

Response Table for Written Submissions Received During Statutory Consultation

No.	Comment From	Comment Summary	Region Response
1	Jennifer Dockstader - Fort Erie Native Friendship Centre	1.3.6 comment: I would bold this for emphasis	Thank you for the comment.
2	City of Niagara Falls	<p>We note and appreciate the change in the policies to remove the rigid language surrounding the policies for Direction to local municipalities. It is essential that the Regional Plan provide guidance without creating instances requiring multiple future amendments to accommodate the individual nature of the local area municipalities.</p> <p>With regards to Chapter 3 - Sustainable Niagara – our comments of November 11, 2021 stand as they relate to the environmental policies as few of our observations seem to have been translated in the updated Section.</p> <p>We do realize the time constraints and pressure associated with the Province’s timelines for the creation of the Region’s Official Plan however, we would expect that some future adjustments to the text and policies will be required in the future to improve readability and to make the format more intuitive to all readers of the Plan.</p>	Responses were provided to the City of Niagara Falls comment dated November 11, 2021 as part of the report that went to Regional Council in December in regards to the selection of the preferred NES option.
3	Gracia Janes on behalf of the The Niagara District Council of Women	What harm is there in any delay this might cause in meeting the proposed provincial deadline?	Staff are required to bring a document for adoption by Council before the provincial conformity date.

No.	Comment From	Comment Summary	Region Response
4	Gracia Janes on behalf of the The Niagara District Council of Women	<p>Today there is substantial and growing public concern in Niagara about this proposed Niagara Regional Official Plan, which needlessly predicts and plans for urbanization of our treasured natural areas and prime farmlands in Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, and West Lincoln, and climatically suitable grape lands in Niagara Falls . And elsewhere across Ontario there is overwhelming public support for the growing number of municipalities such as Peel, Hamilton, Halton, Orillia, York, Durham, Oxford who are willing to take the risk of having their protective farmland and natural area Official Plans turned down by the Province . They know that in this time of climate change and extreme weather events, prime farmlands, that produce food close to markets, and provide an excellent carbon sink are invaluable finite resources , as are treasured natural heritage resources. Niagara District Council of Women urges Regional Councillors to consider the impact of accepting the current Regional Planning Department proposed Official Plan and join other Ontario Municipalities in their opposition to unneeded and extremely damaging urbanization of farmlands and heritage natural resources .</p>	Thank you for the comment.
5	John Bacher on behalf of Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society	<p>To summarize, in our experience PALS has no great complaint about the contents of the current Niagara Regional Official Plan, and we are dismayed that after approximately three years of public consultations few improvements have emerged in the proposed new Official Plan. In fact, we find it shocking that the recommended urban boundary expansion</p>	The Land Needs Assessment calculates a community and employment land need in certain municipalities despite a higher (60%) regional intensification rate. Impacts to the natural environment and agricultural

No.	Comment From	Comment Summary	Region Response
		<p>areas in an Official plan that is going to guide the protection of our prime farmlands, natural areas and potential new grape lands in Niagara over the next 30 years, needlessly proposes urban development expansions onto such lands in Niagara Falls, West Lincoln, Fort Erie and Fonthill.</p>	<p>systems were key criteria in deciding where expansions should take place.</p>
6	NR Bodimeade	<p>I'm concerned still at the level of sprawl expansion we see proposed in this plan, and the lack of protection for what few wild and unbuilt-upon spaces remain. Natural areas can act as an important buffer to increasingly extreme weather events we're witnessing and having to pay for as a result of climate change. Ecosystem-based Adaptation is a very promising, well-studied alternative to face this future. As a citizen, we don't want more sprawl. We don't want where we grew up to be turned into a "transportation corridor" just of people travelling between two places, and we shouldn't allow this to happen. This is a home, a place, and it should be valued as such, not simply as a way-between or a profit-making site of extraction. Already we see problems as a result of "development" – properties downstream of East Fonthill development eroding as a result of poor planning. Shriner's Creek in Niagara Falls has been filled with E Coli.</p> <p>The choice isn't a binary between 20-story Port Dalhousie luxury condos, and endless single-family detached sprawl. We can have attached duplexes and triplexes. Housing like this is the norm in much of the world, including for any of you who have visited, in one of the most beautiful cities in the world, Paris.</p>	<p>The extent of settlement areas expansions is based on a land needs assessment that incorporates an intensification rate that is higher than the Provincial requirement.</p> <p>The land needs assessment has indicated more employment lands are required within certain communities.</p> <p>The impact on the natural environment and agricultural systems were important assessment criteria in the settlement area boundary review. Areas have been selected to try and limit impact on these areas. Where natural features are brought into the urban area they will be protected by the same policies as other natural features within the current urban areas.</p> <p>For larger areas, development will proceed by secondary plans in concert with subwatershed plans to ensure</p>

No.	Comment From	Comment Summary	Region Response
		<p>We don't need more "employment land". As we saw during the pandemic, people increasingly can and want to work from home. We don't need more road development. Increasingly autonomous vehicles will drive transport during nights.</p> <p>We can have infilling. Including of areas currently of single-family detached houses. This can be a joyful density.</p> <p>I am baffled by the deference this Plan seems to give to aggregate extraction.</p> <p>I've heard talk of the Region's eventual intent to plan for climate change, and a Regional Greening Plan, however, I implore you to go further and make use of this Plan to its full capacity.</p>	<p>growth options protect the natural environment system.</p>
7	Ken Carey - The St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation	<p>The Niagara Region is proposing to change the land-use along the Welland Canal to reflect Protected Countryside, Niagara Escarpment Plan Area, Urban Areas, Core, Dynamic, and Future Employment Areas. As you may be aware, SLSMC manages heavy industrial land for current and future business operations; along the Welland Canal from Port Weller to Port Colborne. These heavy industrial lands provide support for all forms of transportation and handling of heavy/project cargo or bulk commodities, including but not limited to, heavy machinery and trucking activities 24/7 (road and marine activities).</p> <p>Although, SLSMC will continue to manage all federally owned lands designed as heavy industrial lands, SLSMC is requesting the Niagara Region alter the proposed Niagara Official Plan to exempt all</p>	<p>St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation can exercise their legal rights as an upper tier government as legally allowed.</p>

No.	Comment From	Comment Summary	Region Response
		federally owned lands managed by SLSCMC from the Niagara Official Plan.	

Chapter 2 (Growing Region) Comments with Response Matrix

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
1	Niagara Parks Commission	2.2	2.2.2.1	2.2.2.1 Number error – shown as 2.1.2.1	This has been corrected.
2	Niagara Parks Commission	2.2	2.2.1.1h	2.2.1.1 h Gentle density not-defined. Suggest add 'gentle density' to glossary Add clarity to plan and policy intent	Decision to leave undefined.
3	Niagara Parks Commission	2.2	2.2.4.8	2.2.4.8 Smart City Strategy in capitals as a title but not defined Suggest Add Smart City Strategy to glossary Adds clarity to plan	It is a Strategy to be developed and its scope will be developed at that time.
4	Jennifer Dockstader for Fort Erie Native Friendship Centre	2.1	2.1.1 c	Affordable housing should also start using Affordable Home Ownership. After all there is better revenue for home ownership than rental.	Affordable housing ownership targets are established. The Plan promotes a variety of housing types to deal with age in place and affordability.
5	Jennifer Dockstader for Fort Erie Native Friendship Centre	2.1	2.1.1 e	Solar and other "green", net Zero impact	The Plan contains policies to transition to net zero communities.
6	Jennifer Dockstader for Fort Erie Native Friendship Centre	2.2	2.2.2.10 c	YES! Let's clean up past messes where we didn't know better and do better. Deserves a bold	Thank you for your comment. Staff appreciates your support for the policy.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
7	Jennifer Dockstader for Fort Erie Native Friendship Centre	2.2	2.2.2.14	Please consider an e Space for community gardens	Addressed by Policy 7.8.1.1€.
8	Jennifer Dockstader for Fort Erie Native Friendship Centre	2.3	2.3	Please consider adding Affordable Home Ownership as well	The plan establishes targets for affordable home ownership.
9	Gino Vendittelli			<p>I have a parcel of land in Vineland, approximately 1.75 acres, that I purchased in the 1980s to expand the Auto Service Centre/Petro Canada that I owned at the time. I applied for rezoning on this property in the early 90s as I was going to open a Subaru dealership and the rezoning was approved by the Town of Lincoln. The only condition that I had to satisfy was to merge the parcels, but since the early 90s fell upon hard economic times. My thought process was to revisit this in the future when the economic climate got better...well it did get better but, in the meantime, the Provincial government at the time decided to institute the Greenbelt Plan and arbitrarily drew a boundary with no regard for exceptions. The property address is [REDACTED] and surrounded by homes and agricultural. The current bylaws allow 40% of land coverage which will allow me to build 30,000 sq ft of</p>	Urban expansions are not permitted on to specialty crop identified in the Greenbelt Plan. The Region has made the Province aware of various mapping issues during the provincial coordinated land review and can do the same at the next coordinated provincial plan review.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				residential with 3 rooms of B&B and an auxiliary storage building but because it's in the Greenbelt, no other type of development is allowed. If I built what is currently allowed on this property it would render it useless as agricultural land and would not allow the residential density mandated by the Ontario government to be fulfilled. There's a housing shortage and this property would be ideal for a residential infill development and I urge you to consider adding this property as a residential development land.	
10	Harsh Pabla			[REDACTED] - I would like to request information in regards to Zoning, official plan and or whether this land IS or WILL be in the future consider as Settlement Area Boundary Technical Adjustment and Rationalization Review.	Staff have previously responded to this inquiry - the property in question is not within the existing settlement area boundary. Further the property is not within the proposed settlement area boundary from either an expansion, rationalization or technical boundary change perspective as part of the proposed Niagara Official Plan. The proposed expansion areas were made after an extensive and comprehensive settlement area boundary review.
11	Paul J L Hicks			High rise apartments units are being allowed without any consultations with owners in surrounding properties, especially where single family homes already exist; these taxpayers deserve to have their concerns addressed and mitigated. Planning department should be directly involved with these owners, and not just rubber stamp big construction company plans. Will the region maintain control over levels of planning departments by setting up a definitive code whereby present area owners must be given direct notice of any large condo or rental projects as soon as a company	The region establishes overall growth allocations and intensification targets for individual municipalities. The region's policies also encourage secondary planning and intensification strategies to establish a community blueprint for how intensification can occur in local municipalities. Local municipalities at a minimum must comply with the requirement of the Planning Act on notification.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>proposes to build, and their concerns must be addressed before any approval to build is given. Additionally a yearly review of building site designations must be done, and those affected must be notified; again planing departments must not be allowed to rubber stamp long ago approved land designations, and not inform the tax paying owners affected by the proposed construction (as happened on [REDACTED]) and other areas. For low income accommodation, will the region and municipalities enforce a proposal for condo or rental units that it should include a designated number of less expensive condos or lower rent affordable units. The companies must be held accountable, by fine or permit revocation; if they do not provide units as stipulated in their proposal.</p>	
12	Ms. Shari Ruston and Dr. Arne Rungi			<p>Our question is why a 51 acre property (assessment parcels [REDACTED]) with the majority of the property designated as prime agricultural land chosen over 76 acres (assessment parcels [REDACTED]) of rural and rural residential land identified for urban expansion by the Niagara region, service by Town water, abutting current urban residential lands that are approved for a plan of subdivision, and with great access to transportation routes as it has significant frontage on a main collector road, deeded use of a Town right of way to Hwy#3 and the opportunity to utilize a closed road allowance still in possession of the Town. What would the process be to have this property re-examined for urban expansion?</p>	<p>The property you identified as assessment parcel [REDACTED] was evaluated through our Settlement Area Boundary Review (SABR ID 1368).</p> <p>The site scored well based on our assessment criteria. Ultimately, we can only add a set amount of land to the Urban Area Boundary and other sites within Fort Erie were determined to be more appropriate for expansion at this time.</p> <p>The Region is required to include the Provincial agricultural system policies and mapping as set out in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>If this site will not be re-considered for urban expansion through this process then what options exist as this site is a large rural plot of land with Town water and great transportation access?</p> <p>We own a 20 acre property (assessment parcels [REDACTED] on the south west corner of [REDACTED]. Three new 2.5 acre lots were severed from this parcel in 2021 with a 12.5 acre remnant parcel remaining. In the new regional official plan, the zoning calls for this land to be changed to prime agricultural area from agricultural and rural. After going through a thorough hydrological study for the severances, the close proximity to Sherkston Shores Resort, across the road from the Hamlet commercial Sherkston go-cart track, north of rural lands with resident housing, south of Hamlet lands that currently house a community centre and residential homes, and east of a land locked parcel of agricultural land (planted with rotating crops) that is accessed through a hamlet residential property on Sherkston Rd, we do not understand how the land would be considered prime agricultural. Could you please provide a rational for this change? What is the process to have this land designation reinstated to its current status?</p>	<p>This parcel of land is already predominantly identified as Prime Agricultural Area. A small portion of your parcel has been identified as a “Candidate Area” for inclusion into a Prime Agricultural Areas designation by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, and through development of the new Plan, the residual portion (candidate area) has been assessed and deemed suitable for inclusion in the Prime Agricultural Area designation.</p> <p>Final determinations on Prime Agricultural Area designations will be made by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs as well as the Minister of Municipal Affairs.</p>
13	Scott Robinson			<p>My name is Scott Robinson - I'm a NOTL resident and a housing advocate in the region. I'm searching around the site to try and understand what the proposed official plan includes for secondary suites</p>	<p>Policy 2.3.3.2: Local municipalities shall permit as-of-right up to two additional residential units within new or existing residential development, subject to Provincial legislation and appropriate land use, size, and</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				and accessory dwelling units. Could you help point me in the right direction, for what documents I should be reading?	locational criteria. Anything more detailed is dealt with by local Official Plans.
14	Parva Vora			<p>My 1st request is to expand the number of General Commercial properties and incorporate properties such as mine. The reason for requesting it is not complex but simply based on the Official Plan and Bylaw from the 1970s which included 3 properties to the eastern side of my house and converted them to a GC zone along with the plaza that is to the north of my house. I request that my property be given a fair chance for it to be incorporated into a GC zone, considering the fact that properties adjacent to my eastern side are GC although they bear the same detached home characteristics as mine and are facing the same plaza. I am not simply claiming this because it's an adjacent property, but also because it is a part of the same block within Colborne St. which has 6 houses with relevant similarities to the first two houses that are GC([REDACTED]).</p> <p>The city is also looking forward to improving housing diversity to improve its economy, and such small steps toward commercialization would be similar to that of the 1970's official plan and would make more room for small commercial enterprises since the demand for affordable offices and small businesses are attracting people to our city.</p>	Staff have responded and identified this to be a local planning matter. A contact for staff in the Niagara Falls planning department was provided.
15	Parva Vora			My 2nd request is to have easier regulations for Vacation Rental operations since the current regulations require that middle-class homeowners pay close to \$ 22,000	This is a local planning matter. Please contact the City of Niagara Falls planning department.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>fees. The fees and process are almost at par with what major operations such as motels or hotels would pay. I believe that the city should be fairer to the middle-class homeowners who make their living from such operations while contributing to the economy and reasonable increment to the property prices. There are close to 1000 such VRUs operating in the City of Niagara bringing in almost 720,000 guests to the city on an annual basis. The VRU currently contributes to almost 10% of the 10000 rooms of hotel,motel and bnb rooms that are booked every night. Therefore, instead of harsh regulations, it would be favourable for the city to implement affordable licences and include more zones for the homeowners to obtain a licence..</p> <p>I sincerely request the council to look into this matter because the City of Niagara falls relies on its millions of tourists each year who want the new type of convenience called VRU. The global tourism industry is evolving and Niagara Falls is one of the most famous destinations and must not be left behind by fearing something that does not exist.</p>	
16	Sydney DiTomasso for Better Neighbourhoods			<p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In urban areas, mandate local Official Plans to require a maximum of 1 stall per dwelling unit, allow tandem parking, and remove parking requirements for ADUs -Encourage municipalities to strive for “minimal parking”, or the smallest number of parking spaces possible. - Eliminate discriminatory language and policies that hinder the evolution of neighbourhoods - Mandate that Local Official Plans limit restrictive 	<p>Regional policies encourage intensification in local municipalities in a strategic fashion encouraging secondary planning and intensification strategies. Policies promote complete streets approach and active transportation. The Growth Plan requires the Region to consider market demand in planning for communities. The Plan provides flexibility to the local municipalities in the approach used to achieve outcomes.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>policies and superfluous requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) - Improve walkability, safety, and development by allowing Level of Service (LOS) Level F on Regional Roads - Implement narrower lanes to encourage slower driving speeds and improve pedestrian safety while maintaining goods movement. - Design Regional roads to be no more than 3-lanes - Laneways should be strongly encouraged where context appropriate, unless it is demonstrated unpractical - Require local Official Plans to prioritize new infill housing proposals over the ambiguous policy goals of ‘preserving’ neighbourhood ‘character’ in ‘established’ neighbourhoods. - Low-density, single-family housing should be discouraged, if not redesignated. - High-traffic roads, such as Welland Avenue and Ontario Street in St. Catharines, should have protected cycling infrastructure that fills in the gaps across Niagara - Accept a reduced LOS on high-traffic roads to encourage active transportation - Provide high quality cycling infrastructure that prioritizes the safety of cyclists 	
17	Brigitte Bonner			<p>I am extremely concerned about the pace of development in our region. I believe the urban boundaries should not be expanded. We are destroying agricultural and natural lands that cannot be replaced. Intensification and the use of brownfields should be prioritized over the destruction of our environment.</p>	<p>The Region is required to plan for an overall growth allocation and consider market demand in the planning which involves planning for all housing types to a degree. Despite using an intensification rate 10% higher than the provincial requirement certain municipalities need more land.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
18	Salony Sharma, Chair Regional Chair's Youth Advisory Panel			Stress the importance of building complete communities in Niagara. The panel felt that having policies which encourage neighbourhoods to be walkable and practically serviced by public transit would be beneficial to the environment and in our efforts to combat climate change. We would encourage the Region's new OP to implement policies that ensure our communities have amenities (such as schools, shopping centres, medical institutions and recreation options) available either by foot, or through public transportation.	The NOP policies encourage local municipalities to use secondary planning and intensification strategies. The policies also support a complete streets approach and active transportation. The use of secondary Plans at the local level provide the opportunity to address the recommendations submitted at the local level.
19	Salony Sharma, Chair Regional Chair's Youth Advisory Panel			In order to better support public transit, we would also encourage the OP to consider higher population density targets. Many experts in urban planning suggest that population densities of 80 to 100 persons and jobs per hectare would provide the support necessary development to ensure public transit is viable. Many planners state that a walkable neighborhood in North America, that supports a good design and maximizes walking speed and public transit, should have 8,000 to 10,000 people per square kilometer, or roughly 80 to 100 persons per hectare. It is our belief that reducing our reliance on cars will have a net benefit in our efforts to fight climate change, and costly urban sprawl, making better use of the land currently allocated for development and protecting our natural green space.	New objective on transit supportive development and comment box on reason for importance.
20	Salony Sharma, Chair Regional Chair's			Higher density targets, as mentioned above, would also ensure that more diverse forms of housing would be available outside of single-family detached homes. Looking at the current trends of housing prices, and the job opportunities that are currently available in Niagara,	The NOP proposes a higher intensification rate than required by the province and also supports provision for all forms of housing for age in place and assisting in addressing affordability. The region is required to

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
	Youth Advisory Panel			the reality of homeownership, and even rental, is becoming an even more severe challenge. Having more diverse forms of higher-density housing (i.e. “vertical development”, apartment buildings, condos, multi-unit development, mid- and high-rise, “granny flats”) would allow more units to be introduced to the region, helping to provide more options for young people like ourselves.	address market demand, which is all forms of housing, in planning for growth.
21	CJ Brushett, on behalf of Blythwood Homes			Demand for housing in Niagara falls and Fort Erie is very high. The proposed expansion of lands in Fort Erie will provide a much needed supply of land for more single detached , town and rental housing. The area under consideration is significant but We would recommend that about twice this area be considered so that future needs can be addressed. The areas noted are close to existing services like the high school, fitness facilities, theater and municipal center. The areas considered have no agricultural value so they are well suited to urban uses. We would suggest that the zoning be flexible to encourage creative planning for homes with medium to high densities. Pre approved densities for designated mid rise areas would be beneficial. In summation we believe the expansion as noted in Fort Erie is a very positive change and should help with the housing shortage	The Region can not exceed the land supply needs identified in the Land Needs Assessment based on growth allocations provided by and agreed to by the Province.
22	2779103 Ontario Limited and 2779347 Ontario Inc.			We act for 2779103 Ontario Limited and 2779347 Ontario Inc., the owners of the land at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Regional planning staff have recommended	Thank you for the comment.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
	c/o Aird Berlis			<p>that these lands be included in the settlement area through the Region’s current Municipal Comprehensive Review process.</p> <p>We are writing to express our support for the recommendations in the report before Committee.</p>	
23	Jean Grandoni			<p>The Region Planning Staff have designated two large prime Agricultural areas for urban boundary expansion in the City of Niagara Falls, situated between Niagara Falls and Thorold and between the Welland River and the Escarpment.</p> <p>My concern is that we are losing these foodlands based on inaccurate mapping designations. Enough historical and current evidence exists to designate this area as specialty crop not just prime agricultural lands as now being mapped in the new Niagara Region Official Plan.</p>	<p>The identification of prime agricultural lands is based on provincial mapping. The impact on agricultural lands was a key criteria in the settlement area boundary review.</p>
24	Robert Mills for Blythwood Homes			<p>Demand for housing in Niagara falls and Fort Erie is very high. The proposed expansion of lands in Fort Erie will provide a much needed supply of land for more single detached , town and rental housing. The area under consideration is significant but We would recommend that about twice this area be considered so that future needs can be addressed. The areas noted are close to existing services like the high school, fitness facilities, theater and municipal center. The areas considered have no agricultural value so they are well suited to urban uses. We would suggest that the zoning be flexible to encourage creative planning for homes with medium to high densities. Pre approved densities for designated mid rise areas would be beneficial. In summation we believe the expansion as noted in Fort Erie is a very</p>	<p>The Region cannot exceed the land supply needs identified in the Land Needs Assessment based on growth allocations provided by and agreed to by the Province.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				positive change and should help with the housing shortage	
25	Smithville Landowners Group c/o SGL Planning & Design Inc.			<p>SGL Planning & Design Inc. (SGL) represents The Smithville Landowners Group, which own land within the Smithville community of West Lincoln. We have reviewed the March 9, 2022 staff report PDS 6-2022 and the five appendices and support the proposed expansion to Smithville. It reflects the same settlement area boundary as the Preferred Concept Plan prepared by the Town’s consultants.</p> <p>We would like to thank Regional staff for all their hard word on finalizing the Municipal Comprehensive Review and for the opportunity to comment.</p>	Thank you for your supporting comments.
26	DDC Lands Inc. c/o Turkstra Mazza			<p>We are counsel to DDC Lands Inc. (“Owner”), owner of the property municipally known as [REDACTED], within the City of [REDACTED] (“Subject Lands”). There is a shortage of land required to accommodate the Region’s land need to 2051. Consequently, the Region’s Land Needs Assessment does not conform with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and policy 2.2.8.2 in particular. Furthermore, the LNA is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and policies 1.1.3.7 and 1.4.1 in particular.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Subject Lands are well-suited to assist in accommodating this shortage, particularly from a servicing perspective. In support of this position, we would ask that you please consider the attached correspondence from the Owner’s consultants. Once you have had the opportunity to review the Owner’s position,</p>	The Final LNA has been revised to recognize that lands within 2km of Solvay are constrained. The addition of a South Niagara Strategic Growth Area offset the need for additional expansion lands. PPS Policy 1.1.3.7 will be implemented through local official plan conformity and Policy 1.4.1. refers to Regional Market Area and focuses on intensification.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				we are requesting a meeting with Staff to discuss the comments and our client's position further.	
27	1982167 Ontario Inc. c/o Urban Solutions			In the Draft Niagara Region Official Plan, the subject lands are proposed to remain in the "Designated Greenfield Area" designation. As the subject lands have not been identified as residing within a Provincial Significant Employment Zones and the final land uses have yet to be determined based on the imminent Sub Watershed Study, please be advised that the owner and UrbanSolutions support the proposed "Designated Greenfield Area" identified on Schedule F: Regional Structure of the Draft Niagara Region Official Plan.	Thank you for your supporting comments.
28	Graham Pett and Edie Pett			For the East Fonthill development, unless just about every future built form will be an apartment/condominium (and we know that's not going to happen), under any other scenario can one envisage how this development will come anywhere close to achieving its population target of 5500 to 6500 at completion? As Town of Pelham Planning advised; Yes, we have to grow up and not out. It would not surprise us in the least to learn that other municipalities in Niagara and beyond are experiencing these same results. In walking through these developments, these detached dwellings and townhouses are not smallish homes. One must ask, how can we realistically sustain (the infrastructure costs, the energy usage, the loss of our natural heritage, etc) building these 2,000 and 3,000 square foot houses for 1 to 2 people? Because that's what's substantially happening right now! The Official Plan prescribes "compact built form". We ask, how will	As required under the Planning Act, the ROP requires municipalities to reflect that within their own official plans and zoning bylaws, that up to two units, either within the dwelling or as an accessory to that dwelling be permitted for single detached, semi-detached and row housing or townhouse housing. Our housing policies also encourage more flexibility in the zoning provisions being provided to accommodate those additional residential units, but also to allow for a range of housing. We want to see more types of housing to accommodate our population. We want to direct more of that housing inwards, to achieve the Region-wide 60% intensification target.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>that be mandated? While lofty statements are made in the Plan regarding protecting and increasing the supply of affordable housing, it simply is clear to us that we as a society must build smaller (more compact); this if low to medium income working families, seniors on fixed income and others are to have any chance of being able to afford a place to live.</p> <p>For Pelham, the Official Plan designates an intensification rate of 25%. As Town Planning advised, if the intensification target was set higher than 25% there could be a decrease in the amount of new land needed to be added to our urban area. While we understand smaller municipalities may have lesser options for intensifying versus larger cities, we believe 25% is too low. The Town of Pelham has recently passed zoning allowance for placing a second dwelling on a property. Why not make a real effort at encouraging this? Cut development costs substantially, give a property tax break for the second dwelling, etc.</p>	
29	Graham Pett and Edie Pett			<p>Another strategy. Newly built single story retail-commercial properties that could have added a second or a third story for rental purposes. This should be mandated. We observe new apartments/condominiums in the downtown core that always have commercial space on the first floor. Sometimes these sit vacant for months, or there's a revolving door of businesses that come and go. Why not encourage these builders to build first floor apartments?</p> <p>We REQUEST, set a higher intensification rate for smaller municipalities. Set incentives for intensification</p>	<p>Re-designating existing commercial spaces is something we are proactively working with our local partners on. Schedule B of the official plan shows major transit station areas, which are areas that have secondary plans in place that looked at the potential evolution of big box stores and commercial plazas for more mixed use development.</p> <p>The regional intensification rate is 60%, which is higher than the provincial minimum target. We are required by provincial policy to plan for market demand, including planning to provide for all forms of housing. While we're</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>as discussed above, then assess and evaluate over a fixed period of time.</p> <p>The Official Plan’s minimum density rate is set at 50 residents/jobs per hectare. That is the same rate set for the East Fonthill Secondary Plan, and that plan certainly appears nowhere close to achieving its population growth target. We REQUEST that the density target be raised, this in keeping with Planning department’s statement that we must GROW UP, and not out.</p> <p>Given the realities we are facing in Pelham in coping with growth and the loss of our natural habitat, we believe people will be more accepting of growing up (at reasonable heights).</p>	<p>certainly encouraging more medium and higher density development, we do have to plan for all forms of housing and addressing the market.</p> <p>The greenfield density targets are minimums. Local municipalities can and are encouraged to exceed the targets which are developed to also consider the requirement to plan for market demand. Secondary planning can ensure higher densities are planned along corridors to support public transit.</p>
30	City of Welland			<p>Welland Planning Staff are anticipating even more growth than what has been forecasted. Based on the Region’s data, Welland would see growth of an estimated 463 dwelling units per year over 30 years, however, the City has already experienced the start of 759 dwelling units in 2021 and 309 dwelling units between January to March for this year alone; with more growth anticipated through out year. Further, the City has experienced an average annual increase in dwelling units of 45% over the last five years. As this trend is likely to continue, Planning Staff and its Consultant will be required to accommodate for this anticipated growth through the City’s own Official Plan Update.</p> <p>Although the Region has identified that these are minimum growth targets, the concern of City staff is that the population and job numbers in the Official Plan are</p>	<p>Local Area Municipalities may plan for additional intensification units and higher intensification rates within <i>built-up areas</i> than those identified in Table 2-2 in Chapter 2 of the Plan, for <i>infrastructure</i> purposes as it reflects <i>development</i> trends and land use permissions at the time of local conformity.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>used to guide numerous other municipal documents, including: Development Charges, servicing upgrades and expansions, transit, transportation studies, school planning, etc. If the growth allocations do not correctly reflect current or future situations, it may negatively impact how the City plans for infrastructure and services in the future. It also could expose the City to appeals for some of these studies as the population and dwelling units projections would not be consistent with actual growth.</p>	
31	City of Welland			<p>Staff are in support of the Region identifying Downtown Welland as a Regional Growth Centre. However, staff note that the policies of the City’s Official Plan need to be updated to direct intensification to the Downtown. It is important to note that the majority of growth that will occur within Welland between 2021-2051 will occur within the Built-up Area. While much of this growth will be dispersed throughout Welland, on vacant lands and on underutilized sites, there is recognition that Downtown Welland is being planned to accommodate much of the intensification. Hence why the Region is planning for a density target of 125 people and jobs per hectare by the year 2051 for the Downtown Welland Regional Growth Centre. This is further supported as the Region and City are forecasting the majority of units to be located within the Built-up Area to be in the form of apartments.</p> <p>What City Staff are not in support of is the requirement for Secondary Plans to be prepared for Strategic Growth Areas. City Staff argue that this requirement is</p>	<p>Policy for secondary plans for strategic growth areas has been revised to require a secondary plan or equivalent.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				unnecessary as the Local Official Plan will be updated to include the strategic growth location, with specific policies, as well as include already developed Urban Design Guidelines. Staff have also posed the question of who will be required to pay for the Region’s required Secondary Plan as the retaining of services for Secondary planning is often costly, however, have received no answer.	
32	Gracia Janes on behalf of the The Niagara District Council of Women			The Province only allocated a population growth target 674,000 for the 30 year planning period of 2021-2051 . Why did the Regional planning consultants and staff, feel it necessary to bump the goal up by 20,000 to 294,000 and cheerlead for urban expansions onto prime farmland , grape land and treasured natural Carolinian lands using the term “Niagara’s going to grow!!!”	The Region used the Provincially mandated “Land Needs Assessment Methodology for the Greater Golden Horseshoe” in order to formulate the population projections and allocations included in the draft Official Plan. Staff released a draft 2051 allocation plan in May of 2021. It was then further reviewed for opportunity for new growth within each of our municipal municipalities, and we determined that in Lincoln and Welland, there is more capacity, and more demand for units than what was recognized. Therefore, there was an increase in the 2051 by 20,000 people to reflect this, all 20,000 people will be within the built boundary. There will be no additional pressure on farm lands or unmapped fruitlands, or the Carolinian ecosystem.
33	Gracia Janes on behalf of the The Niagara District Council of Women			Why hasn’t close attention been paid to important contrary briefs from public and professional experts such as well known naturalist, Dr. John Bacher, who with former Brock Professor biologist Mike Dickman, has played a strong role in successful OMB hearings, and Jean Grandoni whose long experience in land use issues related to her own and other farm lands in Niagara Falls , particularly related to climate and soil,	Thank you for your submission. The full range of comments received was taken into consideration during the preparation of the Plan and any final recommendations by Planning staff

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				should be heeded. Both John and Jean have been successful in fruit land preservation OMB hearings , one of which will be lost if these recommendations are accepted by the Region .	
34	Gracia Janes on behalf of the The Niagara District Council of Women			What grounds would the Province have to turn down the Region’s Official Plan if Regional Councillors changed their minds regarding the current higher population target and urban boundary expansion proposals ?	When the plan is adopted by the region and goes to the province, they have the power to modify the plan or red line the plan and make changes that would deal with conformity to Provincial Plans such as the Provincial Policy Statement the Growth Plan, Greenbelt Plan, etc.
35	Gracia Janes on behalf of the The Niagara District Council of Women			Why would a Regional Official Plan with its original population projection lowered to the Provincial Target for Niagara; immediate growth plans shifted to Port Colborne and Thorold ; and a 60 % growth target in Niagara Falls, as recommended by its planners accepted by Council , not be approved by the Province ?	The proposed growth strategy considers development pressures and market demand which must be planned for. When the plan is adopted by the region and goes to the province, they have the power to modify the plan or red line the plan and make changes that would deal with conformity to Provincial Plans such as the Provincial Policy Statement the Growth Plan, Greenbelt Plan, etc.
36	Gracia Janes on behalf of the The Niagara District Council of Women			Hamilton City Council has voted 13 to 3 to hold firm on the city’s urban Boundary, in order to protect 1,310 hectares of prime farmland, and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs just says the City’s Official Plan “poses a risk that the City would not conform to provincial requirements” Why wouldn’t this committee at least expect the staff and consultants to present an alternative plan that protects the proposed urban expansion areas for Niagara? .	Maintaining the existing urban boundaries would result in a significant increase to the intensification rate and would not allow planning for market demand, which requires us to provide all types of housing.
37	John Bacher on behalf of Preservation			Requirements of Agricultural Policies in Provincial Policy Statement, (PPS) not Followed in Review: The most serious error in the approach taken by the	As identified, expansion can occur to prime agricultural lands as long as we've looked at alternative locations. The Region went through a fairly robust process on our

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
	of Agricultural Lands Society			<p>Niagara Regional Planning Department in developing the draft new Official Plan was to ignore an important component of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) the Agricultural Policy . As although all the proposed urban expansions are within prime agricultural areas established under the PPS, they are not justified according to its established criteria . Specifically, the approach fails to conform to the methodology for urban expansions onto what the PPS defines as a prime agricultural area . That is “Planning Authorities shall exclude land from the prime agricultural area for expansion or identification of settlement areas” only “in accordance with Policy C 1.1.3.8, c) ,of the PPS”, whereby , “alternative areas have been evaluated and that there are no alternatives which avoid prime agricultural areas.” It also requires that, “there are no reasonable alternatives on lower priority agricultural lands in prime agricultural areas.”</p> <p>There is a further requirement that urban expansions are “in compliance with the minimum distance formula” established to protect livestock operations. There is also a requirement that any expansions “are mitigated to the fullest extent possible”. This would seem to imply the establishment of buffers to protect the remaining prime agricultural area impacted by the new urban expansion.</p>	settlement area boundary review, which did evaluate impacts on agricultural land, looked at soil classifications, the presence of existing farming operations, the presence of livestock operations and then looked at the cumulative impacts of what expansion in select areas would have on the agricultural system.
38	John Bacher on behalf of Preservation of		38	<p>Lesser Quality Lands in Port Colborne Suitable for Urban Expansions: Nowhere in the three years of development of a new Niagara Regional Official Plan is there any reference to</p>	Thank you for your comment. The Settlement Area Boundary Review (SABR) process that was comprehensive and considered a range of criteria in

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
	Agricultural Lands Society			<p>the potential for urban expansions on lands of what the PPS terms areas of “lower priority. For instance, in reviewing the Official Plans of Welland and Port Colborne there are several areas of lesser agricultural capability. Unlike the two areas in Niagara Falls proposed for urban expansion across the road from estate wineries, (Mountain Road and Lundy’s Lane), none of these lands have microclimates that support specialty crops, and all are contiguous with the existing urban service boundaries.</p> <p>The definition in the Port Colborne Official Plan of several areas which should have been accessed for an urban boundary expansion, clearly shows that they are, to use the language of the PPS, lands of lesser agricultural capability. One area is adjacent to the municipal boundary of Wainfleet. and is designated as Rural. Other lands are designated as Rural, and Rural Employment on the eastern edge of the Port Colborne urban boundary. These lands are near the urban boundary of Welland. Welland’s urban boundary south of Ridge Road and north of the Port Colborne municipal boundary could be expanded to compliment an urban expansion here.</p>	<p>accordance with Provincial requirements. Agricultural criteria were part of the SABR process.</p>
39	John Bacher on behalf of Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society			<p>Questionable Assumptions of Need for Proposed Urban Expansions:</p> <p>The proposed need for urban expansion is justified by planners, using two methods, that are not found in the Agricultural Policies of the PPS. One of the most questionable assumptions is the use of population figures higher than those assigned to Niagara by the</p>	<p>The Region used the Provincially mandated “Land Needs Assessment Methodology for the Greater Golden Horseshoe” in order to formulate the population projections and allocations included in the draft Official Plan. Further information is outlined in the Revised Land Needs Assessment Summary for the Niagara Official Plan. https://pub-</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>province. This is especially troublesome given that the Agricultural policies of the PPS assign the highest levels of protection to Specialty Crop lands.</p>	<p>niagararegion.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=17781. Specialty Crop areas are protected from urban expansions under the Greenbelt Plan.</p>
40	John Bacher on behalf of Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society			<p>Weak Justification of Commercial-Industrial Need: In following the shifting explanations in multiple draft Official Plans over the past few years, there has been a weak justification for commercial-industrial expansion needs, on what are termed Employment Lands. At first it was indicated that the need was approximately that of the capacity of the urban boundaries, but no exact capacity figure for need of these various expansions has been presented. It has been admitted by the Planning staff that this type of growth is not guided by intensification guidelines. The need for the various Employment Land expansions is not based on a regional planning basis. They are all corollaries for expansions based on situations arising from related residential expansions in lower tier municipalities, and more general concepts such as the Gateway. Need in such circumstances is not based on mathematical models.</p>	<p>The Region is responsible for identifying employment areas and ensuring there is a sufficient supply of land within employment areas for job growth and long term investment. The land needs assessment calculates that additional employment area lands are necessary to accommodate the allocated jobs for certain municipalities over the next 30 years. The LNA is built on numerous strategies and reports that have been presented related to the Official Plan.</p>
41	John Bacher on behalf of Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society			<p>Use of the Aggregate and Agricultural Resources Policies: The protection of Aggregate Resources, and Agriculture are the oldest and strongest policies of the PPS. As part of their justification for an urban boundary expansion, the Proposed new Official Plan minimizes the various natural heritage features which will be degraded</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Settlement Area Boundary Review (SABR) process that was comprehensive and considered a range of criteria in accordance with Provincial requirements. Agricultural, aggregates, and the natural environment criteria were part of the SABR process.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				if placed within an urban zoning envelope. These features are quite significant. They were among the reasons why the OMB rejected an urban boundary expansion on the Northwest Quadrant lands in the City of Niagara Falls. It found that environmental conditions existing there could not be assessed since the information was seven to eight years old.	
42	John Bacher on behalf of Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society			<p>Natural Heritage Areas at Risk:</p> <p>Niagara Falls - All three of the urban boundary expansions in Niagara Falls contain important natural heritage features, which will be degraded if they are subjected to an urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>FortErie - Similarly, in Fort Erie the protected wetlands in the former Canadian Motor Speedway (CMS) lands are highly vulnerable to road extensions. All the proposed Fort Erie expansions are in environmentally sensitive ground water discharge areas.</p> <p>West Lincoln - It was a serious omission that during the three years of developing a new official plan, no attempt was made to map West Lincoln’s Karst formations. Since Karst formations are already clearly mapped, they should have been identified and excluded from urban boundary expansions.</p>	Thank you for your comment. The Settlement Area Boundary Review (SABR) process that was comprehensive and considered a range of criteria in accordance with Provincial requirements. The natural environment was an important part of the SABR process. Additional analysis of natural features will occur in any expansion areas as the planning process moves forward (e.g. subwatershed study in support of the secondary planning process)
43	John Bacher on behalf of Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society			<p>Future Studies Will Not Mitigate Environmental Damage of Urban Expansions:</p> <p>It is unfortunate that within the three-year framework of the review the urban boundary expansion component of the public discussions have taken place quite recently. Earlier in these discussions it was promised that watershed studies would be conducted before any</p>	A Watershed Study was completed in support of the SABR process and new Niagara Official Plan. The study is known as the Niagara Watershed Plan (NWP). The NWP is being published in 3 volumes: characterization, management, and growth analysis. Consultation with the public and other stakeholders

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				such specific urban areas were identified. These have not been undertaken and now such studies are proposed to take place in the future, after the boundary expansions are in principle, approved through the new regional plan.	was undertaken during the completion of the NWP project.
44	John Bacher on behalf of Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society			Tests for Urban Boundary Expansions Fail to Meet the Standards Set by OMB in Adjudication of Requests to Extend Urban Boundaries in Niagara Falls: PALS finds it ironic that the evidence used to recommend the proposed urban expansion in the Northwest Quadrant of Niagara Falls, runs directly counter to the standard set in a decision on the same lands by the OMB in 2015 by its Vice-Chair, Susan de Avenar Schiller. (It's relevance is underscored by its being upheld in an appeal to the Ontario Superior Court of Justice.)	Staff's review is based on the current Provincial Growth Plan which plans for a horizon to 2051, and sets the criteria for how expansions can be considered. The need is based on following the Land Needs Assessment Methodology as set out by the Province. This policy framework did not exist at the time of the OMB decision in 2015.
45	Patricia Nelson c/o Susan Naylor			Nowhere to begin or end my thoughts on the incredible value this rescue holds for the Niagara region. I cannot imagine that you would want to be responsible for ripping that out of the very heart of what makes Niagara such a beautifully one-of-a-kind place to live. Save Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue and Sanctuary and let that be your legacy as a Council. That one shot at true Greatness where Compassion wins over Commerce.	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.
46	Michelle Flynn c/o Susan Naylor			Comments on the Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue. It's also an incredible place to learn about nature, environmental issues, species that are in threat of extinction, and the kindness and healing the horses provide. This place is a gem, the heartbeat of the community, and the highlight of my week	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
47	William Connor c/o Susan Naylor, Greater Fort Erie Secondary School			Letter of Support for Last Chance Horse and Pony This letter is to acknowledge the continual support of Greater Fort Erie Secondary School Students (GFESS) by Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue. For a number of years, the Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue has allowed secondary students to complete their secondary school cooperative education experience at their facility. While at the Last Chance Horse and Pony, students learn workplace skills to prepare for their future. Additionally, the facility offers the opportunity for students to obtain their community services hours.	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.
48	Jennifer Parker c/o Susan Naylor, Portal Village Retirement Home			Letter of support for The Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue Sanctuary. I am the Recreation Director at Portal Village Retirement Home in Port Colborne. We have been blessed to have the horses visit our residents for several years.	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.
49	Sandra Leemet c/o Susan Naylor, Community Living Fort Erie			Community Living - Fort Erie wishes to provide this letter in support in regards to the Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue and Sanctuary (LCHPR). Community Living - Fort Erie exists to promote inclusion and ensure that people with intellectual challenges have their rights and privileges upheld. Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue and Sanctuary have provided the people we support with many volunteer placements over the past sixteen years.	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.
50	Lezlie Leduc c/o Susan Naylor,			Letter in support of the Last Chance Pony Program. Pre-Covid they brought different Ponies out to our Long Term Care Home and the residents loved the opportunity to	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
	Niagara Health System			see the ponies. The ponies are a great height to visit with the residents and truly gives them an opportunity to reminisce about their lives on the farm by chatting with the ponies, handlers, Recreation Therapy Staff and other residents.	Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.
51	Sharon Levy c/o Susan Naylor			Visited LVHP Rescue today for the first time. What a grand place it is. I was amazed by the peaceful atmosphere.	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.
52	Sharon Simmons c/o Susan Naylor			Last Chance Pony Rescue has provided therapeutic animal visits to our seniors at both Maple Park Lodge and Crescent Park Lodge throughout the past 6 years that I have worked in the position as Director of Therapeutic Recreation Services. Please consider the importance of this non-profit and the potential negative impact it may have should they move or change operations.	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.
53	Ria Roseburg			Concern I am writing to you with regards to the proposed zoning changes in the Crystal Beach area which will impact the charitable rescue organization, Last Chance Horse and Pony. The impact this will have on the horses is devastating. They simply have nowhere else to go to! Please vote NO to the upcoming zoning changes and vote YES to save Last Chance and its precious horses.	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.
54	Ginny Lovelace			I am a partner in Let Pets Live, a Foundation in the Niagara Region serving rescues and charities who support animal welfare. I am writing you regarding the proposed zoning changes in the Crystal Beach area. I was disturbed to hear that Last Chance Horse and Pony may be negativity impacted by those proposed changes	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				and wanted to be sure our lawmakers understand the value this organization brings to our region. Please vote NO against the upcoming zoning changes and vote YES for Last Chance!	
55	Jule Metcalfe			It is so important that the Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue remain zoned agricultural land. They are a huge asset to our community as they take participation in many community affairs and bring help to the area nursing homes y bringing ponies to visit.	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.
56	Rose Marie Cipryk			Urban areas work much better when they focus on fine tuning the existing urban areas, making better use of existing transportation, libraries, firehalls and those public services we value so much. Don't sprawl beyond where we are. Pay attention to improving the interconnectedness and better designs and infilling. Improve the way our existing urban area functions.	Urban and rural settlement area boundaries are proposed to address community and employment needs over the next 30 years based on a land needs assessment and higher intensification rate than required by the Province.
57	Sue Naylor			In this written submission, we are providing letters and comments from individuals, business, community organizations and institutions throughout Niagara. The letters and comments communicate the importance of their relationship with Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue and Sanctuary and their strong desire for its continuance in its home location in Crystal Beach/Ridgeway. The submissions speak for themselves. The content of all submissions have been filed with the Niagara Region Official Plan team. They have also been sent to each member of Niagara Regional Council in letters dated March 7, 2022, April 11, 2022 and April 27, 2022, attached here. We have also attached a selection of the	This parcel of land is no longer recommended for inclusion into the urban area boundary of Crystal Beach, in the recommended June 2022 Niagara Official Plan.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				original letters we received. We also include information on an online petition that was posted on Change.ORG on April 10, 2022. The purpose of this petition is to have the land on which the Rescue resides excluded from the urban area boundary expansion. This includes comments made in respect of the petition. Paper versions of the petition are also being circulated and can be submitted for future reference.	

Chapter 3 (Sustainable Region) Comments with Response Matrix

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
1	Niagara Escarpment Commission	3.1	3.1.14.1	The proposed policy with respect to development in Life Science and Earth Science ANSI's is that it is not permitted unless it can be demonstrated that there will be no negative impact (Policy 3.1.14.1). The Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) identifies Life Science and Earth Science ANSI's as key natural heritage features and only allows limited development (NEP Part 2.7.2). The Region's proposed policy would appear to be more permissive.	As noted in S. 3.1.8 "Development and site alteration within and adjacent to key natural heritage features and key hydrological features in the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area is subject to the policies of the Niagara Escarpment Plan". Within the Niagara escarpment area, the policies of the NEP plan apply.
2	50by30 Niagara	3.5	3.5.3.1 b) ii)	the proposed wording in section 3.5.3.1. b) ii. reads as follows: (that the region support conservation and energy reduction by:) promoting opportunities for district energy, renewable energy systems and alternative energy systems	Policy 3.5.3.1 b) ii has been revised to link to the municipal energy plan in policy 3.5.3.1. The municipal energy plan can look at opportunities for district energy and other forms of renewable energy in Niagara. Section 3.5 includes many new climate change

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>I ask that:</p> <p>~ the phrase “promote opportunities’ be replaced with, “require feasibility studies for...”</p> <p>~ that a clause be added "conducting a feasibility study for a district heating and cooling utility company, powered by geothermal energy or a fossil-fuel free alternative."</p> <p>~ the words, 'promote' and 'require' throughout this section be changed to 'require' and 'ensure', as they are already used at many points in the document.</p> <p>District Energy for heating and cooling is a technology that is well established and used across the world and has the capacity to reduce energy consumption by up to 50%. Geothermal district energy is being brought online across Ontario: Kitchener Waterloo has just finished its feasibility studies; Oakville is conducting its feasibility study for a Geothermal District Heating Utility Company right now; and Markham Centre Geothermal District Heating Utility Company went from conception to completion of its first project in 5 years.</p>	<p>commitments that use the language "will" which implies that the policy direction will be carried out. The Region will also explore additional opportunities to support emissions reduction planning in accordance with Policy 3.5.7.1. Further action is required on climate change, and the policies of the Niagara Official Plan do not limit the Region in this regard.</p>
3	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.			<p>Mineral aggregate operations should be permitted in the Region’s Natural Environment System, subject to the policies of the applicable Provincial Plans and Provincial Policy Statement. This should be made clear in the policies of Chapter 3 and Section 4.3. The Region’s Natural Environment System policies cannot be more</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment. Some policy adjustments have been made in chapter 3 and 4.3.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				restrictive than provincial policy relative to mineral aggregate operations.	
4	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.		Policy Section 3.1.1	Earth science areas of natural and scientific interest are not identified as “key natural heritage features” in the Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan. This is also recognized in the definition of key natural heritage features in the draft Official Plan. Table 3-1 should therefore be updated accordingly.	That is correct - Earth Science ANSI's are not a key natural heritage feature in the Growth Plan. Earth Science ANSI's are however a natural heritage feature and area within the definitions of the Provincial Policy Statement. Staff have reviewed table 3.1 (which is now part of Schedule L) and are satisfied with the notes in the footer as written.
5	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.		Policy Section 3.1.9.5	Significant woodlands outside the Provincial Natural Heritage System should not be afforded a “no development” test. Rather it should be identified under the “no negative impacts” test in Section 3.1.9.5.2 so that it is consistent with Section 2.1.5 of the Provincial Policy Statement. The term “significant” should be added before “areas of natural and scientific interest” in Policy 3.1.9.5.2 d).	Part III of the PPS (on page 3) states that “The policies of the Provincial Policy Statement’ represent minimum standards. Within the framework of the provincial policy-led planning system, planning authorities and decision-makers may go beyond these minimum standards to address matters of importance to a specific community, unless doing so would conflict with any policy of the Provincial Policy Statement” Regional Council has directed staff to implement NES Option 3C with the understanding that this option would go beyond the minimum standards of the Province. It is therefore the opinion of Regional Planning staff that it is both appropriate and consistent with the PPS to provide additional protection to significant woodlands in the Region.
6	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.		Policy 3.1.9.9.2	A specific exception should be provided for mineral aggregate operations. Without this, the policy could have the effect of prohibiting aggregate extraction within buffers but not the feature itself, if the appropriate test has been satisfied (e.g. no negative impacts). We suggest the following change:	The wording of this policy has be changed to ensure that it will not be interpreted that a buffer has a higher level of protection than the feature.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>“Development or site alteration shall not be permitted in the minimum prescribed buffer, with the exception of that described in Section 3.1.9.5.3, <u>mineral aggregate operations in accordance with Section 4.3.4 of this Plan, or infrastructure serving the agricultural sector.</u>”</p>	
7	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.		Policy 3.1.14	<p>The call-out box that describes how Earth Science ANSI’s are identified erroneously includes “ecological functions” as a criteria. “Ecological functions” is a criteria used to identify Life Science ANSI’s but not Earth Science ANSI’s. From the Natural Heritage Reference Manual: “Earth science ANSI’s are geological in nature, consist of some of the most significant representative examples of the bedrock, fossils and landforms in Ontario, and include examples of ongoing geological processes” (p. 91).</p> <p>To be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and in recognition that Earth Science ANSI’s are not considered “key natural heritage features” in the Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan, we recommend the following changes to Policy 3.1.14.1:</p> <p>“Development and site alteration shall not be permitted within a provincially-or regionally-significant earth science area of natural and scientific interest or within 50 metres of the feature an earth science area of natural and scientific interest unless it can be demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the geological <u>significant earth science</u> features, or the interpretative and scientific values for which the earth science area of natural and scientific interest was identified. Applications for development and site alteration which have the</p>	<p>The text box in this section of the plan has been removed.</p> <p>It is unclear what on what basis the argument is made that it is not consistent with the PPS to identify earth science ANSI’s. Although it is correct that they are not identified as key natural heritage features by the Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan the definition of ANSI in the PPS references both earth science and life science ANSI’s.</p> <p>Other minor wording changes based on this comment have been made, although the additional policy regarding offsetting has not been included.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>potential for negative impacts shall be accompanied by an earth science heritage evaluation that:</p> <p>a) identifies planning, design and construction practices that will ensure protection of the <u>identified interpretative and scientific, geological or geomorphological values</u> attributes for which the area of natural and scientific interest was identified; and</p> <p>b) <u>offset negative impacts through mitigation or compensation methods that enhance educational and scientific values; and</u></p> <p>c) determines whether a minimum a buffer is required, and if so, specifies the dimensions of that buffer.”</p> <p>The suggested edits above build upon the direction provided in the Natural Heritage Reference Manual but also the existing policy framework in the Region’s Official Plan e.g. Policy 7.A.4.2.</p>	
8	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.	3.1	Policy 3.1.14.2	<p>Therefore we recommend that the Region consider adding the following to s.3.1.14.2:</p> <p>“Notwithstanding the above, the policies of sections 3.1.14 regarding regionally significant earth areas of natural and scientific interest do not apply to new or expanding mineral aggregate operations. <u>For provincially significant earth science areas of natural and scientific interest, mitigation or compensation methods that enhance educational and scientific values may be taken into account in the assessment of negative impacts related to new or expanding mineral aggregate operations”.</u></p> <p>These suggested revisions to the earth science ANSI’s not only build on the Region’s existing Policy 7.A.4.2, but</p>	Thank you for the comment. As noted - changes have been recently made to this policy. Staff are comfortable with the policy as written.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				also ensure that these frameworks are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.	
9	Mark Freeman	3.5		I request that the words ‘promote’ and ‘encourage’ be replaced with words demonstrating more commitment to Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation actions, such as ‘require’, ‘ensure’, and ‘mandate’. We are in the 11th hour of a Climate Emergency - there can be no ambiguity or room for loopholes.	Section 3.5 includes many new climate change commitments that use the language "will" which implies that the policy direction will be carried out. The Region will also explore additional opportunities to support emissions reduction planning in accordance with Policy 3.5.7.1. Further action is required on climate change, and the policies of the Niagara Official Plan do not limit the Region in this regard.
10	Mark Freeman	3.5	3.5.1.2	We need clear and measurable emission reduction targets established consistently across all municipalities within the region. Consistent with IPCC and other scientifically supported reports, we need to set a goal of reducing GHGs by 50% (from 1990 levels) by 2030. This should imperative.	Policy 3.5.1.2 commits the Region to establish new greenhouse gas reduction targets to work toward the long-term goal of net-zero communities. Policy 3.5.1.11 encourages the local area municipalities to also establish greenhouse gas reduction targets, consistent with direction in the Growth Plan. Some of the local area municipalities have already established targets and undertaken additional work on climate change, such as the preparation of climate change adaptation plans.
11	Mark Freeman	3.5	3.5.1.5	We need a commitment for a cross-functional team to be established in order to develop a Green Building Development Plan for Niagara Region. Items of concern for me would include: Stopping new buildings (residential, commercial and industrial) from automatically being hooked up to so-called natural gas; Ensuring all new buildings are built with sufficient insulation to reduce heating/cooling/energy demands. Ensuring new buildings are physically orientated to maximize roof-top solar exposure whenever possible.	Thank you for the comments. Policy 3.5.1.5 states that the Region, in collaboration with the local area municipalities, building and development industry and utility companies will explore opportunities to elevate standards of green building development across the Region. The policy has been further revised to add 'organized interest groups' to the team. In addition, policy 3.5.1.3 states that the Region will develop a municipal energy plan in consultation with

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				Mandating new buildings to have rooftop solar panels, heatpumps and EV chargers when appropriate. Ensuring an aggressive plan to convert half of existing buildings from natural gas to electric (or some other fossil fuel alternative) heating prior to 2030. These actions will also enable local business opportunities to manufacture and implement solar equipment, heatpumps, etc...	the local area municipalities, utility companies and organized interest groups to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, complement land use and infrastructure master planning, and support economic development opportunities in the region.
12	Mark Freeman	3.5	3.5.1.11	Please change this to a requirement, not just encouraged...	This policy direction is consistent with the Growth Plan. Some of the local area municipalities have already undertaken or initiated this work.
13	Mark Freeman	3.5	3.5.2.4. –	Please change this to a mandate for completion prior to 2030, not just explored...	This policy commits to exploring opportunities to transition to a zero-emissions vehicle fleet. Recommendations and any associated timeframes will follow from the background work.
14	Mark Freeman	3.5	3.5.3.1. A	We need a commitment to increase coverage of public transit and upgrading all public transit and municipal vehicles to electric (or hydrogen) within a reasonable timeframe prior to 2030. We must ensure that EV charging stations are available at places of work and retail stores. We cannot allow any more traditional gas stations to be built in the Region.	Thank you for the comment. The Region will be establishing a new Regional Transit Commission. The details of the bus fleet have not yet been established. Policies 3.5.1.6 and 3.5.2.3 address EV charging infrastructure.
15	Mark Freeman	3.5	3.5.3.1. B	We need a plan to meet the massive increase in electricity demand that is coming. We need a commitment to increasing local electricity capacity, without depending on the Province's poorly thought out Natural Gas and Nuclear solutions, by establishing locally owned Energy Co-operatives based on wind, solar, geothermal and storage solutions.	Policy 3.5.1.3 states that the Region will develop a municipal energy plan in consultation with the local area municipalities, utility companies and organized interest groups to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, complement land use and infrastructure master planning, and support economic development opportunities in the region.
16	Mark Freeman	3.5	3.5.3.1. B ii	We need a solid plan based on renewable energy solutions, not just promoting...	Policy 3.5.3.1 b) ii has been revised to link to the municipal energy plan in policy 3.5.3.1. The municipal

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
					energy plan can look at opportunities for district energy and other forms of renewable energy in Niagara.
17	Mark Freeman	3.5	3.5.3.1. B vi	We must have a plan to ban single use plastics and to actually recycle plastic waste. Niagara Region can be more ambitious than current Federal or Provincial measures. This will enable local business opportunities to develop replacement products as well as recycling facilities.	Thank you for the comment.
18	Mark Freeman	3.5	3.5.3.1. C	We desperately need to increase local carbon sinks to offset CO2 emissions, so a priority must be placed on conserving (and properly managing) remaining natural places (forests, wetlands, etc...) in Niagara Region when planning for (human) growth/development. To protect our land and water we must also reduce the use of fertilizers and pesticides by requiring re-generative agriculture practices in the region. In order to become more self-sufficient (and reduce transportation costs/environmental impacts), we need to incent local farmers to increase year-round food production, as well as require local retail stores to increase content of locally sourced produce. This will enable local businesses many opportunities.	Thank you for the comment. Policy 3.5.1.4 commits the Region to develop and implement a Regional Greening Initiative to enhance vegetative cover to store carbon.
19	Mark Freeman	3.5	3.5.4.1.	We cannot damage/remove any more wetlands. New developments must include adequate greenspaces and to improve drainage, we must not allow residences and businesses from covering the earth with concrete and asphalt. This will enable local business opportunities to develop replacement products and associated implementation services. The Urban Boundary Expansion that is currently being planned must be reversed/revised accordingly.	The policies of the plan include protection for wetlands.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
20	Mark Freeman	3.5		I strongly suggest the Niagara Region redesigns the Municipal Tax structure to “incent” residents and businesses to do their fair share in reducing GHG emissions. This should have a component based on an individual’s or business’ carbon footprint and include things like installing solar panels, switching to EVs, permeable landscaping/driveways/parking lots, etc...	Thank you for the comment.
21	Niagara Parks Commission	3.1	3.1.15.1 a)	3.1.15.1 a) Grasslands are only included as a feature that supports the ecological function of adjacent key natural areas. Suggest Add wording that identifies native grasslands as an feature (for future mapping) Add reference that grasslands mitigate Climate Change Native grassland habitats are rare and in decline, critical for many rare and at risk species, Grasslands are enormous carbon sinks often more resilient than woodlands/forests cover to be maintained or enhanced. Unclear language. Suggest ‘maintained and ‘when possible enhanced’. Provided clarity	NES comments from the Niagara Parks Commission were addressed as part of the March 2022 response matrix.
22	Niagara Parks Commission	3.1	3.1.25.1 3.1.26.1 3.1.27.1	cover to be maintained or enhanced. Unclear language. Suggest ‘maintained and ‘when possible enhanced’. Provided clarity	NES comments from the Niagara Parks Commission were addressed as part of the March 2022 response matrix.
23	Niagara Parks Commission	3.1	3.1.29.1	Acknowledges and supports the role of the Local Municipalities, NPCA, etc. Add The Niagara Parks Commission. Suggest “ The Niagara Parks Commission, and other provincial agencies’	NES comments from the Niagara Parks Commission were addressed as part of the March 2022 response matrix.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
24	Niagara Parks Commission	3.1	3.1.29.3	Niagara Parks should be noted. Suggest 'The Niagara Parks Commission, and other provincial agencies'. NPC lands are ground zero for many invasive species,, lands along Niagara River corridor cross municipal boundaries.	NES comments from the Niagara Parks Commission were addressed as part of the March 2022 response matrix.
25	Travers Fitzpatrick on behalf of Seaway Mall, Doral Holdings Limited, Idrakoth Ltd and 2494551 Ontario Inc.	3.1	3.1.9.5.4.	Proposed Policy 3.1.9.5.4. of the draft Official Plan provides as follows: "Development and site alteration in and within 30 metres of other wetlands in settlement areas that are regulated by the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority is subject to the regulations and land use planning policies of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority. While the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority may approve offsetting of wetlands under its Policies and in accordance with its Regulatory role, the use of offsetting is not supported by this Plan ". We find this proposed policy particularly troublesome in that it sets up a conflict between the NPCA and the Region in an important policy area where the NPCA clearly has the approval authority. It also confuses the development community and creates conflicts for local municipalities in trying to deal with development approval where the NPCA takes one position and the Region an opposite position. As a result, in our view the text that is bold and italicized in red should be deleted from the proposed plan.	Comment was addressed as part of March 2022 response matrix.
26	Gerard Warner			12 Mile Creek's watershed gives so much to our community , why have we abandoned it ? The Province has so many Restoration and Nature Conservatory programs , how does the one and only Watershed in St.Catharines mange to avoid all these programs and funding ? Walter Sendzik trains his people to say it's not	Thank you. Comment noted.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>a City Issue and other facets of governance are to blame . Is Jim Bradley to Blame ? What is going on ? Are funds being misappropriated? Why is such an asset being neglected ? Visitors enjoying the Bruce Trail use this trail system to make their way to our Downtown Core while vacationing on our portion of the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve , is this what we want to show our Eco Tourists ?</p>	
27	Paul J L Hicks			<p>As trees are our lifeblood, will a definitive “ no cut” plan for the regions tree lots and private lands be implemented, before more clear cutting and land clearing for housing and high rise units is allowed.</p> <p>Green belt land in the region is required for our ecosystem.. will the region enforce land designations for wet lands, forests and streams that do not allow building of housing of any type within the region affected by the green land designations</p>	<p>Regional Council has directed staff to implement natural environment system (NES) option 3C. This option goes beyond the minimum standards of the province and will provide additional protections to treed areas and other natural features in the Region.</p>
28	Bill Heska			<p>Peer reviews- this issue was mentioned several times. Does it only apply to Impact Studies?yWhen is a peer review required and/or declared? Are the results made public? Can a Municipality in the Niagara Region request one? An example of an existing situation is the Storm Water Pond at SW corner of Hwy. 20 and Rice Rd. in Pelham. There has been MAJOR erosion north of Hwy. 20 from the outflow of the pond. What is the root cause of the problem and solution?</p> <p>Wetland restoration- Who determines the need and details what has to be done?. Who pays for this work-</p>	<p>Staff provided the following response directly via e-mail: The discussion around peer reviews at the April 7, 2022 Public Open House was regarding environmental impact studies (EIS’s). Draft policy 3.1.33.5 allows for a 3rd party peer review to be required on an EIS at the applicant’s expenses. Peer reviews can be requested for a number of reasons – although typically the review of EIS is completed by Region staff. The Region employs Land Use Planners, Environmental Planners, Planning Ecologists, and Water Resource Engineers who are fully qualified to do this work.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>the Niagara Region, Municipality, Developer, etc.?</p> <p>Storm Water Management (SWM) - Does the N. Region have a SWM master plan for the Region? The Municipalities require the Developer to provide a SWM plan for a new development, but do not have staff to provide technical review. Who has ultimate responsibility for the SWM plan design and performance?</p>	<p>Wetland restoration work can be completed for a variety reasons. If it is required as part of development application it would likely be the responsibility of the applicant. However there are a variety of other reason and programs where restoration may been undertaken including by the Region, Local Municipalities, NPCA, landowners, and environmental groups in the region.</p> <p>The Niagara Region does not have a SWM master plan for the entire Region. The majority of SWM infrastructure is the responsibility of the local municipalities and therefore, they are best suited for having a SWM Master Plan. These SWM Master Plans would be informed by Subwatershed Studies that are typically completed with a Secondary Plan. Please note that the local municipalities, Niagara Region and NPCA all have a role in SWM review for new development. In general, the local municipality will assume new storm sewers and SWM ponds from subdivisions once inspected and constructed as per the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks approval (Environmental Compliance Approval).</p> <p>For your information, the Region is currently working on developing new SWM Guidelines which will build upon local municipal and Provincial SWM guidelines. Additional project information can be found on the project page along with a video of a public information</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
					webinar for the Regional SWM Guideline Presentation held on October 5, 2021.
29	Sydney DiTomasso for Better Neighbourhoods			Environmental policies should be much more flexible within established urban areas to maintain the urban continuity intended by the policies of the time and to avoid loss of opportunities to infill and intensify the urban fabric - Regional policies should encourage the integration of natural features within the built-up area into the urban fabric for the benefit of the public rather than isolate them for protection	Thank you. Comment noted.
30	Salony Sharma, Chair Regional Chair's Youth Advisory Panel			We also value Niagara's greenspace, agricultural elements and rural areas. We suggest that policies for the new OP aim to protect Niagara's environment; more specifically, highly sensitive areas such as Provincially Significant Wetlands, and other areas with high levels of bio-diversity, should be protected and remain undisturbed as we continue to grow and develop. We also encourage the OP to consider certain design elements such as rooftop/community gardens. The panel members would also support policies that mandate trees be planted to help offset the impacts of development.	Thank you. Comment noted. There are policies to protect sensitive areas such as PSW's in the plan. Protecting biodiversity in the Region was an important consideration in the development of the integrated natural environment system. Further, Regional Council has directed staff to implement natural environment system option 3C which goes beyond the minimum standards of the Province.
31	Donald Alexander			I think everything is influenced by our climate change policies and all the other topics of interest, should be ranked to reflect that.	Thank you. Comment noted.
32	Chris Fazari			Our family has some land in Fort Erie on [REDACTED] that is currently just outside of the urban boundary. We have been working with Anne Yagi (Eco Canada Certified Environmental Professional and SER Certified Ecological	Staff provided the following response: The Region's review of settlement area boundary expansion (SABR) is in the final stages and the work to review candidate sites has concluded. Regional Planning staff have advanced recommendations on

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>Restoration Practitioner) to do some work on the land and she has notified us that the region is doing their official plan and asking landowners if they want their land included in the urban areas. We spoke to the Town of Fort Erie a couple of years ago and they weren't sure when our land would be in the urban boundary. Is there a form or anything specific that needs to be filled out in order to submit a request for the land to be in the urban area? Any information would be greatly appreciated.</p>	<p>SABR seeking endorsement the upcoming March 9, 2022 meeting of Planning and Economic Development.</p> <p>As part of the boundary considerations, Region staff considered Town of Fort Erie Reports PDS-03-2021, PDS-14-2021 and PDS-41-2021 on boundary expansion. Your lands were not identified in those reports.</p> <p>You should be aware, however, that Region staff did examine all areas around the perimeter of the current settlement areas to consider sites that may be suitable for additional review. Given the environmental features that were available to us at that time, your lands were not added to the regional identified sites for review.</p>
33	Janet Kellam			<p>What does being a landowner with a natural environment system feature on my property mean? You mention that my feature is not marked on the present regional plan. Will it be on the new plan? If it is or isn't on the new plan what would that mean to my use of the land? I saw at your meeting on Thursday that a person with a marked property wondered and they just said to contact region. Can you tell me if being marked on the new plan protects my feature (woods and trees) from development regardless of whether done by me or a future owner. This property is in an urban area. The trees are not old growth being about 40to50 years at oldest and all the white ash have died. Is this feature part of the attempt to achieve 30% cover by 2030? Is it for town or the whole region?</p>	<p>Region Planning Staff spoke to Ms. Kellam on the phone. She owns a large parcel of land in Fort Erie which is being identified as significant woodland in the draft mapping. Ms. Kellam want the property protected, supports Option 3C, and supports the work that the Region is doing to develop a natural environment system.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
34	Kevin Freeman, Kaneff Group			<p>Is there also flexibility within the policy to reclassify a woodland if it is determined through an EIS that the woodland does not meet the definition of a “significant woodland” as per the OP?</p> <p>We had submitted a letter back in February highlighting our concerns with lands in NOTL that were identified as “significant woodland” on draft Schedule C2 (see attached). The lands at the terminus of Westwood Court have since been redesignated from significant woodlands to other woodlands since it was confirmed by Regional staff in August 2021 that these lands did not meet the definition of a “woodland”.</p> <p>I’m curious as to why the lands outlined in red below remain designated as a “significant woodland”. These are lands that are zoned and designated to permit industrial development within a strategic growth area. The significant woodland policies seem to be quite a bit more restrictive considering the policy tests as you have described below. We respectfully request that these lands highlighted below be given the same consideration for classification.</p>	<p>Region Staff previously replied via e-mail as follows: The draft policy provides the ability to reclassify a woodland if it is determined through an EIS (completed to the satisfaction of the Region) that the woodland does not meet the definition of a “significant woodland” as per the definitions and criteria document, assuming that it does not conflict with any other policies of the plan.</p> <p>In regards to the area that you have circled - Regional staff did not access the lands, so we were not in a position to make any further changes. We only updated the woodlands where our Regional Forester and our Environmental Planner had visited.</p>
35	Marcie Jacklin			<p>First, well done. This is a lot of work. I'm still disappointed that no attempts were made to fix the EIS process which is clearly broken. This results in a bias toward developers hiring people who care more about a paycheque than doing what is right for the environment. The EIS process will result in the continued degradation of the environment. I also have serious reservation about the</p>	<p>Thank you. Comment noted.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>urban boundary expansion especially since they seem to overlay areas that have been identified as protected by 3C and also farm lands. Finally the mapping used hasn't been ground truthed and I feel we will see a continuation of loss of habitat, wetlands, woodlands and farm land. The communities of Niagara deserved better than this and clearly sent a message.</p>	
36	Jenny Mancuso			<p>I oppose the changed! I bought land on Montrose Road in 2005. We were told at the time of our survey of the property we would be able to build. Now my land will be affected... Why do the rich people get to do what they want with their land but not us "nobodies". Contrary to what had been told we did not receive notice from the region...</p>	<p>Staff have reviewed and responded to the landowner regarding her property.</p>
37	Fred Rudolph			<p>We object to the proposed Plan's down designation of a large portion of our neighbourhood. The stated intent is to down designate large portions of over 100 residential properties by changing residential lands to natural heritage lands. Down designation is not warranted in this case. The minor valley lands in question are not recognized by the CA. Any natural features have been either entirely removed or significantly altered by 70 years of residential activities and uses adjacent to or in the valley area. A slavish adherence to the PPS and any other relevant policy guidelines regarding use restrictions and/or setbacks and process protections for environmental areas will lead to the unwarranted sterilization of huge portions of residential areas.</p>	<p>The natural environment system is an 'overlay' meaning that it sits on top of other land-use designations.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				The proposed down designation has the potential of sterilizing, for no good reason, over 30% of our lot.	
38	Donna Warner			For site specific information on my property being re-zoned at [REDACTED] what will be the new zoning, what new restrictions, and what if we oppose?	For clarification the Region does not 'zone' lands. Zoning is a responsibility of the local municipality. The natural environment system is an overlay that sits on top of other land use designations. The property at 7705 Schisler Road is within the Provincial Growth Plan natural heritage system. This a system that was mapped by the province and which the Region is required to implement. Within provincial and regional policy there are exemptions for the full range of existing and new agricultural uses.
39	Graham Pett and Edie Pett			<p>The following is requested: For developments, a Tree Preservation Plan should not be a maybe. We REQUEST that prior to any activities being carried out on prospective development land that a full tree inventory be taken of that land. The developer must produce a plan that preserves as many trees as possible. Where trees must be cut, these must be replaced on a sliding scale depending on the size of tree taken (i.e. 5 replacement trees for a large tree removed). If these replacement trees cannot all be planted on the development property, then these will be planted elsewhere as the municipality will dictate. Plant more trees period! They have SO MANY benefits.</p>	Tree preservation plans (TPP) may be requested a part of a development application to ensure that all trees to be retained are protected during construction and grading. Further, the TPP inventories the trees on site to inform replanting requirements and general health of the feature in question. We will include additional information on the process and requirements for a TPP as part of the updated EIS guidelines.
40	Graham Pett and Edie Pett			the following is requested. The Official Plan mandates the protection of heritage features and areas, water resource systems and the Region's NES. Biodiversity is to be conserved. We REQUEST. Leave our vital	Thank you. Regional Council has directed staff to implement natural environment system option 3C which goes beyond the minimum standards of the Province.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				wetlands untouched. Take them out of the equation, whether it's houses or a road. Unlike other parts of Canada, Niagara has been fortunate so far to have avoided the perils of severe destructive flooding. We cannot depend on this luck continuing. Paving over our wetlands will simply doom future generations (including non-human species) to the ravages of climate change.	The integrated NES includes both a natural heritage and water resource system.
41	City of Welland			Given the proposed policy and mapping and its potential implications on lands within the Urban Boundary, City staff have expressed their concerns regarding some lands that are identified to contain environmental features in the mapping. As such, Regional staff have been collaborating with City Staff on the proposed Niagara Environmental Mapping updates and identified numerous revisions. It should be noted that some individuals have reached out to Staff in support of the proposed mapping. Conversely, it should also be noted that several individuals, including land owners, have reached out to City Staff with concerns regarding the proposed mapping and how it will impact the future permitted use of their land. One particular property is a large 1.7 Hectare parcel located to the North of Viger Drive (see Appendix II) and designated for Low Density Residential development. This parcel currently does not have any environmental features identified on it as per the current Natural Heritage System mapping however is proposed to be identified as Other Wetlands per the updated mapping.	Staff have been in discussions with the landowner's environmental consultant. Regional data was provided and Regional staff are awaiting information from the landowner's consultant.
42	City of Welland			Staff have also identified that the more stringent application of the natural environment policies within	Thank you. Comment noted. As part of the land needs assessment the extent of the proposed natural

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				urban boundaries will result in less available land for development. This will result in the need to expand urban boundaries to accommodate growth that can no longer be constructed in the urban serviced area due to the newly created natural heritage layers and buffers.	environment system in existing urban areas was taken into consideration.
43	Losani Homes			We have concerns with the proposed Other Woodlands designation and request the designation be removed from the 4020 Mountain St. property to reflect the current permissions for development of the lands for residential use.	A meeting in regards to this property was held. It was discussed that the transition policies in section 3.1 would likely be applicable.
44				Inquired whether land holdings for PINs [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are located within the proposed settlement area expansion area in Niagara Falls.	The Land PIN's identified are not located within the recommended settlement area expansion area in Niagara Falls. A map was attached that identifies the lands recommended for inclusion in the settlement area expansion for reference (Appendix 1 of PDS 6-2022). The Land PIN's identified are located in a Future Employment Area corridor overlay in the draft mapping, which will be considered for employment use in the future. Draft Appendix 2 to the Niagara Regional Official Plan was attached for reference.
45				Requested an update on the reports submitted in support of the settlement area expansion request at [REDACTED]. Further requested why other sites are recommended, but theirs is not.	The Region reviewed all the materials submitted by interested parties as part of the Settlement Area Boundary Review. As such, the analysis you submitted in February 2022 for SABR ID [REDACTED] was reviewed. Ultimately, the Region can only add a set amount of land the Settlement Area Boundary and other sites within Niagara Falls were determined to be more appropriate for expansion at this time.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
46				Inquired whether their property is located within the proposed settlement area expansion area in Niagara Falls.	The Region confirms that [REDACTED] is located within the proposed settlement area expansion area. Mapping was attached for reference, in addition to a copy of the letter sent via mail to the landowner.

Chapter 4 (Competitive Region) Comments with Response Matrix

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
1	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.			The current Regional Official Plan includes “Possible Aggregate Areas” adjacent to our Fonthill Pit in the Town of Pelham. Lafarge objects to the removal of this Possible Aggregate Area designation on this property in the January 2022 Draft Official Plan mapping and policies. The “Possible Aggregate Area” mapping that is currently included on Schedule D4 of the Region’s Official Plan (2014 consolidation) should continue to be maintained on draft Schedule H with appropriate policies included in section 4.3. In the current Official Plan, properties identified as “Possible Aggregate Area” do not require a Regional Official Plan Amendment and this policy and mapping has been included in the Region’s Official Plan since the Plan’s inception in the 1970s. Strategic land holdings have been acquired and maintained over the years based on this Designation which ensures the long-term protection of high-quality aggregate resources adjacent to existing operations. Removing this existing Designation represents a	That is correct the "Possible Aggregate Areas" designation exists in the existing Official Plan in several areas of the Region and would allow for a new pit or quarry without the need for a Regional Official Plan. It is the opinion of Regional staff that this designation may have been appropriate in the 1970's, but it is no longer appropriate given the changes to provincial and regional policies regarding the extraction of mineral aggregate resources.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				form of “down-designation” thereby stripping the landowner of established development and property use rights.	
2	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.	4.3	Policy 4.3.4.9, Policy 4.3.4.11	<p>These policies should be revised so that the wording “avoided first and mitigated where avoidance is not possible” is deleted in reference to potential impacts on ground and surface water resources and Intake Protection Zones (IPZ). In underline italics, we suggest the following revised wording which aligns with the wording in s. 2.5.2.2 of the PPS:</p> <p>Policy 4.3.4.9 - “...Where extraction is proposed below the water table, applicants shall demonstrate how impact on both water quality and quantity are minimized and mitigated where required.”</p> <p>Policy 4.3.4.11 - “Applications to permit a mineral aggregate operations within source water intake protection zones (IPZ) shall demonstrate how potential threats to source water are minimized and mitigated where required...”</p>	Region planning staff are comfortable with the proposed wording. It is our opinion that the proposed policies are consistent and do no conflict with any other policies of the PPS.
3	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.	4.3	Section 4.3.5	The haul route policies have remain unchanged from the previous draft version. As outlined in Lafarge’s July 2021 comments, these policies are unreasonable and unfairly target the aggregate industry. These policies should beremoved from the Aggregate Resources Section of the Official Plan and added to the Transportation Section. Generally, truck route related policies should apply to all applicable land-uses (e.g. warehousing, industrial, distribution centers etc.), not just aggregate uses.	It is the opinion of Regional Planning staff that the polices regarding aggregate truck traffic are neither 'unreasonable' or 'unfair'. Through the background work and consultation work as part of developing the aggregate policies, haul routes and truck traffic were identified as an important issue in the Region. It is the opinion of Region staff that the draft polices are appropriate and several revisions to the wording of the policies have already been made based on previous input from the aggregate industry.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
4	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.	4.3	Policy 4.3.5.1	“ mineral aggregate truck traffic shall be directed away from settlement areas to the maximum extent feasible and to make use of existing Provincial and Regional road networks. Local road networks should be used as local access routes when required. In general, each, each mineral aggregate operations should have a defined haul route. ”	See response above. It is the opinion of Region staff that the draft policies are appropriate given the consultation and background work completed in support of the development of the new Regional Official Plan.
5	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.	4.3	Policy 4.3.5.1	This policy should be deleted as it is redundant. This policy intent is already covered in Policy 4.3.4.4 (g).	See response above. It is the opinion of Region staff that the draft policies are appropriate given the consultation and background work completed in support of the development of the new Regional Official Plan.
6	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.	4.3	Policy 4.3.5.3	The Region may require applicants to enter into Haul Route Agreements as part of the process to permit a mineral aggregate operation to ensure haul routes are defined and utilized ; to secure for improvements and additional maintenance in accordance with the ARA.; and to outline the formula for the method of payment by a licence holder, where required. Improvements required to a Regional or Local road due to a new or expanded mineral aggregate operation shall not be at the public expense.	See response above. It is the opinion of Region staff that the draft policies are appropriate given the consultation and background work completed in support of the development of the new Regional Official Plan.
7	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.	4.3	Policy 4.3.5.4, 4.3.5.5, 4.3.5.6	These policies should be deleted and replaced with a general policy in the Transportation Section of the Official Plan that addresses Major goods movement facilities and corridors (PPS 1.6.8.2) in the Niagara Region through the development of a Transportation Master Plan. The focus of these policies must be on sufficient connectivity for truck routes that does not create excessive travel time	See response above. It is the opinion of Region staff that the draft policies are appropriate given the consultation and background work completed in support of the development of the new Regional Official Plan.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				compared to the shortest travel distance, and offers one or more truck route connections.	
8	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.	4.3	Policy 4.3.6.3	To be consistent with the wording of the PPS, we suggest this policy be revised as follows: “Comprehensive rehabilitation planning is required <u>encouraged</u> where there is a concentration of mineral aggregate operations”.	Part III of the PPS (on page 3) states that “The policies of the Provincial Policy Statement’ represent minimum standards. Within the framework of the provincial policy-led planning system, planning authorities and decision-makers may go beyond these minimum standards to address matters of importance to a specific community, unless doing so would conflict with any policy of the Provincial Policy Statement”. It is the opinion of Region staff that in this case, going beyond the minimum standards does not conflict with any other policies. It is the opinion of Region staff that the draft policy is both appropriate and consistent with the PPS.
9	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.	4.2	Policy Section 4.2	The PPS permits the extraction of mineral aggregate resources as an interim use in prime agricultural areas and in speciality crop areas, subject to specific criteria. The Agricultural policies should be revised to recognize mineral aggregate operations as a permitted non-agricultural use that are subject to the policies in Section 4.3.	It is the opinion of Region staff that the current policies in S. 4.3 are sufficient to recognize the interaction between aggregates and agriculture.
10	David Bazargan on behalf of Lafarge Canada Inc.			Given the two-year moratorium under Section 22(2.1) and 34(10.0.0.1) of the Planning Act, we would like to understand the approach Niagara Region intends to take in order to make aggregate available in a manner that is consistent with the PPS. This provision should not be applied to Official Plan Amendment applications for new or expanded mineral aggregate operations as sufficient supplies of close-to-market aggregate are required to	Comment has been addressed. Appropriate transition policies have been added to Section 7 of the plan.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>support Regional development, construction, and infrastructure projects.</p> <p>Wording needs to be added to the Region’s new Official Plan to ensure that Regional Official Plan Amendments for new or expanding Mineral Aggregate Operations will continue to be received during the two-year period. The following wording should be added to the Region’s new Official Plan: In accordance with Sections 22(2.1) and 34(10.0.0.1) of the Planning Act, a request to amend this Plan and/or a Local Official Plan and/or a Zoning By-law to establish a new or expanded mineral aggregate operation is allowed before the second anniversary of the first day that these Plans came into effect.</p>	
11	Mary Lou Tanner - NPG for Nyon Lands	4.2	4.2.2.1 4.2.2.4	<p>a. In Policy #1, there is reference to a date in June 2006 (date of the Growth Plan implementation as I recall) and uses existing prior to that date. The two issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Nyon uses did not exist prior to that date as the various applications were still in process (Regional OPA and Local applications). The applications were submitted prior to the Growth Plan coming into effect. ii. Nyon’s applications to the City and Region that resulted in the OMB decision were subject to pre-Growth Plan policies and the PPS at that time. <p>b. In Policy 4 there are references to expansion of existing uses. The Nyon site is going through the Site Plan process as the zoning is in place for these lands as well as the balance of the Rural</p>	The policy in the draft plan has been revised in response to the comment received.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>Employment lands in Port Colborne. The Nyon lands will be developed in phases so the policy as worded would not work for the phased development approach.</p> <p>Given the above, our preference is to continue the existing Rural Employment policies which implement the OMB decision.</p>	
12	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.5.1	<p>Walker requests that policy 4.3.5.1 be taken out of section 4.3 and inserted into section 5.1.5 or 5.1.6 of the draft Official Plan and serve as a more general policy for truck traffic rather than being solely aimed at aggregate truck traffic. Suggested wording: 5.1.X Mineral aggregate truck Truck traffic shall be is encouraged to be directed away from settlement areas and to the maximum extent feasible and will be encouraged to make use of existing Provincial and Regional road networks. Local road networks should be used as local access routes only where possible. In general, each mineral aggregate operation should have a defined haul route.</p>	<p>Through the background work and consultation work as part of developing the aggregate policies haul routes and truck traffic were identified as an important issue in the Region. It is the opinion of Region staff that the draft policies are appropriate and several revisions to the wording of the policies have already been made based on previous input from the aggregate industry.</p>
13	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.5.1 & 4.3.5.2	<p>Given that the Region prefers to have specific policy related to mineral aggregate haul routes, the following revised Policy 4.3.5.2 is acceptable that also addresses 4.3.5.1: Applications to permit a mineral aggregate operation shall include an evaluation of alternative haul routes that assesses the potential economic, social, environmental and physical impacts associated with future aggregate traffic to or from a</p>	<p>See response above. It is the opinion of Region staff that the draft policies are appropriate given the consultation and background work completed in support of the development of the new Regional Official Plan.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				proposed mineral aggregate operation and identifies the haul route with least potential impact. In determining the acceptability of impact, the City will take into account the category of road as identified on Schedule ___ and associated transportation policies.	
14	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC			Consistency with PPS and Growth Plan: For the most part, aggregate policies have been updated since the previous version to more precisely reflect language in the Growth Plan (and other provincial plan policies). However, there are still some inconsistencies with the PPS, Growth Plan, and Greenbelt Plan. To address this, Walker suggests that the Region simply refer back to provincial policy relative to mineral aggregate applications rather than inserting provincial policy wording into the OP. This will enable the new OP to be consistent with provincial policy, avoiding non-conforming OP policies if changes are made to provincial policy, which would be of benefit to both the Region and applicants. If this approach is not adopted by the Region, Walker has also provided detailed comments on draft OP policy to ensure consistency with the PPS and conformity with Provincial Plans as currently worded.	It is the opinion of Region Planning staff that it is not appropriate to simply insert Provincial policy into the plan. There are many instances where provincial policy is only providing general direction to municipalities as opposed to implementable policy. Additional policies are required by the Region.
15	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.4.4	Policies contained in the OP, including natural heritage policies, cannot be more restrictive than provincial policy relative to mineral aggregate applications. Therefore, aggregate applications must meet provincial policy where it comes to aggregate resources. Walker therefore suggests a	Thank you for the suggestion. Staff are comfortable with the approach that is currently being taken.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>more simplistic approach and requests the introduction of a new subsection within section 4.3 of the draft Official Plan specifically to deal with mineral aggregate operation applications in the context of the Natural Heritage System. This approach would greatly clarify the requirements for mineral aggregate application associated with the different components of the natural heritage system and also the implementation of such requirements. It is therefore requested that a new subsection be included after policy 4.3.4.4 in the new Official Plan, which would read “Natural Heritage Policies for Mineral Aggregate Operation Applications” and be accompanied by the following introductory text: “Notwithstanding other policies in this Plan, an application to permit a mineral aggregate operation shall conform to this section (4.3) of the Official Plan and the policies contained herein”.</p>	
16	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.4.3	<p>Walker request that Draft Policy 4.3.4.3 be reworded as follows: Applications to permit a mineral aggregate operation shall: a) be consist with the Provincial Policy Statement; b) conform to and not conflict with the Provincial Plans, Regional and Local Official Plans; c) consider policies of the Conservation Authority; and, conform to the overall intent of policies contained in the Regional and local Official Plans; d) give due have regard for other policies or</p>	Regional staff have reviewed the proposed wording and prefer the wording of the policies as currently proposed.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				guidelines that are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and in conformity with Provincial Plan polices and the requirements under the Aggregate Resources Act and its regulations.	
17	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.4.5	<p>Policy 4.3.4.5 should be reworded as follows: Within the Provincial Natural Heritage System, The establishment of no new mineral aggregate operation and no new wayside pits and quarries, or any ancillary or accessory use thereto, within a Provincial Natural Heritage System is not will be permitted in the following key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features (as defined by the Provincial Policy Statement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Significant wetlands; b) Habitat of endangered species and threatened species; and, c) significant woodlands unless the woodland is occupied by young plantation or early successional habitat, as defined by the Province, in which case, the application must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the approval authority that provincial policies have been addressed. 	Regional staff are comfortable with the draft wording. The suggested revisions have the exact same meaning.
18	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.4.6	<p>Given that this policy is derived directly from Policy 4.3.2.3 b) of the Greenbelt Plan, Walker requests that the wording and defined terms of this policy are consistent with both the Greenbelt Plan and PPS. In order to be consistent with the Greenbelt Plan, Policy 4.3.4.6 should be reworded as follows: Any application for a new mineral aggregate operation within a Provincial Natural Heritage</p>	Consistency does not mean that Regional policies need to be verbatim of provincial policy. It is the opinion of Regional staff that the proposed policies do not conflict with the PPS and are therefore appropriate.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>System will be required to demonstrate how:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) connectivity between key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features will be maintained before, during, and after the extraction of mineral aggregate resources; b) the operator could replace key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features that would be lost or significantly altered from the site with equivalent or enhanced features on another part of the site or on adjacent lands; c) the water resource system will be protected or enhanced; and, d) any key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features and their associated vegetation protection zones not identified in 4.3.4.5, will be addressed in accordance with Provincial policy and the policies of this Plan. 	
19	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.4.7	<p>Walker requests that Draft Policy 4.3.4.7 be reworded as follows in order to be consistent with 4.2.8.2 c) of the Growth Plan:</p> <p>An application to permit the expansion of an existing mineral aggregate operation may be permitted within a Provincial Natural Heritage System may be permitted including in key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features and any associated vegetation protection zones, if the related decision and rehabilitation is consistent with the PPS and satisfies the rehabilitation requirements of Provincial, Regional and Local Municipal policies.</p>	<p>Consistency does not mean that Regional policies need to be verbatim of provincial policy. It is the opinion of Regional staff that the proposed policies do not conflict with the PPS and are therefore appropriate.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
20	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.4.8	It is requested that the wording of Draft Policy 4.3.4.8 be revised as follows: Applications to permit a mineral aggregate operation shall implement be encouraged where possible to implement the Provincial guidelines and industry best practices in regards to managing and mitigating potential impacts related to noise, dust, and vibration.	It is the opinion of Region planning staff that provincial guidelines and best practices for mineral aggregate operations should be met. Simply encouraging them to be met where possible is not considered to be good public policy.
21	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.4.9	It is requested that the wording of Draft Policy 4.3.4.9 be revised as follows: Applications to permit a mineral aggregate operation shall demonstrate how potential negative impacts to ground and surface water resources will be protected minimized . Where extraction is proposed below the water table, applicants shall demonstrate how impacts on both water quality and quantity are avoided first and mitigated where avoidance is not possible.	Regional staff have reviewed the proposed wording and prefer the wording of the policies as currently proposed.
22	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.4.10	In order to make Draft Policy 4.3.4.10 consistent with Provincial Policy (specifically 4.2.8.3 of the Growth Plan) and Standards, it is suggested that the wording of the policy be revised as follows: “In prime agricultural areas, applications to permit a new mineral aggregate operation shall be supported by an Agricultural Impact Assessment and, where possible, will seek in accordance with Provincial guidance. The Agricultural Impact Assessment shall provide guidance on how to maintain or improve connectivity of the agricultural	Consistency does not mean that Regional policies need to be verbatim of provincial policy. It is the opinion of Regional staff that the proposed policies do not conflict with the PPS and are therefore appropriate. We have added additional language to allow the policy to be more easily interpreted and implemented.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				system and be completed by a qualified professional”.	
23	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.4.11	<p>It is requested that policy 4.3.4.11 be reworded as follows:</p> <p>4.3.4.11 Applications to permit a mineral aggregate operation within source water in-take protection zones (IPZ) shall identify applicable source water protection policy and requirements that will be implemented as part of the proposal. demonstrate how potential threats to source water are avoided first and mitigated where avoidance is not possible. Applications within IPZs shall be considered in the context of the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Impact on source water features; b) Proposed source water mitigation and monitoring; and, c) Proposed type of licence, ARA site plan conditions, rehabilitation, and proposed after use of the site. 	Regional staff have reviewed the proposed wording and prefer the wording of the policies as currently proposed.
24	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.5.2	<p>Walker requests that this policy be deleted and the general principles of Draft Policy 4.3.5.2 be integrated with general transportation policy for all types of truck traffic and not specific to mineral aggregate truck traffic. For example:</p> <p>All Regional Roads will be classified as truck or haul routes unless prohibitions or time restrictions are imposed on particular sections based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the section of roadway is not designed or constructed for heavy truck traffic or long vehicles; (b) there are critical height or weight restrictions on 	Through the background work and consultation work as part of developing the aggregate policies haul routes and truck traffic were identified as an important issue in the Region. It is the opinion of Region staff that the draft policies are appropriate and several revisions to the wording of the policies have already been made based on previous input from the aggregate industry.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>the section of roadway; (c) the land uses adjacent to the roadway are primarily front-lotted urban residential and a suitable alternate route is available; or (d) other considerations as determined by Regional Council. Regional Roads provide safe, direct, accessible and multi-modal transportation links for moving people and goods throughout Niagara Region, and to adjacent municipalities. Regional Roads will be planned and constructed in accordance with the provisions of applicable design standards and guidelines.</p>	
25	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.5.3	Walker would like to again request that this policy be removed for reasons highlighted in our previous submission to the Region (dated: July 2, 2021) and that policies relative to road access, network, hierarchy and use should be addressed in a more encompassing manner in a Transportation Section of the draft OP.	See response above. It is the opinion of Region staff that the draft policies are appropriate given the consultation and background work completed in support of the development of the new Regional Official Plan.
26	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.6.3	Policy 4.3.6.3 as currently worded is not consistent with the PPS. The word “required” should be replaced with the word “encouraged” in order to be consistent with the PPS (Section 2.5.3.2 of PPS), as follows: Comprehensive rehabilitation planning is encouraged required where there is a concentration of mineral aggregate operations.	Consistency does not mean that Regional policies need to be verbatim of provincial policy. The PPS clearly states that the policies of the PPS are minimum standards and that municipalities may go beyond the minimum standards if they do not conflict with other policies. It is the opinion of Regional staff that the proposed policies do not conflict with the PPS and are therefore appropriate.
27	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.6.4	Given that this policy is derived directly from section 4.2.8.4 of the Growth Plan, Walker requests that policy 4.3.6.4 be reworded as follows for	Consistency does not mean that Regional policies need to be verbatim of provincial policy. It is the opinion of Regional staff that the proposed policies do

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>consistency with the Growth Plan: For rehabilitation plans for a of new mineral aggregate operation sites, shall comply with the following policies apply: a) the disturbed area of a site shall will be rehabilitated to a state of equal or greater ecological value and, for the entire site, long-term ecological integrity will shall be maintained or enhanced; b) if there are key natural heritage features or key hydrologic features on the site, or if such features existed on the site at the time of an application: iii. the health, diversity and size of these key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features will shall be maintained or enhanced; and, iv. any areas where permitted extraction of mineral aggregates resources that occurs was permitted within a feature shall will be completed, and the area will be rehabilitated, as early as possible in the life of the operation; c) aquatic areas remaining after extraction are to shall be rehabilitated to an aquatic enhancement, which will be environment representative of the natural ecosystem in that particular setting or ecodistrict, and the combined terrestrial and aquatic rehabilitation will meet the intent of Policy 4.3.6.7 b), and, d) outside a Provincial Natural Heritage System, and except as provided in policies 4.3.6.4 a), b) and c), final rehabilitation will shall appropriately reflect the long-term land use of the general area, taking into account applicable policies of provincial plans</p>	<p>not conflict with the PPS and are therefore appropriate.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>and, to the extent permitted under provincial plans, existing municipal and provincial policies and the policies of this Plan.</p> <p>In prime agricultural areas, the site shall be rehabilitated in accordance with policy 2.5.4 of the PPS, 2020. Provincial policy and the requirements of this Plan.</p>	
28	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.6.7	Walker would also like to bring to the attention of the Region that the reference to Policy 4.3.6.7 b) in part c) of the policy needs to be corrected as there is no such policy contained in the draft Niagara Region Official Plan.	Comment no longer applicable.
29	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.6.5	<p>Given that this policy is derived directly from section 4.2.8.5 of the Growth Plan, Walker requests that policy 4.3.6.5 be reworded as follows for consistency with the Growth Plan.</p> <p>* See posted submission on the Official Plan website for details.</p>	Changes have been made to the policy to more closely align with the wording of the Growth Plan.
30	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.6.6	Walker acknowledges that this policy has been modified since the previous draft version of the Official Plan. However, upon review the of the change to policy 4.3.6.6, we would like to emphasize that in order to be consistent with the PPS, the wording in the above policy “on prime agricultural lands” should be changed to “prime agricultural areas, on prime agricultural land”, as follows:	Consistency does not mean that Regional policies need to be verbatim of provincial policy. It is the opinion of Regional staff that the proposed policies do not conflict with the PPS and are therefore appropriate.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				* See posted submission on the Official Plan website for details.	
31	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.9.2	<p>Given that this policy is derived directly from section 4.3.2.5 of the Greenbelt Plan, Walker requests that Draft Policy 4.3.9.2 be reworded to ensure consistency with the Greenbelt Plan, which is as follows:</p> <p>* See posted submission on the Official Plan website for details.</p>	<p>Consistency does not mean that Regional policies need to be verbatim of provincial policy. It is the opinion of Regional staff that the proposed policies do not conflict with the PPS and are therefore appropriate.</p>
32	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	4.3	4.3.9.3	<p>Given that this policy is derived directly from section 4.3.2.9 of the Greenbelt Plan, Walker requests that Draft Policy 4.3.9.3 be reworded as shown below in order to be consistent with the Greenbelt Plan.</p> <p>* See posted submission on the Official Plan website for details.</p>	<p>Consistency does not mean that Regional policies need to be verbatim of provincial policy. It is the opinion of Regional staff that the proposed policies do not conflict with the PPS and are therefore appropriate.</p>
33	Mike Pettigrew for 1984296 Ontario Inc. c/o Biglieri Group	4.2		<p>In recognizing the role of institutional uses as major employers, it would stand to reason that the St. Catharines OPA 26 to create a new Institutional use which is not considered as Employment Area in the St. Catharines Official Plan (“LOP”) and is not reflected as Employment Area (of any classification) in the draft ROP Schedule G. For this reason, it should be recognized that the balance and distribution of Employment Areas per OPA 26 could be amended to recognize portion of the Institutional</p>	<p>One of key purposes of Employment Areas is to protect employment uses from other more sensitive land uses encroaching and causing compatibility issues. This includes protecting industrial areas from sensitive residential uses.</p> <p>Employment areas were developed in consultation with the local municipality, and the employment areas recommended in the Niagara Official plan are in alignment with the recommendations of OPA 26.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>designation as Employment Areas and allow the Port Weller lands to be excluded from the Employment Area calculation.</p> <p>The potential for converting lands designation Employment Area will only be permitted during an MCR per policy 4.2.1.11, which reads “Conversion of lands within employment areas shall not be permitted except during the Region’s municipal comprehensive review. The Region will work with local municipalities to review and update employment area minimum density targets through the Region’s municipal comprehensive review.” The City of St. Catharines completed the land needs assessment used to develop OPA 26 before the Region had finalized their employment growth targets.</p> <p>The redesignation of Employment Lands to Institutional for major employers such as hospitals or universities/colleges as part of this Draft ROP reduces the available land for Employment Area but still contributes to the employment need.</p>	
34	Mike Pettigrew for 1984296 Ontario Inc. c/o Biglieri Group	4.2	4.2.1.12	<p>policy 4.2.1.12 states that “Local municipalities shall use planning tools to achieve land use compatibility between employment areas and non-employment lands.” In its determination to balance the employment area land need with the removal of key existing major institutions (the General Hospital and Brock University), and the removal of the GM lands as employment, the City has simply solidified other currently designated Employment Lands within the Urban Boundary regardless of their viability. This</p>	<p>Employment areas were developed in consultation with the local municipality, and the employment areas recommended in the Niagara Official plan are in alignment with the recommendations of OPA 26.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				ignores the compatibility issues and conflicts that persist throughout Port Weller East and will be exacerbated if the lands are to be developed for Core (industrial) Employment uses.	
35	Mike Pettigrew for 1984296 Ontario Inc. c/o Biglieri Group	4.2		Given that the Subject Lands [REDACTED] - [REDACTED] Employment Conversion) have been designated for Employment for over 50 years and have never been developed, and that the area north of Lakeshore Road are in decline and increasingly conflict with the sensitive lands uses (residential) and have seen significant transportation and logistical issues, it would stand to reason that the proposed Employment Area designation for the Port Weller east area (inclusive of the Subject Lands) is entirely inappropriate. The Port Weller area is isolated from all major highway and rail corridors in the Region and any upgrades to the road network will require heavy truck traffic through residential neighbourhoods or along rural roads outside the urban boundary and within the Greenbelt to connect to the nearest highway (QEW 6km south via Niagara Street or 7km via Read Road). Whereas significant swaths of land within and adjacent to the urban boundary existing along the QEW or within protected Future Employment Areas within the Niagara Economic Centre or Zone.	The Region has the responsibility of identifying and protecting sufficient employment areas needs to plan for 2051. The Region worked in close consultation with local planning departments to identify employment areas. The employment areas identified by the Region and City of St. Catharines, align with the decisions of OPA 26.
36	Mike Pettigrew for 1984296 Ontario Inc. c/o Biglieri Group			Policy 4.2.5.2 states that “Local Official Plans may contain criteria for employment land redevelopment to non-employment uses outside of an employment area. If local criteria are unavailable, the Region and local municipalities may use the Region’s	Thank you for the comment.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>Employment Land Redevelopment Criteria Guideline identified in Appendix 3.” And that, (4.2.5.3) “the Region and local municipalities shall discourage any redevelopment of employment land that may restrict the ability for nearby existing or planned employment uses to operate or expand.” Based on the land use compatibility study provided with our client’s applications for the currently designated employment land to be converted, in part, to residential uses in proximity to the existing Heddle Shipyard, it is feasible to permit residential development on the Subject Lands with the appropriate built form and building orientation.</p>	
37	Mike Pettigrew for 1984296 Ontario Inc. c/o Biglieri Group			<p>Based on the above and further review of the Draft Niagara Region Official Plan, there are major concerns with how the employment land need has been determined and how it is allocated based on the three Employment Area classifications. Furthermore, the criteria for determining where Employment Areas are appropriate does not correlate with the rationale by the City of St. Catharines or Region of Niagara’s decision to designate the area around Port Weller East as Employment Area, and even more so as Core Employment Area. The Subject Lands are not adjacent or even in close proximity to any major transportation corridors, they have remained vacant for over 50 years while being designated for employment uses, and thus are not a viable location for protected employment. They do not serve the Region or the City to meet their employment land</p>	<p>The lands in question are along a major transportation corridor (Welland Canal). The employment areas identified by the Region and City of St. Catharines, align with the decisions of OPA 26.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>needs which are better suited near transportation facilities and corridors. Jobs and services to support the Port Weller East community can be achieved in alternative Mixed Use forms that provide the existing residents with greater amenities. It is for these reasons that we request that the Region of Niagara consider removing the Port Weller East lands from the Employment Area designation and allow opportunity for a locally driven process to occur to determine the best use of the lands to better serve the City and local residents.</p>	
38	Bill Heska			<p>Cannabis Grow Operations- There was no reference to this industry in the session presentation. I attended a meeting that was organized by the Niagara Region Planning and Development Services back in Dec. 11, 2019 where the topic was Cannabis Land-Use Workshop. What N.R. Planning Dept. action was a result of this workshop. Is there work in progress on this industry? changes</p>	<p>Growing of cannabis is considered a normal farm practice, and is protected under the Farming & Food Production Protection Act. As such, there are no policies in the draft Official Plan that single out this agricultural use. With respect to the session the Region organized, that was meant as an information sharing opportunity between the local municipalities in Niagara. As you may recall, there were presentations on best practices for municipalities to regulate agricultural activities. Since the workshop, several of the local municipalities have undertaken Official Plan and Zoning amendments with respect to agricultural uses.</p>

Chapter 5 (Connected Region) Comments with Response Matrix

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
1	Niagara Escarpment Commission	5.1	5.1.1.7	We support the revision to Policy 5.1.1.7 which recognizes the need for transportation infrastructure to conform to the NEP. The consideration of alternatives to infrastructure within the NEP Area, through a comprehensive environmental assessment process is key to demonstrating the achievement of the policies in Parts 2.6, 2.7 and 2.12 of the NEP. Policy 5.1.5.10 is consistent in that regard.	Thank you for the comment.
2	Niagara Escarpment Commission	5.2	5.2.4.6	In our letter to the Ministry we noted that new waste disposal sites are not permitted in the NEP Area. Policy 5.2.4.6 relating to the location of new waste disposal sites should include a new subsection which makes this clear.	Policy has been revised.
3	Niagara Escarpment Commission	5.3	5.3.1.4	Please correct the reference in Policy 5.3.1.4 to the Niagara Escarpment Parks and Open Space System (not “Spaces”). We support this policy.	The typo has been corrected.
4	Niagara Parks Commission	5.1	5.1.3	Active transportation linkages to Niagara Parks recreation trail system Add clause: The Region will encourage and work with the Niagara Parks Commission to improve the cycling network within their jurisdiction’ Reinforces and supports connected cycling network across all jurisdictions.	Policy has been revised.
5	Niagara Parks Commission	5.3	5.3.1.2	Add the Niagara Parks Commission to list Suggest “... the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority, The Niagara Parks Commission, and other interest	The revision has been made.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				agencies.” NPC has 5,000 hectares of public parkland, trails and open spaces in Region, major contributor to open space in Niagara	
6	Niagara Parks Commission	5.3	5.3.1.4	Language is too narrow. Suggest: “The Region encourages the local municipalities, the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority, and provincial agencies to” Public lands from all levels of government are recognized in the NEP as part of the NEPOSS	Provincial agencies has been added to the policy.
7	TransCanada PipeLines	5.2	5.2.8	5.2.8.1 TransCanada PipeLines Limited (“TCPL”) operates two high pressure natural gas pipelines within its right-of-way crossing the Region as well as two industrial compressor stations and are identified on Schedule B, Regional Structure.	The revisions have been made.
8	TransCanada PipeLines	5.2	5.2.8	5.2.8.2 Development resulting in increased population density in proximity to TCPL’s right-of-way and compressor stations may result in TransCanada being required to replace its pipeline(s) to comply with CSA Code Z662. Early consultation with TCPL or its designated representative, for any development proposals within 200 metres of its pipelines and within 750 metres of TransCanada’s compressor stations should be undertaken to ensure TCPL can assess potential	The revision has been made.

Chapter 6 (Vibrant Region) Comments with Response Matrix

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
1	City of Niagara Falls	6.1	6.1.4.2	The interpretation of 'large' should be a collaborate decision with the local municipality	Policy revised to clarify size.
2	City of Niagara Falls	6.2	6.2.2.2	Within urban boundaries the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and transit should be prioritized over private motorists.	Policy 6.2.2.8 e) prioritizes pedestrian and cycling infrastructure in downtowns and community cores.
3	City of Niagara Falls	6.2	6.2.3.1	If the local municipality Urban design guidelines - they should have priority over the Regions. The Region can provide its guidelines and terms of reference templates for municipalities that do not have Staff or expertise in house.	Policy was already updated to address similar comment from Town of Fort Erie.
4	City of Welland			While City Staff recognize the importance of conserving archaeological resources as well as the importance of ensuring that the proper archaeological assessment processes are undertaken in known archaeological sites, Staff note some concerns with the proposed AMP Mapping: Many Areas of Archaeological Potential identified in the Mapping are within the Urban Area and have already been significantly disturbed. In Planning Staff's opinion, requiring archaeological assessments for infill development or redevelopments where properties are already substantially disturbed is an overreach and will create another barrier to development.	Disturbed sites were accounted for in the consultant's modeling. Remaining areas identified exhibit the potential to contain artifacts.
5	Jennifer Dockstader for Fort Erie Native Friendship Centre	6.3		Pretty clear language. Do you want to specify who they should contact? I know they will contact the Region's department, but	The Region will explore opportunities to share contact information in a supplemental document. This work will be undertaken in collaboration with First Nations and Indigenous communities.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				should you provide the contacts for the First Nations in this document as well?	

Chapter 7 (Implementation) Comments with Response Matrix

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
1	City of Niagara Falls	7.2	7.2.1.2	For the purposes of implementation, this Plan contains : this phrase should be deleted to improve readability with the sublist.	Revision made.
2	City of Niagara Falls	7.11	7.11.4.1 d)	Reword to improve tense and readability within the list	Revision made.
3	Graham Pett and Edie Pett			Lastly, we REQUEST that the Official Plan be evaluated on an on-going and regular basis and that a major evaluation be conducted no longer than the 3rd year into its implementation, this to assess its effectiveness and to undertake adjustments as necessary. Among many important areas for review and analysis will be as to whether progress is being made on increasing the affordable housing supply and if the density and intensification targets are leading to the targeted increases in population, or not.	The document is not intended to remain unchanged and will be updated to respond to changing trends and innovation that affect land use planning. The Planning Act requires that the Official Plan be updated at least 10 years after approval, and then every 5 years thereafter.

Chapter 8 (Site Specific) Comments with Response Matrix

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
1	Niagara Escarpment Commission	8.1	8.1.2	In our letter to the MMAH, we noted that “existing use” has a specific definition in Appendix 2 of the NEP and specific policies relating to them in Part 2.3. We noted that the proposed Official Plan does not refer to the unique NEP policy approach to existing uses in Policy 8.1.2. We continue to recommend that this section of the Official Plan be revised to indicate that what may be considered an existing use in the OP or the Greenbelt Plan, may not meet the definition of an existing use in the NEP.	Staff feel the policy as written, does not prevent the NEC policies from applying. Where there is a conflict, the NEC policies will prevail.
2	Niagara Escarpment Commission	8.3	8.3.4.1	With respect to other proposed site-specific policies, we reiterate our comments to the MMAH below. Further discussion regarding these sites may be warranted if the Region has more information which would support the proposed policy (i.e. are they considered existing uses). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.3.4.1 – permits proposed Vincor International estate winery (described as east of Jordan, south of RR 81) to connect to sanitary sewer forcemain. Not sure if the lands are within the NEP, part of this area is within NEP but immediate area to the east of Jordan is not. No map is provided. If the lands are within the NEP Area and are outside the urban boundary, municipal servicing is not permitted by the policies of the NEP. 	Staff feel the policy as written, does not prevent the NEC policies from applying. Where there is a conflict, the NEC policies will prevail.
3	Niagara Escarpment Commission	8.3	8.3.13.10	With respect to other proposed site-specific policies, we reiterate our comments to the MMAH below. Further discussion regarding these sites	A master plan is being developed for these lands. Region staff notes the land is owned by the City of Niagara Falls and falls within Escarpment Rural Area.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>may be warranted if the Region has more information which would support the proposed policy (i.e. are they considered existing uses).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.3.13.10 – [REDACTED] – would permit a municipally serviced recreation facility. A Development Permit was issued for a recreational complex in late 1990s, fill placement for a future sports park in 2003. Mapping shows the site as being part of NEPOSS. An amendment was proposed during the Co-ordinated Provincial Plan review to remove the subject lands from the NEP Area, but the application was not approved. The proposed use and the related servicing do not appear to be permitted uses according to NEP policy. 	<p>Staff disagree that the parcel is part of the NEPOSS system.</p>
4	Niagara Parks Commission	8.3	8.3.23.2 d)	<p>x. archaeology assessment is a new requirement Delete “ X. archaeology assessment” It is a new requirement not previously included in OMB decision. As a provincial agency Niagara Parks is bound to higher standards of when archaeological assessments are required, and in this regard NPC has already undertaken assessments. Stage 3 archaeological assessments have been completed and areas of avoidance documented.</p>	<p>Staff agree with comment - Archaeology assessment requirement remove from list.</p>

Chapter 9 (Glossary) Comments with Response Matrix

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Term	Comment	Region Response
1	Niagara Escarpment Commission	9	On-Farm Diversified Use	The definition of on-farm diversified uses includes home occupations. The NEP allows home occupations in several designations, and these can be permitted on properties which are not farms or are un-related to farming activities. A separate definition of home occupation would help to clarify this. Will the Region consider adding a separate definition of home occupation to address non-farm-related home occupations? From a policy perspective, home occupations should be allowed in the Region even if not associated with agriculture. This became an issue with respect to a recent NEC Development Permit application where Regional planning staff appeared not to support a home occupation on an agricultural property because the nature of the home occupation did not relate to the farming activity.	Staff do not feel a change is necessary. The definition is consistent with the definition in the PPS.
2	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	9	Natural Heritage Features and Areas	It is requested that the last sentence be removed from the above definition as it does not form part of the definition contained in the PPS and goes beyond provincial interests.	Additional language was added to the definition to allow implementation of the Region's integrated natural environment system.
3	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	9	Natural Heritage System	The definition of Natural Heritage System in the draft Official Plan does not fully align with the definition contained in the PPS. The definition included in the draft plan incorporates additional features such as “wetlands” and “key hydrologic features”, which do not form part of the definition of the Natural Heritage System in the PPS and therefore goes beyond the intended	Additional language was added to the definition to allow implementation of the Region's integrated natural environment system.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Term	Comment	Region Response
				scope of provincial policy. Following this, Walker requests that this definition be changed to fully reflect the defined term in the PPS. Furthermore, the definition of Natural Heritage System, the Region needs to italicize and link back other defined terms in the Plan for consistency with the PPS.	
4	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	9	Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest	The definition of Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest in the draft Official Plan is currently not consistent with the PPS. Walker therefore requests that the current definition of Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest be reworded to align with the definition contained in the PPS.	Consistency does not mean that Regional definitions need to be verbatim of provincial definitions. It is the opinion of Regional staff that the proposed policies do not conflict with the PPS and are therefore appropriate.
5	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	9	Ecological Integrity and Ecological Value	The definition of both Ecological Integrity and Ecological Value in the draft Official Plan is currently not consistent with the Greenbelt Plan. Walker therefore requests that the current definitions of Ecological Integrity and Ecological Value be reworded to align with the definition contained with the Greenbelt Plan.	Consistency does not mean that Regional definitions need to be verbatim of provincial definitions. It is the opinion of Regional staff that the proposed policies do not conflict with the PPS and are therefore appropriate.

Chapter 10 (Schedules) Comments with Response Matrix

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
1	Niagara Escarpment Commission	10		NEC staff had a series of discussions relating to proposed urban boundary changes with Regional and local planning staff. We also shared our concerns regarding proposed mapping of some urban boundaries with MMAH staff. We are not aware whether MMAH raised these mapping issues	These comments pertain to technical boundary updates. Staff have met with NEC and discussed changes. No further technical updates have been proposed.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				with Regional staff or whether any further mapping changes are proposed in relation to urban boundaries.	
2	TransCanada PipeLines	10		The second compressor station area should be identified on Schedule B. The location is 3183 Cosby Road, just south of Yonge Street.	Added to Schedule B and Appendix 2.
3	TransCanada PipeLines	10		There is a north-south pipeline that connects the east-west TCPL line to a more southerly line. This connecting line begins at the east side of David Road and south of Upper's Lane at the southeast corner of the Niagara Detention Centre, and heads southward and parallels Regional Road 82 (Allanport Road) to the east by approx. 420 metres, before connecting to the southeasterly TCPL line that jogs southeastward from just south of Hurricane Road as already shown on the Schedule B map.	Added to Schedule B and Appendix 2.
4	TransCanada PipeLines	10		The southerly pipeline that extends from the Hamilton boundary to Road 82, in Thorold, is not a TCPL line and does not connect with the TCPL line that extends from Hurricane Road southward to the USA border.	Lines have been differentiated to identify TCPL and Enbridge pipelines.
5	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	10		Ridgemount Quarry (Licence 4459) Draft mapping of the Region's Natural Environment System identifies: ii) an Earth Science ANSI; and iii) the Growth Plan Natural Heritage System on portions of the active Ridgemount quarry licence area (see Figures 2-4). We are requesting that these features within the licenced area be removed from the proposed	These features/areas are identified/mapped by the province and will continue to be reflected in the schedules.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				Region Draft OP Schedules as they are located in an area approved and licenced for aggregate extraction and are subject to specific rehabilitation requirements in accordance with detailed Site Plans approved and regulated under the Aggregate Resources Act.	
6	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	10		Spring Creek Quarry (Licence 4435) Draft mapping of the Region’s Natural Environment System identifies: i) “Significant Woodlands” ii) the Growth Plan Natural Heritage System; and iii) Provincially Significant Wetlands on portions of the Spring Creek Quarry licenced area as shown on Figure 5 and 6. Walker requests that these features within the licenced area be removed from the Natural Environment System Mapping as they are located in an area approved and licenced for aggregate extraction and are subject to specific rehabilitation requirements in accordance with detailed Site Plans approved and regulated under the Aggregate Resources Act.	Some of these features/areas are identified/mapped by the province and will continue to be reflected in the schedules. The significant woodlands have been reviewed and staff are satisfied with the mapping.
7	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	10		Vineland Quarry (Licence 11171, 11167, 88636, & 4436) Walker’s lands in the Vineland area are subject to four (4) separate active licences for aggregate extraction (Licence Nos. 11171, 11167, 88636, and 4436). Draft mapping of the Region’s Natural Environment System identifies: i) Significant Woodlands	Some of these features/areas are identified/mapped by the province and will continue to be reflected in the schedules. The woodlands and shoreline areas have been reviewed and staff are satisfied with the mapping.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				ii) Other Woodlands iii) Greenbelt Natural Heritage System iv) Other Wetlands and Non Provincially Significant Wetlands v) Provincially Significant Wetlands vi) Shoreline Areas on portion of these licenced areas (see Figures 7-9). We are requesting that these features within the licenced area be removed from the Natural Environment System Mapping as they are located in areas approved and licenced for aggregate extraction and are subject to specific rehabilitation requirements in accordance with detailed Site Plans approved and regulated through the Aggregate Resources Act.	
8	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	10		Schedule G of the Draft Official Plan identifies a number of “Employment Areas” within Niagara Region. The Rolling Meadows Secondary Plan, as part of the City of Thorold Official Plan, identifies employment lands along Thorold Townline Road to accommodate Prestige Industrial and Light Industrial uses (please see previous submission to the draft Niagara Region Official Plan, dated: July 2, 2021) and is intended to provide an appropriate buffer between sensitive land uses and the Stone Resource area identified on Schedule H2 of the Draft Niagara Official Plan. Walker requests that the employment lands shown in the Rolling Meadows Secondary Plan be included and identified as “Employment Areas” on Schedule G of the Draft Official Plan in order to minimize the	The City of Thorold Official Plan provides policy direction on employment uses within the Rolling Meadows Secondary Plan area. These polices will provide for the long-term protection of employment uses and minimize encroachment towards the resource area

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				encroachment of sensitive lands uses towards the resource area in the long term.	
9	Walker Aggregates c/o MHBC	10		<p>Schedule H2 of the Draft Official Plan identifies Known Deposits of Mineral Aggregate Resources- Bedrock. Walker has observed that certain stone resource areas have been removed or have shrunk in the draft schedule mapping in comparison with the potential stone resource schedule in the current Official Plan. The removal or reduction of stone resource areas identified on the Draft OP mapping have occurred in close proximity to two locations where Walker operate licenced quarries (to the east of Spring Creek Quarry and to the south of Ridgemount Quarry).</p> <p>In light of this, Walker wishes to request that stone resources areas currently identified by the in-effect OP not be reduced in size, particularly given Policy 2.5.1 of the PPS and given that development has been approved on identified resource areas that has sterilized mapped resources in the Region.</p> <p>Furthermore, Walker has also observed that certain licenced quarries have been partially excluded from the Stone Resource areas identified on Schedule H2 of the draft Official Plan (namely Vineland Quarries and Crushed Stone located to the southwest of the settlement of Vineland, and Walker Brothers Quarry located on Taylor Rd, Allanburg). Given that these licenced quarries are in operation and actively extracting mineral aggregate, Walker</p>	Bedrock mapping is provided and maintained by Provincial Agencies.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				requests that these licenced sites be included as Stone Resource areas on Schedule H2.	
10	Ms. Shari Ruston and Dr. Arne Rungi	10		Assessment parcel [REDACTED] - As per the Niagara Navigator, and the basemap gallery with ariel imagery, and looking at the definition of natural woodlots, we would appreciate another look at this property to determine if the woodlot in the north/west corner is truly as extensive as it is represented to be in the proposed Niagara OP. While we would be willing to complete an EIS to support this, we do not currently own the property and as such do not have the ability to undertake this study.	Staff have reviewed the feature and are satisfied that the mapping reflects the feature accurately. Approved site specific studies would be expected to further refine the mapping if necessary.
11	Brandon Ferri	10		Submission in regards to [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] - Have submitted a copy of the drainage plan previously submitted to the city of Welland. It deals with all drainage issues so they do not believe it is appropriate to map a portion of the property as non-significant wetland.	Region planning staff had previously visited the site and refined the extent of the natural features on the property. Based on the submission received Regional staff again visited the site. Based on both the site visits completed, staff are comfortable that the mapping of features on the site is appropriate. Any additional refinement of the natural features would require additional analysis through an application for development or site alteration.
12	Domenic Sardella	10		I am watching the Regional Council meeting taking place the evening of April 28th. The maps provided on the agenda are difficult to determine if my family's property at [REDACTED], ON., Roll# [REDACTED], fall with in the proposed boundary as environmentally protected lands. Can you please confirm that we do or do not	We've looked up the property with the Roll number you provided, however, it comes up as [REDACTED]. The proposed natural environment mapping for the Region's draft Official Plan does not show any natural features on this site.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				fall within any protected area. If we fall within the protected area I would like to go on record as objecting to the mapping and to any change to our current status. We currently are in the middle of the development process and have already had a preconsultation meeting with the City of Port Colborne on May 27, 2021. We are in the process of undertaking the required tests and studies as part of the process.	
13	O.F. Carranza	10		I am the owner of [REDACTED], in the town of [REDACTED]. My property has been identified under the new proposed Niagara official plan as having a natural environment system (wooded area). I would like to request that my property be excluded from this designation.	Planning staff have spoken to the property owner on the phone. The property is part of a significant woodland. This feature is identified is currently identified in the Town of Fort Erie Official Plan (although not in the existing Regional Official Plan). Staff have also visited the area and confirmed that a woodland does exist in this location. The property owner was advised that any refinement to the mapping of the features would require the submission of an environmental impact study (EIS).
14	Kathleen Fischuk	10		I submitted comments on other woodland area and other wetland area, on the mapping tools. I understood someone would get back. Is the information still being reviewed? Could you please confirm this. Thank you. I have recently taken photos of the woodland area, to submit	Staff have reviewed feature and completed a site visit. Mapping has been updated to reflect site conditions.
15	Mari Ann Rusnov	10		It was noted on the proposed Niagara Official Plan that the above property had portions designated as wetlands. This is a 2.23-acre parcel, and years ago was used to farm vegetable crops. All the surrounding lands were at the same level with no wetland issues or designations. Since then, some	Staff have reviewed feature and completed a site visit. Mapping has been updated to reflect site conditions.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>of the surrounding lands were sold to a developer who built a subdivision. To accommodate the low-density development on the two sides of Michael Drive, the developer managed to receive authorization to direct drainage through the property without our knowledge or permission. We would appreciate a site visit by a representative so further details can be communicated, and the true layout of the land can be seen first-hand. We trust following a review, the wetlands designation can be removed, and an alternate drainage solution determined that will not impact our property.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, and I look forward to your response.</p>	
16	Heather Hall on behalf of Deanna Biller	10		<p>I have not yet delved into this issue with legal counsel, but I cannot imagine that any organization can simply decide for our family that our heritage can be red stroked. That said, perhaps I am misunderstanding intent and nothing at all is amiss. As you can imagine, I am waiting on some answers so that I have a better idea of how to direct my mother as far as maintaining the family legacy on lots that she has continued to pay taxes on for years. My grandfather, uncle and brother and nephew were/are all prominent community members with ties to many builders and construction related trades in town. I have been made aware that some with lots in the vicinity have recently sold them. I am also aware that there is a subdivision going into this general area as most of the Nevinger/ Biller family resides in Fort Erie.</p>	<p>Staff have reviewed and responded to the landowner regarding her property.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
17	Andrea Mannell, Sullivan Mahoney representing Deanna Biller	10		<p>We are the solicitors for Deanna Biller (“Client”), the owner of vacant lands identified as [REDACTED] (“Subject Lands”).</p> <p>On behalf of our Client, please accept this correspondence as our written submissions with respect to the intended designation of the Subject Lands as Significant Woodlands within the Natural Environment System as part of the New Official Plan.</p> <p>Based on the location of the Subject Lands, being within the Town’s urban area and with residential development occurring to the east and west, they are ideal for residential development. Moreover, the development of the Subject Lands for residential purposes would assist the Region and the Town in meeting their intensification targets. The proposed designation of the lands as a Significant Woodland seriously hinders this possibility and severely restricts our Client’s use of the Subject Lands.</p> <p>In light of the above, we respectfully request that the Region remove all of the Subject Lands from any designation as a Significant Woodland or within the Natural Environment System, as proposed in the Draft Official Plan.</p>	<p>The property is part of a significant woodland. This feature is identified is currently identified in the Town of Fort Erie Official Plan (although not in the existing Regional Official Plan). Staff have also visited the area and confirmed that a woodland does exist in this location.</p>
18	Anne McDonald c/o Owners of Memorial Dr. property	10		<p>As indicated below, I am working with the owner of a property located in Welland which has been mapped as wetland in the draft natural environment system mapping. The property located on [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Staff have been in discussions with the landowner’s environmental consultant.</p> <p>Regional data was provided and Regional staff are awaiting information from the landowner’s consultant.</p>

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>It is my professional opinion that this site has been erroneously mapped as wetland and it is my recommendation that the layer be removed from the property. I had prepared a summary which was submitted by the client's lawyer to the Planning and Economic Development Committee on March 9, 2022. We have had no correspondence from the Policy Planners regarding this matter and I am looking for an update.</p>	
19	Rian Hoogenberk	10		<p>We live @ [REDACTED] and there is a creek next to our house that does have wildlife and fish that return yearly.</p> <p>Not sure if any other action can be taken at this time. I know that a development company is wanting to build extra house back there and has installed a culvert that is taking more water into the zone now.</p>	Thank you. Comment noted.
20	Travers Fitzpatrick on behalf of Seaway Mall, Doral Holdings Limited, Idrakoth Ltd and 2494551 Ontario Inc.	10		<p>This memorandum and comments are submitted on behalf of Seaway Mall, Doral Holdings Limited, Idrakoth Ltd and 2494551 Ontario Inc. For clarification purposes the PIN numbers for the lands are as follows: for 16 Seaway Dr. PIN 644230008 and for 18 Woodlawn Road PIN 644230213. The subject lands are currently involved in a pre-consultation/pre-development process to determine the potential for the lands to be developed for some 350+ residential units. The proposed "wetlands" feature which occurs periodically on 16 Seaway Drive is a consequence of the fill deposited on the lands in the early 2000's not being graded. The</p>	See responses in Chapter 3.

No.	Comment From	Chapter Subsection	Policy Number	Comment	Region Response
				<p>same can be said of the intermittent streams (ditches) which occur on the same parcel. Given the size and condition of the “woodlands” (thicket of invasive species) on the subject lands as well as the nature of the “wetlands” and “intermittent streams” (ditches) on the lands, we question whether the criteria set out in the draft Official Plan documents for “Significant Woodland”, “Intermittent Streams” and “Wetlands” are met by the features on the lands. The “constraints” proposed by the Region for the lands given the history of the lands and the need for residential development in the Region seem to us to be at odds. Surely there are other areas in the Region with much more significant environment features which do require protection than the subject lands which are, as a reminder, within an established urban area next to a transit hub.</p> <p>As a consequence of the foregoing, we would request that the constraints designations proposed for the subject lands be deferred until such time as the current development application(s) is finalized. After that time, any constraint designation which is agreed upon as a result of that process can and should be put in place.</p>	