

DRAFT- External Agency Comments on
Township Council Adopted Version – September 23, 2019
Our King: Township of King Official Plan

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (November 29, 2019)		
Schedule E1 – Hamlet of Pottageville Schedule E2 – Hamlet of Laskay	<p>We noted new changes to the OP with respect to the boundaries of two rural settlement areas, Pottageville and Laskay, both of which appear to have been enlarged in the adopted OP. While we recognize that the Township is transitioning from historic hamlet mapping to a more updated and precise set of hamlet maps in the new OP, the Region should be satisfied the delineation of these hamlet boundaries conforms with provincial plans and policies, as previously noted.</p> <p><u>March 26, 2020 e-mail from MMAH</u> Responding to additional information provided regarding Hamlet Boundaries provided March 24, 2020:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thanks for sharing the information from King about the Hamlets. The information was helpful and we have no further comments in that regard. 	No modifications required as per response from MMAH dated March 26, 2020.
4.8.2 – Schomberg Special Policy Area	<p>We have also noted concerns with respect to revisions to the Schomberg Special Policy Area policies in the Official Plan. While we recognize the Township's intent was to maintain the SPA policies as they were originally approved by the province, it appears that some policy revisions may trigger the need for further provincial approval in accordance with 3.1.4 a) of the Provincial Policy Statement. We request that the Region defer any decision on the SPA policies in the Official Plan until further discussion with the province can be undertaken.</p> <p><u>Modifications provided in an email dated March 30, 2020 from MMAH:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delete policies 4.8.2.4 and 4.8.2.5 or integrate them into Section 9.1.2, Complete Applications. This should have the same result without amending the SPA policies. <p>For reference, these are the policies:</p> <p>4.8.2.4 That all applications for development or redevelopment shall be accompanied by studies by qualified professionals addressing flood frequency, velocity and depth of storm flows, flood damage mitigation and reduction measures.</p> <p>4.8.2.5 That structural engineering studies may be required to confirm that development is designed to withstand the depths, velocities and hydrostatic pressures associated with a flooding event.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Delete the wording “the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan” in policies 4.8.2.6 c), d), and f), and replace it with the wording “policies 4.8.2.7, 4.8.2.8, and 4.8.2.9”. 3. The word “development” should not be italicized in 4.8.2.16. 	Modifications 87., 88. and 89. proposed to address comment.
6.10 – Provincial Agricultural System	We have identified some minor revisions for the Region's consideration regarding policy 6.10, Provincial Agricultural System. In the second sentence, the 2017 Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan should also be noted, and the words, "Greenbelt Plan Area" should be changed to " Greenbelt Area ". In 6.10.1 and 6.10.2, "agricultural system" should be changed to " agricultural land base " where it occurs.	Modifications 151. and 153. proposed to address comment. All applicable Schedules have been modified to utilize the term “Greenbelt Plan Area Boundary”.
Toronto Region Conservation Authority		

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
C. Smith, Senior Manager, Development Planning and Permits - December 10, 2019		
1.5.1.1.c – Environmental Goals and Objectives	Please add “wetlands” to Policy 1.5.1.1.c as follows: “Protecting, managing and maintaining surface and groundwater quality and quantity and the health of the Township’s rivers, streams, wetlands and lakes, including the use of sustainable green infrastructure and low impact development techniques.”	Modification 4. proposed to reflect comment.
3.2.2.1 – Sustainable Construction Practices	<p>Please amend this section as follows:</p> <p>“To develop minimum sustainable construction practices, including but not limited to practices which:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Avoid construction outside “windows” for sensitive habitat life stages, as per federal or provincial requirements; b. Prevent removal of vegetation to be generally no more than 30 days prior to grading or construction; c. Require structures or other stormwater, sedimentation and erosion control measures that will control and convey runoff; d. Prevent and minimize sediment and erosion both onsite and offsite during construction; e. Seed exposed soils once construction is complete as permitted by seasonal conditions Stabilize exposed soils as development and site alteration proceeds and at the completion of each phase of work using methods appropriate for the season (e.g., seed); and f. Ensure erosion and sediment controls are implemented and maintained effectively.” <p>We also would like to note that the “Erosion and Sediment Control Guideline for Urban Construction” (2006) would be a helpful resource to consult or to reference in the King Official Plan (KOP) or future guideline documents.</p> 	<p>Modification 16. proposed to address comment and further discussions with TRCA.</p> <p>Guidelines can be referenced through the Township lead pre-consultation meeting process and re-iterated in the pre-consultation meeting letter but are not reflected as a modification to the King OP 2019.</p>
3.2.3.1 – Excess Soil Reuse	Conservation authorities regulate portions of the Township for activities such as fill placement. As such, we ask that conservation authorities be included in the development of the Excess Soil Reuse Strategy noted in Policy 3.2.3.1 in partnership with the Township and Region. To this end, consideration should also be given to including other stakeholders in the development of this strategy including private operators, NGOs, academia and the Province. TRCA’s “Preserving and Restoring Healthy Soil: Best Practices for Urban Construction” guide is another helpful resource in this regard.	Modification 17. proposed to address comment.
3.8.8 – Live-Work Units	<p>The following policies should be added to Section 3.8.8 for Live-Work Units:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “That the live-work unit is not located in an area that is in a hazardous site or within hazardous lands such as a floodplain.” • “That the live-work unit is not located in an area that would be rendered inaccessible to people and vehicles due to natural hazards unless it is demonstrated the site has safe access.” 	Modification 27. proposed to address comment.
3.8.10 – Garden Suites	<p>We note that Garden Suites have been added back into the adopted version of the KOP. As such, we ask that the following policies be added to Section 3.8.10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “That the garden suite is not located in an area that is in a hazardous site or within hazardous lands such as a floodplain.” • “That the garden suite is not located in an area that would be rendered inaccessible to people and vehicles due to natural hazards unless it is demonstrated the site has safe access.” 	Modification 30. proposed to address comment.
4.2 – Our Natural Heritage System	<p>York Region Official Plan (YROP) Policies 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 indicate:</p> <p><u>“2.1.4 That local official plans shall include policies and mapping to establish and protect greenlands systems from development and site alteration. These systems shall incorporate, complement and build on the Regional Greenlands System, and include the identification of enhancement areas and linkages.</u></p> <p><u>2.1.5 That in the Urban Area and Towns and Villages, the Regional Greenlands System shall be identified more specifically in local official plans and secondary plans, and integrated into community design. These plans shall contain policies and detail initiatives that encourage remedial works and enhancement opportunities within the Regional Greenlands System. [emphasis added].”</u></p>	Modifications 32., 34., 35., 37., 55., 57., 58. and 99. proposed to address comments and reflect further discussions with TRCA.

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
	<p>To that end, TRCA continues to have concerns that the Township's natural heritage system (NHS) has not incorporated local features as directed in YROP's policies, most notably non-significant valleylands and <u>non-significant</u> woodlands.</p> <p>We understand that background environmental work was not completed in support of the King OP. While this may impact the mapping of local features, it should not preclude their protection in the policies of the KOP.</p> <p>In addition, conservation authorities have significant environmental data available through our watershed planning and regulatory mapping work that could be leveraged by the Township in order to map and further incorporate policies relating to local features in the KOP, particularly as it relates to valley and stream corridors.</p> <p>In light of the above, please find attached to this letter TRCA's recommended edits to Table 3 relating to local natural heritage features. If the changes are incorporated into the KOP, the corresponding policies in Chapter 4 would need to be modified to reflect these changes (as further described below).</p> <p>As well, while TRCA is recommending a 10-metre minimum vegetation protection zone (MVPZ) for non-significant valleylands and woodlands, we would support the Township should they wish to apply 30-metre MVPZs for these features consistent with the KOP's environmental goals (1.5.1) "to continue to be a leader in environmental conservation" and for building a robust NHS promoting greater resilience to climate change (4.0).</p>	
4.2 – Our Natural Heritage System	<p>TRCA staff asks that there be a greater recognition of the natural hazard components of the NHS in the Section 4.2 policies. For example, natural hazards could be added as a component of the NHS in Policy 4.2.1.3, in Section 4.2.3 and in Table 3.</p> <p>TRCA had previously asked that the delineation of valleylands and permanent / intermittent streams in Table 3 include the hazard components of those features. Please find attached to this letter the recommended edits to Table 3.</p> <p>The intent of these edits would be to recognize the interconnectedness of natural hazards and natural features and to capture appropriate setbacks / minimum vegetation protection zones from the greatest extent of both features and hazards. Greater emphasis on the natural hazard component in the context of setting development limits would be consistent with 3.1.3 of the PPS, "Planning authorities shall consider the potential impacts of climate change that may increase the risk associated with natural hazards."</p>	Modification 84. proposed to address comment and reflect further discussions with TRCA.
General	As noted by the consulting team, background environmental studies were not completed as part of the current KOP process. It is recommended that the Township consider undertaking such studies in preparation of the next KOP update, which we understand will follow the YROP update anticipated in mid-2020.	Noted.
4.2.1.3 – General Policies for Our Natural Heritage System	<p>The Township's NHS consists of several components as outlined in Policy 4.2.1.3, including "Other natural heritage and hydrologic features and functions as may be identified through the completion of Natural Heritage Evaluations, hydrological evaluation or other studies." It is not clear what is meant by "other natural heritage and hydrologic features and functions". If these other features and functions are not specifically identified in the policies of the KOP (e.g., local features, or those subject to the policies of other agencies like headwater drainage features) then it seems unlikely that an NHE or hydrologic evaluation will voluntarily identify other features and functions for protection. "Other natural heritage and hydrologic features and functions" should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be defined in the KOP policies and cross-referenced here; and • Include natural heritage and hydrologic features and functions of local importance as noted earlier. • Include natural heritage and hydrologic features and functions identified in the legislation, regulations, policies, guidelines and technical papers of other agencies, as may be applicable. 	Modification 32. proposed to address comment.

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
4.2.1.7 - General Policies for Our Natural Heritage System	<p>Section 5.4.2 of the Greenbelt Plan reads: "Boundaries of the Natural Heritage System may be refined at the time of municipal conformity in accordance with the Natural Heritage System policies of section 3.2.2.5. No further refinements to the boundaries of the Natural Heritage System can occur after a municipality has made this one-time refinement." Policy 3.2.2.5 of the Greenbelt Plan states: "When official plans are brought into conformity with this Plan, the boundaries of the Natural Heritage System may be refined, with greater precision, in a manner that is consistent with this Plan and the system shown on Schedule 4."</p> <p>Please clarify how these policies relate to the current Policy 4.2.1.7 of the KOP and amend this policy if needed: "That the boundaries of the Greenbelt Plan's Natural Heritage System are is based upon the Greenbelt Plan and will only be modified by the Province and subsequently implemented in this Plan in accordance with Provincial requirements."</p>	Modification 33. proposed to correct grammatical error. No further modifications proposed.
4.2.1.14 - General Policies for Our Natural Heritage System	TRCA staff appreciate the inclusion of Policy 4.2.1.14. We recommend the addition of the bolded text: "To work with York Region, the Conservation Authorities and the Province to support the protection , restoration and enhancement of our Natural Heritage System."	Modification 34. proposed to address comment.
4.2.1.15 - General Policies for Our Natural Heritage System	<p>YROP Policies 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 also support the identification of enhancement areas and linkages at the local level, and the need for policies that encourage remedial works and enhancement opportunities within the Regional Greenlands System.</p> <p>In the adopted KOP, Policy 4.2.1.1 states in part that "The Natural Heritage system will build upon and complement the York Region Greenlands System and will include the identification of enhancement areas and linkages in accordance with the policies of this Plan." There are other policies included elsewhere in the KOP that generally refer to enhancement and linkage opportunities and we note from WSP's responses that those policies were carried over from the provincial plans.</p> <p>While Policy 4.2.1.1 indicates that the NHS will include the identification of enhancement areas and linkages, the current KOP schedules do not identify any enhancement areas and linkages as there was no background environmental study prepared in advance of the KOP process. The existing policies are also do not direct proponents to provide opportunities for restoration, enhancements and linkages.</p> <p>In light of the above, the Township should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider identifying restoration, enhancement and linkage opportunities in the schedules using previous data from the community plans (e.g., King City Community Plan) and/or the data available from conservation authorities (e.g. the potential natural cover layer of TRCA's Terrestrial Natural Heritage System Strategy). • Amend Policy 4.2.1.15 as follows: "That opportunities for restoration, enhancements and linkages shall-will be identified and addressed through the preparation of any required Natural Heritage Evaluation or Hydrologic Evaluation, in consultation with the Conservation Authorities, Region, and/or Province." • Amend Policy 4.2.1.15 to include more robust language that directs proponents (private, government or otherwise) to implement the restoration, enhancement and linkage opportunities identified in the Natural Heritage Evaluation or Hydrologic Evaluation through the development and site alteration process. 	Modification 35. proposed to address comment and reflect further discussions with TRCA.
4.2.1.18 - General Policies for Our Natural Heritage System	"Quality" is repeated twice in Policy 4.2.1.18. Replace one with the word " quantity ".	Modification 36. proposed to address comment.
4.2.2.2 – Key Natural Heritage Features and Key Hydrologic Features	As noted above, it is TRCA staff opinion that non-significant valleylands and woodlands should be added to the list of KNHFs in Policy 4.2.2.2.	Modification 32. proposed to address comment and reflect further discussions with TRCA.
4.2.2.2 – Key Natural Heritage Features and Key Hydrologic Features	It is recommended that earth science areas of natural and scientific interest (ANSIs) be added to the list of KNHFs in Policy 4.2.2.2. While earth science ANSIs are not listed as KNHFs in the ORMCP, they are recognized as natural heritage features in the YROP and the PPS.	Modifications 38. and 39. proposed to address comment.
4.2.2.5 - Key Natural Heritage Features and Key Hydrologic Features	It is recommended that the bolded text be added to Policy 4.2.2.5: "To recognize that not all of the key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features are shown on Schedule 'C'. The remaining key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features identified in Sections 4.2.2.2 and 4.2.2.3 shall be identified in accordance with the criteria contained in this Plan, or where criteria are not provided,	Modification 40. proposed to reflect comment.

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
	using procedures established by the Province, Region or conservation authority , where applicable.”	
4.2.2.12 - Key Natural Heritage Features and Key Hydrologic Features	<p>We thank the Township for inclusion of a Policy 4.2.2.12 that speaks to instances where unauthorized feature removals have occurred as had been requested by LSRCA. This policy currently reads as follows:</p> <p>“To consider a site alteration by-law and tree by-law in accordance with this Plan, and the Municipal Act, and the York Region Official Plan, to support the implementation of the policies of this Plan regarding protection of key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features. Further, areas where an unauthorized removal has occurred shall continue to be subject to the policies of this Plan as if the feature was still in place, and impacted areas shall be restored.”</p> <p>It is recommended that this policy be separated into two parts to better distinguish between the two concepts, with the latter specifically relating to the unauthorized feature removals reworded to be consistent with YROP Policy 2.2.7:</p> <p>“To prohibit removal, in whole or in part, of a key natural heritage feature or a key hydrologic feature by unauthorized development or site alteration. Areas where an unauthorized removal has occurred shall continue to be subject to the policies of this Plan as if the feature was still in place. Impacted areas shall be restored.”</p>	Modification 42. proposed to address comment and reflect further discussions with TRCA.
4.2.3 – Minimum Vegetation Protection Zones	<p>TRCA staff applaud the Township for identifying and applying MVPZs throughout the Township, including its Villages and Hamlets. Based on our interpretation of the KOP policies, any reduction of the MVPZs would require an official plan amendment consistent with the Township’s current practices.</p> <p>Should the Township opt to give staff the ability to consider minor and localized modifications to the MVPZs based on site-specific circumstances without the need for an amendment to the KOP, a policy could be inserted in Section 4.2.3. Examples of such policies include Policy 5.17.1.7 of the KOP relating to greenfield development in the northeast corner of King City, Policy 3.2.3.11 of the City of Vaughan Official Plan 2010 regarding minor modifications to Core Features including MVPZs, or Policy 7.4.2.1a) of TRCA’s Living City Policies relating to redevelopment scenarios. TRCA staff would be happy to work with the Township and Region to develop criteria should the Township opt to include a policy in this regard.</p>	Addressed by policy 5.6.3.6 in adopted OP. No further modification required as per discussion with TRCA.
4.2.3 - Minimum Vegetation Protection Zones and Table 3 – Adjacent Lands and Minimum Vegetation Protection Zones	Please find attached to this letter TRCA’s recommended edits to Table 3 relating to KNHFs, KHFs and MVPZs.	Modifications 43., 44., 55., 57. and 58. proposed to address comment and reflect further discussions with TRCA.
Table 3 - Adjacent Lands and Minimum Vegetation Protection Zones	For earth science ANSIs, replace “As determined in the Natural Heritage Evaluation” with “ As determined in the Earth Science Heritage Evaluation ”.	Modification 43. proposed to reflect comment.
Table 3 - Adjacent Lands and Minimum Vegetation Protection Zones	Alvars are missing from Table 3 but are listed as KNHFs in Policy 4.2.2.2. Amend Table 3 accordingly.	No further modification necessary as a modification 39. is proposed to remove Alvars from the referenced policy.
4.2.4 – Wetlands and Other Hydrologic Features	<p>A new policy is recommended at the end of Section 4.2.4 similar to what is included in Section 4.8 identifying that conservation authorities regulate wetlands and some other hydrologic features, like permanent and intermittent streams:</p> <p>“To work with the Conservation Authorities to confirm the current Regulation Limit, recognizing that certain lands within the Township are subject to the Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulations as administered by the Conservation Authorities. The Regulation Limit does not represent a development limit, yet it</p>	Modification 48. proposed to address comment.

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
	represents the greatest physical extent of the combined natural hazards and natural features plus a prescribed allowance as set out in the Conservation Authority Regulations. For reference purposes, Appendix 1 illustrates the Regulation Limit for the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority. The Conservation Authority should be contacted for more updated mapping. The text of the Regulations prevails over any mapping.”	
4.2.4.3 - Wetlands and Other Hydrologic Features	Add “ lakes including kettle lakes ” to Policy 4.2.4.3 as these are also shown on Schedule ‘C3’.	Modification 47. proposed to reflect comment.
4.2.5.6.a - Woodlands	Add “ Environmentally Significant Area ” to Policy 4.2.5.6.a.	Modification 50. proposed to reflect comment.
4.2.5 - Woodlands	It is recommended that the Section 4.2.5 include a policy consistent with YROP Policy 2.2.50 that local municipalities shall develop an Urban Forest Management Plan, together with York Region, that may include additional locally significant woodlands.	Modification 54. proposed to address comment.
4.2.5 - Woodlands	It is recommended that a new policy be inserted in Section 4.2.5 requiring an MVPZ to local woodlands identified for protection as previously requested by TRCA in Section 4.2.3 and Table 3 above.	Modification 55. proposed to address comment.
4.2.6.1 - Valleylands	We ask that Policy 4.2.6.1 be amended to add the bolded text: “To prohibit development and site alteration in a significant valleyland or other valleyland except as provided in this Plan. ”	Modifications 57. and 58. proposed to address comment.
4.2.6 - Valleylands	A new policy is recommended at the end of Section 4.2.6 similar to what is included in Section 4.8 regarding lands regulated by conservation authorities, such as valleylands: “ To work with the Conservation Authorities to confirm the current Regulation Limit, recognizing that certain lands, such as valleylands, within the Township are subject to the Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulations as administered by the Conservation Authorities. The Regulation Limit does not represent a development limit, yet it represents the greatest physical extent of the combined natural hazards and natural features plus a prescribed allowance as set out in the Conservation Authority Regulations. For reference purposes, Appendix 1 illustrates the Regulation Limit for the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority. The Conservation Authority should be contacted for more updated mapping. The text of the Regulations prevails over any mapping. ”	Modification 58. proposed to reflect comment.
4.2.8.1 – Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest and Environmentally Significant Areas	We ask that Policy 4.2.8.1 be amended to add the bolded text: “...The addition of any Life Science or Earth Science ANSIs...”	Modification 60. proposed to reflect comment.
4.2.8.3 – Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest and Environmentally Significant Areas	Add “ technical papers or policies ” to the end of the sentence in Policy 4.2.8.3.	Modification 61. proposed to reflect comment.
4.2.8 – Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest and Environmentally Significant Areas	Add a new policy at the end of Section 4.2.8 similar to YROP Policy 2.2.24: “ That Environmentally Significant Areas on the Oak Ridges Moraine or within the Natural Heritage System of the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan, which have been identified by a conservation authority, are also considered to be key natural heritage features, subject to the same requirements for protection and study as those identified in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and Greenbelt Plan for Life Science Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest. ”	Modification 62. proposed to reflect comment.
4.3.1.d – Natural Heritage	We ask that Policy 4.3.1.d be amended to add the bolded text: “Meet the requirements of the Provincial Plans and in accordance with	Modification 64. proposed to reflect comment.

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
Evaluations and Hydrologic Evaluations	Provincial and Conservation Authority policies , technical papers and guidelines as applicable.”	
4.3.2 - Natural Heritage Evaluations and Hydrologic Evaluations	Policy 4.3.2 should be expanded to indicate that “The boundaries of other key natural heritage features within the natural heritage system will need to be staked and surveyed in the field and approved by the Township in consultation with the conservation authority, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry or other agencies as may be required, depending on the features involved.”	Modification 65. proposed to reflect comment.
4.5 – Watershed Planning	Consider incorporating the YROP policies on watershed planning (2.3.36 to 2.3.39) in KOP Section 4.5 where they are not already covered in this section.	Modifications 66. and 67. proposed to address comment and reflect further discussions with TRCA.
4.6 – Key Hydrologic Areas	The abbreviation for Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas in Section 4.6 should be <u>SGRAs</u> , not <u>SRGAs</u> .	Modification 68. proposed to reflect comment.
4.6 – Key Hydrologic Areas	Add the word “and” in the last paragraph of Section 4.6: “...not negatively affect the hydrological and hydrogeological functions...”	Modification 69. proposed to reflect comment.
4.6.1 - Key Hydrologic Areas	With reference to Clause 2 (b): The CTC SPP only requires that an Environmental Assessment or similar planning process be implemented to demonstrate how stormwater pond discharges and sanitary sewers and related pipes can be located outside of Wellhead Protection Area B because in this vulnerable area the activity could be a significant drinking water threat. Stormwater pond discharge and sanitary sewers and related pipes cannot be a significant drinking water threat in highly vulnerable aquifers. Given the fairly expansive distribution, it will be difficult to demonstrate how stormwater pond discharges and sanitary sewers and related pipes can be located outside of these areas.	Modification 70. proposed to address comment and reflect further discussions with TRCA.
4.7 – Source Protection	Please remove the word “and” in reference to the Credit Valley – Toronto and Region – Central Lake Ontario Source Protection Region.	Modification 71. proposed to reflect comment.
4.7.2 – Wellhead Protection Areas	Please label Section 4.7.2 as “Wellhead Protection Areas – Water Quality ” for consistency with Section 4.7.3.	Modification 74. proposed to reflect comment.
4.7.2.5. - Wellhead Protection Area B with a vulnerability score of 10 as shown on Schedule G	Please add the following land uses to those prohibited in the WHPA B with a vulnerability score of 10: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Below Grade Snow Storage Facilities that are 0.01 hectares in size or greater. • At or Above Grade Snow Storage Facilities that are greater than 1 hectare in area, except in emergency scenarios. • Aggregate Extraction Sites requiring the storage of fuel where the amount of fuel stored is greater than 250 Litres, within the Toronto and Region Source Protection Area. • Storage Buildings used for non-agricultural source material (NASM) that includes, but is not necessarily restricted to the following materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) sewage biosolids; ii) Processed plant-based materials including bakery washwater, and iii) Any other material that is not from an agricultural source and that is capable of being applied to land as a nutrient exclusive of unprocessed plant-based materials. • Aircraft de-icing facilities. 	Modification 76. proposed to address comment and reflect further discussions with TRCA and York Region Water Resources.
4.7.2.6 - Wellhead Protection Area A with a vulnerability score of 10 as shown on Schedule G	Please remove the “Storage of snow where the threat is considered significant”. This is captured with the addition of the two circumstances above and the statement of 6a.	Modification 77. proposed to reflect comment.
4.7.2.6 - Wellhead Protection	Please add the following land uses to those prohibited in the WHPA A with a vulnerability score of 10:	Modification 79. proposed to address comment

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
Area A with a vulnerability score of 10 as shown on Schedule G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestock grazing and pasturing Agricultural outdoor confinement, pasturing or farm animal yards where the nutrients are generated at an annual rate that is not more than 1 nutrient unit per acre. • On-site septic systems, including holding tanks, governed under the Building Code Act. • Septic systems governed under the Ontario Water Resources Act. • Parking lots greater than 2000 square meters in size to protect the municipal water supply from road salt contamination. 	and reflect further discussions with TRCA and York Region Water Resources.
4.7.2.6 - Wellhead Protection Area A with a vulnerability score of 10 as shown on Schedule G	Please add the bold text to the description of “Storage Facilities for Non-Agricultural Source Material – Category 1 (unprocessed plant-based materials including remnants of or discarded fruit and vegetable).”	No modification required as per further discussion with TRCA and York Region Water Resources.
4.7.3 – Wellhead Protection Areas – Quantity (WHPA-Q)	<p>Please add the following text for consistency with the CTC Source Protection Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Only approving settlement area expansions as part of a municipal comprehensive review where it has been demonstrated that recharge functions will be maintained on lands designated Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas. • Settlement area expansions will only be permitted as part of a municipal comprehensive review where the applicable provincial planning criteria have been met and the following has been demonstrated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) The aquifer has sufficient capacity to sustainably provide municipal water Services to the expanded settlement area; B) the expansion will not adversely impact the aquifers ability to meet the municipal water supply requirements for current and planned service capacity, for other permitted takings, or for wastewater receiving bodies; and C) the hydrological integrity of municipal wells will be maintained.” 	No modification required as per further discussion with TRCA and York Region Water Resources to address comment.
4.8.1.3 and 4.8.1.17 – Hazardous Lands, Hazardous Sites and Hazardous Forest Types	Add “The text of the Regulations prevails over any mapping. The Regulation Limit does not represent a development limit.” to the end of Policies 4.8.1.3 and 4.8.1.17.	Modifications 81. and 85. proposed to reflect comment.
4.8.1.4 and 4.8.1.14 - Hazardous Lands, Hazardous Sites and Hazardous Forest Types	<p>Please amend Policies 4.8.1.4 and 4.8.1.14 by the adding the text in bold:</p> <p>“That the delineation of hazardous lands and hazardous sites be confirmed through development application review or other applicable studies in consultation with to the satisfaction of the Conservation Authority and that hazardous lands and hazardous sites be suitably zoned in an implementing zoning by-law along with any required setbacks.”</p> <p>“To require setbacks, buffers or other measures from hazardous lands and hazardous sites as may be determined through technical studies in support of development applications, and to consult with the Conservation Authority about the appropriateness of setbacks with consideration made to risks associated with climate change. The setback, buffer or minimum vegetation protection zone from a natural hazard (e.g., flood plain, meander belt, stable top of bank) shall be in accordance with Table 3 and policy 4.8.1.14, and shall be to the satisfaction of the Township and Conservation Authority., unless an alternative is approved by the Conservation Authority.”</p> <p>Should TRCA’s recommended changes to Table 3 not be incorporated into the KOP, we ask that minimum buffers to hazardous lands and hazardous sites be incorporated in Policy 4.8.1.14 and that the policy indicate that those buffers shall be to the satisfaction of the Conservation Authority. TRCA’s recommended minimum buffer is 10 metres from the greatest extent of all features and hazards (see 7.3.1.4 of The Living City Policies for full policies, which also includes 30 metre buffers to provincially significant wetlands).</p>	Modifications 82. and 84. proposed to reflect comment and further reflect further discussions with TRCA.

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
4.8.1.10 - Hazardous Lands, Hazardous Sites and Hazardous Forest Types	The reference to Section 4.7.2 in Policy 4.8.1.10 should be replaced with “ 4.8.2 ”.	Modification 83. proposed to reflect comment.
4.8.1 - Hazardous Lands, Hazardous Sites and Hazardous Forest Types	Consider adding a new policy at the end of Section 4.8.1, similar to Policy 3.6.3.2 of the Vaughan Official Plan 2010 which addresses overall hazard management and recognizes the interconnectedness of natural hazards and natural features: “To take a comprehensive approach to natural hazard management for all development and site alteration proposals considering factors including but not limited to: a. risk to life and property; b. upstream and downstream impacts and the cumulative impacts of development on the overall hazard level; c. climate change effects on the overall hazard level; and d. impacts to natural features and areas including their ecological and hydrologic functions.” Again, these changes emphasize the interconnectedness of natural hazard and natural feature management.	Modification 86. proposed to reflect comment.
4.9.1.4 and 4.9.1.10 – Human-made Hazards	It is recommended that Policies 4.9.1.4 and 4.9.1.10 be broadened to encourage the remediation, reuse and rehabilitation of <u>all</u> human made hazards, not just waste disposal sites. Policy 4.9.1.10 should also include private landowners and operators in these remediation, reuse and rehabilitation initiatives.	Modifications 90. and 92. proposed to reflect comment.
8.5.4 – Road Network, Schedule ‘F’ – Transportation Networks and its Sub-schedules	In the road network on Schedule ‘F’ and its sub-schedules, there are Potential Future Linkages and Proposed Township Roads that traverse significant environmental areas, including KNHFs, HFs and hazardous lands. Examples include: the Proposed Township Road in the northwest quadrant of King City extending out to Jane Street; the Potential Future Linkage in the southwest quadrant of King City also extending out to Jane Street; and, the Potential Future Linkage in the northeast quadrant of King City extending out to Dufferin Street. The latter is identified in Policy 5.17.1.4 as not being a viable linkage option and should be removed from the Schedule ‘F1’. The others should be supported by a new policy in Section 8.5.4 specifically indicating that the Potential Future Linkages and Proposed Township Roads shown on the schedules are conceptual and subject to confirmation and alternative alignment based on the studies and policies identified elsewhere in the KOP.	Modifications 173. and to Schedules F – Transportation Networks proposed to address comment.
8.5.9 – Active Transportation, Schedule ‘F’ – Transportation Networks and its Sub-schedules	On September 27, 2019, the TRCA Board of Directors fully endorsed the TRCA Trail Strategy for the Greater Toronto Region (https://trca.ca/conservation/greenspace-management/trail-strategy/). The strategy outlines TRCA’s plan to work with partners to complete, expand, manage and celebrate the Greater Toronto Region Trail Network, a connected trail network in our regional greenspace system. It serves as a framework to protect potential trail alignments, and to guide the planning, development, and management of these trails. While the TRCA Trail Strategy for the Greater Toronto Region was endorsed after Council adoption of the KOP on September 23, 2019, we would like to take this opportunity to incorporate components of this regional initiative into the Plan. Much of TRCA’s Strategy is already captured in KOP Schedule ‘F’. TRCA Greenspace Conservation staff would be pleased to meet with Township and Region staff to discuss the Trail Strategy and our shared objectives for trail linkages.	Modifications to Schedules F – Transportation Networks, where applicable, proposed to address comment.
9.1.2.10 – Complete Applications	TRCA staff asks that commenting agencies be added to the list of parties in Policy 9.1.2.10 that can request additional submission materials beyond those provided in Table 4 as part of the plan review process.	No modification required based on further discussion with TRCA.
9.2.2.h - Consents	Please remove the word “ significant ” from Policy 9.2.2.h to ensure there is no negative impact on <u>all</u> natural heritage features, <u>all</u> hydrologic features, or their functions.	Modification 189. proposed to reflect comment.
Schedule ‘C’ – Natural Heritage Systems, ‘D’ –	We note in WSP’s response to agency comments that the conservation authorities’ NHS mapping has been incorporated into the KOP schedules. We note in some areas that this does not appear to be the case, e.g., Laskay. We would ask that the digital NHS layer in the	No modification required based on further discussion with TRCA.

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
Villages Land Uses Designations and 'E' - Countryside Land Uses and their Sub-schedules - Hamlet Land Uses	KOP be shared with TRCA to confirm.	
Schedules 'D'- Villages Land Uses Designations and 'E' - Countryside Land Uses and their Sub-schedules - Hamlet Land Uses	TRCA staff notes the NHS land use designation was modified to address recent development approvals to the extent possible prior to Council adoption of the Plan. We acknowledge and appreciate those changes, but there still appears to be errors in Schedules 'D' and 'E'. Some areas designated as residential have been approved as part of the NHS and vice versa. The example highlighted in TRCA's September 5, 2019 email in the northwest quadrant of Nobleton (Edgecore Investments/Via Moto) is one example of a site that contains a stream corridor that is part of the approved NHS. Mary Lake Estates southwest of Keele Street and 15 th Sideroad in King City is another example. Schedules 'D' and 'E' should be checked and updated with the most recent information.	Modifications to Schedule D2 – Village of Nobleton Land Use Designations proposed to address comment.
Schedule 'C4' – Key Hydrologic Areas	The Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas illustrated on Schedule 'C4' are not current. TRCA staff sent the most current, Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks-approved SGRA spatial data to Ann-Marie McCallum, GIS Coordinator on June 6, 2019.	Modifications to Schedule C4 – Key Hydrologic Areas proposed to reflect comment.
Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority D. Ruggle, Planner II – November 20, 2019		
	<p>Appears that the previous comments of the LSRCA have been addressed in the adopted document. As such we have no concerns with the Region approving the Plan.</p> <p>We do note that “phosphorus” is misspelled a number of times within the text as well as the acronym for Significant Groundwater Recharge Area should read “SGRA” not “SRGA” in section 4.6.</p>	Modifications 166.,169.,170., 185. and 68. proposed to reflect comment.
Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury R. Windle, Manager, Office of Community Planning - October 22, 2019		
Township-wide Schedules	No substantive comments but point of clarification regarding boundary depiction between Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury and Township of King where the portion of King Township stretches down Highway 11 towards Bridges Street. Concerned it is not reflected on the applicable Schedules.	Modifications to all Schedules, where appropriate, proposed to address comment.
Town of Aurora A. Sallese, Senior Policy Planning - November 21, 2019		
Active Transportation, Complete Streets and Travel Demand Management	<p>The Growth Plan (2019) sets out a broad vision for transportation within the Greater Golden Horseshoe. It includes policies to improve integration between transportation and land use planning decisions across the region, including, among other matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - requiring the adoption of a complete streets approach when designing, refurbishing or reconstructing existing or planned streets and street networks, and highlighting the importance of active transportation, particularly for transit; - promoting an increased modal share for active transportation and transit, including convenient, multimodal options for intra- and inter-municipal travel, which supports reduced air pollution and improved public health outcomes; and, - requiring municipalities to develop and implement Transportation Demand Management policies in official plans and other planning documents. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff applaud King Township Staff and the draft OP policy direction for active transportation routes, the use of alternate transportation modes (e.g. transit, walking & cycling) to reduce automobile dependence in existing rights-of-way, and policies that promote a Complete Streets approach in the design of new and existing streets. 2. Staff recommend further strengthening the policies by considering specific and measurable Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and Travel Demand Management (TDM) policies to reduce single-occupant vehicle usage. 	Modification 171. proposed to reflect comment.

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
	<p>3. Schedule F of the draft KTOP identifies planned 'Active Transportation' routes on 17th Sideroad (Wellington St W) and 18th Sideroad (St. John's Sideroad). Have cross-sections for the above Regional Roads been developed for these rights-of-way as part of the Regional Transportation Master Plan, or at a local level, and do they include active transportation facilities?</p>	
Municipal Coordination & the Regional Street Network	<p>The Town of Aurora's Official Plan promotes transportation systems that provide convenient movement within, and linkages to, external transportation systems within the Town, Region and throughout the Province. An important objective of the Town's Official Plan is the provision of a highly interconnected, convenient and safe system of routes for pedestrians and cyclists, across municipal boundaries, and developing a multi-modal transportation system that is compatible with existing and future land use system.</p> <p>4. Staff are pleased to see that the KTOP includes policies that encourage improved connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists by way of Planned Active Transportation Routes. We look forward to working with the Town and Region in implementing an integrated multi-modal transportation system between municipalities.</p>	No further modifications required.
The Role of Public Streets and Planned Rights-of-Way	<p>Public streets are significant public open spaces which connect people and places and can support the development of sustainable, economically vibrant and complete communities. A goal in improving the function of the transportation network is to provide for the efficient and safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists, the operation of public transit, and a balanced approach to providing infrastructure for vehicles.</p> <p>5. Staff recommend refining the policies in the draft KTOP to further support the role of public streets and their function in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) integrating and <u>balancing</u> the needs and priorities of the various users and uses within the right-of-way, including space for other street elements, such as trees and landscaping, green infrastructure, snow and stormwater management, wayfinding, boulevard cafes, marketing and vending, and street furniture; b) improving the quality and convenience of active transportation options within all communities; c) reflecting differences in local context and character; d) providing building access <u>and address</u>; and e) serving as community destinations and public gathering places. <p>6. The Town of Aurora's Official Plan identifies the classification of streets and planned rights-of-way of in Schedules 'I' and 'J' (see attached). Staff recommend creating similar schedules in the KTOP. Please note that York Region's OP (Map 12) indicates that there is a segment of east-road road at the intersection of Wellington Street West and Bathurst Street that should have a planned ROW of up to 20m, whereas both the KTOP & Town of Aurora's Official Plan (see attached) show this segment as having a 36m planned right-of-way.</p>	No further modifications required.
Public Transit	<p>Public transit is an integral part of the transportation network and its importance in reducing traffic, greenhouse gas emissions, promoting active transportation, and reducing the need for unnecessary road expansions through established neighbourhoods.</p> <p>7. Staff would like to continue to work with its municipal partners and the Region to ensure that active transportation networks, including cycling, are comprehensive and integrated into transportation planning. The integration of transportation and land use planning is an important component to shifting modality from automobiles to more sustainable transportation options, and increasing accessibility throughout the Town and across municipal boundaries.</p>	Noted. No changes required.
Cycling & Pedestrian Policy Framework	<p>The Town of Aurora's Official Plan supports building a physical environment that supports and encourages walking, including vibrant streets, parks, public squares and neighbourhoods where people will choose to walk more often. Aurora's Trail Network forms an important link connects people to destinations such as schools, recreation centres, employment areas and commercial centres.</p> <p>8. Staff recommend strengthening the KTOP policies such that they promote the development of safe and comfortable pedestrian and cycling routes across municipal boundaries in support of an integrated transportation system across the Region.</p>	Modifications to Schedules F – Transportation Networks proposed to address comment.

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
	<p>9. Please note that the Town of Aurora completed a Trails Master Plan in 2011 (see attached) which identifies an improved pedestrian environment/trails system, including an existing trail connection at Henderson Drive and Bathurst Street (Oak Ridges Trail) that might connect with King Township's active transportation route at 16th Sideroad. https://www.aurora.ca/thingstodo/documents/final%20aurora%20trails%20master%20pla%20(november%202011)%20-%20january%2016%202012%20(compressed).pdf</p> <p>10. The future Oak Ridges Trail alignment in Aurora passes through the Case Woodlot in Aurora, adjacent Bathurst, between Henderson and McLellan Way. Consider the possibility for a future trail connection between Aurora and King at Bathurst and McLellan, possibly through the Fairfield Drive subdivision on the King side, to connect with the Oak Ridges Trail Route at Dufferin Street.</p> <p>11. Comments regarding Schedule F's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed Active Transportation Routes are shown on Schedule F1, on Keele Street between 15th Sideroad to the King City GO Station, which are not shown on Schedule F. - A Proposed Active Transportation Route is shown on King Road between Jane Street and Dufferin Street, which is not shown on Schedule F. - A Proposed Active Transportation Route is shown halfway across 15th Sideroad, west of Dufferin Street on Schedule F, which is not reflected on Schedule F1. - An Existing Active Transportation Route is shown on Schedule F on Dufferin Street south of King Sideroad, which is not reflected in Schedule F. - In Schedule F, the legend includes an Existing Active Transportation Route whereas Schedule F1 uses the same line/colour but calls it an Existing Trail. 	
Cross Jurisdictional Matters	<p>The Town of Aurora is undertaking a Master Transportation Study (MTS) with the intention to develop an integrated set of road network and infrastructure solutions to accommodate vehicles, cyclists, pedestrians, and transit users. A report on the MTS will be before the Town's Council in 2020.</p> <p>The Town of Aurora is also initiating a review of the 2010 Official Plan and Municipal Comprehensive Review. The draft scope of work for this Study includes a Movement and Infrastructure Strategy. Coordination of transportation policies between neighbouring municipalities that promote the design, development and implementation of safe, comfortable and convenient pedestrian and cycling routes across municipal boundaries, supports an integrated Regional transportation system.</p>	Noted. No changes required.
City of Vaughan M. Caputo, Senior Planning – November 22, 2019		
	No comment.	
Town of Newmarket A. Cammaert, Acting Manager, Planning Services – December 12, 2019		
	No concerns.	
Southlake Regional Health Centre P. Green, Director, Capital Development – October 28, 2019		
	<p>Southlake Regional Health Centre understands the impact of provincial and regional planning requirements on local communities, in particular, the provincial Places to Grow Strategy. In this context, continued residential development is not unexpected.</p> <p>It is important for Council to recognize however, that provincial growth policies do not provide for the necessary capital investment to</p>	Noted. No changes required.

Section in Adopted Official Plan	Agency Review Comments	Action/ Response
	expand hospital infrastructure to meet the health care needs of new residents. At Southlake we are doing our best to find new and innovative ways to better serve our growing communities and we will continue to do so. Southlake will require Council's continued support with respect to supporting local share fundraising and to supporting our efforts to secure necessary funding approvals from the provincial government to help meet the needs of our growing population.	
Rogers A. Kailan, Planning Coordinator – October 29, 2019		
	No comments or concerns at this time.	
Bell R. Courville, Access Network Provisioning Manager – December 12, 2019		
	<p>No further comment beyond what was has already been provided.</p> <p>However, I do note that (with the exception of Policy 5.4.3.7.i) it does not appear as though our comments/recommendations made it in to the adopted version of the plan.</p>	<p>King reviewed and responded to Bell's comments in preparation for the September 2019 adoption. The review resulted in not all of Bell's comments being incorporated and addressed as outlined in the previous response matrix.</p> <p>No further modifications proposed.</p>
Canada Post Corporation C. Wilson, Officer, Delivery Services – December 13, 2019		
	Canada Post does not have any comments to provide for the Official Plan.	
Conseil Scolaire Viamonde D. Stojc, Supervisor of Planning – December 13, 2019		
	The Conseil Scolaire Viamonde has no comments regarding the Township's official plan.	
Enbridge Gas Inc. A. Coleman, Municipal Planning Coordinator – December 16, 2019		
	Enbridge Gas Inc. does not object to the adopted version of the Township of King Official Plan.	