

## Policy Conformity Table

PD-39-2018, Attachment 7

Provincial Policy Statement (2014)		
Policy Number	Policy	Comments
2.3.6.1	<p>Planning authorities may only permit non-agricultural uses in prime areas for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) extraction of minerals, petroleum resources and mineral aggregate resources, in accordance with policies 2.4 and 2.5; or</li> <li>b) limited non-residential uses, provided that all of the following are demonstrated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the land does not comprise a specialty crop area;</li> <li>2. the proposed use complies with the minimum distance separation formulae;</li> <li>3. there is an identified need within the planning horizon provided for in policy 1.1.2 for additional land to be designated to accommodate the proposed use; and</li> <li>4. alternative locations have been evaluated, and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. there are no reasonable alternative locations which avoid prime agricultural areas; and</li> <li>ii. there are no reasonable alternative locations in prime agricultural areas with lower priority agricultural lands.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The proposal is not related to the extraction of minerals, petroleum resources and mineral aggregate resources, nor is it for residential use.</p> <p>The policies contained in section 2.3.6.1 b) have been reviewed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the land does not comprise a specialty crop area, irrespective of the fact that the soils are classified as CLI Class I. The size and overburden located on the site would impede the ability to grow any crops, specialty or standard.</li> <li>2) The proposed use is not affected by MDs as there are no livestock operations exist or are proposed in the vicinity of the subject lands. Additionally, the lands are adjacent to property designated as Urban Business Park.</li> <li>3) The subject lands would be zoned such that only the min-storage and climate controlled warehousing uses are added to the list of permitted uses for the site. There are zones in the County that would permit the use as of right, however these lands also permit more employment uses. Directing this use to a site capable of providing more employment opportunities may not provide the same sort benefit as rezoning the subject lands.</li> <li>4) The proponents have commented that lands with as-of-right permission are not suitable for the proposed use. The location of these other properties relative to target markets and their size are prohibitive to the subject proposal.</li> </ul>

Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017)		
Policy Number	Policy	Comment
4.2.6.3	Where <i>agricultural uses</i> and non-agricultural uses interface outside of <i>settlement areas</i> , land use compatibility will be achieved by avoiding or where avoidance is not possible, minimizing and mitigating adverse impacts on the <i>Agricultural System</i> . Where mitigation is required, measures should be incorporated as part of the non-agricultural uses, as appropriate, within the area being developed.	In this case, the agricultural use that exists adjacent to the proposed non-agricultural use is interim in nature. In other words, the agricultural activities taking place to the east of the subject lands are occurring on land designated Urban Business Park. These lands have been identified for future employment uses rather than continued agricultural uses.