

Section / Policy #’s	Changes	Purpose / Rationale
6.11.7.2.1 Land Use Concept 6.11.7.4.3 Stormwater Management	Change references to “preferred locations” for stormwater management facilities to “conceptual locations”	To be consistent and clear on the intent of the mapping of future stormwater management facility locations shown on the land use concept plan
6.11.7.3.3 e) Natural Heritage System – Definitions	Changed “trails” to “trail corridors” and “green infrastructure” to “green utility/servicing corridors”	To clarify the corridors and areas that may be considered as part of the natural cover target – “green infrastructure” is redundant with “stormwater management facilities”, the intent is to include other green servicing/utility corridors the play a role in connecting natural landscapes and maximizing permeable areas to mitigate stormwater impacts
6.11.7.3.4 d)	<p>Regarding refinements to the mapping of the Natural Heritage System as contemplated through the Block Plan process and the preparation of a Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) and Environmental Impact Study (EIS), add the following:</p> <p>“Where refinements to the boundaries of the NHS or Natural Hazards are approved by the Township, the refinement shall be deemed to be a refinement of the boundary between the NHS or Natural Hazards, as applicable, and the adjoining land use designation shown on the Land Use Plan (Schedules “E-8” to “E-11”). The adjoining land use designation shall</p>	To clarify the applicable land use designation and permitted uses where Natural Heritage System boundaries are refined based on further study.

	apply to any areas removed from the NHS or Natural Hazard shown on the Land Use Plan as a result of approved boundary refinements.”	
6.11.7.3.4 h) Natural Heritage System – General Policies	In reference to refinements to the boundaries of Linkage Areas or Recommended Restoration Areas, replace “ensures the overall land area occupied by such Areas in the NHS is maintained or increased” with “maintains or enhances their ecological functions and contributes to the achievement of the natural cover target in combination with the other features and areas identified in Policy 6.11.7.3.3 e).”	For consistency and clarity of wording with respect to the nature of the refinements that may be considered through further study of certain components of the Natural Heritage System and to relate the amount of area to be conserved back to the natural cover target.
6.11.7.3.14 b) and e) Natural Heritage System – Conceptual Buffers	<p>Reword b) from “The ecologically and hydrologically appropriate width for each Buffer associated with a proposed development shall be established through the completion of an Environmental Impact Study and shall generally be 30 metres” to “The width for each Buffer associated with a proposed development shall be a minimum of 30 metres as conceptually shown on Schedule “E-12” unless an ecologically and hydrologically appropriate alternative Buffer width is established through the completion of an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) approved by the Township in consultation with the Region and the NPCA.”</p> <p>Reword e) from “Where the width established for a Buffer through the completion of an EIS differs from the conceptual width shown on Schedule “E-12”, minor alterations may be made to the boundaries of the Buffer on that Schedule, without requiring an amendment to this Official Plan” to include “as determined by the Township in</p>	To clarify the intent that the final width of required Buffers may vary from the 30 metre Conceptual Buffers shown on Schedule “E-12” – Natural Heritage System, where an alternative width is justified through an approved EIS. This allows for more detailed study to establish an ecologically and hydrologically appropriate Buffer width for specific features and maintains the requirement for Township approval of the final Buffer widths and any minor alterations to the boundaries of the Buffer based on consultation with appropriate agencies to provide the necessary expertise for EIS review and approval.

	consultation with the Region and the NPCA based on the recommendations made in the EIS.”	
6.11.7.3.15, a), b), j) Natural Heritage System – Linkages	<p>In the second paragraph, reword the last sentence from “The identification of the type, classification and width of Linkages shall be determined based on the SWS” to “... based on guidance within the SWS and may be refined based upon an EIS approved by the Township in consultation with the Region and the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.”</p> <p>Add “hydrologic” to a) and b) when describing the role and functions of linkages which may include ecological and hydrologic aspects.</p> <p>In j), remove “of any width” and add a sentence “The appropriate width of this linkage will be determined by the Township in consultation with the Region and the NPCA and based on the recommendations made in the approved EIS.”</p>	<p>To clarify the intent that the final details of Linkages and related refinements are to be determined through further study (EIS) based on the guidance provided by the SWS and subject to approval by the Township based on consultation with appropriate agencies to provide the necessary expertise for EIS review and approval.</p> <p>To acknowledge and clarify that linkages may have both ecological and hydrologic roles and functions which need to be understood, studied and considered.</p> <p>To clarify that the final width of this specific linkage between the unnamed tributary of Twenty Mile Creek that runs south of Forestview Court and the U-shaped woodland located approximately 500 metres to the south will be determined via the required EIS which is subject to Township approval based on consultation with appropriate agencies to provide the necessary expertise for EIS review and approval.</p>
6.11.7.3.16 c) iii., v. and i) Natural Heritage System – Restoration Areas	Reword iii. And consolidate with v., from “may refine the boundaries of Recommended Restoration Areas as they are shown on Schedule “E-12”, provided that the overall area designated as “Recommended Restoration Area” is not reduced by such refinements” to “...shall not be reduced by such refinements unless it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Township that the refinement has taken into consideration and supports the	<p>For consistency and clarity of wording with respect to the nature of the refinements that may be considered through further study of certain components of the Natural Heritage System and to relate the amount of area to be conserved back to the natural cover target.</p> <p>Paragraph i) is not required based on further consideration, as the appropriate edge treatments of</p>

	<p>achievement of the natural cover target in combination with the other features and areas identified in Policy 6.11.7.3.3 e).”</p> <p>Delete i) “For consistency and clarity of wording with respect to the nature of the refinements that may be considered through further study of certain components of the Natural Heritage System and to relate the amount of area to be conserved back to the natural cover target.”</p>	<p>Restoration Areas can be addressed through the restoration plan rather than adding buffers around the perimeter of the Restoration Area.</p>
<p>6.11.7.3.17, d), e), f)</p> <p>Natural Hazards – Karst</p>	<p>Reword third paragraph, second sentence, from “There are three high-constraint karst features in the Smithville MCP Area” to “Through the karst review completed as part of the SWS, three potential high-constraint karst features are identified...” and to add the other applicable Schedule references “E-8” and “E-11” providing the mapping of the karst features.</p> <p>Revise d) “No development or site alteration shall be permitted within 50 metres of a high-constraint karst feature or the medium constraint karst feature shown on Schedule “E-11” to this Plan” and consolidate d) with f) “Any development or site alteration proposed within 50 metres of a karst feature shall be subject to i. approval of the NPCA, in accordance with the NPCA regulations and policies” to read “Any development or site alteration proposed within 50 metres of a karst feature, including the potential high- and medium-constraint karst features identified on Schedules “E-8” and “E-11” and any other potential high- and medium-constraint karst features identified through further study, shall be subject to the following: i. the</p>	<p>The proposed re-wording acknowledges that the karst study completed as part of the SWS identified potential high-constraint features and that more detailed karst hazard assessments of individual karst features will determine the final constraint level and appropriate setbacks.</p>

	<p>requirement to complete a Karst Hazard Assessment which shall recommend the constraint level and classification of each karst feature identified on the landscape and recommend minimum setbacks for development and other appropriate mitigation strategies; and, ii. approval of the NPCA, in accordance with NPCA regulations and policies.”</p> <p>Revise e) from “No development or site alteration shall be permitted within 50 metres of a medium-constraint karst feature not identified in Policy 6.11.7.3.17 d) ii above, unless a Karst Hazard Assessment has demonstrated that...” to “No development or site alteration shall be permitted within 50 metres of a high-constraint or medium-constraint karst feature, unless an approved Karst Hazard Assessment has recommended an appropriate alternative setback and has demonstrated that...”</p>									
6.11.7.4.4 g) and h) Transportation Network	<p>Replace reference to minimum right-of-way width of 20 metres for roads in Township’s jurisdiction with the following table identifying the minimum right-of-way widths recommended for each classification of road as per the Transportation Master Plan:</p> <p>“</p> <table><tr><th>Road Classification</th><th>Minimum Right-of-Way Width</th></tr><tr><td>Arterial “B”</td><td>25.0 m</td></tr><tr><td>Collector</td><td>22.0 m</td></tr><tr><td>Local Road</td><td>20.0 m</td></tr></table>	Road Classification	Minimum Right-of-Way Width	Arterial “B”	25.0 m	Collector	22.0 m	Local Road	20.0 m	<p>Updates to this policy are needed to ensure sufficient right-of-way width is protected and can be acquired by the Township for the four roadway classifications applicable to existing and future roads under the Township’s jurisdiction as identified in the transportation map schedule (Schedule “E-13”) and in the Transportation Master Plan. A wider right-of-way is needed for part of Industrial Road due to underground infrastructure and spacing requirements in that corridor.</p> <p>Clause h) i. allows flexibility for the Township to permit a reduced right-of-way width without</p>
Road Classification	Minimum Right-of-Way Width									
Arterial “B”	25.0 m									
Collector	22.0 m									
Local Road	20.0 m									

	<table><tr><td>Rural Road</td><td>28.5 m</td></tr></table> <p>“</p> <p>Revise h) to add the following subclause based on further review of the right-of-way requirements for Industrial Road (based on underground infrastructure corridor needs):</p> <p>“ii. Industrial Road between London Road and St. Catharines Street shall have a minimum right-of-way width of 25 metres.”</p>	Rural Road	28.5 m	requiring an Official Plan Amendment. This policy does not obligate the Township to accept a reduce right-of-way width but avoids the need for an Official Plan Amendment if the Township determines a reduced right-of-way width can be accepted in specific locations/circumstances if warranted as determined by the Township.
Rural Road	28.5 m			
6.11.7.4.5 c) Smithville Bypass Road Corridor	Change minimum right-of-way width from 31.5 metres to 30.5 metres.	Based on Transportation Master Plan. As noted in the policy, the final right-of-way width for the by-pass corridor will be determined in consultation with the Region during the Block Plan process.		
Schedule “H”	Correct Block Plan boundaries between Blocks 8 and 9, and between Blocks 9 and 10.	Correction of small mapping error.		
Schedule “T”	Correct Block Plan boundaries between Blocks 8 and 9, and between Blocks 9 and 10.			
Schedule “L”	Correct Block Plan boundaries between Blocks 8 and 9, and between Blocks 9 and 10.			
Schedule “N”	Correct hidden Linkage along north side of Townline Road.			
Schedule “P”	Add missing boundary line between Sub Phases 1A and 1B.			
	Correct Stage Areas boundary line between Stages 2B and 3A.			
	Correct boundary line between Sub Phases 3A and 3B.			

