

Kannakko, Kris (MNR)

From: Malloy, Erin (MNR)
Sent: September 23, 2008 9:45 AM
To: Standeven, Justin (MNR)
Subject: FW: McNab/Braeside OP - Draft Section 9 and Appendix A - MNR comments

Hi Justin,
Re. the FIPPA request... I think this is the only email/correspondence that I have about the alvar...its on the file and not really relating to the evaluation of the feature...

Erin

From: Malloy, Erin (MNR)
Sent: April 23, 2008 3:54 PM
To: 'Bruce Howarth'
Cc: Malloy, Erin (MNR)
Subject: McNab/Braeside OP - Draft Section 9 and Appendix A - MNR comments

Hello Bruce,
Below are MNR comments regarding the Draft Section 9.0 and Draft Appendix A for the McNab Braeside OP.

9.4(5) Suggested wording for second sentence

"As such, these areas contain features and values of biological, social, hydrological, and special feature significance that are considered environmentally sensitive to development."

Several local wetlands have been identified on Appendix A, are/will these be zoned EP? Consider including some text in the policy regarding treatment of development applications in or adjacent to local wetlands. Local wetlands also support a number of features and functions which can be considered and protected through development application review. MNR staff or other qualified individuals, provided they use the approved OWES methodology, can identify PSWs. The MNR can approve PSWs delineated by the Municipality.

9.4 (11)

Should have similar wording to 9.4(5) regarding EIS requirements

"Council shall require an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) regarding development adjacent to Endangered and Threatened species habitat in accordance with Section 9.6 of the Plan"

Last line should read "...lands within 50 metres of an identified *habitat* of threatened or endangered species."

Suggest including a sentence indicating that sensitive areas of concern can also be added without amendment to the plan similar to Alvar and PSWs

9.1 2nd paragraph and 9.4 (12) Suggested wording "...possess alvar soil conditions producing globally and provincially rare vegetation communities with globally and provincially rare plants."

9.4(12)

Perhaps provide some clarification regarding Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) and the connection to Alvar (as a type of SWH) because reference is made to both in the policy – could include PPS definitions or reference from Natural Heritage Reference Manual.

For Example:

Wildlife Habitat: means areas where plants, animals and other organisms live, and find adequate amounts of food, water, shelter and space needed to sustain their populations. Specific wildlife habitats of concern may include areas where species concentrate at a vulnerable point in their annual or life cycle; and areas which are important to migratory or non-migratory species. *PPS 2005*

Significant: means d)...ecologically important in terms of features, functions, representation or amount, and contributing to the quality and diversity of an identifiable geographic area or natural heritage system. *PPS 2005*

Negative Impacts: means c) in regard to other natural heritage features and areas, degradation that threatens the health and integrity of the natural features or ecological functions for which an area is identified due to single, multiple or successive development or site alteration activities. *PPS 2005*

To ensure a comprehensive approach to identifying and evaluating significant wildlife habitat, wildlife habitat has been divided into four broad categories:

- Seasonal concentration areas
- Rare vegetation communities or specialized habitats for wildlife
- Habitats of species of conservation concern, excluding the habitats of endangered and threatened species
- Animal movement corridors

Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide, pg 8

The MNR has identified and provided SWH values for the purpose of this plan, including deer wintering areas, waterfowl staging areas and provincially or globally significant areas, however many were not identified on Appendix A. At minimum, policy text should define SWH and speak to values in McNab/Braeside. There are components of sensitive areas of concern that are SWH, the alvar is SWH and many areas of SWH have been identified. Development applications could be considered on a case by case basis and further information (eg.scoped EIS) required for certain properties.

9.4(12)(b) Suggested wording - "Development *and site alteration* shall not be permitted...."

Also, there is no mention of adjacent land. The Province recommends an adjacent land width of 50 metres as a guideline. (NHRM 1999, pg.30)

Regarding the last sentence in 9.4(12)(b) "...consent for residential purposes, nor the residential development of existing lots of record."

Regarding our phone call earlier, I had some questions about point (b), thanks for the information/clarification here Bruce, from what I understand - The effective application of this point and the definitions of residential purposes/residential development is dependent on the area designated as "Potential Alvar Habitat" to be zoned Rural, any development proposal for more than a single detached dwelling (permitted residential on Rural zoning) will require further application (eg.ZBA) and could trigger the OP – and ensure that an EIS is required. Please correct if I misunderstood, thanks again Bruce!

9.4(12)(c) Use similar wording as for 9.4(5) and 9.4(11)

"...Council shall require an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) regarding development in areas identified to have potential alvar habitat, in accordance with Section 9.6 of this Plan."

9.4(12)(d) Bruce, I believe you were going to look into the process of additions to the Appendix without an amendment....

9.6 Environmental Impact Studies

This section should include some text regarding the need to pre-consult with the MNR regarding EIS's that pertain to PSW's, ANSI's and habitat of END and THR species. If requested, the MNR will assist in developing TOR for these EIS's to ensure they are satisfactory.

We recommend use of the term Environmental Impact Study (EIS) consistently throughout Section 9, rather than interchangeably with 'biological overview' or 'environmental survey', to ensure application of section 9.6 and avoid confusion regarding what is required.

Appendix A

- Our maps indicate that the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority jurisdiction does not enter into McNab township. Could you please verify this?

Section 1.9(5) (Scope and Structure) indicates that Appendices do not form part of the Official Plan document, nor do they receive formal approval of the County of Renfrew – as I understand from our phone call today, because Section 9.5 states that "It shall be the policy of Council to utilize Appendix A...as a guide in reviewing development proposals..." and this Policy is part of the Plan, section 1.9(5) does not limit the effectiveness or use

of Appendix A. Perhaps this could be clarified in Section 1.9(5).

Thanks Bruce. Please call with any questions!

Erin Malloy
District Planner
Pembroke District MNR
613-732-5522