

Attachment C – Methodology

Project Design

The Urban Expansion Evaluation Process was designed to meet the objectives of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 and the themes of the GROW Norfolk, Growth Management Study which itself was derived from the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020; the goals and objectives laid out in Norfolk County's Official Plan; the project themes approved through the Terms of Reference and various technical papers (Volumes 1 to 6) and fine-tuned with the guidance of the 2022-2026 Strategic Plan, Our Future Norfolk. The priority of the evaluation process was to identify potential land for urban expansion within the context of the identified need derived from the Land Needs Assessment and GROW Norfolk project work. The key components of potential lands for expansion include: ensuring that the land that is not prime agricultural (or is of least viability and utility), that the land can be accessed and serviced economically by existing infrastructure where ever possible, and the land is close to existing community infrastructure to support a complete community.

Selecting Land

Land needs were identified in terms of gross employment land and gross residential community land. Gross employment land is identified in relation to the lands proposed to be protected as an Employment area, as defined in the PPS, 2020 and accordingly proposed to be designated Protected Industrial to solidify the intention of the land for that use. In addition to gross employment land, gross residential community land refers to land which dwelling, and all other uses that are normally found in new residential communities will be constructed, not including lands proposed for employment land use. Other uses found in the gross residential community land can include but is not limited to: neighbourhood commercial, parks, pathways, schools, community centers, churches, roads and infrastructure such as stormwater facilities.

Scoring Land

The overall objective of the evaluation was to identify the land which exemplified and leveraged the best use of existing infrastructure capacity and existing community resources in an area which reduced the impacts or removal of prime agricultural land to the extent feasible in order to address the County's interest in creating complete and well serviced communities which are financially viable long term. Noting that, the majority of lands within Norfolk County are prime agricultural and therefore, examination of the alternatives or reduced negative impacts were a part of the evaluation.

In order to review possible scenarios of lands that are proposed or requested to be part of an expansion area, , a multiple step evaluation system was created, using best practices and methodologies used in MCR's completed in other municipalities. This

system which generally consists of two “passes” or components was developed using a mixed methods approach. The first “pass” was developed with a quantitative lens. It took the identified priorities and themes of the project and created markers to measure the individual parcels against one another. The intent of establishing the criterion or markers was to try and identify the specific features that, in terms of the established themes and considerations of the larger project as well as the provincial policy statement, would indicate the potential for an ideal addition to the existing community framework. The criterion, as they pertained to the project themes and the overall policy framework of the comprehensive review, was established through the input of the project’s technical team made up of representatives from various departments and divisions including housing, development engineering, recreation and facilities.

Table 1. Project Themes and Associated Pass 1 Criteria

Themes	Criterion	Potential High Score
Complete Communities	Walkability	4
	Commercial Proximity	4
Agricultural	LEAR	8
Infrastructure	Connectivity	4
	Water	8
	Wastewater	8
	Storm sewer	4
Community Infrastructure	Transportation – EMS Score	4
	Childcare	4
	Medical Access	4
Institutional	County Facilities	4
	Institutional Access	4
Natural Heritage & Open Spaces	Parks	4
	Natural Heritage	4
	TOTAL	64

In addition to the criteria identified above, technical staff also reviewed each property for the presence of Heritage Designated Structures both on the site and on adjacent lands. Given that none existed on any of the sites, this specific component of the evaluation did not have any bearing on the scores.

As a part of the public engagement process, a supporting document titled "Phase One Municipal Comprehensive Review OPA – Urban Settlement Boundary Expansion Request Evaluations, Supplemental Evaluation Criteria Document" was provided. It is attached to this package. It provides an initial summary of the related policy and additional information on the individual criteria.

Nearly all the measurements included as a part of this component of the study were based on geospatial data pertaining to the individual parcels that were proposed. Guided by the PPS and Norfolk County’s Official Plan, one of the focuses of this project

was on complete communities. A complete community is one that meets the needs of residents' daily living throughout a lifetime, and is characterized by convenient access to jobs, local services, housing and other community amenities. As assumption of this process was that potential urban area boundary expansion lands do not yet have perfect access to services and community features; however, measuring the distance from proposed lands to the various identified components of a complete community can provide an indication of the ease in which the proposed lands can be integrated into the community to facilitate the creation of complete communities in a way that utilizes existing services and community infrastructure.

The majority of the scores from Pass 1 were established using a quintile system. EMS, Commercial and County Facilities were scored by driving distance to the nearest facility. Childcare, Medical Access, Institutional, Walkability and Parks were scored by the number of features within a distance from the proposed expansion land. Each criterion was then assigned to one of five groups based on where it ranks when compared to the scores from all other properties within the evaluation. These five groups were scored between 0 to 4. This scoring process is known as quintile scoring. For example, a dataset of drive distances contains the following values:

1km, 1km, 2km, 3km, 4km, 5km, 7km, 8km, 12km, 13km

Dividing this dataset into 5 equal quintiles would yield the following scoring:

Score	Values
0	12km, 13km
1	7km, 8km
2	4km, 5km
3	2km, 3km
4	1km, 1km

Quintile scoring helps eliminate bias by selecting break points between groups by the distribution of the data values rather than relying on arbitrary criteria set by individuals. Additionally, quintile scoring allows for nuanced evaluation between possible options

Infrastructure-related criteria were assessed in a slightly different manner. Due to the complexity of the data inputs necessary to evaluate servicing and infrastructure, an individual site evaluation was necessary. This evaluation was not scored using a quintile system. Instead, each parcel was reviewed by technical experts using a pre-established sub criteria evaluating water, wastewater, and stormwater. Scores were applied based on the ability of the existing infrastructure systems to accommodate any proposed development on the site with the minimum amount of necessary infrastructure investment. Accordingly, the highest score was allotted to a potential property where no infrastructure investment was required, with scores decreasing incrementally based on the level of investment required from there. Infrastructure scores were also allotted double the score to recognize the importance of infrastructure to the overall evaluation.

Limitations of Approach

Staff recognize that any evaluation approach comes with parameters and ultimately limitations. In developing the Pass 1 criteria and the overall evaluation process, one potential limitation that was identified was the use of parcels, based on roll numbers, as the evaluated unit for the proposed lands for inclusion. Due to amount of land identified as needed as a part of the Land Needs Assessment and the amount of land requested to be added to the urban boundaries, it was identified that the majority of land proposed would not be required. While staff were aware of partnerships between some property owners and at times shared ownership between parcels, the decision was made to evaluate individual parcels on their own merits through Pass 1 to ensure the most equitable application of the process. It was the opinion of staff that given the dynamic nature of land ownership and potential partnerships over the course of the project, it would be most appropriate to not assume any long-term relationships or continued partnerships, nor any potential property mergers without any formal notification from MPAC and base it on individual parcels only.

Part of the intent of the development of the Pass 2 evaluation was to address potential shortfalls in the Pass 1 evaluation. The potential limitation presented by the use of individual parcels was counteracted by the parcel-by-parcel review which occurred in Pass 2 by ensuring each score was reviewed along with components which could contribute or potentially alter scores. Staff noted that while property owners interpreted a potential benefit to larger parcels or groups of parcels for evaluations, larger parcels or groups of parcels (when tested) did not score as well as smaller parcels.

On a similar note, while in some instances, portions of parcels were proposed for addition to the urban boundary, Pass 1 provided a score for the whole parcel. Again, Pass 2 provided an opportunity to evaluate the score provided through the Pass 1 evaluation and further analyze the merits of the parcel or portion of the parcel as proposed. Pass 2 is further explained below.

Pass 2 Lands Evaluation

Following the scoring of lands through the Pass 1 evaluation, all parcels were reviewed through a second pass which was qualitative and iterative in nature. As noted previously, "Pass 2" served multiple purposes. Firstly, it addressed some potential shortfalls of the Pass 1 evaluation such as the evaluation being based on individual parcels and not groups of potential partnering parcels or portions of parcels as proposed. It was also intended to pair with the initial feedback component which was a part of the Public Information Centre and the following stakeholder meetings. As additional information was provided or clarified, those inputs could be evaluated along with the Pass 1 score to provide a better understanding of the proposed expansion lands.

Pass 2 property evaluations involved a review of the needs identified within each urban settlement area as per the GROW Norfolk Land Needs Assessment work and a further evaluation of the land proposed within Norfolk County as a whole. Parcels were evaluated and reevaluated based on additional information sources presented as a part of the public engagement process.