

Town of Plympton Wyoming – Official Plan Update – Comments and Responses to Comments

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
1.	-	-	Brian Wilmer (President, Hillsboro Beach Association	The draft OPA mapping, i.e. schedules and appendices, have labels for Hillsboro and Hillsboro Beach incorrectly located. Specifically, Hillsboro Beach is labelled as Hillsboro and the label Hillsboro Beach appears to the north of Townsend Line in Lambton Shores. Also, would prefer the label for Hillsboro Beach be located more precisely, which would involve labelling Hillsboro Beach North and South separately as they are accessed off Hillsboro Road in different locations.	This change has been made. Label “Hillsboro” will be replaced by a repositioned “Hillsboro Beach” label on the schedules and appendices.
2.	20	2.11 d)	Patty Helps	Noted that the possibility to sever off a part of their farm to allow one of their children to build a home of their own was not part of the proposed changes to the Town’s Official Plan. Asked if the changes proposed would address building second dwelling units on a farm with an existing dwelling present.	The revised OPA includes updated policies to permit what are referred to as “additional dwelling units” on lands designated Agricultural Area. This includes revised policies to allow both a second unit in existing dwellings as well as an additional dwelling unit in a new or existing detached accessory building, within the farm cluster of buildings.
3.		2.11	Jenn Walsh (on behalf of her parents Frank and Joan Clement)	Asked about possibility of severing a half-acre lot from 4015 Egremont Road.	Property is located on lands designated Agricultural Area just outside the settlement area boundary for Camlachie. The Provincial Policy Statement does not permit new residential lot creation in prime agricultural areas, which Agricultural Areas in Plympton-Wyoming constitute. The only possible exception is where a farm dwelling is made surplus by a farm consolidation. In those cases, a new lot may be permitted.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
4.	88	4.1.17	James Coleman	<p>Comment on proposed policies to permit and regulate Short-term Vacation Rentals (STVRs) in the draft OPA. Generally supportive but provides suggestions and concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opposed to grandfathering of existing STVRs - Licensing fee should start high and been reduced each year thereafter - No bunkies on property - Concerned about how neighbours will be able to get in touch with property managers. - No commercial use permitted in Hamlet of Blue Point. Wants it to stay that way as he feels that STVRs are businesses. - Suggests a 4% hotel tax would provide revenue for the Town to recover costs. 	<p>The new policies do not “grandfather” existing legally established uses of land, buildings or structures, that is done when the Town updates its Zoning By-law. The new policies clarify what is permitted going forward when a new use is proposed for any given property.</p> <p>Licensing fees are outside the scope of an Official Plan but could be implemented via a bylaw passed by Council pursuant to the Municipal Act.</p> <p>Bunkhouses are addressed through the Town’s Zoning By-law and the Building Code for Ontario.</p> <p>Addressing how complaints should be addressed is outside the scope of an Official Plan.</p> <p>Not all STVRs constitute a commercial use or business, which is why a three-guest room policy is recommended with some associated relief for bed and breakfast operations. In instances where four or more guest rooms are involved a zoning by-law amendment be required.</p> <p>How STVRs are taxed is outside of the scope of an Official Plan.</p>
5.	-	-	Jamie and Janessa Klazinga	Submitted a letter outlining concerns about the change in land use permission at 4386 Confederation Line.	These lands are included within the settlement area boundary established by the Lambton County Official Plan. Their future development will be determined through planning applications to the Town.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
6.	21	2.11 e)	Monica Douglas	Supports allowing lot creation for farm dwellings made surplus by a farm consolidation but suggests the lot size be increased to 2.5 acres.	The policy has been revised to refer to the maximum size being determined by a study for private servicing. The study will determine the area needed for a septic system.
7.	-	-	Elio Comello	<p>Identifies that the mapping of a water course/Fleming Drain is incorrect on the draft schedules and appendices covering the Hamlet of Errol.</p> <p>Identifies a wooded area south of Egremont Road and west of Fleming Road that is not identified as natural heritage feature (significant woodland) but appears as though it should be.</p> <p>Notes that a managed forest is present on his property and requests that it be differentiated from the Significant Natural Area identified on draft Schedule C.</p>	<p>This change has been made.</p> <p>The Conservation Authority has identified this wooded area in their comments as meeting the criteria for a significant woodland. Schedule C has been updated to reflect this.</p> <p>The natural heritage policies of the PPS, Lambton County Official Plan and Town's Official Plan apply. An Environmental Impact Study would be required to address this issue.</p>
8.	-	-	Brad Zantingh	Asks if the response to his question on whether the Town's Official Plan must match with the Lambton County Official Plan was consistent between the Open House on April 19, 2021 and a letter sent to other residents about the planning status of his property on Confederation Line. The letter was dated October 6, 2020 and prepared by the Town's planner.	Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 54 includes the Lambton County Settlement Area boundary on the mapping of the property on Confederation Line. The land use designation in the Town's Official Plan for the subject lands will remain as Agriculture/Restricted Agriculture. Land use designation changes will be addressed through privately initiated Official Plan Amendments to address the comprehensive set of applications required for development of these lands, which includes rezoning and plan of subdivision applications.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
9.	-	-	Paul Demczak, MCIP, RPP (on behalf of Dale Lane of 3042 Sandpiper Trail)	<p>Letter submitted on behalf of his client: Dale Lane of 3042 Sandpiper Trail.</p> <p>States his client and a group of local residents are concerned about the existing neighbourhood character policies within the Town's Official Plan. Suggests that neighbourhood character policies do not appear to have been within the scope of the work completed through the Official Plan Review.</p> <p>Indicates there is an opportunity to refine and expand on policy direction in the Town's Official Plan to address how infill development and consent applications relate to existing neighbourhood lot fabric and built form. Notes that not all new construction in established residential neighbourhoods requires a planning process as "as-of-right" zoning may permit larger, new dwellings.</p> <p>Provides links to design guidelines for infill and stable residential communities, as well as a neighbourhood character study, developed by other municipalities in Ontario.</p>	<p>The Town's Official Plan includes policies that address the need for development to respect the established physical character of residential areas (see in particular section 16.10.3 in Part 4 of the Plan). That includes having regard for the a) size and configuration of lots; b) heights, massing, scale and dwelling type of nearby properties; c) predominant building types in the area; d) setbacks of building features that contribute to a unique character in the area; and e) impacts on designated heritage buildings, districts or other features which have been designated under the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act.</p> <p>The proposed OPA also revises and adds new policies to section 16.3 in Part 4 of the Plan that address aspects of urban design such as streetscapes, building design, site design, landscaping and parking that speak to the concerns raised. These revised and new urban design policies apply to <i>Planning Act</i> applications in settlement areas as appropriate. Addressing what is permitted "as-of-right" via existing zoning is beyond the scope of the Official Plan review and update.</p>
10.			Dale Lane	<p>Provided full text of comments prepared for April 19th Open House. States their comments during the Open House paraphrased this text.</p>	<p>Please see response to Paul Demczak (above).</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<p>Key issues:</p> <p>1. Provide more protection of neighbourhood character in existing, mature residential developments from unwanted intensification development and secondary dwellings. Notes Lambton County's Official Plan directs municipalities to develop local policies and zoning regulations that establish criteria for infill lots to protect neighbourhood character and enjoyment of abutting properties. Provides that SvN planners and architects prepared neighbourhood character guidelines for development in Toronto's Long Branch community.</p> <p>2. Provide more protection for residents when relief from zoning bylaws is requested through minor variances.</p> <p>3. Was told by Town staff the consultants working on the official plan review would be directed to include provisions to address concerns expressed by residents of the Bird Lanes neighbourhood who are very concerned about erosion of neighbourhood character from infilling development could not find anything on the subject.</p>	
11.	-	-	Marty Cogswell	Submitted a letter focused on concerns about industrial hemp and cannabis production facilities and the need to regulate them in a similar way given they both generate light and odour pollution issues.	Changes have been made to policies 13.1 to 13.5 in the OPA text to address concerns raised about lighting. A number of issues raised would be addressed by other by-laws and are not addressed in Official Plan policies.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<p>Various suggestions/recommended changes to proposed OPA policies on Cannabis Production Facilities drawing from the “Land Use Study on Cannabis Production in the Town of Pelham” (2020) and Amendment 9 to Pelham’s Official Plan. Other supporting materials provided as appendices.</p> <p>Also notes the neighbourhood of Bird Lanes would like criteria to protect its character added to the Official Plan to prevent lot severances—similar to what is provided for Errol Village and Blue Point.</p> <p>Outlines existing policies in the Lambton County and Plympton-Wyoming Official Plans relevant to the concerns raised in the letter and provides suggested changes to the existing Official Plan policies.</p> <p>Would prefer cannabis and hemp facilities not be allowed to operate in Plympton-Wyoming. Suggests the issues they will bring will likely outweigh their benefits. Offers that medically certified cannabis facilities typically operate at an industrial scale and should only be permitted in areas zoned as industrial. Notes that regulations or standards relating to odour, light and minimum distance separation appear to be left to municipalities to determine. Advises that the most restrictive guidelines be sought out and implemented.</p>	Please see response to Paul Demczak (above).

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
12.	-	-	Marty Cogswell	Provided an electronic copy of a recently adopted interim control bylaw to freeze large greenhouse developments in Chatham-Kent to allow the municipality to determine how to deal with lighting issues—abatement to address light pollution.	Noted. Refer to response above.
13.	-	-	Mike and Judy Hanki	<p>Various issues and concerns outlined: agricultural policies, municipal services, Reece’s Corners Gravel Pit, undeveloped residential lands, sidewalks, stormwater management, design of Confederation Line, and the importance of holding provisions.</p> <p>Concerned about residential development occurring outside the existing village (of Wyoming), particularly outside of lands now identified as settlement area.</p> <p>Asked whether various studies and requirements have been done to support development, particularly residential subdivision development outside of the existing village (of Wyoming).</p>	<p>Many of the issues and concerns raised are specific to lands proposed for development and will be dealt with in future when development applications are brought forward. Holding provisions are an important tool for managing when development of an approved future use can occur. They allow the Town to stipulate conditions to be met or further studies to be completed before certain uses will be permitted.</p> <p>Only lands within the settlement area boundary identified in the Lambton County Official Plan can be developed. The lands referred to were brought into the settlement area by the County through the County Official Plan process but have not been redesignated by the Town. A future planning process—local official plan and zoning amendments and plan of subdivision applications—will determine what specifically can be built. When that happens various studies and requirements, including those outlined in the Town’s Official Plan, will need to be</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
					provided and/or met through the private applications from the landowner.
14.	-	-	Dave Hannam, Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (Planning Consultancy)	<p>Letter submitted on behalf of the Southside Group—owners of approximately 1.72 hectares (4.24 acres) of land currently in agricultural use (for cash crop farming) located at the westerly corner of Hillsboro Road and Townsend Line in the Hillsboro Beach area of the Town.</p> <p>Letter notes these lands are identified as “Secondary Settlement” in the Lambton County Official Plan and are zoned “Residential 5 (R5)” in the Town’s Zoning By-law, but the draft OPA has left them designated “Restricted Agricultural Area”. Requests the lands be included in the “Lakeshore Residential Area” designation.</p>	The land use designation in the Town’s Official Plan for the subject lands will remain as Agriculture/Restricted Agriculture. Land use designation changes will be addressed through privately initiated Official Plan Amendments to address the comprehensive set of applications required for development of these lands, which includes rezoning and plan of subdivision applications.
15.	-	-	Dave Hannam, Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (Planning Consultancy)	Letter submitted on behalf of the Southside Group—owners of approximately 112 acres (45 hectares) of undeveloped land located between Bonnie Doon Road and Santa Monica Boulevard on the northside of Queen Street. Indicates the lands are designated Restricted Agricultural Area with a portion of the designated Woodlot on the existing Schedule A to the Town’s Official Plan and that the lands are surrounded by residential subdivisions or approved residential lots. Submits the lands should be redesignated to encourage residential uses in order	The lands designated Restricted Agricultural Area on the draft Part 4 to Schedule A in the Town’s Official Plan are outside of the settlement area boundary identified by the Lambton County Official Plan and cannot be designated in the Town’s Official Plan for residential development.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				to make efficient use of infrastructure in the municipality.	
16.	9	2.1	Doris St Amand	Notes a redundant revision and provides a recommended wording for the revised policy on permitted agricultural uses. Advises that the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMFRA) now spells “agro-forestry” without a hyphen and identifies maple syrup production as a type of agroforestry.	The redundant revision has been deleted. The proposed wording and spelling in the draft OPA corresponds to the PPS definition of agricultural uses and has not been further revised.
17.	10 11	2.2(a) 2.2(b)	Doris St Amand	These policies are the same.	The duplication between 2.2 (a) and (b) has been addressed in the revised OPA. 2.2 (b) has been changed to address what the PPS considers agriculture-related uses.
18.	29	2.24 (a) 2.24 (b)(i)	Doris St Amand	<p>Please define the word “limited” in the phrase “limited bed and breakfast” in 2.24 (a)</p> <p>Policy 2.24 (b)(i) states “they are to be secondary and subordinate to the principal farm operation and activities on the property;”</p> <p>1. Does the word “principal” govern the word “activities” so that it reads “principal farm operation and principal activities on the property”?</p>	<p>We have not provided a definition of limited in the policy or elsewhere in the proposed OPA. There are other pieces of legislation and guidelines that impact how the policy is applied. Applicable legislation and guidelines can change from time to time, so it is prudent not to define the term “limited”.</p> <p>Principal applies to principal farm operation and principal activities. The word principal will be added before “activities” in the revised OPA.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<p>2. What is the definition of “principal” and of “activities”?</p> <p>3. Hypothetical to help me appreciate the scope of this section:</p> <p>I own a farm and grow cash crops on 50% of the property and run a corn maze and hiking/bike trail activities. I want to start an on-site food production activity to enable visitors to actively engage in pick/cut/process utilizing produce from a diversified farm garden/orchard to create a memorable hands-on farm dinner/culinary experience as part of a family farm vacation.</p> <p>Would my new agri-tourism activity be allowed as being subordinate to the main cash crop – soybeans – and subordinate to the principal activities of hiking/bike trails?</p> <p>Would I be allowed to renovate my existing surplus farm house/building to operate a short-term rental facility integral to the farm vacation experience?</p> <p>2.24(b)(vi) “... not cause or generate off-site negative impacts related to infrastructure, noise or traffic”</p> <p>Are there penalties?</p>	<p>For interpretation of principal activities refer to agriculture uses and the examples in Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) Guideline 851. Similarly, for the hypothetical, refer to Guideline 851 on agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses. On-farm diversified uses, such as short-term vacation rental facility or hiking/bike trail, would be limited to 2% of the overall farm parcel and would need to include the area occupied by associated parking, landscaping, and water and sewage services.</p> <p>There are no penalties for off-site impacts. The assessment of off-site impacts is part of the review of</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
					planning applications to ensure impacts, if any, can be managed and/or mitigated.
19.	37	3.2.1	Doris St Amand	Asks for clarity on where “additional dwelling units” are to be inserted in the sentence of permitted residential uses.	In the revised OPA the insertion of “additional dwelling units” as a permitted use will be moved to a revised second sentence in policy 3.2.1 and reference to section 4.1.2 will be changed to section 4.1.
20.	49	3.6.1	Doris St Amand	Asks what the rational is for adding policy 3.6.1: “The policies in Section 8 regarding redevelopment of golf courses shall apply to Open Space Uses in Hamlets.”	The policy is recommended because across Ontario golf courses that are part of settlement areas are being redeveloped for housing. Part of the golf course in Camlachie is within the hamlet boundary. This policy ensures that redevelopment of any golf course is done through a more substantive process.
21.	116	8.1.1	Doris St Amand	Notes minor typo/copy-edit in draft OPA.	Noted. This has been fixed in the revised OPA.
22.		8.5.8 8.5.9	Doris St Amand	Notes that policies 8.5.8 and 8.5.9 pertain to the Bonnie Doon Golf and Country Club which has become the Ferguson Estates. Asks if these policy subsections should be deleted by proposed OPA.	These policies have been deleted in the revised OPA.
23.	122	8.1.11	Doris St Amand	Notes that bonusing is referred to in policy 8.1.11.	The portion of the policy that pertains to bonusing has been deleted.
24.	17 21	2.8 2.11 e)	Mike and Judy Hanki (April	Raised the following in their comments: - questioned the definition of settlement areas;	The definition of settlement area is provided in the PPS and represent a firm boundary identified in the Lambton

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
			19 th Open House)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - asked why the minimum farm size is 38 hectares; - noted concerns about surplus farm dwellings, natural heritage and surrounding areas; and municipal drains and setbacks for buildings. 	<p>County Official Plan which the Town's Official Plan must conform to.</p> <p>The minimum farm parcel size is set at 38 ha for the Town in the Lambton County Official Plan.</p> <p>The proposed OPA allows for lot creation for a surplus farm dwelling only where a farm consolidation has occurred. A planning process is required before any severance can occur.</p> <p>Natural heritage policies have been updated and recognize the importance of agricultural uses and protection of municipal drains.</p>
25.	21	2.11 e)	Patty Helps (April 19 th Open House)	Asked if there would be any changes to the policies allowing severances in agricultural policies.	The proposed OPA would permit severances in the agricultural area for farm dwellings made surplus by farm consolidation. Residential lot creation is not otherwise permitted by the PPS or Lambton County Official Plan.
26.	-	-	John Armstrong (April 19 th Open House)	Noted that the building design section does not provide protection if a builder is looking to build to some lower standard. He suggested that the language used in the Downtown Wyoming Design Guidelines be considered as it is clearer and easier for the developer to meet those guidelines.	Downtown Wyoming Design Guidelines are not intended to apply Town-wide. No changes have been made.
27.	-	-	Andrew Payne (April 19 th Open House)	Advised he had submitted his comments through Mr. Armstrong.	Noted.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
28.	125 309 315	9.1.1 Schedule A Schedule C (new)	Brad Zantingh (April 19 th Open House)	<p>Inquired about the Natural Heritage System Group C Features. Further Mr. Zantingh inquired as to why the green in the mapping covers the road and houses.</p> <p>Asked whether lands at 4386 Confederation Line match between the County Official Plan and the Town's Official Plan.</p> <p>Asked if the Town's planning consultants had reviewed the Minutes of Settlement reached in relation to his lands on Lakeshore Road. Indicated the lands in question should be residential.</p>	<p>Group C Features are carried forward from the mapping in the County of Lambton's Official Plan. Development throughout this coloured mapping area could potentially require environmental impact studies but they could be scoped to reflect the features on the ground.</p> <p>The Town's Official Plan must conform to the Lambton County Official Plan. 4386 Confederation Line is within the settlement area boundary identified by the Lambton County Official Plan.</p> <p>The Minutes of Settlement were reviewed by the Town's planning consultants. The lands are identified as Lakeshore Residential Area on Part 1 to Schedule A as part of the mapping changes proposed.</p>
29.	21	2.11 e)	Jenn Welsh (April 19 th Open House)	Inquired about 28 acres her family owns on Egremont Road. Asked why they were having a difficult time severing off lands to build a house. Noted it is not a farm but is acreage outside of Town.	Follow-up after the open house determined the lands in question were designated agricultural area and outside of the settlement area boundary where residential lot creation is not permitted, except for where an existing farm dwelling is made surplus by a farm consolidation.
30.	21	2.11 e)	Brendan Wouters (April 19 th Open House)	Felt that 1 acre lot size for surplus farm dwellings is too small.	Noted. The PPS requires that new lots for surplus farm dwellings be limited to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use and appropriate sewage and water services. The wording has been revised (see response to Monica Douglas above).
31.	-	-	Dale Lane (April 19 th Open House)	Spoke about neighbourhood character, intensification and secondary dwellings. Noted that the County Official Plan directs that the Town establish criteria to	Noted. A response has been provided in this chart to the letter submitted on behalf of Dale Lane by a professional planner (Paul Demczak, MCIP RPP) outlining concerns

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<p>protect neighbourhood character and spoke to a report from Toronto which said that the block, the street, the neighbourhood should be considered.</p> <p>Further noted concern about how relief from zoning by-laws are sought through the Committee of Adjustment Process.</p>	<p>about how neighbourhood character is address in the Town's Official Plan.</p> <p>Updated wording has been included in Section 1, referencing the importance of the planning process, to include plans of subdivision and consent.</p>
32.	21	2.11 e)	Jordan Douglas (April 19 th Open House)	<p>Reiterated comments previously sent via e-mail. Supports severances for surplus farm dwellings but with larger minimum lot sizes. Indicated deviance from setback limits should be approved provided all parties agree.</p>	Please see response to Monica Douglas (above).
33.	-	-	Phil Policelli (April 19 th Open House)	<p>Inquired about hobby farms. Pointed to some farm lands along Egremont Road that are already undersized due to being split by the road.</p> <p>Asked if severing an area that encompassed a creek would be allowed in the agricultural area.</p>	<p>"Hobby" farms are considered farms in the PPS and County Official Plan – there is no distinction. If a farm does not meet the new minimum of 38 hectares, it would be considered non-complying to the Official Plan. The Official Plan has policies on how to address non-complying uses that ensure the farm and its uses can continue.</p> <p>Lot creation is not permitted under these circumstances.</p>
34.	-	-	Martin Cogswell (April 19 th Open House)	<p>Asked about greenhouses and cannabis facilities, re: light pollution concerns and what kind of regulations could be imposed to ensure that humans or nature are not impacted.</p>	<p>There are policies in the Town's Official Plan dealing with lighting, odour and noise, so that these impacts do not impact neighbours. Please see earlier response to feedback from Mr. Cogswell. In addition, Cannabis facilities need to meet D-6 guidelines for industrial facilities, which are Ontario's guidelines for industrial uses in the vicinity of residential uses. Any decision on</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
					application with such impacts would require a public process and Council approval.
35.	-	-	Brian Marsh (April 26 th Public Meeting)	Requested mapping for the Official Plan	Was advised the mapping is available on the Town's website and that staff would follow-up to ensure Mr. Marsh could access the correction information.
36.	-	-	Jeff Bolichowski (April 26 th Public Meeting)	Advised his comments had been made through John Armstrong last week.	Noted.
37.	-	-	Paul Demczak (April 26 th Public Meeting)	Advised he had been retained by a resident on Sandpiper Trail in relation to concerns about policies surrounding neighbourhood character, particularly balancing infill developments with the need to preserve existing character. Noted the Wyoming Downtown Design Guidelines might be applied to neighbourhood character. Indicated he would submit a letter.	Letter was received. Feedback is provided for the letter earlier in this chart.
38.	-	-	Mike Hanki (April 26 th Public Meeting)	Questioned whether it was sufficient to hold an electronic meeting given some residents may not have internet access. Inquired about lands proximate to his property which have had their designation changed from agricultural	Electronic meetings held via telephone or internet have been allowed by the Province due to the pandemic. Specific development related issues for these lands will be addressed via future planning processes such as applications for Official Plan Amendment, zoning changes and plans of subdivision.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<p>to residential. Raised concerns about how this change will impact the area.</p> <p>Noted that proposed OPA shows agriculture as the highest priority yet severances are to be allowed. Asked what the minimum size required would be.</p> <p>Asked a series of questions related to residential land needs of the town and the impacts of re-designation of the lands near his to residential. Expressed the view that lands in the village (Wyoming) should be fully developed before allowing development outside of it.</p>	<p>The PPS allows that lot creation may be permitted in agricultural areas for a limited number of purposes, including for farm dwellings made surplus by farm consolidation. The minimum lot area for surplus farm dwellings is not prescribed but the direction is no larger than required for the use and appropriate water and sewage services.</p> <p>The PPS requires municipalities to maintain the ability to accommodate residential growth going forward for a minimum of 15 years. That includes lands for residential intensification and redevelopment and where necessary lands designated and available for residential development.</p>
39.	21	2.11 e)	Mark Guthrie (April 26 th Public Meeting)	<p>Inquired about a 30-acre parcel of land on Egremont Road owned by his family for many decades and asked if land could be severed from it for a residence.</p> <p>Asked if there is a definition of a hobby farm?</p>	<p>The PPS does not currently allow for residential lot creation in prime agricultural areas (the agricultural area of the Town), except in the case of surplus farm dwellings. There are, however, policies being considered by Council in this Official Plan review to accommodate additional dwelling units in an existing farmhouse or in a detached accessory building in the farm cluster of buildings.</p> <p>There is no definition of a hobby farm – the PPS and Lambton County Official Plan consider all farms, regardless of size.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
40.	-	-	Councillor. Tim Wilkins (April 19 th Open House)	Is there a flexibility in 38-hectare requirement when considering surplus farm severances?	<p>The response provided at the Open House was that the 38-hectare provision is a County of Lambton requirement.</p> <p>Further response: Yes, there would be flexibility. The 38 hectares size is for the farm parcel. Consolidation will result in two or more parcels as one farm operation and will support retention of agricultural land in production.</p>
41.	-	-	Jamie Klazinga (April 26 th Public Meeting)	<p>Commented on the changes to the land designation on the lands to the east of his property on Confederation Line near Wyoming. Reiterated concerns raised by Mr. Hanki. Suggested land in the middle of a field outside of Wyoming should not be residential where it might create issues with municipal drains, livestock operations, and access to lands.</p> <p>Noted he had not received notice of the public meeting as previously requested.</p>	<p>The properties in question were brought into the settlement area boundary through a Lambton County Official Plan process. The lands have not been redesignated in the Town's Official Plan. Various issues related to redesignation and development will be addressed in future planning processes, including through private development applications.</p> <p>Notice was provided by the Town in accordance with <i>Planning Act</i> requirements. If persons or organizations had signed in at past public meetings or asked to be on the list the notice was circulated to them. Apologies for the inconvenience were extended if notices were not received.</p>
42.	-	-	Councillor Netty McEwen (April 22 nd email) and also stated at April 26, 2021 public meeting	<p>Provided the following as comments and/or observations:</p> <p>a) Would it be possible for the Murphy subdivision (most westerly subdivision along Lake Huron) to be included as a settlement area.</p>	<p>a) Settlement area boundaries are established by Lambton County in their Official Plan.</p> <p>b) The current wording in Policy 4.1.2.2 states that "Professional offices will be permitted in existing residential dwellings within the residential areas." The revised wording narrows this policy to say "A limited amount of local professional offices will be permitted in</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Should permitting professional offices in residential areas require the residential dwelling be owner-occupied and limit the number of employees and parking spots. c) Trailer Parks such as the Lakewood Conference Grounds and in Reece's Corners should also be recognized. d) With respect to severances in the Agricultural Area, notes that severances should be allowed for everyone or not allowed at all (related to proposed policy to allow lot creation for farm dwellings made surplus by a farm consolidation. Notes that retirement lots for farmers are being included). e) Concern that proposed Community Planning Permit System appears to delegate considerable authority to staff. f) Asks if Community Benefit Charges will be separate of Development Charges. g) Recommends adding a statement regarding the protection of wildlife in addition to protection of bush/parkland. h) Asks for clarification about jurisdiction over marine archaeological sites. 	<p>existing residential dwellings within the residential areas." We've scoped down the permission because it can happen that professional offices overtake a residential area. The existing policies deal with parking (4.1.2.4(b)). In terms of the owner residing in the home, this isn't always practical as the Town's current policies have a preference for these types of offices to be on arterial or collector roads – it is really about preserving existing houses and repurposing them. What we've tried to do is say there is a limit to how much of this should occur. Also, with regard to the number of employees, the size of the building and the amount of on-site parking will generally limit this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) Lakewood Christian Campground is designated as Major Open Space and has site-specific policies in Part 2, Section 8 of the OP that pertain to it. The Country View Motel and RV Camping Resort will be redesignated from Major Open Space to Mobile Home/Recreational Campground to align with the direction provided in Part 2, Section 6 of the Official Plan. The small trailer park south of London Line west of Oil Heritage Road is part of the Reece's Corners Policy Area. d) The Provincial Policy Statement does not allow retirement lots for farmers. The Town is not able to implement retirement lots for farmers as this does not comply to the Provincial Policy Statement. The Official Plan update we have proposed includes "additional dwelling units" in farmhouses and farm

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
					<p>buildings as a way to create additional housing in the agricultural area without a severance.</p> <p>e) It is up to Council to determine how much that Council wishes to delegate to staff. We'd suggest the more routine matters be delegated to staff and more complex permits be brought to Council. Routine matters include a community planning permit that complies to the By-law and are generally smaller developments. More complex matters would be larger developments or those where a number of decisions need to be made within the By-law.</p> <p>f) Community Benefit Charges will be separate of Development Charges.</p> <p>g) Protection of wildlife is addressed within the proposed changes – Nos. 141 and 147 in draft OPA 54</p> <p>h) Jurisdiction over marine archaeological sites is in part federal, but provincial requirements apply as well. The Provincial Policy Statement includes marine archaeology in the definition of archaeology in the PPS which means decisions by municipalities must address the marine archaeological requirements where such archaeological resources exist.</p>
43.	-	-	Councillor Wilkins (April 26 th Public Meeting)	<p>Noted that the Town is not required to permit severances for surplus farming dwellings. It can choose to be restrictive.</p> <p>Provided examples or scenarios to illustrate the impact (or potential impacts) of permitting surplus</p>	<p>The PPS only allows that residential lot creation for surplus farm dwellings may be allowed. The draft OPA provides options based on feedback received. Council is not required to implement these changes.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				farm dwellings, particularly on the next generation of farmers who inherit a scenario where farm parcels have been created that are prohibited from a farm dwelling on them. Also, noted the possibility that minimum distance separation needs and other compatibility issues might increase and impact farm operations in future.	
44.	-	-	Councillor Atkinson (April 26 th Public Meeting)	Asked if a breakdown of proposed changes could be provided for each section.	This is beyond the scope of this project.
45.	21	2.11 e)	Councillor Vasey (April 26 th Public Meeting)	Noted they are aware of retired farmers staying on farm in another house after passing on the main farm dwelling to their children.	The PPS does not permit lot creation in prime agricultural areas for “retirement lots”. There are policies in the draft OPA to permit “additional dwelling units”, including in detached accessory buildings, on farms within the farm cluster of buildings.
46.	21	2.11 e)	Mayor Napper (April 26 th Public Meeting)	<p>Provided comment on surplus farm dwellings. Expressed concern about the number of farmhouses that sit unused and suggested they could be severed to provide housing supply and tax revenue.</p> <p>Suggested the Reece’s Corners Policy Area be looked at again with regard to amount of residential vs commercial land designated.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Reece’s Corners is for employment – with the amount of employment additional residential uses could create land use incompatibility.</p>
47.	21	2.11 e)	Councillor Woolvett (April	Shared personal experience of living on lands that were created as a result of surplus farm dwelling	Noted.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
			26 th Public Meeting)	severance. Indicated farmers should be able to choose to sever surplus farm dwellings and that it would improve the tax base and allow the Town to support infrastructure in the agricultural area.	
48.	308	Schedule A	Councillor Netty McEwen (follow-up on comments made about parks to be designated at public meeting on April 26 th)	<p>List of suggested mapping changes provided. Includes parks to be designated in the Official Plan, labelling changes, and lots and subdivisions to be identified. Annotated schedules from existing Official Plan provided.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • add Lamrecton Family Park • add Eton Court Parkette • change name on McEwen Park 2. Location labelling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • change Huron Heights location • correct Wellington Beach Location • Identify Sunset Acres and Sunset View • Silver Springs • Sundance Estates (west of Craigmere) 3. New subdivisions or lots (add) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Elms • Errol Woods and Key Homes • Fill in extension of Victoria Street • New lots on Egremont Road • Longo (subdivision ... verify name) 	<p>Here is the response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parks – The park names will be added. 2. Location Labelling – the base mapping is from Lambton County's GIS. The naming of areas must be done on the basis of the County's GIS data protocol. It is suggested that the Town may wish to determine how it wants areas named and the naming protocol could then be added to the County's GIS so all maps are the same. This is very important as the GIS is used for other services so the naming of places must be consistent with the needs of other services (e.g. emergency services). 3. New subdivisions – The subdivisions are added to the County's GIS base mapping after they are registered with the land registry office. There is a process in place for the County's mapping to be updated after registration takes place. These subdivisions will be added through that process at the appropriate time.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New lots on Queen Street • Arie Court • Blue Coast Heights • Muskoka Trail • Allen Developments • Lots on Hillsboro Road 	
49.	-	-	Kelly Elliott, Lambton Public Health	Reviewed the draft OPA and mapping and noted they are pleased to see content on affordable housing, increasing density, active transportation supports and other healthy communities content. Provided no suggestions or recommended changes.	Noted.
50.	16	2.6	OMAFRA	<p>Minimum Distance Separation Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policies addressing MDS should include reference to <i>anaerobic digesters</i>, as well as <i>livestock facilities</i>. - Policies addressing reductions in MDS setbacks can be considered through other types of planning mechanisms other than a minor variance (e.g. OPA or ZBLA). For consistency, it is recommended that this policy be updated to include the other planning mechanisms, as well. As per to IG#43 on pg 42 of the MDS Document (2017). - The municipality may find it helpful to include a statement such as "the overarching principle 	<p>This change has been made.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. This change has been made.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				remains that MDS setbacks should not be reduced except in limited site-specific circumstances that meet the intent of the prevention of land use conflicts and minimization of nuisance complaints from odour.”	
51.	31	2A	OMAFRA	<p>Restricted Agricultural Area Comments</p> <p>Policy 2.3.3.2 of the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) states that in <i>prime agricultural areas</i>, all types, sizes and intensities of <i>agricultural uses</i> and <i>normal farm practices</i> shall be promoted and protected in accordance with provincial standards. OMAFRA is concerned that the “Restricted Agricultural Area” seems to create a two-tiered agricultural designation. It is the preference of OMAFRA that this designation be removed to capture the intent of Policy 2.3.3.2 of the PPS as one agricultural designation.</p>	Lambton County OP policy 4.1.19 states “Local official plans should rely on the minimum distance separation formulae to provide adequate separations between land uses rather than "restricted agricultural" designations. This Plan does not however require that such designations be deleted if they already exist in a Local Plan. Except for the prohibition of livestock, such areas shall be subject to the Agricultural Area policies of this Plan and protected for agricultural use in the long-term. This prohibition shall not imply such an area is intended, preferred, or held for urban use, nor exempt from meeting such criteria as apply respecting future settlement expansions.”
52.	14	2.4	OMAFRA	<p>Minimum Lot Size Comments</p> <p>The current Plympton-Wyoming OP (2011) contains flexible wording like “generally be 40 hectares”. This wording is consistent with the PPS (2020) and the County of Lambton OP, therefore this verbiage is encouraged to remain. The current policy amendment suggestions to change “40 to 38” hectares. If the numeric changes (i.e, 40 to 38) proceed, OMAFRA</p>	This change has been made.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				suggests the removal of the flexible terminology such as “generally”, in order to discourage farmland fragmentation.	
53.	-	-	SCRCA	Throughout the document, where it refers to the conservation authority, we recommend that it specify St. Clair Region Conservation Authority to assist landowners in contacting the correct Conservation Authority for their area.	This change has been made.
54.	20	2.11	SCRCA	Accessory Dwelling Units SCRCA recommends that the following text be added to this policy: “f) Accessory Dwelling Units shall not be permitted within natural hazard areas (e.g. flood hazard areas and unstable slopes).”	This change has been made. The wording will be revised to change “Accessory” to “Additional”.
55.	81	4.1.1.30	SCRCA	Additional Dwelling Units SCRCA recommends the following additional item be added to the policy. “f) Additional Dwelling units shall not be permitted within natural hazard areas (e.g. flood hazard areas, unstable slopes).” It is noted that the existing Policy 4.1.1.31 within the Official Plan (proposed to be deleted) prohibits Accessory Second Dwelling Units within detached accessory buildings in the Lakeshore Area designation and within dwellings located within more hazardous portions of the Lakeshore Area designation.	This change has been made. Noted. The terminology has been updated in 4.1.1.31 from “accessory second dwelling units” to “additional dwelling units”.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
56.	124	9.0	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA recommends adding the following to the bottom of the proposed text for the introduction of section 9.0 "While some of the provisions of this section apply more particularly to one designation than another, the policies of this section apply to the "Lakeshore Area" designation of Schedule A, "Natural Hazard" of Appendix 4 and "Significant Woodland" of Schedule C of this plan and also apply more generally to any other location where such conditions as described in this section exist."</p> <p>The term "Hazard and Environmental Protection Areas", used throughout Section 9.0, should be replaced with "Natural Heritage and Natural Hazards Areas", rather than Natural Heritage System. The Natural Heritage System does not always include Natural Hazards areas. Natural Heritage includes the Natural Heritage System and Significant Natural Features and Areas, whereas Natural Hazards includes Flood Plains, Unstable Slopes and the Lakeshore Area.</p> <p>SCRCA recommends that the entire section 9.0 be reorganized as follows:</p> <p>9.0 Natural Heritage --> 9.0 Natural Heritage and Natural Hazards 9.1 General Policies --> keep section 9.1 General Policies, Add section 9.2 Natural Heritage System</p>	<p>This change has been made.</p> <p>This change has been made and where applicable will be "Natural Heritage System and natural hazards". 9.1 General Policies will be retained. The re-ordering has not been done; the policies are written to be a logical sequencing.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<p>9.2 Significant Natural Areas --> 9.3 Significant Natural Areas new section proposed, 9.4 Environmental Impact Studies (recommend grouping with Natural Heritage System Policies rather than after Natural Hazards)</p> <p>9.3 Natural Hazards --> 9.5 Natural Hazards</p> <p>9.4 Lakeshore Area --> 9.6 Lakeshore Area</p> <p>SCRCA recommends moving the following text to Section 9.3 Natural Hazards:</p> <p>The Town contains areas that are subject to natural hazards such as flooding and/or instability due to erosion and excessive slopes where development must be prohibited or restricted to protect against loss of life, damage to public and private property, and undue financial burdens for the Town, County, and Province.</p> <p>The Conservation Authority Regulation governs the extent of regulated areas, including around shorelines, wetlands, watercourses or hazardous lands, where development or site alteration is prohibited subject to written approval from the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority.”</p>	<p>This change has not been made. It would be appropriate for this text to remain here.</p>
57.	126	9.1.2	SCRCA	Policy 9.1.2 can be deleted. This policy is addressed in the subsequent policies.	This policy has been deleted.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
58.	127	9.1.3	SCRCA	The words "Hazard and Environmental Protection Areas" should be replaced with "Natural Heritage and Natural Hazard Areas".	Comment has been addressed previously.
59.	128	9.1.4	SCRCA	<p>The words "Hazard and Environmental Protection Areas" should be replaced with "Natural Heritage and Natural Hazard Areas".</p> <p>The words "detailed assessment" should not be amended to "Environmental Impact Study" as this policy discusses both hazard and heritage features. The assessment required could be an EIS but may also be a hazard related study.</p> <p>SCRCA recommends breaking the natural heritage and hazard policies of 9.1.4 into subsections "9.1.4.1 Natural Heritage Features and Areas Changes to Schedules</p> <p>In the case of Environmentally Sensitive Areas or Features, Council will consider the nature and sensitivity of the area or feature and must be satisfied that the impact can be alleviated consistent with sound resource management practices. The Municipality will consult with the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority or the Province.</p> <p>9.1.4.2 Natural Hazard Areas Changes to Schedules In the case of Hazard Lands, the Council must consider the existing environmental hazards and the</p>	<p>Comment has been addressed previously.</p> <p>This change has not been made. The words “detailed assessment” are vague. It is further noted that there are existing policies in this section that address hazard related studies.</p> <p>10.1.4 will be further revised as recommended to split or break natural heritage system and natural hazard policies into subsections. However, the proposed OPA does not map natural hazards on schedules to the Plan.</p> <p>The balance of the wording changes have not been made; the existing policies, with the revisions above, address this.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				potential impact of these hazards, and must be satisfied that the hazard has been addressed in a manner consistent with accepted engineering techniques and resource management practices. The Municipality will consult with the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority."	
60.	129	9.1.5	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends "Natural Heritage System" be amended to "Natural Heritage and Natural Hazard Areas". SCRCA is supportive of the other amendments made to this policy.	This change has been made.
61.	130	9.1.6	SCRCA	The words "Hazard and Environmental Protection Areas" should be replaced with "Natural Heritage and Natural Hazard Areas".	Comment has been addressed previously.
62.	131	9.1.7	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA can support the new recommended wording for policy 9.1.7, however, the following original wording describing the delineation of natural hazards should be moved to section 9.5:</p> <p>"It is possible that the delineation of the Environmental Protection designation follows the defined flood line, however this may not always be the situation. Accurate mapping of flood lines may not exist in many cases. Where any flood and erosion risk mapping, flood control or other works are undertaken which result in significant changes to the boundaries of Hazard and Environmental Protection Areas, the Official Plan will be amended accordingly."</p>	The wording regarding floodlines will be put in the amendment as requested, subject to wording revisions regarding "Hazard and Environmental Protection Area" to "Natural Heritage and Natural Hazard". Also, the references to updating the Official Plan will be changed from "will" to "should"

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
63.	132	9.1.8	SCRCA	The words "Hazard and Environmental Protection Areas" should be replaced with "Natural Heritage and Natural Hazard Areas".	Comment has been addressed previously.
64.	133	9.1.9	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA recommends separate policies for each of natural heritage and natural hazard setbacks.</p> <p>SCRCA recommends that this section should state: "Building setbacks will be imposed from the boundaries of natural heritage features in relation to the type of feature, sensitivity of the feature, and degree of proposed disturbance to the feature. A standard setback may be included in the implementing Zoning By-law."</p> <p>Wording regarding development setbacks in relation to natural hazards is already included in the proposed new policy 9.3.1.3. We recommend that a new section, d), be added to that policy stating that "technical studies, including shoreline, floodplain or geotechnical studies, may be required to inform appropriate setbacks. The Municipality will consult with the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority on the required studies."</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This change has been made.</p> <p>This has not been added as the policies address the Town updating its Zoning By-law. The Town will work with the Conservation Authority on the Zoning update.</p>
65.	134	9.1.10	SCRCA	The words "Hazard and Environmental Protection Areas" should be replaced with "Natural Heritage and Natural Hazard Areas".	Comment has been addressed previously.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
66.	136	9.1.12	SCRCA	<p>With the removal of section 9.1.11, SCRCA recommends this section be titled “Alteration to Significant Natural Heritage or Hazard Features”.</p> <p>After “Significant Natural Areas” the term “Natural Hazard Areas” should be added.</p> <p>SCRCA recommends that the following text be added to this policy “With regards to site grading, dumping or removal of fill, alterations to watercourses and natural drainage areas, as shown in Appendix 4, reference should be made to the SCRCA’s Ontario Regulation 171/06.”</p>	<p>This change has been made.</p> <p>This change has not been made as recommended. Reference has been made to the applicable Conservation Authority Regulation and not a specific number.</p>
67.	137	9.1.13	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA recommends this section be grouped with 9.1.14, under the heading ‘Zoning of Natural Heritage Features’.</p> <p>The words "Hazard and Environmental Protection Areas" should be replaced with "Natural Heritage and Natural Hazard Areas".</p> <p>Following the proposed new wording "As detailed mapping of" add the following "Natural Hazards," before "the Natural Heritage System". In the last paragraph, add "and Natural Hazard" after "Natural Heritage System".</p>	<p>This change has not been made.</p> <p>Comment has been addressed previously.</p> <p>This change has been made.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
68.	138	9.1.14	SCRCA	The words "Hazard and Environmental Protection Areas" should be replaced with "Natural Heritage and Natural Hazard Areas".	Comment has been addressed previously.
69.		9.3	SCRCA	<p>Natural Hazards</p> <p>SCRCA recommends that the Natural Hazard designation be returned to Schedule A.</p> <p>SCRCA recommends a second paragraph be added to section 9.3 which states "Those areas susceptible to flooding and erosion have been identified on Schedule A with the "Natural Hazard" designation and also apply more generally to any other location where such conditions as described in this section exist, which may include the Areas Affected by Regulation (Ontario Regulation 171/06) identified in Appendix 4."</p>	<p>This change has not been made. Natural Hazards were removed from Schedule A and identified separately on Appendix 4 as the location and boundary of Natural Hazards are determined by the Conservation Authority.</p> <p>This change will be made without reference to Schedule A. Natural Hazards will be identified on Appendix 4. Reference to Areas Affected by Regulated will not include the Regulation Number as it can change.</p>
70.	155	9.3.1	SCRCA	<p>General Policies</p> <p>For the proposed policy 9.3.1.1, the Town does not have any sites with marine clay soils or karst, therefore these terms can be removed.</p> <p>For proposed new policy 9.3.1.2, the wording "(unless in a special policy area)" should be deleted. The Town does not have a special policy area which allows development within the floodway.</p>	<p>This change has been made.</p> <p>This change has been made.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<p>Item e) should be revised as follows: "vehicles and people have a way of safely entering and exiting the area, as per Provincial Standards, during times of flooding, erosion and other emergencies."</p> <p>For 9.3.1.2 b), add "hydrogeological" to "coastal and geotechnical engineering practices."</p> <p>e) vehicle and pedestrian access, as per Provincial Standards, is available during times of flooding...</p> <p>recommend revised wording:</p> <p>9.3.1.4 For any development or site alteration proposed with lands regulated by the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority, as shown on Appendix 4, the proponent must obtain written permission from the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority before the Town will issue a building permit</p> <p>SCRCA recommends policies be added to this section to address how the Planning authority will prepare for the impacts of a changing climate that may increase the risk associated with natural hazards, as outlined in PPS policy 3.1.3.</p>	<p>This change has been made.</p> <p>This change has been made.</p> <p>Please see response above to e).</p> <p>This change has been made, except reference to "the Conservation Authority" is maintained.</p> <p>Climate change is addressed through policy changes in the Natural Heritage and other sections of draft OPA.</p>
71.	156	9.3.2.2	SCRCA	<p>One Zone Concept</p> <p>The final paragraph of this policy should be updated to replace "Fill, Construction and Alteration to</p>	<p>This change has been made.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				Waterways" to "Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses" to reflect the correct wording of Ontario Regulation 171/06.	
72.		9.3.2.5	SCRCA	<p>Two Zone Concept Policy 9.3.2.5 should be amended by replacing "outside the 100 year flood line but within the flood line of the Hurricane Hazel flood line otherwise referred to as the floodfringe area." with "within the floodfringe area and prohibited within the floodway."</p> <p>In accordance with the MNRF Flooding Hazard Technical Guide and the PPS, delineation of a Two Zone floodplain should be based on a depth and velocity analysis and not merely the 100 year flood line and the Hurricane Hazel flood line.</p>	<p>This change has been made.</p> <p>This change has been made.</p>
73.	284	17.2.1	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends the following additional item be added to the list in this policy : " h) Assessment of natural hazards to determine a suitable area for development."	This change has been made.
74.	287	17.6.1	SCRCA	SCRCA strongly supports the proposed text.	Noted.
75.		17.6.1.1	SCRCA	<p>Submission Requirements The references within this section will need to be updated to reflect the changes in policy numbers as a result of the proposed changes. EIS Section 9.1 & 9.2, Natural Hazards flood line mapping (section</p>	Noted.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				9.3.2) slope, geotechnical and/or erosion (Section 9.3.3 & 9.4.3.2.4).	
76.	298	18.3	SCRCA	In item b) delete "Lake St. Clair and". The Town of Plympton-Wyoming does not include a portion of the shoreline of Lake St. Clair, only Lake Huron.	This change has been made.
77.	308	Schedule A	SCRCA	SCRCA does not recommend that the Natural Heritage and Natural Hazard designations be removed from Schedule A. Where development is prohibited or restricted through the policies of the Official Plan, should be shown as designations. Where further detail is required, SCRCA is supportive of the use of the proposed Schedule C (new) for details regarding the County of Lambton Group A to C Natural Heritage features.	Noted. However this change has not been made as Natural Hazards are an Appendix to the Plan.
78.	312	Schedule B	SCRCA	See comments above for Item No. 308 regarding removal of the natural heritage and natural hazard designations.	Comment has been addressed previously.
79.	315	Schedule C	SCRCA	As noted above, SCRCA recommends that the designations Significant Woodlands and Wetlands should return to Schedule A.	Noted. However this change has not been made.
80.	319	Appendix 4	SCRCA	The title of Appendix 4 should be St. Clair Region Conservation Authority Regulated Area. The legend item should state "Areas Affected by Regulations (Conservation Authority Regulation 171/06)".	This change has been made as "Conservation Authority Regulated Area".

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				The "Legacy Hazard Areas" should be removed from this Appendix and returned to Schedule A as a "Natural Hazard" designation consistent with the policies of Section 9.0. The Natural Hazard designation is not the same as the Regulated Area under Ontario 171/06, defined by the Conservation Authorities Act.	Legacy Hazards Areas have been removed. Natural hazards are not included as a designation on Schedules to this Plan. They have been included on Appendix 4.
81.	-	-	SCRCA	To be consistent with the PPS, the County of Lambton Official Plan, and the County of Lambton Woodlands Conservation By-law, the terms 'woodlots' and 'woodlands' are not interchangeable. The term Significant Woodland should be used for any of the natural heritage policies, when discussing features which meet the criteria defined in Policy 8.4.2 of the County's Official Plan. The terms 'woodland' and 'woodlot' are defined through the Woodland Conservation By-law, and should be used within the appropriate context.	This change has been made.
82.	23	2.15	SCRCA	The term Lambton County Tree Cutting By-law should be replaced with The County of Lambton Woodlands Conservation By-Law. This should be used consistently throughout the Plan.	This change has been made.
83.	124	9.0	SCRCA	After the new text "The Natural Heritage System and associated policies are not intended to limit the ability of agricultural uses to continue." SCRCA recommends adding "exclusive of any forms of	This change has not been made. The recommended wording is more restrictive than the PPS and is not supported.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				agriculture that would remove natural heritage features”.	
84.	125	9.1.1	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA recommends that a reference be included stating that the definitions and significance criteria for the natural heritage features are available in the County’s Official Plan.</p> <p>Please note the typo “endangered specifies” and replace with “endangered species”.</p> <p>SCRCA recommends that provincially significant wetlands and significant woodlands be included as designations on Schedule A.</p> <p>SCRCA recommends adding a note that review and approval from Fisheries and Oceans Canada may be required for any development along the shoreline, including shoreline protection works, and review and approval of the Ministry of Environment Conservation and Parks will be required for any development within the habitat of endangered or threatened species.</p>	<p>This change has been made.</p> <p>Typo has been addressed.</p> <p>Noted. Comment has been addressed previously.</p> <p>This change has been made.</p>
85.	135	9.1.11	SCRCA	SCRCA is satisfied that the policy can be deleted, as this is addressed through the new section 9.5 Environmental Impact Studies.	Noted.
86.	136	9.1.12	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends the revised wording: “The Municipality may prohibit all development, dumping or removal of fill, alteration to watercourses	This change has not been made as Group A and B features are already addressed in other policies.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<p>and natural drainage areas, removal of tree stands and the installation of roads and services within Group A, B or some Group C features of the Natural Heritage System without demonstration by an Environment Impact Study prepared in accordance with Section 9.5 of this Plan that there will be no significant negative impacts to the features or their ecological functions.</p> <p>Any site alteration, including dumping or removal of fill, or alterations to watercourses and natural drainage areas will require a written permission through the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority."</p>	<p>This text has been added.</p> <p>This text has been added, except reference is made to "the Conservation Authority".</p>
87.	137	9.1.13	SCRCA	SCRCA supports the policy regarding updating the natural heritage feature mapping of this Plan and the Zoning By-law, consistent with approved EIS reports prepared in accordance with this Plan.	Noted.
88.	138	9.1.14	SCRCA	SCRCA supports the revised wording of this policy, however a similar policy should be added to the natural hazards proposed section 9.5 of the Plan indicating that Natural Hazard areas will be identified in a separate category or overlay in the implementing Zoning By-law.	Noted. See response to previous comments on this policy.
89.	139	9.2.1	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends that the wording be revised to: "The Township will designate Significant Woodlands and Provincially Significant Wetlands on Schedule A of the Official Plan, and will encourage the	This change has not been made. Significant Woodlands and Provincially Significant Wetlands will be designated on Schedule C to this Plan.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				maintenance of these lands in their natural state, subject to the policies of this plan. Other Significant Natural Areas and Features will be shown as Group A, Group B or Group C features on Schedule C of the Official Plan, except those described in Policy 10.1.1.	
90.	142	9.2.2.1	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends the revised wording, “The Town will designate provincially and locally significant wetlands, including coastal wetlands, in this Plan as identified and delineated using the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES), and approved by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry”. Wetlands can be delineated by qualified professionals using OWES, but updates must be reviewed and approved by the Ministry.	This change has been made.
91.	143	9.2.2.2	SCRCA	SCRCA has provided the attached mapping to note several significant woodlands which meet the Lambton Natural Heritage Study criteria for significant woodlands, which have not been included on the proposed Schedule C. We recommend updating the mapping on Schedule C, and returning the significant woodland designation to Schedule A.	The significant woodlands identified have been added to Schedule C to this Plan.
92.	145	9.2.2.4	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends linking the proposed new policy with policy 9.2.7 which discusses development along watercourses and impacts of fish habitat. We recommend replacing the word ‘off-stream’ with ‘off-line’ with reference to ponds, as this is the	This change has been made. This change has been made.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<p>standard terminology used by Conservation Authorities.</p> <p>The proposed policy directs fish habitat screening to the Province. Fish habitat is the jurisdiction of the federal government, under Fisheries and Oceans Canada.</p> <p>The Province reviews for Species at Risk fish.</p>	Noted. The wording used in the draft OPA came from the Lambton County Official Plan. This change has been made.
93.	148	9.2.3	SCRCA	SCRCA has no concerns with this deletion, as the policies regarding Environmental Impact Studies are addressed in the new section 9.5.	Noted.
94.	149	9.2.4	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA recommends the following revised wording:</p> <p>“The lands defined as Adjacent Lands are generally the lands within 120 metres of a feature, unless an alternative standard for Adjacent Lands is established through the Lambton County Official Plan, or in the policies of section 9.5 of this Plan.”</p>	This change has not been made. It is unclear how this substantively changes/improves what is proposed in the draft OPA.
95.	150	9.2.5	SCRCA	We recommend including ‘and the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority’ to the list of partners.	The Conservation Authority will be added to the list of partners.
96.	151	9.2.9	SCRCA	To be consistent with the wording of the by-law, replace Lambton County Tree Cutting By-law with The County of Lambton Woodlands Conservation By-Law.	This change has been made.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
97.	153	9.2.11	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA recommends replacing the term “wild life” with “wildlife”.</p> <p>SCRCA recommends the following updated wording for section g):</p> <p>“g) incorporate the requirements of an Environmental Impact Study if the wooded area is part of a Significant Woodland, as defined by the criteria outlined in the County of Lambton Official Plan.”</p> <p>The criteria listed in the current policy are not consistent with the current County Official Plan.</p>	<p>This change has been made.</p> <p>This change has been made.</p> <p>Noted. Revision to g) above addresses this comment.</p>
98.	154	9.2.12	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA recommends the revised wording</p> <p>“Improving linkages within the Natural Heritage System through a comprehensive system of primary corridors and linkage features will be encouraged. Stewardship initiatives and compatible land uses will be encouraged in an effort to restore areas of vegetation gaps and woodland openings within these natural corridors. Any reforestation required under the Lambton County Woodlands Conservation By-law or a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan should maintain and enhance existing corridors where practical.”</p>	<p>This change has been made.</p>
99.	157	9.5	SCRCA	<p>As discussed above, SCRCA recommends this new section be added after the natural heritage policies,</p>	<p>Noted. However the section has not been renumbered/moved.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				rather than following the Natural Hazard section, in order to improve readability.	
100.	158	9.5.1	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA recommends the following revised wording:</p> <p>“An Environmental Impact Study shall be required, in accordance with the policies of this Plan, for development and site alteration within natural heritage features, or on lands adjacent to the natural heritage features. The study shall demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in negative impacts on the natural heritage features or the ecological functions for which the feature is identified. The study should determine the type(s) of natural heritage feature(s) and its ecological functions; the sensitivity of the features to disturbance, the degree of impact of the proposed disturbance, and methods proposed to alleviate such impacts. The final development plans shall address the recommendations of the study, which may include buffers or setbacks between the feature and the proposed development.”</p>	The wording of the EIS description has been updated.
101.	159	9.5.2	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA recommends that the final sentence of this section be revised to read:</p> <p>“External peer-review of the completed EIS by the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority, or other qualified consultant, will be required, at the landowner’s expense. The scope and the content of</p>	This change has not been made. The policy provides broad opportunity for peer review beyond the Conservation Authority which is appropriate as agencies beyond the Conservation Authority may require a peer review. Matters of cost for peer reviews should not be found in the OP. They can be matters of practice by the agencies and local municipalities.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				the EIS should be discussed with the Approval Authority and the reviewer prior to commencement of the study.”	The following has been added: “The scope and the content of the EIS should be discussed with the Approval Authority prior to commencement of the study”.
102.	160	9.5.3	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA suggests the following wording be substituted for the proposed.</p> <p>a) “An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) shall be required for development on lands adjacent to significant natural heritage features (i.e. Group A, and Group B features). The lands defined as Adjacent Lands are generally the lands within 120 metres of a feature, unless and alternative standard for Adjacent Lands is established through the Lambton County Official Plan.</p> <p>b) The extent of Adjacent Lands where an EIS is required may be reduced on a site-specific basis, based on the nature of the features, the existing conditions of the site and surrounding lands, the scale of the proposed development, and the likelihood of potential negative impacts to the natural heritage features.”</p> <p>c) An Environmental Impact Study may be required for development within or adjacent to Group C features, as determined by the Town and the Conservation Authority.</p>	<p>Most of these changes have been made. With regard to c), the wording will read:</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Study may be required for development within or adjacent to Group C features, as determined by the Town in consultation with the Conservation Authority.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				St. Clair Region should be added prior to words "Conservation Authority" in c)	
103.	163	9.5.6	SCRCA	<p>SCRCA recommends the wording of the first paragraph be revised as:</p> <p>"An Environmental Impact Study may not be required if the Town, in consultation with the County and the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority, determines that development within the adjacent lands of a natural heritage feature is not expected to result in negative impact on the natural features or their ecological functions."</p> <p>As written, it seems the impact on adjacent lands is being considered, rather than impacts on the features.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the Conservation Authority will be consulted prior to waiving the requirements for an EIS in the below noted situations, however we suggest the following revisions.</p> <p>For parts a) and b), it would be useful to have a frame of reference for what is considered "small scale" or "medium scale".</p> <p>For part e), we recommend adding "Where the development is an addition to an existing structure located away from the feature."</p>	<p>The wording as drafted includes references to the feature and adjacent land. No changes have been made.</p> <p>Small scale development is a relative term and will require the input of the review agencies to determine what is small scale.</p> <p>This text has been added.</p>

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
104.	165	9.5.8	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends the following revised wording: “Where it has been demonstrated, through an EIS or Environmental Assessment Act process, that all or a portion of a Group B or Group C feature does not meet the criteria for designation under this Plan, the restrictions for development or site alteration within a feature or the associated adjacent lands do not apply.”	This change has not been made. The existing draft OPA policy achieves the same.
105.	166	9.5.9	SCRCA	We recommend including “in coordination with Lambton County and the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority , may develop guidelines for the evaluation of development proposals consistent with the natural heritage policies of this Plan.”	This change has been made.
106.	167	9.5.10	SCRCA	The terms “native species” and “indigenous species” are used throughout the Plan. SCRCA recommends the use of the term “indigenous species” to be consistent. SCRCA recommends the following revised wording for part c): “Where the Town is undertaking infrastructure work, existing woodlands shall be protected and preserved, where feasible. If it is necessary for infrastructure works to destroy any trees, the Town shall endeavour to compensate by re-planting on site and/or planting trees elsewhere. Should the removal/destruction of any trees that are listed as <i>threatened or endangered</i>	Noted. This change has been made throughout the Plan. This change has been made.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				<i>species</i> be required to complete infrastructure works, the Town will contact the appropriate Provincial authority to determine the necessary approvals and mitigation.”	
107.	168	9.5.11	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends the following revised wording: “Any land dedication that may be accepted by the Town shall be managed consistent with the Natural Heritage Policies of this Plan.”	This change has been made.
108.	170	10.4	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends replacing the term “Natural Environmental designations” with “Natural Heritage Features” The term ‘hydrogeology study’ should be replaced with “hydrogeologic study”.	This change has been made. This change has been made.
109.	214	14.2.3	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends the following revised wording: “The public services and facilities listed in Section 14.1 will be prohibited in Significant Natural Heritage Features and Areas unless they are authorized under an Environmental Assessment process, or subject to the Drainage Act.” SCRCA recommends including the St. Clair Region Conservation Authority as a partner to determine appropriate planting locations. SCRCA recommends replacing the term ‘environmental policies’ with ‘natural hazard and	This change has been made. This change has been made. This change has been made.

#	Item No. (in Draft OPA)	OP Policy	Received From	Description of Comment	Response
				natural heritage policies' to be consistent with the remainder of the plan.	
110.	284	17.1.1	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends revising the wording of section b) as follows: "The effectiveness of the Plan in protecting water quality and natural heritage features within the Town."	This change has been made.
111.	308	Schedule A	SCRCA	SCRCA recommends that Significant Woodlands and Significant Wetlands be included as Official Plan Designations on Schedule A. The Natural Heritage System, shown on the new Schedule C, should be considered an overlay, but those two specific natural heritage features, where development is prohibited or restricted through the policies of the Official Plan, should be shown as designations.	Noted. Significant Woodlands and Significant Wetlands have been included on Schedule C to this Plan.
112.	315	Schedule C	SCRCA	SCRCA is supportive of the use of the proposed Schedule C (new) for details regarding the County of Lambton Group A to C Natural Heritage features.	Noted.
113.	-	-	Ken Melanson (Lambton County)	Suggested a policy be included in the revised OPA to allow emergency operations centres and facilities needed to respond to a state of emergency as permitted uses without the need for site plan control.	This change has been made.