

If you require this information in an alternate format, please contact the Accessibility Coordinator at accessibility@northumberland.ca or 1-800-354-7050 ext. 2327



## Report 2024-131

**Report Title:** Northumberland Next: County Official Plan Amendment (OPA2) - What We Heard

**Committee Name:** Economic Development, Tourism and Planning

**Committee Meeting Date:** October 2, 2024

**Prepared by:** Dwayne Campbell  
Acting Director / Manager Planning and Community Development  
Economic Development, Tourism and Strategic Initiatives

**Reviewed by:** Dan Borowec  
Director  
Economic Development, Tourism and Strategic Initiatives

**Approved by:** Jennifer Moore, CAO

**Council Meeting Date:** October 16, 2024

**Strategic Plan Priorities:**  Innovate for Service Excellence  
 Ignite Economic Opportunity  
 Foster a Thriving Community  
 Propel Sustainable Growth  
 Champion a Vibrant Future

---

### Information Report

**That** the Economic Development, Tourism and Land Use Planning Committee, receive Report 2024-131 'Northumberland Next: County Official Plan Amendment (OPA2) - What We Heard', for information; and

**Further That** the Committee recommend that County Council direct staff to send a copy of the report to each member municipality for information."

---

### Purpose

This report highlights the public consultation process and summarizes the public feedback received for County Official Plan Amendment No. 2 – Growth Management Amendment.

### Background

From May to June 2024, the County hosted two open house events (Cobourg and Port Hope) and a public meeting before the Economic Development, Tourism and Planning Committee to gather public feedback and input on the Growth Management Amendment (GMA) to the County Official Plan.

## **Consultations**

The County conducted a comprehensive engagement and consultation process, leveraging a mix of digital and print advertising alongside a dedicated project page on the County's consultation platform, Join In Northumberland.

The engagement concluded with six media stories covering the GMA, achieving a 100% key message pick-up rate. Of the coverage, 17% included a spokesperson's quote, and all coverage (100%) reflected a balanced sentiment. The effort was further supported by a robust social media campaign featuring both paid and organic posts on the County's corporate X and Facebook accounts. Organic Facebook posts reached an average of 2.1k users per post, with 2.4k impressions per post. Posts on the County's X account garnered an average of 107 impressions each. Digital advertising through Meta reached an estimated 19,534 accounts, generating 69,463 impressions, 1,246 link clicks, and click-through rate of 4.86%.

The Northumberland Next: Official Plan Update consultation webpage received 3.7k project visits, with 2.4k visitors categorized as "aware," meaning they visited the project page at least once. Of these, 1.2k visitors were classified as "informed," having viewed the page multiple times or interacted with project tools or documents. The specific GMA page attracted 822 visitors, with the top three most-reviewed documents being:

- 434 downloads of the Amendment No. 2: Draft Growth Management OPA (revised April 24, 2024)
- 386 downloads of the Growth Management Report Executive Summary
- 280 downloads of the Growth Management Strategy/Land Needs Analysis Council Report

During the consultation period, two newsletters were distributed to subscribers. The first newsletter sent on May 1st, was distributed to 227 recipients, achieving an 85.5% open rate and a 20.7% click-through rate. The second newsletter, sent on May 24th and including additional consultation date, reached 256 participants with a 74.2% open rate and a 10.9% click-through rate. Additionally, two print advertisements were published in the Community Press newspaper and a mail-out delivered to 535 households within the proposed expansion areas.

## **Legislative Authority / Risk Considerations**

Advertising for the open house events and public meeting exceeded Planning Act requirements.

## Discussion / Options

Part A: Proposal To Expand Port Hope Urban Area			
A number of written submissions have been received on the proposal to expand the Port Hope urban area from Alexandra Brown and Ronald Estey, Bruce Forrest, John Butell, Vicki Mink, Dale and Robert DeMatteo, Shannon Linton, Margot Currelly, Gary Bowen, H. Stoosh, Faye Langmaid (2 submissions), Bree Nixon, Robert Fishlock and Robert and Heather Sculthorpe. The comments made in these submissions, and those made at the public sessions have been summarized below and a response to each comment has been provided			
	Topic	What We Heard	Response
A1	Identifying Port Hope as a growth area	Additional growth should be directed elsewhere in the County and not to new greenfield lands in Port Hope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A key element of the County's growth strategy in the in-effect and approved Official Plan is to direct growth to the 6 urban centres in the County in a manner that is generally proportional to each urban area's share of the urban population in the County</li> <li>• In keeping with this strategy, 36% of all new growth in the County to 2051 is directed to Cobourg and about 27% is directed to Port Hope (the two largest urban centres) - and the remaining 37% is directed to the 4 other urban centres and the remaining rural area</li> <li>• As a result, the amount of growth directed to Port Hope to 2051 is consistent with the in-effect growth strategy</li> <li>• In addition, this strategy recognizes that growth pressures have been and will continue to be the most pronounced in the southwestern portion of the County, which is easily accessible by Highway 401 to the remainder of the Greater Toronto Area</li> </ul>
A2	Intensification versus greenfield development	The Port Hope urban area should not be expanded and instead all new growth should be accommodated within the existing urban boundary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A key element of the County's growth management strategy is to determine how and where to accommodate the growth that has been allocated to the County by the Province</li> <li>• Before looking at whether urban areas should expand, a detailed analysis of each urban area was carried out to determine its capacity for growth through intensification and on existing vacant or developing greenfield areas that are currently within the urban boundary</li> <li>• In the case of Port Hope, it is expected to supply approximately 4,210 new dwellings by 2051. It has been determined based on the analysis completed that the potential exists to develop 900 new dwellings in existing built-up areas, 699 dwellings on existing greenfield lands and about 235 dwellings in the rural area - this leaves a shortfall of 2,376 dwellings.</li> <li>• With respect to Cobourg, where the highest percentage of new growth is directed, the Town is able to accommodate the 5,400 new dwellings that are planned for Cobourg within intensification areas (potential for 1,105 units) and within existing greenfield areas (the remaining 4,295 units).</li> </ul>
A3	Alternative locations within Port Hope have	Lands north of the 401 should be explored for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the Province's view as expressed through Provincial policy that new development should take place in areas adjacent to the existing built-up area and have a compact</li> </ul>

	not been reviewed	residential development	<p>form and mix of densities - expanding in this manner also optimizes the use of existing infrastructure and public service facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It continues to be the view of the consulting team that going west is the most logical choice for urban expansion because it would serve as a continuation of the existing pattern of urban development - however, it is proposed as an option to reduce the size of the expansion such that it extends to a natural boundary, which is Baulch Road.</li> <li>• If this option was implemented, the expansion area would be reduced from 131 hectares to about 47 hectares and support about 850 new homes</li> <li>• To make up the difference, the expansion of the urban area northwards into the Welcome area is being explored</li> </ul>
A4	Alternative locations within neighbouring Hamilton Township have not been reviewed	Lands to the east of Port Hope in Hamilton Township should be explored for residential development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying growth options in Hamilton Township were not initially considered because the lands are in a different municipality and municipal boundaries would need to change to accommodate growth on full services</li> <li>• Since that time, exploratory talks have been held with the Township of Hamilton and it was made clear by Township representatives that there is and will be no desire to modify existing municipal boundaries - so that means that a review of the potential for development only in Welcome will be carried out</li> </ul>
A5	Alternative locations not comprising prime agricultural land should be utilized instead	Prime agricultural lands should not be utilized for growth because of their importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lands on all three sides of the Port Hope urban area are considered to be within a prime agricultural area (by both the County and the Province) - so any expansion will consume prime agricultural land - which is permitted by the Province because this reality exists through most of the Greater Toronto Area.</li> <li>• It is recognized that prime agricultural lands are important - this is why every effort will be made to reduce the footprint of the urban expansion area by increasing densities and requiring more mixed-use development</li> </ul>
A6	Impacts on the environment	Concern about new 131 hectare growth area on environmental features and functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The County retained North South Environmental to identify areas that should be avoided and which areas require further study. This information would be incorporated in any final mapping of the urban expansion area. The same will be completed in support of any urban expansions in the Welcome area</li> </ul>
A7	Loss of woodlands	Concern about loss of large woodlands on both sides of Baulch Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing woodlands in the 131 hectare growth area on the west side of the urban area have been reviewed and determined for the most part to be significant, meaning that they will be protected from development</li> </ul>
A8	Impacts on agricultural land and agricultural operations	Concern about new 131 hectare growth area on agricultural land and agricultural operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The County retained DBH Soil Services to review potential impacts on agricultural land and agricultural operations and no significant issues were identified. The</li> </ul>

			<p>same will be completed in support of any urban expansions in the Welcome area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognized that additional traffic from the proposed development (in a reduced form) will compete with farm traffic that uses local roads. This is an issue on lands adjacent to urban areas. As roads are upgraded in the area to accommodate additional traffic, it is recommended that this issue be considered further (through the creation of wider shoulders for example).</li> </ul>
A9	Impacts on transportation network	Concern about the impacts of 131 hectare growth area on Marsh Road, Toronto Road and Lakeshore Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A traffic impact study has not been completed; however, both Marsh Road and Toronto Road would likely require a number of improvements to accommodate the additional traffic. It is also anticipated that a second connection between Baulch Road and Toronto Road would be ideal to provide options. If only 47 hectares to Baulch Road are included in the urban boundary, transportation impacts will be significantly less.</li> </ul>
A10	Impacts on local taxpayers	Concern about the cost of funding the infrastructure required for new growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The landowners who will benefit from being included in the urban area will be required to pay for all required studies, the extension of sewer and water infrastructure to the lands, the upgrading of all roads that are a direct result of the proposed development and will construct all new streets, sidewalks and streetlights in the new development areas.</li> <li>Lands needed for parks and schools will also be dedicated to the municipality and school boards as required and at no charge, with both the municipality and the school board then responsible for the land's development.</li> <li>The additional taxes collected from the proposed development will then be used to pay for the increased demand for services required to support new development and the new residents will support businesses in the municipality and support the introduction of new businesses and investments.</li> <li>All of the above will be reviewed in a detailed Financial Impact Assessment prepared for the by the developer and reviewed by the municipality before it is accepted.</li> </ul>
A11	Incorporating housing on the proposed employment lands	Suggestion is to permit new housing developments north of proposed employment area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the nature of the uses proposed in the new employment area, the establishment of potentially incompatible uses adjacent to the employment area is not recommended because it may reduce the attractiveness of the site to potential users</li> <li>In addition, new conflicts between truck traffic and passenger vehicles may be created</li> </ul>
A12	Process	Concerned about the 'rushed' nature of the project and lack of local municipal involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The County has been working on the update of its Official Plan since 2018</li> <li>Local municipal staff have been aware of the need to designate lands adjacent to the Port Hope urban area</li> </ul>

			<p>for both residential and employment purposes since 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In response to concerns about lack of process, a second open house was held on June 13, 2024</li> <li>• In addition, and in response to the many comments made, options to expand the Port Hope area northwards in conjunction with a much smaller expansion to Baulch Road to the west are being explored</li> </ul>
A13	Impacts on Highway 401	Concern about the impacts of new development on Highway 401	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Province is well aware of the need to widen Highway 401 and rebuild antiquated interchanges, particularly the one at County Road 28 and the Province has initiated a study in this regard. It is noted that ultimately, Highway 401 is planned to have between 8 and 10 lanes in this area.</li> </ul>
A14	Need for Secondary Plan and watershed plan	Concern about lack of direction in OPA 2 for Secondary Plan and Subwatershed plan to be prepared	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recommended that any new urban area be supported by a Secondary Plan that is initiated and completed by the Municipality of Port Hope. Such a Secondary Plan would be informed by detailed environmental, servicing, transportation and financial impact studies.</li> <li>• Given the small scale of the proposed residential areas (47 hectares and 90 hectares), the preparation of a stand-alone subwatershed plan is not recommended and instead, it is recommended that comprehensive studies be prepared to address the same or similar requirements, with full input from the GRCA expected</li> </ul>
A15	Impacts on health services	Concern about impact of new development on the provision of health services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is acknowledged that health services are top of mind for many people. The provision of health services is a Provincial responsibility and the Province is well aware of the demand for additional services across the Province.</li> </ul>
A16	Impacts on schools	Concern about the impact of the proposed development on schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recognized that additional population will generate the need for new classroom space</li> <li>• Through the locally-initiated Secondary Plan process, discussions will be held with the school boards on the capacity of the existing schools to accommodate new students and whether new schools are required.</li> <li>• If one or more schools are required in new development areas, conditions of approval will require the dedication of the required lands to the school board for school construction purposes.</li> </ul>
A17	Form of servicing	Concern about the use of private communal services in Port Hope expansion areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A draft of OPA 2 included some updated language that was emerging in the draft Provincial Planning Statement - this wording now has to change such that it states the following as per Section 3.6.3 of the new PPS: <i>3.6.3 - Where municipal sewage services and municipal water services are not available, planned or feasible, private communal sewage services and private communal water services are the preferred form of</i></li> </ul>

			<p><i>servicing for multi-unit/lot development to support protection of the environment and minimize potential risks to human health and safety.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The above means that communal services may be considered if full municipal services are not available. The expansions to the Port Hope urban area are proposed to occur on full municipal services.</li> </ul>
--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Part B: Proposal To Expand Codrington Rural Settlement Area**

A number of written submissions have been received on the proposal to expand the Codrington Rural Settlement Area from the Northumberland Federation of Agriculture, Mark Hutchinson, Barbara Lamb, Willie Wham and Jackie Van De Valk. The comments made in these submissions, and those made at the public sessions have been summarized below and a response to each comment has been provided

	Topic	What We Heard	Response
B1	Need for the proposed development	The results of the Growth Management Study indicate that there is a surplus of about 193 hectares of land for development in the Brighton urban area - so there is no need to expand the Codrington Rural Settlement Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is acknowledged that there is a surplus of land for residential development in the Brighton urban area, which is best suited for additional development and has the services to support it</li> <li>However, the Growth Plan provides a 'notwithstanding' path for these types of applications to expand rural settlement areas (in the form of Section 2.2.9.7) and does not require that the application be justified from a 'need' perspective. This is in keeping with the Provincial direction to support housing in its many forms in both large urban areas and rural areas.</li> <li>The tests set out in Section 2.2.9.7 of the Growth Plan, the primary of which is that the expansion constitutes a minor rounding out of existing development, have been satisfied</li> <li>It is noted that Section 2.2.9.7 of the Growth Plan, along with the remainder of the Growth Plan, will no longer exist as of October 20, 2024. The new PPS, which is to take effect on the same date, does not explicitly include the same 'notwithstanding' policy; however, it remains generally permissive when it comes to settlement area expansions - in this regard, the need for the expansion of a settlement area is proposed to be a 'consideration' in the new policy framework</li> </ul>
B2	Loss of prime agricultural land	Concerned about the loss of valuable prime agricultural land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognized that about 6.2 hectares of prime agricultural land will be lost as a result of the proposed development - this is explicitly permitted by the Province and is the way most urban expansions have occurred in the past throughout southern Ontario</li> </ul>
B3	Directing growth to Codrington	Given the small size of the hamlet and the absence of goods and services, growth should not be directed to Codrington and should be directed to the Brighton urban area instead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is acknowledged that the majority of growth should be directed to fully serviced settlement areas; however, the Province also supports growth in rural settlement areas as well.</li> </ul>

B4	Affordable housing	Building large estate homes will not solve the housing crisis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is acknowledged that the proposed dwellings will not constitute affordable housing</li> <li>However, it is the Province's view that the supply of every type of housing should be increased and one component of that supply is higher end housing</li> </ul>
B5	Traffic impacts at intersection of Aranda Way and County Road 30	The development of additional housing will create dangerous traffic conditions at Aranda Way and County Road 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the small size of the proposed development and the limited number of trips that will be generated (5 inbound and 13 outbound automobile trips during the weekday am peak hour and 8 inbound and 5 outbound automobile trips during the weekday pm peak hour - according to applicants Traffic Impact Study), impacts to the functioning of the intersection are not anticipated</li> </ul>
B6	Safety impacts on Aranda Way	Concern about portion of Aranda Way that is a one-lane cross section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This concern has not been addressed to date; however, it is anticipated that through the local Official Plan Amendment and Plan of Subdivision process that this issue would be reviewed and if improvements were necessary - it would be the responsibility of the developer and the municipality to address accordingly</li> </ul>

#### Part C: Proposal To Expand Grafton Rural Settlement Area To The West

It is proposed to expand the Grafton Rural Settlement Area to the west and east. Two written submissions have been received on the proposal to expand the Grafton Settlement Area from the Clive Cudmore and Shannon Linton. The comments made in these submissions, and those made at the public sessions have been summarized below and a response to each comment has been provided

	Topic	What We Heard	Response
C1	Loss of agricultural land	Concerned about the loss of valuable agricultural land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognized that both of the areas proposed for expansion are used for agricultural purposes. However, both of the areas are not considered to be part of the County's prime agricultural area by the County Official Plan (i.e. it is not designated Agricultural Area) and the Province of Ontario, in their Agricultural System mapping released in 2018.</li> </ul>
C2	Impacts on the housing crisis	The proposed developments will not solve the housing crisis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognized that these two developments in of themselves will not solve Ontario's housing crisis. However, the cumulative effect of supporting hundreds of smaller developments like these in both urban and rural areas across the Province will go a long way to increasing the supply of lands for housing.</li> </ul>
C3	Need for the proposed development	There is no need to expand the Grafton Rural Settlement Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No recommendations were made in the County's growth management study on the need to expand the Grafton Rural Settlement Area, or for any other Rural Settlement Area for that matter - instead the focus was and remains on urban land needs.</li> <li>The Growth Plan provides a 'notwithstanding' path for requests to expand Rural Settlement Areas provided the expansion does not encroach into the Greenbelt Plan area (in the form of Section 2.2.9.7). In cases like these, the justification of 'need' for the development is not required. This is in keeping with the Provincial direction to support housing in its many forms in both large urban areas and rural areas.</li> </ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tests set out in Section 2.2.9.7 of the Growth Plan, the primary of which is that the expansion constitutes a minor rounding out of existing development, have been satisfied in both of these cases.</li> <li>• It is noted that Section 2.2.9.7 of the Growth Plan, along with the remainder of the Growth Plan, will no longer exist as of October 20, 2024. The new PPS, which is to take effect on the same date, does not explicitly include the same 'notwithstanding' policy; however, it remains generally permissive when it comes to settlement area expansions - in this regard, the need for the expansion of a settlement area is proposed to be a 'consideration'</li> </ul>
--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Part D: Request To Expand Orland Rural Settlement Area To The North**

A request has been made by Tammy Archer at 2548 County Road 30 to expand the Orland Rural Settlement Area to the north to include the southern 11 hectares of a 30 hectare property.

**Response**

- The submission was not supported by any technical reports
- The Subject Lands are designated Agricultural Area by the County Official Plan and have been included in the County's prime agricultural area by Agricultural System mapping released by the Province in 2018
- No recommendations were made in the County's growth management study on the need to expand the Orland Rural Settlement Area, or for any other Rural Settlement Area for that matter - instead the focus was and remains on urban land needs.
- The Growth Plan provides a 'notwithstanding' path for requests to expand Rural Settlement Areas provided the expansion does not encroach into the Greenbelt Plan area (in the form of Section 2.2.9.7) and provided the 'change would constitute a minor rounding out of existing development, in keeping with the rural character of the area.' In cases like these, the justification of 'need' for the development is not required. This is in keeping with the Provincial direction to support housing in its many forms in both large urban areas and rural areas.
- The Subject lands are separated from the Orland Rural Settlement area by Cold Creek and as a result, the proposal would not be considered the minor rounding out of existing development.

**Part E: Request To Expand Campbellford Urban Area To The South**

A request has been made by Sifton Properties Limited (the owners of the Haven on Trent Subdivision) to expand the Campbellford Urban Area to the south to include a proposed 149 unit Plan of Subdivision

**Response**

- The Subject Lands were approved for development by the previous Seymour Official Plan prior to 2001
- Of the 149 units, about 30 have been developed
- The Subject Lands are serviced by full municipal services
- One of the objectives of the Municipal Comprehensive Review is to rationalize and/or correct settlement area boundaries to include those already developed areas or other areas that are functionally related to the settlement area
- In this case, the Subject Lands have been previously approved for fully serviced residential development on the edge of the urban boundary and it is recommended that the lands be included in the Urban Area

**Part F: Request To Expand Hamilton West Rural Settlement Area To The North And West**

A request has been made by Brenda Watson to expand the Hamilton West Rural Settlement Area to the north and west to include all of their lands

**Response**

- The Subject Lands have a land area of approximately 45 hectares.
- Lands to the south and east of the West Branch of Cobourg Creek are currently included in the Hamilton West Rural Settlement Area and we are not aware of any impediments to developing these lands for residential purposes

- Lands to the north and west of the West Branch of Cobourg Creek and the majority of the Subject Lands are designated Agricultural Area by the County Official Plan and identified as part of the County's prime agricultural area by Agricultural System mapping released by the Province in 2018
- The submission was not supported by any technical reports
- No recommendations were made in the County's growth management study on the need to expand the Hamilton West Rural Settlement Area, or for any other Rural Settlement Area for that matter - instead the focus was and remains on urban land needs.
- The Growth Plan provides a 'notwithstanding' path for requests to expand Rural Settlement Areas provided the expansion does not encroach into the Greenbelt Plan area (in the form of Section 2.2.9.7) and provided the 'change would constitute and minor rounding out of existing development, in keeping with the rural character of the area.' In cases like these, the justification of 'need' for the development is not required. This is in keeping with the Provincial direction to support housing in its many forms in both large urban areas and rural areas.
- However, the Subject lands are separated from the Hamilton West Rural Settlement area by the West Branch of Cobourg Creek and as a result, the proposal would not be considered the minor rounding out of existing development.

**Part G: Request To Identify A Special Policy Area On The Lakeport Beach Lands To Accommodate Between 700 And 800 Dwelling Units**

A request has been made by Bousfield's Inc. on behalf of Lakeport Beach Inc. ("Landlab") to establish a special policy area on the Subject Lands

**Response**

- The lands subject to the proposal were the subject of a request for municipal support for a Ministry Zoning Order ('MZO') in September 2021 - the request was not supported by Council.
- A previous decision by Alnwick-Haldimand in 2015 to permit a 68 lot Plan of Subdivision on the Subject Lands through a special policy permission was not supported by the approval authority (being the Ministry of Municipal Affairs), which removed the permission - this decision by the approval authority was appealed and remains under appeal
- The Growth Management Study prepared in support of the MCR forecasted that the number of housing units in Alnwick-Haldimand would increase by 775 units between 2016 to 2051, which works out to an average of 22 units per year and it is anticipated that these units would be developed in existing settlement areas, on existing vacant lots and on new lots created by consent
- It is also noted that as of May 2024, there were 163 proposed lots in draft approved or proposed subdivisions in Alnwick-Haldimand (County Report 2024-068)
- The approval of the Lakeport Beach development would represent all of the rural development that has been allocated to the Township
- The current proposal is not supported by the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, which directs most forms of development to urban areas - it is noted that the Growth Plan will be repealed on October 20, 2024
- Section 1.1.3.1 of the PPS (2020) and Section 2.3.1.1 of the PPS (2024) indicate that settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development - the lands subject to this request are not within a settlement area
- Given the lack of support for the development by Alnwick-Haldimand Council, the development potential of the Subject Lands for 700-800 units has not been considered in the County Growth Management Study
- As a result of the lack of local Council support and the policies of the Growth Plan and the PPS (existing and new), it is not recommended that a Special Policy Area be established on the Subject Lands

**Part H: General Comments By Northumberland Blue Dot**

The comments made in The Northumberland Blue Dot submission have been summarized below and a response to each comment has been provided

	Topic	What We Heard	Response
H1	Intensification target	Opposed to a reduction in the intensification target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The County Growth Management Study recommended that the overall intensification target be reduced from 40% to 17% - this recommendation was made in response to the limited opportunities for additional development that exist within the built boundary areas established in 2006 and the increased amount of growth being directed to the County by the Province</li> <li>The new Provincial Planning Statement that will come into effect on October 20, 2024 will require that intensification targets be established within built-up areas based on local conditions - as a result, this issue will be reviewed again based on this new policy direction</li> <li>Through this review, the built-up area can be expanded to include more land than was identified in 2006, which means that the area that is 'eligible' for intensification development will be increased</li> </ul>
H2	Intensification versus greenfield development	The Port Hope urban area should not be expanded and instead all new growth should be accommodated within the existing urban boundary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A key element of the County's growth management strategy is to determine how and where to accommodate the growth that has been allocated to the County by the Province</li> <li>Before looking at whether urban areas should expand, a detailed analysis of each urban area was carried out to determine its capacity for growth through intensification and on existing vacant or developing greenfield areas that are currently within the urban boundary</li> <li>In the case of Port Hope, it is expected to supply approximately 4,210 new dwellings by 2051. It has been determined based on the analysis completed that the potential exists to develop 900 new dwellings in existing built-up areas, 699 dwellings on existing greenfield lands and about 235 dwellings in the rural area - this leaves a shortfall of 2,376 dwellings.</li> <li>With respect to Cobourg, where the highest percentage of new growth is directed, the Town is able to accommodate the 5,400 new dwellings that are planned for Cobourg within intensification areas (potential for 1,105 units) and within existing greenfield areas (the remaining 4,295 units).</li> </ul>
H3	Alternative locations not comprising prime agricultural land should be utilized instead	Prime agricultural lands should not be utilized for growth because of their importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lands on all three sides of the Port Hope urban area are considered to be within a prime agricultural area (by both the County and the Province) - so any expansion will consume prime agricultural land - which is permitted by the Province because this reality exists through most of the Greater Toronto Area.</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognized that prime agricultural lands are important - this is why every effort will be made to reduce the footprint of the urban expansion area by increasing densities and requiring more mixed-use development</li> </ul>
H4	Development potential in Wesleyville	The ability of the lands in Wesleyville to accommodate housing should be factored into the calculations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the present time, Wesleyville is designated for employment uses only and residential uses are not permitted</li> <li>It is recognized that there was a desire to accommodate residential development on these lands, but these efforts were not supported by the Province</li> <li>As a result, Wesleyville cannot be included in the land supply for urban residential development</li> </ul>
<b>Part I: General Comments By Ganaraska Region Conservation Authority</b>			
The comments made in Ganaraska River Conservation Authority ('GRCA') submission have been summarized below and a response to each comment has been provided			
	<b>Topic</b>	<b>What We Heard</b>	<b>Response</b>
11	Minimum density greenfield area target	Request is that natural hazard lands be excluded from calculations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Item 10 in the LNA OPA 2 indicates that the minimum density target shall exclude natural heritage features and areas and floodplains, provided development is prohibited in these areas - this wording is from the Growth Plan</li> <li>The Growth Plan will be repealed on October 20, 2024 and the new PPS does not establish how the designated greenfield area density target is to be calculated - as a result, the manner in which this is done will be reviewed</li> </ul>
12	Servicing policies	The servicing policies should be updated to exactly match with those found in the new PPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All required changes to OPA 2 that are necessary as a result of the new PPS will be made, as appropriate</li> </ul>
13	Subwatershed planning	Request that stronger policies be included in the Official Plan as per the new PPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All required changes to OPA 2 that are necessary as a result of the new PPS will be made, as appropriate</li> </ul>
14	Technical reports submitted in support of proposed urban expansions	A number of comments have been provided on the technical reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These comments will be further considered as the process unfolds</li> </ul>
15	Source water protection	Regard for Intake Protection Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GRCA notes that the proposed urban expansion areas are within the vulnerable IPZ-2 area and a number of requirements will apply to any proposed development - this is acknowledged</li> </ul>

## Financial Impact

The GMA and costs associated with public engagement/consultation are within the Council approved budget for the Official Plan update that was approved in 2020.

## **Member Municipality Impacts**

A copy of this report with the public feedback received and initial response will be provided to each member municipality for information. Also, County Planning staff will be meeting with member municipal planning staff to review the feedback received and discuss next steps.

## **Conclusion / Outcomes**

This report summarizes the public engagement statics and feedback received from May to June 2024, for the draft Growth Management Amendment to the County Official Plan. County staff and the consultant team will consider all feedback received and adjust the Growth Management Amendment as necessary prior to presenting a final recommendation to County Council.

## **Attachments**

1. Report 2024-131 ATTACH 1 'Written Public Submissions Received'