

ISSUE DATE:
June 12, 2012



Ontario

PL100206

**Ontario Municipal Board
Commission des affaires municipales de l'Ontario**

IN THE MATTER OF subsection 17(36) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended
Appellants: SEE SCHEDULE "1"
Subject: Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. OPA #76
Municipality: City of Ottawa
OMB Case No.: PL100206
OMB File No.: PL100206

Before:

N. JACKSON)
VICE-CHAIR) Tuesday, the 12th day
)
A. CHRISTOU)
MEMBER) of June, 2012

THIS MATTER having come on for public hearing and the Ontario Municipal Board (the "Board") in its decision issued on April 4, 2012 (the "Decision"), arising from a hearing of the Urban Boundary – Methodology appeals (Phase 2A hearing), having withheld its Order pending receipt of a draft Order from the parties identifying the details of the methodology from the Decision;

THE BOARD ORDERS that OPA 76 as approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is hereby modified in accordance with Attachment 1 to this Order;

THE BOARD FURTHER ORDERS that in respect of the Maxwell lands (Parcel 1FS):

1. A noise study may, at the option of Mr. Maxwell, be prepared for consideration in the context of the Phase 2B hearing;
2. The noise study shall be provided to the parties to the Phase 2B hearing on the date for the distribution of witness statements for such hearing, such date to be determined by further Order of the Board;
3. Should the Board find in the Phase 2B hearing that on account of noise impacts that the Maxwell lands are not suitable for residential development, the lands will not be considered for inclusion within the Urban Boundary through OPA 76;

4. Should the Board find in the Phase 2B hearing that the noise impacts are not such as to render the Maxwell lands unsuitable for residential development, then the Maxwell lands will be evaluated with the other candidate parcels through the application of the methodology attached as Attachment 1.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jenne Heggen". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a period at the end.

SECRETARY

ATTACHMENT "1"

Item	Section	Details of Amendment to OPA 76
6	Section 2.2.1 – Urban Area and Village Boundaries	<p>Further amend Item 6 by adding the new sub-policy at the end of Policy 4 as shown in bold text below:</p> <p>4. if the assessment indicates a need for additional urban land, the merit of designating land in different locations and amounts will be compared and evaluated in consultation with the community, landowners and other interested parties. The evaluation will assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The ability of existing or planned infrastructure to support the development of this expansion area. Infrastructure includes such matters as pipes, public utilities, roads, transit, community resources including schools and greenspace; b. The need to preserve the National Capital Greenbelt, agricultural areas, mineral resource areas, and Natural Heritage System identified in this Plan. Where an urban designation is considered for any of these areas, there must be sufficient evidence that there are no reasonable alternative locations that avoid these designations. For Agriculture Resource Areas, additional justification is required to demonstrate that there are no reasonable alternatives that make use of poorer soils in the designation; c. The need to provide new or upgrade existing roads, transit, water, stormwater and wastewater services, and public utilities municipal services and the cost of providing same; d. Any other effect the designation would have on the City's ability to achieve the policies in this Plan. e. The methodology, evaluation criteria, scoring and weighting of criteria included in Annex 15 that are to be used to determine the lands to be added.
New Item 288	Section 7	<p>Further amend OPA 76 by adding a new item that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. deletes the Preamble to the Table of Annexes in Section 7 and replaces it with the following: <p>"With the exception of Annex 1, Annex 8A to 8D, Annex 12 and Annex 15, the annexes are not part of the plan. They are provided as information to help the reader understand the policies in the plan."</p> <p>and</p> b. by adding a new Annex 15 as follows:

ATTACHMENT "1"

"ANNEX 15 - URBAN EXPANSION AREAS – METHODOLOGY FOR DETERMINING AND EVALUATING CANDIDATE AREAS"

Methodology

Identification of Candidate Areas

A number of assumptions guide the identification of candidate areas for analysis:

1. The parcels must be a logical extension of the existing urban area
2. No lands in an Agricultural Resource Area designation are considered
3. No lands in a Natural Environment Area designation are considered;
4. Mineral Aggregate Resource lands may be considered as candidate areas, where there is reasonable assurance that the resources would be depleted within the planning period.
5. May include all lands in a General Rural Area designation abutting the existing Urban Area that are not rendered unsuitable for residential purposes due to influences such as aircraft noise and proximity to solid waste disposal sites.

Definition of Gross Residential Hectares

The objective is to identify an additional 850 hectares of gross residential land. Gross residential land includes residential land, public streets and a limited range of non-residential uses typically found in a neighbourhood such as parks, schools, community centres, churches, convenience level retail and stormwater facilities. It is usually measured in dwelling units per land area.

The candidate areas are examined with respect to the presence of natural heritage features. Those lands identified as containing elements of the natural heritage system are subtracted from the gross residential land as are Hydro corridors, required setbacks from mineral resources, wetlands and other features. The remainder is the gross residential area of the candidate parcel.

Evaluation Criteria

The overall objective is to select areas that make the best use of existing available infrastructure capacity and community resources. These parcels should be developable within a reasonable period of time such as the next five to 10 years. The Official Plan is reviewed every five years and the condition of City infrastructure is monitored continuously. Lands that score lower today may very well be good candidates later.

ATTACHMENT "1"

Table 1: Potential Evaluation Scores (weighted) by category

Category	Criterion	Weighted Score	% of total	
Engineering	Water	8	9	
	Wastewater	8	9	
	Stormwater	8	9	
	Depth to Bedrock	2	2	
Total for Engineering				
		26	30%	
Transportation	Capacity	6	7	
	Accessibility	8	9	
	Distance to Rapid Transit	10	11	
Total for Transportation				
		24	27%	
Integration with Community	Distance to Mixed-use Centre (MUC) or Mainstreet	5	6	
	Ability to work in community	3	3	
	Distance to Major Recreational Facility	5	6	
	Distance to Emergency Services	5	6	
	Conflicting Land Uses	4	5	
	Connectivity	4	5	
	Local Bus Service	2	2	
	Agriculture Conflict	2	2	
	Total for Integration			
			30	34%
Land Absorption	Approximate Years Supply	8	9%	
TOTAL				
		88	100%	

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relative merits of the various candidate areas. Each candidate area was evaluated against the criteria in Table 2. All distances are measured from the centroid of the parcel to the facility or service being assessed. The possible scores are distributed as follows and then weighted.

Table 2 – Evaluation Criteria and Scores

Criteria	Description	Scores	Possible Score
----------	-------------	--------	----------------

ATTACHMENT "1"

	<p>1. Servicingability – Water</p>	<p>Scores for each site ranged from 0 to 4 based on consideration of the factors in the next column</p>	<p>0 – major upgrade / expansion of pump station and/or distribution system required to service development area;</p> <p>2 – good integration with existing network but requires moderate upgrades to existing facilities;</p> <p>4 – residual capacity available in pressure zone to service development area with no or minimal investment in existing distribution system.</p>	<p>4 weighted by 2 = 8</p>
	<p>2. Servicingability – Wastewater</p>	<p>Scores for each site ranged from 0 to 4 based on consideration of the factors in the next column</p>	<p>0 – no gravity outlet; may require new local pump station and force main due to topographic conditions; capacity upgrades required in external trunk sewers and / or pump station;</p> <p>2 – access to gravity sewers but requires moderate upgrades to existing facilities;</p> <p>4 – existing trunk sewers and / or pump stations have residual capacity to service development area with no or minimal investment.</p>	<p>4 weighted by 2 = 8</p>

ATTACHMENT "1"

		<p>3. Servicing – Stormwater</p>	<p>Scores for each site ranged from 0 to 4 based on consideration of the factors in the next column</p>	<p>0 - existing servicing constraints; flood hazard constraints; no Environmental Management / Subwatershed Plan available to guide development area;</p> <p>2 - no flood hazard constraints; Environmental Management / Subwatershed Plan available to guide development, but requires update to consider cumulative impact of additional growth area;</p> <p>4 - up-to-date Environmental Management / Subwatershed Plan available to guide development; drainage system and stormwater management systems approved and ready to accommodate future development.</p>	<p>4 weighted by 2 = 8</p>
	<p>4. Capacity - Roads</p>	<p>Examined the existing/ planned road infrastructure to determine if capacity can accommodate demand</p>	<p>See table below</p>	<p>3 weighted by 2 = 6</p>	

ATTACHMENT "1"

Level of Service (LOS)	Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C)	Point scoring based on worst of two screenlines measured
A	0 to 0.60	not scored, none in this range
B	0.61 to 0.70	not scored, none in this range
C	0.71 to 0.80	3 (weighted by 2 = 6)
D	0.81 to 0.90	1.5 (weighted by 2 = 3)
E	0.91 to 1.00	0
F	> 1.00	0

Note: The Transportation Master Plan seeks to provide a sufficient peak hour directional capacity to achieve a Level of Service "D" for screenlines outside of the City's inner core.

<p>5. Accessibility – Arterial and Collector Roads</p>	<p>Direct access to existing or planned arterial and collector roads</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 – No direct access • 1 – Direct access to one or more collector roads • 2 – Direct access to one arterial road • 3 – Direct access to 1 arterial and 1 or more collectors • 4 – Direct access to two or more arterials and any number of collectors 	<p>4 weighted by 2 = 8</p>
<p>6. Accessibility – Transit</p>	<p>Distance to existing or planned rapid transit network or to park and ride. The average is 2.9 km. The points measure up to 25% more or less and 50% more or less.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 points – more than 4.4 km • 1 points – 3.7 to 4.3 • 2 points – 3.0 to 3.6 • 3 points – 2.3 to 2.9 • 4 points – 1.5 to 2.2 • 5 points – 0 to 1.4 	<p>5 weighted by 2 = 10</p>

ATTACHMENT "1"

	<p>7. Accessibility to existing or planned retail/commercial focus</p>	<p>Distance to a Mainstreet or Mixed-Use Centre. The average is 4.8 km</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 points – more than 7.4 km • 1 points – 6.1 to 7.3 • 2 points – 4.9 to 6.0 • 3 points – 3.7 to 4.8 • 4 points – 2.5 to 3.6 • 5 points – 0 to 2.4 	5
	<p>8. Ability to work in community</p>	<p>Jobs/Housing Balance. This is cumulative, starting at the parcel nearest the urban boundary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 – <1.10 • 1 – 1.1 to 1.19 • 2 – 1.2 to 1.24 • 3 – equal to or over 1.25 	3
	<p>9. Accessibility to community facilities</p>	<p>Distance to a Major Recreational Facility. The average is 4.0 km</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 points – more than 6.1 km • 1 points – 5.1 to 6.0 • 2 points – 4.1 to 5.0 • 3 points – 3.1 to 4.0 • 4 points – 2.1 to 3.0 • 5 points – 0 to 2.0 	5
	<p>10. Availability of existing or planned emergency services</p>	<p>Distance to emergency services – fire, ambulance and police (total /3). The average is 5.0 km</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 points – more than 7.6 km • 1 points – 6.4 to 7.5 • 2 points – 5.1 to 6.3 • 3 points – 3.9 to 5.0 • 4 points – 2.6 to 3.8 • 5 points – 0 to 2.5 	5

ATTACHMENT "1"

		<p>11. Connectivity to the Community</p> <p>The ability to connect is available or can be planned</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 points – good – totally unobstructed in all directions; • 3 points – less than good – partial obstruction in one direction; • 2 points – medium – unable to connect in one direction; • 0 points – poor – obstructions in 2 or more directions. 	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>
	<p>12. Existing Bus Service</p>	<p>Local bus service exists today at the parcel</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points – all day service exists • 1 point – peak period service exists • 0 points – service does not exist 	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>
	<p>13. Potential Conflicting Land Uses</p>	<p>Agricultural Resource Area within 500 metres</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 – yes • 2 – no 	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>
	<p>14. Potential Conflicting Land Uses</p>	<p>Adjacent rural development (Country Lot or Village) or adjacent landfill constraint</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 – yes • 2 – no 	<p style="text-align: center;">2 weighted by 2 = 4</p>
	<p>15. Depth to Bedrock</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 is 0-2 metres • 1 is 2 to 5 metres • 2 is 5 or more metres 	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>

ATTACHMENT "1"

		<p>16. Land Absorption</p>	<p>Approximate years supply in 2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 – >19 (Leitrim, Riverside South) • 1 – 18 to 19 • 2 – 16 to 17 (Kanata-Stittsville) • 3 – 14 to 15 • 4 – <14 (South Nepean, Orleans) 	<p>4 weighted by 2 = 8</p>
Total					88

