

County Official Plan Modifications

Meeting Minutes – August 15, 2024 Technical Advisory Committee OP Modification Meeting No. 9



Location: Committee Room, County Court House

Attendees: Arya Hejazi (HBM), Matt Wilkinson (CM), Emily Baker (OSM), Karen Ellis (CM), Ed Whitmore (AN), Derek Bertram (TL), Per Lundberg (SEL), Emily Fitzgerald (NK), Iain Mudd (County), Keziah Holden (County)

Regrets: Darryl Tighe (NK), Christina Coulter (DD), Madhupreeta Muralidhar (DD Student), Tom Cowie (Hiawatha FN), Kaitlin Hill (Curve Lake FN), Adele Arbour (TL), Barb Waldron (TL), Bryan Weir (County)

NOTE: Modification Meetings are being held to draft modifications to the new Official Plan to be consistent with the draft Provincial Planning Statement and as directed by County Council through report PPW 2023-17, and to incorporate Official Plan Amendments approved since the time of adoption of the new Official Plan.

Meeting started at 2:07pm

Items and issues discussed at the meeting were as follows:

Revisit Previous Policy Review

- Time is scheduled at the start of each meeting that will allow TAC members to revisit any previous modifications, recognizing that additional thoughts or insight may be gained between meetings.
- Previously noted that intensification target is currently set at 40 residents and jobs combined per hectare – County Staff still researching this to determine whether an alternative figure should be used as it has historically been a difficult number to reach.
- County Staff discussed the possibility of removing individual or clusters of residential lots from the Agriculture designation with MMAH. Province advised that direction has been to leave those lots in the Agriculture designation. These lots are largely developed with little opportunity for further severances. OP policy allows them to be in a different zoning category to recognize their residential use.
- Update on Watershed Plan was provided. The contract was awarded to Matrix Solutions Inc. County Staff will be meeting with Matrix in the next few weeks, and a Technical Advisory Committee will be formed specifically for the Watershed Plan.

- Discussion to be had with Risk Management Official with regard to new PPS policies and relationship with highly vulnerable aquifers/groundwater recharge areas.
- Direction from Council needed on whether language to address cross-border servicing, similar to that which was included in the City of Peterborough OP, should be included. It is anticipated that this would be included as part of the overall list of modifications put before Council.

Proposed Modifications based on draft PPS (2024)

- Preference of TAC is to create a new land use designation which highlights certain environmental features and provides direction on how these features are to be addressed at the time of development. Showing these features on the Land Use Schedules not only highlights their importance but provides the reader with a clearer overall picture of the constraints on a property.
 - Features included in this new designation are intended to maintain a level of protection that falls between the current requirements of the Growth Plan with the proposed requirements of the new PPS. There are many environmentally sensitive areas in the County that are not addressed by the PPS. The new OP should provide everyone with clear direction on all types of features.
 - New 'Environmentally Sensitive Area' designation will capture locally significant wetlands and a 30m vegetative buffer, provincially significant Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI's), and a 30m vegetative buffer around streams. New lots may be created within these features, but may be required to demonstrate that there is a sufficient building envelope located outside of the feature and associated buffer. An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) may also be required in accordance with other policies of the Plan.
- Non-evaluated wetlands continue to be a complex feature to address due to the quality of the dataset and its vast coverage across the County. There are examples from all areas of the County where the data is correct, and also where it is inaccurate so there is no 'one size fits all' solution.
 - TAC has provided direction to show non-evaluated wetlands on an Environmental Schedule (these schedules already exist in the adopted OP) with policy text to provide direction that is specific to these features.
- Discussion around 30m water setback being applied to major rivers in the County vs a 30m vegetative buffer around streams. Direction to provide a definition for "waterbodies" to be created which clarifies where the 30m water setback is applicable.
- Natural Heritage System (NHS) was briefly discussed. Noted that the draft PPS only requires a Natural Heritage System in ecoregions 6E and 7E. The County of Peterborough is split between ecoregion 5E (north end of County) and 6E (south end of County).

- While there has been support for utilizing the Kawarthas Naturally Connected mapping as the NHS for the new OP, some Townships in ecoregion 5E may not wish to have it applied if it is not a requirement of the PPS.
- PPS does allow Official Plans to provide greater protection provided that such policies do not conflict with the PPS.
- Linkages will be key to the NHS since many of the other features within the system will be protected through other policies.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm