

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
1.0 Introduction	
1.1 Context	In most cases changes would include minor updates (e.g., clarifying how the Greenbelt Plan works with other government initiatives, removing outdated references, etc.). Proposed changes / additions to Section 1.1 include: • An increased focus on the significant natural assets located in the region that benefit public health and overall quality of life; • Recognition of the unique soil, moderate climate and abundant water resources of the region that support some of Canada's most productive farmland; • Recognition of the interests of First Nations and Métis communities in land use planning; • References to the Ontario Climate Change Strategy, 2015, and long-term greenhouse gas and emissions reduction targets; • More direction on how the Greenbelt Plan works with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe; • A new purpose for the Greenbelt Plan "settlement areas" to support the achievement of "complete communities" that have a long-term goal of becoming "net-zero" or low carbon communities; and • An acknowledgment that the Greenbelt may be expanded in the future to include additional significant ecological and hydrological areas.
1.2 Vision and Goals	Proposed changes would include a number of updates and clarifications. In other cases, new concepts are proposed (e.g., building resilience to and mitigating climate change, "complete communities", community hubs).
1.2.1	A new central vision of the Plan to encourage building resilience to and mitigating climate change. Recognition that the vision of the Plan requires effective collaboration with many partners including First Nations and Métis communities.
1.2.2	Updated agricultural viability and protection goals, including a goal related to the protection and enhancement of the "Agricultural System" Protected Countryside goals for agriculture would be expanded to emphasize agricultural viability and highlight the importance of enhancing the strengths of the Agricultural System A modified environmental protection goal that would require consideration of natural heritage and water resources when contemplating watershed / subwatershed and stormwater management planning and water and wastewater

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
	servicing A revised culture, recreation and tourism goal promoting the conservation of “cultural heritage resources” to support the social, economic and cultural well-being of all communities New Protected Countryside goals for “settlement areas” that would encourage the development of “complete communities” that have a long-term goal of becoming “net-zero communities” and encourage the development of community hubs A revised infrastructure and natural resources goal that would promote the integration of land use planning with “infrastructure” development; A proposed new section related to climate change goals, which would promote integrating climate change considerations into planning and growth management: - Planning and managing the Agricultural System, Natural Heritage System and Water Resource System to improve resilience and protect carbon sequestration potential; and - Planning and managing growth by incorporating techniques to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in resilient settlement areas and infrastructure within the Greenbelt
1.2.3	Revisions to the urban river valley goals to include coastal “wetlands” as features to be protected along urban river valleys and the promotion of “cultural heritage resources” conservation”
1.4.1	The existing section that provides direction on how to read the plan would be retained, with some minor updates. Proposed changes / additions would include: • More direction on how the policies should be applied and how the Plan works with provincial plans, other legislation, and policies (e.g., the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, the <i>Great Lakes Protection Act, 2015</i>, etc.); • Updates to terminology to reflect new concepts (e.g., the “Agricultural Support Network”, “key hydrologic areas”, etc.); and • The requirement to apply the policies of the Greenbelt Plan and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe to “settlement area” expansions in the Greenbelt.
1.4.2	An update to redefine the Water Resource System to include key hydrologic areas, in addition to ground and surface water features (also in 3.2.1 and 3.2.4)

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
---------------	-------------------------

2.0 Greenbelt Plan	
2.1 Lands within the Oak Ridges Moraine Area	A proposed change would entail a technical adjustment to harmonize the boundary of the Protected Countryside with the Oak Ridges Moraine Area boundary.
3.0 Geographic Specific Policies in the Protected Countryside	
3.1 Agricultural System	A number of changes are proposed to encourage opportunities for economic activities on agricultural lands to support viable rural economies, consistent with several PPS, 2014 policies
3.1.1	An update to redefine the “Agricultural System” as containing an “Agricultural Support Network” (“infrastructure”, services and assets that support the viability of the agri-food sector) in addition to the land base; The introduction of newly defined terms (e.g., “on-farm diversified uses”, “Agricultural Support Network”); Revised direction requiring upper- or single-tier municipalities to refine their official plan mapping to bring “prime agricultural areas”, “specialty crop areas”, and “rural lands” into conformity with provincial mapping, through a municipal comprehensive review under the Growth Plan, where there are inconsistencies at municipal boundaries or discrepancies between provincial and municipal mapping that are significant;
3.1.2.1	The permission for additional uses on farms such as “on-farm diversified uses” (e.g., agri-tourism) and flexibility for larger “agriculture-related uses” (e.g., grain dryers) to service the broader farming community (3.1.2.1, 3.1.3.1.3.1.4.2, 3.2.2.1, 3.2.2.2, 4.5.4) A new policy requiring “agriculture-related uses” and “on-farm diversified uses” proposed within “specialty crop areas” and “prime agricultural areas” to be compatible with and not hinder surrounding agricultural operations. In rural lands, this would be encouraged. In all circumstances, criteria for these uses would be based on provincial Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
3.1.2.2	A new policy requiring “agricultural impact assessments” where non-agricultural uses are proposed in “specialty crop areas” and “prime agricultural areas” to determine how adverse impacts on the “Agricultural System” are avoided, or if avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated. In rural lands, this would be encouraged. “Agricultural impact assessments” would be required in additional circumstances (e.g., “settlement area” boundary expansions proposed into “prime agricultural areas”)
3.1.2.5	New policies requiring land use compatibility where “agricultural uses” and non-agricultural uses interface, to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate adverse impacts on the Agricultural System (3.1.2.5, 3.1.3.5, 3.1.4.7)
3.1.2.6	New policy requiring the geographic continuity of the agricultural land base and the functional and economic connections of the Agricultural Support Network to be maintained and enhanced (also in 3.1.3.6 and 3.1.4.8)
3.1.3.1	The permission for additional uses on farms such as “on-farm diversified uses” (e.g., agri-tourism) and flexibility for larger “agriculture-related uses” (e.g., grain dryers) to service the broader farming community (3.1.2.1, 3.1.3.1, 3.1.4.2, 3.2.2.1, 3.2.2.2, 4.5.4) A new policy requiring “agriculture-related uses” and “on-farm diversified uses” proposed within “specialty crop areas” and “prime agricultural areas” to be compatible with and not hinder surrounding agricultural operations. In rural lands, this would be encouraged. In all circumstances, criteria for these uses would be based on provincial Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas
3.1.3.3	A new policy requiring “agricultural impact assessments” where non-agricultural uses are proposed in “specialty crop areas” and “prime agricultural areas” to determine how adverse impacts on the “Agricultural System” are avoided, or if avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated. In rural lands, this would be encouraged. “Agricultural impact assessments” would be required in additional circumstances (e.g., “settlement area” boundary expansions proposed into “prime agricultural areas”)
3.1.3.5	New policies requiring land use compatibility where “agricultural uses” and non-agricultural uses interface, to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate adverse impacts on the Agricultural System (3.1.2.5, 3.1.3.5, 3.1.4.7)
3.1.3.6	New policy requiring the geographic continuity of the agricultural land base and the functional and economic connections of the Agricultural Support Network to be maintained and enhanced (also in 3.1.2.6 and 3.1.4.8)

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
3.1.4.2	The permission for additional uses on farms such as “on-farm diversified uses” (e.g., agri-tourism) and flexibility for larger “agriculture-related uses” (e.g., grain dryers) to service the broader farming community (3.1.2.1, 3.1.3.1, 3.1.4.2, 3.2.2.1, 3.2.2.2, 4.5.4) A new policy requiring “agriculture-related uses” and “on-farm diversified uses” proposed within “specialty crop areas” and “prime agricultural areas” to be compatible with and not hinder surrounding agricultural operations. In rural lands, this would be encouraged. In all circumstances, criteria for these uses would be based on provincial Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas
3.1.4.4	A new policy requiring “agricultural impact assessments” where non-agricultural uses are proposed in “specialty crop areas” and “prime agricultural areas” to determine how adverse impacts on the “Agricultural System” are avoided, or if avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated. In rural lands, this would be encouraged. “Agricultural impact assessments” would be required in additional circumstances (e.g., “settlement area” boundary expansions proposed into “prime agricultural areas”)
3.1.4.7	New policies requiring land use compatibility where “agricultural uses” and non-agricultural uses interface, to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate adverse impacts on the Agricultural System (3.1.2.5, 3.1.3.5, 3.1.4.7)
3.1.4.8	New policy requiring the geographic continuity of the agricultural land base and the functional and economic connections of the Agricultural Support Network to be maintained and enhanced (also in 3.1.2.6 and 3.1.3.6)
3.1.4.9	A new policy encouraging community hubs in rural settings (to maintain and adapt public service facilities as community hubs in rural lands where feasible)
3.1.5	New section of policies encouraging municipalities to implement strategies and approaches to sustain and enhance the Agricultural System, including the maintenance and improvement of the “Agricultural Support Network” (e.g., providing opportunities to support local food / near-urban agriculture, preparing regional agri-food strategies or establishing and/or consulting with agricultural advisory committees or liaison officers, etc.).
3.1.6	A new policy requiring continuity of the agricultural land base and the functional and economic connections of the “Agricultural Support Network” to be maintained and enhanced

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
3.2 Natural System	In some cases, the changes that are proposed for this section involve reorganizing and revising existing policy directions (e.g., requiring, instead of encouraging, “watershed planning” to inform decisions on growth) and in other cases, new concepts are proposed to be added (e.g., natural heritage and hydrologic evaluation exemptions for uses related to agriculture). Proposed changes/ additions would include: • New wording highlighting the natural heritage system connections beyond the Greenbelt, in the “Greater Golden Horseshoe” that speaks to the broader natural heritage system connections that would be identified in the Growth Plan Area; • New policies requiring municipalities to identify and protect “key hydrologic areas” (“significant groundwater recharge areas”, “highly vulnerable aquifers”, and “significant surface water contribution areas”) and to undertake “watershed planning” as a basis for identifying and protecting these areas; • Bringing policies on the “habitat of endangered species and threatened species” into closer alignment with the PPS, 2014 and the <i>Endangered Species Act, 2007</i> (e.g., natural heritage evaluation may not be required)
3.2.1	An update to redefine the Water Resource System to include key hydrologic areas, in addition to ground and surface water features (also in 1.4.2 and 3.2.4)
3.2.2.1	The permission for additional uses on farms such as “on-farm diversified uses” (e.g., agri-tourism) and flexibility for larger “agriculture-related uses” (e.g., grain dryers) to service the broader farming community (3.1.2.1, 3.1.3.1, 3.1.4.2, 3.2.2.1, 3.2.2.2, 4.5.4)
3.2.2.2	New structures for agricultural uses not subject to natural heritage policies
3.2.2.5	Provision for refinements to Natural Heritage System boundaries See Report for Comment and Recommendation 2.1
3.2.3.2	Revised policy requiring “watershed planning”, instead of encouraging it, to inform decisions on growth, “development”, “settlement area” boundary expansions and planning for water, wastewater and stormwater “infrastructure”;
3.2.3.3	Revised policy requiring the development of “watershed plans” and watershed management approaches, instead of encouraging it, to be integrated with “watershed planning” and management in the Niagara Escarpment Plan, Oak

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
	Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe
3.2.3.4	New policy requiring municipalities to consider the Great Lakes Strategy, the targets and goals of the <i>Great Lakes Protection Act, 2015</i> , and applicable Great Lakes agreements as part of “watershed planning”, coastal, or waterfront planning initiatives;
3.2.3.5	A new policy requiring “subwatershed plans”, or equivalent, before the approval of “settlement area” boundary expansions, secondary plans and resort development to guide planning and “development” decisions
3.2.4	An update to redefine the Water Resource System to include key hydrologic areas, in addition to ground and surface water features (also in 1.4.2 and 3.2.1)
3.2.4.1	New policies requiring a number of criteria to be met where “major development” is proposed within a “key hydrologic area” in order to protect, improve or restore the “hydrologic functions” of these areas. “Major development” would need to be consistent with the criteria set out in the relevant watershed or “subwatershed plan”;
3.2.5.6	New policies for new development or site alternation within Natural Heritage Systems
3.2.5.8	A new policy exempting buildings and structures for “agricultural uses”, “agriculture-related uses” and “on-farm diversified uses” (within 120 metres of a key natural heritage feature or a key hydrologic feature) from the requirement to undertake a natural heritage or hydrologic evaluation (subject to criteria), while still ensuring ecological impacts are minimized
3.2.5.9	A new policy that would permit new buildings or structures for “agricultural uses”, “agriculture-related uses” and “on-farm diversified uses”, within 30 metres of certain streams in the Niagara Tender Fruit and Grape Area without a hydrologic evaluation, subject to criteria;
3.2.6	A new policy that would add many of the major watercourses between the Greenbelt and Lake Ontario (the external connections shown on Schedules 1, 2 and 4) and several coastal “wetlands” into the Greenbelt Plan as Urban River Valley areas (these areas would be subject to the policies of Section 6.0 of the Plan)
3.2.7	Recognition of the importance of the Rouge Urban National Park Management Plan meeting or exceeding the policy

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
	requirements of the Greenbelt Plan.
3.3 Parkland, Open Space and Trails	Propose changes include: - Recognition that parks, open spaces and trails are important components of “complete communities”, which also help to address the causes and impacts of climate change - New policy encouraging measures that prevent trespass on farm properties from nearby parkland, open spaces and trails. See Report for Comment and Recommendations 2.5 and 2.6
3.3.1	Description of parkland, open spaces and trails
3.3.3.4	Considerations in municipal trail strategies See Report for Comment and Recommendation 2.6
3.4 Settlement Areas	Changes would include minor updates (e.g., the removal of the Hamlet boundary minor rounding out policy) and several new additions (e.g., consideration for modest expansions of “settlement areas” to be considered as part of a municipal comprehensive review under the Growth Plan). To reduce duplication between the Greenbelt Plan and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, it is proposed that in this section, the Greenbelt Plan would defer to the Growth Plan for policies on climate change and “settlement area” boundary expansions.
3.4.1	New goals for “settlement areas” that would encourage the development of community hubs and the development of “complete communities” that have a long-term goal of becoming “net-zero communities”
3.4.2	New General Settlement Areas policies for lands within Towns & Villages within the Protected Countryside.
3.4.2.2	New policies directing municipalities to facilitate the development of community hubs and to collaborate with service planning, funding and delivery sectors
3.4.2.3	New policies directing municipalities to facilitate the development of community hubs and to collaborate with service planning, funding and delivery sectors

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
3.4.2.4	A new policy that defers to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe for policy direction that would require municipalities to integrate climate change considerations into planning and managing growth in “settlement areas” (Growth Plan policy 4.2.10)
3.4.2.5	New policies encouraging the development of soil re-use strategies and the use of best practices for the management of excess soil and fill
3.4.2.6	New policies encouraging the development of soil re-use strategies and the use of best practices for the management of excess soil and fill
3.4.3.1	Revised policy specifying that the “Agricultural Support Network” policies, parkland, open space and trail policies and the policies of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe apply in Towns/ Villages and Hamlets
3.4.3.2	New policy requires agricultural impact assessment
3.4.3.3	A revised policy allowing an upper- or single-tier municipality to consider modest expansions of “settlement area” boundaries as part of a municipal comprehensive review under the Growth Plan A new policy that defers to the Growth Plan (2.2.8) for the Greater Golden Horseshoe for policy direction pertaining to modest expansions of “settlement area” boundaries (the Growth Plan includes new criteria for assessing feasibility of an expansion and determining the most appropriate location) The Growth Plan would retain the existing Greenbelt Plan tests for settlement area boundary expansions within the Protected Countryside (e.g., expansion does not extend into the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt of into specialty crop areas – see Growth Plan 2.2.8
3.4.4	Removal of the policy that allowed minor rounding out of Hamlet boundaries at the time of municipal conformity (former Greenbelt Plan policy 3.4.4.2)
4.0 General Policies for the Protected Countryside	

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
4.1 Non-Agricultural Uses	Proposed changes would support increased protections for agricultural operations. Other changes would reduce duplication between the Greenbelt Plan and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe by deferring to the Growth Plan for policies pertaining to shoreline development.
4.1.1	A new policy encouraging the completion of an “agricultural impact assessment” where non-agricultural uses are proposed in “rural lands” to determine how adverse impacts on the “Agricultural System” are avoided, or if avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated
4.1.3	A new policy that defers to the Growth Plan (4.2.4.5) for the Greater Golden Horseshoe for policy direction pertaining to shoreline development. (policies moved from Greenbelt Plan to Growth Plan, and some new requirements added)
4.2 Infrastructure	Proposed policy would involve the addition of a number of new concepts (e.g., “low impact development” and “green infrastructure”) and new policy direction (e.g., the requirement for an “agricultural impact assessment” where “infrastructure” is proposed to cross “specialty crop areas” and “prime agricultural areas”). To reduce duplication between the Greenbelt Plan and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, it is proposed that, in this section, the Greenbelt Plan would defer to the Growth Plan for policies pertaining to the requirement to complete water and wastewater, and stormwater master plans. Proposed changes / additions would include: • New direction that planning for growth would need to be undertaken in an integrated and co-coordinated manner with land use and master planning while ensuring that “infrastructure” is financially viable over its lifecycle through asset management plans; • New wording that would speak to municipalities increasing resiliency of “infrastructure” and encouraging the use of “green infrastructure”, to reduce risks and costs associated with extreme weather events. Infrastructure vulnerability risk assessments and climate change adaptation strategies would be highlighted as useful tools to help mitigate the impacts of climate change
4.2.1.2	New policy direction for “infrastructure” to minimally traverse/ occupy the Water Resource System and to minimize “negative impacts” and disturbances where “infrastructure” does cross or intrude (a, d and e) New policy direction requiring new or expanding “infrastructure” to avoid “specialty crop areas” and other “prime

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
	agricultural areas”, unless need has been demonstrated and there is no reasonable alternative, in which case, an “agricultural impact assessment” would be required
4.2.2.1	New policies that largely defer to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe for policy direction pertaining to sewage and water “infrastructure” and stormwater management and “infrastructure”, and key new policies in the Growth Plan would require the completion of water and wastewater and stormwater master plans. Water and wastewater master plans, or equivalent, for the expansion of water and wastewater services to demonstrate no negative impact on water quality and quantity, financial viability and assimilative capacity (Growth Plan 3.2.6.2.c)
4.2.3.1	New policies that largely defer to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe for policy direction pertaining to sewage and water “infrastructure” and stormwater management and “infrastructure”, and key new policies in the Growth Plan would require the completion of water and wastewater and stormwater master plans Stormwater master plans, or equivalent, would be required for serviced settlement areas informed by watershed planning (Growth Plan 3.2.7.1)
4.2.3.2	New policies that largely defer to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe for policy direction pertaining to sewage and water “infrastructure” and stormwater management and “infrastructure” (vulnerability), and key new policies in the Growth Plan (3.2.1.4) would require the completion of water and wastewater and stormwater master plans.
4.2.3.3	Existing unchanged policy – storm watermanagement ponds are prohibited in key natural heritage features of key hydrologic features of their vegetation protection zones. See Report for Comment and Recommendation 1.19
4.2.3.4	New requirements for low impact development to help address climate change
4.3 Natural Resources	This section is proposed to be revised and restructured. In most cases changes would include minor updates (e.g., refinements to rehabilitation requirements), while other sections would introduce key policy changes (e.g., the requirement for an “agricultural impact assessment” where new “mineral aggregate operations” are proposed in “prime agricultural areas”).

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
4.3.2.4	A new policy requiring an “agricultural impact assessment” to be conducted where new “mineral aggregate operations” are proposed in “prime agricultural areas”, to determine how adverse impacts on the “Agricultural System” are avoided, or if avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated
4.3.2.5	Refinements to the mineral aggregate rehabilitation policies to clarify requirements
4.4 Cultural Heritage Resources	Proposed changes would encourage opportunities for (require) cultural heritage conservation, consistent with several PPS, 2014 policies. See Report for Comment and Recommendation 2.11
4.4.1	A new policy that would require “significant cultural heritage resources”, “built heritage resources”, “cultural heritage landscapes” and “archaeological resources” to be conserved
4.4.2	A new policy that would require planning authorities to work with stakeholders and consider the interests of First Nations and Métis communities in conserving “cultural heritage resources” through official plan policies and strategies
4.4.3	A new policy that would encourage municipalities to consider the Greenbelt’s vision and goals in preparing archaeological management plans and municipal cultural plans in their decision-making.
4.6	New lot creation policies would limit lot creation only for uses permitted by the policies of this plan See Report for Comment and Recommendation 2.9
5.0 Implementation	
5.3 Municipal Implementation of Protected Countryside Policies	Proposed changes would include new mapping-related requirements and direction, including: • A new policy requiring municipalities to include a map of “key hydrologic areas” and policies in their official plans; and to undertake watershed planning as a basis for identifying and protecting these areas • A new policy requiring the province, in collaboration with municipalities, to undertake an exercise to provide consistent identification, mapping and protection of the “Agricultural System” across the “Greater Golden Horseshoe” (building on the existing Greenbelt Agricultural System mapping)

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
	Revised direction requiring upper- or single-tier municipalities to refine their official plan mapping to bring “prime agricultural areas”, “specialty crop areas”, and “rural lands” into conformity with provincial mapping, through a municipal comprehensive review under the Growth Plan, where there are inconsistencies at municipal boundaries or discrepancies between provincial and municipal mapping that are significant See Report for Comment and Recommendation 2.2
5.7 Amendments to Greenbelt Plan and other Provincial Plans	Proposed changes would include highlighting the addition of new Urban River Valley areas to the Greenbelt and would describe the ways the Greenbelt could be grown in the future
5.7.1.2	A new policy that would support the province in leading a process to identify potential areas (with a focus on areas of ecological and hydrological significance) to be added to the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt.
5.7.1.3	A new policy that identifies urban river valleys provide additional public lands to be added to the Greenbelt in the future by amendment.
5.7.1.4	A new policy that would outline that the province will consider requests from municipalities to grow the Greenbelt with the Protected Countryside and/or Urban River Valley designations.
5.8 Monitoring/ Performance Measures	It is proposed that the existing policies of Section 5.8 of the Greenbelt Plan be updated and clarified. Proposed changes/ additions would include revised policies supporting the establishment of a comprehensive monitoring program to measure the effectiveness of the Plan. Building on existing plan policies that support data collection and monitoring to measure the effectiveness of the Plan by introducing municipal reporting requirements.
6.0 Urban River Valleys	
6.2	Existing policies are proposed to be updated and clarified.

Appendix B – Proposed Greenbelt Plan 2016 – Key Policy Changes

Policy Number	Proposed Policy Changes
Policies	See Report for Comment and Recommendation 2.3
6.2.1	A new policy clarifying that only publicly owned lands are subject to the policies of the Urban River Valley designation
Definitions	Proposed changes would support the proposed changes to other parts of the Plan through the addition of new defined terms. Many of the new defined terms being proposed (e.g., “cultural heritage landscape”) would be replicated from the PPS, 2014 and, where possible, would align with the terms that would be used in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Niagara Escarpment Plan. Some of the Greenbelt Plan’s defined terms, including “development” and “infrastructure”, have been revised.
Schedules	Proposed revisions to the schedules and appendices would include: • Updated ‘settlement area’ boundaries and transitional matters reflecting the latest municipal official plan schedules, capturing transitioned matters and providing consistency across the provincial plans • Updated Niagara Escarpment Plan boundary; and • Proposed Greenbelt expansion areas including new Urban River Valley areas, two areas in Hamilton, one in Grimsby and the Lake Gibson area in Thorold in Niagara Region. See Report for Comment and Recommendations 2.7 & 2.8
	Proposed Greenbelt Additions • 21 major watercourses between the Greenbelt and Lake Ontario and associated coastal wetlands to be added as Urban River Valley • 4 parcels to be added as Protected Countryside; two areas in Hamilton, one area in Grimsby and one in the Lake Gibson area in Thorold