Appendix A – City Wide and Urban amendments

Amendment	Volume and Policy, Schedule, or Annex	Correction, Clarification, or Update	Description / Rationale	Amendment Details (Unless otherwise indicated: ~~strikeout~~ indicates removal, **bold underline** indicates new text)
1	Volume 1, Section 2	Update	For ease of reference and consistency of formatting within the Plan, the bullets within Section 2 are proposed be re-formatted to letters.	Replace all bulleted lists in Section 2 with alphabetical lists
2	Volume 1, Section 3.1, Figure 6	Update	The proposed modification updates the boundaries shown on Figure 6 to reflect the urban expansion lands as adjusted by the Provincial rollback.	Update Figure 6 to include Future Neighbourhood areas within the "Urban Greenfield Area"
3	Volume 1, Section 3.2, Policy 11)	Update	The proposed modification updates terminology to align with the legislative changes brought forth through *Bill 23*.	11) **Additional** ~~Accessory~~ dwellings**,** and coach houses**,** may be counted as part of the residential density target.
4	Volume 1, Section 3.2, Policy 12)	Clarification	Table 3A refers to density requirements whereas Table 3B refers to density targets. The as-written policy incorrectly refers to targets for both tables. The proposed wording corrects the error.	12) The **minimum area-wide** density ~~targets~~ **requirements** in Table~~s~~ 3a, ~~and~~ **minimum area-wide density targets in Table** 3b and the overall Growth Management targets in Table 2 shall be implemented in the Zoning By-law through a municipally initiated zoning conformity exercise and: a) Shall permit intensification such that the average area-wide density generally meets or exceeds the applicable **minimum area-wide density requirement or target**~~targets~~;
5	Volume 1, Section 3.3, Policy 2)	Clarification	The proposed modification clarifies that Greenfield growth areas include lands within the Future Neighbourhood Overlay rather than being defined by them.	2) Greenfield growth areas **include previous urban expansion areas that were undeveloped as of July 1, 2018 and** ~~are~~ **areas** identified by the Future Neighbourhood Overlay on the B-series of schedules.
6	Volume 1, Section 3.3, Policy 3)	Clarification	For clarity, the proposed modification adds a reference to the policy section for the Future Neighbourhood Overlay.	3) A secondary plan**, prepared** in accordance with Section **5.6.2 and Section** 12**,** shall ~~generally~~ be required for ~~the~~ development of ~~new neighbourhoods as shown~~ with**in** a Future Neighbourhood Overlay.
7	Volume 1, Section 3.5, Policy 12) d)	Clarification	The proposed modification is intended to resolve a contradiction between 3.5 11) and 12) d) as Major office development would imply a primary use rather than accessory.	11) **Small-scale Office** uses within the Industrial and Logistics designation shall only be permitted as an accessory to a primary use so that lands are preserved for manufacturing, construction, storage, distribution and logistics uses, so that lands are conserved for the primary purpose of this designation.

<table>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Volume 1, Section 3.5, Policy 12) c)</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>The proposed modification improves legibility of the applicable sub-policies. Sub-policy c) currently implies that transit priority corridors are designated on the B series schedules, when they are actually designated on C2.</td>
<td>12) c) On land fronting Corridors <u>as designated on Schedules B1 through B8</u> that are transit priority corridors ~~as designated on Schedules B1 through B8~~, or have a frequent street transit route, or where a primary building entrance is within 800 metres walking distance of an existing or planned rapid transit station;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Volume 1, Section 4.1.2, Policies 11), 12), and 13)</td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Omnibus 1 improved the legibility of Policy 11 by rewriting and rephrasing it using a table; however, some of the information was carried over incorrectly or misinterpreted. The proposed modification would correct the wording, remove the last column of the table, and re-introduce the last note as a policy.</td>
<td>11) The City shall require the provision of pedestrian and cycling facilities through new development, road construction, road reconstruction, and in transportation infrastructure renewal projects, <u>in a manner consistent with the Safe Systems Approach and</u> as outlined in the following table:

Number the table and renumber subsequent tables. Adjust the table by deleting the “Intersection Facilities” column and making the following text changes:
<table>
<tr><th>Street Type</th><th>Sidewalks</th><th>Cycling Facilities</th><th>Multi-use Pathways</th><th>~~Intersection Facilities~~</th></tr>
<tr><td>Arterials, Major Collectors, and Collectors (Urban Areas & Villages)</td><td>Both sides</td><td>Generally, unidirectional on both sides or bidirectional on one side in limited circumstances</td><td>Allowed within Greenbelt Transect and may be considered ~~elsewhere for improved continuity and/or safety~~ <u>in specific situations in other Transects as outlined by the Transportation Master Plan Multi-Use Pathway Policy</u></td><td>~~Continue through intersections in all directions using crosswalks & crossrides~~</td></tr>
<tr><td>New Local Streets (Downtown Core & Inner Urban Transects)</td><td>Both sides</td><td colspan="3">~~May be identified through secondary planning processes~~ <u>As identified by schedules, plans, studies, or road designs as listed in Subsection 4.1.2, Policy 12) below.</u></td></tr>
<tr><td>New Local Streets (Outer Urban, Suburban Transects, & Villages)</td><td>At least one side, both sides when required for direct connections to destinations such as transit stops or stations, schools, parks, pathways, public buildings, public institutions and commercial areas</td><td colspan="3"><u>As identified by schedules, plans, studies, or road designs as listed in Subsection 4.1.2, Policy 12) below.</u></td></tr>
<tr><td>Existing Local Streets</td><td>Pursue through reconstruction where possible</td><td colspan="3"><u>As identified by schedules, plans, studies, or road designs as listed in Subsection 4.1.2, Policy 12) below.</u></td></tr>
</table>
</td>
</tr>
</table>

				(Urban Areas & Villages) and affordable, prioritizing safety **for vulnerable road users** over vehicular capacity Notes: In the case of Mainstreet and Minor Corridors with narrow rights of way, additional consideration shall be given to the provision of on-street parking to support small business, while balancing the need for pedestrian and cycling supportive infrastructure. Intersections: Where pedestrian and cycling facilities are required approaching an intersection, these facilities shall be continued through the intersection in all directions using crosswalks and crossrides. The City may consider limiting crossrides where connectivity is not required or where safe cycling crossings can be provided in another way; ~~The City will require pedestrian and cycling facilities as identified on Schedules C3 and C8, the Transportation Master Plan, Local Plans (and supporting studies such as Transportation Master Studies), Community Design Plans, in new road designs, or in area traffic management plans.~~ **12) The City will require pedestrian and cycling facilities in all Transects including the Rural Transect as identified on Schedules C3 and C8, the Transportation Master Plan, Local Plans (and supporting studies such as Transportation Master Studies), Community Design Plans, in new road designs, or in area traffic management plans.** ~~12)~~ **13)** The City has identified a network of active transportation facilities identified in the policies outlined above and in Schedules C3 and C8 and in the TMP and associated plans that will be implemented through the review of development applications, development of spaces within the public realm and as part of capital programs to build new transportation facilities or to maintain or upgrade existing facilities. Although not illustrated in Schedule C3, all urban area collectors, major collectors and arterials are cycling routes that, over time, are to include cycling facilities as set out in Table X above. Renumber subsequent policies and tables.
10	Volume 1, Section 4.1.2, Policy 14)	Clarification	The proposed amendment clarifies that greenfield areas include new neighbourhoods and expansion lands.	14) The attractiveness of transit service along Corridors and in Hubs, and in areas targeted for intensification and new growth ~~including~~ **in** greenfield areas~~, new neighbourhoods and expansion lands~~ will be improved through the ongoing implementation of measures to improve service, including the introduction of priority measures, and improvements to frequency and capacity of service, in a way that will achieve or surpass the target mode shares as set out in the TMP and associated plans.
11	Volume 1, Section	Update	The proposed amendment provides a minor terminology change to align with *Bill 23* and provides minor syntax improvements.	3) **Additional** ~~Accessory~~ Dwelling units as provided for by the Planning Act, including coach houses and secondary dwelling units in the main building, are recognized as key components of the affordable housing stock and shall be protected for long-term residential purposes.

	4.2.1, Policy 3)			New policy) The Zoning By-law shall permit these uses on residential lots with one principal dwelling unit ~~in all areas of the City~~ and shall establish criteria to govern appropriate integration of these units with the main dwelling and surrounding context. ~~Furthermore~~, the following criteria and limitations apply: a) On any lot on which the Zoning By-law permits a coach house, a**n additional** ~~secondary~~ dwelling unit is also permitted within the principal dwelling; b) A coach house shall be smaller than the primary home and the Zoning By-law shall set forth the appropriate maximum permitted size; c) The size, floor area, function and occupancy of a dwelling unit in a coach house in the urban area is not intended to exceed that of a typical two-bedroom apartment; d) A coach house may not be severed from the lot accommodating the primary dwelling; e) Applications for Minor Variance / Permissions with respect to coach houses shall have regard for all applicable policies of this Plan, as well as the following considerations: i) The proponent can demonstrate that the privacy of the adjoining properties is maintained; ii) The siting and scale of the coach house does not negatively impact abutting properties; and iii) Distinctive trees and plantings are preserved on the subject property. f) The Zoning By-law shall limit the coach house to a height of one storey for lots in the urban area. An application to allow a height of up to two storeys through a minor variance may be considered where the considerations noted in Subsection 4.2.1, Policy 3 e) above can be satisfied. 4) A coach house shall only be permitted where the primary dwelling is located on: a) A lot in a Public Service Area and only where public or communal services for both water and wastewater services are currently provided to the main dwelling; or b) A lot that is of sufficient size to support private services and is located in a public service area where services are not currently provided to the main dwelling; including a lot in the Rural area or Village and where: i) The primary dwelling is serviced by a private water and wastewater system and the coach house shall share either the water or wastewater system, or both, with the main dwelling; or ii) The primary dwelling is serviced by one public or communal service (water or wastewater) and one private service, and the coach house shall share the public or communal service with the main dwelling. *Renumber subsequent policies within the Section*
12	Volume 1, Section 4.5.2, Policy 4)	Update	The proposed modification provides the ability to request Heritage Impact Assessments across the street from and within 30m of federal heritage resources. This 30-metre buffer was established as part of the UNESCO World Heritage Site designation. It is used in associated federal documentation such as the Rideau Corridor Landscape Strategy. Further,	4) Ottawa is the site of the Rideau Canal World Heritage Site, many National Historic Sites, and both privately- and publicly-owned **heritage** buildings designated by the Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office. Development including ~~or~~, adjacent to**, across the street from, or within 30 metres of** these sites shall have regard for their cultural heritage value, as defined in Federal designation documentation and the City may require demonstration that development does not adversely impact these resources.

			the 30-metre buffer was used in relation to the Rideau Canal in the previous Official Plan and is consistent with the City's distance requirement for HIAs for other protected heritage properties through policy 4.5.2 2).	
13	Volume 1, Section 4.6.6	Update	The current policy results in building "podium" heights that are proportionate to the abutting right-of-way, leading to 9-storey building "podiums" when adjacent to wider Corridors that is an undesirable urban design and could undermine other policies of the Plan. The proposed amendment allows building "podiums" that are lower than the width of the abutting right-of-way, providing flexibility for more desirable urban built forms that are consistent with other policies in the Plan.	7) Mid-rise buildings shall be designed to respond to context, and transect area policies, and should: a) Frame the street block and provide mid-block connections to break up large blocks; b) Include a base with active frontages, and a middle portion that relates to the scale and character of the surrounding buildings, or, planned context; c) **Include a building stepback that is no taller than the corresponding** ~~Be generally proportionate in height to the~~ width of the **abutting** right of way as illustrated in the Figure below, with additional height permitted in the Downtown Core Transect; and d) Provide sufficient setbacks and step backs to: i) Provide landscaping and adequate space for tree planting; ii) Avoid a street canyon effect; and iii) Minimize microclimate impacts on the public realm and private amenity areas.
14	Volume 1, Section 4.8.1, Policy 5)	Correction	This adjustment corrects an oversight. The term "evaluated" was in previous drafts of the Official Plan but was accidentally removed from the version considered by the Joint Planning and Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee on October 14, 2021. The word "evaluated" undermines the intent of the policy by excluding non-evaluated wetlands from the no net loss direction.	5) The City shall take a no-net-loss approach with respect to ~~evaluated~~ wetlands deemed not provincially significant and forest cover outside the urban area and designated villages. Mechanisms for achieving no net loss include land use planning, development processes, acquisition and conservation of land and support for voluntary, private land conservation and stewardship. Development and site alteration is prohibited in provincially significant wetlands
15	Volume 1, Section 4.9.5, Policy 8)	Update	The proposed modification is intended to address an oversight and to clarify that the policy should apply to both potential future groundwater systems and new surface water intake systems. Existing land use activities should be considered prior to establishing a new drinking water system regardless of the source (groundwater or surface water).	8) Prior to establishing a new municipal drinking water well **or surface water intake**, the City shall consult with the Source Protection Region and collaborate in the Source Protection Plan amendment process as required by the Clean Water Act. The City shall consider the potential impacts on existing uses and permitted uses within the Wellhead Protection Area **or Intake Protection Zone** and shall avoid establishing a new municipal drinking water well **or surface water intake** in areas where activities that may constitute a significant threat to drinking water are permitted.
16	Volume 1, Section 5, Table 7	Clarification	This amendment proposes a minor clarification for consistency with the Height Category definitions in Section 13 of this Plan.	Add the following text to Table 7, in the Outer Urban Transect area – Minor Corridors row: Low-rise **and Mid-rise**: minimum 2 storeys and maximum of 6 storeys
17	Volume 1, Section 5.3.1,	Clarification	The proposed modification clarifies that the permitted heights within Minor Corridors	2) The Outer Urban Transect is generally characterized by low- to mid-density development. Development shall be: a) Low-rise within Neighbourhoods ~~and along Minor Corridors~~;

	Policy 2) a)		correspond to the Official Plan's low- and mid-rise categories in Section 13.	New sub-policy: **b) Low- to Mid-rise along Minor Corridors** **Renumber subsequent sub-policies*
18	Volume 1, Section 5.4.1, Policy 2)	Update	Sub-policy iii) requires that the podium height for buildings on Mainstreet Corridors in the Suburban Transect correspond to the width of the abutting road right-of-way. Given that most Mainstreet Corridors are arterial roads with a right-of-way greater than 30m, this often results in the requirement for a podium height greater than 30m or 10 storeys, which undermines the City's urban design guidelines and best practices. The sub-policy is therefore proposed to be deleted.	2) The Suburban Transect is generally characterized by Low- to Mid-density development. Development shall be: a) Low-rise within Neighbourhoods and along Minor Corridors; b) Mid-rise along Mainstreet Corridors, however the following policy additional direction applies; i) Generally not less than 2 storeys; ii) Where the lot fabric can provide a suitable transition to abutting Low-rise areas, High-rise development may be permitted; iii) The **building** stepback ~~requirements fronting the street for buildings shall~~ **should be no taller than the corresponding** ~~proportionate to the~~ width of the abutting right of way, and consistent with the objectives in the urban design section on Mid-rise and High-rise built form in Subsection 4.6.6, Policies 7), 8) and 9); and
19	Volume 1, Section 5.4.4, Policy 2)	Update	The proposed modification aligns the policy with amendment 60, which deletes Schedule C-17 and adds the Future Neighbourhood overlay areas onto the relevant B-Series schedules.	2) Net residential densities shall strive to approach the densities of the Inner Urban Transect over time, but residential development within the Urban Greenfield Area ~~as shown on Figure 6 and urban expansion areas subject to any of the Future Neighbourhood Overlays as shown on Schedule C17 - Urban Expansion Areas~~, shall plan for a minimum density of 36 units per net hectare ~~and permit density increases through intensification and accessory dwelling units~~.
20	Volume 1, Section 5.5.2, Preamble	Clarification	The proposed modification clarifies that the Future Neighbourhood Overlay includes lands within the urban greenfield area.	The Future Neighbourhood Overlay is applied to lands that have been added to the urban boundary to accommodate City growth in the Suburban Transect **and forms part of the Urban Greenfield Area**.
21	Volume 1, Section 5.6.1, Policy 1)	Correction and Clarification	The first proposed modification clarifies that the extent of the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay shown on the B-series of schedules is intended to be general. The second proposed modification clarifies that Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay is intended to apply solely to the Neighbourhood designation. The as-written policy incorrectly implies that the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay also applies to properties designated as Minor Corridor.	1) The Evolving Neighborhood Overlay will apply to areas that are in a location or at stage of evolution that create the opportunity to achieve an urban form in terms of use, density, built form and site design. ~~These areas are proximate to the boundaries of Hubs and Corridors as shown in the B-series of schedules of this Plan.~~ **The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay is shown generally in the B-series of schedules of this Plan. The policies contained in this section should be referred to for greater clarity.** The Evolving Neighborhood Overlay will be applied generally to ~~the properties that have a lot line along a Minor Corridor;~~ lands 150 meters from the boundary of a Hub or Mainstreet designation; and to lands within a 400-metre radius of a rapid transit station. The Overlay is intended to provide opportunities that allow the City to reach the goals of its Growth Management Framework for intensification through the Zoning By-law, by providing: a) Guidance for a gradual change in character based on proximity to Hubs and Corridors, b) Allowance for new building forms and typologies, such as missing middle housing; c) Direction to built form and site design that support an evolution towards more urban built form patterns and applicable transportation mode share goals; and d) Direction to govern the evaluation of development.

22	Volume 1, Section 5.6.1, Policy 4)	Correction	The proposed modification corrects a contradiction with the preamble of 5.6.1. The Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay is applied to areas of the Neighbourhood Designation in close proximity to Hubs and Corridors, but not to Hubs and Corridors themselves.	4) Where an Evolving Neighborhood Overlay abuts lands with no overlay, the overlay applies to both sides of the public street, ~~including designated Corridors as applicable,~~ to allow consistency in built form, generally to the depth of the lot fabric fronting such street.
23	Volume 1, Section 5.6.2.1, Policy 7)	Update	The proposed modification deletes an incorrect reference. Wording in 11.6 does not specify Future Neighbourhood Overlay lands and references zoning amendments not requiring an Official Plan Amendment. All Future Neighbourhood Overlay lands require an Official Plan Amendment. The scope of the studies and plans for FNO even if done through concept plan process is determined through consultation with staff and the development of Terms of Reference.	7) Notwithstanding Policy 5), a concept plan may be acceptable for small scale sites under one ownership, at the sole discretion of the City, ~~subject to the requirements of Subsection 11.6, Policy 13)~~
24	Volume 1, Section 5.6.2.1, Policy 11)	Clarification	The proposed modification re-orders the applicable policies for improved readability. Existing policies 11 and 12 only apply to the Tewin community, and so they should be moved to the end of the section.	**14**~~11~~) The Tewin new community will consist of a net developable area of 445.35ha. A preliminary location for Tewin is shown on Schedule C17. The exact boundary will be adjusted/finalized through the approval of the community design plan and applicable studies. There shall be no net increase in the developable area resulting from the adjustments to the boundary consistent with section 1.1.3.9 of the Provincial Policy Statement. **15**~~12~~) Technical and financial requirements outlined in Annex 10 are required before Council approves a secondary plan for the Category 2 – Tewin new community in addition to the policies of this section and Section 12. 13) Proponents of development shall convey natural heritage features and the natural heritage system at no cost to the City. **11**~~14~~) Proponents of development shall commit to providing recreational pathways identified in the secondary plan or concept plan through development charges or at the expense of the developer. **12**~~15~~) Within the Future Neighbourhood Overlay, applications for minor variances, permissions and site plan control may be considered on lots generally two hectares or less that existed prior to the approval of this Plan on November 4, 2022.
25	Volume 1, Section 5.6.2.1, Policy 11)	Correction	The proposed wording corrects an omission. Technical and financial requirements outlined in Annexes 10 and 12 are required before Council approves a secondary plan for the Tewin new community.	12) Technical and financial requirements outlined in Annex**es** 10 **and 12** are required before Council approves a secondary plan for the Category 2 – Tewin new community in addition to the policies of this section and Section 12.
26	Volume 1, Section	Update	Policy 6.1.1.4 c) establishes criteria for mini-storage warehouses to locate in Hubs. These	4) c) Despite a) iv) recognizing that mini-storage warehouses play a critical role in commercial storage for uses which locate in hubs, mini-storage may be permitted subject to meeting all of the following:

	6.1.1, Policy 4)		uses may be desirable in certain contexts. Sub-policy iii) is overly restrictive and undermines Corridor policies and sub-policy v).	i) Demonstrate conformance to Subsection 6.1.1, Policy 3 f); ii) When located in a Hub in the Downtown and Inner Urban Transects, a mix of uses on the upper levels, including either office or residential is required, in addition to mini-storage uses; in the Outer Urban and Suburban Transects, upper-floor mixed uses are strongly encouraged; ~~iii) Have direct frontage with an arterial road;~~ iv) Include ground floor commercial, including live-work spaces, for any portion of a building fronting onto a Corridor; and v) Required to include ground floor animation fronting non-corridor streets.
27	Volume 1, Section 6.1.2, Policy 4)	Update	This policy was intended to discourage surface parking but has unintentionally also discouraged desirable amenity areas. It has also been demonstrated that it is unfeasible to achieve the 70% minimum lot coverage, even when undevelopable lands are excluded. The proposed modification deletes the minimum lot coverage requirement, as there are other policies within the Plan that adequately address surface parking.	4) The minimum building heights and lot coverage requirements within PMTSAs except as specified by a Secondary Plan, are as follows: a) Within 300 metre radius or 400 metres walking distance, whichever is greatest, of an existing or planned rapid transit station, not less than 4 storeys ~~with a minimum lot coverage of 70 per cent~~; and b) Outside the area described by a) not less than 2 storeys ~~with a minimum lot coverage of 70 per cent~~.
28	Volume 1, Section 6.3.1, Policy 2)	Clarification	The proposed modification clarifies that the policy is only intended to include other properties within the Neighbourhood designation.	2) Permitted building heights in Neighbourhoods shall be Low-rise, except: a) Where existing zoning or secondary plans allow for greater building heights; or b) In areas already characterized by taller buildings **within the Neighbourhood designation**.
29	Volume 1, Section 6.6.1, Policy 1) d)	Update	The proposed modification clarifies that the specific context of Special Districts 6.6.1(1)(d) supersedes the more general policy requiring an amendment to the Zoning By-law for height increases within the same height categories in Section 3.2., policy 14.	6.6.1 1) d): With the exception of Kanata North, the permitted building height will be the higher of the: i) Existing zoning in place at the time of adoption of this Official Plan; or ii) As provided through an adopted secondary plan **or area-specific policy**; **iii) where a secondary plan is not in place, an increase in height above existing zoning may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan where:** **a) the increased building height remains within the same low-rise (1-4 storeys) or mid-rise (5-9 storeys) height category; and** **b) Section 3.2 Policy 13 and Section 4.5.2 Policy 3 can be met**
30	Volume 1, Section 6.6.1, Policy 1)	Clarification	Corridors are intentionally shown as crossing through Special Districts. This modification is intended to clarify that the function of Corridors, such as their treatment of transit and cycling facilities, should be maintained within the Special District.	**New sub-policy g:** Where Corridors intersect or overlap with Special Districts, the building height policies governing Special Districts shall prevail; however: i) Vehicular traffic along the Corridor shall be managed with street design and measures including traffic calming so as not to undermine the pedestrian-, cyclist- and transit user-focused environment of the Corridor; and ii) Subject to i), transit shall be prioritized along Corridors.

31	Volume 1, Section 6.6.3.2, Policy 1) C)	Correction	The proposed modification corrects a reference to a policy that was previously renumbered prior to adoption of the Plan.	1) c) Recognize the importance of both March Road and Legget Drive as major connectors, each with their role to play in mobility and in distinct character: i) March Road, as the main mobility corridor that moves people to and beyond the district and which is designated as a Mainstreet, shall evolve to be a prominent, multi-modal grand street with bus rapid transit that presents the district as an innovation cluster and a living lab; ii) Legget Drive shall evolve to support a more compact built-form, mid- and low-rise, pedestrian-oriented experience and a human scale place; and iii) Where March Road and Legget Drive intersect or overlap with the activity centres which includes the areas generally within 600 metres of the planned Transitway stations located at Terry Fox Drive and Station Road, Subsection ~~6.6.8~~ **6.6.3.2** Policy 4) shall apply;
32	Volume 1, Section 6.6.3.2, Policy 6)	Clarification	The proposed modification is intended to clarify an ambiguous sentence. The policy is intended to apply to areas outside of March Road and Legget Drive.	6) The following applies to the land within the district outside of the ~~a~~**A**ctivity ~~c~~**C**entres, ~~on~~ March Road**,** and Legget Drive:
33	Volume 1, Section 10.1.2, Policy 5)	Update	The proposed modification updates terminology to align with the legislative changes brought forth through *Bill 23*.	5) To avoid an increased risk to life and property, the following shall not be permitted in the flood fringe or in an area of reduced flood risk: a) Creation of a new lot, except to allow for separate ownership of a semi-detached, or townhouse dwelling, or a plan of condominium or strata title for an apartment dwelling, where these uses are permitted in the Zoning By-law; b) A**n additional** ~~secondary~~ dwelling unit or dwelling unit that is either partially or completely below grade, or a coach house; c) An amendment to, or relief granted from, the zoning by-law that increases the number of dwelling units on a lot; d) An institutional use including hospitals, long-term care homes, retirement homes, preschools, school nurseries, day cares and schools; e) An essential emergency service such as that provided by fire, police and ambulance stations and electrical substations; or f) Uses associated with the disposal, manufacture, treatment or storage of hazardous substances.
34	Volume 1, Section 11.5, Policy 9)	Update	The proposed modification expands the subject of the existing policy to include all types of low-rise development. This policy helps to address several design issues that can apply to all low-rise development, rather than infill apartment dwellings specifically.	An application before the Committee of Adjustment for a Minor Variance will address matters such as the following 9) The Committee of Adjustment shall, in addition to all other policies in this Plan, have regard for the following ~~-~~when evaluating minor variances to permit low-rise ~~infill apartment~~ dwellings: a) Variances to reduce the minimum required lot size may only be considered where adequate waste storage and management, bicycle parking and intensive soft landscaping can be provided. b) Variances to alter exterior design requirements such as balconies or facade articulation may be considered where, in the opinion of the Committee of Adjustment, the proposal serves the goals of context sensitive design and urban design. c) Variances to reduce the minimum required side yard: i) May only be considered where alternate measures to ensure adequate access for waste management and bicycle parking are provided; and ii) May reduce side yards to zero to enable attached building designs, where the written consent of the abutting lot owner is secured; d) Variances to reduce the required area of soft landscaping: i) May be tied to requirements for more intensive plantings such as trees or shrubs, so that the volume of vegetation compensates for reduced horizontal area; however,

				ii) Despite i), where the purpose or effect is primarily to enable motor vehicle parking or driveways, variances to reduce the required soft landscaping may only be considered where, in the opinion of the Planning Department, the proposal serves the goals of context sensitive design and results in better urban design than would compliance with the relevant zoning standard, and upholds the intent of this Plan; and e) The Committee of Adjustment may make the approval of variances conditional on substantial or strict conformity with the plans and elevation drawings submitted with the Minor Variance application
35	Volume 1, Section 11.7, Policy 2) a)	Update	Municipalities are required to abide by the changes made to the Planning Act by the Province. The proposed amendment is intended to allow for an alternative notification process for any changes made to the Official Plan to reflect provincial changes to the Planning Act.	2) a): Where amendments are required to fully implement **changes to the Planning Act or** an approved recommendation of Council to amend the Official Plan or Zoning By-law
36	Volume 1, Section 11.8, policy 2	Update	The proposed modification is intended to align with Bill 185, which directs that municipalities cannot require pre-application consultation meetings.	1) Prior to submitting a development proposal, a pre-application consultation meeting is **recommended** ~~required~~ with City staff in order to identify the information that will be required at the time of application submission. The City has the authority to waive the requirement for a formal pre-application consultation meeting. The City also has the authority to request additional information, that will be required as part of a complete application, after further review of the application proposal.
37	Volume 1, Section 12, Title & Intro	Clarification	The proposed modification clarifies the intent of Section 12 by renaming the title of the Section and adjusting the introduction text. Section 12 is intended for both Local Plans and Area Specific Policies.	Local Plans **and Official Plan Amendments**. Section 12: Area-specific policies are **created through Official Plan amendments that are most often proponent initiated and are** also statutory policy ~~documents~~ **direction** that form part of this Plan **in Volume 2C**. **Area-specific policies may** ~~They result from a proponent-initiated planning process similar to secondary plans but~~ apply to a ~~more specific~~ **singular** site or area **containing multiple properties**. They **are meant to** provide a further layer of local policy direction to guide more cohesive development over time **as a result of an Official Plan amendment**.
38	Volume 1, Section 12.1, Policy 2)	Clarification	The proposed modification clarifies that only the City can implement the OPA required to complete a Secondary Plan. Initiating a CDP process, specifically for FNO lands, is done by the proponent.	2) **An Official Plan amendment to implement a** ~~A Secondary~~ **secondary** plan may ~~be~~ only **be** initiated by the City unless otherwise directed by Council. An area specific policy or ~~Community Design Plan~~ **community design plan** may be initiated by the City or by a proponent.
39	Volume 1, Section 12.1, Policy 5)	Clarification	The proposed wording clarifies that a secondary plan only replaces or supersedes the Official Plan where there is overlapping policy. Where a secondary plan is silent, Volume One is still in effect.	5): A secondary plan or area-specific policy, adopted as part of Volume 2 of this Plan, is required to implement density and building heights that differ from those in ~~the~~ ~~parent~~ **Volume 1 of the** Official Plan. **Where a secondary plan or area-specific policy does not change building heights or densities, the policies in Volume 1 of the Official Plan apply, as they relate to the underlying designation.**
40	Volume 1, Section 12.1, Policy 7)	Clarification	The proposed modification improves syntax.	7) Secondary plans and area-specific policies shall take into consideration, and generally be consistent with, the policies of this Plan, although they may establish specific policies, such as different building heights or development densities in support of the Plan. ~~The following are matters that may only be~~

				~~considered as part of a comprehensive review of the Official Plan, changing~~ **Changing** the boundary of a transect area or removing an Overlay, other than the Future Neighbourhood Overlay**, may only be considered as part of a comprehensive review of the Official Plan.**
41	Volume 1, Section 12.1, Policy 11)	Clarification	The proposed modification improves syntax.	11) Clusters of cultural assets as may be identified by the City must be considered and protected in the Development of **secondary plans and area-specific policies** ~~Secondary Plans and Area Specific Policies~~.
42	Volume 1, Section 12.2, Policy 1)	Clarification	The proposed modification aligns with Section 5.6.2.1 and clarifies the process for removing the Future Neighbourhood Overlay. The current language is unclear.	1) The creation of a new secondary plan or revision to an existing secondary plan, ~~undertaken by the City in accordance with Subsection 12.1, Policy 2),~~ is required prior to development of any lands with a Future Neighbourhood Overlay and all of the following are required in advance of the City initiating ~~said secondary plan~~ **an Official Plan Amendment to implement said secondary plan and remove the Future Neighbourhood Overlay**: a) A Community Design Plan, in accordance with Annex 4; b) A designation schedule and associated secondary plan policies; c) A transportation impact assessment submission that follows the Transportation Impact Assessment Guidelines and other related reference documents, that include an appropriate street network, connectivity for active transportation modes and any necessary right-of-way protection; and traffic calming measures; d) Master servicing study; e) An environmental management plan or subwatershed study, including the identification of natural heritage features and the natural heritage system independent of the developable area; f) Minimum distance separation assessment, in accordance with provincial regulations; g) A community energy plan, unless it can be demonstrated that the design of the proposed development complies or is consistent with the High-performance Development Standard; h) A phasing plan; and i) A financial implementation plan.
43	Volume 1, Section 12.3, Policy 1)	Update	The proposed modifications would update and clarify the criteria for the evaluation of proponent driven OPAs. Flexibility is proposed to be added to items g), j), and k) as they are currently unimplementable in most cases. A clarification to h) is needed as it is not applicable in every instance. The modification to i) is necessary as the policy currently prohibits conversions that may in some cases be desirable.	1) The request for an amendment to this Plan to create an area-specific policy shall be supported by a planning rationale which includes all of the following: a) Demonstration of conformity with applicable transect and overlay policies with respect to built form, other than building height; b) The proposed type, scale and phasing of development of the site in its entirety is provided; c) A plan for development that is consistent with all applicable urban design policies of Subsection 4.6, including provisions relating to the transition of the proposed built form on the development site to adjacent low-rise residential uses and a completed urban design brief and presentation for a focused design review; d) A description of how the development is supportive of and contributes to healthy and inclusive communities and walkable 15-minute neighbourhoods as per Subsection 2.2.4; e) A description of access points and circulation for all modes of transportation, with priority given to pedestrians, cyclists and transit over private automobiles; f) A housing approach that meets the intent of Subsection 4.2; g) A landscape concept plan that demonstrates **how** ~~that~~ the existing trees ~~are~~ **may be** retained and ~~that incorporates the retention of existing trees~~ **incorporated** into the development and new tree planting **that** ~~and~~ meets the urban forest canopy cover policies in Subsection 4.8; h) Identification of locations, sizes and shapes of future parks, **as applicable**; i) Demonstration that **the** ~~there is no net~~ loss of gross floor area for the non-residential land uses **at grade is minimized**, ~~which are otherwise supported by the applicable designation, which that existed on the site~~

				~~prior to development;~~ ~~j) Demonstration that, where a High-rise building is proposed, that the site is within 300 metre radius or 400 metres walking distance, whichever is greatest, of an existing or funded rapid transit station, and of sufficient dimension to allow for a transition to abutting areas in built form massing;~~ k) Where taller building height is proposed, demonstration that the proposed development adequately integrates in scale, size and consideration of **existing or planned land uses and densities** ~~proposed land uses, with the surrounding existing or planned land uses~~ **of the surrounding context and that the proposed development is generally located within a 600 metre radius or 900 metres walking distance, whichever is greatest, of an existing or funded rapid transit station.** ~~l) Demonstration that, where a mid-rise building is proposed, that the site is located within 600 metre radius or 900 metres walking distance, whichever is greatest, of an existing or funded rapid transit station~~ ~~m)~~ **l)** Reduced private automobile ownership strategies to encourage new residents to use public transit, for example reduce parking areas, car-sharing services and transit pass subsidies; ~~n)~~ **m)** Demonstration that the development meets or exceeds the large dwelling unit requirement and provides development types which contribute to missing middle housing in accordance with Subsection 3.2; and ~~o)~~ **n)** Any other matters as deemed appropriate by the City.
44 (Schedule A)	Volume 1, Schedule B1 and Schedule C12	Correction	The proposed modification corrects a mapping error within the Rideau Canal Special District. The Greenspace designation was incorrectly applied to private residential lands 80 and 82 Queen Elizabeth Driveway.	Per Schedule A of this report, remove the Urban Greenspace designation from 80 and 82 Queen Elizabeth Driveway on Official Plan Schedule C12. Redesignate the properties from Greenspace to Rideau Canal Special District on Official Plan Schedule B1.
45 (Schedule B)	Volume 1, Schedule B2	Correction	As a resulting of a mapping error, the southeast portion of the Woodward business park was accidentally shown as Neighbourhood on Schedule B2 whereas instead of Mixed Industrial. The lands in question include warehouse lots and should be redesignated Mixed Industrial.	Per Schedule B of this report, redesignate the portions of Woodward Business Park shown as Neighbourhood to Mixed Industrial on Official Plan Schedule B2
46 (Schedule C)	Volume 1, Schedule B3	Correction	On Schedule B3, the Ottawa International Airport Economic District extends outside of the grey transect boundary. On Schedule B4, those same areas are shown as Greenbelt designations. As a result, the areas have two competing designations. The NCC's Greenbelt Master Plan suggests that Schedule B4 is correct and Schedule B3 is incorrect. The Special District on Schedule B3 should therefore be matched to the Transect boundary.	Per Schedule C of this report, Adjust the Ottawa International Airport Economic District boundary on Official Plan Schedule B3 to align with the Outer Urban Transect boundary.
47 (Schedule D)	Volume 1, Schedule B3 and	Correction	The Schedules for the Outer Urban and Greenbelt Transects both identify 60 Moodie Drive and 3450 Carling Avenue with different	Per Schedule D of this report, adjust the Official Plan Schedule B3 boundary to exclude 60 Moodie Drive and 3450 Carling Avenue.

	Schedule B4		designations: Greenbelt Facility and Neighbourhood. This is a mapping error as sites cannot have two designations and should not be identified on two transect maps. The appropriate transect and designation for the properties is Greenbelt Transect and Greenbelt Facility Designation. This is consistent with the NCC's Greenbelt Master Plan. Schedule B3 should be adjusted to remove the subject properties.	
48 (Schedule E)	Volume 1, Schedule B6	Correction	To correct an omission, Omnibus 1 (OPA 5) added Borrisokane Rapid Transit Station to Schedule B6, however, the corresponding Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay was not added. Per policy 5.6.1 1), the Overlay should be added to the schedule as well.	Per Schedule E of this report, on Official Plan Schedule B6, add the Evolving Neighbourhood Overlay to lands designated Neighbourhood within a 400m radius of Borrisokane Rapid Transit Station.
49 (Schedule F)	Schedule B8, Schedule C17	Update	Francois Dupuis Park and community centre are slated to expand eastward. This development is proposed to take place before resolution of the secondary plan. As it is only open space development it is recommended that the area be removed from the E-1 Future Neighbourhood Overlay	Per Schedule F of this report, remove the Future Neighbourhood Overlay from 2263 Portobello Boulevard on Official Plan Schedules B8 and C17.
50 (Schedule G)	Volume 1, Schedule C1	Correction	The PMTSA boundary incorrectly extends into Mixed Industrial and Industrial & Logistics lands near Trim Station. The Secondary Plan clarifies that residential uses are prohibited in these lands. PMTSAs are meant to apply to lands that allow for residential, and the two competing policy frameworks remove almost all development potential. The PMTSA should therefore be removed from these lands to be consistent with the Secondary Plan.	Per Schedule G of this report, remove the PMTSA areas near Trim Station on Official Plan Schedule C1 that correspond with the Mixed Industrial and Industrial & Logistics lands on Official Plan Schedule B8.
51 (Schedule H)	Volume 1, Schedule C2	Clarification	The proposed adjustment is to first clarify that the Protected Transportation Corridor applies to former rail lines, in addition to existing rail lines. Protected Transportation Corridors are intended for future transportation purposes, utility or electrical generation and transmission systems or interim recreational opportunities. S	Per Schedule H of this report, adjust Official Plan Schedule C2 as follows: 1. Remove the green line indicating a "Protected Transportation Corridor" along the former CN rail corridor north of Walkley Road. 2. Adjust the following note: Note: The Protected Transportation Corridor designation that applies to rail lines extends to the City limits for all **existing and former** rail lines

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Secondly, the amendment is to remove a remnant stub corridor that has no viability of use for the above purposes.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>52 (Schedule I)</td><td>Schedule C12</td><td>Correction</td><td>Through Official Plan Amendment #5 (Omnibus 1), 1649 Bearbrook Road was designated as “Greenspace” and “Bedrock Resource Overlay” on Schedule B3 – Outer Urban Transect.

For consistency, the change should have also been reflected on Schedule C12 – Urban Greenspace.

The proposed modification would correct the omission by designating the property with the “Open Space” sub-designation on C-12, which is general designation for properties that do not meet the criteria for other Greenspace typologies.</td><td>Per Schedule I of this report, designate 1649 Bearbrook Road as Open Space on Official Plan Schedule C12.</td></tr>
<tr><td>53</td><td>Volume 1, Schedule C16</td><td>Clarification & Correction</td><td>The intent of the Corso Italia District Secondary Plan was only to take right-of-way from the south side of the Gladstone segment between Loretta and 106m west of Preston Correction. The proposed modification is intended to provide clarity to the existing wording.</td><td>On the “Gladstone from Loretta to 106m west of Preston” row of Schedule C16, replace the ROW to be Protected (m) cell as follows:

Adjust the Note, as follows:

<table><tr><th>Road</th><th>From</th><th>To</th><th>ROW to be Protected (m)</th><th>Classification</th><th>Sector</th></tr><tr><td>Gladstone</td><td>Loretta</td><td>106m west of Preston</td><td>22

Note: 2.0 maximum ~~from~~ <u>widening on the</u> south side <u>only</u>.</td><td>major collector</td><td>urban</td></tr></table></td></tr>
<tr><td>54</td><td>Volume 1, Schedule C16</td><td>Correction</td><td>The name of Elm Street was one of several that changed in 2016 to avoid confusion with similar-sounding street names. Elm Street was changed to Brae Crescent.

The proposed modification would add the correct street name to the schedule and clarify that the “to and from” columns refer to Stittsville Main.</td><td>On Schedule C16, adjust the Elm Main to Main row as follows:

<table><tr><th>Road</th><th>From</th><th>To</th><th>ROW to be Protected (m)</th><th>Classification</th><th>Sector</th></tr><tr><td>Elgin</td><td>Lisgar</td><td>Isabella</td><td>20

Note: Maximum land requirement from property abutting existing ROW (0.90 m).</td><td>arterial</td><td>urban</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

				Subject to widening/easement policy. ~~Elm~~ **Brae Crescent** **Stittsville** Main **Stittsville** Main 24 collector urban
55	Volume 1, Schedule C16	Correction	In 2017, Council changed Triole Street to Lagan Way. The proposed modification adds the correct street name to the schedule in applicable locations.	On Schedule C16, replace all references from “Triole Street” to “Lagan Way”.
56	Volume 2C, NEW Area-Specific Policy	Update	The proposed amendment would formalize a cost-sharing agreement for the Letrim CDP area. The Leitrim CDP predates the use of cost sharing agreements by the City of Ottawa. A cost sharing has since been created between the benefiting owners. It remains unexecuted, but many of the transactions have been completed. One of the landowners is moving forward with the construction of a subdivision and requested a 30cm reserve be placed where their lands abut other owners. Legal has indicated that the 30cm reserve is no longer used as a means of ensuring payback and that the cost sharing agreement should be formalized in policy instead. Staff considered creating a new Area-Specific Policy or elevating the CDP to a secondary plan during the new Official Plan creation, but it was later ruled out as unnecessary in error.	Add new Area-Specific Policy: **Landowners within the boundary of the Leitrim Community Design Plan, approved by Council, shall enter into private agreement(s) to share the costs of the major infrastructure projects or parkland requirements and associated studies and plans required for the development of the Leitrim community.** **Such agreement(s) are initiated by the landowners and provide for the fair sharing of costs among the benefiting parties, to complement or replace the provisions of a Development Charges By-law. Each agreement shall contain a financial schedule describing the estimated costs of the major infrastructure projects and associated studies and plans, as well as the proportionate share of the costs for each landowner.** **The City will require the execution of the agreement(s) by each landowner prior to the approval of any application by the landowner for draft plan of subdivision or condominium, conditional approval of a severance, or approval of site plan control. The City shall include, as a condition of approval for all plans of subdivision and condominium, site plan and severance applications in the Leitrim Community Design Plan, requiring written confirmation from administrator, that the owner has paid its share of any costs pursuant to the agreement(s).**
57 (Schedule J)	Schedules B5, B9, and C17	Correction	The proposed modification corrects a mapping contradiction between schedules. The Future Neighbourhood Overlay was not intended to apply to the lands, and the correct designation for the subject lands is Neighbourhood.	Per Schedule J of this report, show the following properties as Neighbourhood on Official Plan Schedule B5: Part of 2110 Carp Road 2096 Carp Road 2017 Carp Road 2021 Carp Road 2029 Carp Road Remove Future Neighbourhood Overlay from Official Plan Schedule C17 and Rural Countryside designation from Official Plan Schedule B9.

58 (Schedule K)	Schedules B4, B5, B9, C2, C3, C4, C7A, C7B, C9, C10, C11A, C11B, C11C, C12,	Correction	Three rail corridors were discontinued and converted into Rural Cycling Routes prior to the adoption of the Official Plan. These are correctly shown on Schedule C8. The proposed modification removes these segments as being shown as active rail corridors on other applicable schedules.	Per Schedule K of this report, remove discontinued rail corridors from all Official Plan applicable schedules
59 (Schedule L)	Schedule A, B4, B5, B6, B7, B8, B9, C1, C2, C3, C4, C7-B, C8, C9, C11-A, C11-B, C11-C, C12, C15 Annex 2, 6, 7 (Village of Greely), 9	Update	Schedules note that the expansion lands from C17 form part of those Schedules and that a future adjustment would be made to add these lands. These amendment implements that adjustment. The proposed modification adds the Council-adopted expansions areas to the applicable Official Plan schedules and annexes.	On Schedule A of the Official Plan, update the urban boundary and transect boundaries to align with those currently shown on Schedule C17. On all applicable B- and C-Series Schedules, add the Council-adopted expansion areas, the related urban boundary, and transect boundary adjustments currently shown on Schedule C17. Remove the Expansions Lands notation from Schedule A, B4, B5, B6, B7, B8, B9, C1, C2, C3, C4, C8, C9, C12: *Expansion lands also form part of this Schedule, and an adjustment to this map will be undertaken at a later time to add these lands. In the interim the expansion lands are shown on Schedule C17 - Urban Expansion Areas*
60	Schedule C17, NEW Annex	Update	During the Official Plan review, each of the proposed expansion areas were labelled. The proposed modification would label each of the expansion areas for ease of reference.	Delete Official Plan Schedule C17, add a new annex showing and labelling the Council-adopted expansion lands.
61	Volume 2A, West Downtown Core Secondary Plan	Update	Schedule P of the West Downtown Core Secondary Plan shows the Mobility Network for Pimisi Station and the LeBreton Flats District. This is an area of collaboration with the NCC, and it was subject to additional design development following the adoption of the Plan. The existing schedule notes that the delineated roadways are conceptual alignments to allow for discretion to determine the exact locations. The proposed modification adds a similar note for the Future Signalized Intersection and Multi-use Pathways.	On the legend of Schedule P, add the following text: Multi-use Pathway **(conceptual alignment)** Future Signalized Intersection **(conceptual alignment)**

Appendix B – Rural amendments

Amendment	Volume and Policy, Schedule, or Annex	Correction, Clarification, or Update	Description / Rationale	Amendment Details (Unless otherwise indicated: ~~strikeout~~ indicates removal, **bold underline** indicates new text)
62 (Rural 1)	Volume 1, Section 3.4, Policy 8)	Council Direction	The proposed modifications are intended to implement Council motion PLC-ARAC 2021-5-16 (m42.3). The proposed changes to 8) and a) would clarify that applications deemed complete prior to December 31, 2009, can also be considered under the policy, if they later received draft approval. The proposed changes to b) and h) would allow for the consideration of relocation of lands that do not abut Villages but would support better built form and clustering of residential development. These changes are per the direction of Council and are not supported by staff.	Unsupported: b) The new location abuts a village boundary **or is clustered adjacent to existing country lot subdivisions** and new applications for plan of subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment are submitted; [...] h) The proposed development is integrated with the abutting village **or an existing country lot subdivision** through a fully-connected street grid and pathway network so that development is contiguous throughout the village **or an existing country lot subdivision** by providing connections and walkable opportunities to village core areas **and other amenities**; Supported: 8) To support villages as the focus areas of rural growth, a country lot subdivision **that has received draft approval, final approval or registration** may be transferred to a different location within the Rural Countryside area through new applications for plan of subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment, provided all of the following conditions are met: a) ~~Draft approval, final approval or registration has been r~~**R**eceived **and deemed complete** prior to December 31, 2009 in the former location and no development of any kind or local street construction has occurred; b) The new location abuts a village boundary and new applications for plan of subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment are submitted **to finalize the relocation and decommission as per sub-clause e), as applicable**; [...] i) Provided the conditions of Policies c) and d) are met, the newly located transferred subdivision may qualify for a greater number of lots than the **original** ~~deregistered~~ subdivision, provided the total area of the transferred subdivision does not exceed that of the previous approved total of the **original** ~~deregistered~~ subdivision. If the lot transfer produces a smaller amount of lots in the new location than the amount that has received draft approval, final approval or registration in the original location, the remaining lots may not be transferred and shall be rescinded concurrent with draft approval of subdivision in the new location.
63 (Rural 2) (Schedule M)	Volume 1, Schedule B9	Correction	Due to a mapping error, the designation boundaries for multiple properties near Torbolton Ridge Road follow the road line rather than the treed area and active field divide. This has resulted in portions of properties being incorrected shown as Agricultural Resource Area. The proposed modification would correct the designation.	Per Schedule M of this report, adjust Official Plan Schedule B9 by changing the designation for the following properties from Agricultural Resource Area to Rural Countryside: Part of 3596, 3570, 3564, 3558, 3546, 3502, 3486, 3450, 3485, 3402, 3390, 3376, 3364, 3350 Torbolton Ridge Road

				1509, 1530, 1494, 1512 Vances Side Road 3160, 3191, 3148, 3132, 3120, 3098, 3088, 3076, 3068, 3050, 3034, 3026, 2970, 2950, 2864, 2850, 2790, Ridgetop Road 3391, 2885, 2839 Woodkilton Rd PINs 045630061, 045630060, 045630055, 045690039, 045690033, 045690438, 045690441, 045690412, 045690413
65 (Rural 3) (Schedule N)	Volume 1, Schedule B9	Correction	Part of 1420 Earl Armstrong was brought into the urban area by Council in 2021, while the remaining portion was intended to remain rural. As a result of an error, the Agricultural Resource Area designation was removed from the entire property. The Agricultural Resource Area is the correct designation within the rural portion.	The subject lands are shown on N of this report. Per Schedule O of this report, redesignate part of 1420 Earl Armstrong from Rural Countryside to Agricultural Resource Area on Official Plan Schedule B9.
66 (Rural 4) (Schedule O)	Volume 1, Schedule B9	Update	The land at 7660 Mansfield Road is currently designated as Agricultural Resource Area based on the Land Evaluation and Area Review (LEAR) system. This designation was solidified through Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 180, which was adopted by City Council on January 25, 2017. In response to the City's updated LEAR system and OPA 180, several motions were passed by City Council. A significant motion called for a soil survey of lands proposed to be designated as Agricultural Resource Area, specifically in the Fallowfield-Bleeks area, to confirm or update the soil mapping. The results of the soil survey reaffirmed the agricultural capability of much of the land designated under OPA 180. However, one parcel at 2394 Dwyer Hill Road was identified for reconsideration due to its lower soil capability and isolation from the main body of agricultural land. In July 2020, staff were directed to review the boundaries of the Agricultural Resource Area designation within the Fallowfield-Bleeks Study	Per Schedule O of this report, redesignate 7660 Mansfield Road from Agricultural Resource Area to Rural Countryside on Schedule B9.

			Area", specifically considering the potential removal of 2394 Dwyer Hill Road from the Agricultural Resource Area designation. The report before committee in 2020 attracted some public delegates including the landowner of 7660 Mansfield Road. The position of the landowner was that the lands were added by mistake in OPA 180 because the lands scored relatively poorly and the underlying designation was Rural Natural Features. Following up, staff worked with the landowner to determine information requirements for further consideration. In 2023, a third-party study was submitted by the landowner recommending the removal of the Agricultural Resource Area designation from 7660 Mansfield Road. Staff agree with the recommendation. The proposed change would more closely align the land's designation with its actual capabilities and support more appropriate land use in accordance with the Official Plan. Staff further recommend that the current recommendation be the last reconsideration of LEAR arising from the motions in OPA 180. Other lands in the Fallowfield-Bleeks Study Area have had their soil analyzed or they are contiguous to other agricultural lands which scored adequately for designation.	
67 (Rural 5) (Schedule P)	Volume 1, Schedule B9 and Volume 1, Section 13 Table 9	Update	Historical Settlements are referenced in policies 8.4 and 9.2.3 without being defined or identified by the Plan. This amendment is intended to define Historical Settlements and delineate their boundaries on a schedule.	Add the following definition to Section 13: **Historical Settlement:** **A small rural cluster of residential homes established prior to 1900 on private services and anchored by existing or former central community uses such as a church, cemetery, cheese factory, school and/or post office. These historical settlements were identified by former townships and often have markers such as heritage signs identifying a community name. The known historical settlements and their approximate location are identified on Schedule B9.** Per Schedule P of this report, amend Official Plan Schedule B9 to include 12 identified Historical Settlements.
68 (Rural 6)	Volume 1, Schedules	Clarification	The intent of the proposed modification is to identify the Protected Transportation Corridors	Per Schedule Q of this report, label and designate the protected transportation and rail corridors within the rural schedule on Official Plan Schedules C9 and C10.

(Schedule Q)	C9 and C10		on Schedule C9 and C10, which are consistent with the same currently being shown on Schedule C2, to avoid the need for cross-referencing.	
69 (Rural 4) (Schedules R1 and R2)	Volume 2B, Village of Greely Secondary Plan	Correction	The Council-adopted Official Plan did not include these lands within the Village of Greely. The Minister's original decision on the Official Plan added these lands to the Village of Greely on Schedule B9 but inadvertently did not add the lands to the Village of Greely Secondary Plan. OPA 5 included the necessary amendments to implement the Minister's original decision. Bill 162 reverses the Minister's decision to add these lands to the Village of Greely. This amendment is required for the Village of Greely Secondary Plan to be consistent with Bill 162.	Per Schedules R1 and R2 of this report, redesignate 1600 Stagecoach Road to Rural Countryside on Official Plan Schedule B9 and remove the Village Residential designation from the Village of Greely Secondary Plan Schedule A.
70 (Rural 7)	Volume 2C, Area-Specific Policies	Update	This amendment applies to country lot and village subdivisions that received draft approval under the previous Official Plan. The approvals are in place; however, they will soon lapse. This amendment would allow staff to extend the approvals and maintain the minimum lot sizes in the approved draft plan. Staff do not have concerns with the smaller lot sizes that were previously granted.	Add New Area-Specific Policy: Manotick Bravar Maple Creek Estates Subdivision – 5537 First Line Road (PIN 03902-0891 LT), North Gower Maple Forest Estates Subdivision – 2190 Maple Forest Drive (PIN 03912-0331 LT, 03912-0682 LT, 03912-0897 LT), Metcalfe PB Holdings Subdivision – 2548 8th Line Road (PIN 04314-0522 LT), Seabrook Subdivision – 6067 First Line Road (PIN 0390-90158), Cavanagh Huntley Chase Subdivision – 2727 Carp Road Notwithstanding policies 4.7.2 and 9.2.3, the minimum lot sizes permitted may be in accordance with the lot sizes demonstrated on the approved draft plan which received approval prior to the adoption of this Plan.

Appendix C – Staff unsupported amendments

Amendment	Volume and Policy, Schedule, or Annex	Correction, Clarification, or Update	Description / Rationale	Amendment Details (Unless otherwise indicated: ~~strikeout~~ indicates removal, **bold underline** indicates new text)

71	Volume 1, Section 4.2.3, Policy 2	Update	The Joint Committee directed Staff to carry forward policies limiting the number of shelters in Ward 12 to four in the new Zoning By-law, as per report ACS2008-PTE-PLA-0011 (as directed at: 14-Oct-21 PC meeting). This new policy is at the direction of Council and is not supported by staff as the direction is discriminatory. Motion d9.1 from the Joint Meeting of Planning Committee and Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee,Thursday, October 14, 2021: *The Joint Committee direct Staff to carry forward the policies limiting the number of shelters in Ward 12 to four in the new Zoning By-law, as per report ACS2008-PTE-PLA-0011.* The motion is intended to carry forward the shelter cap in the zoning by-law; however, an OPA would first be necessary to enable the cap to be implemented in the new zoning by-law. Staff do not support the amendment as it may be considered discriminatory and it does not achieve a proper land use planning objective consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and the goals and objectives of the Official Plan.	Add new sub-policy to 4.2.3, 2): **d) Notwithstanding policy 4.2.3, 2 c), the number of emergency shelters permitted in Ward 12 is limited to four.**
63 **Partially Supported* **Also shown as Rural 1 for ease of reference*	Volume 1, Section 3.4, Policy 8)	Council Direction	The proposed modifications are intended to implement Council motion PLC-ARAC 2021-5-16 (m42.3). The proposed changes to 8) and a) would clarify that applications deemed complete prior to December 31, 2009, can also be considered under the policy, if they later received draft approval. The proposed changes to b) and h) would allow for the consideration of relocation of lands that do not abut Villages but would support better built form and clustering of residential development. These changes are per the direction of Council and are not supported by staff.	Unsupported: b) The new location abuts a village boundary **or is clustered** **adjacent to existing country lot subdivisions** and new applications for plan of subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment are submitted; [...] h) The proposed development is integrated with the abutting village **or an existing country lot subdivision** through a fully-connected street grid and pathway network so that development is contiguous throughout the village **or an existing country lot subdivision** by providing connections and walkable opportunities to village core areas **and other amenities**; Supported: 8) To support villages as the focus areas of rural growth, a country lot subdivision **that has received draft approval, final approval or registration** may be transferred to a different location within the Rural Countryside area through new applications for plan of subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment, provided all of the following conditions are met: a) ~~Draft approval, final approval or registration has been r~~**R**eceived **and deemed complete** prior to

				December 31, 2009 in the former location and no development of any kind or local street construction has occurred; b) The new location abuts a village boundary and new applications for plan of subdivision and Zoning By-law amendment are submitted **to finalize the relocation and decommission as per sub-clause e), as applicable**; [...] i) Provided the conditions of Policies c) and d) are met, the newly located transferred subdivision may qualify for a greater number of lots than the **original** ~~deregistered~~ subdivision, provided the total area of the transferred subdivision does not exceed that of the previous approved total of the **original** ~~deregistered~~ subdivision. If the lot transfer produces a smaller amount of lots in the new location than the amount that has received draft approval, final approval or registration in the original location, the remaining lots may not be transferred and shall be rescinded concurrent with draft approval of subdivision in the new location.

See Appendix D for mapping changes.