitted a letter objecting to the re-designation of the subject lands.</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b> The subject lands are not proposed to be re-designated. The lands are located in the General Rural Area and will not be affected by the proposed amendments.</p>
96	DESANTI, Nadia Richcraft Homes	<p>Valin Street and Innes Road Richcraft supports the re-designation of the subject lands from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.</p> <p>1508/1572 Frank Kenny Richcraft has retained Coleville Consulting to undertake an Agricultural Impact Assessment of</p>	<p><b>No Action Required</b> Valin Street and Innes Road The property owner supports the proposed re-designation.</p> <p>1508/1572 Frank Kenny The land scores over 145 and is located in an Agricultural Resource Area designation. No</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		<p>the subject lands and to review the proposed LEAR system. Preliminary findings of the Coleville study suggest that the subject lands have marginal productivity and are affected by conflicting non-farming activities in the surrounding area. Drainage improvements are infrequent and dispersed. The soil types are clay or silty clay and are poorly drained.</p> <p>With regard to the LEAR process, the Province has undertaken on-site soils testing however the results of this testing are not available for review as part of the proposed LEAR scoring. The scoring for the LE component is significantly different than the 1997 O-C LEAR, particularly for lower capability soils.</p>	<p>change is proposed to the subject lands.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

**Employment Lands**

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
12	CHOWN, Murray Novatech Engineering	The amendments to the General Rural Area policies are not intended to result in changes to the list of uses currently permitted within the Rural Commercial zone located northeast of Rockdale/Highway 417 interchange. Requests that the amendment include a new policy that specifically states that Council will not initiate amendments to remove uses permitted by the Zoning By-law.	<p><b>Staff does not recommend a new policy regarding the removal of uses permitted by the Zoning By-law.</b></p> <p>The Official Plan Amendment does not alter how current permitted uses in the Zoning By-law are treated for conformity purposes. The Official Plan Amendment proposes to only limit which new uses are to be considered through a Zoning By-law Amendment process within the General Rural Area designation.</p>
50	AMIN, Fareed Walton Development and Management	<p>The inclusion of a 120 hectare parcel southeast of Eagleson Road and Hope Side Road is contiguous to the existing urban boundary, consistent with previous boundary adjustments and is readily serviceable mixed use employment site along a major transportation corridor. Planning Committee should carefully consider whether the following issues have been addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Is there an appropriate range and mix of employment land supply?</li> <li>b. Has a thorough quantitative and qualitative analysis been conducted?</li> <li>c. Is there sufficient access to major transportation corridors that are readily serviceable?</li> <li>d. Does the city have the flexibility to promote and build “complete communities”?</li> <li>e. Do the proposed OPA 2016 policies</li> </ul>	<p><b>Staff does not recommend an urban expansion to add the subject property.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The Ottawa Employment Land Review Final Report by Hemson Consulting and Urban Strategies (the Final Report) has reviewed and provided recommendations for an appropriate range and mix of employment land supply to 2036 consistent with the PPS. The distribution and composition of the recommended employment supply is also appropriate within the context of the city’s transportation system for the movement of goods and labour pool access.</li> <li>b. The Final Report conducted a quantitative and qualitative review of employment land inventory within the city. Quantitatively the existing designated supply exceeds the 20-year limit imposed by the PPS. A qualitative exercise was performed to determine which employment lands were likely to remain vacant by 2036 and those lands were reviewed as candidate conversion areas as part of this Official Plan Amendment.</li> </ul>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		<p>optimize the City's infrastructure investment?</p> <p>f. Has the city considered identifying areas for potential growth and urban boundary expansion?</p>	<p>The inclusion of the subject property was reviewed as part of the employment land review exercise. However, given that the existing supply exceeds the 2036 limit there are other opportunities for employment growth within the urban area to accommodate the projected employment land needs to 2036. An urban expansion to include the subject property for employment purposes is not consistent with the PPS.</p> <p>c. There are sufficient employment land opportunities that are closer to Highway 416 and are serviced. The subject property does not have a particular proximity advantage to a Highway 416 interchange relative to the recommended employment land supply.</p> <p>d. The former Enterprise Areas have the capability to build complete communities, particularly those that retain residential permissions, providing flexibility of integration within the business parks. On a larger scale the employment lands outside of the Greenbelt provide a range of employment opportunities that promotes the concept of complete communities.</p> <p>e. The proposed OPA 2016 policies optimize the City's infrastructure investment by maintaining employment nodes that are planned for in the Infrastructure Master Plan (IMP) and Transportation Master Plan (TMP). In contrast, adding the subject property to the urban area for employment, commercial and residential purposes would deviate from the IMP and TMP and may require a reallocation of planned infrastructure and public service facilities such as emergency</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			<p>services.</p> <p>f. Consistent with the PPS the City has identified opportunities that can accommodate all of the projected growth within the existing urban area and therefore does not require an urban boundary expansion.</p>
51	BLACQUIERE, Faith	<p>Submitted concerns with the Kanata West Urban Employment Area as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The boundary between the Urban Employment Area and General Urban Area north of Highway 417 are too far west;</li> <li>2. The proposed Carpenters Union and UPS depot are not business park uses;</li> <li>3. Business park lands have been steadily eroded and there is little interest in providing uses that provide high paying jobs;</li> <li>4. South of Highway 417 an application for residential, retail and auto dealerships leaves the lands owned by MTO as the remaining employment lands.</li> <li>5. Reconsider the recommendations to ensure there are sufficient land to provide the highest and best uses and high-paying jobs.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Staff does not recommend any changes to the proposed Official Plan Amendment as a result of this submission.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hemson and Urban Strategies met with the landowners regarding uses adjacent to the Cabela's site and have recommended including some of these lands within the General Urban Area designation to provide a larger parcel that is more desirable for economic development purposes.</li> <li>2. Staff are of the opinion that the Carpenters Union and the UPS depot are uses that are consistent with the employment area definition in the PPS and the Official Plan.</li> <li>3. Vacant lands were assumed to be part of the business park inventory until an application demonstrated an intention for a non-employment use. This process may lead one to believe there is an erosion of business park lands; however, the Enterprise Area designation included a permission for up to 50% of the area to be non-employment.</li> <li>4. A site specific policy requiring a minimum of 21.9 gross hectares of developable employment lands retains the commitment of setting aside employment lands in relation to the Enterprise Area designation for Kanata West. The proposed</li> </ol>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			<p>Urban Employment Area extends south of the MTO owned parcel.</p> <p>5. The purpose of employment areas are to set aside lands for a cluster of employment uses. Despite their label their objective is to not provide only uses with jobs or the most jobs. One of the objectives of the Employment Land Review is to ensure the city has a sufficient supply of employment lands, that accommodates manufacturing, warehousing and offices, rather than only for uses that provide high-paying jobs.</p>
51	BLACQUIERE, Faith	Submission that the boundaries for the 416 Business Park, east of Borrisokane Road do not agree with the maps in the Vacant Industrial Land Survey, 2015 or Schedule 'B' to the Official Plan.	<p><b>Staff does not recommend any changes to the proposed Official Plan Amendment as a result of this submission.</b></p> <p>The boundaries for the 416 Business Park east of Borrisokane Road include the Prestige Business Park designation in Area 8 to the South Nepean Secondary, which are not reflected in the 2015 Vacant Industrial Land Survey and are a different shape than depicted on Schedule 'B' to the Official Plan.</p> <p>Staff have included the boundary of the Prestige Business Park in Area 8 of the South Nepean Secondary Plan as part the assessment of the conversion request to ensure the larger area has been assessed.</p>
51	BLACQUIERE, Faith	Submission that the policy of a minimum of 2,000 jobs within an Urban Employment Area	<p><b>Staff does not recommend any changes to the proposed Official Plan Amendment as a result of</b></p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		disregards the size of the area.	<p><b><i>this submission.</i></b></p> <p>New Urban Employment Areas are to provide sufficient land to accommodate a minimum of 2,000 jobs based on a diversified cluster of business types and economic activity and employment densities. Established Urban Employment Areas are to maintain sufficient land to maintain the employment objectives. Staff are satisfied that the Urban Employment Area policies provide the necessary criteria to evaluate these areas on the basis of jobs, diversified clustering and densities, all of which have a relationship to the size of an area.</p>
53	CARRARAR, Julie FoTenn	Supports the proposed area-specific policy for the Vars Business Park (section 3.7.2, policy 23 in the proposed Official Plan Amendment).	<b><i>None required.</i></b>
54	CARRARA, Julie FoTenn	Is the lead planning firm related to the East Urban Community Mixed Use Centre CDP and feels that the CDP is the appropriate process to examine transit supportive densities. Requests that the proposed Site Specific Policy 12 in Section 3.6.5 be amended to include wording that clarifies the ability of an OPA that implements the CDP to amend the minimum density provision.	<b><i>Staff agree with the request as per the wording in Motion (11) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Secondary planning process for the East Urban Community (Response to Submission 54)”.</i></b>
55	CARRARA, Julie FoTenn	Supports the proposed re-designation to General Urban Area within Riverside South.	<b><i>None required.</i></b>
56	CARRARA, Julie FoTenn	Supports the proposed re-designation to General Urban Area and the site-specific policy	<b><i>None required.</i></b>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		(section 3.6.5, policy11 in the proposed Official Plan Amendment) that sets the eastern boundary of the Urban Employment Area as the future realignment of Leitrim Road.	
57	CHOWN, Murray Novatech Engineering	The study recommends a Rural Employment Area designation at the Highway 416 & Fallowfield Rd interchange. However limiting this designation to the area north of Fallowfield Rd only recognizes existing land uses and does little to increase the supply of employment lands at this interchange. Request re-designating lands southwest of Moodie Drive and Fallowfield Road to Rural Employment Area.	<p><b>Staff recommends including the subject lands and lands with existing employment uses southeast of Moodie Drive and Fallowfield Road within the adjoining Rural Employment Area designation as per Motion (12) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – Lands west of the Highway 416 and Fallowfield Road interchange (Response to Submissions 11 and 57)”.</b></p> <p>The lands southeast of Moodie Drive and Fallowfield Road have existing employment uses and as such, given the results of the LEAR process it would be appropriate to re-designate these lands to Rural Employment Area.</p> <p>Given the LEAR process the lands southwest of Moodie Drive and Fallowfield Road have the potential to add vacant rural employment lands to the Moodie Drive business park, which currently only has approximately 7.0 net hectares under Hydro ownership. It would be appropriate to increase economic development opportunities at this business park to capitalize the benefits of the Highway 416 and Fallowfield Road interchange as recommended by the Employment Land Review Final Report.</p> <p>The Official Plan Amendment does not recommend designating the entire Moodie Drive business park within the City’s rural employment land inventory. Portions of the quarry on the west side of Moodie Drive and the portion north of the FedEx terminal</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			<p>have been excluded from the Rural Employment Area due to the existing Limestone Resource and Natural Environment Area designations.</p> <p>The proposed Rural Employment Area north of Moodie Drive and Fallowfield Road is 56.9 hectares, which is less area than the current inventory of 95.5 hectares for the applicable rural business park.</p> <p>The addition of the subject lands is 20.6 hectares and when combined with the proposed Rural Employment Area to the north is 77.5 hectares, which is 18.0 hectares less than the current inventory. Therefore the addition of the subject lands represents no net increase of the existing rural employment land supply.</p> <p>The Rural General Industrial (RG) Zone is intended to accommodate a range of light industrial uses and limited service commercial uses that respects adjacent land uses and will have a minimal impact on the surrounding rural area. This would be the appropriate implementing zone for a Rural Employment Area designation southwest of Moodie Drive and Fallowfield Road given the adjacent residential uses that front onto Fallowfield Road.</p>
58	CHOWN, Murray Novatech Engineering	Supports the proposed re-designation to Arterial Mainstreet and General Urban Area in the South Orléans Business Park as shown on schedule E12 of the proposed Official Plan Amendment.	<b>None required.</b>
59	CHOWN, Murray Novatech Engineering	No consideration or analysis for the interchange of Highway 7 and Hazeldean Rd. If precluded because of Rural Natural Feature designation, this designation does not preclude	<p><b>Staff does not recommend designating the subject lands as Rural Employment Area.</b></p> <p>The terms of reference from Council specifically</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
		development. Request a rural employment node at the intersection of Highway 7 and Hazeldean Road.	<p>requested "...to study all 400 series interchanges, not including those located in an agricultural resource area, to determine if potential unique economic opportunities exist, what the land uses are, and how they can be serviced."</p> <p>Most of the lands surrounding the interchange are designated Rural Natural Features Area and Significant Wetlands. These designations precluded an interchange from further consideration due to the uncertainty of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The requirement for an EIS is to demonstrate no negative impacts to the natural features and the absence of a study demonstrating the same, limits the potential for this area as a focus for rural employment growth. From an economic development stand point the Rural Employment Area designation should provide clarity on the permitted uses rather than be conditional upon a study. To date no EIS has been received that demonstrates no negative impacts.</p> <p>Further, there is more than enough Rural Employment land supply and there is no need to increase the existing supply.</p> <p>The Westwood Industrial Area is a Rural Business Park that is currently within the rural employment land inventory and is within a General Rural Area designation. However, one of the criteria for a candidate Rural Employment Area is a cluster of employment uses. The existing businesses of Permacon and Metro Scrap Metal are segregated and are not comparable to the cluster of uses at the nearby Carp Road Corridor Rural Employment Area.</p> <p>The proximity of the Carp Road Corridor Rural</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			Employment Area means that it can also act as a focus for potential employment growth in the Hazeldean Road and Highway 7 area.
61	HUME, Peter 2325482 Ontario Inc.	The owners of 195 Huntmar Road are satisfied that the proposed re-designations to Urban Employment Area and General Urban Area reflect applications filed in September 2016.	<b>None required.</b>
63	MCELLIGOT, Matthew FoTenn	Is acting on behalf of Huntington Properties at 60 Denzil Doyle Court, northwest of Eagleson Road and Michael Cowpland Drive in the Kanata South Business Park. Requests an Arterial Mainstreet or General Urban Area designation for the southern portion of the property.	<p><b>Staff does not recommend the conversion of this land from an employment area designation. The uses that typically occupy the proposed floor space are already permitted within the proposed Urban Employment Area designation.</b></p> <p>60 Denzil Doyle Court does not have frontage onto the Arterial Mainstreet of Eagleson Road. The bulk of the property fronts onto Denzil Doyle Court and due to the depth from Michael Cowpland Dr does not create a condition that is consistent with the intent to capture properties on abutting side streets that exist within the same corridor.</p> <p>There does not appear to be a demonstrated need for a conversion of the subject property to either the Arterial Mainstreet or General Urban Area designations to permit retail given the existing retail uses adjacent to the subject property within the Eagleson Arterial Mainstreet. In addition there are vacant Arterial Mainstreet lands south of Fernbank Road and Romina Street.</p> <p>The Arterial Mainstreet designation relies on property boundaries to delineate the extent of the designation. In absence of a new property boundary through a land division process the Arterial Mainstreet</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			<p>designation can only be applied to a parcel in whole.</p> <p>Due to the limited building floor space proposed for an Arterial Mainstreet designation fronting onto Michael Cowpland Drive, many of the uses would likely be of an ancillary nature and would be permitted within the Urban Employment Area designation. It is not clear that an Arterial Mainstreet designation is required to proceed with many of the uses that could potentially occupy the proposed building fronting onto Michael Cowpland Drive. The proposed Urban Employment Area designation permits ancillary and low density uses that fits within the concept of a small plaza that has been prepared and discussed with staff over the past four years.</p>
64	MICHAUD, Michael Ashcroft Homes	Owns a 2.3 ha parcel northwest of Colonnade Road and Prince of Wales Drive. Requests the inclusion of residential uses to permit townhouses and apartments through a site specific exception. Ashcroft has not had success finding an employment use on the site and believes that a residential use complements their other residential use (within a General Urban Area designation) near the subject land and represents an infill and redevelopment opportunity.	<p><b>Staff does not recommend the conversion of this land from an employment area designation. Additional permitted uses through zoning conformity are recommended as per Motion (13) “Official Plan Amendment 2016 – 103 Colonnade Road (Response to Submission 64)”.</b></p> <p>Hemson and Urban Strategies have previously considered this request through the development of the Employment Land Review final report and have not recommended a conversion for this business park or any other business park inside the Greenbelt.</p> <p>Through the Official Plan Amendment process staff have evaluated the request in Document 5 to the staff report and recommend retaining an employment area designation on the subject land. There is no demonstrated need for the proposed townhouses/apartments, which also have the potential to disrupt employment uses.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
			<p>The subject property has limited uses through Exception 292 in the Zoning By-law. Exception 292 applies to 15 and 103 Colonnade Road, which carried forward the more restrictive uses in the former Nepean Zoning By-law through the consolidated City of Ottawa Zoning By-law 2008-250. OMB Decision PL080959 on May 15 2009 only relates to height and density at 15 Colonnade Road. To provide a broader range of employment uses staff recommend that when Official Plan Amendment 2016 is being implemented by amendments to Zoning By-law 2008-250, all of the permitted uses in the Light Industrial (IL) Zone be added to 103 Colonnade Road.</p>
65	TREMBLAY, Miguel FoTenn	Supports the proposed Official Plan policy (section 3.6.5, policy 2f) in its current form and encourage Planning Committee to recommend approval of this component of the Official Plan Amendment.	<b>None required.</b>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

**2036 Growth Projections**

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
49	ZAKEM, Steven Aird & Berlis	Section 2.2.2, Policy 3 on page 9 of the proposed Official Plan Amendment has very precise intensification %. They say that is the minimum proportion for the urban area; should refer to built-up urban area (i.e. exclude urban expansion areas = greenfields).	<p><b>Staff does not recommend any changes to the proposed Official Plan Amendment as a result of this submission.</b></p> <p>The ramping of the intensification % every five years was an outcome of an Ontario Municipal Board hearing relating to OPA 76. The proposed Official Plan Amendment carries forward the intensification targets into the next five-year period post-2031.</p> <p>Section 2.2.2 Policies 1 and 2 provides a definition for intensification that effectively refers to the built-up urban area (being four years or older) and excludes urban expansion areas.</p>
78	DALLA ROSA, Lisa Cardel Homes	Requests additional time to review the growth projections in the proposed Official Plan Amendment.	<p><b>Staff does not recommend any changes to the proposed Official Plan Amendment as a result of this submission.</b></p> <p>This Official Plan Amendment is subject to approval by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and as such will require a review period by the province. Further the Official Plan Amendment will be reviewed by the Ontario Municipal Board as part of the OPA 150 appeals, potentially in the summer or fall of 2017. Between Council adoption, approval by the Minister, and review by the Ontario Municipal Board, staff will work with the industry to review any concerns and should any modifications be recommended these will be provided to a future Council meeting before subsequently requesting approval to either the Minister or the Ontario Municipal Board.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<b>Staff Response</b>
79	FLOWERS, Mark Davies Howe	Request a deferral on recommendations pertaining to the growth projections.  Request that the city work with Mattamy.	<p><b>Staff does not recommend any changes to the proposed Official Plan Amendment as a result of this submission.</b></p> <p>This Official Plan Amendment is subject to approval by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and as such will require a review period by the province. Further the Official Plan Amendment will be reviewed by the Ontario Municipal Board as part of the OPA 150 appeals, potentially in the summer or fall of 2017. Between Council adoption, approval by the Minister, and review by the Ontario Municipal Board, staff will work with the industry to review any concerns and should any modifications be recommended these will be provided to a future Council meeting before subsequently requesting approval to either the Minister or the Ontario Municipal Board.</p>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

**Submissions reflected in Motions carried at Planning Committee on November 22 2016**

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	Staff Response
51	BLACQUIERE, Faith	Submitted recommendations to align the Carp Road Corridor Rural Employment Area with the rezoning approved by Council in 2014 to implement the Carp Road Corridor study.	<b>Done. This was addressed by a staff supported Motion at the November 22 2016 Planning Committee moved by Councillor T. Tierney to amend Schedule E1 to reflect the zoning changes made through By-law 2014-166 as part of the Carp Road Corridor Study.</b>
52	BOLIVAR, Roddy Carp Road Corridor BIA	Please ensure Schedule E-1 provides the boundaries of the Employment Area as matching the boundaries of properties zoned for employment use.	<b>Done. This was addressed by a staff supported Motion at the November 22 2016 Planning Committee moved by Councillor T. Tierney to amend Schedule E1 to reflect the zoning changes made through By-law 2014-166 as part of the Carp Road Corridor Study.</b>
60	CLODD, Aaron SmartREIT	Owns a 6.5 ha parcel southeast of Innes Road and Mer Bleue Road that designated as Employment Area in the Official Plan with IG Zoning. Requests the inclusion of a retirement home and a residential care facility as a permitted use through a site specific exception. Feels this will complement a planned seniors residence apartment on a parcel immediately to the west within the Arterial Mainstreet designation and will provide associated jobs.	<b>Done. This was addressed by a Motion at the November 22 2016 Planning Committee moved by Councillor S. Blais to provide a site specific exception for a retirement home and residential care facility.</b>
97	PHILIPS, Ted Taggart	Supports the Motion at the November 22 2016 Planning Committee moved by Councillor T. Tierney regarding the initiation of a planning study which will identify trends in housing (including housing supply), employment and identify opportunities to create complete communities.	<b>None required.</b>

Document 1: Submissions - Draft Official Plan Amendment 2016

SUB NO.	NAME Organisation	Submission	<i>Staff Response</i>
98	MURPHY, Susan Minto	Supports the Motion at the November 22 2016 Planning Committee moved by Councillor T. Tierney to add Schedule E9, which has the effect of re-designating 1.2 hectares of "Employment Area" to "General Urban Area".	<b><i>None required.</i></b>
99	JOHANIS, Paul Greenspace Alliance	Supports the growth projections as recommended by staff in the proposed Official Plan Amendment.	<b><i>None required.</i></b>
12	CHOWN, Murray Novatech Engineering	Acts for the owner 6282 Frank Kenny Road South of Vars and Part of the land zoned RC-Rural Commercial Area On Rockdale Road. Part of This property and part of an adjoining property, also in the RC zone, is designated Agricultural Resource Area in the Official Plan. This designation does not permit the types of Commercial uses currently permitted by the Zoning. The owner requests that the designation be changed so that the zoned land falls within the General Rural designation.	<b><i>Done. This was addressed by a staff supported Motion at the November 22 2016 Planning Committee moved by Councillor T. Tierney to add Schedule R17 that changes the designation of the northern part of the property at 6282 Frank Kenny Road and the western part of the property at 210 Hughson Place from Agricultural Resource Area to General Rural Area.</i></b>