

## Municipality of Kincardine Official Plan Review - Comments & Response Table

prepared by MHBC / November 2020

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
1	Feb. 1/19, Nov. 25/19, Nov. 30/19, Dec. 13/19, Jan. 6/20	Roy Frater & Marian Hyde	n/a	Map amendment required to limits of environmental features on property.	Mapping reviewed by MHBC and NRSI, and adjusted in final Background Report to reflect more detailed review (included removal of some more open areas). Additional comments provided with suggested revision to reflect trees removed due to fire. Overlay provided to client and solicitor for comment in January 2020. Final Draft OP incorporates revised mapping.
2	Feb. 11/19	Russ Coultrup	various	Questions about projected growth numbers and land supply calculations. Additional information provided in presentation to Municipal staff and MHBC.	Some revisions made to mapping of various areas within the Town of Kincardine and reflected in final updated background report. Response provided explaining origin of historic growth figures and projected demand, and also that Municipality can update Official Plan to bring in additional lands if growth is higher than expected.
3	Feb. 13/19	SBGHC – Drew Braithwaite	n/a	Request for copy of draft OP and information on population projections.	Copy provided by MHBC, along with additional information about population projections.
4	May 13/19, Nov. 20/19, Oct. 23/20	Alicia Woods Morley (27 Whispering Woods)	n/a	Lands that are not in the future plan of municipal sewer and water servicing should not be designated within the high density Inverhuron settlement area. Doing so limits severance ability.	Lands are not located within high density area, but within Shoreline Development area of Inverhuron Settlement Area. New lots can be considered on partial services, in accordance with the County of Bruce Official Plan. Wording of D8.5.2.3 revised to clarify policy.
5	Aug. 12/19, Nov. 20/19, Dec. 11/19	Bruce Energy Care / Business & BEC Innovation	various	Believes there is an urgent need for affordable housing, and employment land in Kincardine. Offering solution	Discussions and meetings occurred with property owner and representatives through review process. Growth projections do not show need for settlement

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
		Centre Inc. – Helmut Sieber		to establish such uses through settlement area expansions in Kincardine and Inverhuron.	area expansions at this time. Issue to be reviewed in future through subsequent Official Plan updates.
			n/a	Map amendment requested for property on Broadway, to reflect previous approval.	Site-specific provision added to recognize development previously approved by OMB (now LPAT). Need for future SVCA permits for Hazard Lands noted.
6	Aug. 12/19	Drinking Water Source Protection – Carl Seider	C9.1	Remove paragraph, covered by following source protection details	Text of C9.1 revised as suggested.
		Drinking Water Source Protection – K. Gillan	C.9.2	“The applicable Source Protection Plan covers the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern and Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region...”	Text of C9.2 revised as suggested.
		Drinking Water Source Protection – Carl Seider	C.9.2	Need to include the Kincardine Events Based Area map for fuel storage threats.	Mapping on Schedule C revised as suggested.
			C.9.4.1 Par. 4	Add “and Intake Protection Zones (IPZ)/Events Bases Areas (EBA).” to the end of “The Policies of this section only apply to WHPAs”	Text of C9.4.1 revised as suggested to include additional wording
			C.9.4.1 Par. 6	Include definition of ‘IPZ’ for the Kincardine Drinking Water Intake, and ‘Fuel Handling & Storage Facility’.	Text revised as suggested to include terms in C9.4.1.
			C.9.4.1 Par. 6	Describe that Source Protection Plan policies apply to the Kincardine Drinking Water Intake Events Based	Text revised as suggested to include references.

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
				Area (specifically EBA-3000, EBA-5000 amd ENA-1000)	
			C.9.4.1 Par. 6	Add "IPZ's" after "Where WHPA's..."	Text of C9.4.1 revised as suggested.
			C.9.4.2	Add "and Intake Protection Zones" to subtitle	Title revised to include Intake Protection Zones as suggested.
			C.9.4.2 Par. 1 & 2	Add "IPZs/EBA's after WHPAs	Text of C9.4.2 revised as suggested.
		Drinking Water Source Protection – K. Gillan	C.9.4.2 Par. 1	Ensure it is clear that Maitland Valley Source Protection Plan and Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Plan are two separate plans.	Text revised as suggested to clarify difference between documents.
		Drinking Water Source Protection – Carl Seider	C.9.4.2 Par. 2	Add "and surface water" after "...risk to groundwater..."	Text of C9.4.2 revised as suggested.
			C 9.4.4 Par. 1, 2 & 3	Add "IPZs/EBA's after WHPAs	Text of C9.4.4 revised as suggested.
		Drinking Water Source Protection – K. Gillan	C.9.4.5	Plan should always be referenced as Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Plan	Text of C9.4.5 (and other references) revised as suggested to include full document title.
		Drinking Water Source Protection – Carl Seider	C.9.5	Should include wording for the Kincardine Drinking Water Intake Events Based Area policies related to fuel handing and storage.	Text of C9.5 revised as suggested to include information for Events Based Area.
7	Sept. 3/19, Dec. 24/19, Oct 23/20	Bruce County – Daniel Kingsbury (Sept 2019)	B1.1	Proposed PPS requires a 25 year timeframe. Monitor developments related to PPS.	Noted. PPS updates released at end of February 2020. New PPS allows for up to 25-year timeframe for future growth lands. Previous OP draft projected to 22 years, so Background Report numbers were

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
					updated to reflect the maximum timeline permitted per the PPS.
			B1.3	Check the accuracy of the predicted amount of new residents and how many will be within settlement areas.	Correction made to policies to ensure correct growth figures are provided.
			C2.2.4, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Par.	Want the capability to update the Natural Heritage Schedules based on new studies without needing an OP Amendment.	Text of C2.2.4 has been revised to ensure it is clear that updated can be made without the need for an OPA. Cross-references added to D7.3 as well.
			C3	In the objectives should we explicitly address Inverhuron? Should we be working with the Ministry to explore options for Archaeological Master Plan?	Text revised to include reference in C3.2.4 that an Archaeological Master Plan may be completed.
			C5.2.2	Bruce Nuclear Power Development (BNPD) now called Bruce Power.	Text revised as suggested document-wide to change reference to 'Bruce Power'.
			D1.4.8	In reference to: " <i>Range of Housing types. Low Density 70%, Medium Density 25%, High Density 5'</i> , units per hectare and " <i>Tenure – Ownership 70%, Rental 30%</i> " – Wants to know what these numbers are based on.	Discussed with Municipal staff during review of comments. Recommend wording remain as currently written, as it represents a reasonable mix of housing and ownership types. Densities updated to indicate 15 uph for serviced settlement areas and 5 uph in un-serviced areas, to be consistent with Background Report assumptions.
			D1.4.12	Specify what "keeping in overall character of such areas for infill" means.	Text expanded to indicate that the overall built form, massing and building setbacks are to be retained when considering new development.
			D1.4.22	Is a Low Density Residential Max Densities necessary, or is they by-law enough?	Discussed approach with Municipal staff. Agreed that including the densities in the Official Plan

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
					provides for overall intent. Decided to retain current policy direction.
			D1.5.1 b)	Reference to “single family” areas should be removed.	Text of D1.5.1 revised to replace ‘single family’ term with ‘low-rise’.
			D1.5.2	Is reference to “3 Storey Walk-up” a useful description/referred to anywhere else in the plan?	Text of D1.5.2 revised to replace ‘3-storey’ with ‘low-rise’, as including such a term is a useful reference.
			D1.6 b)	Questioning if some of the criteria like “ <i>demonstrated local need for such a facility</i> ” and “ <i>meets all health, safety and fire safety standards</i> ” are truly useful criteria.	Text was carried over from previous Official Plan. Reviewed and determined that overall criteria are useful to include in Official Plan. Final criteria regarding health and fire safety standards removed, as would be covered by Building Permit.
			D1.6 c)	Reference to “socially disadvantaged” – is that defined or useful?  Is policy limiting group homes in close proximity to one another discriminatory?	Text was carried over from previous Official Plan. Reviewed and determined that phrase could be simplified. Policy revised to include phrase ‘who require such service’ instead.
			D2.7.5	Drive through should be limited, may be more appropriate only within Highway Commercial and Business Park designations instead of Mixed-use designation.	Reviewed and determined it was desirable to allow for the consideration of such facilities through site-specific proposals. The ability to locate drive-thrus in a sensitive manner within Mixed Use is reasonable. No changes made.
			D2.7.9	Bike parking should be required to be provided by commercial developments and reflected in all commercial policies, should be part of adequate off-street parking.	Agreed. Text of D2.7.9 revised as suggested to include reference to bike parking.

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
			D4	Consider area specific policy allowing Mixed-use development only in Highway 9&21 area, not Business Park north of Sutton	Reviewed and discussed with Municipal staff. Recommend retain as proposed, since mixed use could work well in both locations.
			D8.5	Recommend 8.5.1 be removed, as trend is moving towards permanent dwellings in area.	Agreed. Text in 8.5.1 referencing a limited number of year-round dwellings removed to reflect trend.
			F2	Objectives do not mention: cycling infrastructure, safe streets, safe routes to school or active transportation.	Additional wording added to F4.3, to reference active transportation, safe routes, and school.
			F3.5	Proposed policy change on road widening may make it more challenging for municipality to acquire land	Policy to acquire land from both sides, and limit impacts on one side of the road is fair and reflects practice in other areas. Current wording retained.
			F4	No policies on cycling infrastructure.	Additional general direction added to policies in F4.3.
			F4.1.1	Confused about this section.	Text revised to clarify that Municipality will consult with Bruce County and other interested stakeholders regarding airport improvements.
			F4.3	Pedestrian Policies could include a commitment to encourage active transportation and safe routes to school.	General direction added to policies in Section F4.3 as noted.
			Overall	Need more policies on climate change and resiliency	Policies of Section C4 expanded to also address climate change.

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
			Overall	No mention of youth and building communities for all ages	Reviewed by project team. Current policy direction is intended to result in communities built for all ages and population components. No revisions made.
			Overall	Need clarification about vision for the future.	Discussed at early Steering Committee meeting. Decided current Official Plan objectives reflects vision.
		Bruce County – Daniel Kingsbury (Dec. 2019)	C2.3.6 & C2.3.9	Suggest additional clarity be added that EIS scope can be modified or waived altogether.	Current policies allow for scoping. However, additional clarity added to C2.3.6 for easy reference.
			D7.6	Wording related to screening tool in development no longer required, given recent MOU to have SVCA continue this role.	Text revised as suggested to remove reference to screening tool in development.
			D1.4.19	Recommend review and potentially revise direction regarding secondary suites and garden suites, given recent Provincial direction.	Text reviewed to ensure complies with recent Provincial direction regarding secondary / garden suites. Additional direction to be included in Zoning By-law.
			General	County will be updating Official Plan, which may require subsequent Kincardine Official Plan amendment once complete.	Noted. To be revisited once County Official Plan process further advanced. Revisions to be incorporated as necessary.
			General	Province undertaking review of PPS, so Municipality advised to keep informed of progress in case revisions required.	Draft PPS taken into account when updating policies. Final version of new PPS released in late February 2020. Revised OP includes additional policy direction and new definitions as applicable.
		Bruce County – Daniel Kingsbury (Oct. 2020)	D5.8 / E3.4	Request review of servicing policies so that consistent with policy direction in County OP and new PPS.	Current policies do not permit full private services, unless within existing lot of record. Clarification

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
					previously provided in policies. Study requirements also clarified to ensure consistency.
			D1.4.19	Suggest review secondary suite policies to ensure consistency with recent policy changes through Bill 108.	Text reviewed and revised to permit secondary suites in either main dwelling or ancillary structure. Additional review to be undertaken as part of Zoning By-law update.
8	Sept. 4/19	BIA Board – Richard Clarke	Multiple	Strongly support and wish to include in the new OP: <b>D2.2.2</b> , <b>D2.2.3.4</b> (now D.2.2.4), <b>D2.2.5.6</b> (now D2.2.6), <b>D2.4.8</b> , <b>D2.5.1</b> , <b>D2.5.32</b> (now D2.5.3) and D2.5.4	Policies all retained through Official Plan update and have been incorporated into new Official Plan.
			D4.1	Strongly support and wish to include in the new OP, excluding the last component to this section.	Policy included in new Official Plan section. Last section revised (see below).
			D4.1	Concerns about removing or lowering the 232 m <sup>2</sup> (2,500 ft <sup>2</sup> ) size restriction and the potential impacts it may have in allowing the Business Park to be developed as a secondary, competing downtown.	Recommend current size restriction be retained. Requirement for single use building removed, to permit multi-tenant buildings (each with more than 2,500 ft <sup>2</sup> ) of space. Additional flexibility added to allow for consideration of smaller units through ZBA only where anchored by larger commercial unit.
9	Sept. 4/19	Kincardine & District Chamber of Commerce	General	Supports comments being put forward by BIA regarding the direction of the Official Plan, except as noted below.	Noted. As above, additional flexibility added to allow for consideration of smaller units through ZBA only where anchored by larger commercial unit.
			D4.1	Do not want a size restriction placed on new or existing businesses.	As noted above, the single-use requirement is being removed and some flexibility has been introduced. Mixed use and other commercial designations permit wider range of sizes, and uses should be directed there instead of highway commercial and business park.



#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
10	Sept. 4/19, Dec. 19/19	SVCA (Sept 19)	Various	Recommended amendments to some of the policies and mapping related to natural hazards and natural heritage.	See below.
			Schedules	Some areas do not have SVCA hazard mapping designated as Natural Environment (NE), and changes are recommended (e.g. flooding and dynamic beach, slopes). Constraint area overlay in current OP can be removed and replaced with hazard mapping.	Intent was to show some areas as overlays instead of designations. Mapping revised as requested so all hazard lands are mapped NE and included on OP schedules.
			Schedule A	Recommend regulated areas be shown on Schedule B instead of Schedule A.	Mapping revised as requested to include on Schedule B.
			C.2.3.6	Clarification requested regarding supporting materials to include, and scope of EIS.	Policies revised as requested to include clarifications.
			C2.3.9	Revised wording recommended for endangered and threatened species.	Policies revised as requested regarding endangered and threatened species.
			C.2.3.9	Recommend no development permitted in 'Regionally and locally significant wetlands'	Policies already reflect PPS direction regarding wetlands. No revisions required.
			C2.3.9	Revised wording recommended for valleylands	Policies of C2.3.9 revised as requested.
			D7 & D7.2.1	Wording changes recommended for hazard lands description and features included.	Policies of D7 and D7.2.1 revised as requested.

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
			D7.3	Wording revisions recommended for natural environmental designation components.	Policies of D7.3 revised as requested.
			D7.3 a) & Sched. A-2	Additional text recommended to clarify where floodplains are located. Revisions also suggested to Tiverton schedule to correct floodplain.	Policies and mapping revised as requested.
			D7.3 b)	Revisions suggested to clarify regarding stable slope areas. Mapping revisions requested as well.	Policies and mapping revised as requested.
			D7.4	Revision recommended to clarify permitted uses within hazard lands, and where SVCA approval is required. New policy also requested to ensure clarity for institutional uses.	Policies revised as requested.
			D7.5 a)	Revisions to policy requested in order to expand on how structure enlargement within regulated areas is assessed.	Policies revised as requested.
			D7.5 b)	Expanded wording recommended to clarify how new uses within NE designation are assessed.	Policies revised as requested.
			D7.5 d)	Comment that a 2-zone floodplain could be applied within Tiverton to ensure new development is located outside the floodway.	Policy revised to reference a future study may be conducted by the Municipality.

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
			D7.5 d)	Clarification suggested for consideration of replacing buildings damaged by natural causes.	Policies revised as requested.
			D7.5 g)	Duplicate policy – suggest be removed.	Policies revised as requested.
			D7.5 n)	Revisions to language recommended.	Policies revised as requested.
			D7.5 o)	Revisions recommended to match wording in regulations.	Policies revised as requested.
			D7.7	Revisions requested to clarify regarding EIS.	Policies revised as requested.
			D7.8 & D7.9	Exception and constraint areas not shown on mapping.	Discussed with Municipal staff. Decided some areas no longer need to be mapped, and others mapped as hazard lands already. Policy revised to clarify.
			D8.4.7	Revisions requested to clarify that flooding, erosion and dynamic beach hazards should be included.	Policies revised as requested.
			D8.4.11	Recommend Schedule B include all regulated areas as provided by SVCA.	Mapping revised as requested.
			E.3.7	Revision suggested to clarify consultation is with Municipality and SVCA.	Policies revised as requested to reference consultation.
			G2.3 f) & G2.4 j)	Revisions recommended to add impact to public safety and property damage to considerations.	Policies revised as requested.

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
			Glossary	Definition revisions to 'flooding hazard' and '100-year flood level' recommended.	Terms revised as requested.
		SVCA (Dec/19)	Schedules	Recommended hazard mapping included and features appropriately designated. Some areas missed and further revisions recommended.	Further review and discussion occurred through 2020 to ensure features accurately mapped. Final draft Official Plan schedules include most recent information.
			Schedules	Regulated areas missing for area north of Town of Kincardine along shoreline.	Updates incorporated into final draft Official Plan document.
			Schedule B	Suggestion to revise title.	Revision made for final draft Official Plan as suggested.
			Schedules	Development constraint areas not mapped.	Areas removed per previous SVCA request. Policies reference areas and general direction provided in D7.9.
			C2.3.4	Wording revisions recommended to clarify that EIS required to demonstrate no negative impacts.	Policies revised as requested.
			C2.3.6	Recommend section be deleted – repetitive.	Section provides clarity specific to woodlands. Recommend it remains. No changes made.
			C2.3.6 & General	SVCA does not agree with overall direction related to woodlands, as it is a significant departure from current policy direction. Recommend entire coastal wooded area be retained and protected from development pressure.	Policies currently implement Provincial Policy Statement direction regarding significant woodlands, which is a balanced approach to consideration of development and site alteration. Approach better implements PPS as compared to existing Official Plan. No changes made.

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
			D7.6	Revisions recommended to clarify SVCA involvement in development review activities.	Revisions made as requested.
11	Sept. 9/19, Nov.23/20	Smart Centres – Lilly Wu (Sept./19)	Mixed Use	Clarify what is permitted under residential and institutional uses (i.e. retirement homes and long-term care facilities)	Neither use currently referenced under policies, but could be considered through site-specific proposal and amendment.
			Mixed Use	Request that allowed density for above uses be based on suites rather than units (e.g. 3 suites equals approximately 1 med/high density unit).	Key determination is number of people residing in one location, and current policies reflect this goal. Policies are targets and can be refined at site-specific level through zoning applications.
			Mixed Use	Suggest self-storage facilities be permitted.	Currently permitted in Zoning By-law. OP did not specifically address the use, so has now included in D4.1 to provide clarity on direction.
			Mixed Use	Suggest permitted density for designated medium density residential lands be increased from 40 units per ha to 50 units per ha	Reviewed with Municipal staff. Recommend retaining as currently set out in D1.5.2.
	Smart Centres – Lilly Wu (Nov/20)	D4.1	Revisions requested to clarify standalone residential uses can be permitted within mixed use site.	Revisions made as requested.	
		D4.2 (various)	Minor refinements recommended regarding servicing	Policies reviewed and revised in consultation with staff to clarify servicing and buffer requirements. Final decision to allow mixed uses left with staff / Council.	
		D2.7.3 / D2.7.4	Suggest clarification be added when standalone residential buildings can be considered.	Revisions made as requested.	

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
			D2.7.6	Minor revisions requested to note mixed use sites may have multiple phases.	Revisions made as requested.
12	Oct. 30/19	Historic Saugeen Metis	C1.3.6	Suggest use 'Indigenous' term. Also suggested wording regarding engagement.	Revisions made for final draft Official Plan (various locations) to reference 'Indigenous' and also consultation and engagement activities.
			C3.3.6	Suggested wording regarding archaeological resources.	Revisions made for final draft Official Plan to reference additional consultation.
			C3.3.8	Support policy direction.	n/a – no revisions required.
			C6.2.1	Suggested wording regarding working with Indigenous Communities regarding economic development.	Revisions made for final draft Official Plan.
			G2.3	Comment that Heritage Committee should be involved in consultation for Plans of Subdivision to identify cultural heritage and archaeological resources.	Revisions made for final draft Official Plan.
			G.2.4	Comment that Heritage Committee should be involved in consultation for consents to identify cultural heritage and archaeological resources.	Revisions made for final draft Official Plan.
			H6.2	Suggest adding retention of cultural heritage resources to site plan control considerations.	Revisions made for final draft Official Plan.
			Schedules	Consider adding mapping for areas of significant archaeological resources and potential.	Noted. Information not available but could be added in future if prepared.

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
13	Dec. 10/19	Ontario Peninsula Farms	Schedules	Comments related to how features such as streams, drains and environmental features are mapped on new schedules.	Mapping completed at large scale based on work of NRSI and with input from SVCA. Current mapping reflects best information available. Mapping can be refined in future based on site-specific studies completed for development applications.
14	Dec. 11/19	Jeannette Young	Schedules	Concern regarding mapping of property as Natural Environment and implications of same.	Mapping completed at large scale based on work of NRSI and with input from SVCA. Some refinement made through finalization of Official Plan. Current mapping reflects best information available. Mapping can be refined in future based on site-specific studies completed for development applications.
15	Dec. 12/19	Ruth and Lloyd Phillips	Schedules	Concern regarding mapping of property as Natural Environment and implications of same.	Mapping completed at large scale based on work of NRSI and with input from SVCA. Some refinement made through finalization of Official Plan. Current mapping reflects best information available. Mapping can be refined in future based on site-specific studies completed for development applications.
16	Dec. 12/19	Kevin Brindley	Schedules	Concern regarding mapping of property as Natural Environment and implications of same.	Mapping completed at large scale based on work of NRSI and with input from SVCA. Current mapping reflects best information available. Mapping can be refined in future based on site-specific studies completed for development applications. Recommend more detailed environmental work be undertaken in support of development application.
17	Dec. 13/19	Stephen Cobean / Ron Davidson (on behalf of	Schedules	Request for changes to proposed Natural Environment designation, to recognize that studies / plans	Information submitted will form basis for site-specific Zoning By-law amendment (and possibly Official Plan amendment) that will accompany Draft Plan of Subdivision submission. Applicant should

#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
		Sundance Estates)		underway for proposed redevelopment of parcel.	move forward with comprehensive redevelopment plans and submission to Municipality for review and comment.
18	Dec. 19/19	Bluewater District School Board	D5.4	Request that schools be permitted in all designations without amendment to the OP.	Revisions made to permit elementary schools in residential designations. Secondary schools remain in Institutional designation in order ensure proper consideration given to location.
			B1.4	Request that 'day care' and 'day care centres' be replaced with 'child care'.	Most corrections made through previous Official Plan Amendment (#10). Additional revisions made for final draft Official Plan.
			Various	Suggestions for additional language regarding active transportation.	Some revisions made as suggested in final draft Official Plan (in C4.3, F4.3, C8) to ensure referenced throughout document.  Language added to H5.3 regarding bicycle racks. References added to undertaking Active Transportation / Cycling Master Plans (F4.3.6).
			C.8.2, D.5.4.4	Suggest provisions added to OP to allow for shared parking between uses.	Revisions made for final draft Official Plan, with addition of language in D5.4.4. Not required in C8.2.
			Parkland Dedication	Suggest wording be added that parkland dedication not required when schools are expanded, but that it is required when school sites are redeveloped.	No policy revisions made. Details of parkland dedication appropriately addressed through Municipal by-law.
			Partnership	Suggest policies reference that partnerships may be considered with school boards, as it relates to a variety of community uses.	Additional language added to A1.3 to reference partnerships in context of integrated and comprehensive approach.



#	Date	Name	Section #	Comment	MHBC Response
			School sites	Suggest school sites to be reserved in OP or Secondary Plan process for a period of not less than 10 years, and may be relocated as necessary.	Agree school sites should be identified through planning processes. No policy changes required to implement.
			Definitions	Additional definitions suggested for public service facilities, with revisions to remove schools from institutional definition.	Public service facility definition added, per 2020 PPS. Retained current scope of institutional definitions, to allow for elementary schools in Residential designation and secondary schools to remain in Institutional designation.
			Mapping	Request schools be given special symbol on mapping and also that schools not be designated institutional.	Schedules revised to add symbol to school sites. Elementary school designation updated to Residential, as recommended in Background Report. Institutional designation retained for secondary schools.