



# **Natural Heritage Planning Policy In Ontario**

## **A Review of County and Regional Official Plans**

*Report 1 of 3 of the Simcoe County Planning Project*

Prepared for WWF-Canada by: The Community Development Group Ltd.  
August 1999

*A WWF-Canada initiative, in partnership with:*

***Ontario Professional Planners Institute***  
***Ontario Ministry of the Environment***  
***Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources***  
***Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing***

## Acknowledgements

This document was prepared by The Community Development Group under the direction of the Best Policies Working Group, which brought together representatives from a wide range of stakeholder groups:

Kathy Cooper  
Theresa McClenaghan

Canadian Environmental Law Association

Andrea Ferguson-Jones

Conservation Ontario

Linda Pim  
John Riley

Federation of Ontario Naturalists

Tina Schankula

Ontario Federation of Agriculture

Maria Alles-DeVos

Ontario Ministry of the Environment

Usman Ahmed  
Ted Foster

Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and  
Housing

Fred Johnson  
Peter White

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

Don Campbell

Ontario Professional Planners Institute

Bruce Engell  
Jeff Kratky

Urban Development Institute

Kevin Kavanagh  
Tony Iacobelli

World Wildlife Fund Canada

The Community Development Group greatly appreciates the contributions of these individuals and the organizations they represent. Without their ongoing support and expertise, this document would not have come about. The ideas, approaches and information contained in this document, however, do not bind or limit the ability of these individuals or organizations to express opinions or adopt positions that differ from those found in this document.

The special contribution of the Province of Ontario must be acknowledged. The Province provided funding and staff support toward the preparation of this document. The ideas, approaches and information contained in this document, however, should not be

interpreted as policy, nor should it be implied that the Province formally endorses this document in whole or in part.

Finally, we would like to thank all those from the planning and environmental communities who gave of their time to review and comment on early drafts of this document. Their input was instrumental in the development of a user friendly report.

# NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICY IN ONTARIO

## A REVIEW OF COUNTY AND REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLANS

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Progressive Policies Approach	1
1.2	Policy Classification	1
1.3	Report Structure	2
<b>2.</b>	<b>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT POLICY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>OFFICIAL PLANS AND PROGRESSIVE POLICIES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Official Plan Structure	4
3.2	Policy Analysis	4
3.3	Pressures	4
<b>4.</b>	<b>NATURAL HERITAGE POLICY STRUCTURE .....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	Policy Classification Criteria	6
4.1.1	Basic Policies	6
4.1.2	Enhanced Policies	6
4.1.3	Pathfinder Policies	6
4.2	Methodology	7
<b>5.</b>	<b>PROGRESSIVE PLANNING POLICIES .....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1	Natural Heritage Features	14
5.2	Impacts of Development	23
5.3	Land Stewardship	28
5.4	Monitoring and Evaluation	30
<b>APPENDIX A .....</b>	<b>NATURAL HERITAGE POLICY OF THE PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>APPENDIX B .....</b>	<b>STATUS OF COUNTY AND REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLANS</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>APPENDIX C .....</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF POLICY CATEGORIES</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>APPENDIX D .....</b>	<b>NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICY TYPES IN COUNTY AND REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLANS</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDIX E .....</b>	<b>PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS AND REPRESENTATIVES</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>APPENDIX F .....</b>	<b>ENDNOTES</b>	<b>47</b>

**List of Tables:**

TABLE 1 ..... 8  
TEMPORAL RELATIONSHIP OF NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICIES TO THE  
PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

TABLE 2 ..... 9  
COUNTY AND REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLANS THAT HAVE REGARD FOR NATURAL HERITAGE  
POLICY AS SET FORTH IN THE PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

TABLE 3 ..... 10  
NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICIES IN COUNTY AND REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLANS

TABLE 4 ..... 13  
INDEX TO POLICY EXAMPLES SHOWCASED IN SECTION 5, *PROGRESSIVE PLANNING POLICIES*



## 1. INTRODUCTION

This review of natural heritage policy is one part of a larger project to explore and encourage community-based approaches to protecting and enhancing the natural environment. The project has brought World Wildlife Fund Canada, the County of Simcoe and the Province of Ontario together as partners.

The purpose of this “Progressive Planning Policies” component is to examine the range of policies for natural heritage protection in Ontario as presented in county and regional official plans. There are two principal objectives for this component: 1) to disseminate progressive policies for natural heritage protection within the planning, environmental and development communities; and, 2) to support the continuous improvement of natural heritage policy practices.

To undertake the above tasks, a group of provincial stakeholders was assembled under the auspices of the Ontario Professional Planners Institute (see Appendix E). The Best Policies Working Group (as they came to be known) addressed questions of “best policies” as related to natural heritage protection. As well, group members engaged in a number of facilitated discussions to establish certain parameters or ground rules for the process.

The Community Development Group Ltd. was charged with collecting, organizing and analyzing the raw data. The research team put together a set of natural heritage policies and then presented the package to the Best Policies Working Group for discussion and refinement.

### 1.1 Progressive Policies Approach

One of the principal objectives for this project, as indicated above, is the dissemination of innovative policies for natural heritage protection within the planning, environmental and development communities. A policy review or survey is an effective tool for communicating ideas and information. What is more, this approach is well suited to the current public land use policy environment in Ontario.

Policy is evolving constantly in response to changes in both substantive knowledge and public values. Official plans mirror this evolutionary process. The survey approach used in this report presents examples of policy innovation without indicating specific value judgments.

Making available information on current policy initiatives will promote the discussion, development and implementation of natural heritage policy in municipalities across the province. Specifically, innovation in natural heritage policy development will provide an invaluable resource for planners, scientists, environmental groups and the interested public as they work to protect natural spaces within their communities.

### 1.2 Policy Classification

For the purposes of this report, policies have been considered through a focused

discussion of the structure of natural heritage policies in Ontario. The basis of the analysis is a three-part policy classification. These three categories are as follows:

- *Basic policies*
- *Enhanced policies*
- *Pathfinder policies*

The categories listed above provide the foundation for this discussion of policy type and distribution and will be discussed in greater detail. The presentation of planning policies to follow flows from this policy classification.

### 1.3 Report Structure

The report has two major components. The first is explanatory in nature and provides a general overview of natural heritage policy as presented in the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and upper tier official plans. The policy classification and evaluation noted above follow from this policy discussion.

The second part of the report is a showcase for individual natural heritage policies as taken from county and regional official plans. Policy examples are grouped into four broad policy areas – Natural Heritage Features, Impacts of Development, Land Stewardship, and Monitoring and Evaluation. Within each policy area, policies are classified as *Basic*, *Enhanced* or *Pathfinder*.

In addition to these major components, the report contains a number of appendices that both improve the utility of the document and suggest options for further study. The appendices allow the reader to find out more information on individual policies and/or policy types. Complete reference information is provided for each policy showcased in the report to facilitate direct contact with the source municipality. As well, the appendices can be used to link municipalities to as many as 82 different policy types.

## 2. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT POLICY

Policies that address natural heritage protection and enhancement provide the focus for this report. Unfortunately, the language of environmental policy seldom allows for the division of policies into distinct categories. Policy makers rely on a variety of terms when dealing with this policy area and definitions are generally not consistent from plan to plan.

The terms *natural environment* and *natural heritage* will be used throughout this document. For the purposes of this report, the term *natural environment* will be used in reference to all of the features and functions of the environment as related to land, water, soil, air and natural hazards. The words *natural heritage* will be used to denote a subset of the natural environment. Policy 2.3 of the PPS considers the following features and areas to be part of Ontario's natural heritage:

- wetlands;
- habitats of endangered and threatened species;
- fish habitat;
- woodlands;
- valleylands;
- wildlife habitat; and,
- areas of natural and scientific interest

The natural heritage policies showcased in this review attempt to capture the rich diversity of environmental policies from across the province while maintaining a focus on the natural heritage features listed above. For example, policies that target the protection and enhancement of fish habitat may also address broader environmental issues such as water quality and quantity.

### 3. OFFICIAL PLANS AND PROGRESSIVE POLICIES

There are several issues related to official plans that need to be considered when extracting progressive policies for the protection and enhancement of natural heritage. They are as follows:

- nature of official plans in Ontario
- structure of the individual official plan;
- reference to provincial policy;
- policy effectiveness; and
- pressures.

Planning authorities in Ontario have wide latitude with respect to official plan content and approach.<sup>1</sup> Direction is provided at the provincial level through a set of policy statements that municipalities “shall have regard to” when developing and implementing planning policy. This provision has been interpreted as “regard to” provincial policy within the context of the local situation. Lower tier municipalities, in turn, are required to show regard for policy decisions taken at the county or regional level.

The hierarchy of policy conformity from upper to lower tier plans supports a focus on policy developed at the level of the upper tier municipality. For this reason, the policy examples presented in this report reflect policy innovation in county and regional official plan documents. Regrettably, the work of planning authorities and other decision-makers in local municipalities and separated cities falls beyond the limits of this review.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning authorities in all Canadian provinces have great flexibility with respect to policy content and structure. The exception to this statement is the Province of Quebec, which has adopted a centrally directed approach.

<sup>2</sup> Policy innovation is by no means confined to upper tier municipalities. To use a recent example, in June of 1999 the Ontario Municipal Board issued a decision in support of the environmental policies adopted by the City of London (OMB File Number: 0960206). The City of London Official Plan will now provide for ongoing and mandatory monitoring of water quality and quantity, air quality and preservation of agricultural lands.

### 3.1 Official Plan Structure

The complexity of official plans frustrates any attempt at direct comparison. Policies are best compared at the level of the individual policy. In the area of natural heritage policy, such a comparison might involve policies targeting the protection of wetlands, for example.

The report takes this “policy by policy” approach to policy assessment. The reader is provided with examples of progressive policies in a number of specific policy areas. Such an approach represents an objective method of evaluating policy development at the “meta-level”.

The Planning Act requires planning authorities to “have regard to” provincial interests, including those set forth in the Provincial Policy Statement. The PPS addresses multiple policy frameworks including community development, housing, infrastructure, agricultural lands, mineral resources, water quality and quantity, public health and safety, cultural heritage and, of course, natural heritage. When preparing an official plan, municipalities are required to strike a balance among these policy areas. Inevitably, compromises must be made and some policies may lose ground to others in specific policy areas.

An evaluation should always be undertaken with an eye for how an individual plan balances the various policy objectives put forth by the province, the municipality, local interest groups and local communities. Once this policy balance has been struck, it then becomes appropriate to assess the effectiveness and longevity of the plan.

### 3.2 Policy Analysis

Evaluating policy performance over the long-term is perhaps the greatest challenge of policy analysis. There are several tests of policy strength or value. One indicator of policy effectiveness is the language of the policy. Is the policy well crafted to meet its objectives? Is the policy internally consistent, such that no one part of the policy conflicts with any other? The answers to these questions can be found within the policies. This report will rely primarily on this first test for the reasons outlined below.

Assessing the long-term effectiveness of a policy is much more complicated. Over time, policy evolves in response to changing values and new information. The natural heritage policies contained in the most recent official plans reflect both a new provincial approach to policy development and implementation, and a new understanding of how natural systems operate. Natural heritage is an area of policy that has undergone significant changes over the past few years and there is very little information upon which to base a long-term evaluation, to date.

### 3.3 Pressures

When people talk of pressures, it is the pressures surrounding urban development that commonly spring to mind. While the pressures associated with urban growth are

certainly central to any discussion of natural heritage protection and enhancement, there are other factors that need to be considered.

*Natural Heritage* is perhaps the most fragile of the policy areas dealt with in official plans. In addition to urban development pressures, natural heritage areas are vulnerable to natural resource development and active and passive recreation. The following four distinct “pressure types” are recognized as having a significant impact on natural heritage features and functions in the Province of Ontario:

1. Urbanization and urban growth;
2. Recreational development;
3. Natural resource development (forestry, agriculture, mineral resource extraction and water-taking); and,
4. Scattered development.

While certain pressures are more commonly associated with specific areas – urban development in the GTA or agriculture in Southwestern Ontario, for example – the pressures described above are not limited geographically. As well, a single area may experience multiple pressures simultaneously.

The official plan review, in combination with this sampling of innovative policies, reveals an interesting - and rather unexpected relationship - between pressures on natural heritage and the development of natural heritage policy. With few exceptions, the most progressive natural heritage policy originates in those areas facing intense pressures. The important point to keep in mind, however, is that no area in the province is immune to pressures – from one source or another – on their natural heritage systems.

As stated previously, official plans play a critical role with respect to natural heritage protection and enhancement. Given the variable nature of these documents, a “constant” is required when assessing individual planning policies. The Provincial Policy Statement provides a point of reference, as all official plans are required to have regard to provincial policy through the development and approvals processes.

The PPS is a starting point. The classification of natural heritage policies to follow begins in this minimum policy set and then points the way forward through a consideration of progressive planning policies from across the province.

#### 4. NATURAL HERITAGE POLICY STRUCTURE

The structure of natural heritage policy in Ontario is central to the policy classification presented in this report. The purpose of this section is to develop the approach to policy classification used in the showcase of natural heritage policies to follow.

The Provincial Policy Statement addresses three major policy areas. Natural heritage

policies form a subset of the larger ‘Resources’ policy area. Within the Natural Heritage policy set, there are four distinct “sub-policies” (see Appendix A). Policy 2.3.1 extends a level of protection from incompatible development to natural heritage features and areas. Development and site alteration are not permitted in “provincially significant wetlands south and east of the Canadian Shield” and “significant portions of the habitat of endangered and threatened species”. These activities may be permitted in all remaining natural heritage areas, provided that there will be “no negative impacts on the natural features or ecological functions for which the area is identified”.

Policy 2.3.2 limits development and site alteration on lands adjacent to designated natural heritage areas. Development and site alteration is permitted on these lands, subject to the previously noted “no negative impacts” provision. The third “sub-policy” in the set provides for the maintenance of natural diversity and natural connections. And finally, Policy 2.3.4 exempts existing agricultural uses from the three policies outlined above.

#### 4.1 Policy Classification Criteria

Natural heritage policy, as set forth in the PPS, allows for varying degrees of protection at the municipal level. This progressive approach to natural heritage protection inspired the three policy categories used in the report. Again, the categories are as follows:

1. *Basic policies*
2. *Enhanced policies*
3. *Pathfinder policies*

##### 4.1.1 Basic Policies

*Basic* policies are those policies that meet the minimum requirements set forth in the Provincial Policy Statement. Natural heritage policies of this type prohibit the development and site alteration in significant wetlands south and east of the Canadian Shield and in portions of the habitat of endangered and threatened species. These policies also provide some protection to other provincially significant natural features, specifically ANSIs and fish habitat, through the application of the “no negative impacts” provision.

##### 4.1.2 Enhanced Policies

Clearly, the PPS supports much stronger measures for natural heritage protection than those captured in this first category. The PPS, as noted earlier, details other areas of significance for natural heritage protection and enhancement. *Enhanced* policies address the full range of natural heritage features and areas as defined by the PPS and the natural connections between them. A level of protection may also be afforded to natural heritage areas of local or regional value where the Province and/or municipality have determined significance. Finally, policies in this category provide for stronger controls on development and site alteration within natural heritage areas.

##### 4.1.3 Pathfinder Policies

Municipal planning authorities are free to develop and implement policies that exceed the minimum standards set forth in the PPS as both the level of protection afforded to natural

heritage areas and the scope of enhancement efforts are decided at the local level. Several municipalities have adopted policy frameworks that go “above and beyond” the requirements of the PPS. The *Pathfinder* category is reserved for those policies that showcase innovative approaches to natural heritage protection and enhancement.

*Pathfinder* policies address the full range of provincially determined natural heritage areas and features and the natural connections between them. Areas of local significance are also protected and incorporated into the county or regional natural heritage system. Rigorous environmental impact assessment criteria or simple “no development” provisions safeguard natural heritage areas from incompatible development. The development process may even become a tool for natural heritage preservation and enhancement. Finally, *Pathfinder* policies provide for self-monitoring and self-evaluation by establishing quantifiable natural heritage goals or targets.

#### 4.2 Methodology

To set the stage for the showcasing of individual policies, the research team undertook a general overview of county and regional official plans. A key consideration, for the purposes of this process, is the vintage of natural heritage planning policies. Table 1 indicates the temporal relationship of natural heritage policies to the PPS.

Fourteen of the 31 upper tier municipalities surveyed have adopted official plans that post-date the PPS and are therefore required to have regard to provincial policy. Eleven municipalities have plans that pre-date the PPS. Many of these municipalities are in the process of updating their official plans. And finally, six of the municipalities surveyed have no official plan to date.

Three additional tables provide comparative information on natural heritage policies and official plans. Table 2 considers official plan compliance with PPS policy directives. From the table, it is clear that most official plans meet the minimum standards for natural heritage protection established by the PPS. The third table relates the occurrence of specific policy types. Some 82 different natural heritage policy criteria were unearthed from the official plans under review (see Appendix C and Appendix D). For comparative purposes, the number has been reduced to the 22 categories displayed in Table 3.

The fourth table is intended as a guide to the natural heritage policies showcased in the final section of the report. *Basic*, *Enhanced* and *Pathfinder* policies are arranged by policy area and linked to their municipality of origin.

TABLE 1: TEMPORAL RELATIONSHIP OF NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICIES TO THE PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

	<i>PRE-DATE PPS</i>	<i>POST-DATE PPS</i>	<i>NO OP</i>
BRUCE		×	
CHATHAM-KENT			×
DUFFERIN			×
ESSEX			×
GREY		×	
HASTINGS	×		
HURON		×	
LAMBTON		×	
MIDDLESEX		×	
OXFORD		×	
PERTH		×	
PETERBOROUGH	×		
PRESSCOTT AND RUSSELL			×
PRINCE EDWARD		×	
RENFREW			×
SIMCOE		×	
STORMONT, DUNDAS AND GLENGARRY			×
VICTORIA	×		
WELLINGTON		×	
DURHAM	×		
HALTON	×		
HALDIMAND-NORFOLK	×		
HAMILTON-WENTWORTH		×	
MUSKOKA	×		
NIAGARA	×		
OTTAWA-CARLETON		×	
PEEL		×	
SUDBURY	×		
TORONTO <sup>3</sup>	×		
WATERLOO		×	
YORK	×		

<sup>3</sup> The natural heritage planning policies for the former Metropolitan Toronto were reviewed for this report. An official plan document for the new City of Toronto is expected in the spring of 2000.

TABLE 2: COUNTY AND REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLANS THAT HAVE REGARD TO NATURAL HERITAGE POLICY AS SET FORTH IN THE PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

	<i>PROVINCIAL POLICIES</i>					
	2.3.1(a)	2.3.1(b)	2.3.2	2.3.3	2.3.4	2.4.1
BRUCE	×	×	×	×	×	×
GREY	×	×	×	×	×	×
HASTINGS <sup>4</sup>					×	
HURON	×	×	×	×	×	×
LAMBTON	×	×	×	×	×	×
MIDDLESEX	×	×	×	×	×	×
OXFORD	×	×	×	×	×	×
PERTH	×	×	×	×	×	×
PETERBOUROUGH <sup>5</sup>	?	×	?	×	×	×
PRINCE EDWARD <sup>6</sup>		×	?	×	×	×
SIMCOE	×	×	×	×	×	×
VICTORIA <sup>7</sup>		×	?	×	×	×
WELLINGTON	×	×	×	×	×	×
DURHAM	×	×	×	×	×	×
HALDIMAND-NORFOLK	×	×	×	×	×	×
HALTON	×	×	×	×	×	×
HAMILTON-WENTWORTH	×	×	×	×	×	×
MUSKOKA <sup>8</sup>		×	?			×
NIAGARA <sup>9</sup>		×	?	×	×	×
OTTAWA-CARLETON	×	×	×	×	×	×
PEEL	×	×	×	×	×	×
SUDBURY <sup>10</sup>						×
TORONTO <sup>11</sup>		×	?	×	×	×
WATERLOO	×	×	×	×	×	×
YORK	×	×	×	×	×	×

? Consistency with the natural heritage policies set forth in the PPS is uncertain due the age, format and/or language of the policy sets (see Appendix F).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The Official Plan for the County of Hastings came into effect in March 1976. Owing to the age of the document, the policies for the protection of the natural environment contained in this Plan do not have regard to the natural heritage policies set forth in the PPS.

<sup>5</sup> Peterborough does provide a level of protection for the habitat of rare and endangered species within the ANSI designation.

<sup>6</sup> The County of Prince Edward has no specific policies relating to significant portions of the habitat of endangered and threatened species.

<sup>7</sup> The County of Victoria has no specific policies relating to significant wetlands.

<sup>8</sup> The District of Muskoka has no specific policies relating to significant portions of the habitat of endangered and threatened species. The District does provide some protection to wetland areas, but no distinction is made between provincially significant wetlands and those of local significance.

<sup>9</sup> The Regional Municipality of Niagara has no specific policies relating to the protection of significant wetlands and significant portions of the habitat of endangered and threatened species. Wetlands are protected in Escarpment Natural Areas in keeping with the policies of the Niagara Escarpment Plan.

<sup>10</sup> The Official Plan for the Region of Sudbury came into effect in March 1978. Policies within the Environmental Quality designation were last updated in 1993. Owing to the age of the document, the policies for the protection of the natural environment contained in this Plan do not have regard to the natural heritage policies set forth in the PPS.

<sup>11</sup> Toronto has no specific policies relating to significant portions of the habitat of endangered and threatened species.

TABLE 3: NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICIES IN COUNTY AND REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLANS<sup>12</sup>

	WETLANDS	ENDANGERED THREATENED SPECIES	FISH HABITAT	WOODLANDS	VALLEY LANDS	WILDLIFE HABITAT	ANST <sup>s</sup>	NATURAL WATERCOURSES	SHORELINES	LANDFORMS
BRUCE	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
GREY	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
HASTINGS										
HURON	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
LAMBTON	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
MIDDLESEX	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
OXFORD	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
PERTH	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
PETERBOROUGH	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
PRINCE EDWARD	x		x	x		x	x		x	x
SIMCOE	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
VICTORIA		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
WELLINGTON	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
DURHAM	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
HALDIMAND-NORFOLK	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
HALTON	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
HAMILTON-WENTWORTH	x	? <sup>13</sup>	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
MUSKOKA	x		x	x		x		x	x	x
NIAGARA	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
OTTAWA-CARLETON	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
PEEL	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
SUDBURY	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x
TORONTO	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
WATERLOO	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
YORK	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

<sup>12</sup> The twenty-two headings for Table 3 have been selected from a collection of 82 policy types. Please see Appendix C for a complete listing of the policy types used in the initial analysis.

<sup>13</sup> The diamond indicates a measure of uncertainty resulting from the format of the policy set. The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth has no specific policy relating to significant portions of the habitat of endangered or threatened species. The Region, however, does provide for the protection of *rare* species.

TABLE 3: NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICIES IN COUNTY AND REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLANS

	SOILS	NATURAL CONNECTIONS	HYDROLOGICAL IMPORTANCE	WATER CONSERVATION	WATERSHED PLANNING	AIR QUALITY	ENVIRON' L IMPACTS	LAND STEWARDSHIP	PLANNING & DESIGN MECH.	MONITORING & EVAL UATION	COMMUNITY EDUCATION	NET ENVIRON' L GAIN
BRUCE	X	? <sup>14</sup>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
GREY		X	X				X					
HASTINGS							X					
HURON		X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	
LAMBTON	X	X	X				X	X	X		X	
MIDDLESEX		X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	
OXFORD	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
PERTH		X	X				X					
PETERBOROUGH		X	X		X		X		X			X
PRINCE EDWARD	X		X		X		X	X	X			
SIMCOE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
VICTORIA							X					
WELLINGTON		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
DURHAM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	?	
HALDIMAND-NORFOLK		X			X	X	X	X				X
HALTON		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
HAMILTON-WENTWORTH MUSKOKA		X	X			X	X	X	X	X		
NIAGARA	X	X	X			X	X	X		X		
OTTAWA-CARLETON	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
PEEL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SUDBURY	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X	
TORONTO	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
WATERLOO	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
YORK	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		

<sup>14</sup> The County of Bruce has no specific policies relating to natural connections, linkages or corridors. The County, however, does provide for the maintenance and protection of natural systems.

The tremendous variety within the natural heritage policy area reflects the flexibility afforded to municipal planning authorities. For consideration of progressive policies under the categories of *Basic*, *Enhanced* and *Pathfinder*, the 22 policy distinctions presented in Table 3 were regrouped again into the following four headings:

1. *Natural Heritage Features*;
2. *Impacts of Development*;
3. *Land Stewardship*; and,
4. *Monitoring and Evaluation*.

The first policy grouping - *Natural Heritage Features* – is the largest of the four and includes examples of *Basic*, *Enhanced* and *Pathfinder* policies. The other three categories are themselves more advanced policy formulations and as such, contain only *Enhanced* and *Pathfinder* policy examples.

Samplings from all three of the policy categories have been included so as to assist the greatest number of upper tier municipalities with the process of official plan preparation or review. Some municipalities are in the earliest stages of the official plan process and may only possess the means or the will to adopt and implement basic policies. Others may opt for incremental improvements, in which case a wide selection of *Enhanced* policies may be most useful. Finally, certain municipalities may be searching for new and creative answers to specific questions related to natural heritage protection and enhancement. In these cases, the *Pathfinder* policy examples may be of particular interest.

It is hoped that this report will contribute to the ongoing improvement or evolution of natural heritage policy. The innovative policies showcased in the report are presented as a “tool kit” to help municipalities in the preparation of an official plan or with the revision process. This approach allows for individualized responses to local situations by giving planning authorities a range of innovative policy practices from which to “pick and choose”.

## 5. PROGRESSIVE PLANNING POLICIES

The purpose of this section of the report is to showcase natural heritage policies from across the province as presented in county and regional official plans. The policy examples are arranged first by policy area and then along a policy continuum from basic through pathfinder. Again, the four policy areas are as follows:

1. *Natural Heritage Features*;
2. *Impacts of Development*;
3. *Land Stewardship*; and,
4. *Monitoring and Evaluation*.

The policy examples presented in this report are taken “as is” from county and regional

official plans. Both the municipality of origin and the effective date of the plan are included in the body of the report. Additional reference information is provided in an appendix to the report to allow interested individuals or groups to contact the initiating planning department directly for more information (see Appendix F).

Appendices A through D provide the reader with information at a glance, as well as several options for further study. Using the appendices, the reader can connect the four general policy areas used in Section 5 with the 82 natural heritage policy types extracted from county and regional official plans in the initial analysis. Or, the reader can determine which municipal plans touch upon specific policy issues.

TABLE 4: INDEX TO POLICY EXAMPLES SHOWCASED IN SECTION 5, *PROGRESSIVE PLANNING POLICIES*

	<i>NATURAL HERITAGE FEATURES</i>	<i>IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT</i>	<i>LAND STEWARDSHIP</i>	<i>MONITORING AND EVALUATION</i>
BRUCE		E		
GREY	B			
HURON	P			
LAMBTON	E,P	P		
OXFORD	E,P	P	P	
PERTH	B			
PETERBOROUGH		E		
HALTON				P
HALDIMAND-NORFOLK	E			
HAMILTON-WENTWORTH	P	P		
MUSKOKA				P
OTTAWA-CARLETON	E	E,P	E,P	P
PEEL			E	E
TORONTO				P
WATERLOO	P	P	P	
YORK	E			

B *Basic Policies*  
 E *Enhanced Policies*  
 P *Pathfinder Policies*

It should be noted that a number of sweeping changes have taken place at both the provincial and the municipal level since the effective date of some official plans. Policies may make reference to the participation of various provincial ministries in the assessment of environmental impacts. These ministries may no longer provide this service.

In June 1999, the Ministry of Natural Resources released a Natural Heritage Reference Manual for Policy 2.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement. The Manual may be used as a companion document to the policies showcased in this report.

The remainder of this section showcases progressive planning policies as taken from county and regional official plans.

## 5.1 NATURAL HERITAGE FEATURES

The policy practices included in this group have in common a focus on the protection and enhancement of significant natural heritage features. Planning authorities have developed a variety of policy initiatives and approaches toward the protection of natural heritage features and areas. While the collection of policy examples to follow is by no means comprehensive, the policies selected do capture the range of structures and strategies, as presented in county and regional official plans.

### BASIC

*Basic policies meet the minimum requirements set forth in the Provincial Policy Statement. Development and site alteration is not permitted in provincially significant wetlands south and east of the Canadian Shield and in significant portions of the habitat of endangered and threatened species.*

#### WETLANDS

“No development or site alteration is permitted within the Wetlands designation, except where such activity is associated with forestry and uses connected with the conservation of water, soil, wildlife and other natural resources but not including buildings and will not negatively impact on the integrity of the wetland.

Development and site alteration may occur within the adjacent lands of the Wetlands designation provided an Environmental Impact Study is prepared indicating how negative impacts on the natural features or ecological functions of the wetland are mitigated such that no negative impacts will occur to the natural features or ecological functions of the wetland.

#### ENDANGERED SPECIES

No development or site alteration shall be permitted within areas of significant threatened and endangered species. Development and site alteration may be permitted in the adjacent lands, provided an acceptable Environmental Impact Study is completed...”(*County of Grey, 1998*).<sup>2</sup>

?

#### WETLANDS

“Specific policies for the provincially significant wetland areas and their adjacent lands are as follows:

- Development and site alteration shall not be permitted within the wetland area;

- Development and site alteration may be permitted within the 120-meter adjacent land area provided that such development will not result in negative impacts on the natural features or ecological functions of the wetland. An environmental impact study or other appropriate study shall be required in order to assess the impact of the development and site alteration;
- Notwithstanding the policy ...above, agricultural activities including plowing, seeding, harvesting, grazing, animal husbandry, and new and existing buildings associated with farming activities are permitted on adjacent lands without the need for an environmental impact study or other appropriate study; and
- Local municipal Zoning By-laws shall zone wetland areas so as to preclude development and site alteration.

WILDLIFE  
HABITAT

...The “Natural Resources/Environment” designation recognizes and acknowledges that there are a number of significant habitats for threatened or endangered species in the County ...It is not the intent of this Official Plan to specifically designate these sites, but rather to provide a commitment to work with the Ministry of Natural Resources and the local municipalities in the County to prepare an acceptable implementation framework and administrative procedure for the protection of the habitats of these species. The implementation framework and administrative procedure should establish a suitable review mechanism whereby development proposals in the vicinity of the sites can be assessed with respect to their impact on the site and species and address any necessary mitigation measures.

- Development and site alteration shall not be permitted within the habitat area;
- Development and site alteration may be permitted on adjacent lands provided that such development will not negatively affect natural features or the ecological functions of the habitat area. In order to allow for the assessment of impacts, the adjacent land area should be 50 meters in width and if the development may impact the ecological function of the habitat area, an impact assessment may be required. An environmental impact study or other appropriate study shall be required in order to assess the impact of the development and site alteration;
- Notwithstanding the policy ...above, agricultural activities including plowing, seeding, harvesting, grazing, animal husbandry, and new and existing buildings associated with farming activities are permitted on adjacent lands without the need for an environmental impact study or other appropriate study”(*County of Perth, 1998*).<sup>3</sup>

ENHANCED

*Enhanced policies address the full range of natural heritage features as set forth in the Provincial Policy Statement and the natural connections between them. Effective controls on development and site alteration within natural heritage areas are in place.*

NATURAL  
HERITAGE  
SYSTEMS

“The Natural Heritage System is the combination of significant natural areas, their functions, and the corridors that connect them. The system ...includes:

Group A features:

- Provincially significant wetlands
- Significant portions of the habitat of threatened and endangered species

Group B features:

- Lands adjacent to Group A features
- Primary corridors, including anchors

- Fish habitat
- Significant woodlands
- Significant valley lands
- Significant wildlife habitat
- Significant Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI's)
- Locally significant wetlands
- Other significant natural areas

Group C features:

- Linkage areas
- Secondary corridors

These are not mutually exclusive features or functions. In many cases these features overlap in a given geographical location and individual sites usually have values associated with more than one type of feature.

...Both the Province and the County have an interest in conserving and protecting these components of the natural heritage system. Some components are a greater constraint than others when considering new land use planning applications. These constraints are:

- for Group A features, no development is permitted;
- for Group B features, development may be permitted if it can be demonstrated that no negative impacts on the features or their functions will result;
- for Group C features, local official plans will address controls on development.

The Natural Heritage Corridors are divided into primary corridors or areas that generally possess features of a County interest and secondary corridors which generally possess features of a more localized interest. These corridors interconnect with large, wooded natural areas or “anchors”. Where the connection between these features requires rehabilitation, “linkages” are proposed”(County of Lambton, 1998).<sup>4</sup>

?

“Area municipalities shall adopt policy in their area municipal plans which protect provincially significant wetlands and sets out appropriate land use and development policy. Area municipalities shall protect provincially significant wetlands through zoning or other means such as conservation authority regulations.

WETLANDS

Development shall not be permitted within provincially significant wetlands.

The Long Point sand spit, which is part of the Long Point Biosphere Reserve ...shall be protected as wilderness. No development will be permitted on the Long Point sand spit.

Permitted uses within provincially significant wetlands include hunting, trapping, fishing, compatible recreational activities, and educational activities. Facilities such as boardwalks, duck blinds and fish huts may be appropriate in a provincially significant wetland. Consultation with the Ministry of Natural Resources is required in order to ensure no negative impact on the wetland will occur.

...On lands adjacent to a provincially significant wetland area, development will be prohibited unless it can be demonstrated through an environmental impact study provided by the proponent,

prepared in accordance with Provincial guidelines, and approved by the area municipality, that it does not result in any of the following:

- loss of wetland functions;
- subsequent demand for future development which will adversely affect existing wetland functions;
- conflict with existing site-specific wetland management practices; and loss of contiguous wetland area”(*Region of Haldimand-Norfolk, 1997*).<sup>5</sup>

?

WILDLIFE  
HABITAT

“Where the Ministry of Natural Resources has identified lands as providing significant habitat for threatened or endangered species, no development or site alteration shall be permitted within such areas. Development may only be permitted on land contiguous to such areas where and Environmental Impact Study ...demonstrates that the proposal will not negatively affect the natural features or the ecological function of the habitat area.

Notwithstanding the above, severance proposals for the purpose of creating new farm parcels ...may be permitted provided that the zoning by-law or other development controls prohibit the establishment of buildings or structures within the habitat area or on that portion of the contiguous lands where such development could affect significant features or functions.

Where the Province has identified lands providing significant wildlife habitat on the basis of:

- the extent of wildlife;
- the diversity of habitat;
- the existence of linkages between habitat areas; or
- where wildlife species may be concentrated for periods of their life cycle such as deer yards, denning and wintering grounds, heronries or migratory staging areas,

development and site alteration within and on lands contiguous to such areas will require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Study ...which demonstrates that the proposal will not negatively affect the natural features or ecological functions of the habitat area.

Notwithstanding the above, the creation of lots which extend into a significant wildlife habitat area may be permitted where:

- the severance is for the purpose of creating new farm parcels; ...and
- the zoning by-law or other development controls prohibit the establishment of buildings and structures within the habitat area or on that portion of the contiguous lands where such development could effect significant features or functions.

The County recognizes that wildlife resources such as breeding areas, wintering areas, and other elements of wildlife habitat and natural corridors are important natural resources which provide specific functions in the provision and maintenance of healthy wildlife habitats. To the extent that these areas are identified during the development review process, efforts shall be made to protect them from the impacts of development through appropriate mitigative techniques”(*County of Oxford, 1996*).<sup>6</sup>

?

FISH HABITAT

“All fish habitat is protected by federal legislation which is administered by the Ministry of Natural Resources in conjunction with the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

...All fish habitat, including that used seasonally, shall be protected. The Ministry of Natural Resources, or its designate, may be consulted when development is proposed which may affect fish habitat in order to ascertain development alternatives that will achieve no net loss of productive capacity and seek a net gain of productive capacity whenever feasible. Development may be permitted if it does not harmfully alter, disrupt or destroy fish habitat. The relocation and redesign of development proposals is preferred over mitigation and compensation of fish habitat. A net gain can be achieved through the restoration of degraded habitat, the enhancement of existing habitat and/or creation of new habitat where possible.

Fish habitat protection may require a development setback and an appropriate vegetative buffer, the width of which will be determined in consultation with the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Area municipalities are required to consult with the Ministry of Natural Resources and the conservation authority to determine environmental protection methods which will minimize or prevent fish habitat degradation, ensure no net loss of fish or fish habitat and protect the values of Significant Biotic Areas when maintaining municipal drains or establishing new ones”(*Region of Haldimand-Norfolk, 1997*).<sup>7</sup>

?

WOODLOTS  
AND TREES

“The County recognizes that woodlots are a viable component of farming operations since they can enhance soil conservation, improve crop yields, and support locally-based wood processing industries. Woodlots are also recognized as being a renewable resource that needs to be enhanced and maintained through proper forest management.

The use of Woodlot Management Plans by landowners is encouraged. Such plans should consider the management of adjacent wooded lands, include measures to improve species diversity, and should provide for the enlargement of the interior forest portion of woodlots, if possible.

...The County will review and amend the criteria implemented through the Tree-Cutting By-law to ensure consistency with the goals and policies of the Official Plan. The amended criteria may include:

- consideration of whether the woodlot is located within a Significant Woodlot or in a Secondary Natural Heritage Corridor, as identified in this Plan;
- the use of Woodlot Management Plans that incorporate the multiple ownership of the entire woodlot area or patch;
- methods to increase species diversity;
- method to increase use of indigenous species when reforestation is required; and
- the confirmation of significant wild life and wild life habitat within woodlots.

Assistance and input will be sought from public agencies and woodlot owner groups in determining these criteria”(*County of Lambton, 1998*).<sup>8</sup>

?

WOODLOTS  
AND TREES

“When considering plans of subdivision, require applicants to submit a tree planting and land conservation plan that will:

- determine which stands of trees or individual trees warrant retention based on a preliminary assessment;

- for those trees or stands of trees being retained, outline measures for their protection during construction and over the long term;
- indicate tree planting or vegetative cover required to provide protection for stream courses or steep slopes and to improve the aesthetics of the urban or rural landscape;
- investigate the appropriateness of the use of native species in tree planting strategies;
- provide a reference document for future residents on the importance and care of trees on their property.

Promote the use of native species in public projects and private tree planting and land conservation plans wherever appropriate”(Region of Ottawa-Carleton, 1997).<sup>9</sup>

?

FISH  
HABITAT

“[It is the policy of Council] that the natural quality and hydrological characteristics of watercourses and lakes including aquatic habitat, base flow, water quality, temperature, storage levels or capacity are to be maintained, and no development will be permitted that has the potential to create an overall negative effect on any of the [designated] watercourses or lakes”(Region of York, 1994).<sup>10</sup>

### PATHFINDERS

*Pathfinder policies address the full range of provincially determined natural heritage features and areas and the natural connections between them. Areas of local and regional significance are protected and incorporated into a natural heritage system. Rigorous impact assessment criteria or “no development” provisions protect natural heritage areas from incompatible development. Quantifiable natural heritage goals or targets are in place.*

NATURAL  
HERITAGE  
SYSTEMS

“[The Regional Natural Heritage System is] an interrelated system of natural areas and features of varying ecological significance within the ...Region. Areas or features included in the system may be designated or regulated by Provincial or Regional Policy. The areas fall into one of the following categories.

- Core Natural Areas – Are the most significant areas within the Natural Heritage System in terms of biodiversity, productivity and hydrological functions. They are given priority in terms of conservation policy and management.
- Linkages – Are watercourses or naturally vegetated areas that border or connect Core Natural Areas and provide ecological functions such as passage, feeding, shelter, hydrological flow, or buffering from adjacent impacts. Their conservation will protect and enhance Core Natural Areas.
- Restoration Opportunities – Are vacant or available lands or watercourses where natural habitat is altered, degraded or destroyed. With proper habitat restoration and conservation management these areas may function as Linkages”(Region of Hamilton-Wentworth, 1995).<sup>11</sup>

?

NATURAL  
CONNECTIONS

“The integrity and function of the ecosystem will be protected, restored and enhanced. Watershed management plans will be used as guidelines to local municipalities for the development of local plans ...The landscape will be maintained for maximum bio-diversity, beauty, effect and its inherent value. Connections and linkages between natural features shall be

maintained, promoted, and improved”(County of Huron, 1999).<sup>12</sup>

?

#### WETLANDS

“Development will not be permitted in Provincially Significant Wetlands. Development may be permitted within 120 meters of such wetlands provided there is no loss of wetland function, as demonstrated through an Environmental Evaluation. Such an evaluation will utilize all opportunities for protection and rehabilitation of the wetland feature.

Local municipalities will designate Provincially Significant Wetlands in their official plans.

The County encourages the protection of Locally Significant Wetlands, where possible, through land use designations and/or stewardship agreements and conservation easements with naturalist clubs or stewardship groups.

The re-establishment and creation of wetlands will be encouraged where possible, and use of the principle of “no net loss” will be employed when dealing with land use changes that impact wetlands.

The relationship of wetlands to groundwater resources will be specifically considered when dealing with Environmental Evaluations.

The use of Environmental Evaluations is required to assess development proposed within Locally Significant Wetlands to ensure impacts and appropriate mitigation techniques are identified”(County of Lambton, 1998).<sup>13</sup>

?

#### NATURALIZATION

“The Region will, where appropriate, encourage the conservation and enhancement of the region’s native biodiversity.

Regional Council will adopt and from time to time update a list of significant species native to the region.

The Region will co-ordinate the development and maintenance of an environmental database, in co-operation with the Province, Area Municipalities, the ...Conservation Authority, other government agencies, the private sector, and the community, to document the occurrence and distribution of significant species and other features.

The Region encourages individuals and agencies to use native species appropriate to the locality when planting within or contiguous to elements of the Natural Habitat Network. To provide guidance in maintaining the native biodiversity of the Natural Habitat Network, the Region will prepare a list of native trees and shrubs suitable for such use.

The Region discourages individuals and agencies from using non-native species considered invasive and unsuitable for planting within or adjacent/contiguous to elements of the Natural Habitat Network. To provide guidance, the Region will prepare a list of non-native species considered invasive and unsuitable for such use”(Region of Waterloo, 1995).<sup>14</sup>

?

## WOODLANDS

“It is estimated that forest cover is just under 12 percent. County Council adopts a target of increasing forest cover in the County to at least 15 percent over the life of this Plan. The emphasis shall be on woodlot preservation in the rural areas through consideration of woodlots as an integral component of farming operations and by discouraging incompatible development which has permanent long term impacts on woodlots. In the settlement areas, the emphasis will be on woodlot and tree preservation and enhancement.

Where provincially significant woodlands are identified by the Province on the basis of:

- the size of the feature; and
- the occurrence of the provincially significant features; and
- the provision of important ecological functions such as linkage, buffering, or water quality; or
- the composition, age, or site quality results in a feature which is uncommon to the County,

new development and site alteration within and on lands contiguous to the provincially significant woodland will require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Study ...which demonstrates that the proposal will not negatively affect the natural features or the ecological functions of the area.<sup>15</sup>

Notwithstanding the above, the creation of lots which extend into the provincially significant woodland may be permitted where:

- the severance is for the purpose of creating new farm parcels; ...and
- the zoning by-law or other development controls prohibit the establishment of buildings and structures within the heritage feature or on that portion of the contiguous lands where such development could affect significant features or functions.

## WOODLOTS AND TREES

County Council will encourage the retention and enhancement of locally significant woodlots in both the settlement areas and rural areas of the County.

In rural areas, non-farm development will not be permitted within a woodlot. Woodlots are to be maintained as part of a farm parcel and severance of a woodlot will comply with [the Natural Resource Management Policies of this plan]. Development which is proposed contiguous to a woodlot may require an Environmental Impact Study ...to ensure no harmful effect to the woodlot and its associated ecosystems.

The County ...and/or Area Municipalities will consult with the Ministry of Natural Resources and/or the Conservation Authority with jurisdiction in the regard.

In order to increase tree cover in the County ...County Council or Area Council shall consider, as a condition of approval to development, requiring measures to preserve, protect and enhance tree cover in the designated settlements including the following:

- requiring the preparation of a baseline inventory and tree saving plans indicating trees to be maintained, removed and relocated in the course of development as well as trees to be planted;
- requiring site plan control to address the layout and siting of buildings and structures on individual lots to maximize tree-saving;
- establishing requirements for the use of deciduous and coniferous native plant species in any required tree plantings;
- requiring new tree planting on boulevards and on lands to be dedicated as parkland;
- restrictions to site alterations prior to final plan registration to ensure tree saving measures are

complied with.

Area Councils may, as a means of encouraging innovative site design and planning approaches which work to enhance tree-preservation during the course of, and subsequent to development, permit density bonusing, zoning variances and such other measures as may create some flexibility in approach to site design and planning.

Where acceptable to the Area Council, an existing wooded area may be accepted as a portion of the parkland dedication requirements of the Planning Act. Where an existing wooded area is accepted as parkland dedication, Area Councils are encouraged to retain such area in a naturalized state.

County Council shall maintain and enforce a Tree-Cutting By-law and shall periodically review the County Tree-Cutting By-law to ensure that it reflects the current understanding of responsible forestry management and environmental stewardship of woodland areas and contains adequate provisions for its enforcement.

Opportunities for tree-planting on County-owned lands such as parks, open space and Agreement Forests, using a variety of native species, shall be identified and implemented in co-operation with relevant government agencies and local interest groups. Where vegetation is planted on County-owned lands, monoculture planting shall be avoided.

Plans for the construction and/or widening of County roads shall include the planting of trees on abutting properties where such planting will not interfere with road safety or maintenance and where the land owners permission is given. Where road reconstruction and maintenance is proposed, the County shall consider alternative road and pavement widths and standards so as to minimize the cutting of trees. Where tree cutting is necessary, tree replacement shall be a minimum ratio of two trees for each tree lost in connection with the widening or construction of County roads. The County will strive to replace trees in the general vicinity where tree cutting has occurred except where the road configuration, topography or other factor make this impractical”(County of Oxford, 1996).<sup>16</sup>

?

#### WOODLANDS

“Area Municipalities are encouraged to establish policies in their Official Plans to conserve, protect and enhance woodlands through the following means:

- prioritizing woodlands for protection and possible acquisition;
- including woodlands, where appropriate, in park and other open space dedications;
- minimizing the impact of development on productive or potentially productive woodlands by selecting alternative locations for proposed uses, or through the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures;
- conservation and enhancement of hedgerows, and their integration into urban design, to preserve natural linkages among woodlands for wildlife movement and migration; and
- encouraging collective ownership of woodlands where appropriate.

The Region will consider the importance of woodlands management during its review of development applications for land containing woodlots as defined in the Regional Tree-Cutting By-law. In accordance with the Regional Tree-Cutting By-law, consideration will be given to:

- the potential impact of the proposed use on the productive or potentially productive woodlot; and

- opportunities to restore or re-establish productive forest habitats consisting of native species following the development of the proposed use.

The Region encourages and supports the Ministry of Natural Resources in its efforts to identify, protect and enhance woodlands.<sup>17</sup> The Region encourages the owners of woodlands to use forest management extension services provided by the Ministry of Natural Resources, or otherwise manage their woodlands in accordance with sustainable forest management practices.

The Ministry of Natural Resources and the owners of woodlands within Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas are encouraged to take the significant features and ecosystem functions of those woodlands into account in the development and implementation of forest management plans.

The Region will continue to acquire woodlands as finances permit, or to accept donations of woodland tracts to be managed as Regional Agreement Forests.

The objectives for managing Regional Agreement Forests will be accorded the following order of priority:

- the conservation or enhancement of significant natural features and functions, particularly where Regional Agreement Forests lie within the Natural Habitat Network or exhibit “Carolinian forest”, old growth, or interior habitat attributes;
- passive recreation including trails for nature appreciation, hiking and cross-country skiing;
- outdoor education and research;
- timber production according to sustainable forest management practices;
- hunting, fishing, horseback riding and mountain biking where expressly permitted.

Notwithstanding the above, it is recognized that trees and other vegetation may be removed, or destroyed by authorized cutting or burning to achieve the above objectives.

The Region will encourage good stewardship practices to manage public and private woodlands on an ecosystem basis, which not only recognizes the economic value of the timber, but also acknowledges the importance of woodlands as groundwater recharge areas and habitat for wildlife and vegetation”(Region of Waterloo, 1995).<sup>18</sup>

## 5.2 IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT

The policy examples included in this category address the potential effects of development and site alteration within natural heritage areas. Planning authorities approach the issue of incompatible development in environmentally sensitive areas from many directions. Rigorous environmental impact criteria or “no development” policies may be employed in natural heritage areas, to use one example. Or, the development process may become another “tool” for natural heritage preservation and enhancement.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> As noted earlier, the *Impacts of Development* policy category showcases *Enhanced* and *Pathfinder* policies only. Provincial policy, as set forth in the PPS, allows for development and site alteration in significant natural heritage areas “if it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or the ecological functions for which the area is identified”. Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), then, is not a basic requirement. Individual planning authorities may require impact studies to protect against incompatible development.

## ENHANCED

*Enhanced policies address the full range of natural heritage features as set forth in the Provincial Policy Statement and the natural connections between them. Effective controls on development and site alteration within natural heritage areas are in place.*

### IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT

“As determined by the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Conservation Authority, Ministry of the Environment and Energy, federal ministries or agencies or the local municipality, environmental impact assessments will be required for all developments considered to have potential negative impacts on the [following] natural resources: Flood plains, wetlands, fisheries, wildlife, Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest, Environmentally Sensitive Areas, mineral aggregates and non-aggregate mineral resources, and the Oak Ridges Moraine.

Environmental impact assessments prepared in accordance with watershed plans where such watershed plans exist, shall be prepared by professionals and approved by the local municipality, the Conservation Authority and /or the Ministry of Natural Resources and when applicable, the Ministry of the Environment and Energy, federal ministries or agencies, and include:

- a description of the proposal and statement of rationale for the undertaking;
- a description of the existing land use(s) on site and adjacent lands;
- the land use designation on site and adjacent lands, as identified by the County and local municipal Official Plans;
- a description of alternative development proposals for the site as well as the environmental impacts of the alternatives;
- an identification of proposed land uses and activities that may have an environmental impact;
- a delineation of environmental constraint areas;
- an environmental inventory of the area under consideration (plant life, land-based and aquatic wildlife; wetlands, natural landforms, surface waters, hydrogeological features);
- a statement of environmental and ecological significance of the area affected by the proposed development;
- a statement on how the development will establish or facilitate the establishment of linkages between natural areas within the watershed and adjacent watersheds and how these linkages will contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the natural areas;
- a comprehensive description of the proposal including its direct and indirect effect on the environment and considering both the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal;
- a detailed description of mitigating effects;
- any additional information requested by the local municipality; and,
- an assessment of options for servicing the development with full municipal or communal water and sewage services as well as the environmental impacts of the servicing options.

In order to consider the potential cumulative impacts of proposed developments where and environmental impact assessment is not required, and environmental analysis will need to be conducted for the development or redevelopment of existing or new structures/facilities where the local municipality, the County, the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Conservation Authority(s), the Ministry of the Environment and Energy or other interested provincial or federal agencies have a concern.

...Approval of environmental impact assessments ...shall rest with the Ministry of Natural Resources and/or Conservation Authority in consultation with the County and local municipality.

Notwithstanding the above requirements for an environmental impact assessment ...for proposed developments of a particular sensitivity, all developments proposed within 120 meters of a provincially significant wetland or lands connecting individual wetlands within a wetland complex will require an environmental impact assessment..."(*County of Peterborough, 1994*).<sup>19</sup>

?

IMPACTS OF  
DEVELOPMENT

"Require that environmental analysis required to support development proposals, stormwater management, tree retention/planting, hydrogeology and terrain analysis should, where possible, be combined into a comprehensive study to allow for an integrated review. Where these studies are likely to have an effect on basic components of the development design, and the required information is not available as a result of other studies, they are to be completed as a first step in developing a proposal and should accompany the application. Pre-consultation and review of existing plans and information is a critical component of the process"(*Region of Ottawa-Carleton, 1997*).<sup>20</sup>

?

IMPACTS OF  
DEVELOPMENT

"Development of the lands designated 'Inland Resort Community' shall only proceed after a number of studies and development plans have been conducted and approved by the various regulatory bodies.

The required studies and plans shall include the following:

- A hydrogeological, geotechnical and lot size assessment to be carried out by a qualified engineer. This study shall be conducted to the Ministry of Environment specifications.

Such studies shall assess the availability of potable water, the amount of over-burden, nitrate levels and minimum lot sizes. They should also assess whether development could proceed by way of communal water and sewage disposal systems. Approval of such a study shall be required by the Ministry of the Environment and local municipality.

- A study outlining the environmental characteristics of the lands shall be produced by a qualified professional. Such studies shall include recommendations for the sustainable development of the property, ensuring the conservation of the various natural features of the land.

The environmental studies must be reviewed and endorsed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and the local municipality.

- A stormwater management plan shall be prepared by a qualified professional, addressing quantity and quality of stormwater, as well as discharge to an approved outlet. These plans should strive to ensure the least environmentally damaging drainage system for the development.

These plans must be approved by the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Natural Resources and the local municipality.

- A natural habitat retention plan prepared by a qualified professional. Such plans shall identify development envelopes for each residential lot and the location of open space

amenities.

Such studies must be reviewed and endorsed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and the local municipality.

- A fishery management plan shall be prepared for inland water systems associated with the development to ensure the long term survival of any existing fish stocks.

Such studies must be reviewed and endorsed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and the local municipality.

- A wildlife management plan shall be prepared by a qualified professional. Such a plan shall assess the impact of development on games species, predators and provincially rare, threatened and endangered species of plants, mammals, reptiles, birds and insects.

The management plan shall formulate management techniques which will ensure that all development proposals shall be developed in harmony with nature, and shall constitute sustainable development.

The wildlife management plan shall be reviewed and endorsed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and the local municipality.

The findings of the various studies may be implemented through conditions of draft subdivisions or condominium approval, site plan control, holding provisions, subdivider agreements, and through the Co-operative Constitution”(County of Bruce, 1999).<sup>21</sup>

## PATHFINDERS

*Pathfinder policies address the full range of provincially determined natural heritage features and areas and the natural connections between them. Areas of local and regional significance are protected and incorporated into a natural heritage system. Rigorous impact assessment criteria or “no development” provisions protect natural heritage areas from incompatible development. Quantifiable natural heritage goals or targets are in place.*

IMPACTS OF  
DEVELOPMENT

“Where an Environmental Impact Statement ...has demonstrated that a development application may have a serious impact upon the environmentally significant features and functions of an Environmentally Sensitive Policy Area, the Region will, within a period of six months, undertake one of the following:

- negotiate an agreement with the owner of the land requiring conditions of approval, or requiring dedications of land to protect lands supporting the environmentally significant features and functions of the Environmentally Sensitive Policy Area;
- request the Province, the Area Municipality, or the Grand River Conservation Authority to invoke any applicable statutory authority to enable the acquisition and/or protection of the Environmentally Sensitive Policy Area;
- consult with the Area Municipality, the Grand River Conservation Authority, and/or other agencies about acquiring lands by purchase;
- consider the acquisition of all or the affected portion of the Environmentally Sensitive Policy Area; or
- refuse the application”(Region of Waterloo, 1995).<sup>22</sup>

?

REVIEW  
COMMITTEE

“[L]and use changes in or adjacent to Environmentally Significant Areas will only be permitted where, in addition to meeting other policies in this plan, such development:

- will not adversely affect, degrade or destroy any of the qualities which are the basis for the area’s designation;
- will not cause any significant impacts upon water quality and quantity; and,
- will not adversely affect the implementation of any resource protection policies or plans.

[P]roposed changes will be referred to the Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG) for review. ESAIEG will advise Regional Planning staff on whether the proposed changes satisfy the intent of [the policy above]”(*Region of Hamilton-Wentworth, 1995*).<sup>23</sup>

?

DESIGN WITH  
NATURE

“When considering development proposals, require that, where appropriate, the development should incorporate methods to *design with nature*, including ways to maintain and use the natural characteristics and features of a site. This consideration should precede decisions about the location of roads and other infrastructure. The following measures may be appropriate:

- retention of as much natural vegetation as possible;
- use of natural infiltration techniques and source controls and other current stormwater management practices, which shall be reflected as a condition of approval;
- natural channel design principles;
- maintaining natural contours through road design and lot patterns.

[Council shall] review its own practices to serve as a model and to ensure that the development of its properties and the provision of its infrastructure take advantage of opportunities to design with nature, where appropriate.

Request local municipalities to review or establish site plan guidelines and incorporate policies to support opportunities to design with nature.

Initiate an annual recognition program to recognize innovative projects that design with nature”(*Region of Ottawa-Carleton, 1997*).<sup>24</sup>

?

PLANNING AND  
DESIGN

“The County, in co-operation with local municipalities, may utilize site-specific techniques to maximize the protection and rehabilitation of the Natural Heritage System when development proposals are considered. Such techniques may include, but are not limited to, increases in density of development, revision of current development standards or adoption of alternative development standards, reconfiguration of uses, shared facilities, and public/private agreements to facilitate protection or rehabilitation”(*County of Lambton, 1998*).<sup>25</sup>

?

NET ENVIRONMENTAL  
GAIN

“Ensure that development taking place within the County does not unreasonably affect, and wherever possible, results in a *net environmental gain* for the County through the protection and

conservation of existing natural features, the maintenance of existing ecological functions and the creation of new environmental features as development occurs”(County of Oxford, 1996).<sup>26</sup>

### 5.3 LAND STEWARDSHIP

The policy practices showcased in this group address issues of natural heritage protection and enhancement on privately owned lands. The policies promote efforts by landowners, recreationalists, conservation authorities, community organizations and other agencies to manage private lands and explore partnership opportunities.

#### ENHANCED

*Enhanced policies address the full range of natural heritage features as set forth in the Provincial Policy Statement and the natural connections between them. Effective controls on development and site alteration within natural heritage areas are in place.*

PRIVATE  
OWNERSHIP

“[Council shall] in a Natural Environment Area (A) which is under private ownership, consider land acquisition in accordance with the following:

- At the request of the landowner, Council may negotiate a price but if after six months, an agreement has not been reached, the price will be determined in accordance with the *Expropriations Act*, with the concurrence of the landowner; or
- At the request of the landowner, Council may acquire the property through expropriation in accordance with the *Expropriations Act*;
- Council shall not acquire improvements unless requested by the landowner;
- Council shall be prepared to buy a part of a property provided that the size of the part not acquired satisfies the requirements of the local municipality.

[Council shall] pay grants in lieu of taxes to the local municipality for property acquired in Natural Environment Areas (A).

[Council shall] consider alternate methods, where feasible, to meet its objectives for Natural Environment Areas, including exchanging lands of similar value, negotiating conservation easements, entering into agreements with other public bodies concerning land management/maintenance, and other methods that may be proposed from time to time”(Region of Ottawa-Carleton, 1997).<sup>27</sup>

?

RESTORATION

“Promote a wide range of environmental enhancement and restoration opportunities.

Encourage the City ...conservation authorities, and other appropriate agencies to consider opportunities for natural habitat restoration along the shoreline and within the littoral zone of Lake Ontario.

Encourage and promote jointly with conservation authorities, the area municipalities and other agencies, habitat restoration and enhancement programs through the planning approvals process.

COMMUNITY  
STEWARDSHIP

...Work jointly with agencies and landowners to rehabilitate abandoned extraction areas and

progressively rehabilitate operating pits and quarries and peat extraction areas to the highest level of ecological integrity practicable within the context of the area municipal official plans.

Work jointly with the agencies and landowners to implement reforestation programs across the Region with the highest priority on those areas that will enhance the Greenlands System...”(*Region of Peel, 1996*).<sup>28</sup>

## PATHFINDERS

*Pathfinder policies address the full range of provincially determined natural heritage features and areas and the natural connections between them. Areas of local and regional significance are protected and incorporated into a natural heritage system. Rigorous impact assessment criteria or “no development” provisions protect natural heritage areas from incompatible development. Quantifiable natural heritage goals or targets are in place.*

### COMMUNITY STEWARDSHIP

“The Region commends the efforts of agencies, landowners, farmers, recreationalists and others who practice and promote good land stewardship within the region. To assist in continuing the promotion of good stewardship of the region’s soil, water and woodland resources through sustainable agricultural practices, the Region will co-operate with Federal and Provincial Ministries, Area Municipalities, the Grand River Conservation Authority, other government agencies, the private sector, and the community as appropriate to provide education, information and research support to the agricultural community.

Area Municipalities are encouraged to develop partnerships with property owners and community organizations for the purpose of creating and maintaining appropriate recreational trails on rural lands. Such partnerships would:

- encourage landowners to permit the establishment of accessible trails through natural or scenic areas on their property;
- develop an information and contact program;
- encourage landowners to enter into agreements to permit trail use by the public;
- promote respect for the rights of farmers participating in the trail network.

The Region encourages good stewardship of lands within the Natural Habitat Network in accordance with [Natural Habitat Network] policies.

...Elements of the Natural Habitat Network [that] are privately owned are not for use by the public, except at the discretion of the owner.

Area Municipalities are encouraged to acquire elements of the Natural Habitat Network through the development approval process, and to prepare management plans for these lands to conserve and enhance their respective features and functions.

The Region will co-operate with the Province, Area Municipalities, the Grand River Conservation Authority, other government agencies, the private sector, and the community to provide advice to landowners wishing to exercise good stewardship of lands within the Natural Habitat Network.

Concurrent with the implementation of the Water Resources Protection Strategy, the Region may, in co-operation with the Province, Area Municipalities, the Grand River Conservation Authority,

other government agencies, the private sector, and the community assist farmers in the development of individual Environmental Farm Plans. The purpose of these plans is to improve the management of pollution sources, reduce soil loss, protect water quality, and to preserve and enhance the features and functions of elements within the Natural Habitat Network.

The Region will co-operate with the Province, Area Municipalities, the Grand River Conservation Authority, other government agencies, the private sector, and the community to develop interpretive programs for elements within the Natural Habitat Network”(Region of Waterloo, 1995).<sup>29</sup>

?

NATURAL  
HERITAGE  
DEDICATIONS

“The County shall investigate the feasibility of a Conservation Land Trust for the acceptance of monetary and/or land gifts for the purposes of conservation of the natural environment. Where such a Land Trust is established it will be administered directly or indirectly by a standing committee of County Council with a mandate to protect natural areas”(County of Oxford, 1996).<sup>30</sup>

?

PRIVATE  
OWNERSHIP

“Council shall ...Support private landowners in their efforts to manage property in a way which maintains or enhances environmental values, in co-operation with the Conservation Authorities, by:

- Encouraging publicly funded programs, such as reforestation and stream improvement, to focus on measures which enhance the natural environment system including:
- increasing connectivity between natural habitat areas;
- increasing native vegetative cover within and around environmental policy areas;
- increasing vegetative cover on steep slopes or adjacent to watercourses.
- Encouraging initiatives in the agricultural community to develop environmental farm plans and other programs to support farming practices which maintain or enhance environmental quality;
- Making available any information to landowners on natural values; and
- Pursuing opportunities to combine education and communication on natural values with other [Region] activities”(Region of Ottawa-Carleton, 1997).<sup>31</sup>

#### 5.4 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The examples showcased in this policy area incorporate measures to monitor ecosystem health over the long term. Broad-scale environmental studies, databases, community monitoring programs and other research initiatives lay the groundwork for setting targets and evaluating the effectiveness of natural heritage policies.

#### ENHANCED

*Enhanced policies address the full range of natural heritage features as set forth in the Provincial Policy Statement and the natural connections between them. Effective controls on development and site alteration within natural heritage areas are in place.*

DATABASE OR  
STUDY

“Large environmental systems interact with smaller ecosystems, including localized plant and animal communities. This Plan considers airsheds, watersheds, groundwater resources, the Lake Ontario Waterfront, Bioregions, the Niagara Escarpment and the Oak Ridges Moraine as the relevant large environmental systems which [the Region] has a part in protecting.

...It is the policy of Regional Council to:

- Study and protect the overall integrity of [the Region’s] ecosystems which are part of larger biotic (living) and abiotic (non-living) systems.
- Study and create databases for the larger environmental systems.
- Participate in, and support, broader scale environmental studies in order to assess the carrying capacity of ecosystems and the cumulative effects of development in areas where development is likely to have a major impact on the integrity of broader ecosystems and the Greenlands System in [the Region]”(*Region of Peel, 1996*).<sup>32</sup>

### PATHFINDERS

*Pathfinder policies address the full range of provincially determined natural heritage features and areas and the natural connections between them. Areas of local and regional significance are protected and incorporated into a natural heritage system. Rigorous impact assessment criteria or “no development” provisions protect natural heritage areas from incompatible development. Quantifiable natural heritage goals or targets are in place.*

MONITORING AND  
EVALUATION

“Encourage the use of full cost accounting principles in evaluating programs and policies affecting the natural environment”(*Region of Halton, 1995*).<sup>33</sup>

?

MONITORING AND  
EVALUATION

“Council shall ...monitor, in partnership with Conservation Authorities and local municipalities:

- the amount and type of forest cover in [the Region];
- vegetative cover along shorelines;
- surface water quality;
- the implementation of any watershed or sub-watershed study as it relates to initiatives to promote the objectives of this Plan. Emphasis shall be given to proposals to enhance or restore vegetative cover through initiatives outside of planning approvals.

REPORTING ON  
ENVIRONMENT

...For each term of Council prepare a State of the Environment Report to report on key issues related to the environment of [the Region]. The terms of reference for this report shall be approved by Council”(*Region of Ottawa-Carleton, 1997*).<sup>34</sup>

?

MONITORING AND  
EVALUATION

“The District [of Muskoka] has an interest in the water quality of all lakes and rivers within its jurisdiction. The ability of a waterbody to receive nutrients without substantially altering the trophic status of the waterbody or other waterbodies within the same watershed is the initial and primary factor in identifying the capability of a waterbody to accommodate development or redevelopment. The “water quality objective” represents the optimum long-term average chlorophyll a reading for a lake. In general the highest value of chlorophyll a objective on any lake within the District is 6 ug/l which represents good recreational water quality.

The following policy shall apply to all lakes within the District of Muskoka with an established water quality objective:

Where the predicted Chlorophyll a value would exceed the water quality objective (limit) of a waterbody as a result of new development, redevelopment or interest in land, such development or redevelopment shall not be permitted”(District of Muskoka, 1991).<sup>35</sup>

?

DATABASE OR  
STUDY

“[D]evelop and maintain information and monitoring systems and to establish appropriately detailed targets to serve as a basis for assessing the effectiveness of the Plan in achieving its objectives”(Metropolitan Toronto, 1994).<sup>36</sup>

## APPENDIX A

### NATURAL HERITAGE POLICY OF THE PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

#### **2.3 Natural Heritage**

2.3.1 *Natural heritage features and areas* will be protected from incompatible development.

a) *Development and site alteration* will not be permitted in:

- significant wetlands south and east of the Canadian Shield; and
- significant portions of the habitat of *endangered and threatened species*.

b) *Development and site alteration* may be permitted in:

- fish habitat;
- significant wetlands in the Canadian Shield;
- significant woodlands south and east of the Canadian Shield;
- significant valleylands south and east of the Canadian Shield;
- significant wildlife habitat; and
- significant areas of natural and scientific interest

if it has been demonstrated that there will be no *negative impacts* on the natural features or the *ecological functions* for which the area is identified.

2.3.2 Development and site alteration may be permitted on *adjacent lands* to a) and b) if it has been demonstrated that there will be no *negative impacts* on the natural features or on the *ecological functions* for which the area is identified.

2.3.3 The diversity of natural features in an area, and the natural connections between them should be maintained, and improved where possible.

2.3.4 Nothing in policy 2.3 is intended to limit the ability of *agricultural uses* to continue.

APPENDIX B

STATUS OF COUNTY AND REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLANS

	<i>OFFICIAL PLAN STATUS</i>	<i>NATURAL HERITAGE POLICY STATUS</i>
BRUCE	EFFECTIVE FALL 1998	
DUFFERIN	NO OFFICIAL PLAN	
ESSEX	NO OFFICIAL PLAN	
GREY	EFFECTIVE MARCH 1998	
HASTINGS	EFFECTIVE MARCH 1976	
HURON	EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1999	
LAMBTON	EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1998	
MIDDLESEX	EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1997	
OXFORD	EFFECTIVE JULY 1996	
PERTH	EFFECTIVE JUNE 1998	
PETERBOROUGH	EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 1994	
PRESSCOTT AND RUSSELL	NO OFFICIAL PLAN	
PRINCE EDWARD	EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1998	
RENFREW	NO OFFICIAL PLAN	
SIMCOE	MMAH APPROVAL PENDING	
STORMONT, DUNDAS AND GLENGARRY VICTORIA	NO OFFICIAL PLAN	
WELLINGTON	EFFECTIVE 1978	AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO NATURAL ENVIRONMENT DESIGNATIONS
CHATHAM-KENT	PENDING MMAH APPROVAL	
DURHAM	NO OFFICIAL PLAN	
HALTON	EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 1993	
HALDIMAND-NORFOLK	EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 1995	
HAMILTON-WENTWORTH	EFFECTIVE MARCH 1997	NATURAL HERITAGE POLICY CONSISTENT WITH CSPS
MUSKOKA	EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1995	REGIONAL NATURAL HERITAGE SYSTEM AMENDMENT EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1997
NIAGARA	EFFECTIVE JUNE 1991	
OTTAWA-CARLETON	EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 1981	"REGIONAL STRATEGY FOR CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT" EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1994
PEEL	EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1997	
	EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1996	

SUDBURY	EFFECTIVE MARCH 1978	REVISION OF "ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY" DESIGNATION IN OCTOBER 1993
TORONTO	EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1994	THE OFFICIAL PLAN FOR THE NEW CITY OF TORONTO IS EXPECTED IN SPRING 2000
WATERLOO	EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1995	ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES AMENDMENT EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 1998
YORK	EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1994	

---

## APPENDIX C

### SUMMARY OF POLICY CATEGORIES<sup>16</sup>

#### **NATURAL HERITAGE FEATURES**

PROVINCIALY SIGNIFICANT WETLANDS LOCALLY SIGNIFICANT WETLANDS	WETLANDS
HABITAT OF ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES	ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES
SIGNIFICANT WILDLIFE HABITAT PROTECTION FOR UNDISTURBED HABITAT AREAS OF HIGH/UNUSUAL HABITAT DIVERSITY SEASONAL HABITAT CAROLINIAN CANADA SITES ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS	WILDLIFE HABITAT
LIFE SCIENCE ANSI's EARTH SCIENCE ANSI's	ANSI's
SIGNIFICANT WOODLANDS WOODLOTS AND TREES	WOODLANDS
SIGNIFICANT VALLEY LANDS	VALLEYLANDS
FISH HABITAT	FISH HABITAT
NATURAL CONNECTIONS	NATURAL CONNECTIONS
GEOMORPHOLOGICALLY REPRESENTATIVE AREAS ESCARPMENT AREAS	LANDFORMS
SOIL CONSERVATION	SOILS
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE/DISCHARGE AREAS HEADWATER AREAS WELLHEAD PROTECTION AREAS OF HYDROLOGICAL IMPORTANCE	AREAS OF HYDROLOGICAL IMPORTANCE
NATURAL WATERCOURSES STREAMS PONDS, LAKES AND RESEVOIRS	NATURAL WATERCOURSES
SHORELINE MANAGEMENT	SHORELINES
HAZARD LANDS	

#### **IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT**

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT SUBWATERSHED PLANNING GROUNDWATER QUANTITY BASEFLOW (AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM HEALTH) MUNICIPAL WATER QUALITY AND SUPPLY	WATERSHED PLANNING
WATER CONSERVATION WISE USE OF WATER RESOURCES FOR AGRICULTURE	WATER CONSERVATION

---

<sup>16</sup> Appendix C allows the reader to connect the 82 policy types used in the initial analysis with both the 22 policy categories presented in Tables 3 and the 4 major policy areas used in the final review.

AIRSHED PLANNING/AIR QUALITY

WASTE WATER MANAGEMENT  
EXTENDED PUBLIC NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS  
DEVELOPMENT AND SITE ALTERATION IMPACTS  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE  
PROHIBITION OF ACTIVITIES  
DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA  
PERMITTED USES  
IMPACTS OF AGRICULTURE  
IMPACTS OF MINERAL AGGREGATE EXTRACTION  
MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT  
WASTE MANAGEMENT  
HAZARDOUS WASTE  
ZONING  
ADJACENT LANDS  
ENERGY CONSERVATION

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT  
RETENTION OF VEGETATION AND/OR REVEGETATION  
OVERLAPPING NATURAL HERITAGE FEATURES  
NEW LOT CREATION  
AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS  
LOT BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS  
EASEMENTS AND RIGHT-OF-WAY  
SPECIAL POLICY AREAS  
GROWTH MANAGEMENT  
INNOVATIVE DESIGN APPROACHES  
DESIGN WITH NATURE

NET ENVIRONMENTAL GAIN  
RESTORATION  
NATURALIZATION OF FEATURES AND FUNCTIONS

**LAND STEWARDSHIP**

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP  
COMMUNITY STEWARDSHIP  
SUPPORT FOR MULTI-LEVEL COOPERATION  
PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INVESTMENT  
PUBLIC ACQUISITION OF NATURAL HERITAGE AREAS  
ALTERNATIVES TO PUBLIC ACQUISITION  
NATURAL HERITAGE DEDICATIONS  
OTHER LAND SECUREMENT STRATEGIES  
PARKLAND DEDICATIONS  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF AGRICULTURE

EDUCATION PROGRAMS  
PREVENTION PROGRAMS

**MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

COMMUNITY MONITORING AND EVALUATION  
"STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT" REPORTING  
DATABASE DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY  
INVENTORY OF NATURAL HERITAGE FEATURES  
NATURAL FEATURES MAPPING

AIR QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

PLANNING AND DESIGN

NET ENVIRONMENTAL GAIN

LAND STEWARDSHIP

COMMUNITY EDUCATION

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

APPENDIX D

NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICY TYPES IN COUNTY AND REGIONAL  
OFFICIAL PLANS

	PROVINCIAL WETLANDS	LOCAL WETLANDS	ENDANGERED SPECIES	WILDLIFE HABITAT	LIFE SCIENCE ANSI' S	EARTH SCIENCE ANSI' S	WOODLANDS	WOODLOTS AND TREES	VALLEYLANDS	FISH HABITAT	ESA' S	NATURAL CONNECTIONS
BRUCE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	?
GREY	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		?
HASTINGS	?	?	?	?	?	?	?		?	?	?	
HURON	?	?	?	?	?	?	?		?	?	?	X
LAMBTON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
MIDDLESEX	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
OXFORD	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
PERTH	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		X
PETERBOROUGH	X	X	?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PRINCE EDWARD	X	X	?	X	X	X	X	?		X	X	
SIMCOE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VICTORIA	?		X	X	X	X	X	?	X	X	X	
WELLINGTON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
DURHAM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
HALDIMAND- NORFOLK	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
HALTON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
HAMILTON- WENTWORTH	X	X	?	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
MUSKOKA	?	?	?	X	?	?	X	X	?	X	X	?
NIAGARA	?	?		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
OTTAWA- CARLETON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PEEL	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SUDBURY	?	?		X			X	X	X	X	X	?
TORONTO	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
WATERLOO	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
YORK	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X

- X *Municipality addresses the policy issue directly*
- ? *Status of the policy issue is uncertain due to the format and/or language of policy set (See Appendix F)<sup>37</sup>*
- ? *Municipality addresses the policy issue in a manner inconsistent with the terminology of this classification(See Appendix F)<sup>38</sup>*

NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICY TYPES IN COUNTY AND REGIONAL  
OFFICIAL PLANS<sup>17</sup>

	UNDISTURBED HABITAT	AREAS OF HIGH DIVERSITY	CAROLINIAN CANADA	SEASONAL HABITAT	GEOMORPHO' LY REP. AREAS	ESCARPMENT AREAS <sup>18</sup>	ADJACENT LANDS <sup>19</sup>	SOIL CONSERVATION	GROUNDWATER RE/DISCHARGE	HEADWATER AREAS	WELLHEAD PROTECTION	HYDROLOGICAL IMPORTANCE
BRUCE	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X
GREY							X			X		
HASTINGS												
HURON									?			
LAMBTON							X	X	X	X		
MIDDLESEX		?			?		X		X	X		
OXFORD	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X		
PERTH							X		X	?		
PETERBOROUGH		X		X			X		X	?		
PRINCE EDWARD		X		X	X	X	X	X	X			
SIMCOE		?			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VICTORIA				X			X	X				
WELLINGTON		?			X		X		X	X	?	X
DURHAM	?	X			X		X	X	X	X		X
HALDIMAND- NORFOLK	X	X	X	X	X				?			
HALTON	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	?	X
HAMILTON- WENTWORTH	X	X			X	X	X		?			
MUSKOKA		?		X	X				X			
NIAGARA	X	X			X	X	X	X	X			
OTTAWA- CARLETON	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X
PEEL		X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SUDBURY				X	X			X	X			
TORONTO		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
WATERLOO	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X		
YORK	?	X		?	X		X	X	X	X	X	X

<sup>17</sup> It is important to remember that the 82 policy categories exhibited in Appendix D have been applied to a large number of municipalities and across a wide range of planning policy environments. Certain policy categories may not apply to every municipality.

<sup>18</sup> The policy category *Escarpment Areas* includes those municipalities with natural heritage policies that provide for the protection of escarpment features. These features may or may not fall within the boundaries of the Niagara Escarpment.

<sup>19</sup> The policy category *Adjacent Lands* includes those municipalities with natural heritage policies that address the impacts of development and site alterations on lands contiguous to designated natural heritage areas.

NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICY TYPES IN COUNTY AND REGIONAL  
OFFICIAL PLANS

	NATURAL WATERCOURSES	STREAMS	PONDS, LAKES AND RESEVOIRS	WATERSHED MANAGEMENT	SUBWATERSHED PLANNING	SHORELINE MANAGEMENT	GROUNDWATER QUANTITY	WASTE WATER MANAGEMENT	BASE FLOW	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT	MUNICIPAL WATER QUALITY	REVEG' N OF WATERCOURSES
BRUCE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	?	X	X	
GREY		X	?			?						X
HASTINGS												
HURON	?	?	?	X		X	?	X			X	
LAMBTON	X	?	X			X	X	X	?	X	X	X
MIDDLESEX	X	X	?	X			X	X		X	X	X
OXFORD	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
PERTH	X	?	?				X		?	X		X
PETERBOROUGH	X	X	?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PRINCE EDWARD		?	?	X	X	X	X	X		X		X
SIMCOE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VICTORIA	X	X	?			X				?	?	X
WELLINGTON	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
DURHAM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
HALDIMAND- NORFOLK HALTON	X	X	?	X	X	X	X	X	?	X	X	X
HAMILTON- WENTWORTH MUSKOKA	X	X				X	X		?		?	
NIAGARA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		?	X		X
OTTAWA- CARLETON	X	X	?	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
PEEL	X	X	?	X	X	X	X	X	?	X	X	?
SUDBURY			?			X	?	X		X	X	?
TORONTO	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	?	X	X	?
WATERLOO		?	?	X	X		X	?	X	X	X	X
YORK	X	X	?	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	?

NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICY TYPES IN COUNTY AND REGIONAL  
OFFICIAL PLANS

	WATER CONSERVATION	WATER USE FOR AGRICULTURE	AIR QUALITY	NH FEATURES INVENTORY	NH FEATURES MAPPING	OVERLAPPING NH FEATURES	PRIVATE OWNERSHIP	LOT CREATION	AGRICULTURAL OPERATIONS	LOT BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS	EASEMENTS & RIGHT OF WAY	COMMUNITY STEWARDSHIP
BRUCE	X	?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
GREY				X	X			X				
HASTINGS				?	?		X	?	?	?	?	
HURON		?	X	X	X		?		X			X
LAMBTON		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
MIDDLESEX	?			X	X		X	X	X	X		X
OXFORD	X			X	X			X	X	X		
PERTH				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
PETERBOROUGH	?			X	X		X	X	X	X	X	?
PRINCE EDWARD				X	X		X	X	X	X		X
SIMCOE	X	?	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	?
VICTORIA					X			X		X		
WELLINGTON	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	?	X
DURHAM	X	?	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
HALDIMAND- NORFOLK				X			X					X
HALTON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
HAMILTON- WENTWORTH		?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
MUSKOKA			X	X	X			X		X		
NIAGARA				X	X		X	X	X	X		?
OTTAWA- CARLETON		?	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
PEEL	X	?	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X
SUDBURY			X				X					
TORONTO	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X
WATERLOO	X			X	X		X	X	X	?	X	X
YORK	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X

NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICY TYPES IN COUNTY AND REGIONAL  
OFFICIAL PLANS

	EDUCATION PROGRAMS	PREVENTION	EXTENDED NOTIFICATION <sup>20</sup>	COMMUNITY MONITORING	REPORTING ON ENVIRONMENT	DATABASE OR STUDY	MULTI - LEVEL COOPERATION	PRIVATE/PUBLIC INVESTMENT	PUBLIC ACQUISITION	ALTERNATIVES TO PURCHASE	NH DEDICATIONS	LAND SECUREMENT
BRUCE	X				X		X		X	X	X	X
GREY												
HASTINGS							X		X			
HURON	X	X		X	X		X			X		
LAMBTON	X					X	X			X	X	
MIDDLESEX	X			?			X		X	X		
OXFORD	X		X		X		X					
PERTH							X					
PETERBOROUGH							X		X	X		
PRINCE EDWARD	X				X		X		X	X		
SIMCOE				?			X		X	X	?	
VICTORIA												
WELLINGTON							X		?	X	?	X
DURHAM	?	?				X	X		X	X	?	X
HALDIMAND- NORFOLK							X		X			
HALTON	X			X	X		X		X			
HAMILTON- WENTWORTH						X	X		X	X		
MUSKOKA		X			X		X					
NIAGARA				X	?		X		X	X		
OTTAWA- CARLETON	X			X	X		X		X	X		
PEEL	X			?	X	X	X		?	X		
SUDBURY	X	X				X	X		X	X	X	
TORONTO	X			?	X	X	X	X	X	X	?	?
WATERLOO	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
YORK		?		X		X	X			X	X	X

<sup>20</sup> The policy category *Extended Notification* includes those municipalities that support extended public notification requirements for proposed development or site alterations in significant natural heritage areas.

NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICY TYPES IN COUNTY AND REGIONAL  
OFFICIAL PLANS

	PARKLAND DEDICATIONS	E. IMPACTS OF AGRICULTURE <sup>21</sup>	HAZARD LANDS	SPECIAL POLICY AREAS	NET ENVIRONMENTAL GAIN <sup>22</sup>	RESTORATION	NATURALIZATION	GROWTH MANAGEMENT	IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT	REVIEW COMMITTEE	PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES
BRUCE	X	?	X	X			X	X	X		X
GREY			X	X					X		
HASTINGS			X	X					X		
HURON		X	X			X		X	X	X	
LAMBTON	X	X	X	X			X		X		
MIDDLESEX	X		X	X		X		X	X		
OXFORD	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X
PERTH									X		
PETERBOROUGH		X	X	X	X			X	X		
PRINCE EDWARD			X					X	X		
SIMCOE	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		
VICTORIA	X		X						X		
WELLINGTON	X	?	X	X		X	X	X	X		
DURHAM		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
HALDIMAND-NORFOLK					X		X		X		
HALTON		X	X			X		X	X	X	
HAMILTON-WENTWORTH	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	
MUSKOKA		X	X	X				X	X		
NIAGARA	X		X				X	X	X	X	
OTTAWA-CARLETON		X					X		X		
PEEL		X	X	X		X	?	X	X		
SUDBURY	X		X	X		X			X	X	
TORONTO	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
WATERLOO			X	X	X		X	X	X		X
YORK		X	X	X		X		X	X		X

<sup>21</sup> The policy category *Environmental Impacts of Agriculture* includes those municipalities that support sound agricultural practices toward the protection and enhancement of natural heritage features and functions. A second category – *Impacts of Agriculture* – addresses the issue of “limits” to agricultural operations in natural areas.

<sup>22</sup> The policy category *Net Environmental Gain* includes those municipalities that use development in natural heritage areas as a tool for achieving natural heritage restoration and enhancement goals.

NATURAL HERITAGE PLANNING POLICY TYPES IN COUNTY AND REGIONAL  
OFFICIAL PLANS

	DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA	PERMITTED USES	IMPACTS OF AGRICULTURE	IMPACTS OF EXTRACTION	MITIGATION & ENHANCEMENT	WASTE MANAGEMENT	HAZARDOUS WASTE	INNOVATIVE DESIGN	DESIGN WITH NATURE	ZONING	ENERGY CONSERVATION
BRUCE	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
GREY				X						X	
HASTINGS										?	
HURON			X	X	?	X	?				
LAMBTON			X	X			X	X		X	
MIDDLESEX		X	X	X	X	X				X	
OXFORD	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
PERTH		X								X	
PETERBOROUGH			X	X	X	X				X	X
PRINCE EDWARD		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
SIMCOE		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
VICTORIA		X			X		X			X	
WELLINGTON		X	X	X	X	X	X		?	X	X
DURHAM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	?	X	X
HALDIMAND- NORFOLK		X	X		X					X	
HALTON	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
HAMILTON- WENTWORTH MUSKOKA		X	X		X	X		X	X	X	
NIAGARA	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	
OTTAWA- CARLETON		X	X		X			X	X	X	
PEEL		X	X	X	X	X			?		X
SUDBURY		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
TORONTO		X			X	X	X	X		X	X
WATERLOO		X	X	X	X		X	?		X	X
YORK		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X

## APPENDIX E

### PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS AND REPRESENTATIVES

#### **Association of Municipalities of Ontario**

393 University Avenue, Suite 1701  
Toronto, ON M1G 1E6  
Contact: Patricia Vanini  
Tel: (416) 971-9856 Fax: (416) 971-6191

#### **Canadian Environmental Law Association**

517 College Street, Suite 401  
Toronto, ON M6G 4A2  
Contacts: Theresa McClenaghan, Kathy Cooper  
Tel: (416) 960-2284 Fax: (416) 960-9392

#### **Conservation Ontario**

120 Bayview Parkway  
Newmarket, ON L3Y 4W3  
Contact: Andrea Ferguson-Jones  
Tel: (905) 895-0716 Fax: (905) 895-0751

#### **Federation of Ontario Naturalists**

355 Lesmill Road  
Don Mills, ON M3B 2W8  
Contacts: Linda Pim  
Tel: (416) 444-8419 Fax: (416) 444-9866

#### **Nature Conservancy Canada**

110 Eglinton Avenue West, Suite 400  
Toronto, ON M4R 1A3  
Contact: Karen Sun  
Tel: (416) 932-3202 Fax: (416) 932-3208

#### **Ontario Federation of Agriculture**

40 Eglinton Avenue East, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON M4P 3A2  
Contact: Tina Schankula  
Tel: (416) 485-3333 Fax: (416) 485-9027

#### **Ontario Ministry of the Environment**

Land Use Policy Branch  
134 St. Clair Avenue West, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON M4V 1P5  
Contact: Marie Alles-Devos  
Tel: (416) 314-7015 Fax: (416) 314-7200

#### **Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing**

Provincial Planning and Environmental Services Branch  
777 Bay Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5  
Contacts: Usman Ahmed  
Tel: (416) 585-7181 Fax: (416) 585-6870

#### **Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources**

P.O. Box 7000  
300 Water Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, South Tower  
Peterborough, ON K9J 8M5

Contact: Fred Johnson  
Tel: (705) 755-1910 Fax: (705) 755-1971

#### **Ontario Professional Planners Institute**

234 Eglinton Avenue East, Suite 201  
Toronto, ON M4P 1K5

Contact: Don Campbell  
Planner, Regional Municipality of Niagara  
Box 1042  
Thorold, ON L2V 4T7  
Tel: (905) 984-3630 Fax: (905) 641-5208

#### **Urban Development Institute**

2025 Sheppard Avenue East, Suite 2208  
Willowdale, ON M2J 1V6  
Contact: Bruce Engell  
Tel: (416) 947-5081 Fax: (416) 365-1876

#### **World Wildlife Fund Canada**

245 Eglinton Avenue East, Suite 410  
Toronto, ON M4P 3J1

Contact: Tony Iacobelli  
Tel: (416) 489-4567 X269  
Fax: (416) 489-3611

Laura Nemchin  
Counsel  
Ministry of the Attorney General  
Legal Services Branch, Environment and  
Energy  
135 St. Clair Avenue West, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON M4V 1P5  
Tel: (416) 314-6534 Fax: (416) 314-6579

James Flagal  
Counsel  
Ministry of the Attorney General  
Legal Services Branch, Environment and  
Energy  
135 St. Clair Avenue West, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON M4V 1P5  
Tel: (416) 314-6488 Fax: (416) 314-6579

Gary Davidson  
The Community Development Group Ltd.  
P.O. Box 163  
Goderich, ON N7A 3Z2  
Tel: (519) 565-5374 Fax: (519) 524-5677

Nadja Davidson  
The Community Development Group Ltd.  
P.O. Box 88538, 34 Southport Street  
Toronto, ON M6S 4Z8  
Tel: (416) 763-0131 Fax: (416) 763-0954

## APPENDIX F

### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> The diamond indicates a measure of uncertainty resulting from the format of the natural heritage policy sets. The diamonds coincide with an inconsistency with Policy 2.3.1(a). The marked municipalities have no specific policies relating to the protection of significant wetlands and/or significant portions of the habitats of endangered and threatened species and permitted uses on lands adjacent to these areas. The municipalities, however, do have policies relating to permitted uses on lands adjacent to natural heritage areas as designated in their respective Official Plans.

<sup>2</sup> Official Plan for the County of Grey, p. 39

<sup>3</sup> Official Plan for the County of Perth, p. 90-91

<sup>4</sup> Official Plan for the County of Lambton, Section 8

<sup>5</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Haldimand-Norfolk, p. 66

<sup>6</sup> Official Plan for the County of Oxford, p. 3-69 - 3-70

<sup>7</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Haldimand-Norfolk, p. 66-67

<sup>8</sup> Official Plan for the County of Lambton, Section 8.1.3

<sup>9</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, p. 70-71

<sup>10</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of York (Office Consolidation as of July 01, 1998), p. 16

<sup>11</sup> “Amendment No. 5 to the Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth” from the Natural Heritage System Implementation Guide, p. 65

<sup>12</sup> Official Plan for the County of Huron (Revised Draft), p. 11

<sup>13</sup> Official Plan for the County of Lambton, 8.1.2

<sup>14</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (January 1996 Consolidation), p. 18-19

<sup>15</sup> Identification of significant woodland areas is no longer the responsibility of the Ministry of Natural Resources.

<sup>16</sup> Official Plan for the County of Oxford, p. 3-66 – 3-68

<sup>17</sup> Identification of significant woodland areas is no longer the responsibility of the Ministry of Natural Resources.

<sup>18</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (January 1996 Consolidation), p. 61-62

- <sup>19</sup> Official Plan for the County of Peterborough, p. 26-28
- <sup>20</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, p. 75
- <sup>21</sup> Official Plan for the County of Bruce, p. 154-156
- <sup>22</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (January 1996 Consolidation), p. 36-37
- <sup>23</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth, p. 59
- <sup>24</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, p. 72-73
- <sup>25</sup> Official Plan for the County of Lambton, Section 8.1
- <sup>26</sup> Official Plan for the County of Oxford, p. 3-42
- <sup>27</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, p. 80
- <sup>28</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Peel, p. 31-32
- <sup>29</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (January 1996 Consolidation), p.44
- <sup>30</sup> Official Plan for the County of Oxford, p. 3-47
- <sup>31</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, p. 74
- <sup>32</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Peel (Interim Office Consolidation, January 1998), p.9
- <sup>33</sup> Official Plan of the Region of Halton, p. 50
- <sup>34</sup> Official Plan for the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, p. 74-75
- <sup>35</sup> Official Plan of the Muskoka District Area, Section F, p. 3
- <sup>36</sup> Review of Existing Environmental Policies (Collective Official Plans for Metro, East York, Etobicoke, York, North York, Scarborough and the City of Toronto), Table 1A
- <sup>37</sup> The triangle indicates a measure of uncertainty resulting from the format and/or language of the natural heritage policy set. As noted, planning authorities employ a number of terms when developing natural environment policy and definitions are generally not consistent between official plans. For this reason, it is often quite difficult to determine the protective status of specific natural heritage features.
- <sup>38</sup> The circle stands in place of the words “no specific policy”. The varied language of environmental policy does not lend itself to “neat” divisions or distinct categories. A circle indicates that the county or region addresses the policy issue, but not in a manner consistent with the terminology of this classification.