



NIAGARA OFFICIAL PLAN

Appendix 3 - PDS 6-2022 Comments Summary

Urban Settlement Area Boundary Review

Niagara Region
March 2022

GROWING REGION



Table Description

In December 2021, Reports No. PDS 41-2021 and PDS 42-2021 outlined staff's recommendations for urban and rural area expansions as a result of the Settlement Area Boundary Review ("SABR"). The recommendations were provided for further consultation with Council, stakeholders, and members of the public.

This document provides a summary of the submissions for urban area expansions received between November 29, 2021 and February 11, 2022. The tables are sorted by local municipality, and include the nature of the comments received and a summary response by staff. Additional comments received after the submission deadline were not included for reporting purposes. Documents submitted are available online as Appendix 3 to PDS 6-2022.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Fort Erie

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
1	Steve Fraser (AJ Clarke)	1130	Southwest corner of Schooley Road and Michener Road	Supports staff's recommendation to include the subject lands into the settlement area boundary, as well as the lands west of the site (identified as "Recommendation No. 3 – Community Lands" in Staff Report PDS 41-2021).	Thank you for your feedback.
2	Jim Harnum (Municipal VU Consulting Inc.)	1137	0 Nigh Rd.	<p>Requests the subject property be included within the urban area boundary for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified and supported by the Town of Fort Erie for inclusion. • In proximity to "hard and soft services". • Unopened road allowances on the subject land indicate intent for the subject lands to be developed. • Contiguous with existing development and, as such, "would represent a logical extension of the current settlement area boundary". <p>Further provides an overview of the site context and the several studies submitted in support of the proposal, including: archaeological assessments, hydraulic modeling analysis and engineering services assignment, transit and transportation feasibility study, and environmental constraints analysis.</p>	<p>Staff reviewed the submission from MVU Consultants.</p> <p>As indicated in prior meetings and as reflected in the submission, there are environmental and servicing constraints restricting a considerable portion of the subject lands, impacting its developable area.</p> <p>While aspects of the site are appropriately reflected in the submission, Staff must consider all criteria in making recommendations.</p> <p>Staff's recommendations allow for larger more comprehensive complete community planning in this area of the municipality.</p>
2.1	Stuart Wright	1137	0 Nigh Road	Submitted a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment to support the inclusion of the subject property within the urban area boundary.	Staff received the analysis submitted by the property owner's consultant. The Region maintains its initial assessment of the subject property.
2.2	Stuart Wright	1137	0 Nigh Road	Submitted a Hydraulic Modelling Analysis and Engineering Services Assignment to support the inclusion of the subject property within the urban area boundary.	Staff received the analysis submitted by the property owner's consultant. The Region maintains its initial assessment of the subject property.
2.3	Stuart Wright	1137	0 Nigh Road	Submitted a Transit and Transportation Feasibility Study to support the inclusion of the subject property within the urban area boundary.	Staff received the analysis submitted by the property owner's consultant. The Region maintains its initial assessment of the subject property.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Fort Erie

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
2.4	Stuart Wright	1137	0 Nigh Road	Submitted an Environmental Constraints Analysis to support the inclusion of the subject property within the urban area boundary.	<p>Staff reviewed the Environmental Constraints analysis submitted. Staff contacted the property owner to receive permission to conduct a site visit to validate the findings of the Environmental Constraints analysis and met with the property owner’s consultant to discuss those findings.</p> <p>Staff acknowledge that refinements to the feature boundaries is warranted, and our updated understanding of the Natural Environmental System on the subject lands was considered as part of the SABR.</p>
2.5	Stuart Wright	1137	0 Nigh Road	<p>Requests that the Town of Fort Erie Municipal Reports related to the subject property be uploaded to the Region’s interactive online mapping tool.</p> <p>Further requests Staff give the subject property the same consideration as other properties being considered as part of the boundary review.</p> <p>Seeking to clarify where and when public comments will be made available for review.</p>	<p>Comments found in the online mapping tool are a point-in-time reference from an earlier stage in the process. The map has not been updated since this time, nor is there an intention to do so.</p> <p>The Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) was prepared for information and consultation purposes. All material provided by Mr. Wright will be carefully considered as part of our ongoing boundary review and will be given equal consideration as the other properties considered.</p> <p>Staff will post comments received on the Region’s website following the commenting deadline in February 2022, and will report further to our Committee and Council.</p>
3	Greg Lipinski (Hawk Development)	1180	Erie Road and Willowood Avenue	Seeking to clarify why the subject lands were not included in Regional Staff’s recommendations given that the Town of Fort Erie supported its inclusion in the settlement area boundary.	<p>Staff reviewed all locations requested for settlement area boundary expansion using a comprehensive set of criteria.</p> <p>There is a fixed amount of land that can be expanded based on our Land Needs Assessment. Only those that most appropriately met the evaluation criteria were recommended by Staff for expansion. Staff’s recommendations identify the most appropriate locations for expansion for the Town of Fort Erie.</p>
3.1	Greg Lipinski (Hawk Development)	1180	Erie Road and Willowood Avenue	Requests staff to reconsider the inclusion of the subject lands in the settlement area boundary to permit the development of single-detached dwellings on each lot identified.	Staff reviewed the letter submitted and maintains the initial assessment of the subject lands.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Fort Erie

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
4	Murray Evans (Evans Planning Inc.)	1127	171 Gorham Road	Requests the subject property be included within the urban area boundary for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified and supported by the Town of Fort Erie for inclusion. • Adjacent to existing residential and commercial government. • Largely free of environmental constraints. • In proximity to municipal infrastructure, including access to the Friendship Recreational Trail. 	Staff reviewed the submission and has considered the content of the letter in the revisions made to the assessment of the subject property.
4.1	Murray Evans (Evans Planning Inc.)	1127	171 Gorham Road	Provides additional information for Staff to consider prior to final recommendations, including their comments of the assessment outcome.	Staff reviewed the additional materials submitted and considered the consultant criteria opinions. The Region maintains its initial assessment of the subject property.
4.2	Peter Van Loan (Aird & Berlis LLP)	1127	171 Gorham Road	Requests the subject property be included within the urban area boundary for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified and supported by the Town of Fort Erie for inclusion. • Supports the objectives of the Growth Plan and Provincial Policy Statement. • In proximity to municipal infrastructure and adjacent existing development. • Supports the establishment of a trail system for the Town of Fort Erie. 	Staff reviewed the submission and has considered the content of the letter in the revisions made to the assessment of the subject property.
5	Les Griffis	N/A	Highway 3, Ridge Road, Nigh Road and Gorham Road	Seeking to clarify whether the subject lands would be in the urban area boundary and eligible for future development.	The subject lands were assessed as part of SABR, but are not recommended for urban area expansion at this time.
6	Gary Davidson	1116	Bowen Road and the Q.E.W	Advised to speak to Regional staff regarding the SABR assessment in relation to the subject lands.	Staff spoke to Mr. Davidson regarding the SABR process and the draft recommendations for urban area expansion. Mr. Davidson noted that he was supportive of the inclusion of his lands into the urban area boundary. Staff also provided a link to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and appendices as part of an e-mail follow-up.
7	Lori Edward	N/A	Gorham Road and Highland Drive	Requests mapping of the urban area boundary adjustments identified on the subject property.	There are no urban area boundary adjustments identified on the subject property. Supplemental mapping of the surrounding area was provided.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Fort Erie

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
8	Vince D'Ameilo	N/A	Nigh Road and Gorham Road	<p>Requested that the subject lands be considered for urban expansion for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously considered for urban area expansion. • Located adjacent to the Creekside Estates Subdivision and contains a right-of-way for future road and servicing access. • Access to both Night Road and Gorham Road, which are subject to significant infrastructure upgrades, including storm sewers, sidewalk realignment, and upgrades to the Nigh Road culvert crossing over Beaver Creek. • Lands are not viable for agricultural use. 	<p>The commenter owns lands in the area identified in a portion of the SABR ID 1368 site and would seek Staff's reconsideration to include the lands in the settlement area expansion.</p> <p>The subject lands were considered as part of the SABR review and while contiguous with existing settlement area, the assessment for the site has not changed.</p> <p>Staff maintain that other, more appropriate locations in the Ridgeway-Thunder Bay – Crystal Beach settlement area are recommended for expansion at this time.</p>
9	Charles Irvine	1116	1622 Bertie Street	<p>Received the Notice Letter in the mail and wanted further information on the SABR.</p>	<p>Staff spoke to Mr. Irving regarding the SABR process and the draft recommendations for urban area expansion, and provided a link to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and its appendices. Mr. Irvine indicated that he supported the Employment Area designation as recommended.</p>
10	Carol Anderson	N/A	General	<p>Verbatim: "When are these subdivisions ruining our town going to stop? There has been no improvement to infrastructure and no concern what so ever to the environment. I can't wait until the next election!"</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. Your comments will be taken under consideration as we finalize the new Niagara Official Plan.</p>
11	Cheryl Bailey	N/A	General	<p>Verbatim: "We need to protect our land from over development. The animals have no where to go and our current infrastructure cannot support more growth. We have grown in abundance the last few years and it has to stop."</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. Your comments will be taken under consideration as we finalize the new Niagara Official Plan.</p>
12	Debra Kassay	N/A	General	<p>Verbatim: "OMG. Please! You are ruining our town and the exact reason why it is so well loved. How the hell much money does someone need? Please stop!"</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. Your comments will be taken under consideration as we finalize the new Niagara Official Plan.</p>
13	Michelle	N/A	General	<p>Verbatim: "I live in greater Fort Erie. This boundary expansion will put a least one animal rescue out of business. What is happening with this region? Subdivisions, condos, (none of them affordable to low/medium income residents) reckless disregard for the environment. You are allowing these builders to ruin this area. We do not want another Toronto. I'm beginning to think Marz Homes is lining the pockets of our politicians."</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. Staff note that we considered the use of the Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue during the assessment. Retention of the use impacts neighbouring properties that are also suitable for inclusion.</p>

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Fort Erie

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
14	Stu Mcleod	1130, 1178	Schooley Road and Michener Road	<p>Concerned with the potential increase in residential development that is likely to occur as a result of urban area expansion on the subject lands. Specifically, Mr. Mcleod identified increased population in the area would negatively impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The viability of Crystal Beach’s tourist industry. • Capacity of transportation infrastructure, especially the ability to accommodate parking. • The character and “charm” of Crystal Beach. 	<p>Communities are not static. There are many reasons municipalities like Fort Erie are seen as an attractive place to reside. Although this growth can present challenges, it is also an opportunity to invest and strengthen communities over time utilizing a proactive planning approach.</p> <p>The addition of lands into an urban area is not the last step in the planning process. Each site added will require new or updated secondary plans to be put in place to determine where and how future development will occur, as well as any associated infrastructure upgrades required.</p>
15	Alfred Beam	1146, 1148	1219 and 1255 Sunset Drive	<p>Verbatim: “I am the owner of the property located at 1219 and 1225 Sunset Drive in Fort Erie as well as land south. I have been following the Region’s proposed settlement area expansion. I view my and the neighbouring properties identified as being an excellent opportunity to support the Town’s future housing, employment and community development needs. As a lifelong resident I am excited about the positives that will be created as part of the plan as proposed.”</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. Your comments will be taken under consideration as we finalize the new Niagara Official Plan.</p>
16	Chris Dougherty	1178	4269 Michener Road	<p>Verbatim: “I live directly in this area. I do not want an ugly subdivision in my front yard. The Last Chance Horse and Pony Ranch is a beautiful place in a beautiful area that gives unwanted animals a chance. It is an area that provides therapy for individuals who need it, volunteering with the animals. Keep the city out of the country and build elsewhere.”</p>	<p>Staff considered the use of the Last Chance Horse and Pony Ranch during the boundary review. Retention of the use impacts neighbouring properties that are also suitable for inclusion. Inclusion of the facilities will eventually see the use needing to relocate as livestock/stable is generally not a permitted use in an urban settlement area</p> <p>The Town had also included the lands in their assessment work and identified the area of higher interest for inclusion.</p>
17	D Beyer	1178	4269 Michener Road	<p>Verbatim: “As a single parent of 3 special needs children (who are all grown up) I would have loved the opportunity to have been able to use the facility. It would have been not just a learning opportunity but also a good reward system as well. We need more of these places especially with Covid. It teaches everyone how to respect the area, the animals and themselves. It gives everyone and everything a way to feel useful. People who don’t have jobs at least have a place Togo to feel useful and needed. With more resources this could be a fantastic opportunity for people to enjoy. Could even be made into a school credited course. For younger, high school and college students.”</p>	<p>Staff considered the use of the Last Chance Horse and Pony Ranch during the boundary review. Retention of the use impacts neighbouring properties that are also suitable for inclusion. Inclusion of the facilities will eventually see the use needing to relocate as livestock/stable is generally not a permitted use in an urban settlement area</p> <p>The Town had also included the lands in their assessment work and identified the area of higher interest for inclusion.</p>

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Fort Erie

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
18	John Spencer	1178	4269 Michener Road	<p>Verbatim: “I am against development /and or rezoning in the Rebstock area which could cause problems for Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue. The owners have been there for many years looking after retired and unwanted, sick, unwanted or lost horses and other animals. Please let them live out their natural lives without people encroaching onto their natural setting, and/or making complaints about them. It is an ongoing rescue mission with many volunteers, patrons and helpers to keep it operating as a registered charity. This need for a rescue will need to continue. This is their last chance.</p> <p>Don't let every development in our communities of Crystal Beach and Ridgeway, where we live and pay taxes, get overdeveloped. We came here because it WAS a village, and hopefully remains a village. If it gets bigger it will become just another city full of McDonalds and Walmarts and will NOT be inviting to those who wish to move to an area which we currently wish to maintain and enjoy. Nature was here first. Last Chance was here first. Cater to those who ARE here, please, use your conscience. If Last Chance was YOUR rescue, how would you react to know that it may be in jeopardy because of a grab for more taxes and " development ". Let there be some green space, and give the animals respect.”</p>	<p>Staff considered the use of the Last Chance Horse and Pony Ranch during the boundary review. Retention of the use impacts neighbouring properties that are also suitable for inclusion. Inclusion of the facilities will eventually see the use needing to relocate as livestock/stable is generally not a permitted use in an urban settlement area</p> <p>The Town had also included the lands in their assessment work and identified the area of higher interest for inclusion.</p>
19	Kimberley Simons	1178	4269 Michener Road	<p>Verbatim: “I am writing this letter of support for Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue [...]. I run a business that supports adults with disabilities in Port Colborne. We provide educational and recreational activities for 120 people. We have enjoyed taking people to the rescue for tours for many years and believe that it is an important part of our community. The people we support have the opportunity to interact with animals and learn important lessons about taking care of animals and advocating regarding animal abuse. This is an activity that allows people to be out in nature and enjoy green space. It would be a real shame if the rescue was closed due to residential development. Please be in touch with any questions or concerns.”</p>	<p>Staff considered the use of the Last Chance Horse and Pony Ranch during the boundary review. Retention of the use impacts neighbouring properties that are also suitable for inclusion. Inclusion of the facilities will eventually see the use needing to relocate as livestock/stable is generally not a permitted use in an urban settlement area</p> <p>The Town had also included the lands in their assessment work and identified the area of higher interest for inclusion.</p>
20	Lizz Yakovich	1178	4269 Michener Road	<p>Verbatim: “I support the last chance horse and pony rescue. Building more homes in such close proximity will make it very difficult for then to operate. I believe they are an integral part of out community. Not every square inch of our green space needs to be developed!!</p>	<p>Staff considered the use of the Last Chance Horse and Pony Ranch during the boundary review. Retention of the use impacts neighbouring properties that are also suitable for inclusion. Inclusion of the facilities will eventually see the use needing to relocate as livestock/stable is generally not a permitted use in an urban settlement area</p>

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Fort Erie

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
					The Town had also included the lands in their assessment work and identified the area of higher interest for inclusion.
21	Rita Smith	1178	4269 Michener Road	Verbatim: "It has come to our attention that the region is looking at rezoning in the area of Crystal Beach neat the Last Chance Rescue vicinity. Community Living has had a great partnership with Last Chance Rescue and we would like to continue taking our individuals with developmental disabilities there for therapy and leisure. We are concerned that if the land was rezoned so that homes could be built, the wildlife in that area would be disrupted. We hope that you will reconsider and think of the consequences."	Staff considered the use of the Last Chance Horse and Pony Ranch during the boundary review. Retention of the use impacts neighbouring properties that are also suitable for inclusion. Inclusion of the facilities will eventually see the use needing to relocate as livestock/stable is generally not a permitted use in an urban settlement area The Town had also included the lands in their assessment work and identified the area of higher interest for inclusion.
22	Sherry Dixon	1178	4269 Michener Road	Verbatim: "Please do not disturb this section of land second chance farms is a good thing in our community. Stop being too greedy."	Staff considered the use of the Last Chance Horse and Pony Ranch during the boundary review. Retention of the use impacts neighbouring properties that are also suitable for inclusion. Inclusion of the facilities will eventually see the use needing to relocate as livestock/stable is generally not a permitted use in an urban settlement area The Town had also included the lands in their assessment work and identified the area of higher interest for inclusion.
23	Sharron Allen Wallace	1178	4269 Michener Road	Verbatim: "As the owner and operator of Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue and Sanctuary I am greatly concerned at the proposed Urban Expansion development. The proposal has just come to the attention of myself, volunteers and others affected by it. The LCHPR has been identified as part of the proposed changes to urban settlement area boundaries. With numerous sites for consideration, we at LCHPR need to continue to co-exist by following our charitable mission statement in protecting our existing purpose as a sanctuary. Future development will negatively impact our location, surrounding wildlife and agrarian lands. We need to be involved in future communications regarding additional proposals and changes. Your attention to resolving and excluding site #3 Fort Erie from the urban boundary expansion is crucial to our existence and neighbouring lands. We are forwarding letters of support from organizations and individuals and also invite you to review our activities on our website lchpr.org example the 'Teen' tab."	Staff considered the use of the Last Chance Horse and Pony Ranch during the boundary review. Notification on the proposed inclusion was sent to the property owner in early December 2021. The Town had also included the lands in their assessment work and identified the area of higher interest for inclusion into the settlement area. Retention of the use impacts neighbouring properties that are also suitable for inclusion. Inclusion of the facilities will eventually see the use needing to relocate as livestock/stable is generally not a permitted use in an urban settlement area

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Fort Erie

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
24	Tricia Graves	1178	4269 Michener Road	Verbatim: "It's a sad thing to not just have green space, wild and agricultural areas. Not everything should be developed on. I support last chance horse farm and leaving it be."	Staff considered the use during assessment. Retention of the use impacts neighbouring properties that are also suitable for inclusion.
25	Jessica Lasaga	1178	4269 Michener Road	Volunteer at the Last Chance Horse and Pony Rescue requesting that the use be retained for the horses rescued and wildlife in the area. There is a shared sense of pride for the community to have the facility and the impacts to mental health and wellbeing have been beneficial for her and others.	Staff considered the use during assessment. The Town had also included the lands in their assessment work and identified the area of higher interest for inclusion. Retention of the use impacts neighbouring properties that are also suitable for inclusion. The Town had also included the lands in their assessment work and identified the area of higher interest for inclusion.
26	Geoffrey Aldridge	N/A	Crystal Beach	Seeking information regarding the Crystal Beach Secondary Plan. Mr. Aldridge opposes rezoning of a property within the study area to allow for higher-density residential development, and the relationship between this and the proposed settlement area boundary expansions in the Town of Fort Erie.	Staff provided information and links to the SABR reports and replied to questions on growth forecast and intensification rate proposed for Fort Erie. Staff also provided Mr. Aldridge with information on the secondary planning process and, in particular, the intensification rate within the study area. The Crystal Beach Secondary Plan is already under appeal.
27	Marvin Riegle	N/A	General	Seeking to discuss matters related to intensification, expansion, and specific sites within the municipality Mr. Riegle felt were underutilized. Requested more detailed mapping of Staff's recommendations.	Staff spoke to Mr. Riegle on a number of topics to help clarify understanding on intensification, redevelopment of long-term care homes, the planning and development review process, settlement area boundary expansions. Staff provided a link to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and appendices, including detailed mapping of Staff's recommended areas for expansion.
28	Stephen Bedford (LANDx)	1149	1257 Pettit Road	Supports staff's recommendation to include the subject lands into the settlement area boundary.	Thank you for your feedback.
29	Jack and Larry Gibson	1149	1150 Sunset Drive	Supports staff's recommendation to include the subject lands into the settlement area boundary.	Thank you for your feedback.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Fort Erie

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
30	Stephen Bedford (LANDx)	1150	809 Buffalo Road	<p>Requests the subject property be included within the urban area boundary for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the subject property is located in existing urban area. • The property owner also owns the property to the south, creating a larger parcel for potential development. • In proximity to municipal services. • Located adjacent to existing development and can be integrated into the existing fabric of the neighbourhood. <p>Further provides a detailed response to each criteria identified in the Region’s assessment of the subject lands.</p>	<p>Staff reviewed the submission. No modifications have been made to assessment criteria response for this site as a result. Servicing remains challenging for the entire area south of Garrison Road.</p> <p>Staff recognizes the proximity to municipal facilities as being beneficial, however, there is a fixed amount of land that can be expanded based on our Land Needs Assessment. Only those that most appropriately met the evaluation criteria were recommended by Staff for expansion. Staff’s recommendations identify the most appropriate locations for expansion for the Town of Fort Erie.</p>
31	Dalton Tartaglia	N/A	2034 Jewson Road	<p>Requests the subject property be included within the urban area boundary given the site’s proximity to recommended expansion areas and improvements to the environmental conditions for existing residents if lands were brought in and serviced.</p>	<p>Staff are reviewing all comments received and will take them into consideration prior to finalizing our urban boundary recommendations, including comments received by the writer.</p>
Phone Call No Source document	Richard T.	N/A	N/A	<p>Advised of expansion program and is now seeking further information on the SABR.</p>	<p>In response to the caller’s questions, Staff advised that his lands are not part of Regional staff’s recommendations. He expressed that he was satisfied with this direction.</p>
Phone Call No Source document	Milos Krytek	1253	General	<p>Seeking to clarify whether the subject lands were included in the review and how to access the staff report.</p>	<p>Staff advised that the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) is available on the Region’s website.</p> <p>Staff also advised that the subject lands were not contiguous with the existing urban area, and due to Provincial Policy implications, cannot be considered for expansions as this would create a new settlement area.</p>
Phone Call No Source document	John Castrilli	1149	Fort Erie Golf Club	<p>Seeking an update on the SABR.</p>	<p>Staff spoke with Mr. Castrilli and directed him to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) for information regarding the boundary review and Staff’s recommendations.</p>
Phone Call No Source document	Ed and Mary Geyer	N/A	Gilmore Road and Sunset Drive	<p>Received the Notice Letter in the mail and is seeking further information on the SABR.</p>	<p>Staff provided an overview of the SABR process and Staff’s recommendations.</p> <p>Mr. and Ms. Geyer noted that they were not adverse to expansion in the area, and were in support of additional employment lands and other opportunities in the community. However, they still maintained concerns with potential impacts expansion may have on environmental features.</p>

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Fort Erie

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
Phone Call No Source document	Glen Bowley	1149	1317 Pettit Road	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and is seeking to clarify whether he would be displaced as a result of the boundary review and whether his property taxes would be raised.	Staff spoke with Mr. Bowley to clarify questions regarding the impacts of the SABR. Clarified that there would be no displacement as a result of the expansion. Further advised that MPAC is the organization that assesses property values and that property taxes are based on land use. Eventually, when servicing is made available or development around him is occurring, he could expect changes.
Phone Call No Source document	Michael Racey	1116	1640 Sunset Drive	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and is seeking further information on the timing of the boundary review.	Staff spoke to Mr. Racey regarding the SABR process and the approximate timing for Council adoption, Provincial approval, and local conformity. Staff advised that no information is available yet regarding the timing of servicing and local land use planning studies.
Phone Call No Source document	Chris and Stacie Hollingsworth	N/A	1453 Pettit Road	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and is seeking further information on the timing of the boundary review, the land uses on the subject lands, and the potential that his lands would be expropriated.	Staff outlined the SABR process, what boundary expansions represent, and advised that local municipalities will conduct more detailed planning as part of conformity should the subject lands be approved for expansion. Staff also advised that there would be no expropriation of the subject lands as a result of the boundary review.
32	William Thompson	N/A	1325 Sunset Drive	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and is seeking further information regarding the SABR.	Staff spoke with Mr. Thompson regarding the overview of the SABR process and provided a link to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and its appendices in a follow-up e-mail.
33	Matt Kernahan (Upper Canada Consultants)	N/A	Garrison Road and Rosehill Road	The current expansion limit recommended by Staff runs through the subject lands. Requests that the entire property, as well as properties to the west, be included within the urban area boundary in order to improve public health and environmental safety by providing sanitary services.	Staff reviewed the submission and confirm the boundary is currently illustrated through a former road allowance. Comments are under review and being considered.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Grimsby

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
34	Josie Jarnevic	N/A	378 Main Street West	Inquired whether the Greenbelt designations could be removed from the subject lands.	Advised that per Provincial policy, expansions cannot be made into the Greenbelt Plan area.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Lincoln

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
35	Gustavo Santana	1100	Hillside Drive and Mountain Road	Verbatim: "I saw in the map that an area currently with Long Term Care and houses to third age people in Mountain Street wants to be modify in their use but it is not clear. What type is zoning or use are propose in this area? It's close to the escarpment and considering the current use and very light concentration of people, need to be keep it in that way."	The Niagara Escarpment Plan has designated the area as "Urban". As such, the inclusion of the subject lands into the urban area boundary is considered a technical adjustment needed for Provincial conformity. Any zoning changes would be a local matter as part of the local municipality's future conformity to to the new Niagara Official Plan.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the City of Niagara Falls

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
36	Liquat Mian (LJM Developments)	1061	Lands near Garner Road	Supports staff's recommendation to include the subject lands into the settlement area boundary.	Thank you for your feedback.
37	Don Wilson (Colliers International)	N/A	Kalar Road and Mountain Road	Seeking to clarify the colour coding used for the online interactive mapping tool, specifically as it relates to the subject lands.	Staff directed the commenter to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and its appendices, which provide detailed mapping of Staff's settlement area boundary expansion recommendations and information on the overall review process.
38	Jean Grandoni	N/A	Multiple	<p>Seeking to provide comments on the recommended settlement area boundary expansion locations in the City of in Niagara Falls:</p> <p>Area 1: One of the property owners has cut two, aged hedgerows in the last year or two.</p> <p>Area 2: Concerned that the inclusion of these lands would require major infrastructure upgrades, disrupting the nearby agricultural community.</p> <p>Questioned whether the Review Team sought the opinion of Niagara South Federation of Agriculture on its recommendations. Believes the area southwest of Chippawa should be the location for proposed expansion as recommended in the past.</p>	<p>Impacts to the Natural Environment System and agricultural uses were two important criteria used to assess potential expansion areas. The agricultural assessment component, in particular, was based on the Province's agricultural classifications.</p> <p>The Land Needs Assessment incorporated a Regional intensification rate of 60%, which is above the provincial requirement. Despite this, certain municipalities still need more land to support community and employment growth to 2051.</p> <p>Without expansions the intensification rate goes up significantly and the approach would also not consider the provincial requirement of addressing market demand relative to providing for different housing types.</p>

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the City of Niagara Falls

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
39	Greg Lipinski (Hawk Development)	1180	2233 Stanley Avenue	Requests the subject property be included within the urban area boundary given that a portion of the property is located within the existing urban area boundary and is zoned site-specific for development.	Staff advised that the lands are located outside of the urban boundary and within the Niagara Escarpment Plan area, designated Mineral Resource Extraction Area. The first stage of the Region's review process eliminated sites within the Niagara Escarpment Plan area from being considered for expansion as is prohibited by Provincial policy.
40	Jennifer Vida (JV Consulting)	1199	21277 Willick Road	Requests a minor adjustment to the initial settlement area boundary expansion request on the subject lands, presented along with four separate scenarios that outlined how the lands fronting onto Willick Road could be configured for development if brought into the settlement area boundary.	Staff have reviewed submission and have determined that the subject lands are not ideal for adjustments at this time due to environmental constraints.
41	Victor Muratori (Sullivan Mahoney LLP)	1114, 1383	Garner Road and Beaverdams Road	Supports the inclusion of the recommended settlement area boundary expansions, specifically the lands identified as "Recommendation No. 2 – Community Lands" in Staff Report PDS 41-2021). Further requests that the subject lands be included within the settlement area boundary.	Staff acknowledge the support for Recommendation No. 2. The Region maintains its initial recommendations within Niagara Falls as identified in the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021).
42	Vince Piterna	1134	Thorold Stone Road and Garner Road	Seeking to determine whether his property was identified for expansion and whether the proximity of the Walkers landfill impacted the assessment. Commenter does not agree with the lands recommended for settlement area expansion in the City of Niagara Falls and does not believe that the Land Needs Assessment is accurate.	Staff agreed to meet with this landowner to discuss the SABR process and the assessment of the lands. Based on the outcome of the Land Needs Assessment and review of the 45 locations assessed around the Niagara Falls settlement area boundary, Staff have advanced sites that best meet the identified land need. In Staff's opinion, the most appropriate locations in the City of Niagara Falls were recommended for expansion. The recommendations remain draft and will be subject to further commenting and public consultation. Staff provided a link to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and its appendices for additional information.
8	Vince D'Ameilo	N/A	Willoughby Road and Marshall Drive	Requests that the subject lands be considered for urban expansion given the surrounding site characteristics, which includes existing residential development, the Legends on the Niagara Golf Course, and poor viability for agricultural uses.	Provincial policy requires that all settlement area expansions occur adjacent to existing urban areas or rural settlement areas. The subject lands are not contiguous with an existing urban area, and as such, cannot be recommended for expansion.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the City of Niagara Falls

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
43	Councillor Greenwood	1370	Rexinger Road and Ort Road	Seeking to clarify why Staff’s recommendations did not include the subject lands given plans to extend infrastructure to Ort Road and its poor viability for agricultural uses.	<p>Staff carefully considered the subject lands in their evaluation of potential expansion areas. There is a fixed amount of land that can be expanded based on our Land Needs Assessment. Only sites that most appropriately met the evaluation criteria, including consideration of soil quality, natural heritage features, and transportation infrastructure, were recommended by staff for expansion.</p> <p>In this case, other sites in the City more appropriately met the criteria. For this reason, our expansion recommendations for Niagara Falls did not include any lands southeast of the Q.E.W towards Chippawa.</p>
44	Danny Pietrangelo	1370	North of Rexinger Road, West of Ort Road	Questioned why staff’s recommendations did not include the subject lands, especially given plans to extend infrastructure.	<p>Staff carefully considered the subject lands in their evaluation of potential expansion areas. There is a fixed amount of land that can be expanded based on our Land Needs Assessment. Only sites that most appropriately met the evaluation criteria, including consideration of soil quality, natural heritage features, and transportation infrastructure, were recommended by staff for expansion.</p> <p>In this case, other sites in the City more appropriately met the criteria. For this reason, our expansion recommendations for Niagara Falls did not include any lands southeast of the Q.E.W towards Chippawa.</p>
45	Terry Narweth	N/A	Miller Road, Welland River, the Q.E.W, and the Niagara River	Requests information regarding plans for urban area expansion on the subject lands. Also requests information on related plans for infrastructure expansion in the area, including expansion of internet cable/fibre optic phone service.	<p>The subject lands are already located within the settlement area, and as such, there is no boundary adjustments or expansions proposed.</p> <p>Staff undertook a review of lands south of Chippawa Creek between the Q.E.W and Niagara River. Following that review, Staff did not make any recommendations for lands to be added to the urban settlement area in that location.</p> <p>Matters of utilities, such as cable, are not a direct responsibility of the Niagara Region. Instead, Staff suggest contacting the utilities directly to inquire about any service planning that is within their purview and capital planning for your area of interest.</p>

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the City of Niagara Falls

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
46	Aric Greco	1061	McLeod Road, Lundy's Lane, and Garner Road	Requests information regarding the proposed expansion on the subject lands, and the different designations listed on the Region's mapping tool for expansion requests (i.e. Private, Local Area Municipality, and Regional).	Staff spoke with Mr. Greco to explain the SABR process, Staff's recommendations, and the purpose and function of the online mapping tool. Staff provided a link to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) for further information, including information on the evaluation of infrastructure and servicing criteria.
47	Ken Moore	1061	McLeod Road, Lundy's Lane, and Garner Road	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and is seeking further information regarding the SABR.	Staff provided a link to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and its appendices, as well as a link to the comment mapping tool.
48	Joyce Sankey	1119, 1379, 1380,	South of Biggar Road, Southeast of the Q.E.W	<p>Verbatim: "The woodlands, especially on the other side of Montrose Road should be protected. Adequate buffers are needed for the wetlands and watercourses. Buffers must not be downgraded by the EIS process. Connections between natural features need to be planned for, mapped and then protected.</p> <p>Niagara Falls has many areas that are ripe for redevelopment and this should be the focus.</p> <p>There is a great need for affordable homes but all the emphasis is on single family homes and townhouses which are out of reach for so many current residents of Niagara. There is a great deal of talk about complete communities all the while sprawling residential subdivisions that are completely car dependent are what councils are approving and developers are building."</p>	<p>The Natural Environment System will be subject to the policies and mapping of the new Niagara Official Plan. The new Official Plan also contains direction for higher intensification, a range of housing types and densities, and other tools and methods of addressing housing affordability in a comprehensive manner</p> <p>A consolidated draft of the Official Plan, including mapping of the Natural Environment System, can be found through the following website: https://www.niagararegion.ca/official-plan/draft-consolidated-plan.aspx</p>
49	Kevin Kehl (Walker Aggregates)	1061	McLeod Road, Lundy's Lane, and Garner Road	<p>Concerned with the recommendation to expand the urban area boundary to the subject lands given the proximity of a new quarry being established approximately 0.9 kilometres away.</p> <p>Mr. Kehl noted that the Region must ensure that urban boundary expansions are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement as it relates to the protection of mineral aggregate resources and surrounding land use compatibility.</p> <p>Suggests that sensitive land uses be located outside of a potential area of influence of 1,000 metres from the new quarry site.</p>	The addition of lands into an urban area is not the last step in the planning process. Each site added will require new or updated secondary plans to be put in place to determine where and how future development will occur, including the mitigation of any encroaching land uses on existing or planned mineral aggregate operations.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the City of Niagara Falls

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
50	Stephen Bedford (LANDx)	1372	4336 Willick Road	<p>Requests the subject property be included within the urban area boundary for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the subject property is located in existing urban area. • In proximity to existing municipal services. • Located adjacent to existing development and can be integrated into the existing fabric of the neighbourhood. <p>Further provides a detailed response to each criteria identified in the Region’s assessment of the subject lands.</p>	<p>Staff reviewed the materials provided. While alternate opinions is provided by Mr. Bedford, Staff maintain the assessment it prepared as part of PDS 41-2021 due to existing constraints.</p> <p>While recognizing that a portion of the lands are within the existing urban area, additional lands for the area south of Chippawa Creek need a long term servicing strategy for trunk services for a larger area to include direction of flows to the new South Niagara WWTP. Existing wet weather conditions are also a constraint for addition of lands beyond that of the existing urban area.</p> <p>Additionally, the subject lands are fragmented with flood plain.</p>
51	Danato Pietrangelo	1370	North side of Rexinger Road between Ort Road and Stanley Avenue	<p>Requests the subject property be included within the urban area boundary. The subject lands should be considered together with lands to the east that have a small portion already in the urban area boundary. Believes traffic will occur through Sodom Road to gain access to Lyons Creek Road, not the Stanley bridge. States that the City will miss out on potential assessment / tax revenue if the lands are not brought into the urban area.</p>	<p>Staff have considered the comments provided and maintain the assessment it prepared as part of PDS 41-2021 reflects site conditions and characteristics.</p>
52	Linda Babb	N/A	General	<p>Objects strongly to settlement area boundary expansions and expresses concern for the loss of farmland. Disappointed in the Regional support for expansions to occur.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. Your comments will be taken under consideration as we finalize the new Niagara Official Plan.</p>
53	Margaret Pirosko	N/A	10894 Willodell Road	<p>Expressed desire to have their site considered for settlement expansion. Critical of City permitting expansion of automotive wrecking yard along north side of their lands.</p>	<p>These lands were not previously identified for review during the SABR process.</p> <p>Land need has been satisfied in the City of Niagara Falls with the recommendations identified by Regional Staff in consultation with the City. The subject lands are not contiguous with the existing urban area boundary and would have been removed through Step 1 of the criteria review.</p>
54	Joseph Pirosko	N/A	10894 Willodell Road	<p>Verbatim: “In light of the changes that the City of Niagara Falls has made to the land use directly North of our property at 10894 Willodell Rd. Port Robinson, we are requesting to be added to the Settlement Boundary review.”</p>	<p>These lands were not previously identified for review during the SABR process.</p> <p>Land need has been satisfied in the City of Niagara Falls with the recommendations identified by Regional Staff in consultation with the City. The subject lands are not contiguous with the existing urban area boundary and would have been removed through Step 1 of the criteria review.</p>

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the City of Niagara Falls

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
55	Karen Cudmore	1379	Montrose Road and Carl Road	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and is seeking further to determine how far over the boundary limits along Carl Road were.	Staff spoke to Ms. Cudmore with regards to the SABR process and Staff's recommendations. Prepared and supplied map showing the addresses in the vicinity to help with her question.
56	Stephen Bedford (LANDx)	1061	6169 Garner Road	Supports staff's recommendation to include the subject lands into the settlement area boundary.	Thank you for your feedback.
57	Durgesh Patel	1134	8472 Thorold Stone Road	Verbatim: "We are requesting 8472 Thorold Stone Road, Niagara Falls to be considered in the Urban Boundary expansion. This 62-acre parcel is located at the busy intersection of Garner Rd & Thorold Stone Road. We are at abutting the current boundary line with all services easily accessible. We would request to be included in the expansion of the boundary line."	Staff spoke and met with the property owner (Piterna) to review and discuss Staff's recommendations and the Land Needs Assessment earlier in the commenting period. The lands are not contiguous with the existing settlement area boundary and would require intervening lands to be brought in prior to considering this site. Adjacent lands were assessed as part of the SABR process, however staff maintains their current recommendations.
58	Livable Chippawa	N/A	General	Seeking to clarify the decision for intensification rates in the City of Niagara Falls and to express concerns regarding the environmental impacts of the proposed expansions in South Niagara Falls and in Niagara South. Supports sustainable development and see the dire need to maintain biodiversity and protect fragile natural ecosystems	Thank you for your feedback. Your comments will be taken under consideration as we finalize the new Niagara Official Plan. The Region identified a 50% intensification rate for the City of Niagara Falls, increasing it from their current Official Plan target of 40%. City staff recommended a higher target of 65% intensification, however, City Council did not support the higher intensification rate, noting the increase from 40% to 50% intensification was already significant and growth should be balanced between new areas and existing built-up areas. Through the Region's work, more growth is being concentrated in our built-up areas, including an overall higher intensification rate for already developed areas.
59	Stephen Bedford (LANDx)	1370	9265 Ort Road	Requests the subject property and the adjacent vacant lands be included within the urban area boundary for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the subject property is already located within the existing urban area. • Development of both properties would support the creation of complete communities for the Village of Chippawa, for which there are limited opportunities. 	Staff reviewed the submission and note that no modifications have been made to the assessment criteria response for this site as a result. Staff recognize the proximity to the existing village area however, must consider the criteria holistically. While an option for servicing the site was presented, staff are not prepared to make any change to the assessment response at this time. Servicing remains challenging for the Chippawa area with wet weather compounding conditions.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the City of Niagara Falls

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The lands are within proximity to existing municipal services. <p>Further provides a detailed response to each criteria identified in the Region’s assessment of the subject lands.</p>	This combined with Natural Environmental Systems features (i.e. Significant Woodlands and Provincially Significant Wetlands) identified on site, including the Provincial Natural Heritage System connection to Lyons Creek with areas south, Staff’s assessment remains as originally reported. Staff have advanced recommended expansion locations most appropriate for the City of Niagara Falls at this time.
60	John Paul Cahill	1135	4810 Garner Road	Seeking to clarify the land used in the calculation of the Land Needs Assessment Methodology. Believes constraints on the subject lands should be discounted, and that the Region should reconsider the site for inclusion into the urban area boundary.	Staff replied to multiple inquiries on this topic and met with the Mr. Cahill and adjacent owners as part of consultation with those who had requested. Staff included all discussion and topics as part of the public commenting and review phase of the SABR program and recommendations advanced.
Phone Call No Source document	Alice Reddick	1119	7093 McCredie Road	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and seeking further information on the SABR.	Staff spoke with Ms. Reddick regarding the SABR process and Staff’s recommendations. Ms. Reddick expressed that she would be supportive of sewer and water being brought to the subject property.
Phone Call No Source document	Kim Pennacchio	1061	7085 Garner Road	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and are not in favour of their lands being brought into the urban area as they would prefer to maintain their agricultural status and current property taxes.	Staff spoke with Ms. Pennacchio regarding the SABR process, its relationship to growth, and Staff’s recommendation. Ms. Pennacchio stated that they bought the lands thinking it would remain outside the urban area boundary. She had moved from a prior location that was included in expansion and is disappointed to see this happening to them once again. Staff advised that the phone call would be captured in commenting for the report to Committee and Council.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
61	Pat Rapone	1211	York Road and Concession 5	While acknowledging that the subject lands did not advance to Step 2 of the SABR assessment as they are located in the Greenbelt Plan area, Mr. Rapone is of the opinion that the site would respond favorably to the majority of the Step 2 criteria and that the Greenbelt Plan is not intended to protect a collection of	The subject did not advance to Stage 2 assessment both because it is located in the Greenbelt Plan area <i>and</i> because the Region did not identify a land need in the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake. Staff maintain their initial recommendations and encourage Mr.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
				<p>small parcels in urban, rural residential and service commercial settings for agricultural use.</p> <p>Requests the Niagara Region and local municipality take the opportunity to consider all factors, support and approve the request for boundary expansion to include the subject lands.</p>	Rapone to participate in the Provincial Plan review process to address his concerns with the Greenbelt Plan boundary.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Pelham

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
62	Andy Nero	1056	Rice Road and Quaker Road, Pelham	Supports staff's recommendation to include the subject lands into the settlement area boundary and for their commitment to outreach during the SABR process.	Thank you for your feedback.
63	Doug McCollum	1056, 1065	1311 Rice Road	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and wanted further information regarding the SABR.	Staff spoke to Mr. McCollum regarding the SABR process as well as the unique context of the subject lands (i.e. located between Thorold and Pelham and the Greenbelt Plan area). Staff also provided a link to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and its appendices.
64	Joyce Sankey	1056, 1065, 1181	South of Port Robinson Road, East of Rice Road	Verbatim: "This area has many wetlands and forests. The wetlands and forests are natural assets that cannot be replaced. The deep ditches that are planned on each side of the road would destroy the wetlands. This area should not be developed."	Thank you for your feedback. Your comments will be taken under consideration as we finalize the new Niagara Official Plan.
65	Tom Richardson (Sullivan Mahoney)	N/A	1361 Rice Road	Received the Notice Letter that the subject lands are recommended for inclusion into the settlement area and is seeking clarification.	<p>Spoke to Mr. Richardson to explain the SABR process and the site context related to lands at the rear portion of the subject lands. Staff are recommending that the lands outside of the Greenbelt Plan area be included into the settlement area, which would effectively fill the hole left between the three municipal settlement areas of Pelham, Thorold, and Welland.</p> <p>Staff advised that, despite the property owner's interest to be removed from Greenbelt Plan area, the Region cannot change the Provincial Plan designation. The property owner can make such requests during next Provincial Plan review.</p>
66	Marianne Schlett	N/A	1317 Rice Road	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and is seeking further information about what this means to them as property owners.	Staff spoke with Ms. Schlett and provided mapping to illustrate which part of their lands the notice was referencing. Discussed the Greenbelt Plan designation and that only the Province can

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Town of Pelham

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
				Desire to have lands available for development like that on the west side of Rice Road.	make changes to remove. Staff explained the timing of the Provincial Plan review, and confirmed that they are aware of other similar requests on the east side of Rice Road.
67	Christine Knighton	N/A	Multiple	Verbatim: "I am very disturbed to see that the proposed boundary expansion for Welland/Thorold/Pelham includes Provincially Significant Wetlands at the unopened end of the (proposed) Merritt Road expansion. When will this end? We now KNOW how very important these wetlands are and the extremely important role they will play in helping us combat the destruction from climate change yet we keep filling them in and turning them into subdivisions and roads. There is no excuse for it when the science is clear. Studies show that wetlands are way more valuable "as is" than anything gray infrastructure we can build. Our regional representatives should be leading the way on this and it's not what I'm seeing."	Thank you for your feedback. Your comments will be taken under consideration as we finalize the new Niagara Official Plan.
Phone Call No Source document	Julia Sajn	1156	West side of Pelham Street	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and is seeking further information regarding the impacts to property value.	Staff spoke to Ms. Sajn regarding the SABR process. Advised Staff could not provide advice on the question of property value, and instead that a licenced appraisal firm could provide this information.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the City of St. Catharines

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
68	Desmond Sequeira	N/A	General	<p>Requests that Council reject all recommendations to expand settlement area boundaries. Further requests that the Region restore the Natural Environment System to at least 30% tree canopy.</p> <p>Believes that future needs may be met by building vertically, that natural recreational and greening spaces can be incorporated into building structures, and that brownfield site redevelopment and intensification should be prioritized and awarded contracts first.</p>	<p>The Land Needs Assessment incorporated a 60% Regional intensification rate, well above the Provincial requirement. Despite this, certain municipalities still need more land to support community and employment growth to 2051. Without expansions the intensification rate goes up significantly, which puts more people in the built up areas and existing urban areas. This approach would also not consider the Provincial requirement for municipalities to address market demand for housing.</p> <p>New expansion areas will be planned using implementation tools such as secondary plans that utilize subwatershed plans in its analysis. Secondary plans provide direction for communities to grow and develop in a sustainable and resilient manner. This process will establish appropriate land uses and help to protect key natural features. It can also ensure that the plan addresses key climate change policies, including the use of technology and built forms that contribute towards net-zero emissions targets, requiring consideration for enhanced sustainability features (i.e. LID or green building design) and the establishment of transit supportive densities to facilitate future transit connections.</p>

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the City of Thorold

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
69	Shaylyn Costello (LANDx)	N/A	100 Dock Road and 1522 Beaverdams Road	Requests detailed mapping for the technical boundary adjustments proposed on the subject properties. Seeking to clarify whether the lands surrounding 1522 Beaverdams Road in Thorold have been included in the settlement area boundary through the technical adjustment process.	Staff provided mapping to identify the lands that would be brought into the settlement area boundary through the technical adjustments process. Staff advised that the lands surrounding 1522 Beaverdams Road have not been brought into the settlement area boundary.
70	Ron Palmer (Planning Partnership)	1143	Lands near the Brock Business Park	Requests that the lands adjacent to the Brock Business Park be included in the settlement area boundary. The subject lands are designated Environmental Protection and Open Space and Parks.	Staff considered the subject lands for settlement area boundary expansion and maintain the initial assessment of the property.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the City of Thorold

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
71	Ian Macpherson (Primont)	1181	436 Quaker Road	Requests the subject lands be included in the settlement area boundary. Further requests that the Region consider amending the language in Policy 8.2.1 to allow for a scoped approach to be considered with respect to completing the required studies for the removal of the zoned holding symbol. This would be to permit individual property owners or smaller assemblies of land owner groups to advance approvals if deemed acceptable.	Staff acknowledge support for the recommendation to include the subject lands in the settlement area boundary. Staff will consider amending language in Policy 8.2.1.
72	Sam Vecchi	N/A	6071 Garner Road	Received the Notice Letter in the mail, and had questions regarding the ability to develop on the subject lands as well as timing for development surrounding the subject lands.	Staff provided an overview of the SABR process and the approximate timing for Council endorsement, Provincial approval, and local conformity. Staff also explained the role of local municipalities in overseeing community level planning (i.e. parks, schools, density locations, etc.) As part of the discussion, staff advised that municipal servicing for the area would ultimately be directed to new the South Niagara-WWTP, expected to be completed by 2027-2028.
73	Rajeev Sharma	1115	Lands near the Hwy 20 Corridor	Seeking guidance on how to prepare a motion to include the Hwy 20 Corridor for servicing in an effort to encourage employment growth in the area.	Staff advised Mr. Sharma that we cannot provide planning advice in this circumstance. Advised his comments are being captured and would be included in report to Committee and Council, and also indicated that the City of Thorold does not have an identified land need through the Land Needs Assessment.
74	Marcel and Jody Cadieux	n/a	2845 Port Robinson Road	Disappointed that the lands all around them are either developed or will be developed as they would like the same consideration to be extended for their lands within the Greenbelt Plan area.	Staff advised that the Region cannot change the Greenbelt Plan designation, however, their will be an upcoming Provincial Plan review in which they and others in the area can request the Province to remove them from the designation.
75	Durgesh Patel	N/A	13105 Hwy 20	Requests the subject property be included within the urban area boundary given that a portion of the lands are already within the existing urban area boundary, and that it could help to address rapid growth in the area.	The Land Needs Assessment does not identify a need for additional Community or Employment lands in the City of Thorold. Based on this outcome, Thorold is considered to have enough supply to accommodate growth to 2051 and no expansions are being considered within the municipality.
76	Stephen Bedford (LANDx)	N/A	100 Dock Street	Supportive of the changes reflected in the Region's draft mapping with respect to a technical adjustment on the subject lands.	Thank you for your feedback.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the City of Welland

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
77	Nilesh Luhar (Antrix Architects)	1234	Forks Road and Elm Street, Welland/Port Colborne	Seeking to determine whether there was a change to the recommendation to include the subject lands within the settlement area boundary expansion.	The Land Needs Assessment does not identify a need for additional Community or Employment lands in the Cities of Welland and Port Colborne. Based on this outcome, Thorold is considered to have enough supply to accommodate growth to 2051 and no expansions are being considered within these municipalities. Staff provided a link to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) for the more information.
77.1	Nilesh Luhar (Antrix Architects)	1234	Forks Road and Elm Street	Proposing residences on private water and septic services in a net zero community. Acknowledges that servicing is not currently available. Believes that the Region should encourage rural residential development instead of designating the property for a prime agricultural use and natural heritage system.	Staff did not identify a land need in Welland or Port Colborne. As such, the Region is not recommending any settlement area boundary expansions in Welland or Port Colborne.
78	Chirag Patel (Flora Designs Inc.)	1234	Forks Road and Elm Street	Believed that the e-mail sent by the Region indicated that this site was included in the recommendations for inclusion in the settlement area boundary. After meeting with the Region the commenter was surprised that the lands are not being considered for inclusion in the settlement area boundary expansion. Does not understand why the lands are being designated for agricultural uses as it will not be able to undergo development for 30 years. The commenter would like to build a rural residential subdivision on the lands and would like to file an objection to the recommendation.	Staff met with the commenter to address concerns and outline the overall settlement area boundary review process. Staff walked through the land needs assessment methodology undertaken for the Region and highlighted that no land need was identified for Welland or Port Colborne where the lands are located. Staff advised that the change in agricultural use is a Provincial designation which is outside the Regions jurisdiction. Staff encouraged the commenter to become involved in the Provincial plan review process. Region maintains its initial assessment for the lands.
79	Manni Chauhan (G-force Urban Planners)	1234	Forks Road and Elm Street	Submission supplied in advance of a scheduled meeting requesting the subject lands be included in the urban area boundary. Argues that the current market is missing estate dwellings, either in an urban area or in a rural area. The subject lands can meet this missing demand. Growth should not be limited to compact development such as apartment and townhomes. Opposed to being designated as Prime Agriculture.	Staff have met with the representatives to discuss. Staff advised that the Cities of Welland and Port Colborne do not have identified Community Land need and the Region would not be considering any further expansion for Community Land purposes. Further, whether the lands are Good General Agricultural or Prime Agricultural, the change is in name only. It does not change what is shown. Provincial policy is quite clear and that despite area having some rural residential, more would not be permitted under current policy.

SABR Comments Received relating to sites in the Township of West Lincoln

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
80	Paul Lowes (SGL Planning & Design)	N/A	Multiple	Seeks to clarify the following matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Report PDS 41-2021 identifies an expansion of 400 ha, of which 330 ha is Community Area and 70 ha Employment Area. The Township’s consultants indicated the same boundary was comprised of 344 ha of Community Area and 78 ha of Employment Area. Please confirm the difference. • The Preferred Concept Plan prepared by the Township’s consultants showed the portion of the proposed expansion area on Townline Road, south of the rail corridor as Employment. However, the Region shows this same area as Community Area. Please explain the difference. 	<p>The difference in developable land supply between PDS 41-2021 and the Smithville Master Community Plan (SMCP) technical report, despite the same expansion boundaries, is related to environmental mapping. The Region’s figures were based on the Region’s Natural Environment System mapping, whereas the SMCP undertook a more comprehensive watershed exercise. The Region’s final Land Needs Assessment will be updated accordingly.</p> <p>Employment Area and Community Area boundaries, as recommended in PDS 41-2021, were established in consultation with Township staff and SMCP consultants. They reflect Township endorsed boundaries, found in Attachment No.1 to PD-115-2021.</p>
81	Mike Crough (IBI Group)	2169	South Chippewa Road and Caistorville Road	Requests that the boundary of the lands being brought into the urban area reflect the natural heritage buffers identified in the attached mapping. The reason for the request is that bringing in all the lands would result in less efficient use of the expansion area and reduced ability to provide dwelling units.	Staff reviewed the request and associated mapping provided. The Region will maintain its recommendation to include the entirety of the lands within the settlement area boundary expansion. The environmental features brought into the settlement area boundary will be protected by environmental designations and appropriately buffered. These environmental features are discounted from land need and are non-developable.
Phone Call No Source document	Robert Gerow	N/A	2449 Port Davidson Road	Received the Notice Letter in the mail and is seeking further information on the SABR. Mr. Gerow noted that he has recently moved from Toronto to live in a rural location, and as such would not like to see subdivisions; however, he understands why growth in the area makes sense	Staff provided an overview of the SABR process, and advised that links to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and its appendices, as well as a requested aerial image of the subject lands, would be provided.
Phone Call No Source document	Zander Goldie	N/A	2453 Port Davidson Road	Received the Notice Letter in the mail, and had questions regarding the timing of the boundary review and the proposed land uses on the subject lands.	<p>Staff outlined the respective roles of the Region and local municipality in establishing land uses on the subject lands and in recommending urban area expansions.</p> <p>Staff also advised that Development Phasing has not been determined and will form part of future strategies for the subject lands. Staff provided a link to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and its appendices.</p>

SABR General Comments Received

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
82	Tina Schankula (Ontario Federation of Agriculture)	N/A	General	Not aware of the open house regarding the SABR. Requests any information available to review.	Staff advised that a video recording of the session, the presentation, and a table of the questions and answers would be posted on the Region's website Staff provided links to available information and informed Ms. Schankula where to sign-up for upcoming webinars and e-mail updates related to the development of the new Niagara Official Plan.
83	Judy Doerr	N/A	General	The climate crisis and housing crisis have not been adequately addressed by the government for decades. Development must consider these priorities and ignoring these crises causes financial long term costs to tax payers and life threatening conditions. The responsibility to preserve, protect and enhance community health must be clear in the new Official Plan. Clear and precise language must be used.	Thank you for your feedback. Your comments will be taken under consideration as we finalize the new Niagara Official Plan. The new Official Plan incorporates an integrated policy approach addressing climate change. Policy direction across the Plan supports the transition to net-zero, climate-resilient communities by: prioritizing investments in public transit and active transportation infrastructure; promoting the design of compact, mixed-use communities that use land wisely; encouraging intensification within existing urban areas and strategic growth areas; integrate low impact development and green infrastructure into new development; and enhance natural features that help to store greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, the new Official Plan commits to developing a greening strategy, adaptation strategy, greenhouse gas reduction targets and climate modelling.
84	Mary Lou Jorgensen-Bacher	N/A	General	Requests a link to the Niagara Falls Housing Strategy, which contained recommendations regarding intensification and forecasted housing mix.	Staff provided a link to the October City Council agenda containing the subject report.
85	Antonio Gallo	N/A	General	Requests detailed mapping of the Region's urban boundary extension recommendations.	Staff provided a link the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and it appendices, which contains detailed mapping of staff's recommendations.
86	Jennifer Vida (JV Consulting)	Multiple	Multiple	Requests detailed mapping of technical amendments in Niagara Falls and Niagara-on-the-Lake.	Staff provided the detailed mapping as requested.

SABR General Comments Received

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
87	Mary Lou Tanner (NPG)	Multiple	Multiple	Requests detailed mapping of technical amendments and a link to Appendix 9 to Report PDS 41-2021. Further requests rationalization for the technical amendments noted.	Staff provided a link to the Staff Report (PDS 41-2021) and its appendices, and attached both the detailed mapping as requested as well as Appendix 18.4 of Report PDS 17-2021, which outlined the criteria for boundary rationalizations/technical adjustments.
88	Rachael Haynes	N/A	General	Verbatim: “PSWs and Woodlots should be blocked from development. This proposal is irresponsible and greedy. Welland and Thorold have brown fields that should be developed before we destroy habitats that cannot be replaced nor replicated.”	Thank you for your feedback. Your comments will be taken under consideration as we finalize the new Niagara Official Plan.
89	Brigette Bonner	N/A	General	Concerned with the long-term ramifications for expansion onto agricultural lands and environmentally significant areas, and believes that development needs to be concentrated in existing urban areas, including brownfield development. Cites both the Niagara Falls Housing Strategy recommendations and the City of Hamilton’s decision to not expand as the preferred direction for Niagara Region.	The Land Needs Assessment incorporated a 60%, Regional intensification rate, which exceeds the minimum requirements laid out by the Province. Despite this, certain municipalities will still need more land to support community and employment growth. Selection of expansion locations considered the Natural Environment System, watershed planning and impacts on agriculture amongst other factors. Bringing natural features in to the urban area through expansion does not mean these areas will not be protected.
90	Mike Cushman	N/A	General	Has personally witness the health impacts of environmental pollution in the Niagara Region, and was happy with the progress of recent efforts to reverse this damage. However, concerned that these environmental efforts are being disregarded in exchange for urban expansions that will impact agricultural lands and environmentally significant areas. Smart growth principles and intensification should be used instead of urban expansion, with a particular need to increase development of high-rise apartments. In additional, it’s important that Regional and local governments undertake and verify environmental site assessments and risk assessments to ensure brownfield developments appropriately “cleans up” contaminated lands to reduce risks to human health and safety.	The Land Needs Assessment incorporated a Regional 60% intensification rate, which exceeds the minimum requirements laid out by the Province. Despite this, certain municipalities will still need more land to support community and employment growth. Selection of expansion locations considered the Natural Environment System, watershed planning and impacts on agriculture amongst other factors. Bringing natural features into the urban area through expansion does not mean these areas will not be protected as part of future development. Staff will take the comments risks to site contamination for brownfield development under advisement as part of site specific development.

SABR General Comments Received

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
91	Kevin Beaulieu (Greenbelt Foundation)	N/A	Greenbelt Plan Area	Requests Region-wide mapping showing technical amendments to settlement area boundaries.	Staff provided mapping as requested with links to Staff Reports for general information.
92	Bruce Allen	N/A	General	Opposes expansions to the settlement area boundaries due to impacts on climate change and natural habitats.	<p>The new Niagara Official Plan will direct more growth in existing built up areas, including an overall higher intensification rate for the Niagara Region. Intensification and redevelopment will more efficiently use land and infrastructure and support climate initiatives by improving watershed conditions within established communities.</p> <p>Additionally, the Region will encourage areas undergoing change to prepare intensification strategies and secondary plans to proactively provide direction for sustainable redevelopment.</p> <p>New expansion areas will be planned using implementation tools such as secondary plans with associated subwatershed plans. Secondary plans provide the direction for communities to grow and develop in a sustainable and resilient manner. This process will establish appropriate land uses and help to protect key natural features. It can ensure that the plan addresses key climate change policies, including through the use of technology and built forms that contribute towards net-zero emissions targets, enhanced sustainability features (i.e. LID or green building design), and the establishment of transit supportive densities to facilitate future transit connections.</p> <p>In addition to providing current policy directions, the proposed Niagara Official Plan commits to development of a greening strategy, adaptation strategy, greenhouse gas reduction targets and climate modelling.</p>
93	Chris Koop (Niagara Federation of Agriculture)	N/A	General	<p>Supports a fixed boundaries approach and having even further intensification targets. Provides figures on agricultural economy and natural heritage policies, interpretation of CLI soil class designations and suggests that other development alternatives be considered to settlement area boundary expansions.</p> <p>Requests a breakdown of net areas gained and a response to the impacts on agricultural systems/agri-food networks.</p>	Thank you for your feedback. These comments will be taken under consideration as we advance the new Niagara Official Plan.

SABR General Comments Received

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
94	Biodiversity and Climate Action Niagara	N/A	General	<p>Identified several overall areas of concern related to the proposed SABR recommendations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of prime agricultural land. • Addressing the climate crisis. • Impacts to the Natural Environment System • Market Demand. • Utilizing additional 40 hectare expansions as per Policy 2.2.8.5 of the Growth Plan. <p>The letter also identified specific concerns with the identification of a 50% intensification target for the City of Niagara Falls Intensification and several of the locations recommended for expansions in Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, Pelham, and West Lincoln.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. The comments received on the site specific expansion areas are taken under consideration as we finalized our work.</p> <p>Staff have reached out to Biodiversity and Climate Change Niagara specifically with regards to the specific questions identified in their submission. In summary, the response clarifies that the Niagara Official Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bases its Settlement Area boundaries on a Land Needs Assessment that is required to identify a housing mix that considers both affordability and market-demand, establishing Settlement Areas that ensure sufficient supply of land is available for development to 2051. • Contains clear policies to protect the agricultural land base and the Agricultural System, including local processing. • Encourages intensification rates above the Provincial average, requires local municipalities to update or create intensification strategies to achieve or exceed these targets, and identifies strategic growth areas to support transit-oriented development. • Policies requiring secondary plans to be completed for larger expansion areas, which will include additional study including secondary plans, sub-watershed plans, transportation studies, servicing, urban design, etc. The planning of the expansion areas will look at net zero communities, protecting the environment, recommending engineering solutions that use green infrastructure.
95	Anne Yagi (8Trees Inc.)	N/A	General	<p>Writer cites decline of “smart growth” planning. Offers unsolicited proposal for Kraft Drain Watershed and Chippawa.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. These comments will be taken under consideration as we advance the new Niagara Official Plan.</p>

SABR General Comments Received

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
96	Don Ciparis, (National Farmers Union – Ontario)	N/A	General	Opposes any boundary expansion that results in the loss of prime agricultural land. Requests Staff to reimagine population growth through responsible densification.	<p>The new Niagara Official Plan will direct more growth in existing built up areas, including an overall higher intensification rate for the Niagara Region. Intensification and redevelopment will more efficiently use land and infrastructure and support climate initiatives by improving watershed conditions within established communities.</p> <p>Agriculture lands are important to Niagara. The Region’s assessment criteria carefully considered impacts to the agricultural area through the assessment; including soil classification, the overall agricultural system and any impacts to existing livestock operations using minimum distance separation (MDS) information.</p>
106	Linda Manson	N/A	General	<p>Identifies several areas of concern related to the urban settlement area boundary review, primarily in relation to the protection of the natural environment system. Questions and comments are summarized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Desire to have a mapping tool that overlays information. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Q: Will you start doing that?” 2. Questions what the Region will do if developers ask to utilize the 40 hectare expansion policy in the Growth Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Q: What will you say when they ask?” 3. In support of the City of Niagara Falls’ proposed 65% intensification rate and inquires if staff looked at the local report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Q: Did you, in fact, even take a look at that staff report?” 4. Skeptical whether the natural environment system would be protected once lands are brought into the settlement area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Q: What opportunities will exist to improve on Option 3C — within urban boundaries?” 	<p>Staff response provided in corresponding question sequence.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Region has made all Natural Environment Systems (NES) and feature layers available as part of the online mapping used for consultation. Users can “make visible” any individual layer or a complete, comprehensive set of layers for inspection. Mapping for the purposes of Official Plan Schedules are structured in a manner that provides clarity to distinguish features to assist those interpreting mapping and related policies. Multiple mapping schedules avoids instances of overlap that may otherwise block out features that are identified in the same location. The Schedules are to be used together when information is sought on properties. <p>The online mapping tool can be viewed with the following link. https://niagararegion.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/basic/index.html?appid=21e7b3d3663e476799277823f3a40b44</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The Niagara Official Plan will establish Settlement Area boundaries to accommodate growth to 2051. Additional expansions to accommodate 2051 growth should not be required unless there are significant changes to housing demand and population growth.

SABR General Comments Received

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
				<p>5. Suggests Niagara needs a “you destroy ... you never develop there” policy. The tree cutting by-law and enforcement needs to be proactive, not reactive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Q: Are you aware of such a thing elsewhere?” ○ “Q: Would you be willing to suggest?” <p>6. Seeks to stop the Merritt Road extension in the Town of Pelham.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Q: How do we stop it?” <p>7. Seeks to have lands south of Garrison Road next to Fort Erie’s Town Hall removed from the expansion recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Q: Will you be looking for a replacement recommendation — or better yet, an intensification option?” 	<p>3. Yes, staff reviewed this report and many others. Staff have met with all our local counterparts throughout the Official Plan development and during the review of potential expansion areas. City of Niagara Falls Council made a decision to use a 50% intensification rate for Niagara Falls.</p> <p>4. Council chose Option 3C for the Region. This was the highest level of environmental protection out of all the options put forward. For expansion areas further study work will determine appropriate setbacks/buffers/linkages (For example when secondary planning and sub-watershed study work is being undertaken). If a local council wishes to further enhance the environmental system for their own municipality, they can include policies in their local official plan during their conformity update.</p> <p>5. The Region has a Woodland Conservation By-law (By-law No. 2020-79). The by-law prohibits the injury or destruction of any tree located within a woodland or designated as a Heritage Tree or a Significant Community Tree except under certain specified circumstances. The Region’s By-law has been in place since 1981.</p> <p>6. Niagara Region is undertaking a Schedule C Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for Merritt Road (Regional Road 37) and Rice Road (Regional Road 54) in Pelham, Thorold and Welland. The project is following the approved process under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act.</p>

SABR General Comments Received

Comment Source ID(s)	Commenter	Parcel ID(s)	Location	Comments Received	Regional Response
					<p>The proposed transportation improvements are required in order to provide capacity for the projected traffic growth in the area. Transportation improvements include active transportation facilities in line with the Region’s complete streets approach and sustainable transportation network. It is recognized that some impacts will occur on the natural environment. An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) is underway in consultation with the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA) and will comply with Provincial and Regional plans, policies and guidelines as required to support the MCEA process.</p> <p>The Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority has requested that additional work be completed to monitor the wetlands and to show how the ecohydrological functions of the watercourses and wetlands will be maintained during and post construction. All technical investigations prepared as part of the Class EA Study will be made available for public review along with the Environmental Study Report, when available.</p> <p>The natural environment features within the Study Area (provincially significant wetlands, woodlands) are part of the Core Natural Heritage under the existing Niagara Region Official Plan. These features are being identified as part of the Natural Environment System under the New Niagara Region Official.</p> <p>7. Based on public consultation and additional information that was made available the area was removed from the recommended expansion area.</p>