

ROPA RQ62A – Response Document

Staff Analysis of Comments Received on ROPA Application RQ62A – “MEV” Received January 11, 2021 to May 30, 2022.

Overview

This document provides responses to written submissions received by Halton Region on Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) Application RQ62A from January 11, 2021 to May 30, 2022.

The document is organized into three columns: ‘Source’, ‘Submission’, and ‘Response’.

The submissions are organized chronologically.

Index of Submissions

No.	Commenter	Date Received	Page
1.	Conservation Halton	January 11, 2021	1 - 2
2.	Conseil Scolaire Catholique MonAvenir (CSCMA)	January 12, 2021	2
3.	Conseil Scolaire Viamonde (CSV)	January 13, 2021	2 - 3
4.	Halton District School Board	January 22, 2021	3 - 7
5.	Halton Catholic District School Board	March 9, 2021	7 - 10
6.	Caldwell Consulting	December 11, 2021	10 - 23
7.	Chris Harley, Milton resident	January 26, 2022	23
8.	Janice Smith, on behalf of Milton residents	January 27, 2022	24
9.	1062119 Ontario Inc., Milton resident	February 9, 2022	24
10.	Town of Milton (Applicant)	May 19, 2022	24 - 25

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>the PSW for this particular site. Permission is required from CH prior to undertaking any development within CH's regulated area and development must meet CH's <i>Policies and Guidelines for the Administration of Ontario Regulation 162/06</i> (https://conservationhalton.ca/policies-and-guidelines). Conservation Authority regulatory requirements are required to be met for any potential development within the Greenbelt Lands in addition to the requirements set out in the ROPA 51.</p> <p>The MEV Subwatershed Impact Study (SIS) is required to assess the impacts of development on the entire MEV site including those land included within the ROPA 51 Subject Lands. As part of the MEV SIS, confirmation of the limits of natural hazards will need to be completed, as well as review of the SWM infrastructure within the Greenbelt lands incorporated into the MEV SIS.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>CH staff appreciates the opportunity to review the Draft ROPA 51: Milton Education Village Complementary Greenbelt Lands Policy Area and are supportive of the approach taken with respect to potential complementary uses within the Greenbelt Land. CH looks forward to continuing to work with the Region of Halton and Town of Milton staff in the development within the MEV area.</p> <p>Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me by email at hdearlove@hrca.on.ca.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Heather Dearlove, B.Sc. Environmental Planner</p>	<p>Comments noted. Halton Region will continue to work with Conservation Halton and the Town of Milton in the development within the Milton Education Village Innovation District.</p>
2.	<p>Conseil Scolaire Catholique MonAvenir</p> <p>Email dated January 12, 2021</p>	<p>Hi Matt,</p> <p>No comments from Csc MonAvenir.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Albert M. Aazouz Director of Facilities and Planning</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
3.	<p>Counseil Scolaire Viamonde</p>	<p>Hi Matt,</p> <p>Thanks for the follow up.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
	<p>Email dated January 13, 2021</p>	<p>The Conseil scolaire Viamonde has no comment regarding the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA).</p> <p>Best regards and have a great day!</p> <p>Kenny Lamizana Planning Officer, Maintenance and Planning Department</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Halton District School Board</p> <p>Email dated January 22, 2021</p>	<p>Dear Mr. O. McCabe:</p> <p>Subject: Milton Education Village Proposed Amendment to the Halton Region Official Plan ROPA Application RQ62A Town Initiated Official Plan Amendment LOPA-07/20</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Town of Milton's Education Village Secondary Plan as circulated on January 11, 2021. The Halton District School Board represents English public schools in the four municipalities of Halton. As of October 1, 2020, there are approximately 16,600 students registered in public elementary and public secondary schools in Milton. The Town of Milton's student enrolments has increased by 36% since 2011. It is projected that with the current developments on file it will continue to increase by an additional 20% over the next 10 years.</p> <p>There are seventeen elementary schools and two secondary schools in Milton, with a new elementary school scheduled to open for January 2022, at the earliest (Milton SW #11 ps), a new elementary school to open for September 2022, and a new secondary school (Milton SW #1 hs) scheduled to open in September 2021. The majority of schools have enrolments above their On-The-Ground Capacity (OTG). Moreover, seven elementary schools and both high schools are projected to surpass total capacity within the next 10 years. The Halton District School Board does not build schools for peak enrolments but plans schools for stable long-term enrolments. Therefore, most new schools will require portables on opening day and for the first ten years, in Milton.</p> <p>The school board applies annually to the Ministry of Education (MOE) for capital funding for the construction of new schools as well as additions. Applications are made for new schools or additions to existing</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>schools within the next four years. Halton DSB has received funding for Milton SW #11 ps, Milton SW #12 ps, and Milton SW #1 hs.</p> <p>As a result of ongoing rapid residential growth in Milton, it provides accommodation challenges to the Halton DSB. The Halton DSB depends on collaboration with the Town of Milton in order to ensure that new schools and additions are planned and built in a timely fashion in order to meet the student accommodation needs.</p> <p>The Halton DSB has participated as a commenting agency in the Secondary and Tertiary planning of the Milton Education Village. All comments have been provided to the Town of Milton.</p> <p>Town Initiated Official Plan Amendments – Milton Education Village Comments</p> <p>C.12.4 Transportation</p> <p>1. Under C.12.4.5.3 b) Collector Roads, Halton DSB will support traffic calming measures applied to the areas located near elementary schools.</p> <p>C.12.5 Parks, Public Open Space, and Greenways</p> <p>2. Under C.12.5.5.2 Halton DSB supports the Greenway System of multifunctional corridors for active transportation as a connection to the elementary school.</p> <p><i>Halton DSB will support active transportation to and from schools.</i></p> <p><i>Halton DSB will not support a Greenway/Active Transportation Connection bisecting the school property, as shown on Schedule C.12.A and Schedule C.12.B.</i></p> <p><i>There should be no physical infrastructure (whether surface or subterranean) that bisect or encumber the efficient development of the site.</i></p> <p><i>Halton DSB will not encourage the general public to use these corridors on school property during school hours.</i></p> <p>C.12.6 Community Service and Facilities</p> <p>3. Under C.12.6.1.1 The Halton DSB been consulted with regards to the location of the elementary school. The designated location is acceptable to the Board.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. Regional Staff will continue to work with the Town of Milton and Halton District School Board to further refine Milton Education Village Innovation District's development concept.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>4. Under C.12.6.2.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. At this time Halton DSB does not have an alternative standard for high-density neighbourhood schools. One will need to be developed in collaboration with the Town in order to better understand design requirements and whether it will meet the Board's long-term accommodation needs. b. It should be noted that site size and layout of Halton DSB designs and builds are aimed to meet long-term enrolment needs (i.e. portables), sufficient parking for staff and visitors (as defined by the Town and needs), and outdoor play space. Where possible, the Halton DSB is willing to collaborate with the Town of Milton with the development of the park to ensure together we can optimize land utilization. c. In consideration of the above, the Board is not supportive of accepting a smaller site size until such a time the Board has satisfied itself that it is able to accommodate all site infrastructure efficiently, and effectively, without compromising exterior play space. d. Under the new Education Development Charges Guidelines, the Board is able to identify Alternative Accommodation Projects that may allow for alternative capital projects which can offset land needs. These should be discussed with the Board when the next EDC Background study is ready for review. <p>5. Under C.12.6.2.3, Halton DSB is funded by the Ministry of Education. Halton DSB will continue to encourage a collaborative relationship with other government agencies. Should the opportunity arise to secure additional funding sources Halton DSB will pursue any application to achieve alternative designs. Note that these are not guaranteed, especially with recent limitations in capital funding. More information is required to understand the policy requirements of when the Board is no longer able to explore other funding mechanisms, and are required to proceed with the construction of the school.</p> <p>C.12.9 Urban Design Under C.12.9.3</p>	<p>Comments noted. Regional Staff will continue to work with the Town of Milton and Halton District School Board to further refine Milton Education Village Innovation District's development concept.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>b), Halton DSB is willing to create a hub with other community facilities to serve as a focal point.</p> <p>l) Halton DSB supports barrier-free facilities such as a school park campus.</p> <p>As a general comment, the funding envelope provided by the Ministry of Education for the construction of schools is very limited and is based on a per square foot benchmark funding formulae. That said, the Board has finite resources, and may be limited in providing certain design elements that may be recommended in this policy section.</p> <p>C.12.10 Implementation</p> <p>Under C.12.10, the Board is supportive of phasing policies that provide for the necessary framework to advance school sites when pupil accommodation requirements are needed. The Board is also supportive of phasing policies that align the availability of school sites and neighbourhood parks to better allow for campus designs as contemplated under C.12.6.6.2. Using recent school construction timelines in Boyne and the Region as a whole, the Board anticipates it can take between 2-3 years to construct a school, pending the status and serviceability of the site when it is acquired by the Board.</p> <p>In consideration of the above timing, there are instances where the development approvals timelines for the landowners and the Board are not aligned, which may present challenges in the timely provision of serviced school sites. Drawing from lessons learned in the latest secondary plans in the Region of Halton, the Board would like to take the opportunity to discuss phasing strategies with the Town to enhance our existing coordination strategies in future school projects. Examples could include, but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensuring, where possible, that school sites are not tied to multiple SIS within the area. In the event they are, explore solutions on how the site could proceed with interim infrastructure in place. 2. Ensure school sites are located on a single landowner's property 3. Draft Plans of Subdivision that include a school site should demonstrate that in the event the school site is dependent on 	<p>Comments noted. The Region will continue to work with the Town of Milton and the Halton District School Board to ensure school sites concerns are properly addressed in the Milton Education Village development concept and implemented through local development applications.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>infrastructure outside of their land holdings (e.g. storm pond further south), how the site could be serviced in the interim (e.g. temp pond).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Draft Plans of Subdivision that don't include a school site, but include key infrastructure to service a school site should be required to extend services to the school block (ultimate or interim) in order to facilitate the timely delivery of school sites. 5. Where shared parking is an option with a community/neighbourhood park, but the timing of school and park are not aligned, identify interim solutions that can bridge the gap to ensure the ultimate neighbourhood benefits from a campus design. 6. Provide additional tools to Boards to access and prepare school sites as part of or outside of the Draft Plan of Subdivision process (e.g. ZBA, SPA). <p>The Halton District School Board at this time does support the Concept Plan with minor changes. If you have any questions or require further discussion, please contact Michelle D'Aguiar, Senior Planner, at 905 335-3663 (ext. 3395).</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Frederick Thibeault, MPI, BES General Manager of Planning HDSB</p>	
5.	<p>Halton Catholic District School Board</p> <p>Email dated March 9, 2021</p>	<p>Dear Owen:</p> <p>RE: Application for Regional Official Plan Amendment Milton Education Village Town of Milton Your File No.: RQ62A</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the application from the Town of Milton to amend the Halton Region Official Plan as it seeks to support the Town's planning vision for the Milton Education Village (MEV).</p> <p>The Halton Catholic District School Board (HCDSB) delivers high quality Catholic education programs at ten (10) elementary and two (2) secondary schools in the Town</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>of Milton. Together, these Public Service Facilities serve over 11,800 students within the Town of Milton, which represents a growth of over 127% since 2010 when the enrolment was a total of 5,227 students. With ongoing growth, it is anticipated that enrolment will increase by an additional 49% by 2030, to approximately 17,672 students.</p> <p>To address increasing enrolment demands, the HCDSB has three (3) planned elementary schools to open between 2022 and 2024, as well as one (1) secondary school currently under construction and scheduled to open in the 2023-2024 school year within the Boyne Secondary Plan area.</p> <p>These four (4) facilities are all planned to accommodate all growth anticipated from the Phase 3 Lands. The planned facilities currently identified in the Board's 2019 Long-Term Capital Plan are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milton #3 Catholic Secondary School (Cobben) – planned opening 2020-2021 school year • Milton #10 Catholic Elementary School (Cobben) – planned opening 2021-2022 school year • Milton #9 Catholic Elementary School (Walker) – planned opening 2022-2023 school year • Milton #11 Catholic Elementary School (Bowes) – planned opening 2024-2025 school year <p>The above timelines are dependent on Ministry funding, approvals, and construction timelines, and are subject to change.</p> <p>At present, all but two (2) existing elementary schools in the Town of Milton are operating with portables on site. The schools that have excess space are both operating above 90% facility utilization. Both will either receive additional students from the Milton Heights Secondary Plan or through boundary changes aimed at reducing enrolment pressures at other schools.</p> <p>The Town has engaged the HCDSB throughout the Milton Education Village Secondary Plan process. Comments provided to the Town on July 26, 2018 are attached to this letter.</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>It is understood that the one (1) elementary school and one (1) secondary school designated in the Land Use Plan were requested by other school boards. Based on the Board's current student yields for Milton, students can be accommodated in existing schools or planned schools in the Boyne Secondary Plan. As such, the Board will not be providing comments specific to the school sites designated within this Secondary Plan.</p> <p>The following additional comments are provided.</p> <p>C.12.4.3 Active Transportation – Walking and Cycling</p> <p>The Board is generally supportive of the development of safe active transportation linkages within communities to ensure that school-aged children can travel to/from school by walking, cycling or other active modes of travel.</p> <p>As there is no Catholic school designated within the Milton Education Village lands, elementary and secondary students will need to access schools east of Tremaine Road. To ensure students can safely travel across Tremaine Road, the Board is strongly supportive of grade separated active transportation links across Tremaine Road, given that the road for the most part has between 4-6 travel lanes, traffic circles at major intersections, and acts as a major north-south arterial road across Milton.</p> <p>In the absence of grade separated crossings, signalized crossings with crossing guards will need to be provided to ensure students can travel safely across major roads. The Board has provided similar comments in the past to the Town.</p> <p>C.12.4.4 Public Transit</p> <p>The Board is generally supportive of infrastructure that enhances transit services in the community to provide an alternative mode of transportation to secondary students for travel to/from school, places of employment, volunteering and other community services (e.g. sport fields, public libraries, community centres).</p>	<p>Comments noted. Regional Staff will continue to work with the Town of Milton and Halton Catholic District School Board to further refine Milton Education Village Innovation District's development concept.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>C.12.4.5 Street Network</p> <p>The Board is generally supportive of street design that enhances active transportation (e.g. walking, cycling) for students traveling to/from school, including provision of pedestrian friendly streets and traffic calming measures.</p> <p>C.12.6.2 Schools</p> <p>The Board does not have a designated elementary or secondary school within the Milton Education Village lands. Depending on future boundary reviews within the area, elementary students may be directed to Milton #9 CES in the Mattamy Varga lands subdivision (24T-14014/M) or Lumen Christi CES. Secondary students may be directed to St. Francis Xavier CSS.</p> <p>Due to the location of these schools east of Tremaine Road, the comments provided above under C.12.4.3, C.12.4.4 and C.12.4.5 apply as it relates to ensuring that safe connections to those facilities are provided.</p> <p>If you have any questions regarding the aforementioned, please contact the undersigned.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>Dhilan Gunasekara Planning Officer</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
6.	<p>Caldwell Consulting</p> <p>Comments dated December 11, 2021</p>	<p><u>RE: Peer Review of the Wilfrid Laurier University Milton Campus Agricultural Impact Assessment</u></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the Wilfrid Laurier University Milton Campus Agricultural Impact Assessment (referred to as the Laurier AIA within this document) prepared by DBH Soil Services Inc., dated October 2021.</p> <p>I have reviewed this document to ensure completeness and consistency with the Agricultural Impact Assessment Guidelines (2014) developed by the Region of Halton (Table 1). I have also reviewed the findings to determine their adequacy in addressing issues related to the interests of agriculture as stipulated within the Halton Region Guidelines.</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>At the outset it is appropriate to recognize the policy basis for the Agricultural Impact Assessment. The requirement for an AIA is established within provincial and regional planning documents. This policy direction reflects the goals of the region (and province) to protect agriculture and related agricultural interests. This includes both interests at the individual farm level and broader interests concerned with protecting the integrity of the overall agricultural system.</p> <p>Laurier AIA Overview</p> <p>As background to the AIA and this report it is worth repeating the following from the Laurier AIA (page 1):</p> <p><i>The vision for the WLU lands proposes future development of Green Infrastructure including but not limited to innovative storm water management systems and a broad range of activities related to the use of renewable resources and educational programming on the western portion of the WLU Milton Campus area extending westerly from the MEV Secondary Plan Area.</i></p> <p><i>The WLU Milton Campus lands include Part Lot 8 in Concession 7 in the Town of Milton, Regional Municipality of Halton. These lands are generally bounded by Bell School Line to the west, are included in the built area of Milton on the east, agricultural lands and woodlots to the north, and woodlots to the south. This study will be specific to the WLU Milton Campus lands that are located west of the built area of Milton.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed future development of these lands for the specific creation of Green Infrastructure within the Greenbelt, supporting the vision for the WLU Lands, requires the completion of an Agricultural Impact Assessment. The purpose of this AIA is to document the existing agricultural character, identify agricultural impacts (potential or real), and to provide avoidance or mitigative measures as necessary to offset any potential impacts. For this study, the WLU Campus area lands (located west of the MEV Secondary Plan Area) will be referred to as the Study Area.</i></p> <p><i>For the purpose of an Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) report, agricultural operations and activities are evaluated in a larger area, the Secondary Study Area, described as a potential zone of impact extending a minimum of 1500 m (1.5 km)</i></p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p><i>beyond the boundary of the Study Area. This minimum 1500 m (1.5 km) area of potential impact outside the Study Area is used to allow for characterization of the agricultural community and the assessment of impacts both on and in the immediate vicinity of the Study Area.</i></p> <p>While the above background materials refer to “future development of Green Infrastructure including but not limited to innovative storm water management systems and a broad range of activities related to the use of renewable resources and educational programming” the actual analysis completed by DBH focuses on “Green Infrastructure (Storm Water Management Ponds)”.</p> <p>Assessing Completeness of the Laurier AIA. The Regional Agricultural Impact Assessment Guidelines (https://www.halton.ca/Repository/Agricultural-Impact-Assessment-(AIA)-Guidelines) were used by DBH as a framework for completing the AIA. Figure 1 of these Guidelines, AIA Scope of Study summarizes the key components of an AIA. Table 1 of Regional Guidelines.</p> <p>In summary, I find that the Laurier AIA covers the elements of an AIA as identified within the Region’s Guidelines. It looks at both the “subject area” and a “secondary study area” to a distance of 1.5 km from the subject area. The AIA is comprehensive, and uses appropriate data sources. The main concerns identified in Table 1 will be reviewed later within this report, but largely hinge on the failure of the AIA to consider the broader range of uses contemplated by the applicants (i.e. in addition to storm water management ponds).</p> <p>There are 6 things that need to be done to enhance the completion of the AIA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The AIA needs to consider and conduct analysis reflecting the full range of uses contemplated by the applicants (educational programming, research, recreation, and outdoor classrooms/gathering, indigenous placemaking (including lodging facilities etc). These additional uses could impact agriculture in a number of ways, such as car traffic, foot or bike traffic, and lighting that could have an effect on neighbouring farms on Bell School Line. Additionally, these 	<p>Comments noted. As noted in Staff Report LPS42-22, although the Agricultural Impact Assessment generally addresses the requirements of the Region’s Agricultural Impact Assessment Guidelines, it requires further consideration and analysis reflecting the full range of uses contemplated by the applicants. ROPA 51 will require sufficient mitigation and alternatives analysis be conducted through the local development applications process to demonstrate consistency with Provincial and Regional policy.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>placemaking (including lodging facilities etc.) goes beyond the exemption for infrastructure provided by MDS Guideline 3. Indeed, beyond MDS considerations the impacts of these additional activities to an area that already has difficulty moving farm machinery in a safe manner could be substantial.</p> <p>5) Impacts on Agriculture, Mitigative Measures and Conclusions need to be refined based on the broader range of uses (including potential traffic impacts on Bell School Line) (See Table 1 for more details)</p> <p>6) There are clear requirements of the PPS when considering non-agricultural uses in prime agricultural areas (2.3.6.1b)). Additionally, the Greenbelt Plan has criteria for locating and constructing infrastructure in the Protected Countryside (4.2.1.2f/g)). There has been limited discussion on the need and evaluation of alternatives nor of the location of the “stormwater ponds”. Discussion of the demonstration of need and the evaluation of alternatives needs to be considered and is appropriate within the AIA.</p> <p>If the applicants clarify that the proposed uses will be limited to storm water management ponds than many of the issues flagged within this report will have been addressed subject to addressing item 2 above, addressing some specific mitigation measures outlined below and confirmation of need and evaluation of alternatives as identified in point 6 above (Greenbelt and PPS requirements) ²</p> <p>Assessing Adequacy of the Laurier AIA. As noted above if the proposed uses on the property are limited to Storm Water Management Ponds than the AIA does a good job of evaluating policy, reviewing agriculture resource potential, considering impacts, and reviewing mitigation. The accompanying documents (including the Justification Report, Communications from Laurier and the Draft ROPA), however imply a much broader range of uses, and these have not been evaluated within the Laurier</p>	<p>and Regional policies must be demonstrated prior to development being permitted.</p> <p>Comments noted. Refer to the response above for further information.</p> <p>Comments noted. Refer to the response above for further information.</p>

² As a general comment it is noted that some of the map references in the text are incorrect relative to the Map title.

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>AIA. Some of the resulting concerns are as follows:</p> <p>1) Failure to consider the full range of uses</p> <p>The Planning Justification Report – November 2020 (Page 26) indicates:</p> <p><i>“The proposed ROPA provides a site-specific policy set to enable consideration of green infrastructure, including naturalised stormwater management systems, and a broad range of activities related to the use of renewable resources, including education programming, within the Protected Countryside lands of the Greenbelt.”</i></p> <p>Further to this in an undated and unsigned memo to Milton and Halton from Wilfrid Laurier University they speak to “Enhancements to Greenbelt Land Use”. The memo notes:</p> <p><i>“This plan envisions integration of certain campus activities into the Greenbelt land to achieve broader objectives that coincide with Laurier’s academic mission and research interests.”</i></p> <p>The Memo goes on to indicate “<i>The enhanced use of the Greenbelt lands for stormwater management, research, recreation, and outdoor classrooms/gathering is desirable to achieve better community planning, integration with, and stewardship of the Greenbelt lands.</i>”</p> <p>In addition to stormwater management the memo indicates that the following land uses are desired: research, recreation, and outdoor classrooms/gathering. These uses are not discussed within the AIA.</p> <p>Further, the draft ROPA (Sept. 24, 2021) identified a number of uses. I bring specific attention to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) greenhouses associated with agricultural operations or scientific study, education and research purposes; iv) buildings and structures that may provide temporary lodging and board for the provision of programs and services of Indigenous place-making and culture camps; and 	<p>Comments noted. As noted in Staff Report LPS42-22, should the applicants propose uses outside of stormwater management systems, further consideration and analysis reflecting the full range of uses contemplated by the applicants will be required. ROPA 51 will require sufficient mitigation and alternatives analysis be conducted through the local development applications process to demonstrate consistency with Provincial and Regional policy.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>While the draft ROPA (Sept 24, 2021) does not include a legal description of the property or a map, a map prepared by Brook McIlroy (undated) entitled Conceptual Greenbelt and Campus Framework (Laurier Milton Campus Master Plan) shows an area labelled “Indigenous Placemaking”. This appears to be within the study area and it is assumed that it is within this area that temporary lodging and board facilities are contemplated. Likewise, greenhouses for scientific study, education and research purposes raises the potential to establish uses that are significantly different from the agricultural uses that have existed on the site for more than 100 years. Their potential location is not shown.</p>  <p>Conceptual Greenbelt and Campus Framework Laurier Milton Campus Master Plan Without Prejudice BrookMcIlroy</p> <p>It is understood that the Concept Plan for the WLU campus continues to evolve. Indeed there is a version of the concept plan that extends the subject area onto the lands to the north (which if maintained will require a revised AIA to address the revised subject area and secondary study area). There needs to be clarity on what is being proposed so that there is clarity on how to assess impacts to agriculture.</p> <p>The failure of the Laurier AIA to consider this range of uses, is a major concern. This range of uses goes beyond what is required to accommodate the proposed storm water management ponds. They have not been contemplated within the AIA and the resulting impact of these uses on agriculture and related policy is unknown.</p> <p>2) Minimum Distance Separation exclusions. Section 2.1.5 of the AIA includes the following section:</p> <p>2.1.5 MINIMUM DISTANCE SEPARATION Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) formulae were developed by OMAFRA to reduce and minimize nuisance complaints due to odour from livestock facilities and to reduce land use incompatibility. MDS Guideline # 3 states</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>“Certain proposed uses are not reasonably expected to be impacted by existing livestock facilities or anaerobic digesters and as a result, do not require an MDS I setback. Such uses may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extraction of minerals, petroleum resources and mineral aggregate resources; • infrastructure; and • landfills. <p>The proposed development of the Study Area would accommodate Green Infrastructure (storm water management ponds). As indicated in MDS Guideline #3, neither MDS 1 nor MDS 11 apply, as the proposed use is not reasonably expected to be impacted by existing livestock facilities.</p> <p>Therefore, MDS 1 calculations are NOT required for this study and have not been completed.</p> <p>While I agree that MDS Guideline 3 excludes storm water management ponds under the definition of infrastructure I do not believe that this excludes the range of uses outlined above and contemplated for the site. In my opinion, based on this range of requested uses MDS I calculations needs to be completed (or alternatively clear direction provided by the applicants that the only contemplated uses on the subject site are stormwater management ponds).</p> <p>3) Agricultural Policy Analysis The Policy Analysis section of the AIA covers a number of relevant plans and documents. These documents are Provincial, Regional and Local (Milton). This analysis focuses on the potential to establish Infrastructure (storm water management ponds) within the subject area. My review will bring focus to the Greenbelt Plan. The AIA report includes a number of key statements copied below:</p> <p><i>“With respect to this AIA, where the proposed future development of portions of the Study Area would comprise Green Infrastructure (storm water management ponds), the General Policies for the Protected Countryside are provided in Section 4.2 Infrastructure. Select policies, relevant to this AIA are provided below.”</i></p>	<p>Comments noted that MDS I analysis will be required for certain uses contemplated by the applicant and will be addressed as part of future local development applications. Conformity with Provincial and Regional policies must be demonstrated prior to development being permitted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>The AIA reports copies important sections of the Greenbelt Plan. I bring focus to these (emphasis added in bold):</p> <p><i>2. The location and construction of infrastructure and expansions, extensions, operations and maintenance of infrastructure in the Protected Countryside are subject to the following:</i></p> <p><i>a) Planning, design and construction practices shall minimize, wherever possible, the amount of the Greenbelt, and particularly the Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System, traversed and/or occupied by such infrastructure;</i></p> <p><i>c) Where practicable, existing capacity and co-ordination with different infrastructure services shall be optimized so that the rural and existing character of the Protected Countryside and the overall hierarchy of areas where growth will be accommodated in the GGH established by the Greenbelt Plan and the Growth Plan are supported and reinforced;</i></p> <p><i>f) New or expanding infrastructure shall avoid specialty crop areas and other prime agricultural areas in that order of priority, unless need has been demonstrated and it has been established that there is no reasonable alternative;</i></p> <p><i>g) Where infrastructure crosses prime agricultural areas, including specialty crop areas, an agricultural impact assessment or equivalent analysis as part of an environmental assessment shall be undertaken;</i></p> <p>The AIA Report (page 14) concludes: “Therefore, as identified in the Greenbelt Plan (2017) policy, infrastructure is an allowable land use within the Protected Countryside.”</p> <p>While the Greenbelt Plan certainly permits infrastructure in the Protected Countryside, it does so in a specific way. The key policies / considerations are identified below. It is important to note this as it provides additional context and tempers the conclusion reached by the AIA.</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>First, the Greenbelt Plan identifies overall objectives for infrastructure in the Protected Countryside (4.2.1.1 a) and b)) –infrastructure is permitted provided it meets one of these two objectives. If it does not than the use would not be permitted.</p> <p>Second, it subjects the location and construction of infrastructure to the criteria in 4.2.1.2, a, c, f, and g (above). These are critical considerations which require more detail demonstrating how these criteria have been met. Third, it subjects stormwater infrastructure to specific policy tests as set out in 4.2.3. While this may be beyond the AIA it is important to note that 4.2.3.3 prohibits storm water management facilities in key natural heritage features and their associated vegetation protection zones. This locational criteria further challenges the proposal. There are also other general policies related to natural heritage in the PPS, Greenbelt Plan, and Regional Official Plan that have a bearing on the proposal.</p> <p>I will also add the Definition of Infrastructure from the Greenbelt Plan: Infrastructure <i>Means physical structures (facilities and corridors) that form the foundation for development. Infrastructure includes: sewage and water systems, septage treatment systems, stormwater management systems, waste management systems, electricity generation facilities, electricity transmission and distribution systems, communications/telecommunications, transit and transportation corridors and facilities, oil and gas pipelines and associated facilities (PPS, 2014).</i></p> <p>As noted previously Stormwater Management Ponds are different than the much broader range of uses contemplated and applied for in various documents provided by the applicants.</p> <p>As noted above Sections a, c, f and g are critical to the review of the proposed use and have not been sufficiently answered by the AIA. In my view the applicants need to minimize the amount of land occupied by infrastructure; they need to maintain the rural and existing character of the Protected</p>	

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>Countryside and new infrastructure shall avoid prime agricultural areas, unless need has been demonstrated and it has been established that there is no reasonable alternative.</p> <p>There are several questions and observations that emanate from these policies. What is the minimum amount of land required to provide the required stormwater management capacity? How does the range of uses impact the rural and existing character of the Protected Countryside and finally if this use is to locate on prime land where is the evaluation that looks at alternatives? (perhaps within the previously designated area or in some other format).</p> <p>With regard to the establishment of these broader uses on the subject site they appear as an intrusion of an urban use into the countryside. Indeed, the storm water management ponds facilitate urban growth and expansion, not to mention the much broader range of uses contemplated for the site. How does this impact the willingness of farmers to make further investments in the secondary study area? How does this impact the long-term intent of the planning system to establish firm urban boundaries? As a minimum, if this infrastructure use (storm water management ponds) are required in this location and permitted by applicable policy they should occupy the least amount of land possible and physically locate as close as possible to the development.</p> <p>4) Traffic Analysis The AIA indicates there will be no traffic off of Bell School Line. If the permitted uses are limited to storm water management ponds this is probably a reasonable conclusion. Having said this, the range of permitted uses contemplated and the mapping shows pedestrian trails and maintenance access ways that exit onto Bell School Line (see Conceptual Greenbelt and Campus Framework map earlier in this report). It is not too difficult to imagine cars parked on the side of the road to access pedestrian trails or traffic wanting to use the maintenance access ways to access other contemplated facilities/uses on site.</p> <p>Given the range of broader uses it would be appropriate to revisit the potential for traffic issues on Bell School Line within the AIA.</p> <p>5) Mitigation: An analysis of mitigation can be reviewed in two ways.</p>	<p>Comments noted. As noted in Staff Report LPS42-22, OPA51 require demonstration through the local development applications of consistency with all applicable Provincial and Regional policy prior to development being permitted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>First, there are suggestions provided within the AIA report. These apply to the study area and include a range of actions such as fencing, signage, berms, vegetation screening, etc. These suggestions reflect the AIA assessment focused on storm water management ponds. The suggestions are reasonable enough given the use of the property for storm water management ponds only.</p> <p>A mitigative strategy identified within the AIA that should be repeated is that <i>“The design of the Green Infrastructure (storm water management ponds) should take into consideration to use the smallest footprint for the ponds.”</i></p> <p>Second, mitigative strategies need to be considered in the context of the broader range of uses that is mentioned in other documents and incorporated into the draft ROPA. Given that this analysis has not been completed as part of this AIA it is difficult to speculate on further mitigative strategies but they may relate to MDS I (would area farms be limited by the proposed development), compatibility, the potential for traffic onto Bell School Line, the presence of accommodations etc.). As an example the Region/Town may wish to consider a dedication of land to limit land access (pedestrian and vehicular) from Bell School Line.</p> <p><u>Summary and Recommendations</u> I find myself challenged by the Laurier AIA.</p> <p>It is one of the better AIA’s I have reviewed. It is comprehensive, well-written, uses appropriate data sources and presents them in a logical, reflective way. It must be noted, however, that there are gaps in the policy analysis (PPS, Greenbelt Plan), and a number of unanswered questions (such as how much land is actually required for the storm water management ponds, are there alternatives that avoid the previously farmed lands on the subject site, and are there additional mitigative measures to be pursued in response to these questions). This additional information is required to comment conclusively on the adequacy of the AIA in addressing subject area and secondary study area impacts. The existing AIA concludes that the impact on agriculture will be limited. This is a reasonable conclusion for the secondary study area if these four criteria are met. i) the use is limited to storm water management ponds, ii) the use complies with all applicable planning documents</p>	<p>Comments noted. As noted in Staff Report LPS42-22, ROPA 51 will require sufficient mitigation and alternatives analysis be conducted through the local development applications process to demonstrate consistency with Provincial and Regional policy.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>This would have the advantage of addressing a number of issues flagged within this analysis. It provides the most certainty for agriculture in the Secondary Study Area, it affirms the position of the Laurier AIA that MDS I calculations do not need to be completed, it minimizes the risk of traffic developing on Bell School Line related to trail or other uses on the property, it minimizes potential conflicts associated with lodging and other identified uses. It respects the Protected Countryside designation of the Greenbelt Plan, it prioritizes agriculture over development and it also provides the municipality with a certain level of certainty as to how this area will develop over time (vs. a range of uses that are not clearly defined that may evolve incrementally in the absence of clear policy for the subject property).</p> <p>I hope the above comments are helpful. If you have any questions please let me know.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Wayne Caldwell, PhD, RPP, FCIP President, Caldwell Consulting</p> <p><i>[please refer to Appendix 1 at the end of this document for a detailed comment table provided as an appendix to this submission]</i></p>	
7.	<p>Chris Harley Milton resident</p> <p>Comments via voicemail dated January 26, 2022</p>	<p>Hi, good morning Owen,</p> <p>My name is Chris Harley and I am calling on behalf of my mother. We own about 75 acres just north of the MEV, basically at the corner of Bell School Line along Derry Road, with the exception of one or two dwellings at the very corner.</p> <p>I understand that there has been a proposed amendment to change the zoning for the land behind the MEV towards Bell School Line. I want to get a little more information on that. We also did not receive any mail or notifications that some of our neighbors had. Not too sure why that is. Maybe you can shed some light and ensure that we are on your mailing list. Can you please call me back?</p> <p>Chris Harley</p>	<p>Clarification was provided in response to this submission explaining that the resident's lands are located beyond 120 metres from the lands subject to the application, and thus were not covered by the Region's mail out in accordance with the Planning Act. Statutory Public Meeting notice materials were forwarded to the resident.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
8.	<p>Janice Smith on behalf of Milton resident</p> <p>Comments via voicemail dated January 27, 2022</p>	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I am calling on behalf of a property owner. They are looking to get copies of three attachments that were from October. We haven't been able to find them.</p> <p>We are looking for the proposed MEV ROPA RQ62A the October 2021 version, the MEV Context Map, and the Wilfred University Greenbelt Lands Concept Plan. If you could please call me back that would be great.</p> <p>Thank you, Janice</p>	<p>Information requested were provided by regional staff in response to this submission.</p>
9.	<p>1062119 Ontario Inc. Milton Resident</p> <p>Comments via voicemail and email dated February 9, 2022.</p>	<p><i>Voicemail dated February 9, 2022</i></p> <p>Hi Owen,</p> <p>My name is Adrian Zulian. We received notice about a possible changing of zoning to a property that we own on Bell School Line, and the meeting is tomorrow. If you could give me a call back, I just have a couple of quick questions for you.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p><i>Email dated February 9, 2022</i></p> <p>Thank you Owen:</p> <p>We listened in and found the meeting quite interesting! The land we own is held in a corporation owned by 3 family members who all were able to listen in. We would like to be kept informed as to the next steps in the process and to have a link to the recording of the meeting.</p> <p>Can you direct us to the right person ... would that be the regional clerk?</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Adrian Zulian Director and Secretary 1062119 Ontario Inc.</p>	<p>The resident's contact information was added to the notification list as requested and directed to the Region's amendment project site for further information.</p> <p>Link to the meeting recording was provided by regional staff in response to this submission.</p> <p>Regional staff also advised that the proposed amendment would add additional permitted uses to the subject lands and would not change underlying zoning designations or permissions currently in place over the resident's lands, as a response to the resident's inquiries to the Regional Clerk.</p>
10.	<p>Town of Milton</p> <p>Email dated May 19, 2022</p>	<p>Good afternoon Laurielle</p> <p>I am writing to confirm that Town Staff support the approach taken by Regional Staff to incorporate the provisions for the MEV Complementary Greenbelt Lands in the Regional Official Plan.</p> <p>Town Staff consider that the proposed modified ROPA acknowledges and respects the unique nature of the proposal. The</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

No.	Source	Submission	Response
		<p>policy framework proposed in the modified ROPA provides a policy gateway that will enable the vision of a world class stormwater research facility to be realized. The Town of Milton are excited at the prospect of establishing a research facility that capitalizes on this unique location to address the pressing concerns of urban stormwater management and climate change in concert with the principles of good environmental stewardship and sustainable development.</p> <p>I can also confirm that the proposal will be implemented through local planning processes in the form of a Plan of Subdivision supported by relevant studies as required.</p> <p>Thank you for your co-operation and assistance on this important file for the Town of Milton and the Region of Halton.</p> <p>Best regards</p> <p>David Director, Planning Policy & Urban Design</p> <p><i>Follow up email dated May 19, 2022</i></p> <p>Hi Laurielle</p> <p>It is our view that a LOPA is not required. We anticipate implementing through the subdivision planning process.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>David Director, Planning Policy & Urban Design</p>	

Appendix 1 – Peer Review of Wilfrid Laurier University Milton Campus Agricultural Impact Assessment Comment - Table 1

Table 1: Assessing Completeness of the Laurier AIA.

Does the Laurier AIA include content consistent with individual guideline criteria identified in Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) Guidelines Regional Official Plan Guidelines (summarized in Figure 1, AIA Scope of Study)

AIA Content

Criteria to be addressed:	Comments
Summary	
Description of Proposal	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of application • Nature of Application 	<p>The specific description and nature of the application is not fully reviewed within the AIA. The AIA refers to Infrastructure uses related to Stormwater Management but remains silent on the broader range of uses that appear to be contemplated and are noted in the Introduction to the AIA and in other documents (research, recreation, and outdoor classrooms/gathering).</p> <p>Commentary and analysis should be provided in light of the range of uses contemplated with the Sept 24, 2021 draft ROPA</p> <p>The specific details of the subject amendment are not reviewed (these are included in the Justification Report and the Sept 24, 2021 draft ROPA) and should be reflected within the AIA.</p>
Policy Context	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPS – section 2.3.4 • PPS – section 2.3.5 • PPS – section 2.3.6 • PPS – section 2.4.4 • Greenbelt Plan • Growth Plan • Niagara Escarpment Plan • Regional Official Plan • Local Official Plan • Zoning By-law • Other (as Applicable) 	<p>While the applicability of these documents varies, the Laurier AIA reviews these guiding documents in appropriate detail. It is noted however that the analysis is largely limited to storm water management ponds in the context of Infrastructure. The analysis does not speak to the broader range of uses that are contemplated (educational programming, research, recreation, and outdoor classrooms/gathering, indigenous placemaking (including lodging facilities etc). As a result some of the conclusions and observations can be questioned.</p>
Physical Resource inventory	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-site – Soils • On-site – Climate • On-site – Topography • On-site - Drainage • Off-site – Soils • Off-site – Climate • Off-site – Topography • Off-site - Drainage 	<p>The Laurier AIA reviews each of these physical resource attributes drawing upon generally accepted data sources. The level of analysis is appropriate.</p> <p>The AIA notes that the subject lands are class 1 according to the CLI. The report also notes that there are wetlands on site and that these areas would be more appropriately classified as class 5w. It is noted that there are related issues of drainage although cropping occurred historically over a significant portion of lot 8, concession 7 and to the portion of that lot that comprises the study area.</p> <p>It should be noted that much of this property was farmed for many, many decades prior to more recently being taken out of crop production.</p>

On-Site Land Use Features	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Past Farming Practices • Existing production • Non-Ag land use on site • Parcel characteristics • Farm management • Capital investment 	<p>It would be helpful if the AIA provided a more detailed history of agriculture on the subject site (when was it most recently cropped, was it part of a neighbouring farm, why was it removed from crop production etc). While it is currently identified as an “open field”, historic air photos suggests that it was cropped until relatively recently. Indeed a visual inspection leads one to conclude that the potential for cropping is similar to that of the field to the immediate north.</p> <p>Review of a 1954 air photo for example (Lot 8, Concession 7) portrays a relatively typical farm with the subject lands including both woodlot and farm fields (Air photo extract showing this parcel to the right):</p>  <p>Other aspects of on-site land use are reviewed in appropriate detail. The one water well on the subject parcel is noted.</p>
Off-Site Land Use Features	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surrounding land use types • Existing and potential constraints • Land Use, lotting and tenure patterns 	<p>The Laurier AIA considers surrounding land use and Existing and Potential Constraints to On-site Agriculture. The Secondary area is covered to a distance of 1.5 km. Figures 13, 14 and 15 for example cover Land Use, Agricultural Investment and Fragmentation in appropriate detail.</p> <p>The methods for the collection of this data are appropriate (especially in the context of Covid). The review of agricultural facilities within the secondary study area includes quality information and detail. Likewise the study of drainage and water wells appears to be complete.</p> <p>Of interest the presentation of results (for example Table 2 of the AIA) appears to include the existing designated and built up area to the east and north-east of the subject lands (i.e. urban lands within Milton). The end result is that this significantly downplays the prevalence of agriculture within the remaining Secondary Study area. Whether the data should or should not be presented this way is a point for debate, but the effect should be noted.</p> <p>The issue of fragmentation is important and the AIA reviews this in some detail. It is perhaps worth noting that much of this fragmentation is historic. The Region has had a rigorous framework in place for many years that has effectively limited severances that contribute to fragmentation in the rural areas.</p>

Agricultural Viability	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site/property • Neighbouring operations 	The use of census data and the agricultural systems portal of OMAFRA is effective in capturing broader economic trends.
Impacts on Agriculture	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of resources • Effect on surrounding lands • Character of the area • Cumulative Impacts 	<p>The AIA provides rational for not completing an MDS review. This is based on the proposed use consisting of Stormwater Management Ponds. This appears to ignore the broader range of uses contemplated by the applicants. For example Laurier has indicated: <i>“The enhanced use of the Greenbelt lands for stormwater management, research, recreation, and outdoor classrooms/gathering (emphasis added) is desirable to achieve better community planning, integration with, and stewardship of the Greenbelt lands.”</i></p> <p>The AIA report concludes that there will be minimal on and off site impacts on agriculture. This conclusion is captured in the very last point of section 5.1: <i>“Disruption to surrounding farm operations – there should be no disruption for surrounding/adjacent farms as the proposed future development would be the creation/construction of Green Infrastructure (storm water management ponds).”</i></p> <p>As noted previously the AIA report considers a single land use - storm water management ponds and does not take into account the broader range of uses that are contemplated by the application.</p> <p>Likewise the AIA report concludes: “The proposed future development of the Study Area lands for Green Infrastructure (storm water management ponds) will not result in an increase in traffic.” This fails to consider the potential for unrelated uses that are physically close to Bell School Line and which have the potential to generate related parking and traffic issues over time (maintenance access ways, pedestrian trails, recreation, indigenous place making (lodgings) etc). Bell School Line has limited capacity and is used by farm vehicles and equipment.</p> <p>If there are only storm management ponds, will there be lighting in and around these? Where will they be located and exactly how many? Lighting on neighbouring crops has been reported to delay maturation in soybeans resulting in reduced yields and impacting farm revenue. Additional information is needed to assess potential impacts.</p>
Mitigative Measures	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures to reduce impacts • Notices (item 2.9 c) 	<p>This is covered in Section 5.4 of the AIA report.</p> <p>Section 5.4.1 Avoidance concludes with: <i>There may be a loss of the use of all, or a portion of, the small areas of designated agricultural lands, if the agricultural lands are not within the Dillon Consulting defined wetland portions of the Study Area. Any potential loss of lands (agriculture or non-agriculture) will be dependent on the design and location of the Green Infrastructure within the Study Area lands. It should be noted that the lands that will be used for the Green Infrastructure (storm water management ponds) and is an allowed land use within the Greenbelt Protected Countryside.</i></p> <p>Section 5.4.2 Avoidance concludes with:</p>

	<p><i>As the loss of lands cannot be avoided, mitigation should limit the amount of land lost and direct the design of the Green Infrastructure to avoid the Prime Agricultural areas. The design of the Green Infrastructure (storm water management ponds) should take into consideration to use the smallest footprint for the ponds.</i></p> <p>Section 5.4.3 Mitigating Impacts offers a number of suggestions related to the use of Storm Water Management Ponds. The resulting conclusion is:</p> <p><i>It has been identified previously in this AIA report, that there will be no impacts to the adjacent agricultural lands. Therefore, these mitigation measures are provided as potential enhancements to the Study Area lands.</i></p> <p>Specifically Section 5.4.3 offers a number of strategies such as fencing, signage, berms, vegetation screening, etc. These are to be located on the subject site.</p>
Conclusions	<p>Section 6 provides a Summary and Conclusions. The section provides an abbreviated summary of the findings of the AIA as presented within the report.</p> <p>It concludes with the paragraph:</p> <p><i>Given the geographical location of these lands, it is the conclusion of this study that the proposed future development of portions of the Study Area lands for Green Infrastructure (storm water management ponds) would have no impact on the surrounding agricultural activities within the Secondary Study Area. It is also the conclusion of this study that the proposed future development for Green Infrastructure is an allowed use of lands and it is my opinion that these lands can reasonably be developed for Green Infrastructure.</i></p>
Background Information	<p>Appendices are included that provide photos, CLI information and CV's.</p>