

Natural Heritage Policy and Planning Protection-Analysis of Official Plans and Municipal Surveys in the Land Between

Katie Allen

**Trent University
Environmental Law
December 2007**

The aim of the project

The project's aim was to assess trends in Natural Heritage Planning and protection across the region of The Land Between; to gather information on review dates of Official Plans; as well as anecdotal data on development for comparisons across the region of the Land Between.

The Methodology

The methodology employed was the creation and distribution of surveys to the County planners and clerks in Upper Tier Municipalities across The Land Between. There were two surveys: one sent to the planner that detailed questions from a planning background, and the other survey was sent to the county clerk and contained three questions on development trends such as applications for severances, condominiums, and new subdivisions. The latter also included questions on site applications for shoreline developments.

The surveys were sent to Peterborough County, Haliburton County, Hastings County, Simcoe County, Muskoka, Stone Mills and Addington highlands. Unfortunately not all of the counties replied such as Muskoka, Addington Highlands and Stone Mills.

After the surveys were collected the Official Plans for the Counties were then obtained and reviewed for policy and direction on Natural Heritage with a focus on sensitive species and spaces. These were analyzed and then were compared to the survey results.

Peterborough County

Official Plans Timing and Review

This table states the timing, schedules available and time of the last update of the Official Plan as answered by the survey questions.

Timing of Review	Schedules	Last Updated
Within the next two years but the focus will be on implementing the Provincial Growth Plan (Places to Grow Legislation)	Full review with the focus of the Provincial Growth Plan. There are no sensitive species or significant features outlined in the schedules. There are two map schedules in the Official Plan.	March 2006 by the Province

Development Trends

This table stipulates the results of the survey sent to the Peterborough clerk on development trends in the area.

Applications for subdivisions or condominiums in the past 12 months	Applications for land Severances in the past 12 months	Site applications for new developments along shorelines in the past 12 months
None to date	To date the Land Division Office has received a total of 177 applications since January 1, 2007. These applications are scattered throughout the entire County of Peterborough. Severance applications do not only relate to the creation of new lots but are also required for lot line adjustments, easements and right-of-ways. The 177 applications that have received are for all these purposes and are not all for lot creation.	None

Natural Heritage Values

This table examines the Natural Heritage Values of Peterborough County that are direct from the County Official Plan. General Comment: s. 4.1.3 an environmental impact assessment for proposed development in or adjacent to a significant natural heritage feature will include as its study area the natural heritage feature as well as the area surrounding that type of feature, as follows:

Significant Wildlife Habitat	Significant Habitat for endangered or threatened species	Head Waters	Significant Wetlands	Fish Habitat	Areas of Restoration
Sec. 4.1.3.4 significant wildlife habitat - all lands within 50 metres	Sec 4.1.3.4 Development and site alterations within significant portions of the habitat of endangered and threatened species is not	Policy to have local OP's identify and protect strategic water sources, also recognizes more work by the	Sec 4.1.3.4 Local plans will prohibit development and site alterations within the of this <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant natural heritage feature. Significant wetlands - all lands 	Sec 4.1.3.4 fish habitat - all lands are protected from development within 30 meters	General policy to encourage restoration of linkages

	<p>permitted. Significant portions of the habitat of endangered and threatened species - all lands within 50 metres.</p> <p>The local municipalities must identify such features in their own plans. The county plan states that these features must be evaluated where they have been identified by the local plan or by the Ministry of Natural Resources.</p>	<p>Conservation Authority is underway/required.</p>	<p>surrounding within 120 metres are protected from development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local municipalities must identify such features in their own plans. The county plan states that these features must be evaluated where they have been identified by the local plan or by the Ministry of Natural Resources 	<p>of the high water mark of all watercourses.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--

Significant Woodlands	Significant Valley Lands	ANSI s	Corridors	Areas of important ecological function (from which question in the survey?...please be specific. headwaters etc.)
<p>significant woodlands south of the southern limit of the Canadian Shield - all lands surrounding within 50 metres.</p> <p>The local municipalities must identify such features in their own plans. The county plan states that these features must be evaluated where they have been identified by the local plan or by the Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>significant valley lands south of the southern limit of the Canadian Shield - all lands surrounding within 50 metres</p> <p>Local plans permit development in significant valleylands south and east of the Canadian Shield however there must be an environmental impact assessment must be completed.</p>	<p>significant areas of natural and scientific interest - all lands surrounding within 50 metres;</p> <p>Development is permitted if an Environmental Impact assessment is completed and states that there will be no impact to the natural area.</p>	<p>Policy to encourage connectivity of Natural Heritage features and corridors</p>	<p>Development on such areas will be permitted if an Environmental impact study is completed, and it reveals that there is no impact.</p>

Significant Wildlife Habitat	Significant Habitat for endangered or threatened species	Head Waters	Significant Wetlands	Fish Habitat	Areas of Restoration
The local municipalities must identify such features in their own plans. The county plan states that these features must be evaluated where they have been identified by the local plan or by the Ministry of Natural Resources	The local municipalities must identify such features in their own plans. The county plan states that these features must be evaluated where they have been identified by the local plan or by the Ministry of Natural Resources.	Policy to have local OP's identify and protect strategic water sources, also recognizes more work by the Conservation Authority is underway/required.	PSW are protected and development is prohibited, however and environmental impact study is required for development adjacent to PSW's.	No development permitted within identified fish habitat areas except in accordance with Provincial and Federal regulations.	General policy to encourage restoration of linkages.

Question 7

This table breaks down the answers to question 7 in the survey that was answered by the County Planner on the protection of natural Heritage Values.

Significant Woodlands	Significant Valley Lands	ANSI s	Corridors	Areas of important ecological function
The local municipalities must identify such features in their own plans. The county plan states that these features must be evaluated where they have been identified by the local plan or by the Ministry of Natural Resources	Development is permitted if an Environmental Impact assessment is completed and states that there will be no impact to the natural area.	Development is permitted if an Environmental Impact assessment is completed and states that there will be no impact to the natural area.	Policy to encourage connectivity of Natural Heritage features and corridors.	Where areas of importance are known, there is a policy to protect.

This survey sets out the answers to questions 4, 5, 6, 1 of the planner survey. It addresses sensitive species and environmental designation within the Official Plan.

4.Are sensitive species or Designated significant features /sites outlined in the	5.Sensitive and Natural Areas and Species at Risk addressed within the Official Plan	6. Estimated total area or portion of the municipality under environmental designation.	10. What environmental policies govern the management of municipally owned or controlled open space lands
--	---	--	--

schedule			
N/A	<p>Zoning by-laws are a local responsibility, the county is not involved</p> <p>The Upper Tier plan directs the scope of the local OP; it states that municipalities must identify such features within their own plans.</p>	<p>The Upper Tier plan directs the scope of the local OP; it states that municipalities must identify such features within their own plans. Thus this estimation would fall under the responsibility of the municipality.</p>	<p>OP makes reference to County-owned forest and its use for managed forest health practices and for the establishment of a recreational trails network.</p>

Peterborough County Summary and Discussion

In the County of Peterborough there are no targets set for natural cover or open spaces such as along water courses, area, shorelines or public access beaches. Peterborough also does not have an environmental advisory committee. However, the county does utilize the Natural Heritage Information Centre (NHIC) database when planning. The County was asked how within the Official Plan certain environmental issues were addressed and to what degree. The answers are coming from the perspective of the County Planner Bryan Weir on a scale of 1 (limited) 3 (General) and 5 (detailed).

- Areas with shallow soils are limited and received a 1.
- Shoreline health is an issue that is stringently dealt with as it received a 5, and there is a mandatory 100 foot setback from waterfront for all new lot creations, and there is encouragement of naturalized buffers.
- Natural Heritage connections/linkages are generally addressed as there is one of encouragement and not a mandatory policy dealing with this issue.
- Water conservancy/quantity is again generally addressed receiving a 2. This also has a policy that is of encouragement and not mandatory to follow.
- Water quality has a policy that is also of encouragement, however recognizes more study by the Conservation Authority is ongoing/required.
- Coordination with neighboring counties/ municipalities on environmental issues is limited.

Currently the County of Peterborough has an overall acceptable amount of protection to the level of development. Each Natural Heritage Value site has been identified in the Official Plan easily and states the clear protection of the area and zoning around the identified lands or water sources. As Peterborough County continues to develop the Official Plans designations will have to conform to the growing population and development threats to species and sensitive areas. Areas that could use more attention to protection are areas with shallow soils, water conservancy/quantity and coordination with neighboring counties/municipalities. Most of the policies addressing these issues are policies of encouragement and nothing substantial to back up the protection of these values. Also most designations fall under the lower tier responsibility allowing for the upper tier plan to direct the scope of the lower tier plan. This is because zoning bylaws fall under the local responsibility in regards to sensitive species and environmental designation.

County of Haliburton

Official Plans Timing and Review

This table states the timing, schedules available and time of the last update of the Official Plan as answered by the survey questions.

Timing of Review	Schedules	Last Updated
Current Official Plan was approved March 2006; therefore 5 year review is due in March 2011.	3 maps	The current OP was last updated in March 2006.

Development Trends

This table stipulates the results of the survey sent to the Peterborough clerk.

Applications for subdivisions or condominiums in the past 12 months	Applications for land Severances in the past 12 months	Site applications for new developments along shorelines in the past 12 months
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2006- 132. • year to date 91 	None, site plan approval is a responsibility of the local municipalities.

Natural Heritage Values

This table examines the Natural Heritage Values of Peterborough County that are direct from the County Official Plan. Development and site alteration may be permitted on adjacent lands in accordance with policies of the local Official Plans and provided that it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on the ecological function for which the area is identified.

Significant Wildlife Habitat	Significant Habitat for endangered or threatened species	Head Waters	Significant Wetlands	Fish Habitat	Areas of Restoration
Sec 3.10.6 These features shall be identified in accordance with criteria provided by the Province on a site specific basis or	Sec 3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as	N/A	Sec 3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and	Sec 3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the	N/A

<p>through the appropriate study such as a natural heritage evaluation</p>	<p>provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.8 Where new development or site alteration is proposed within the minimum area of influence identified in the Table of the ORMCP surrounding a key natural heritage feature a natural heritage evaluation and/or a hydrological evaluation, as detailed in the ORMCP is required. An evaluation may result in the minimum vegetation protection zone being greater than that shown in the Table in part III of the ORMCP.</p> <p>Sec 3.10.9 where a minor change may affect a wetland, area of natural and scientific interest (life science and earth science) and significant portions of the habitat of endangered, rare and threatened species, confirmation will be required from the Ministry of Natural Resources</p>		<p>35(4) of the ORMCP.</p> <p>where a minor change may affect a wetland, area of natural and scientific interest (life science and earth science) and significant portions of the habitat of endangered, rare and threatened species, confirmation will be required from the Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.8 Where new development or site alteration is proposed within the minimum area of influence identified in the Table of the ORMCP surrounding a key natural heritage feature a natural heritage evaluation and/or a hydrological evaluation, as detailed in the ORMCP is required. An evaluation may result in the minimum vegetation protection zone being greater than that shown in the Table in part III of the ORMCP.</p>	
--	---	--	--	---	--

Significant Woodlands	Significant Valley Lands	ANSI s	Corridors	Areas of important ecological
<p>Sec 3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part</p>	<p>Sec. 3.10.6 These features shall be identified in accordance with criteria provided by the Province on a site specific basis or through</p>	<p>Sec 3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.8 Where new development or site alteration is proposed within the minimum area of influence identified in the Table of the ORMCP surrounding a key natural heritage feature and/or a hydrologically sensitive feature, a natural heritage evaluation and/or a hydrological evaluation, as detailed in the ORMCP is required. An evaluation may result in the minimum vegetation protection zone being greater than that shown in the Table in part III of the ORMCP.</p>	<p>the appropriate study such as a natural heritage evaluation.</p>	<p>35(4) of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.8 Where new development or site alteration is proposed within the minimum area of influence identified in the Table of the ORMCP surrounding a key natural heritage feature a natural heritage evaluation and/or as detailed in the ORMCP is required. An evaluation may result in the minimum vegetation protection zone being greater than that shown in the Table in part III of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.9 where a minor change may affect a wetland, area of natural and scientific interest (life science and earth science) and significant portions of the habitat of endangered, rare and threatened species, confirmation will be required from the Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	
---	---	--	--

Questions from Survey 4, 5, 6, 10

This survey sets out the answers to questions 4, 5, 6, 1 of the planner survey. It addresses sensitive species and environmental designation within the Official Plan.

4.Are sensitive species or Designated significant features /sites outlined in the schedule	5.Sensitive and Natural Areas and Species at Risk addressed within the Official Plan	6. Estimated total area or portion of the municipality under environmental designation.	10. What environmental policies govern the management of municipally owned or controlled open space lands
Yes	<p>General policies outlining policies to be included on local OP's as well as Specific Policies relating to cold water lake trout habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoning By-laws N/A • In conservation bylaws and approval requirements • Tree cutting by-laws 	5%	The county OP sets common policy direction but is specific in only very limited areas, Local OP's contain these types of policies.

Question 7

This table breaks down the answers to question 7 in the survey that were answered by the County Planner on the protection of natural Heritage Values.

Significant Woodlands	Significant Valley Lands	ANSI s	Corridors	Areas of important ecological function
General policy - prohibits development and site alteration within significant features and requires local official plans to further identify areas. Requires local official plans to set out policies that will only permit development in adjacent lands if it can be shown that there will be no negative impacts.	General policy - prohibits development and site alteration within significant features and requires local official plans to further identify areas. Requires local official plans to set out policies that will only permit development in adjacent lands if it can be shown that there will be no negative impacts.	General policy - prohibits development and site alteration within significant features and requires local official plans to further identify areas. Requires local official plans to set out policies that will only permit development in adjacent lands if it can be shown that there will be no negative impacts.	General policy - prohibits development and site alteration within habitat and requires local official plans to further identify areas. Requires local official plans to set out policies that will only permit development in adjacent lands if it can be shown that there will be no negative impacts.	General policy - prohibits development and site alteration within habitat and requires local official plans to further identify areas. Requires local official plans to set out policies that will only permit development in adjacent lands if it can be shown that there will be no negative impacts.

Signifiican Wildlife Habitat	Significant Habitat for endangered species	Head Waters	Significant Wetlands	Fish habitats	Areas of Restoration
General policy - prohibits development and site alteration within habitat and requires local official plans to further identify areas. Requires local official plans to set out policies that will only permit development in adjacent lands if it can be shown that there will	General policy - prohibits development and site alteration within habitat and requires local official plans to further identify areas. Requires local official plans to set out policies that will only permit development in adjacent lands if it can be shown that there will be	General policy - requires protection of ground and surface water and improvement where degradation has occurred. County is headwater for six tertiary watersheds and has (and continues) to participate in several provincial research initiatives geared to	General policy - prohibits development and site alteration within significant features and requires local official plans to further identify areas. Requires local official plans to set out policies that will only permit development in	Specific policies - permits development on adjacent lands if the proposal complies with one of six very stringent criteria, all of which ensure that the lake capacity is not decreased and may in fact be	Not specifically dealt with in upper tier plan.

be no negative impacts.	no negative impacts.	protecting the headwaters for the long-term.	adjacent lands if it can be shown that there will be no negative impacts.	improved. These policies are to be supported and complimented by the local official plans and override the local plan should conflict arise. However there isn't any conflict between the local plans and the County plan.	
-------------------------	----------------------	--	---	--	--

Haliburton County

Summary/ Discussion

Haliburton does not have an environmental committee. The natural Heritage Information Centre is not directly utilized however, studies are submitted and peer review consultants use the database on a regular basis when planning. The Natural Heritage reference Manual is used as a basis for the requirements for several studies required in support of development applications. When utilizing the Natural Heritage Reference manual it included such areas as: shallow soils, shoreline health, Natural heritage connections/linkages, water conservancy/quantity, water quality, coordination with neighboring counties as well as monitoring these areas. The survey section on perspectives was not completed.

In regards to protected areas this has shown that the upper tier Official Plan has set out the scope of the protected areas, however it is under the responsibility of the lower tier municipalities to identify these areas in the schedules and plans. There are general policies that are set out to protect the significant features and prohibit development. For an in depth analysis the lower tier Official Plans would need to be examined in order to have a very clear outline regarding to protection of the Natural Heritage features and sensitive species in the local areas.

Simcoe County

Official Plans Timing and Review

Timing of Review	Schedules	Last Updated
The review of the County Official Plan is as commenced.	At least 10	The Plan was approved by the OMB Nov. 1999

Development Trends

Based on questions answered in the clerk survey

Applications for subdivisions or condominiums in the past 12 months	Applications for land Severances in the past 12 months	Site applications for new developments along shorelines in the past 12 months
Simcoe County is the approval authority of Condo/Subdivisions for 7 lower tier municipalities, there is a total of 16 lower tier municipalities in the County, therefore the # of applications provided by the County is only for the 7 municipalities for which we are the approval authority =_27 [from Jan 07 – Nov 07]	The County is a commenting agency for all the consent applications in the County [from Jan 07- Nov 07] = approx. 325 applications	Approximately 150 Consent applications are along a shoreline and approximately 10 Condo/Subdivision applications are along a shoreline of the 7 municipalities of which we are the approval authority for subdivisions.

Natural Heritage Values

This table examines the Natural Heritage Values of Peterborough County that are direct from the County Official Plan. Simcoe County has not updated the County OP to be in conformity with the PPS 2005 – that is part of a review process. Such features where known have been part of our natural heritage system units.

Significant Wildlife Habitat	Significant Habitat for endangered or threatened species	Head Waters	Significant Wetlands	Fish Habitat	Areas of Restoration
Sem 3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2)	Sem 3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP	Sem 3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2)	Sem 3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP	Sem 3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP	Sem 3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in

and 35(4) of the ORMCP		and 35(4) of the ORMCP		except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP	Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP
------------------------	--	------------------------	--	--	--

Significant Woodlands	Significant Valley Lands	ANSI s	Corridors	Areas of important ecological function
<p>3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.8 Where new development or site alteration is proposed within the minimum area of influence identified in the Table of the ORMCP surrounding a key natural heritage feature and/or a hydrologically sensitive feature, a natural heritage evaluation and/or a hydrological evaluation, as detailed in the ORMCP is required. An</p>	<p>3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.8 Where new development or site alteration is proposed within the minimum area of influence identified in the Table of the ORMCP surrounding a key natural heritage feature</p>	<p>3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.8 Where new development or site alteration is proposed within the minimum area of influence identified in the Table of the ORMCP surrounding a key natural heritage feature and/or a hydrologically sensitive feature, a natural heritage evaluation and/or a hydrological evaluation, as detailed in the ORMCP is required. An</p>	<p>3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.8 Where new development or site alteration is proposed within the minimum area of influence identified in the Table of the ORMCP surrounding a key natural heritage feature and/or a hydrologically sensitive feature, a natural heritage evaluation and/or a</p>	<p>3.10.7 Development and site alteration shall be prohibited within key natural heritage features and hydrologically sensitive features and their related minimum vegetation protection zone of 30 metres or as identified in the Table in Part III of the ORMCP except as provided for in Sections 22(2), 26(2) and 35(4) of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.8 Where new development or site alteration is proposed within the minimum area of influence identified in the Table of the ORMCP surrounding a key natural heritage feature and/or a hydrologically sensitive feature, a natural heritage evaluation and/or a hydrological</p>

<p>evaluation may result in the minimum vegetation protection zone being greater than that shown in the Table in part III of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.9 Site specific studies conducted in accordance with the requirements of the ORMCP or updated information from the <i>Province</i>, resulting in minor changes to the extent or presence of key natural heritage features or hydrologically sensitive features will not require an amendment to this Plan.</p>	<p>and/or a hydrologically sensitive feature, a natural heritage evaluation and/or a hydrological evaluation, as detailed in the ORMCP is required. An evaluation may result in the minimum vegetation protection zone being greater than that shown in the Table in part III of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.9 Site specific studies conducted in accordance with the requirements of the ORMCP or updated information from the <i>Province</i>, resulting in minor changes to the extent or presence of key natural heritage features or hydrologically sensitive features will not require an amendment to this Plan.</p>	<p>evaluation may result in the minimum vegetation protection zone being greater than that shown in the Table in part III of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.9 Site specific studies conducted in accordance with the requirements of the ORMCP or updated information from the <i>Province</i>, resulting in minor changes to the extent or presence of key natural heritage features or hydrologically sensitive features will not require an amendment to this Plan.</p>	<p>hydrological evaluation, as detailed in the ORMCP is required. An evaluation may result in the minimum vegetation protection zone being greater than that shown in the Table in part III of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.9 Site specific studies conducted in accordance with the requirements of the ORMCP or updated information from the <i>Province</i>, resulting in minor changes to the extent or presence of key natural heritage features or hydrologically sensitive features will not require an amendment to this Plan.</p>	<p>evaluation, as detailed in the ORMCP is required. An evaluation may result in the minimum vegetation protection zone being greater than that shown in the Table in part III of the ORMCP.</p> <p>3.10.9 Site specific studies conducted in accordance with the requirements of the ORMCP or updated information from the <i>Province</i>, resulting in minor changes to the extent or presence of key natural heritage features or hydrologically sensitive features will not require an amendment to this Plan.</p>
---	---	---	---	--

Question 7

This table breaks down the answers to question 7 in the survey that were answered by the County Planner on the protection of natural

Significant Woodlands	Significant Valley Lands	ANSI s	Corridors	Areas of important ecological function etc.)
<p>significant woodlands south of the southern limit of the Canadian Shield - all lands surrounding within 50 metres.</p> <p>The local municipalities must identify such features in their own plans. The county plan states that these features must be evaluated where they have been identified by the local plan or by the Ministry of Natural Resources</p>	<p>significant valley lands south of the southern limit of the Canadian Shield - all lands surrounding within 50 metres</p> <p>Local plans permit development in significant valleylands south and east of the Canadian Shield however there must be an environmental impact assessment must be completed.</p>	<p>significant areas of natural and scientific interest - all lands surrounding within 50 metres;</p> <p>Development is permitted if an Environmental Impact assessment is completed and states that there will be no impact to the natural area.</p>	<p>Policy to encourage connectivity of Natural Heritage features and corridors</p>	<p>Development on such areas will be permitted if an Environmental impact study is completed, and it reveals that there is no impact.</p>

Heritage Values. Simcoe County has not updated the County OP to be in conformity with the PPS 2005 – that is part of a review

Significant Wildlife Habitat	Significant Habitat for endangered or threatened species	Head Waters	Significant Wetlands	Fish Habitat	Areas of Restoration
<p>General policy - prohibits development and site alteration within habitat and requires local official plans to further identify areas. Requires local official plans to set out policies that will only permit development in adjacent lands if it can be shown that there will be no negative impacts.</p>	<p>General policy - prohibits development and site alteration within habitat and requires local official plans to further identify areas. Requires local official plans to set out policies that will only permit development in adjacent lands if it can be shown that there will be no negative impacts.</p>	<p>General policy - requires protection of ground and surface water and improvement where degradation has occurred. County is headwater for six tertiary watersheds and has (and continues) to participate in several provincial research initiatives geared to protecting the headwaters for the long-term</p>	<p>General policy - prohibits development and site alteration within significant features and requires local official plans to further identify areas. Requires local official plans to set out policies that will only permit development in adjacent lands if it can be shown that there will be no negative impacts.</p>	<p>Specific policies - permits development on adjacent lands if the proposal complies with one of six very stringent criteria, all of which ensure that the lake capacity is not decreased and may in fact be improved. These policies are to be supported and complimented by the local official plans and override the local plan should conflict arise. However there isn't any conflict between the local plans and the County plan.</p>	<p>Not specifically dealt with in upper tier plan.</p>

Table answers questions 4, 5, 6, 1 of the planner survey. It addresses sensitive species and environmental designation within the Official Plan

4.Are sensitive species or Designated significant features /sites outlined in the schedule	5.Sensitive and Natural Areas and Species at Risk addressed within the Official Plan	6. Estimated total area or portion of the municipality under environmental designation.	10. What environmental policies govern the management of municipally owned or controlled open space lands
N/A	<p>As part of the Green lands system</p> <p>Zoning by-laws are as part of the county’s Greenland system</p> <p>Conservation by-laws and approval requirements process under the County Greenlands Official Plan policies</p>	Approx 20%	No difference

Simcoe County
Summary and Discussion

Simcoe County does not have an environmental committee, however stated by Gail White (environmental planner for Simcoe County) several of the municipalities do have environmental committees. The Natural Heritage Information Centre database is used when planning for development in such areas. Also the Natural Heritage Reference Manual will be a reference in the upcoming review process of the Official Plan. Within the Simcoe County Official Plan from the prospective of Gail white, has stated that:

- Areas with shallow soils is not dealt with
- Shoreline health- not dealt with
- Water conservation/quantity is limitedly dealt with
- Water Quality is limitedly dealt with
- Coordination with neighbouring counties is limitedly dealt with
- Monitoring /evaluation are limitedly dealt with.

Simcoe has clearly identified areas of special designation through the ORMA. These exerpts detail the protection of Natural Heritage areas:

Sec 3.10 Through the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act, 2001, and the accompanying Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP), the *Province* has established a number of objectives for the Oak Ridges Moraine. These include, but are not limited to, the protection, restoration and enhancement of the health, diversity, size and connectivity of ecological and hydrological features and functions, self-sustaining vegetation, wildlife and fish habitat, natural stream form and flow, groundwater recharge, and landform features.

Sec 3.10.3 Applications for development or site alteration within the ORMCP area will only be considered where they comply with the provisions of this Plan and of Parts III and IV of the ORMCP. Within the ORMCP the following land use designations and permitted uses apply:

a) Natural Core Areas are areas with a high concentration of key natural features, hydrologically sensitive features, and/or landform conservation areas and are critical to maintaining and improving the integrity of the Moraine as a whole. Permitted uses include: fish, wildlife and forestry management, conservation projects and flood and erosion control projects, agricultural uses, transportation, infrastructure and utilities as described in section 41 of the ORMCP, but only if the need for the project has been demonstrated and there is no reasonable alternative, home businesses, home industries, bed and breakfast establishments, farm vacation homes, low intensity recreational uses as described in Section 37 of the ORMCP, unserviced parks, and uses accessory to the permitted uses

b) Natural Linkage Areas are areas forming part of a central corridor system that support or have the potential to support movement of plants and animals between the Natural Core Areas, Natural Linkage Areas, river valleys and stream corridors. Permitted uses include: fish, wildlife and forestry management, conservation projects and flood and erosion control projects, *agricultural uses*, transportation, infrastructure and utilities as described in section 41 of the ORMCP, but only if the need for the project has been demonstrated and there is no reasonable alternative, home businesses, home industries, bed and breakfast establishments, farm vacation homes, low intensity recreational uses as described in Section 37 of the ORMCP, unserviced parks, mineral aggregate operations, wayside pits and uses accessory to the permitted uses.

Simcoe County has addressed the protection of sensitive species and habitat areas fairly thoroughly in regards to development. Simcoe had the most applications, doubling that of the second largest urbanized county, Peterborough.

City of Kawartha Lakes

Official Plan Timing and Review

Timing of Review	Schedules	Last Updated
The City has published it's draft Official Plan on 26 June 2006 and is finalizing it before Dec.2007	Total maps -10 plus many attachments.	Previous plan was prepared in 1978 and was continuously modified from time to time.

Development Trends This table stipulates the results of the survey sent to the City of Kawartha Lakes clerk on development trends in the area

Applications for subdivisions or condominiums in the past 12 months	Applications for land Severances in the past 12 months	Site applications for new developments along shorelines in the past 12 months
3 subdivisions, 0 condominiums	63 YTD (November 8, 2007)	1

Natural Heritage Values

This table examines the Natural Heritage Values of Peterborough County that are direct from the County Official Plan. Sec 6.4.4 Permitted uses within this designation should maintain the unique natural characteristics of such lands and should not contribute to problems of erosion, flooding, pollution or the deterioration of the environment. Sec 6.4.6 in some instances, the boundary of the Environmental Protection designation may be found not to reflect the true limit of the land subject to flooding or having a natural hazard. To determine this, a detailed evaluation shall be undertaken to demonstrate that the land is not subject to flooding or other physical constraint. The evaluation shall be reviewed and approved by the City. The City will consult with the Conservation Authority or other expertise in the review of the evaluation. This provision applies where the designation boundary is found to be in error and the proposed use is minor and it is determined by the City that an amendment to the Plan is not required

Significant Wildlife Habitat	Significant Habitat for endangered or threatened species	Head Waters	Significant Wetlands	Fish Habitat	Areas of Restoration
Sec 6.4.2 Wildlife management will be permitted within the Environmental Protection designation	Sec 6.4.2 Conservation will be permitted within the Environmental Protection designation	Sec 6.4.9 When an open watercourse is part of an area to be dedicated, sufficient land adjacent to the watercourse should be provided for maintenance and operations.	n/a	n/a	Sec 6.4.6 If it is found through the evaluation that the boundary is in error and the land is not subject to flooding or other physical constraint, then an alternate use permitted in the abutting land use designation may be considered and the land appropriately zoned

Significant Woodlands	Significant Valley Lands	ANSI s	Corridors	Areas of important ecological function
------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------	------------------	---

Sec6.4.9 Lands designated Environmental Protection may, at the discretion of the City, be accepted as part or all of the parkland dedication in a subdivision. All lands dedicated to the City shall be conveyed in a physical condition satisfactory to the municipality.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
---	-----	-----	-----	-----

Question 7

This table breaks down the answers to question 7 in the survey that were answered by the County Planner on the protection of natural Heritage Values.

Significant Wildlife Habitat	Significant Habitat for endangered or threatened species	Head Waters	Significant Wetlands	Fish Habitat	Areas of Restoration
yes	yes	watershed and flooding potential area defined	yes	yes	Adjacent areas

Significant Woodlands	Significant Valley Lands	ANSI s	Corridors	Areas of important ecological function
yes	yes	yes	yes	yes loke alvar and carden plain area in city

This table sets out the answers to questions 4, 5, 6, 1 of the planner survey. It addresses sensitive species and environmental designation within the Official Plan.

4.Are sensitive species or Designated significant features /sites outlined in the schedule	5.Sensitive and Natural Areas and Species at Risk addressed within the Official Plan	6. Estimated total area or portion of the municipality under environmental designation.	10. What environmental policies govern the management of municipally owned or controlled open space lands
Yes, Wetlands, significant woodlands, valley lands, area of endangered species, concerned species and above all Oak Ridge Moraine area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Protection or sensitive Areas: Land use designation with development restrictions also on adjacent lands • In zoning by- laws same as above • In conservation bylaws and approval requirements/processes • (Tree cutting/wetland filling/extraction/conservation bylaws/environmental assessments/other types • as above 	8 to 10 %	No % target is advisable but all possible potential spaces committed to be preserved as Environment First policy.

City of Kawartha Lakes

Summary and Discussion

The City of Kawartha Lakes uses the PPS that has defined 5% and at the percent of the area to be devoted for all new development for commercial or residential development for municipally owned or controlled open space lands. The city also has an environmental advisory committee and utilizes the Natural Heritage information database. While using the MNR set of defined regulation in place of the Natural Heritage Reference Manual. The within the City of Kawartha Lakes Official Plan through the perception of the city planner has answered the following on a scale of 1 (limited) 3(general) 5 (detailed).

- Areas with shallow soils- detailed
- Shoreline health-detailed- 30 m setback
- Natural Heritage Connections/linkages-detailed- 30 meters to 120 m adjacent land
- Water conservation/quantity- source water protection fairly detailed
- Water quality- detailed MOE Rules
- Coordination with neighbouring counties/municipalities-detailed with surrounding county
- Monitoring and evaluation is detailed and continuous.

When analyzing the City of Kawartha Lakes Official Plan it is difficult to detect the level of protection for Natural Heritage areas as they are not specifically named in the plan. Also there are areas of Natural Heritage Value that are not exclusively listed such as: Significant Valley Lands, Significant Wetlands, fish habitat, ANSI's, areas of ecological importance and corridors. There is a general policy outlining the protection of Environmental Designation areas however it only states explicitly from sec 6.4.2:

Land Uses Permitted

The following uses will be permitted within the Environmental Protection designation:

- Agricultural, excluding buildings or structures
- Buildings or structures for erosion or flood control
- Conservation, excluding buildings or structures
- Forestry, excluding buildings or structures
- Nursery and market gardening, excluding buildings or structures
- Recreation or park purposes, excluding buildings or structures
- Wildlife management areas, excluding buildings or structures

This does not show a clear protection of sensitive species, or habitats. From the opinion of the county clerk there is significant protection in areas detailed in question 8 of the survey however, it does not specifically state protection and outlines in the natural heritage areas.

County of Hastings
Official Plan Timing and Review

Timing of Review	Schedules	Last Updated
It is currently under review	22 rural, and 6 urban	The existing one was approved in 2002.

Hastings Official Plan is currently under review.

Natural Heritage Values Question 7

This table breaks down the answers to question 7 in the survey that were answered by the County Planner on the protection of natural Heritage Values.

Significant Wildlife Habitat	Significant Habitat for endangered or threatened species	Head Waters	Significant Wetlands	Fish Habitat	Areas of Restoration
Only partial	No	No	Yes	Yes, in policy only	No

Significant Woodlands	Significant Valley Lands	ANSI s	Corridors	Areas of important ecological function
No	No	Yes	No	Within PSW's

This Table sets out the answers to questions 4, 5, 6, 1 of the planner survey. It addresses sensitive species and environmental designation within the Official Plan.

4.Are sensitive species or Designated significant features /sites outlined in the schedule	5.Sensitive and Natural Areas and Species at Risk addressed within the Official Plan	6. Estimated total area or portion of the municipality under environmental designation.	10. What environmental policies govern the management of municipally owned or controlled open space lands
Prov. Wetlands, ANSI's, deer yards, sensitive lakes and streams	n/a	unknown	None specifically

Summary/Discussion

Hastings County currently does not have an environmental committee, however it is under consideration. The Natural Heritage Information Centre database is utilized when developing. The Natural Heritage Reference Manual is also utilized in establishing adjacency requirements in the Official Plan and as a reference in the drafting of a Resources Management Background Report.

Hastings County planner was asked how within the Official Plan certain environmental issues were addressed and to what degree within question 7 of the survey. The answers are coming from the perspective of the County Planner Paul Walsh on a scale of 1 (limited) 3 (General) and 5 (detailed).

- Areas of Shallow Soils received a 1
- Shoreline health received a 3
- Natural Heritage Connections/linkages received a 1
- Water Conservation/quantity received a 1
- Water quality received a 5
- Coordination with Neighboring Counties/municipalities received a 3
- Monitoring and evaluations received a 3

This representation does not show particularly strong protection in sensitive areas.

Conclusion:

Cross Comparison and Individual Analysis of County Planning Protection

Peterborough County has been experiencing rapid urbanization over the past few decades. Analyzing the level of protection compared to the level of development from the survey results and examining the Official Plan for the area, it may seem that there is a model providing adequate protection for Natural Heritage sites and sensitive species. There are many areas however within the county that protection has not been clearly or thoroughly addressed such as: areas with shallow soils; water conservation and water quality; and coordination with neighboring counties; these views are directly taken from the opinion questions in the survey. Peterborough County is continuously growing and because of this the protection of the sensitive areas and species will have to extend to conform to the rapid development that is encroaching on these areas.

In the Peterborough County Official Plan it states clearly the natural heritage values and the level of protection granted for each value. This allows for a clear interpretation of how these sites are protected, compared to the City of Kawartha Lakes Official Plan that does not specifically name the natural heritage features or their level of protection.

The Haliburton County Official Plan was also easy to interpret, as the Natural Heritage Values were stated clearly and the level of protection specified, with the exception of corridor areas, areas of ecological importance, areas of restoration and headwaters. Because sections clearly identified features and protection levels it is evident that the protections of these areas are important to the county. In Haliburton County the upper tier Official Plan sets the scope for the lower tier OP's. Thus Haliburton County and Peterborough County Official Plans appear to be protecting natural Heritage features to a degree matching the level of development in the area.

Simcoe County has not updated the Official Plan to conform with the Provincial Policy Statement of 2005, therefore such natural heritage features are assumed to be a part of the targeted natural heritage system units. The Official Plan does clearly assign the level of protection against the level of development. Simcoe County addresses the Natural Heritage systems and sensitive species habitat at a decent standard; however, there are no highlighted areas of protection. An environmental impact assessment must be completed when development may occur and this is similar in most other Counties.

The County of Simcoe is alike to Peterborough as it has rapidly developing urbanization that is encroaching onto sensitive species habitats and natural heritage features and alas must conform to the growing demand of land to develop. Both counties (Simcoe and Peterborough) have a clear focus on protecting certain features and species habitat. However Simcoe County does not address other important features such as: areas with shallow soils; shoreline health; water quality; coordination with neighboring counties and monitoring and evaluation. This is quite disappointing as these areas and themes are ecologically important. However Simcoe County does have the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act that states under sec 3.10 of Simcoe's OP:

Sec 3.10 Through the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act, 2001, and the accompanying Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP), the Province has established a number of objectives for the Oak Ridges Moraine. These include, but are not limited to, the protection, restoration and enhancement of the health, diversity, size and connectivity of ecological and hydrological features and functions, self-sustaining vegetation, wildlife and fish habitat, natural stream form and flow, groundwater recharge, and landform features

The other counties do not have a specific piece that is at this level of protection; however the other counties also do not have the Oak Ridges Moraine to protect. On side the level of protection far outweighs that of the other Counties in the Land Between and at the same time it falls short on the protection from the opinion of the planner of other natural features.

The City of Kawartha Lakes Official Plan is relatively difficult to follow, as it refers mainly to flood plain areas. There are designations to protect the unique natural characteristics and not contributing to erosion, flooding, pollution or the deterioration of the environment from sec 6.4.4 of the Official Plan. This can be left open to much interpretation, and as the City of Kawartha Lakes develops the urban landscape there must be more specific and thorough protection of the sensitive species habitat and Natural Heritage systems. Compared to the other Counties in the Land Between that were examined it may seem that the City of Kawartha Lakes may have the most obscure protection structure for such areas. However in regards to shallow soils, shoreline health, natural heritage connections/linkages, water conservation/quantity and quality, coordination with neighboring counties and monitoring and evaluation from the perspective of the Planner is thorough and detailed.

The County of Hastings Official Plan is currently under review. However from the planner was certain that water quality was thoroughly addressed; which is a major issue within municipalities. Also according to the perspective of the planner most natural heritage areas are not addressed such as: significant habitat for endangered/ threatened species; headwaters; areas of restoration; significant woodlots; significant valley lands; and corridors. This is the weakest County for protection of these systems. In the upcoming review it would be beneficial to the county to detail the protection of these areas.

Most counties surveyed demonstrated a clear overall trend of protecting natural heritage features and sensitive species habitat, with the exception of Hastings. However, overall each county had some measure of weakness or gaps in protection mechanisms. The views of the planners showed that these weaknesses were acknowledged.

Peterborough County and City of Kawartha Lakes lack adequate detail and areas for application of protection measures. All counties had missing components in Natural Heritage planning protection. Specific areas that lacked in protection included the following: Simcoe County lacked protection of features in areas beyond the Oak Ridges Moraine and so in the Land Between; the County of Hastings Official Plan is lacking entirely, yet is still under review. Peterborough County and Simcoe County are both developing rapidly increasing urbanization, which is encroaching on Natural Heritage features and have improved measures of protection; the question is if they are enforced.

Planners opinion vs. actual protection

Planners were asked to express their opinions as to the level of protection offered by their county's Official Plans. They were asked to rank areas of protection from level 1, being weak, to a level 5, being strong. The survey also allowed for comments.

Protection measures within the Peterborough County Official Plan are fairly thorough within the plan itself. From the planners prospective Natural Heritage features protection is fairly detailed. According to the Planner, there are no major discrepancies, the main issue is that the upper tier sets the scope and the lower tier will then take the necessary steps in identifying and protecting the values. However the planner believes that within the areas of shallow soils, shoreline health, water conservancy/quantity/quality, and coordination with neighboring counties there is a somewhat weak approach as it is mainly voluntary approaches or the issue is limitedly addressed. The views of the planner are an accurate assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the Official Plan as compared across the board.

Haliburton's Official Plan has a similar level of protection and takes a similar approach to Peterborough County. The OP states clearly the protection of the natural heritage systems and in detail. The Planner had backed up that information.. However the opinion section within the survey was not filled out.

Simcoe County has incorporated the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act that deals specifically with development in the Oak Ridges Moraine area. The OP also has regulations extending beyond the ORM area that prohibits development in specified areas of natural heritage and/or specifically fish habitat. Simcoe County however in the opinion of the planner does not address any of the areas of shallow soils, shoreline health, and coordination with neighboring counties or monitoring. The OP has stated a clear protection for identified areas of natural heritage values however; these other concerns are not addressed.

Identifying the natural heritage features and their protection in the City of Kawartha Lakes OP is somewhat difficult. This makes it difficult to analyze the level of protection compared to the planner's opinion. The planner had stated that all natural heritage features were addressed within the OP. The features however are vaguely referred to as Environmental Protection Designations and fall under this protection under sec 6.4.2:

- *Agricultural, excluding buildings or structures*
- *Buildings or structures for erosion or flood control*
- *Conservation, excluding buildings or structures*
- *Forestry, excluding buildings or structures*
- *Nursery and market gardening, excluding buildings or structures*
- *Recreation or park purposes, excluding buildings or structures*
- *Wildlife management areas, excluding buildings or structures*

The Official Plan from Hastings County is currently under review therefore an Official Plan was not available to contrast to the Planners opinion on the counties protection of the natural heritage features. Hastings protection of these features is fairly weak. In the opinion of the County Planner, most areas are not addressed. The only area that is detailed in the protection is water quality, which is an important aspect to any municipality.

After analyzing and contrasting the Counties Official Plans and the opinions of the Planners on the protection of the Natural Heritage Features it is clear which counties have taken steps in planning protection and which areas the counties have neglected to address key or overall natural heritage features. All counties have taken into consideration some level of natural heritage protection although it is clear that large gaps in key areas and especially in coordination are present across The Land Between. Three, of five counties surveyed had adequate levels of protection and these counties also displayed more urbanization than the others. However, all counties need to address natural heritage service, linkages and features in a more comprehensive manner to ensure that features and functions are not encroached upon and depleted. On paper, all the counties "aim" to protect natural heritage features, with the expanding growth of all counties in particular Simcoe and Peterborough County it must remain imperative to adjust and strengthen the protection of these environmentally sensitive areas for the future.