



CATARAQUI REGION  
CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

---

# **Service Delivery Procedures for Plan Review<sup>1</sup>**

---

June 2018

---

<sup>1</sup> Applications made under the authority of the *Planning Act*

Document Revisions

<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date (mm/dd/yy)</b>	<b>Description of changes</b>
0	12/04/13	Original Issue (Adopted by Full Authority Board Resolution 099-13)
1	27/06/18	Update (Amended by Full Authority Board Resolution 070-18)

## Table of Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION .....	1
2.0	CRCA ROLES IN PLAN REVIEW .....	1
3.0	PLANNING SERVICE AGREEMENTS .....	2
4.0	PLAN REVIEW FEES.....	3
4.1	Fee Collection Protocol .....	3
4.2	Dispute Over Fee .....	3
4.3	Refunds.....	4
5.0	APPLICATION REVIEW PROCEDURES .....	4
5.1	Administration.....	4
5.2	Complete Applications and Supporting Documents .....	5
5.3	Comment Timelines .....	5
5.4	Overview of the Review Process .....	5
5.5	Review Procedure for All Applications.....	6
5.6	Site Inspections .....	7
5.7	Procedures for Specific Application Types.....	8
5.7.1	Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments.....	8
5.7.2	Minor Variances .....	9
5.7.3	Development Permits .....	9
5.7.4	Land Division – Plans of Subdivision or Plans of Condominium .....	9
5.7.5	Land Division – Consents .....	10
5.7.6	Site Plan Control.....	10
5.8	Property Inquiries.....	10
5.9	Relationship to Other Agencies.....	11
5.9.1	Parks Canada – Rideau Canal .....	11
5.9.2	Adjacent Conservation Authorities.....	12
5.9.3	Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.....	12
5.9.4	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry.....	13
5.9.5	Drinking Water Source Protection Risk Management.....	13
6.0	TRIBUNALS .....	14
6.1	Procedure for Initiating an Appeal.....	14
6.2	Appearing Before a Tribunal .....	14

## **List of Appendices**

- A Classification Codes for Municipalities and for Application Types
- B Development Review Application and Site Inspection Checklist

## **Resolution of Adoption**

This document was developed and updated with oversight by the Planning and Permitting *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority (CRCA) Full Authority Board.

This revised procedural document was adopted by the CRCA Full Authority Board through Resolution 070-18 on June 27, 2018.

These procedures took effect immediately following their adoption by the CRCA Full Authority Board.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The review of *Planning Act* applications by staff is a well-established practice that aims to add value to the municipally-led process. CRCA aims to provide clear, practical advice to approval authorities that reflects the law, best practice and the public good. Services are delivered in a respectful, timely manner with solutions in mind.

The CRCA Full Authority Board approves service delivery procedures and environmental planning policies that are used by staff to review and provide comment on applications made under the *Planning Act*. These documents were prepared in accordance with the Policies and Procedures for Conservation Authority Plan Review and Permitting Activities (Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Conservation Ontario, 2010), and are normally subject to a coordinated, comprehensive review at least every 5 years.

The service delivery procedures document:

- lists the roles of CRCA in the plan review process;
- describes municipal planning service agreements;
- outlines the administrative process for application receipt, file creation and closure;
- identifies the types of information required to thoroughly review an application;
- explains comment timelines and the coordination of comments in specific circumstances; and
- outlines procedures for collecting review fees.

## 2.0 CRCA ROLES IN PLAN REVIEW

Consideration for the natural environment is an important part of land use planning. CRCA provides planning and technical advice to assist municipalities and other approval authorities in fulfilling their responsibilities associated with natural hazards, natural heritage, and water resources. The Conservation Authority provides reliable information and professional opinions to approval authorities, as they make decisions on planning documents and applications. CRCA also works to coordinate the land use planning process with other regulatory processes (such as approvals under the *Conservation Authorities Act*) as appropriate.

CRCA provides recommendations on planning documents and applications based on its various roles:

1. **Through delegated 'provincial interest' in plan review.** The Conservation Authority has been delegated responsibilities from the Ontario Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry to represent provincial interests regarding natural hazards encompassed by section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement. Staff review and provide comments on

municipal policy documents and applications submitted pursuant to the *Planning Act* as part of the Provincial One-Window Plan Review Service.

2. **As a watershed-based resource management agency.** The Conservation Authority develops business strategic plans, watershed plans and natural resource management plans for its jurisdiction. These plans may recommend specific approaches to land use and resource planning and management that should be implemented through incorporation into municipal planning documents and related development applications.
3. **As a public commenting body.** Conservation authorities are public bodies under the *Planning Act*, and are to be notified of proposed amendments to municipal policy documents and development applications. The Conservation Authority may elect to comment on these documents and development applications.
4. **Through planning advisory services to municipalities.** The Conservation Authority has planning service agreements with its member municipalities that identify the areas of technical expertise on which it will advise the municipalities. When providing comments and recommendations on planning documents and applications submitted for review, staff typically address natural hazards, natural heritage, and water quality and quantity matters (subject to the terms of the planning service agreement).
5. **As a regulator.** Conservation Authority staff review of applications made under the *Planning Act* takes into consideration requirements under Ontario Regulation 148/06 to ensure adherence to these requirements and to eliminate unnecessary delay or duplication in these processes. Staff also raise awareness of requirements of other legislation for which the Conservation Authority is delegated or assigned regulatory/approval responsibilities.
6. **As a landowner.** The Conservation Authority is a landowner, and as such, may become involved in the planning process either as an adjacent land owner or as a proponent. The Conservation Authority ensures that any comments provided as a landowner are separate from comments and recommendations provided under a technical, advisory, and/or regulatory role. Where the Conservation Authority is the proponent, it normally recommends that the approval authority request that an adjacent conservation authority address its commenting responsibilities.

### 3.0 PLANNING SERVICE AGREEMENTS

CRCA enters into planning service agreements with its member municipalities (approval authorities). These documents are posted on the CRCA website ([www.crca.ca](http://www.crca.ca)). These agreements identify, for example:

- the types of applications typically reviewed;

- the screening areas that will be used by the approval authority to identify which applications are to be forwarded to CRCA for review;
- the specific items that are being considered by CRCA;
- guiding legislation and policy documents that will be considered by staff;
- timelines for providing comments; and
- CRCA fees for service delivery / responsibility for the collection of fees.

Planning service agreements will be reviewed and updated as necessary through consultation with the approval authorities.

#### **4.0 PLAN REVIEW FEES**

The plan review services provided by CRCA are undertaken on a fee-for-service basis. Fees are collected for processing and reviewing privately initiated *Planning Act* applications and for reviewing technical reports in accordance with the Plan Review Service Fee Schedule and Technical Report Fee Schedule. The latest version of these documents are posted on the CRCA website ([www.crca.ca](http://www.crca.ca)).

Approval authorities will be notified of changes to the fee schedule at least 21 days prior to implementation of the new fee schedule. Changes to the fee schedule will be advertised on the CRCA website at least 21 days prior to the implementation of the new fee schedule.

#### **4.1 Fee Collection Protocol**

The planning service agreement between CRCA and the approval authority dictates whether fees are collected by the approval authority on behalf of the CRCA and remitted with applications, or if CRCA collects fees directly from proponents.

Where CRCA collects fees directly from proponents, this may be done through an accounting invoice.

Comments to the approval authority may be withheld until the payment of the fee. In this situation, staff normally request that the approval authority defer making a decision on the application until the Conservation Authority has received the fee and has provided comments to the approval authority. This will be based on agreements with the approval authority.

#### **4.2 Dispute Over Fee**

Where the applicant disputes the fee charged, the Supervisor, Development Review has the discretionary power to adjust the fee which must be collected. If then not satisfied, the applicant may request a review by the General Manager and Manager, Watershed Planning &



Engineering. The applicant has the after-the-fact right to appeal the fee to the CRCA Full Authority Board.

Decisions of the CRCA Full Authority Board regarding plan review fees are final.

### **4.3 Refunds**

A submitted fee may be returned or refunded if the applicant withdraws the application before the Conservation Authority has received the application from the approval authority and/or before the assigned technical staff person begins his/her review. A submitted fee may also be returned or refunded if the assigned staff person determines that the application does not need to be reviewed by CRCA (e.g., the property or proposal does not meet the screening criteria for relevant aspects).

Where the applicant withdraws an application and wishes a refund of the application review fee, the Supervisor, Development Review has the discretionary power to refund a portion or all of the fee which must be collected. If then not satisfied, the applicant may request a review by the General Manager and Manager, Watershed Planning & Engineering. The applicant has the after-the-fact right to appeal the fee to the CRCA Full Authority Board.

Decisions of the CRCA Full Authority Board regarding plan review fees are final.

## **5.0 APPLICATION REVIEW PROCEDURES**

The sections below outline general procedures for *Planning Act* applications, procedures for specific application types, and considerations for specific locations such as the Rideau Canal.

### **5.1 Administration**

1. Planning applications circulated through postal mail are initially received by the Receptionist/Clerk.
2. Planning applications circulated to technical staff through e-mail or web posting (e.g., CivicWeb, DASH) are to be forwarded to the Receptionist/Clerk.
3. The Receptionist/Clerk will date stamp an application, note on the front of the application whether or not payment for fees was received, and create and populate a record in the Planning database with all available information (e.g., file numbers, payment information, due date, property information).
4. A CRCA file number identifier is assigned to each application (e.g., MV/CKN/1/2018). The Conservation Authority uses a classification code system for municipalities and for types of planning applications. For example, a minor variance is referred to as “MV” and

the City of Kingston is referred to as “CKN”. A list of these codes is included in Appendix ‘A’.

5. The Receptionist/Clerk will submit the fee, when received, to the Accounting department. The money will be marked for plan review fees, and include the municipality and application number. The Receptionist/Clerk will update the database record after a payment is made.
6. The application is passed on to the technical staff person that has been assigned the file for review and comment.

## **5.2 Complete Applications and Supporting Documents**

At the commencement of the review process technical staff ensure that each application includes the necessary information on which to base their opinion, such as the specific details of the approval(s) being requested, the location of the site, drawings of any proposed work and supporting studies (as applicable). If additional information and/or hard copy full size drawings are required, staff will inform the municipality immediately so that the applicant can be advised.

## **5.3 Comment Timelines**

The approval authority sets the request dates for comments. Commenting timelines are specified in the municipal planning service agreements. These vary by approval authority and planning application type and can range from five days to two months. Staff attempt to meet the request date set by the approval authority. When this is not feasible, staff notify the approval authority as soon as possible and indicate the anticipated timing of response.

## **5.4 Overview of the Review Process**

Pre-application consultation with applicants and/or their consultants is mandatory in several municipalities, and is strongly encouraged in others to determine what will constitute a complete application (e.g., whether supporting studies such as a hydraulic and hydrologic analysis or an environmental impact assessment will be required). Staff are typically invited to participate in pre-consultation dialogue between the applicant and approval authority. However, this dialogue may also occur via separate discussions and correspondence. Comments provided through these consultations are preliminary in nature, and may change based on formal application submissions.

The review of site-specific applications for development and site alteration shall include consideration for the characteristics of the site and its context.

Staff should always attempt to draw on the collective wisdom of the development review team. The skills and expertise of various staff may be drawn upon as part of the application review process (such as the Technologist, Water Resources).

Examples of previous correspondence are to be consulted to guide the preparation of the final correspondence going back to the approval authority or inquirer. Staff confer with their peers and check in-house databases to ensure that consistent messages are being conveyed, as appropriate, with respect to a given property or proposal.

Applications are carefully reviewed pursuant to the provisions of the *Planning Act*, taking into consideration natural hazard, natural heritage and water resource (water quality and quantity protection) policies. Comments on applications also acknowledge the influence of other legislation or policies on the proposal. This supports a 'one-window' approach with benefits to customer service and internal coordination.

Legislation and policies typically acknowledged include:

- Provincial Policy Statement
- Municipal official plan and zoning by-law
- CRCA Environmental Planning Policies
- CRCA Guidelines for Implementing Ontario Regulation 148/06: Development, Interference with Wetlands, and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses
- Cataraqui Source Protection Plan
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry training and reference manuals on natural hazards, natural heritage and significant wildlife habitat
- Ontario Ministry of the Environment Storm Water Management Planning and Design Manual (2003, as amended)

## **5.5 Review Procedure for All Applications**

This section outlines the procedure followed for the review of all applications.

1. Access the comprehensive geographic information system (GIS) to determine the location of the subject property, and to determine conservation issues such as the proximity to a watercourse, flood plain or natural feature such as a wetland, Area of Natural or Scientific Interest (ANSI) or significant woodland. Staff may need to consult in-house documents such as floodplain mapping and wave uprush tables, habitat maps (e.g., Eastern Loggerhead Shrike) and wetland evaluations for more detailed information. The GIS and the database are also used to determine the history of a property (i.e., previous planning applications, O. Reg. 148/06 permits).
2. Refer to the Provincial Policy Statement, CRCA Environmental Planning Policies, as well as the official plan and zoning-by law for the municipality where the subject property is located.
3. Refer to CRCA Guidelines for Implementing Ontario Regulation 148/06 if any portion of the subject property is located within a regulated area.

4. Determine if the subject property is associated with a location or feature that requires collaboration with other agencies, such as the Rideau Canal (see section 5.10 below).
5. A site inspection shall generally be conducted (see section 5.6 below).
6. Convey findings in writing back to the approval authority, by e-mail or web posting, taking into consideration natural heritage, natural hazard and water quantity and quality protection. A copy of the letter is forwarded to the proponent by e-mail or regular mail.
7. Ensure post-mailing procedures are completed. These include scanning any hard copy documents (e.g., letter, application, notice of decision) and placing them into the file on the server. Hard copy documents are to be placed in the filing cabinet in the Planning office under the relevant heading. The person assigned to the file will complete the record in the Planning database (e.g., sent date, server link, UTM coordinates (easting/northing), features, recommendation, decision details).

## 5.6 Site Inspections

To provide complete and accurate comments on an application, the site is inspected as necessary based on the type of application and the conservation issues. If a site inspection is undertaken, this is explicitly stated in the letter being sent to the approval authority.

Access to property will be done in accordance with the Access to Private Property Policy (CRCA, 2007). In a situation where permission is denied and a site inspection is deemed necessary to complete the review, staff will recommend that the approval authority defer making a decision on the application until such time as the site can be accessed, and/or additional information is provided to assist in the completion of the review (e.g., topographic survey, site photos).

Health and safety is of paramount importance during travel to/from sites and while on-site. Staff adhere to related sections of the Health and Safety Policies and Procedures Manual (CRCA, 2011, as amended).

A “Development Review Application and Site Inspection Checklist” (Appendix ‘B’) has been prepared to help guide site inspections.

Fleet vehicles are normally used for site inspections. Ideally these are booked in advance. Site inspections are coordinated (often with other staff members) such that several proximate inspections are completed in one day to save time and fuel.

There is a need to ensure that all relevant site features (e.g., slope, existing vegetation, soil/rock conditions) can be properly observed at the time of the site inspection, and are not obscured due to snow cover, construction materials or other factors. If a site inspection in clear conditions is deemed necessary to complete the review, staff will recommend that the approval authority defer making a decision on the application until such time as the site can be accessed, and/or additional information is provided to assist in the completion of the review (e.g., topographic survey, site photos).

There are numerous islands within the Cataraqui Region. If possible, an attempt is made to have the landowner or his/her agent arrange for staff transportation to an island site. Alternatively, CRCA owns a boat that can be used. Two staff persons are required to be present when using the boat, one of whom must be certified to operate it. Travel by boat may not be feasible due to weather conditions. Staff are not permitted to travel to islands or conduct a geodetic elevation (water transfer) survey over ice.

## **5.7 Procedures for Specific Application Types**

Comments on applications reflect a broad range of considerations from policy (e.g., Provincial policy, official plan) to site details (e.g., stormwater management) depending on the nature and scale of the proposal. Comments typically focus on matters related to natural hazards, natural heritage and water resources.

In all situations, staff determine whether the proposal could be supported under CRCA Environmental Planning Policies, and under Ontario Regulation 148/06, and identify any regulation-specific requirements that should be accounted for.

The sections below outline some considerations for comments on specific types of planning applications.

### **5.7.1 Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments**

An official plan is a municipal planning policy document that outlines an intended course for a community's land use and development over the longer term. A 20-year planning horizon is often used – with associated questions such as “what do we want our community to look like in twenty years?” With this in mind, official plans are increasingly being viewed as companion documents to integrated community sustainability plans and other strategic plans.

Comments on official plan amendments reflect this strategic purpose. Staff ensure that the development that would be enabled via the amendment is consistent with Provincial policy, with the goals and objectives of the official plan and any applicable watershed-based plan.

A zoning by-law is a permissive legal tool that a municipality uses to implement the intent of its official plan. Zoning speaks to “where” certain land uses are permitted (through zones and schedules), and “how” development may occur (through provisions such as waterfront setback rules).

Amendments are proposed to either change the zoning of a given parcel from say “rural” to “industrial”, or to create a new site-specific zone with unique provisions (e.g., rural special exception 1, with a waterfront setback requirement of 15 metres).

Comments on zoning by-law amendments reflect whether or not the requested relief would be in keeping with the general intent of Provincial policy and the official plan. Staff also look at the

practical implications of the application – would the proposed development “conform with” the proposed requirements of the zone, and would it “comply with” specific provisions such as lot coverage and setbacks.

Where an official plan amendment and/or zoning by-law amendment is a precursor to a detailed design application such as a plan of subdivision or site plan control, staff provide either preliminary or detailed input on the information that should be included in subsequent applications (e.g., stormwater management parameters, sediment and erosion control measures, setbacks).

### **5.7.2 Minor Variances**

Sometimes it is necessary for a property owner to seek relief from one or more requirements of a municipal zoning by-law. When the magnitude of the relief is not deemed sufficient to warrant a zoning by-law amendment, then a “minor variance” application is submitted to the municipal committee of adjustment.

Comments on minor variance applications consider whether or not the application meets the “four tests” that are spelled out by section 45(1) of the *Planning Act*:

- Does the proposal meet the intent of the official plan?
- Does the proposal meet the intent of the zoning by-law?
- Does it represent a desirable or appropriate use of the land?
- Is the variance truly minor in nature?

### **5.7.3 Development Permits**

Municipalities in Ontario are now able to pass development permit by-laws under the authority of Ontario Regulation 608/06 under the *Planning Act*. The development permit process combines the capacity to provide relief (i.e., zoning by-law amendments and minor variances) with the capacity to regulate the detailed arrangement of a site (i.e., site plan control).

Comments on development permit applications reflect a broad range of considerations from policy (e.g., Provincial policy, official plan) to site details (e.g., snow storage).

### **5.7.4 Land Division – Plans of Subdivision or Plans of Condominium**

The division of a parcel of land into multiple new parcels is addressed through a “plan of subdivision”. The subdivision process is used when there are public facilities such as roads and utilities envisioned as part of a development process. When those facilities (and/or lands) will be held in common by the owners within the plan, then the matter is reviewed under a “plan of condominium” through the Ontario *Condominium Act*.

Staff normally issue detailed comments on plans of subdivision and plans of condominium. The design and function of stormwater management systems is often a key interest, along with the avoidance of natural hazards, and impacts on natural heritage features and functions. The Conservation Authority encourages the preparation of secondary plans and master drainage plans to ensure that these topics are considered at a subwatershed or landscape scale, rather than on a site-by-site basis.

### **5.7.5 Land Division – Consents**

Smaller scale divisions of land are addressed through the “consent” process. A land severance, also referred to as consent, is the authorized separation of a piece of land to form two new properties. Consent to sever is required if a portion of land is to be sold, mortgaged, charged or is to form part of an agreement (usually lasting more than 21 years). In addition to the division of land, the registration of rights-of-way, easements, and any changes to existing property boundaries (e.g., lot addition) requires consent approval.

Comments consider both the severed lands and the retained lands, especially with respect to whether there is sufficient area on which to build the permitted development outside of any natural hazards, and set back from any waterbodies and natural heritage features.

### **5.7.6 Site Plan Control**

Municipal “site plan control by-laws” regulate how development is laid out on a given parcel of land within parameters laid out in section 41 of the *Planning Act*. The scope of site plan control varies between municipalities depending on the by-laws (e.g., may apply only to waterfront properties, commercial properties).

Comments on applications for site plan approval normally focus on adherence to existing plans for the subject area (e.g., subwatershed, secondary, master drainage, subdivision) and the specific designs for elements such as grading, stormwater management and plantings.

## **5.8 Property Inquiries**

The Conservation Authority often receives requests for site-specific information on a property to determine if there are constraints to development and applicable policies and regulations. CRCA issues a letter in response to each request, on a fee-for-service basis.

A site inspection may be undertaken for a property inquiry, depending on the level of detail requested by the inquirer. Landowner permission to enter the property is required where the inquirer is not the legal owner.

A property inquiry letter generally includes the following information:

- the municipal official plan designation and zoning for the property;

- confirmation with respect to Ontario Regulation 148/06 and applicable guidelines for implementing the ~~r~~Regulation;
- information pertaining to potential natural hazards such as flooding and erosion;
- information pertaining to natural heritage features and water resources considerations;
- an opinion on the suitability of the land for the proposed purpose;
- identification of an appropriate building envelope on the property; and
- adequacy of vehicular access.

It is important that any written correspondence include a statement that findings are based on conditions on the site at the time of review, on current legislation and policy, and on the nature of the proposal at the time of writing, and therefore that the findings are subject to change.

## 5.9 Relationship to Other Agencies

There are many agencies at the federal, provincial and municipal level that have an interest in, and a responsibility for, the review and approval of development applications. Depending on the scope and location of a proposal, the review process can be complex, involving a number of federal and provincial agencies, in addition to the local approval authority. CRCA collaborates with some of these agencies to provide a consistent and coordinated approach on matters of mutual interest, as appropriate.

### 5.9.1 Parks Canada – Rideau Canal

Parks Canada has permitting authority in, on and over the bed of the Rideau Canal ~~Federal lands~~ below the Upper Controlled Navigation Limit while CRCA applies its regulatory jurisdiction on private or Provincial Crown lands, which is typically above the Upper Controlled Navigation Limit. CRCA works collaboratively with Parks Canada and the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority as part of the Rideau Waterway Development Review Team to provide a consistent and coordinated approach to the review of municipal planning documents and *Planning Act* applications, and to the approval of development activities along the Rideau Canal. Separate agency submissions may be made on a case by case basis.

Specific Procedures:

1. Applications for proposals adjacent to the Rideau Canal are discussed with staff of the Parks Canada – Rideau Canal Office;
2. Joint site inspections are performed as needed;
3. Conservation Authority staff generally lead the preparation of comment letters with input from Parks Canada staff, particularly related to cultural heritage and in-water works;



4. Letters are written on Rideau Waterway Development Review Team letterhead;
5. Letters are copied to Parks Canada staff (currently the Planner).

### **5.9.2 Adjacent Conservation Authorities**

Several municipalities in the Cataraqui Region are located within more than one watershed (i.e., within the jurisdiction of more than one conservation authority). Where a planning document (e.g., official plan or zoning by-law) is circulated for review and comment that also involves the jurisdiction of other conservation authorities, CRCA normally collaborates with the other organizations to provide a coordinated response. For site-specific applications where the property is located within the jurisdiction of more than one conservation authority, typically one conservation authority will lead the review upon mutual agreement between the organizations.

Specific Procedures:

1. Applications are discussed with staff of the other conservation authority;
2. Joint site inspections are performed as needed;
3. Typically one conservation authority will lead the review upon mutual agreement between the organizations, and prepare comment letters with input from the other conservation authority;
4. Letters are copied to the other conservation authority.

### **5.9.3 Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change**

Lake trout are highly sought after by the angling community and the species are an important biological indicator of a healthy aquatic environment. They need cold, clean water with a high dissolved oxygen content, especially in late summer when water temperatures traditionally peak.

Lake trout and their habitat are considered to be a sensitive, declining resource in southeastern Ontario due to threats such as:

- increased nutrient loading of lakes;
- increased silt loading;
- direct disturbance of spawning grounds by activities such as dredging, infilling and the removal of substrate material;
- over-fishing; and
- the stressors from climate change.

As a consequence, efforts have been made to provide greater protection to lake trout habitats. Lake trout lakes are assessed for their optimal and usable lake trout habitat and ranked (“at-capacity” or “not at-capacity”) according to their ability to withstand nutrient inputs.

Numerous lakes in the CRCA jurisdiction are considered “lake trout lakes” and as such require special consideration in making planning decisions. CRCA letters regarding applications for lands adjacent to lake trout lakes are therefore:

- discussed with staff of the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change – Kingston District as required; and
- copied to the Environmental Planner, Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change – Kingston District.

#### **5.9.4 Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry**

The natural heritage system consists of many different features and areas. The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry determines Provincially Significant Wetlands through the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System and areas of natural and scientific interest (ANSIs) through the ANSI Confirmation Procedure, and needs to be consulted on proposals to adjust the boundaries of these features and must approve such proposals. The Ministry is also responsible for implementing the *Endangered Species Act*. Although the approval authority is responsible for ensuring that consultation occurs with the Ministry on these matters, CRCA staff will also discuss with MNRF staff to provide a consistent and coordinated approach to the review of *Planning Act* applications as appropriate.

#### **5.9.5 Drinking Water Source Protection Risk Management**

Municipal planning decisions affecting lands within groundwater wellhead protection areas and surface water intake protection zones, may have to “conform with” or “have regard to” the Cataraqui Source Protection Plan (2014, as amended), depending on degree of risk posed by associated activities.

Comments on applications in groundwater wellhead protection areas and surface water intake protection zones may specifically refer to drinking water source protection matters. Staff work in concert with the risk management officials and inspectors appointed by municipalities under the Ontario *Clean Water Act*.

## **6.0 TRIBUNALS**

### **6.1 Procedure for Initiating an Appeal**

There may be situations where it is appropriate for CRCA to initiate an appeal of the decision of an approval authority to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal. For example, when staff recommended denial of the application on the basis of protecting public health and safety from natural hazards. The decision to initiate an appeal will be made by appropriate CRCA management staff after a discussion on the matter.

### **6.2 Appearing Before a Tribunal**

When requested to give evidence before the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal, or a similar judicial body, in situations where CRCA did not initiate the appeal, staff shall request and obtain a written subpoena, prior to the hearing.

## Appendix A: Classification Codes for Municipalities and for Application Types

Revised May 2018

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Former Municipality</b>	<b>Code</b>
Athens, Twp	ATH	Athens, Village	AT
Athens, Twp	ATH	Rear of Yonge and Escott, Twp	RYE
Augusta, Twp	AUG	-	-
Brockville, City	BR	Brockville, City	BR
Elizabethtown-Kitley, Twp	ELK	Elizabethtown, Twp	EL
Elizabethtown-Kitley, Twp	ELK	Kitley, Twp	KIT
Frontenac Islands, Twp	FI	-	-
Front of Yonge, Twp	FY	Front of Yonge, Twp	FY
Gananoque, Town	GAN	Gananoque, Town	GAN
Greater Napanee, Town	NAP	Adolphustown, Twp	AD
Greater Napanee, Town	NAP	North Fredricksburgh, Twp	NFR
Greater Napanee, Town	NAP	South Fredricksburgh, Twp	SFR
Kingston, City	CKN	Kingston, City	CK
Kingston, City	CKN	Kingston, Twp	TK
Kingston, City	CKN	Pittsburgh, Twp	PIT
Leeds & the Thousand Islands, Twp	LTI	Front of Escott, Twp	FES
Leeds & the Thousand Islands, Twp	LTI	Front of Leeds and Lansdowne, Twp	FLL
Leeds & the Thousand Islands, Twp	LTI	Rear of Leeds and Lansdowne, Twp	RLL
Loyalist, Twp	LOY	Bath, Village	BA
Loyalist, Twp	LOY	Ernestown, Twp	ER
Rideau Lakes, Twp	RID	Bastard & South Burgess, Twp	BSB
Rideau Lakes, Twp	RID	North Crosby, Twp	NCR
Rideau Lakes, Twp	RID	South Crosby, Twp	SCR
Rideau Lakes, Twp	RID	Newboro, Village	NEW
South Frontenac, Twp	FRS	Bedford, Twp	BED
South Frontenac, Twp	FRS	Loughborough, Twp	LO
South Frontenac, Twp	FRS	Portland, Twp	POR
South Frontenac, Twp	FRS	Storrington, Twp	STO
Stone Mills, Twp	SM	-	-
Frontenac, County	FR	-	-
Leeds and Grenville, County	UCLG	-	-
Lennox and Addington, County	LA	-	-

N.B. Former municipality codes are provided for information only.

<b>Application Type</b>	<b>Code</b>
Condomium	CDM
Development Permit System	DPS
Environmental Assessment	EA
Fisheries	FIS
General Correspondence	GC
Inquiry	INQ or I
Minor Variance	MV
Official Plan	OP
Property Clearance	PC
Report	REP
Severance / Consent	SEV
Site Plan Control	SPC
Subdivision, Draft Plan	SUBD
Subdivision, Final Plan	SUBF
Zoning By-law	ZBL

**Appendix B: Development Review Application and Site Inspection Checklist**



**CATARAQUI REGION CONSERVATION AUTHORITY**  
 1641 Perth Road, P.O. Box 160 Glenburnie, Ontario K0H 1S0  
 Phone: (613) 546-4228 Toll Free (613 area code): 1-877-956-CRCA  
 Fax: (613) 547-6474 E-mail: info@crca.ca  
 Websites: www.crca.ca & www.cleanwatercataraqui.ca



### Development Review Application and Site Inspection Checklist

CRCA App # \_\_\_\_\_ Municipal App # \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Applicant/Agent: \_\_\_\_\_ Tel: \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Property Address or Location (e.g. Lot and Conc.): \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary of Proposal**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Site Inspection \_\_\_\_\_

Water Level \_\_\_\_\_

Inspected By \_\_\_\_\_

Accompanied by \_\_\_\_\_

The property or the proposal is subject to:

- Flooding hazards  
     Elevation \_\_\_\_\_ Based on: GIS / field survey / other (specify)
- Erosion hazards  
     Shoreline type \_\_\_\_\_ Rise/Run \_\_\_\_\_ Based on: GIS / field survey / other (specify)
- Dynamic beaches

The property contains  Unstable soils       Unstable bedrock

The property is within or adjacent to:

- Wetland (evaluated / unevaluated) \_\_\_\_\_  Woodland (significant / contributory)
- ANSI or ESA \_\_\_\_\_  Linkages and corridors
- Significant wildlife habitat \_\_\_\_\_  Fish habitat
- Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

The property is on:

- Rideau Canal       Lake Trout lake
- Precambrian Shield lake
- Soil depth \_\_\_\_\_ Soil texture \_\_\_\_\_ Slope \_\_\_\_\_ Vegetation type \_\_\_\_\_

- Erosion and sediment control measures       Proposed  Required
- Vegetated riparian buffer zones               Proposed  Required

## Development Review Application and Site Inspection Checklist Page 2

### *Review and Consideration for:*

- PPS policies
  - Official Plan policies and Zoning By-law provisions
  - OP Designation(s) \_\_\_\_\_
  - Zone(s) \_\_\_\_\_
  - Future development on adjacent properties, including CRCA properties
  - Severed and retained parcels
  - Four "tests" of a minor variance application
  - Does this application represent good environmental/land use planning?
  
  - O. Reg. 148/06 Implementation Guidelines
  - Five "tests" under the Regulation
  - In-water works considerations
- Watershed or subwatershed studies
  - Stormwater management requirements
  - CRCA Planning Policies
  - Hutchinson Report (for Precambrian Shield lakes)

### *Notes and Sketches*