

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

09 JANUARY 1996

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

Members: D. Beamish, P. Clark, A. Cullen, B. Hill, P. Hume, J. Legendre, A. Munter and R. van den Ham

REGRETS: W. Stewart

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Councillor Legendre asked that page 8 of the minutes (the first full paragraph, line 4) be amended to read "he did not feel the existence of the RCCEVAW grant was justified."

**That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 12 December 1995, as amended.**

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEMS

1. Second Call for Proposals - Community Environmental Project Grants Program (CEPGP)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
-Director, Finance & Administration Div., Environment Section, Env. and Trans. Dept.  
report dated 1 Dec 95

**That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the allocation of funds for the second round of CEPGP project proposals as outlined in Annex A.**

CARRIED

## PLANNING ITEMS

2. Regional Plan Review: Detailed Evaluation Phase  
- Planning and Property Commissioner report dated 29 November 1995

At the outset, Chair Clark made reference to Bill 20, which the Province expects to pass sometime in March. Since the scope of the Regional Official Plan Review was dictated in part by the former government's Bill 163, he raised the question of whether the review should be completed in the scope as was envisioned. He suggested that the Committee might want to make a decision as to whether the Region should continue with the review.

Committee Chair Hunter suggested that staff consider the comments made by Chair Clark during their presentation.

Pamela Sweet, A/Commissioner, Planning and Property Department, provided an overview of the staff report. She drew the Committee's attention to the title of the report, the "Regional Plan Review" as opposed to the Regional Official Plan Review, which refers to the fact that it encompasses the Water and Wastewater Master Plan and the Transportation Master Plan. In this regard, Ms. Sweet introduced Brendan Reid, Project Coordinator for the Transportation Master Plan and Kim Eaton, Project Coordinator for the Water and Wastewater Master Plan.

Referring to comments made by the Regional Chair, Ms. Sweet noted that the Regional Official Plan needs updating; some parts of it are over 20 years old. She assured the Committee that staff would conduct the review within the framework of the new provincial policies. Another argument in support of completing the review at this time, is the issue of affordability (i.e. what can the Region afford in terms of infrastructure in the Plan). Integration of the Official Plan Review with the Environmental Assessment (EA) process could result in great savings on EA work that would be needed for future infrastructure. Finally, Ms. Sweet stated that the Transportation Master Plan and the Water and Wastewater Master Plan would be unable to be completed independent of the Regional Official Plan Review.

Councillor Cullen asked if staff's reference to Ottawa's Greenway system (page 11) was congruent with the NCC's interior Greenbelt corridor. Ms. Sweet advised that the original wording contained "NCC Corridors"; staff is suggesting a slightly different wording that respects the Ottawa Greenway system, which for the most part includes the NCC corridors. With input from the NCC, staff recognized that there are going to be parcels that are surplus to the NCC's needs that will be potentially offered for sale. Staff are recommending that these areas be studied to see where the impacts are and then it will be up to Regional Council to decide whether the areas proposed for development are acceptable. Councillor Cullen referred to the public's importance of greenspace and he

indicated he would like to see the NCC corridors included in the Official Plan. He did not want to leave the impression that the Region was in agreement that greenspace could be disposed of.

Responding to questions from Councillor Cullen, with regard to Item 2 of “Refinement of Preferred Regional Development Pattern”, Ms. Sweet advised that the report “How Shall We Grow” recommended three steps regarding development. They were to look inside greenbelt first, look at the suburban communities second and then if more expansion is needed, then thirdly examine expansion to the boundaries. Through studying the various suburban areas that have potential for urban expansion, it appears the west has the most opportunity. However, this will be the last step and it may not be needed. Councillor Cullen suggested that the wording of the statement should read “If further urban expansion is needed, examine merits of urban boundary expansions in the west first.”

With reference to Bullet 9 of Table 1, Councillor Cullen noted that the “trend” of employment is very low and slow; by the year 2021, the impact of the “trend” would not be very significant. Ms. Sweet agreed and noted that the Region must take advantage of opportunities that are there; it will not be a pure trend line projection. She cited as an example, the area around the airport and stated it is recognized that there is opportunity for a lot more jobs. Issues such as this will be taken into account. The Councillor suggested that the trend could be looked at as a minimum, but that a more aggressive approach should be taken.

Subsequent to further questions to staff, the Committee then heard from the following public delegations.

Jim Sevigny and Wilf Koppert, Planning, Economic Development and Housing, City of Ottawa Mr. Sevigny, speaking on behalf of the City of Ottawa Council and staff, expressed strong support for the process Regional staff have been following and in the direction and conclusions that have been arrived at to-date. He noted that Ottawa Council approved a motion recommending that the Region adopt the re-urbanization and low-land consumption option as its Regional Development Strategy. The City of Ottawa has actively participated in the review process and has confidence that the evaluation criteria established by staff is realistic, fair and credible given the current economic and political realities. The City of Ottawa supports the “Guidelines for Testing Distribution of Population and Jobs” (Table 1 of the staff report); this is consistent with Ottawa’s previous direction to pursue an urban, low-land development scenario. Mr. Sevigny said he was looking forward to working with the Region to continue to evaluate growth options and develop policies to ensure the future prosperity of the Region.

Dave Darch and Larry Morrison, Planning Department City of Gloucester Mr. Darch addressed the guidelines contained in Table 1. He stated Gloucester was supportive of the

process and believe it to be thorough. He appreciated the involvement of the area municipalities. Regarding the second bullet Mr. Darch stated Gloucester was encouraged to see that Regional Staff are looking to support the historic growth rates in the rural communities and he advised that Gloucester will be looking for its fair share of rural growth and will be bringing forward proposals for growth in the rural area for staff's consideration. Commenting on Bullet 4, the speaker noted Gloucester does not disagree with looking at growth within approved boundaries but was disappointed that staff is taking the position that it should be limited to certain growth areas. As well, it is Gloucester's opinion that consideration should be given to minor boundary changes. The second last bullet refers to minimization of local infrastructure costs and this is commendable but the costs of local infrastructure should be looked at as well. Mr. Darch cautioned that cost should not be the only factor considered. With regard to the last bullet on employment distribution, the speaker stated he was encouraged by statements made by Ms. Sweet that consideration will be given to a balanced analysis. He expressed support for better use of existing transportation infrastructure and sewer systems, however, he hoped this would not preclude the optimization of development possibilities in growth areas (i.e. west Rideau Collector). Mr. Darch took issue with a statement on page 11 of the report regarding the phasing of Leitrim services, that they were not to be built until the phasing strategy is completed.

Councillor Beamish, referring to Bullet 4, asked if it meant that the Region would not look at minor boundary adjustments. Ms. Sweet advised that a statement on page 10, said that very minor boundary adjustments would be considered if a servicing benefit were evident.

Bruce MacNabb, Monarch Construction Mr. MacNabb's comments focused on the last bullet of Table 1 concerning trend employment distribution. He expressed hope that the potential economic impact of Highway 416 would be considered. He noted the future potential of Highway 416 when it connects to Highway 401 and provides direct expressway access to the north-eastern United States; this will open up a market in excess of \$100 million. Ms. Sweet agreed that this was the type of matter that would be taken into consideration.

Ron Richards, Richcraft Homes Mr. Richards endorsed the comments and concerns raised by Mr. Darch of the City of Gloucester. Referring to Bullet 5 on page 6 of the report and a section of a Transportation background report, Mr. Richards expressed concern that a detailed analysis/threshold analysis would not be carried out on the potential for boundary expansion in the Southeast, to the extent of other growth areas in the Region. He asked for staff comment on this and for an indication that current urban boundaries, capacity allocations and servicing to those areas will be left as they are. As well, he asked what phasing, as referred to in the staff report, could mean to these areas.

In response to these questions, Ms. Sweet confirmed that no testing on the expansion of the boundaries in the Southeast will be done. However, it is staff's intention to test an increase in the number of units within the Southeast to the same level of detail as other suburban communities. Mr. Reid also pointed out that the Southeast Sector study which was completed a year ago, encompassed a detailed analysis of the Southeast (including the thresholds of development). This report also revealed the major amount of infrastructure that is necessary to serve this development. With regard to Mr. Richard's questions on the current urban boundaries, servicing and phasing, Ms. Sweet advised that staff have committed to not taking away from pre-committed planning in the current plan. There could however be some very minor boundary decreases. Capacity will be looked at in terms of phasing; staff do not want to recommend taking away units from certain areas however, phasing could be looked at in terms of when services are extended to those communities and will also be looking at a strategy that is cost efficient.

Tom Hussey and Paulette Hodge, Leitrim Development Committee Ms. Hodge, speaking on behalf of Gerd Rebhein, Chairman of the Gloucester Chamber of Commerce provided the Committee with some background information on the Gloucester Chamber of Commerce. She noted that the City of Gloucester is one of growth and in order to feed the growth, they must continually look to expansion.

Mr. Hussey made a presentation to the Committee, emphasizing the many qualities and benefits of the Leitrim area. The Leitrim Development Committee recommended that the Leitrim growth area be considered independently as a growth scenario; be recognized as an economically viable growth area in the Region; be evaluated to reflect the actual costs of servicing for water, sewer and transportation to the existing growth area; and that Leitrim be given priority for Regional infrastructure provisions in the Capital Works Plan. Referring to the staff report which states that servicing for Leitrim should not be done until after the review; Mr. Hussey noted that many businesses developed in the Leitrim area over 20 years ago believing that services would be forthcoming. This does not appear to be happening. Mr. Hussey asked that the concerns and recommendations of the Leitrim Development Committee be given fair consideration.

Ms. Sweet noted that in the next detailed phase of the review, Leitrim will be separated from the South Urban Community and the actual costs will become evident.

Councillor Beamish stated he had had discussions with members of the Leitrim Development Committee and he clarified they were not seeking expansion of the boundaries. Rather, they were looking for further development of Leitrim within the existing boundaries.

Maureen Kemp, Leitrim Community Association Ms. Kemp advised that the Leitrim community would welcome new residents with open arms; she described the many

services, benefits and conveniences that Leitrim has to offer. She felt that the development of Leitrim would not require major changes in the existing transportation links or trigger costly core facilities. The speaker noted that the large industrial park and the privatization of the McDonald/Cartier Airport will attract new residents and businesses. Ms. Kemp closed by saying that Leitrim is eager to proceed with the growth

Andy Ellwood, Kemp Park Residents' Association Mr. Ellwood advised that Kemp Park consists of about 60 homes and is located just outside of Leitrim. Because of the close proximity to Leitrim, whatever happens within the boundaries of Leitrim will have an effect on Kemp Park. He noted that Kemp Park is located within the Greenbelt and will not expand anymore; the residents however, would like to see further growth in Leitrim. Refuting a statement in the report concerning airport noise, Mr. Ellwood explained that this is not a problem as Leitrim is downwind of the major runways.

Mr. Ellwood went on to say that Leitrim should not be grouped in with the South Urban Community (SUC); Leitrim in fact is closer to downtown Ottawa than it is to the SUC. He felt that to make assessments on the two areas together is not a wise thing to do. The other point raised was the lack of sewer systems in the area. He noted that 20 years ago a water system was installed but not sewers; this has resulted in rising water tables which are becoming a health hazard. If the installation of sewers is put off, the residents of Kemp Park and Leitrim will be faced with greater problems.

Chris Jalkotzy, Ecovision, provided the Committee with a written submission which is on file with the Regional Clerk. Mr. Jalkotzy stated that in his review of the "How Should We Grow" scenarios, he found that these proposals would not cost any less than what is in the current Regional Official Plan. He found this shocking as he believed the whole point of the review was to find scenarios that would save the Region money. He noted that a manageable spending curve would see capital costs cut by 80%; none of the scenarios presented reflect this kind of cut. The speaker felt that the Region should be more up front about where the urban boundaries are going to be in the year 2021; he felt by doing this, the public would be able to assist the Region in solving its problems.

Referring to page 5 of his submission, Mr. Jalkotzy noted that the Guidelines presented by staff do not contain a reference to the environment. He suggested that a bullet be added to highlight the issue of the environment, namely, "Maintain or improve on present air and water quality". He proposed that this statement be added in before bullet 7 - "Maintain choice of housing and bear in mind 'market forces'". Mr. Jalkotzy concluded by saying that he was looking forward to working on developing an affordable scenario. He cautioned the committee that they would be met with pleas from property owners to develop and he suggested that they enlist the public's support in denying these requests.

Councillor Legendre, referring to the speaker's request for an addition to the Guidelines to address the issue of the environment, asked for staff's comment. Ms. Sweet advised that Table 1 does not include all of the criteria, but rather consists of basic ground rules for evaluation. She referred the Councillor to page 18 of the staff report which sets out the evaluation criteria and in particular that section dealing with the Natural Environment. Councillor Legendre felt that a statement dealing with the environment should be included in the Guidelines table.

Dan Paquette and Ernie Faintuck, Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association (OCHBA) Mr. Paquette expressed concern with the process of the Review. He noted that the building industry is having their worst year since World War II. OCHBA's concerns are with the emphasis that is being placed on infill development within the Greenbelt, at the expense of the suburbs. The Association believes this will force growth outside of the Region. He noted that the Outaouais and Aylmer markets are doing quite well because of the higher costs of developing on this side of the river. He stated that OCHBA believes there is a role for infill but staff is being lured by a theoretical model that can only work when one controls the entire market place; the Region of Ottawa-Carleton does not control the entire market place.

Mr. Faintuck prefaced his comments by reminding the Committee that this was a testing phase; the purpose of which is to produce evidence to allow intelligent decisions to be made in the future. In this regard, he felt it would be best not to unduly limit the testing phase. He went on to say that the Region is not in a monopolistic position of directing growth through policy and that the scenarios presented may not give sufficient recognition to this state of affairs, as there is an assumption that there will be growth inside the Region. He advised there is significant resistance to intensification within the Greenbelt. Mr. Faintuck also disagreed with the assumption that the ageing population will seek higher density locations within the greenbelt and that there will be sufficient land to accommodate this market preference. He questioned why ageing suburbanites would want to leave their communities to become urbanites. He felt that more detailed evidence is needed to sufficiently qualify this assumption. Mr. Faintuck went on to question what would happen if the objectives set are not achieved; he felt that some thought should be given to the impact this would have.

In conclusion, Mr. Faintuck stated the testing procedure should be market driven rather than market tempered. He cautioned that the Region should ensure there is in fact a credible land base inside the Greenbelt and it should be well detailed to demonstrate the credibility of the intensification assumptions that appear to be part of the testing process.

Amy Kempster, Federation of Ottawa-Carleton Citizen's Association, drew the Committee's attention to the written submission she provided them with (on file with the Regional Clerk). She highlighted three main points in her presentation. The first being

concerns with the consultation process. She noted that a preliminary report was received and commented on. However, the final report was available only on the Friday preceding the public meeting and she noted the difficulty in convening a meeting and preparing a response in such a short timeframe. She suggested that Committee reports be available at least 10 days before the Committee meetings.

Ms. Kempster went on to commend staff on the quantity and quality of work they have accomplished. She voiced the association's agreement with the general direction of this next phase of the Review. Referring to comments made by OCHBA representatives, the speaker agreed that this next phase has to remain grounded in reality and she noted that FCA's submission contained recommendations that would help ensure this. As well, it is FCA's recommendation that the guidelines be strengthened to prohibit residential or commercial development in parks and other greenspaces unless otherwise provided for in announced preliminary agreements with federal authorities. She advised that the FCA supports intensification but want the developers to consult with the communities early in the process. She asked that the phasing issues be faced head on; the public has a right to expect a phasing strategy that upholds the desired outcomes even if the populations and jobs are significantly less than projected. The FCA feels that the proposed population projections are too high and should be more realistic.

Referring to Item F of the FCA's submission, Councillor Cullen asked staff if there would be a problem amending the Criteria in C1, C3, C7 and C10 to apply to all of the reviews and not just the Transportation Master Plan. Ms. Sweet advised that this will add extra work; these criteria were applied during the strategic work and were taken into account. Councillor Cullen felt that in particular C10 - Impact on health, should apply to all of the reviews; he indicated he would be putting forward a motion in this regard.

Chris Cummins, President, Rural Kanata Conservation Association and Vice President, March Rural Community Association. Mr. Cummins advised that he had participated in the Community Visioning exercises. He agreed that the most important question for Ottawa-Carleton is where future growth should occur and he urged the Committee to make conservation (land, water, sewage, transportation, etc.) the watchword of the review. This would translate into locating additional growth within the Greenbelt boundaries and to tighten controls on boundary expansion. Mr. Cummins suggested that Kanata would be willing to give up its share of rural development; there seems to be a contradiction between rural character and urban development. In closing, the speaker expressed support for the primary conclusions arrived at to-date.

David McNicoll spoke on his own behalf and on behalf of the Ottawa-South Community Association (OSCA). He also provided two submissions, which are on file with the Regional Clerk. Mr. McNicoll stated that the OSCA feels that the detailed evaluation phase is premature given the research to-date. He gave as examples areas such as energy



production and conservation, natural resources, health issues, comprehensive economic development plan and human ecological footprint research, as policy areas without serious research. The OSCA feels that delay, to research some of these issues, is in order.

Speaking on his own behalf, Mr. McNicoll referred to the last paragraph of his submission which dealt with staff's projection of a population increase to 1,000,000 by the year 2021. He opined that without renewable energy or resources, this would result in global death. He indicated he would be giving a lecture on this matter, entitled "Model for Global Integrity" on 1 February 1996 and invited the Councillors to attend.

At Councillor Legendre's request, Mr. McNicoll agreed to provide staff with a list of the publications (dealing with conservation options, generation of energy sources) referred to in his presentation.

Curry Wood, Vice President, Capital Planning and Real Asset Management and Francois Lapointe, Director, Long Range Planning, National Capital Commission Mr. Wood expressed support for the direction of the Review as presented in the report. The approach makes sense because it helps preserve the natural environment, contributes to a high quality of life for the community and makes effective use of infrastructure. The NCC, with its federal government partners can play a significant role with the Region to achieve these general planning goals. Mr. Wood noted the benefits of a cooperative approach towards the protection of the environment and urban greenspace and cited as an example the recent urban corridors agreements between the NCC, the Region and the City of Ottawa. The NCC supports the wording presented in the draft guidelines as they are fair, accommodate many interests and balance concerns for the environment, economy and communities. In particular, Mr. Wood expressed support for the wording of the third guideline which deals with development on parklands, wetlands, greenways, etc. The speaker agreed that urban development is not appropriate on land designated as parkland, wetland or land which has significant natural features. However, there may be lands in the urban area which can accommodate growth and these should be investigated further. All Federal departments are taking a very serious look at how much land is needed to support changing program requirements and one can expect that some federal land will be declared surplus. Mr. Wood agreed that the evaluation of a new Regional Development Strategy is an appropriate time to test the implications of developing some of these federal lands

After hearing from all public delegations, Committee Chair Hunter read the motions put forward by members of the Committee as follows:

Moved by D. Beamish

That the report be amended to read that a phasing strategy will be developed but that, in the meantime, all reasonable proposals for development within the existing urban boundaries be considered and brought to the Planning and Environment Committee.

Moved by D. Beamish

That staff be directed to entertain all proposals for the development of the Leitrim Urban Area and to report back to the Planning and Environment Committee within two months with a report.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Step 2, of the steps to develop a preferred regional development pattern to 2021 be amended to read: "If further urban expansion is clearly needed, then examine the merits of urban boundary expansion in the west urban centre first."

Moved by A. Cullen

That Bullet 3 be replaced with the following: "Avoid development on parkland, lands in Ottawa's Greenway System, on NCC corridors currently designated NILM (National Interest Land Mass), provincially significant wetlands, and significant natural features within existing urban boundaries."

Moved by A. Cullen

That Bullet 9 be amended to read: "Assume the "trend" employment distribution as a minimum, but develop additional scenarios to move toward a balanced employment distribution."

Moved by J. Legendre

That the following be added as a bullet in the guidelines table (Table 1): "Testing of development levels and distributions will consider the resulting effects, positive and negative, on the health of the environment as well as on the quality of life and the health of the citizens of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa Carleton."

Moved by A. Cullen

That, in Annex B, evaluation criteria C10 be amended from "TMP" to "ALL".

Moved by D. Beamish

That Planning Committee recommend that the report not be accepted and that the Official Plan Review be terminated immediately.

Moved by P. Clark

That Councillor Beamish's motion be amended by replacing "terminated" with "suspend in order to evaluate the impact of provincial legislative changes on the scope requirements".

Committee Chair Hunter suggested that the Committee deal first with Chair Clark's amendment and then Councillor Beamish's motion. He advised that should Councillor Beamish's motion pass, the remainder of the motions would not be voted on. Rather, they would be considered tabled and would be included in the report to Council.

Responding to questions posed by Councillor Hume, concerning the effect of Councillor Beamish's motion, Ms. Sweet advised that the present plan contains phasing policies but they have expired and offer no guidance as to which area should be developed next. As well, the Water and Wastewater Master Plan and the Transportation Master Plan could not go forward without the Regional Official Plan Review as there is no new basis on which to continue their work.

Carol Christensen reinforced that the Master Plans are being done to meet Environmental Assessment requirements; the current plan does not provide a complete framework for continued work on the Water and Wastewater Master Plan and the Transportation Master Plan.

Councillor Cullen noted that he was part of the Council that approved the Regional Official Plan Review and that much has been done on the review to date. He felt that public expectations have been raised to expect an updated plan. He cited many examples of policies that need to be changed i.e. Regional Development Strategy, policies on the retail sector, greenbelt and transportation objectives. If the Regional Official Plan Review is terminated now, a tremendous amount of very good work will be wasted.

Councillor Munter stated that Councillor Beamish's motion would have merit if it meant the current urban boundaries would remain. However, the Councillor noted that fifty amendments to the 1988 Regional Official Plan have been approved and it is his belief that if the Official Plan is not changed, the Region will be faced with a great many more amendments. Councillor Munter said the review is an important exercise that was premised on the fact that the current plan is unaffordable (i.e. capital commitments); the

Region has an obligation to the taxpayers to be more responsible. For these reasons, he could not support Councillor Beamish's motion.

Councillor Hill stated that much has happened since the review was approved, including the fact that development has ground to a halt, a new provincial government is in place and the cuts in funding from the province have been drastic. The Councillor felt that this type of expenditure could not be justified to the taxpayers. Further, she noted that the work that has been done to date will not be lost.

Councillor Beamish speaking to his motion, felt that the ROP review was merely an academic exercise to keep planners busy. He felt the costs associated with the review would be far greater than first realized. In addition to the work done by Regional planners, the area municipality planners and local developers have also had to spend a great amount of time examining and analysing the various stages of the review. The Councillor felt the termination of this review would not have an impact as there is no development taking place, there is a twenty-year supply of developable land within the Region and therefore no need to expand the Region's boundaries.

Regional Chair Clark stated that the review was premised on the former government's initiatives (i.e. the Sewell Report and Bill 163); the government and many of the policies have now changed. Referring to comments made by Councillor Munter concerning the number of amendments to the ROP, the Chair stated that many of these amendments were in response to Provincial changes that the Region had to have regard to. He did not agree that the review should be terminated at this time, but rather it should be suspended to allow staff the opportunity to examine whether the scope of the review needs to be modified. Further, the Chair disagreed that the Transportation Master Plan and the Water and Wastewater Master Plan could not continue without the Official Plan review.

Councillor van den Ham expressed disagreement with termination of the Review. Regarding suspension, the Councillor felt that staff could take into consideration the changes proposed by the Province, while continuing with the Review. He felt it important to the citizens of Ottawa-Carleton and the development community to proceed with the Official Plan Review to see if improvements over the current Official Plan can be obtained.

Councillor Legendre expressed agreement with Chair Clark that the premise for the Official Plan Review has changed. However, the current Official Plan is outdated and he felt that the current Provincial government would agree with this. He stated that the new provincial policies appear to lower the minimum standards but give municipalities the flexibility to go beyond these standards; this makes it even more urgent that the Region carry on with the Official Plan Review and to strengthen the policies contained in it.

Committee Chair Hunter empathized with the frustration expressed by members of the Committee over the Official Plan Review process but stated this is not a reason to stop it. Referring to comments concerning the lack of development in the Region, Chair Hunter said this was an argument for doing a review at this time as it can be undertaken without having to face the pressure of developers approaching the Region to develop or expand on an ad hoc basis.

Chair Hunter explained that the whole process of this review actually started in 1991 with the environmental audit program. The environmental policies were not reviewed in the 1988 Regional Official Plan and there was considerable public pressure to update these policies. Referring to the amendments made to the Regional Official Plan, Chair Hunter noted that Council rarely had strong basis to say no. For this reason, a freeze on all amendments pertaining to the urban boundary was imposed, pending completion of the official plan review. The Region now has the opportunity to ensure that consideration of all boundary changes are considered on the same basis. He noted affordability is an important consideration and if the review is allowed to continue, Council will be able to compare the costs associated with development or expansion of each area. He urged the Committee not to support termination or suspension of the Regional Official Plan Review.

Councillor Hume felt that the current urban boundaries should be confirmed and the fiscal situation would dictate the servicing requirements. The Councillor stated that the numbers projected by staff of 60,000 to 100,000 dwelling units within the greenbelt, was unrealistic. He noted that between 1971 and 1991, a time when the baby boomers were driving the market, only 65,000 dwelling units were created in the greenbelt. He felt it unnecessary to go through the detailed evaluation and testing phase at this time. Rather, it would be more appropriate to update the necessary policies through amendments and to opt for the least expensive development proposals. For these reasons he stated he could not support proceeding with the official plan review.

The Committee then considered the motion of Chair Clark.

Moved by P. Clark

**That Councillor Beamish's motion be amended by replacing "terminated" with "suspend in order to evaluate the impact of provincial legislative changes on the scope requirements".**

CARRIED

YEAS: Councillors Hill, Hume, Hunter, Legendre, van den Ham and Chair Clark....6  
NAYS: Councillors Beamish, Cullen and Munter....3

Councillor Beamish's motion, as amended by the foregoing was then considered.

Moved by D. Beamish

**That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council not accept the Departmental report and that the Official Plan Review be suspended in order to evaluate the impact of provincial legislative changes on the scope requirements.**

CARRIED

YEAS: Councillors Beamish, Hill, Hume, van den Ham and Chair Clark....5

NAYS: Councillors Cullen, Hunter, Legendre and Munter....4

**ADDITIONAL ITEMS**

Moved by A. Cullen

**That the notice required under the Procedures By-law be waived to allow the following motion to be considered.**

CARRIED

3. Request to NCC for Extension of Deadline for Public Comments on the  
Greenbelt Master Plan Environmental Evaluation

Councillor Cullen advised that he had discussed his motion and the timelines contained therein, with staff and they agreed that this could be accomplished.

Moved by A. Cullen

**WHEREAS on May 24, 1995 the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton approved its response to the National Capital Commission's Draft Greenbelt Master Plan;**

**WHEREAS on January 2, 1996 a public notice published by the NCC appeared in the Ottawa Citizen (copy attached) declaring that an initial environmental assessment has been prepared for its Greenbelt Master Plan, that the NCC has determined that all potentially adverse environmental effects are mitigable with known technology;**

**WHEREAS it appears from the NCC document Environmental Assessment of the Master Plan for the National Capital Greenbelt (Jan. 1996) that many of the issues raised by both the public and the RMOC have not been addressed in this report;**

**WHEREAS** neither RMOC Planning staff nor local community groups have been circulated with the NCC environmental assessment documentation;

**WHEREAS** the deadline for public comments to the NCC's environmental evaluation (according to the Jan. 2, 1996 notice) is January 17, 1996;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the RMOC request the NCC to extend its deadline for public comments on the Greenbelt Master Plan environmental evaluation to the end of February, 1996;

**THAT** Planning staff prepare a report for the first meeting of Planning & Environment Committee in February on the NCC's *Environmental Assessment of the Master Plan for the National Capital Greenbelt* report, to be submitted to the NCC as the RMOC's comments, following Council approval;

**AND THAT** Council be requested to waive the rules of procedure to consider this recommendation at its January 10, 1996 special meeting.

CARRIED

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

**Reports on the Natural Environment Systems Strategy: Assessing Significance**

- Planning and Property Commissioner memorandum dated 14 Dec 95

**Regional Solid Waste Collection - Tender Call**

- Director, Solid Waste Div., Env. and Trans. Dept. memorandum dated 7 Dec 95

**Rural Consultation Program**

- Director, Policy Division, Planning and Property Dept. memorandum dated 8 Dec 95

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

---

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

---

COMMITTEE CHAIR