

MINUTES OF THE
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON
CHAMPLAIN ROOM
12 AND 13 JUNE 1997

**COMMITTEE DELIBERATION OF:
DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN, DRAFT WATER AND
WASTEWATER MASTER PLANS, AND DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL
PLAN AMENDMENTS**

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

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

Thursday, 12 June 1997 - 9:00 a.m.

1. DRAFT WATER AND WASTEWATER MASTER PLANS
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 05 May 97

Councillor Hill put forward a motion to include the connection of Manotick to the West Rideau Collector in the Wastewater Master Plan, noting it had been proposed since the MacLaren-Richards servicing report was approved by Regional Council in 1970. She also noted that the Manotick connection has been included in the Region's Capital Budget as Phase 5, each year since.

Kim Eaton, Senior Project Manager, Environment, Planning and Development Approvals Department, advised staff feel this issue is a bit premature in that the Township of Rideau has only just completed a servicing report, which Regional staff have not had the opportunity to review. She noted in the Wastewater Master Plan, allowance has been made for servicing potential for Manotick, however, because staff did not have complete information (i.e. the servicing report), no recommendation was made.

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 09 July 97 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 62.

Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division pointed out there are many issues to be addressed, such as land-use planning issues and exactly how Manotick should be serviced (e.g. communal servicing or collector); also public consultation should be undertaken. She suggested it would be best not to include this in the Plan at this time, but that staff would work with the Township of Rideau and the community and propose a Regional Official Plan Amendment in the near future.

Committee Chair Hunter suggested there should be some recognition in the Master Plan to acknowledge Councillor Hill's point. Ms. Eaton provided Councillor Hill with suggested wording to amend Section 4.1.4 b). The Councillor agreed and put forward the following motion.

Moved by B. Hill

That the following be added to the third paragraph of Section 4.1.4 b) "The need for servicing Manotick by a connection to the West Rideau Collector will be established through Manotick Planning and Servicing Studies with the Infrastructure Plan updated as appropriate."

CARRIED

Referring to Section 3.5.2 c) of the Wastewater Master Plan, Councillor Legendre noted staff are proposing replacement of this Section to remove reference to the wet weather flow removal factor of 1.25 times the total flow from a proposed development (p. 291, volume 2 of the Transmittal report of 5 May 97). The Councillor felt the original policy attempted to improve, over time, the wastewater flows in areas of Ottawa-Carleton that have older systems; he felt the proposed policy, which does not set a target, would not achieve anything. He put forward a motion to amend the proposed policy to include, after the words "flow removal program", the words "at 1.25 times the difference in peak wastewater flow projected to be generated after completion of development when compared to existing flow".

Ms. Eaton reminded members this issue was raised by Mr. Leonard Lee at the public meetings in May, and, as a result, staff are proposing this amendment to the policy. She noted the Region would still be looking at removing flows from the system, however, the onus would be put on the municipalities (local and Region), who are in a better position to know how to remove flows from the system, rather than the developers. This would be an interim flow removal program, until the more long-term solutions (i.e. the flow diversions and the comprehensive flow management strategy) are put in place.

Councillor Legendre stated he was comfortable with putting the onus on the municipalities, however he would like to see the target (1.25) remain in the policy. Chair Hunter suggested, and Councillor Legendre agreed to amend his motion to add the words "at a target of" at the beginning of the sentence. The Committee then considered the motion.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the staff recommendation for Section 3.5.2 c) of the Wastewater Master Plan be amended by adding the words “at a target of 1.25 times the difference in peak wastewater flow projected to be generated after completion of development when compared to existing flow” after the words “...through a flow removal program”.

CARRIED
(D. Beamish dissented)

The Committee then approved the Water and Wastewater Master Plans, as amended.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve:

- 1. The Water Master Plan with the changes attached as Annex ‘A’;**
- 2. The Wastewater Master Plan with the changes attached as Annex ‘B’, as amended.**

CARRIED

2. PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER
DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENTS

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner’s report dated 05 May 97
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner’s report dated 03 June 1997

On the issue of ROPA 51, Councillor Hill, referring to page 34 of the 12 June 97 Agenda (Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals’ report dated 03 June 97) noted staff are recommending 9.3 ha be retained as Extensive Employment, whereas previously, staff were recommending the entire parcel (48.32 ha) be designated General Urban.

Ms. Sweet advised that Fotenn Consultants (on behalf of Mr. Sweetnam) requested the entire parcel be designated General Urban; Goulbourn Council had indicated their desire to retain the 9.3 ha for business park purposes. She noted although staff would prefer to see the 9.3 ha of land designated as Extensive Employment in the ROP, the General Urban designation would not preclude this land from being used for employment purposes, as the local Official Plan could designate it as Restricted Industrial.

With leave of the Committee, Danny Page, Township of Goulbourn, advised that Goulbourn Council is indifferent as to how the 9.3 ha is designated in the Regional Official Plan. He explained Goulbourn Council wishes to see this land used for industrial purposes and as long as this is possible under the General Urban designation, they are satisfied.

Councillor Hill felt the General Urban designation on the entire parcel, would allow the owners a degree of flexibility, noting the Official Plan is for a twenty-five year period. In this regard, the Committee considered the Councillor's motion.

Moved by B. Hill

That Amendment 51, Relocatable Homes designate 48.32 ha (120 acres) General Urban.

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, J. Legendre, W. Stewart and
R. van den Ham...7
NAYS: A. Cullen and A. Munter....2

Referring to the ROPAs staff are recommending be refused, Committee Chair Hunter and Councillors Beamish and van den Ham pointed out that those amendments that deal with land that will be the subject of the proposed study for the Corel Centre lands, should perhaps be tabled rather than refused. Ms. Sweet advised, if Committee and Council direct staff to undertake such a study and if it results in an Amendment being needed, the Region would undertake such an Amendment at no cost to the landowners.

The Committee then considered the Draft Regional Official Plan Amendments, as amended.

That, having held a public meeting, Planning and Environment Committee recommend that:

1. Council refuse the following requests to amend the Region's Official Plan:

- a) **Amendment 67, Fernbank Estates, attached as Annex B to this report; (05 May 97)**
- b) **Amendment 48, Gibson (1085084 Ontario), attached as Annex D to this report (05 May 97);**
- c) **Amendment 68, Silver (Cedar Lane Estates - 455866 Ontario), attached as Annex E to this report (05 May 97);**
- d) **Amendment 52, Hoddinott Holdings, attached as Annex F to this report (05 May 97);**
- e) **Amendment 71, Moore, attached as Annex G to this report (05 May 97); and**
- f) **Amendment 72, Del Corporation (446341 Ontario Ltd.), attached as Annex H (05 May 97)to this report;**

2. **Council enact a bylaw to adopt Amendment 51, Relocatable Homes, (Sweetnam) as modified and attached as Annex B to this report (03 June 97), as amended.**
3. **Council enact a bylaw to adopt Amendment 69, Davidson (1085084 and 790591 Ontario) as modified and attached as Annex A to this report (03 June 97);**

CARRIED
(A. Cullen dissented on
Recommendation 3)

3. TRANSMITTAL REPORT ON DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's reports dated 03 June 97

The Committee first received the revised proposed ROP and then proceeded through the Second Draft of the Regional Official Plan page by page.

That Planning and Environment Committee receive the revised proposed Regional Official Plan with the changes contained in Annex A of this report, and the changes contained in the 6 May, 14 May and 11 June 97 reports to Planning and Environment Committee.

RECEIVED

The Committee approved pages 1 to 4. On page 5, Councillor put forward the following motions with respect to Sections 1.4.3 and 1.4.4.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 1.4.3 be amended by replacing “job creation and associated business development” with “employment and associated economic activity”.

CARRIED

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 1.4.4 be amended by inserting the words “generally open rural” before the word “publicly”

CARRIED

The Committee approved page 5, as amended and pages 6 and 7. On page 8, Councillor van den Ham referred to Section 1.6.8 and proposed an amendment to address a concern raised by the Township of Cumberland. He moved that the words “Long term existing uses may be

recognized by local municipalities in their zoning by-laws” be added to the end of the existing paragraph.

Marni Cappe, Manager, Policy Planning Branch, suggested that wording proposed by Tim Marc, Solicitor, namely “Further, a zoning by-law may be enacted to render the existing use a legal conforming use.” be substituted. Councillor van den Ham agreed to accept this wording, reserving his right for further amendment at Council.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Section 1.6.8 be amended by adding to the end of the existing paragraph “Further, a zoning by-law may be enacted to render the existing use a legal conforming use.”

CARRIED

The Committee approved page 8 as amended. Councillor Cullen put forward an amendment to Section 1.6.16, on page 9.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 1.6.16 be amended by replacing the words “shall seek partners” with the words “shall encourage partners”

CARRIED

The Committee approved pages 10 and 11. On page 12, Councillor Cullen moved that Section 2.3.3 be amended by replacing the phrase “while minimizing the loss of greenspace”, with the phrase “while avoiding the loss of open space” to reflect the relevant objective in the Regional Development Strategy (RDS).

Councillor Stewart suggested the word “avoiding” in Councillor Cullen’s motion be replaced with “without”. Ms. Sweet felt the word “without” would pose a problem, in that some of the open space land is owned by the National Capital Commission (NCC), (as defined in Section 6, p. 82) who may, if they declare land surplus, want to dispose of it. She noted however, that a Regional Official Plan Amendment would be required if any of the land was proposed for development.

Councillor Beamish moved that the words “publicly owned” be inserted in Section 2.3.3. before the word “greenspace”. Councillor Munter felt this would be too restrictive, and suggested that instead, a definition of open space be included in the glossary. Councillor Beamish agreed to withdraw his motion.

Moved by D. Beamish

That in Section 2.3.3, the words “publicly owned” be inserted before the word “greenspace”.

WITHDRAWN

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 2.3.3 be amending by replacing the words “while minimizing the loss of greenspace” with “while avoiding the loss of open space”.

CARRIED

The Committee approved page 12 as amended. Councillor Legendre, referring to Section 2.3, Policy 6 on page 13, put forward a motion to change the order of “transit, walking and cycling-first” to “walking, cycling and transit-first” and noted this appears numerous times throughout the ROP. He advised the Transportation Committee, in their deliberation of the Transportation Master Plan, had approved this reordering. The Committee agreed the Councillor’s motion would cover the reordering of all instances of “transit, walking and cycling-first” in the ROP.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 2.3, Policy 6 (and all other instances in the Regional Official Plan), be amended to read “ To implement a walking, cycling and transit-first policy as part of a balanced....”

CARRIED

Page 13, as amended, was approved, as were pages 14 and 15. Referring to page 16, Councillor Munter expressed concern with the proposed growth of Leitrim and asked staff to explain why Leitrim appeared in the first Draft with Gloucester South Urban Centre and in the second Draft as a separate growth area. Ms. Sweet explained Leitrim was originally “lumped together” with Gloucester South Urban Centre because they are close together geographically and, because Leitrim is such a small entity, staff felt it would simplify things to have them together. She noted the City of Gloucester and the developers in the area requested that they be separated; their rationale being, that the Gloucester South Urban Centre and Leitrim are not serviced through the same pipes and are serviced by different types of transportation networks.

Councillor Munter felt that as a separate growth area, Leitrim could take on the type of momentum the Gloucester South Urban Centre did, which would result in additional investments in infrastructure. He put forward a motion that Leitrim be included with the Gloucester South Urban Centre, as one growth area. He clarified he was not recommending taking away units from Leitrim.

Moved by A. Munter

That Section 2.4.1.4 be amended by eliminating (e) Leitrim and (d) be amended to read: (d) Gloucester South Urban Centre and Leitrim.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, J. Legendre and R. van den Ham...6
YEAS: A. Cullen and A. Munter....2

The Committee approved pages 16 and 17. Chair Hunter indicated his dissent on all of Section 2.4

With respect to page 18, Section 2.5.7, Councillor Cullen put forward the following motion, which he felt was stronger language and consistent with the RDS policies.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 2.5.7 be amended by replacing the words “Support the protection of” with the word “protect”; and insert the words “significant natural features” after the words “sensitive natural areas”.

CARRIED

The Committee approved page 18, as amended and page 19, with Councillor Hunter dissenting on Table 5 of Section 2.6.

Councillor Hill expressed concern with Policy 5 of Section 2.6.1 (p. 20) which sets out that the Region is to work with the Township of Goulbourn to provide peak period transit service in Stittsville at a level equivalent to other urban centres in the Region, prior to undertaking the widening of Hazeldean Road. She felt this to be unfair and put forward a motion to delete this policy.

Ms. Sweet noted this policy was changed from the first Draft of the ROP (which stated the Region would not issue another draft approval until Stittsville was brought up to this level of transit) and was discussed with the Township of Goulbourn and they were willing to accept this policy. Harry Beere, Senior Project Manager, Transportation, Planning and Development Approvals Department, advised this policy is intended to provide a means, over the life of the plan, to bring Stittsville into a level of equity with the rest of the urban area; the policy is also consistent with the Plan’s transit-first policy. He explained the term “other urban areas” was used to avoid being prescriptive and to allow Goulbourn some flexibility.

Commissioner Tunnacliffe suggested, if Councillor Hill was uncomfortable with the words “other urban areas”, the Policy could be amended to read “the Kanata area”. Councillor Hill indicated this would not satisfy her concerns and asked that her motion stand.

Moved by B. Hill

That Policy 5 of Section 2.6.1 (Page 20 of the Second Draft of the Official Plan) be deleted.

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....5

NAYS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre, A. Munter and W. Stewart....4

The Committee approved page 20 as amended.

Councillor Munter, referring to Table 6, Key Infrastructure Projects for Phase 1 Development, First Priority and Second Priority (p. 20 and 21 respectively), noted Council at its meeting of 11 June 1997, approved the widening of March Road and in this regard, he put forward a motion to move March Road widening (Solandt Rd. to Klondike Rd.) from Second Priority to First Priority. Brendan Reid, Manager, Project and Infrastructure Planning Branch, indicated this motion would be consistent with Council’s decision.

Moved by A. Munter

That Section 2.6.1, Table 6 (Key Infrastructure Projects, First Priority) be amended by adding: March Road widening (Solandt to Klondike); and that this project be deleted from the second priority list.

CARRIED

Councillor Beamish indicated he had a similar motion dealing with Conroy Road. Mr. Reid advised that Council approved the amount of \$800,000 to start work on Conroy Road, however, he pointed out the total cost of widening Conroy Road will be in the order of \$10 million. Council did not indicate where these funds would come from nor that this project would be completed in the next five years (as a first priority).

Councillor Legendre commented that the Committee, in considering the Official Plan, was setting priorities; where the money will come from will be considered during budget deliberations. The Committee then considered Councillor Beamish’s motion.

Moved by D. Beamish

That Section 2.6.1, Table 6 (Key Infrastructure Projects, First Priority) be amended by adding: Conroy Road widening (Hunt Club to Walkley); and that this project be deleted from the second priority list.

CARRIED

Referring to the section “All Urban Areas” on Table 6 (both First and Second Priority), Councillor van den Ham moved that improvements be “considered” in the listed projects as opposed to automatically “included”. He pointed out it did not make sense to include walking facility improvements, for example, along the Highway 17 shoulder bus lane. After hearing arguments of Committee members, Councillor van den Ham agreed to amend his motion to read “included where appropriate”.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Section 2.6.1, Table 6 (Key Infrastructure Projects, First and Second Priority) be amended by adding the words “where appropriate” after the word “included” in the All Urban Areas Section, to read “Walking & cycling facility improvements included where appropriate in the above projects.

CARRIED

Councillor Beamish drew the Committee’s attention to the memorandum from the Commissioner, Development Approvals Department, dated 5 June 1997 which outlined potential changes to the Draft Regional Official Plan, as a result of recommendations made by Transportation Committee at its meeting of 30 May 97. He put forward a motion that the 20 recommendations be adopted in bulk. After discussion, the Committee agreed to consider the recommendations individually and Councillor Beamish withdrew his motion.

Moved by D. Beamish

That the 20 resolutions prepared by staff, resulting from changes to the Draft Transportation Master Plan, be adopted.

WITHDRAWN

Councillor Cullen put forward the following motion, noting it does not mean the pilot rail rapid transit project would happen before 2006 but that the project would come before Council and it would decide if and when it wants it wants to proceed.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 2.6.1, Table 6 (Key Infrastructure Projects, First Priority) be amended by adding: Pilot rail rapid transit project; and that this project be deleted from the second priority list.

CARRIED

(B. Hill and G. Hunter
dissented)

Councillor Cullen then put forward a motion to delete the widening of Carling Avenue (March Road to Moodie Drive) from Table 6, Second Priority. He noted widening would bring more traffic onto Carling Avenue through his ward and would compete with the proposed extension of the Transitway to Kanata.

At Councillor Munter's request, Mr. Reid confirmed that Carling Avenue is critical to the growth of the West Urban Community (including Kanata), that there is traffic in both directions during peak hours and that the recently announced additional 5000 jobs at Nortel had not been factored into the ROP.

Mr. Reid explained his interpretation of the Transportation Committee recommendation (i.e. that the Carling Avenue widening (March Road to Moodie Drive) be deleted from Table 10 and 11) was that it would be deleted from the Transportation Master Plan and the Official Plan and would not happen in the 25 year span of the Plans. Councillor Cullen clarified it was not his intent to remove it entirely from the Official Plan, but rather just from Table 6 such that the widening of Carling Avenue would not occur before 2006.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 2.6.1, Table 6 (Key Infrastructure Projects, Second Priority) be amended by deleting Carling Avenue widening (March Road to Moodie Drive).

LOST

NAYS: B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, A. Munter and R. van den Ham....5
YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen and J. Legendre....3

Yeas and Nays were called on the following three motions, without discussion.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 2.6.1, Table 6 (Key Infrastructure Projects, First Priority) be amended by adding: Pooley's Bridge (walking and cycling facility) to the row entitled "Inside Greenbelt".

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....5
YEAS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter....3

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 2.6.1, Table 6 (Key Infrastructure Projects, Second Priority) be amended by deleting: "Airport Parkway Twinning" from the rows entitled "Inside Greenbelt" and "Gloucester South Urban Centre".

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....5
YEAS: A. Cullen and J. Legendre....2

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 2.6.1, Table 6 (Key Infrastructure Projects, Second Priority) be amended by deleting: “Bronson Avenue widening (Dunbar Bridge to Canal)”from the row entitled “Inside Greenbelt”.

LOST

NAYS: B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....4
YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, J. Legendre and W. Stewart....4

The Committee then approved pages 21 and 22, as amended and page 23.

At this juncture (11:55 a.m.), Committee broke for lunch and reconvened at 12:55 p.m.

The Committee approved pages 24, 25 and 26. On page 27, Councillor Legendre, put forward a motion to amend Section 3.2, Policy 13, which addressed his concern with regard to gated communities. The Councillor also asked that staff review the possibility of including a general policy statement in the Official Plan that speaks to the undesirability of communities isolating themselves in gated communities.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 3.2, Policy 13 i) be added, to read: i) public access unimpeded by security gates or similar barriers.”

CARRIED

The Committee approved pages 27 (as amended), 28 and 29. Councillor Cullen put forward a motion to amend Policy 3 of Section 3.3.2 by replacing the word “expect” with the word “require”. Ms. Cappe stated although she would prefer the word require, the Province has in the past, advised the Region it could not require affordable housing because it does not have the capability to require housing in specific price points. She cautioned therefore that the word “require” may give rise to a number of objections. Councillor van den Ham suggested the word “target” would be a better choice.

Committee Chair Hunter expressed concern with the words “each year”, noting that municipalities will have their ups and downs in terms of affordable housing being built. He suggested this be changed to a five year moving average; Councillor Cullen agreed to move a motion to this effect.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 3.3.2.3 be amended by replacing “each year” with the words “over a five year moving average”.

CARRIED

Councillor Legendre, noted Rockcliffe Park is an anomaly insofar as this Policy is concerned, in that there is no way that the small amount of land that is available for development, could be made affordable. He put forward a motion to exempt Rockcliffe Park from this Policy. Ms. Cappe agreed that Rockcliffe Park is an anomaly, however, staff would be reluctant to specifically exempt it from the provisions of this Policy.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 3.3.2.3 be amended by inserting the words “save and except for the Village of Rockcliffe Park” after the words “in each municipality”.

LOST

NAYS: A. Cullen, P. Hume, G. Hunter and A. Munter...4
YEAS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, J. Legendre and R. van den Ham...4

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 3.3.2.3 be amended by replacing the word “expect” in the first line, with the word “require”.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham...5
YEAS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter...3

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 3.3.2.3 be amended by replacing the word “expect” in the first line, with the word “target”.

CARRIED

With respect to Section 3.3.2.4, Councillor Cullen pointed out the word “respectively” was missing at the end of the sentence and move a motion to add it.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 3.3.2.4 be amended by adding the word “respectively” at the end of the section.

CARRIED

On Policy 5e) of Section 3.3.2, “conditions for development approval”, Councillor van den Ham put forward a motion to delete this subsection. The Councillor noted developers have relayed to him their feelings this Policy is very onerous and unnecessary. Ms. Cappe noted the intent of this policy is to create opportunities for affordable housing (e.g. non-profit and co-op groups looking for ways to develop affordable housing using alternative financing mechanisms). Through this policy, when there are large plans of subdivisions, the Region could try to secure a block of land that could then be made available for affordable housing (either through the developer or another group).

After hearing from staff, Councillor van den Ham stated he would change his motion to add the words “subject to negotiations” at the end of the existing sentence. Mr. Marc advised the Region was recently at the OMB on the implementation of the present provision in the ROP. He noted, while it is acknowledged by staff that all conditions are negotiated with the developer in order to achieve the best possible result, one argument the Region was faced with at the OMB was that if the word “negotiation” is used, the developer effectively has a veto on doing anything by refusing to enter into negotiations or by refusing to bring them to a conclusion. Therefore, Mr. Marc recommended, if it is Committee and Council’s intent to use conditions of approval to achieve this policy, it would be best not to include “subject to negotiations”. Councillor van den Ham indicated he would let his original motion stand.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Section 3.3.2.5 e) be deleted.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, P. Hume, G. Hunter, J. Legendre, A. Munter, and W. Stewart....7

YEAS: B. Hill and R. van den Ham....2

The Committee approved page 30 as amended. With respect to Policy 9 of Section 3.3.2 on page 31, Councillor Cullen drew the Committee’s attention to the word “encourage” in the ninth line and put forward a recommendation to replace it with “require”. He noted his motion would require the municipality to enter into an agreement with the proponents of conversion projects, but does not guarantee all of the conditions listed will be included in the agreement.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 3.3.2.9 be amended by replacing the word “encourage” in the 9th line with the word “require”.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham....6

YEAS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter....3

Councillor Stewart stated she could not support subsection c) of this Policy, as she felt guaranteeing lifetime tenure to sitting tenants was impractical and she put forward the following amendment. Ms. Cappe clarified the origin of subsection c) is from Bill 96, the Tenant Protection Act, which has just received second reading. She pointed out the Act distinguishes between conversion of rental to condominium as opposed to rental to freehold, however, the proposed ROP policy applies to both condominium and freehold.

Moved by W. Stewart

That Section 3.3.2.9 c) be amended by replacing “Guarantee Lifetime Security...” with “Ensure terms of tenure to sitting tenants not willing to buy their respective units.”

CARRIED

(A. Cullen, B. Hill and
P. Hume dissented)

At Councillor Cullen’s request, Ms. Cappe explained the first draft of the ROP had stipulated a minimum of six months tenure guaranteed; the Province requested the change to Guarantee Lifetime Security. Councillor Cullen put forward the following motion to amend Councillor Stewart’s motion.

Moved by A. Cullen

That the words “for a minimum of one year” be added to Councillor Stewart’s amendment to Section 3.3.2.9 c).

CARRIED

(B. Hill, J. Legendre and
W. Stewart dissented)

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 3.3.2.11 be amended by replacing the word “Encourage” with “Require”.

CARRIED

The Committee approved page 31, as amended, with Chair Hunter dissenting on Policy 14 of Section 3.3.2; pages 32, 33 and 34 were approved. Councillor Cullen pointed out in Policy 5 of Section 3.4.2 a “b)” should be inserted prior to the word “implementing”.

Referring to page 35, Section 3.4.2, Policy 11 (d), Councillor Cullen put forward a motion to remove the words “wherever possible”. After hearing from staff that the removal of these words would mean in every instance (e.g. at the corner of Laurier and Elgin) where a road is rehabilitated, reconstructed or constructed, channelised right-turn and multiple left turn lanes would be removed or avoided, Councillor Cullen withdrew his motion.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 3.4.2.11 d) be amended by deleting the words “wherever possible”.

WITHDRAWN

The Committee approved pages 35, 36, 37 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42. Ms. Cappe pointed out that on page 43, Section 3.7.4, Policy 1 c) staff are recommending an amendment as a result of concerns expressed by the Township of Cumberland. The change is outlined in the staff report dated 11 June 97, as Item 816. Councillor van den Ham agreed to move a motion to include this amendment.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Section 3.7.4.1 c) be deleted and add new policies: “1 c) commercial uses to meet the needs of the rural or traveling public or which relate to local resources and which would not be better located within a village; 1d) industrial uses that meet the servicing requirements of Section 10.3 and are not sufficiently large to require additional transportation facilities; 1 e) home based businesses; and renumber policies 1d), e), f), g), h), i), j), k), l), m) accordingly, as set out in staff recommendation 816, third addendum.

CARRIED

Pages 43 (as amended) and 44 were approved. Councillor Legendre then put forward the following two motions, in keeping with his earlier motion on gated communities. He clarified the motion regarding Section 3.7.3, would apply to publicly maintained right-of-ways and would not be applicable in the case of private, internal roads (e.g. in the case of condominium developments).

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 3.7.4 be amended by adding the new policy: “11. Ensure that road layout in country lot subdivisions provides public access unimpeded by security gates or similar barriers.”

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 3.1.1 (Page 24 of the Second Draft of the Official Plan) be amended by adding after the words “and incomes”, the words “and to discourage the development of communities isolated by security walls, gates or similar barriers”.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham...6
YEAS A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter....3

The Committee approved page 45 and page 46. On page 47, Councillor Cullen put forward the following amendment to Section 4.1.1.2 as he found the proposed wording to be confusing.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 4.1.1.2 be amended by replacing the words “with special emphasis on” with the words “recognizing the special role of”.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, A. Munter and W. Stewart....6
YEAS: A. Cullen and J. Legendre....2

Page 47 was approved. Councillor Cullen put forward the following motion to amend Section 4.1.2.9 on page 48. Ms. Sweet advised, at the request of Councillor Stewart, that staff used the word “require” (rather than encourage), as a result of input received from the economic development community and others who wanted to ensure that home based businesses were allowed across the Region. She noted the local municipalities will still be able to limit the types of activities allowed through zoning by-laws.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 4.1.2.9 be amended by replacing the word “require” with the word “encourage”.

LOST

NAYS: B. Hill, J. Legendre, A. Munter and W. Stewart....4
YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, P. Hume and G. Hunter....4

Councillor Legendre then put forward the following motion.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 4.1.2.9 be amended by adding “subject to standards appropriate to residential areas”.

CARRIED

Councillor Cullen put forward a motion to amend Policy 10 of Section 4.1.2 by replacing the word “require”, with the word “encourage”. At Councillor Beamish’s request, Ms. Sweet explained “commercial services which support home-based employment” would be such things

as courier, faxing and photocopying services. This policy would require local municipalities to permit these types of services in or adjacent to communities to support home-based employment.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Policy 4.1.2.10 be amended by replacing the word “require” with the word “encourage”.

CARRIED

Councillor Beamish felt Policy 10 should be deleted entirely and put forward the following motion.

Moved by D. Beamish

That Policy 4.1.2.10 be deleted.

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, B. Hill, G. Hunter and A. Munter....5

NAYS: P. Hume, J. Legendre, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham....4

Councillor Hill referred to Policies 13 and 14 of Section 4.1.2, which deal with studies on the Carp Airport and the Ottawa Macdonald-Cartier International Airport and put forward a motion to add a new policy to this section with regard to a study on the Corel Centre lands. She felt the Region would be remiss if it did not acknowledge this major facility and its future potential in terms of jobs and economic development.

Councillor Cullen asked that staff comment on the decision handed down by the OMB, at the time the Corel Centre lands were approved. Ms. Sweet advised the OMB decided, at that time, the use should be limited to the 100 acres around the Corel Centre and ordered that the Region stop participation in the West Urban expansion study. She pointed out, however, the OMB did not give a finite time frame and she stated her opinion that if a comprehensive study (including a needs justification study) was undertaken by the Region and the municipalities, that conformed to Provincial policies, it would be acceptable. She noted the two studies (Carp and Macdonald Cartier Airports) were included in the Official Plan as a means to show the Region's commitment to being proactive in terms of economic development.

Councillor Munter felt the Corel Centre is much different than the two airports in that Council has already made policy decisions to see development occur at the two airports and the studies will look at how to proceed with the development; Council has not made a decision on whether or not there should be development on the Corel Centre lands. He stated although he does not object to a study being undertaken on the Corel Centre lands, he felt it should not be included in the Official Plan. In this regard, Councillor Munter moved the staff recommendation

contained in the Second Addendum, page 7, Item 751, as a substitution for Councillor Hill's motion.

Moved by A. Munter

That the staff recommendation contained at page 7, Item 751 of the Second Addendum to the Transmittal Report on the Draft Regional Official Plan, namely, "No change to the draft Regional Official Plan; however, staff propose to prepare a Terms of Reference for an economic development study of the lands around the Corel Centre and submit these Terms of Reference to Committee and Council", be approved.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, G. Hunter, J. Legendre and W. Stewart....5

YEAS: A. Cullen, P. Hume, A. Munter and R. van den Ham...4

As a result of Councillor Munter's comments, Councillor Hill agreed to amend her motion to read "...investigate if and how the Corel Centre..." instead of "...investigate and propose how the Corel Centre...". Councillor Beamish asked that Councillor Hill's motion be amended by adding (to what the study would consider) "the extension of Huntmar Road". Committee Chair Hunter ruled this amendment out of order as he felt the Huntmar Road extension should be considered in conjunction with the Transportation schedules.

Moved by B. Hill

That Section 4.1.2 (page 50 of the Second Draft of the Official Plan) be modified to include a new policy with reference to the Corel Centre: "18. Undertake a study in conjunction with the Townships of Goulbourn and West Carleton, the City of Kanata and affected landowners to investigate if and how the Corel Centre can be used as the basis for increased economic activity and employment opportunities. The study would consider:

- **boundaries of the area**
- **transportation and servicing requirements and costs**
- **locational factors that would influence development in this area**
- **revenues to the Regional Municipality of Ottawa Carleton and local municipalities from such development."**

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, J. Legendre, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham...8

NAYS: A. Munter...1

The Committee then approved pages 48,49 and 50, as amended and pages 51 to 58. With respect to Section 4.7.2, Policies for Retail Stores and Commercial Services, Councillor Legendre drew the Committee's attention to correspondence dated 11 June 97 from Janet Bradley of Gowlings (solicitor for St. Laurent Shopping Centre) which asks that the special situation that exists at St. Laurent (i.e. the inclusion of the uses in the basement of St. Laurent causes it to exceed its gross leasable area (GLA) cap of 77,000 square metres) be recognized in the Official Plan. Ms. Sweet advised of staff's reluctance to recognize St. Laurent as an exception as it could set a precedent for other shopping malls in the area that might want to develop their basements. She stated staff are recommending instead, the words "movie theatres" be deleted from the third sentence of Policy 1, Section 4.7.2 (Item 817, page 4 of the third addendum) as a means of addressing St. Laurent's concern. Joseph Phelan, Senior Project Manager, Land Use, added "movie theatres" were not included in the 1988 Official Plan (nor in the existing City of Ottawa OP) as examples of uses considered as commercial services. Therefore, by removing "movie theatres" it is suggested, by inference that it would not be included in the GLA definition. Councillor Legendre then moved the staff recommendation.

Councillor Cullen stated he did not have a problem making an exception for St. Laurent, however, he expressed concern about the deletion of the words "movie theatres" in that other shopping malls (e.g. Carlingwood) might want to use their basement space for movie theatres and this would have a significant impact on the surrounding infrastructure. He put forward a motion to add an asterisk beside St. Laurent in Table 8, on page 61 to indicate that the 77,000 square metres GLA, does not include movie theatres existing at the time of adoption of the new Official Plan. Councillor Legendre asked that Councillor Cullen amend his motion to include "recreational and entertainment type uses" in addition to movie theatres. Councillor Beamish asked that it also be amended to apply to existing or "approved" uses. Councillor Cullen agreed to these amendments and Councillor Legendre withdrew his motion.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the staff recommendation contained in Item 817 (page 4, third addendum to the transmittal report), namely, that Section 4.7.2, Policy 1, be changed to remove the words "movie theatres", be approved.

WITHDRAWN

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 4.7.2, Table 8 be amended to add an asterisk to St. Laurent to indicate that the 77,000 GLA excludes movie theatres and recreational and entertainment type uses, existing or approved at the date of adoption of the new Official Plan.

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, B. Hill, P. Hume, J. Legendre and W. Stewart...6
NAYS: G. Hunter...1

The Committee approved pages 59 and 60 and page 61, as amended. In Section 5, the Committee approved pages 62, 63, 64 and 65. Councillor Legendre put forward the following four motions, amending various policies of Section 5, which the Committee considered and approved.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 5.2.2.5 be amended by replacing the word “policies” in the sixth sentence with the word “measures”, to read: “Exceptions to this setback will be considered if specific measures are provided ...”.

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 5.2.3.1 be amended by replacing the word “possible” with the word “appropriate” to read “When considering development proposals, require that, where appropriate, the development should....”.

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 5.2.3.2 be amended by adding the words “to serve as a model and” after the word “practices” to read “Review its own practices to serve as a model and to ensure that the development.....”.

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 5.3.1.1 be amended by adding the words “and have regard to the urgency and extent of proposed development in the area.” after the word “watersheds” to read “Priorities will identify the need for watershed plans for certain watersheds and have regard to the urgency and extent of proposed development in the area.”

CARRIED

The Committee then approved pages 66 (as amended), 67 (as amended), 68, 69, 70 (as amended), 71 and 72. On page 73, Councillor Cullen put forward a motion to amend Section 5.4.1.3 b) to add the words “wildlife habitat”.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 5.4.1.3 b) be amended by adding the words “wildlife habitat” after the word “wildlife” to read “...water supplies, wildlife, wildlife habitat or other natural features;”.

CARRIED

With respect to the same policy, subsection f), Councillor Legendre drew the Committee’s attention to the last sentence and proposed the following motion. David Miller, Environmental Planner, advised the policy would apply only to existing legal lots, that have not been built upon. He opined, should an entire property be part of the significant feature, Councillor Legendre’s amendment would have the effect of preventing a person from putting a house on a legally, existing vacant lot. Mr. Marc added the first sentence of subsection f), clearly sets out it deals only with lots of record, with the zoning (to build a house) already in place and he opined the Councillor’s motion would not be legally achievable. Councillor Legendre withdrew his motion. He also withdrew a similar motion, dealing with Section 5.4.2.3 g).

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 5.4.1.3 f) be amended by replacing the last sentence with the following: “Approval Authorities will ensure that new buildings are not constructed such as to adversely affect the natural characteristics of the environment or require or result in landform modifications.”

WITHDRAWN

The Committee approved page 73. Councillor Legendre moved the following two motions with respect to Section 5.4.1.6, on page 74.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 5.4.1.6 b) be amended by adding the words “and meets the requirements of Policy 3 above;” at the end of the sentence after the word “prepared”.

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 5.4.1.6 c) be amended by adding the words “and meets the requirements of Policy 3 above;” at the end of the sentence after the word “accessible”.

CARRIED

With respect to Policy 9 of Section 5.4.1, Councillor Cullen felt this did not belong in the Official Plan as it is not a land-use planning matter. At Councillor Stewart’s request, Mr.

Miller advised this policy was included to counteract the public's perception that land designated as an environmental area (particularly in rural areas) is automatically parkland and therefore accessible to the public. He noted many municipalities include this clause in their official plans to address this concern. Councillor Cullen withdrew this motion, as well as a similar motions to delete Sections 5.4.2.7 and 5.5.1.10.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 5.4.1.9, "9. Not allow public use and access to private lands for any purpose, without consent of the landowner" be deleted.

WITHDRAWN

Councillor Hill put forward a motion to delete Lot 19, Concession 4, Constance Bay from the ANSI designation. Mr. Miller referred to page 13 of the second addendum (Item 772) and noted the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) had indicated they would not support the removal of these lands from the ANSI designation. He pointed out the Policies of Environment B, do not preclude estate development. Councillor Hill withdrew her motion.

Moved by B. Hill

That Lot 19, Concession 5, Constance Bay (Peter Smith) be removed from the ANSI designation.

WITHDRAWN

The Committee then considered the following amendment from Councillor Cullen.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 5.4.2.2 be amended by deleting the words "to be refined" in the first line, and by adding the words "for minor revisions to" after the word "Allow" to read: "Allow for minor revisions to the boundaries of Natural Environment Areas (B) without amendment to this Plan,..."

LOST

NAYS: B. Hill, P. Hume, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham...4

YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, G. Hunter and J. Legendre...4

The Committee considered a motion from Councillor Legendre with respect to Section 5.4.3., page 76.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 5.4.3.1 be amended by adding the words “found within natural complexes” after the word “functions” in the first line.

CARRIED

Referring to page 78, Section 5.4.5, Councillor Legendre put forward a motion to amend Policy 2 by adding the words “and Regionally” and that a new Policy 3 be added to establish criteria for regional significance. He spoke of the importance of recognizing regionally significant natural features (in addition to locally and provincially significant features) and of establishing criteria appropriate to both the rural and the urban areas. Councillor van den Ham stated he could not support this motion and indicated he would be moving a motion to delete this section.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 5.4.5.2 be amended by adding the words “and Regionally” after the word “locally”; and that a new Policy 3 be added to read: “In this regard, Council shall undertake to establish criteria for regional significance, including criteria appropriate to both rural and urban areas.”

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume and R. van den Ham...4
YEAS: A. Cullen, G. Hunter, J. Legendre and W. Stewart...4

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Section 5.4.5.2 be deleted.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, P. Hume, G. Hunter, J. Legendre and W. Stewart...6
YEAS: P. Clark, B. Hill and R. van den Ham...3

The Committee approved pages 74 (as amended), 75, 76 (as amended), 77, 78 (as amended), 79, 80 and 81.

The Committee adjourned for the day at 4:10 p.m.

Friday, 13 June 1997, 9:00 a.m.

The Committee first considered an item held over from 12 June 1997. Councillor Beamish put forward a motion dealing with the westerly portion of Lots 16 and 17, Concession 1, Kanata. He noted the subject parcel of land is currently designated as Environmental B; his motion

requests a change in designation to General Rural (on Schedule A) and Environmental Features (on Schedule K) which will allow the property owner a bit of flexibility, while still maintaining the environmental character of the land.

Councillor Munter added the property owner, Mr. Charlebois, had requested this piece of land be designated General Rural; he urged the Committee to support this compromise.

Mr. Miller noted the subject land is on the very edge of the Carp Wetland and for this reason is designated "Environmental B". He confirmed that a General Rural designation on Schedule A, with an overlay of Environmental Features on Schedule K, on this piece of property, would accomplish the same things as the Environmental B designation.

Moved by D. Beamish

That the westerly portion of Lots 16 and 17, Concession 1, in the City of Kanata be shown on Schedule A as General Rural and further identified on Schedule K as Environmental Features.

CARRIED

The Committee then moved on to Section 6 of the Draft Regional Official Plan and considered the following motion from Councillor Cullen.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 6.1.2 be amended by adding the words "and to protect it from urban development" at the end of the sentence.

CARRIED

Referring to the fourth sentence of the third paragraph of Section 6.2 (page 84), Councillor Cullen advised of his motion to delete this sentence, noting that research parks do not have to be located in the Greenbelt and do not require isolation. He felt this to be an unnecessary, provocative statement.

Ms. Sweet advised that the point of this statement was not necessarily to look at a research park but to recognize there are federal institutional uses within the Greenbelt today that have research purposes. She noted the statement reflects the wording contained in the Greenbelt Master Plan. Carol Christensen, Senior Project Manager, Land Use, Policy Planning Branch, added this statement "does not open the doors" for a research park but rather, has the effect of closing the door for a research park in that it speaks to uses requiring isolation.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 6.2 be amended by deleting the fourth sentence in the third paragraph, namely, “Because of the nature of their research, most of these facilities require the isolation a site in the Greenbelt provides.”

CARRIED
(G. Hunter dissented)

The Committee approved pages 82, 83 (as amended) and 84 (as amended). On page 85, Councillor Cullen drew the Committee’s attention to the last sentence in Policy 4, which read “Council may allocate central water and wastewater services required to support these facilities.” He asked staff why this statement was included. Ms. Sweet advised this statement recognizes there are existing uses in the Greenbelt that may now or in the future have water and sewer; it is not saying the Region will provide opportunity through servicing, for development in the Greenbelt.

Councillor Cullen referred to a motion approved by Planning and Environment Committee and Council, that opposed any development application that would require the allocation of servicing capacity to Greenbelt and interior Greenbelt lands that were not, as of 9 May 95, zoned for residential/commercial development. He felt that proponents of development on Greenbelt Employment lands should have to go through the regular process to obtain access to water and sewer (i.e. Official Plan Amendment) and he put forward a motion to delete this statement from the Plan.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter, Ms. Sweet referred the Committee to Policy 2 of Section 10.3.3 (p. 138) which states, in part “Designate regional water and wastewater services to the rural area on Schedule H excluding those described in Section 10.3.6...”. She interpreted this to mean that because these lands in the Greenbelt are not part of the rural area, services could be extended to these areas without amendment to the Plan (even if the subject statement were deleted). Ms. Christensen added the statement was included because staff felt in the past extension of urban services to the Greenbelt has been an area that was unclear; inclusion of this statement makes it clearer.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 6.2.4 be amended by deleting the last sentence, namely, “Council may allocate central water and wastewater services required to support these facilities.”

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....4
YEAS: A. Cullen, P. Hume, J. Legendre and A. Munter....4

The Committee approved pages 85, 86 and 87. Ms. Sweet referred to page 19 of the second addendum report, Item 789 and noted Policy 3 f) scenic routes was inadvertently omitted from Section 6.5 (page 88) of the Second Draft of the ROP. Councillor Stewart agreed to move inclusion of this subsection.

Moved by W. Stewart

That the staff recommendation contained in the Second Addendum, Item 789, namely, that a new subsection f) scenic routes, be added to Section 6.5.3, be approved.

CARRIED

Councillor Cullen put forward a motion to amend Policy 4 of Section 6.5 by replacing the word “Encourage”, with the word “Require”, as he felt local municipalities should be required to review their open space needs. Ms. Sweet advised in the first draft of the ROP, staff used the word require and three municipalities (Kanata, Goulbourn and Gloucester) requested that it be changed to encourage. They pointed out local municipalities are not the only ones that provide these types of uses (e.g. Parks Canada, National Capital Commission) and should therefore not be required to do this.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 6.5.4 be amended by replacing the word “Encourage” in the first line, with the word “Require”.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham...6
YEAS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter....3

Councillor Munter relayed the City of Kanata’s concern with regard to the publicly owned Pinney property located on the Ottawa River and designated Waterfront Open Space. Kanata is concerned because access to the water is unsafe and they are of the opinion they must provide public access to the water. Ms. Christensen advised Policy 6 of Section 6.5 (“Allow limits to public access for safety, security and environmental protection reasons”) was added to address Kanata’s concerns. Subsequently, Councillor Cullen withdrew a motion he was proposing, to delete Section 6.5.6.

Councillor Cullen put forward a motion to add the words “and River” after the words “Rideau Canal” in the fifth sentence of Section 6.7 (p. 89). At Chair Hunter’s request, Nelson Edwards, Planner, advised that Parks Canada feels that only the Canal from Hogs Back north is part of the historical and navigable waterway system, however, he did not feel they would object to the inclusion of the River in the ROP.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 6.7, the fifth sentence of the first paragraph be amended to read “The Rideau Canal and River is a national historic site and navigable historic waterway.”

CARRIED

The Committee approved pages 88 and 89, as amended. Councillor Cullen moved a motion to amend Policy 3 b) of Section 6.7 (p. 90), which speaks to retaining opened and unopened road allowances to maintain the potential for public access to the shoreline. The Councillor felt municipalities should be required, rather than encouraged to do this. Ms. Sweet noted in the first draft of the ROP, staff used the word “require” and, as a result of input from local municipalities, it was changed to “encourage” in the second draft. It was pointed out by the Township of Osgoode the ROP did not recognize they have many unopened road allowances along the Rideau River and they felt it was inappropriate to open all of them to the public. Osgoode agrees with the principle of this Policy and plans to allow this in certain locations but they want to be able to choose which ones will be open to the public.

Councillor Cullen pointed out this Policy merely ensures municipalities do not dispose of their opened and unopened road allowances. At Committee’s request, Mr. Marc advised, in order to close a road a by-law is required and it could conceivably be the case that if the word “require” was to be used, that by-law closing the road would not conform to the ROP and therefore such a by-law could not be passed. He opined this is a “gray area”; on balance he felt the Region could use the word require but he could not say for certain.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 6.7.3 b) be amended by replacing the word “encourage” with the word “require”.

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, P. Hume, J. Legendre and A. Munter....5

NAYS: B. Hill, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....3

Councillor Cullen moved that the word “encourage” in Policy 4 of Section 6.7 be replaced with the word “require”. He noted the Region currently requires 5% parkland dedication and although, the Region cannot require more land than it has a right to, he felt the 5% should be required along the watercourses mentioned in Policy 3 (e.g. the Jock, Carp River, etc.). Ms. Sweet clarified this policy applies only to other watercourses in the urban area. Consequently, Councillor Cullen withdrew this motion, as well as a similar motion to replace the word “encourage” with the word “require” in Section 6.7.6.

Councillor Munter, referring to Policy 5 of Section 6.7 (page 90) commented that, other than the Ottawa River, Rideau River and Rideau Canal, it would be impossible, at some points, to

have a pathway running alongside the rivers and creeks listed. He noted in Policies 6 and 7, this fact is acknowledged and, in this regard, he put forward a motion to amend Policy 5 by adding the words “to the fullest extent possible” after the words “..and Canal, and...”.

Moved by A. Munter

That Section 6.7.5 be amended by adding the words “to the fullest extent possible”, to read “When reviewing development proposals in the urban area and Villages, along the length of the Ottawa River, Rideau River and Canal, and to the fullest extent possible along the Jock, Carp,.....”

CARRIED
(A. Cullen dissented)

The Committee approved pages 90 (as amended), 91 and 92. On page 93, Councillor Cullen moved that Section 6.8 (Recreational Pathways), Policy 2 be amended to read in part, “Not require an amendment to this Plan for “extensions or minor” revisions to the system. Ms. Sweet noted staff added a qualifier to this policy, namely, “and accessing the same destinations”, which was recommended by the cycling committee. Staff are of the opinion this wording allows the Region flexibility to react quickly to the needs of the cycling community.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 6.8.2 be amended by inserting the words “extensions or minor” before the word “revisions”.

LOST

NAYS: B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter and W. Stewart...4
YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter...4

Pages 93 to 95 were approved. On page 96, Chair Hunter stated he would like to see all of Section 6.11 deleted, as he felt these policies had nothing to do with regional-level land use planning and did not belong in the ROP. Mr. Tunnacliffe clarified this Section was intended to provide direction to the RMOC when it undertakes to create or rehabilitate public works. Ms. Sweet suggested adding wording such as “when proposing to erect Regional buildings” to address the Chair’s concerns. Chair Hunter felt the Section should be deleted and Councillor Cullen agreed to move a motion on his behalf.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 6.11 be deleted.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, P. Hume, J. Legendre, A. Munter and W. Stewart...6
YEAS: B. Hill, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham...3

The Committee approved pages 96, 97 (D. Beamish and B. Hill dissented on all of Section 6.12, Cultural Heritage Resources), 98, 99 and 100.

Proceeding to Section 7, Councillor Munter referred to Policy 2 of Section 7.2 and asked for staff comment on this policy, which refers to a study required for consideration of official plan amendments to permit commercial and industrial uses in the vicinity of the interchange of Highways 416 and 417. Ms. Sweet advised staff originally proposed a Regional Official Plan Amendment be required for development in this area, however, as a result of consultation with the local municipalities and the public, staff are suggesting this compromise (i.e. a local official plan amendment). She noted the development in question would be small scale, occurring where there has been fragmentation as a result of the interchange.

Councillor Munter expressed concern about the occurrence of highway strip development and he felt this Policy surrenders control to the local municipalities. The Councillor called for Yeas and Nays on Policy 2 of Section 7.2.

That Section 7.2.2 be approved.

LOST

NAYS: A. Cullen, P. Hume, J. Legendre and A. Munter....4
YEAS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....4

Councillor Munter felt the Policy (7.2.2) contained in the first draft of the Regional Official Plan should be inserted as substitution and moved a motion to this effect.

Moved by A. Munter

That Section 7.2.2 of the Second Draft of the Official Plan (June 1997), be deleted and substituted with Section 7.2.2 of the First Draft of the Official Plan (January 1997).

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....4
YEAS: A. Cullen, P. Hume, J. Legendre and A. Munter....4

This motion having lost, Committee Chair Hunter deemed that Section 7.2.2 of the Second Draft of the ROP would be properly back before the Committee. Councillor van den Ham agreed to move that this section be approved.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Section 7.2.2 (Second Draft of the Official Plan) be approved.

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....5
NAYS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter....3

The Committee approved pages 100 and 102. On page 103, Councillor van den Ham drew the Committee's attention to Section 7.3.1a) which sets out the definition of a "farmer", which includes being "a Registered Ontario Farmer". He indicated he would be moving a motion to delete this portion of the definition and explained he was doing so because a bona fide farmer need not be a Registered Ontario Farmer.

Ms. Sweet referred the Committee to page 3 of the third addendum, Item 818 wherein staff recommends that "Registered Ontario Farmer" be replaced with "farmers registered under the Ontario Farm Business Registration Program". She noted this suggestion came from the Agricultural Advisory Committee. Councillor van den Ham stated he would not be supporting this as there are bona fide farmers who do not register. Councillor Legendre indicated he would be moving the staff recommendation.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 7.3.1a) be amended by replacing the words "Registered Ontario Farmers" with the words "farmers registered under the Ontario Farm Business Registration Program" pursuant to the staff recommendation contained in the third transmittal report, Item 818.

CARRIED

Councillor van den Ham then put forward his motion to delete any reference to registered farmers. Myles Mahon, Planner, Planning and Development Approvals Department, advised deletion of this phrase would not create a problem.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Section 7.3.1 a) be amended by deleting "farmers registered under the Ontario Farm Business Registration Program", to read: "A 'farmer' is defined as someone who is at retirement age, was farming on January 1, 1994 and whose primary occupation consists of working on a farm...."

CARRIED

Moved by B. Hill

That Section 7.4.1 be amended by adding the words "in local Official Plans" after the word "designate" in the second line.

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 7.4.1a) and b) be amended by deleting reference to “Ontario Institute of Pedology Report 58 and Soils Survey Report 47” and replacing with “The Soils of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa Carleton Excluding the Ottawa Urban Fringe - Report 58 and the Soils, Capability and Land Use in the Ottawa Urban Fringe - Report 47”, pursuant to staff recommendation 819, contained in the third addendum.

CARRIED

Referring to Section 7.4.3, Councillor van den Ham felt this Policy should be amended to reflect a more positive aspect and in this regard moved that “nuisances” be replaced with “activities”.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Section 7.4.3 be amended by replacing the words “other nuisances” with the word “activities”, to read “...subjected to noise, dust, odours and activities associated with an agricultural area.”

CARRIED

The Committee approved pages 103 (as amended), 104 (as amended) and 105. The Committee then turned their attention to Section 8, Mineral Aggregate Resources.

Moved by A. Munter

That Section 8.1 be amended by adding: “5. To protect ground and surface water from negative impacts from aggregate extraction activities.”, pursuant to the staff recommendation contained in the Second Addendum, Item 800.

CARRIED

Speaking to Section 8.2.10 d), Councillor Cullen reminded Committee of a presentation made by Susan Springthorpe (public meetings 20 May 97), a microbiologist, who advised that aggregate extraction can affect the drainage pattern, without going below the groundwater table. In this regard, the Councillor moved that the words “below the groundwater table” be removed from this subsection.

Ms. Christensen noted the policies in this section are consistent with the draft regulations set out in Bill 52, which made a clear distinction between the types of studies that would be required if extraction was done above or below the groundwater table. She advised, if the words “below the groundwater table” are removed, it would have the effect of requiring proponents to undertake studies not required under the Aggregate Resources Act and she could not say whether the Region would be successful in this endeavour. The MNR has

advised that the MOEE are satisfied with the draft regulations contained in Bill 52 and feel they will protect the environment.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 8.2.10 d) be amended by deleting in the second sentence, the words “below the groundwater table”.

CARRIED
(G. Hunter dissented)

Referring to page 109, Section 8.2.10 c), Councillor Munter spoke of a quarry that is being proposed in rural Kanata that is of concern to the residents. The MNR a few years ago designated a fair bit of land in the area as Provincially Significant Wetlands; now the MNR is saying the property across the road from the wetland should be designated a quarry. In this regard, he expressed his wish to strengthen the environmental impact aspect and put forward the following motion.

“That 8.2.10 c) be deleted and replaced with a new Policy 11. “Require an Environmental Impact Study as a condition of any rezoning and that such rezoning cannot proceed in the event of adverse environmental impacts.”; and that the Section be renumbered accordingly.”

At Committee Chair Hunter’s request, Mr. Marc explained he would interpret this motion to mean that if there are any adverse impacts at all, the rezoning would not be allowed to proceed. He advised a proponent would always be able to challenge the Region in such an instance and would argue that although there are adverse impacts, they could be mitigated. Councillor Munter proposed that the word “adverse” in his motion be replaced with the word “unmitigatable”. Mr. Marc agreed this would strengthen the Policy.

Moved by A. Munter

That 8.2.10 c) be deleted and replaced with a new Policy 11. “Require an Environmental Impact Study as a condition of any rezoning and that such rezoning cannot proceed in the event of unmitigatable environmental impacts.”; and that the Section be renumbered accordingly.

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, B. Hill, J. Legendre, A. Munter and W. Stewart....6
NAYS: G. Hunter....1

The Committee then approved Section 8, pages 106 (as amended), 107, 108, 109 (as amended) and 110. Moving on to Section 9, the Committee approved pages 111 and 112. On page 113, Councillor Cullen drew the Committee’s attention to Section 9.1.4, noting it deals with the increases of modal share. He advised the Transportation Committee adopted targets for walking to move from 9.7% to at least 12%, instead of 10%; for cycling to move from

1.7% to at least 8% instead of 3% and transit would remain the same. He put forward a motion to this effect.

Committee Chair Hunter asked staff to comment on the effect of this motion. Mr. Reid stated he considers these targets to be very high and he felt they would be unattainable. He advised if staff were directed to apply these new figures in the sizing of the network, the resulting networks would be less than what staff are now recommending based on the assumption that a considerably greater proportion of the peak hour trips would be by walking and cycling and consequently less by car. If the desired results did not manifest themselves, the Region could be exposing itself to great difficulties in the future.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.1 be amended by replacing Objective 4 with the following:

“4. To achieve at least the following increases in pedestrian, cycling and public transit peak hour region-wide modal share by 2021:

- a) walking from 9.7% in 1995 to at least 12%;**
- b) cycling from 1.7% in 1995 to at least 8% (fall conditions);**
- c) transit - from 15.2% in 1995 to at least 20%.”**

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, G. Hunter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham....4

YEAS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter....3

This motion having lost, Councillor Cullen withdrew the following motions relative to this issue.

That Section 9.2 be amended by replacing the first paragraph with the following: “The pedestrian modal share objective is that walking trips comprise at least 12% of peak hour person trips by 2021, region wide.”

That Section 9.3 be amended by replacing the first paragraph with the following: “The cycling modal share objective is that cycling trips increase to at least 8% of peak hour person trips by 2021, region-wide.”

That Section 9.5 be amended by replacing the first paragraph with the following: “The automobile modal share objective is for automobile trips to comprise no more than 60% of peak hour person trips by 2021 region-wide, a decrease from 73.5% in 1995.”

WITHDRAWN

Referring to Section 9.2.1 a) which speaks to the provision of sidewalks on at least one side of all new roads in Business Parks, Councillor Cullen proposed that the words “ or rebuilt” after

roads. Mr. Reid advised that the roads referred to in subsection a) are generally local roads. Councillor Cullen agreed to withdraw his motion.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.2.1 a) be amended by inserting the words “or rebuilt” after the word “new”.

WITHDRAWN

Councillor Cullen, moved that Policy 3 of Section 9.2 be modified by deleting the words “where necessary”, noting this amendment was approved by the Transportation Committee. Commissioner Tunnacliffe pointed out the comma was merely in the wrong place and the sentence should read “Review, and modify where necessary,” Councillor Cullen withdrew his original motion and moved the location of the comma be changed.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.2.3 be amended by deleting the words “where necessary”.

WITHDRAWN

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.2.3 be amended by adding a comma after the word “Review” and deleting the comma after the word “modify”.

CARRIED

Referring to Policy 6 of Section 9.2, Councillor Cullen moved that the wording be amended to reflect the recommendation Transportation Committee had approved with respect to pathways in or adjacent to Transitway corridors.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.2.6 be amended by replacing the words “Consider opportunities for and collaborate with others in providing” with the words: “Ensure, where feasible, the provision of”.

CARRIED

Councillor Cullen proposed the following amendment to Section 9.3.2

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.3.2 be amended by inserting the words “extensions or minor” after the word “for” in the first line.

LOST

NAYS: P. Hume, G. Hunter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham....4
YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter....4

Councillor Cullen, referring to his motion on Section 9.2.6 (“Ensure, where feasible”) which Carried, noted he had a number of motions adding similar wording to policies dealing with pathways, bicycle facilities and the transitway. The Committee agreed to approve these motions (as follows) as well.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.3.5 be amended by replacing the words “Ensure that cycling requirements are fully considered in:”, with the words, “Implement, where feasible, cycling requirements in:”

CARRIED

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.3.6 be amended by replacing the words “Consider opportunities for and collaborate with others in providing”, with the words “Ensure, where feasible, the provision of”.

CARRIED

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.4 be amended by adding a new Policy “27. Ensure, where feasible, the provision of separate cycling facilities or multi-use pathways in or adjacent to Transitway corridors.”

CARRIED

Councillor Cullen proposed additional wording be added to Policy 8 of Section 9.3 in keeping with a motion approved by Transportation Committee.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.3.8 be amended by adding: “Council, in consultation with bicycle groups and area municipalities, shall develop standards in this regard.”

CARRIED

(D. Beamish, G. Hunter and
R. van den Ham dissented)

The Committee then approved pages 111, 112, 113 (as amended), 114, 115 (as amended), 116 and 117. Councillor Cullen proposed the following motion (as approved by Transportation

Committee), however, when it was pointed out the Policy as set out in the Second Draft of the ROP was saying the same thing, the Councillor withdrew his motion.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.4.15 be replaced with the following: “15. Require area municipalities to review and amend parking requirements in zoning by-laws to a level which supports transit through reduced parking requirements and maximum parking space provisions for developments in the vicinity of rapid transit service.”

WITHDRAWN

Yeas and Nays were called on Section 9.4.15.

Moved by A. Munter

That Section 9.4.15 as proposed in the Second Draft of the Official Plan, be approved.

CARRIED

YEAS: A. Cullen, P. Hume, J. Legendre, A. Munter and W. Stewart....5

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....3

Councillor Cullen pointed out that Transportation Committee had approved new wording for Policy 16 of Section 9.4 and put forward a motion in this regard.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.4.16 be replaced with the following: “16. Require area municipalities to review and amend parking requirements in zoning by-laws to a level which supports transit through reduced parking requirements and maximum parking space provisions for developments in areas that are served by transit and have a mix of community services conducive to pedestrian travel.”

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham....6

YEAS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter....3

Councillor Cullen advised that Transportation Committee approved a motion to move the pilot project rapid transit service from Priority Two to Priority One and he asked that the Committee consider the following motion in this regard.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.4.24 be amended to add the words “at minimum cost,” after the word “Introduce” and the words “by the turn of this century (i.e. by the year 2000)” at the end of the first sentence.

CARRIED

(B. Hill, G. Hunter dissented)

Councillor Legendre put forward a motion to delete the words “and Kettle Island Crossings” from Policy 9 of Section 9.5. He reminded members of the support for this motion (the communities, the local MP, the local MPP and the Ontario Government) and he urged the Committee to support this motion.

The Councillor advised he had a further amendment to this Policy, namely to add the wording, “Council reaffirms its opposition to new interprovincial bridge corridors within the urban area.” Ms. Sweet suggested, in the alternative, inserting the words “outside the Greenbelt” in the first sentence, after the words “Ottawa River” as she felt this relayed the same meaning, in a more positive way; Councillor Legendre agreed.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 9.5.9 be amended by removing the words “and Kettle Island crossings”, to read: “Pending an agreement on the location, Council shall protect the approaches to the Cumberland-Angers crossing and request the federal government and affected agencies to do the same.”

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 9.5.9 be amended by adding the words “outside the Greenbelt”, after the words “Actively participate with other levels of government to finalise the location of the next crossing of the Ottawa River

CARRIED

(G. Hunter dissented)

Councillor Legendre proposed the following amendment to Policy 10 of Section 9.5. He felt his motion strengthened the wording of the policy.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 9.5.10 be amended to read: “Traffic calming measures will be examined as possible solutions to operational or safety problems....”.

CARRIED

Referring to his next motion to delete subsections a), b) and e) of Section 9.5.10, Councillor Legendre felt that a) and b), were unnecessary because the only reasons for considering traffic calming measures are public safety and operational problems and e) is unnecessary because it is unlikely that staff would be bringing to Council traffic calming measures that did not meet accepted design standards..

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 9.5.10 be amended by deleting a), b) and e) entirely and re-labeling the remaining factors listed as examples.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, P. Hume, G. Hunter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham....5
YEAS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter....3

Councillor Cullen proposed the following two motions relative to a motion approved by Transportation Committee.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.5 be amending by adding a new Policy 11: “11. Encourage the development of provincial and national design standards which recognize the hierarchy of walking, cycling, transit and automobile use, and concepts such as traffic calming.”; and that the current Policy 11 be renumbered as Policy 12.

LOST

NAYS: P. Hume, G. Hunter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham....4
YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, J. Legendre and A. Munter....4

Moved by A. Cullen

That Section 9.6.5 be replaced with the following: “5. Encourage industry to explore new technologies and practices that can reduce community impacts, improve goods movement efficiency and enhance regional competitiveness, such as the use of warehousing in outlying municipalities to reduce the volume of large trucks within Ottawa-Carleton.

CARRIED

Responding to questions from Councillor Legendre, Mr. Reid confirmed that Table 10 on page 125 had been amended from the first draft of the ROP to delete the widening of Montreal Road between Church and St. Laurent. He referred the Committee to the staff recommendation contained in the second addendum at Item 806.

The Committee approved pages 118, 119 (as amended), 120, 121 (as amended), 122 (as amended), 123, 124, 125, 126, 127 and 128.

The Committee broke for lunch at 12:15 and reconvened at 1:15. On their return, the Committee turned their attention to Section 10, Environmental Services. Ms. Sweet pointed out, as a result of Councillor Legendre's amendment to the Wastewater Master Plan, concerning the target for wastewater flow, a similar amendment was required to Section 10.1.4.3. Councillor Legendre moved a motion to this effect.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 10.1.4.3 be amended by adding the words "at a target of 1.25 times the difference in peak wastewater flow projected to be generated after completion of development when compared to existing flow" after the word "flows" in the first sentence.

CARRIED

The Committee then approved all of Section 10 (pages 129 to 145), as amended. Turning their attention to Section 11, the Committee approved pages 146, 147 and page 148. On page 149, Chair Hunter drew the Committee's attention to Section 11.4.2 and noted staff are recommending an amendment as set out in the second addendum, Item 813 (page 27 of the Agenda). Councillor Munter agreed to moved inclusion of this amendment.

Moved by A. Munter

That Section 11.4.2 be amended by deleting the words "established principles and procedures" and adding the words "the requirements, methodology and practices described in the CSA document Z768-94."; pursuant to the staff recommendation contained in the Second Addendum, Item 813.

CARRIED

Continuing on, the Committee approved pages 149 (as amended), 150 and 151. On page 152, Councillor Legendre proposed the following amendments to Section 11.6.2:

"That the first bullet of paragraph one of Section 11.6.2 be amended to read "55 dBA (decibels on a weighted scale averaged over 30 minutes i.e. Leq (30 min) or less (equivalent to approximately 55 dBA - i.e. Leq (16 hours) averaged between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m.)"

"That the first sentence of Policy 1, Section 11.6.2 be amended to read "Establish Leq 58 dBA averaged over 30 minutes (approximately equivalent to Leq 55 dBA averaged over the 16 hours from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.) or less and Leq 53 dBA or less averaged over 30 minutes in the period 11:00 p.m to 7:00 a.m. as acceptable noise levels...."

The Councillor explained he felt these amendments made it clearer for the average person to understand. He noted that by translating the standard used by staff (i.e. 55 dBA over 16 hours) into a measure that people can experience (i.e. 58 dBA over 30 minutes) this would make it easier to understand. His reasoning being that a person could stand on a busy street corner for 30 minutes and understand what 58 dBA means.

With respect to the first motion, Commissioner Tunnacliffe expressed concern because the lead in to Section 11.6.2 states that "The Ministry of the Environment and Energy recommends...". Councillor Legendre agreed to amend his motion to "Council recommends" and to add "(These levels being approximately the same as the Ministry of Environment and Energy Standards.)". The Committee then considered the motions.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 11.6.2, paragraph 1 be amended to read: "Council recommends the following maximum average noise level (Leq) for noise from roads, railways or Transitways:

- **58dBA (decibels on a weighted scale averaged over 30 minutes i.e. Leq (30 min) or less (equivalent to approximately 55 dBA - i.e. Leq (16 hours) averaged between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m.)**

(These levels being approximately the same as the Ministry of Environment and Energy Standards.)

- **50 dBA or less between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.**

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, B. Hill, J. Legendre, A. Munter and W. Stewart....6
NAYS: P. Hume, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....3

Moved by J. Legendre

That Section 11.6.2.1 be amended to read: "Establish Leq 58 dBA averaged over 30 minutes (approximately equivalent to Leq 55 dBA averaged over the 16 hours from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m) or less and Leq 53 dBA or less averaged over 30 minutes in the period 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. as acceptable noise levels.....".

CARRIED

(P. Hume, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham dissented)

The Committee approved pages 152 (as amended), 153 (as amended) and 154. Chair Hunter voiced his dissent on Policy 4 of Section 11.6.1. The Committee approved the Glossary, noting staff were to add a definition of open space.

Ms. Sweet drew Committee's attention to Item 12, on page 12 of the original transmittal report (06 May 97) which recommends approval of the monitoring mechanisms in the Official Plan as described in Annex C (pages 267 to 268). She explained it is critical that certain elements of the Plan be monitored to be able to examine whether or not the goals established by Council are being met; reports to Council would be yearly at budget time and at the time of the five year review of the ROP. Commissioner Tunnacliffe noted much of the data referred to in Annex C, is currently collected and made available to Council. Ms. Sweet advised many groups, including the Federation of Citizens' Association, urged that a monitoring report be included in the ROP. Councillor Legendre agreed to move the staff recommendation.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the staff recommendation contained in the original Transmittal Report at page 12, Item 12, namely, "Include monitoring mechanisms in the Official Plan as described in Annex C", be approved.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume and G. Hunter....4

YEAS: A. Cullen, J. Legendre, A. Munter and R. van den Ham....4

The Committee then proceeded through the Schedules of the ROP, referring as well to the document provided entitled "Summary of Additional Changes to Schedules".

Councillor van den Ham put forward the following motion. He noted the subject property consists of many small parcels made up of non-agricultural and long standing commercial uses. The Township of Cumberland is requesting that this property be redesignated from Agricultural Resource to General Rural.

Ms. Sweet noted the subject area has a long history of market gardening (Notre Dame de Champs Market Garden Area) and, although the LEAR scores do not show this as prime agricultural land, there still are the market gardens. She added this request only came from Cumberland very recently and therefore there has been no time to do a study to show why the land should be redesignated. She expressed concern if the designation is changed to General Rural, the market gardens in this area would convert to more commercial, industrial and urban uses.

Councillor van den Ham explained it is not Cumberland's intent to cause the market gardens to disappear; rather, it has to do with the land around the market gardens that is not of high agricultural capability and also the redesignation would provide the necessary flexibility for the existing commercial/industrial uses in the area. He stated he could understand staff's concerns, directed them to enter into discussions with the Township of Cumberland to resolve this matter and withdrew his motion.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Parts of Lots 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, Concessions 9 and 10, Township of Cumberland, pursuant to a request from the Township of Cumberland, be redesignated from Agricultural Resource to General Rural on Schedule A.

WITHDRAWN

Councillor Beamish put forward the following motion:

“That the lands within the City of Gloucester bounded by River Road, Spratt Road and Rideau Road and Regional Road 8 be shown on Schedule ‘A’ as General Rural.”

Chair Hunter pointed out staff are recommending there be no change to the designation of this land, pending a response from OMAFRA. Mr. Mahon stated an initial response from OMAFRA indicated they were not satisfied the study undertaken by Dillon Consultants, evaluated the soils using the appropriate soil classification systems and also the study did not supply sufficient soil information to justify the change. Subsequent to a response from Dillon Consultants, staff have forwarded a request to OMAFRA, indicating a site review is in order. Speaking to the lands that are the subject of the motion, Mr. Mahon noted the LEAR scores (132 points) for the Mowat property (Lot 26) indicated it has good potential for agriculture; the Fines Flower property (Lot 27) application has gone to the OMB and was not part of the Dillon Consultants report; and, although the Keenan and Booth properties (Lots 28 and 29) received a lower LEAR score (122 points) in the Dillon report, the determination of the proper soil samples is critical to determine what the potential is for the designation of this land as Agricultural Resource.

Councillor Hume felt the Dillon report included a great deal of information (e.g. soil sample results, etc.), whereas OMAFRA’s details were very sketchy and were not sufficient to convince him that the land should not be redesignated. He noted the study undertaken on the Fines Flower property did not support its request for redesignation and he felt the redesignation of the Mowat property could not be justified; in this regard, he moved that Councillor Beamish’s motion be amended to apply only to the Keenan and Booth properties (Lots 28 and 29).

Moved by P. Hume

That Councillor Beamish’s motion be amended to apply only to the Booth and Keenan properties.

CARRIED

Moved by D. Beamish

That Lots 28 and 29, Concession B.F., City of Gloucester be shown on Schedule A as General Rural.

CARRIED

(A. Cullen, A. Munter
dissented)

Councillor Hill put forward a motion to redesignate Lot 13 to 15, Concession 9, Goulbourn from Limestone Resource to General Rural Area. Ms. Christensen advised the subject land has mineral resources that are of moderate significance; as well, part of the land has natural features that are ranked as moderately significant. She suggested if the Limestone Resource is to be deleted, the Candidate Natural Area should be added to Schedule K. Councillor Hill agreed and the committee considered the following motion.

Moved by B. Hill

That the Limestone Resource designation be deleted in Goulbourn, Concession 9, Lots 13 to 15 and replaced with a General Rural Area designation on Schedule A and the natural area be shown on Schedule K.

CARRIED

Councillor Hill asked that the Committee consider a motion to add Part of Lot 22, Concession 9 and Part of Lot 23, Concession 9, Goulbourn to the Stittsville urban area. Ms. Sweet advised staff are not in favour of this amendment to extend the urban boundary, as this land is not needed at this point in time. She noted 500 units were added to Stittsville to ensure there are sufficient units for those areas already designated within the urban boundaries of Stittsville (i.e. Phase II). If more land is added to the urban boundary, technically there will be more land than there are units allocated.

Moved by B. Hill

That Part of Lot 22, Concession 9 (5.47 ha) and Part of Lot 23, Concession 9 (13.795 ha), Township of Goulbourn be redesignated from General Rural to Urban Area on Schedule A; and accordingly, designated as General Urban Area on Schedule B to form part of the urban area of Stittsville.

LOST

NAYS: A. Cullen, P. Hume, G. Hunter, J. Legendre, A. Munter, W. Stewart and
R. van den Ham...7

YEAS: D. Beamish and B. Hill...2

Committee Chair Hunter inquired about the status of Lot 13, Concession 4, Goulbourn. Ms. Christensen advised that staff are proposing this property be designated Sand and Gravel

Resource, as there is a license for a pit on the property (it may not be in operation). She noted the Committee might want to adjust the northern boundary slightly to ensure that the designation does not apply to any of the lots fronting on Franktown Road. Chair Hunter felt that more information should be obtained from the owner of the property.

Councillor Munter, referring to his earlier comments on a proposed quarry in Kanata, moved the following motion. He noted although the residents do not want this quarry in the community, they would settle for a series of protections in the ROP. He added the proponent and the community are in agreement with his proposal, however, the MNR is not in total agreement. Ms. Sweet stated this motion could be put in the ROP (in Section 8.2) as a notwithstanding clause.

Moved by A. Munter

That the Limestone Resource Area designation, Kanata, Concession 3, Lots 22 and 23, be amended to provide for a minimum 150 metre buffer between Regional Road 9 and any extraction activity; and that staff draft the necessary wording and incorporate into the Regional Official Plan.

CARRIED

Councillor van den Ham put forward the following motion, noting that 85% of the subject property is Class 4 or worse and that Provincial policies state that Classes 1, 2 and 3 are considered prime agricultural land. Ms. Sweet provided a bit of history for the property, noting Council originally considered and refused the redesignation of this land from Agricultural Resource to General Rural, as ROPA 42. In the first draft of the ROP, staff recommended this land be General Rural (as a result of the LEAR scores indicating poor agricultural capability), however, many of the surrounding landowners expressed objection to this land being redesignated as General Rural and for this reason, staff are recommending it be put back into Agricultural Resource. Mr. Mahon advised the Committee that the eastern half of Lot 33 is Class 3 and is being actively farmed.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Parts of Lots 31, 32 and 33, Concession B.F., Township of Osgoode be redesignated from Agricultural Resource to General Rural on Schedule A.

CARRIED

(D. Beamish dissented)

Mr. Mahon commented on the following motion put forward by Councillor Hill, that ideally this land would fit better in a Poor Pockets designation, however, because of the small lot size, the General Rural designation is more appropriate.

Moved by B. Hill

That the lands located in the East 1/2 of Lots 16 and 17, Concession 3, North Gower, Rideau Township, with soil capability for agriculture of Class 5, be designated as General Rural on Schedule A. .

CARRIED

Councillor Hume put forward the following motion, noting that because the rezoning of this land will require an Environmental Impact Study (pursuant to Councillor Munter's motion to add a new Policy 11 to Section 8.2, as approved by the Committee) the Environmental Features overlay on Schedule K is unnecessary. Ms. Christensen referred the Committee to staff's recommendation contained in Item 821, on page 5 of the third addendum. She noted the difference between staff's recommendation and Councillor Hume's, is that staff is recommending that a portion of the property still be shown as Environmental Feature on Schedule K whereas Councillor Hume is asking that it be deleted from all of the property. She added the same studies would be required in either case (i.e. whether an Environmental Impact Study as a result of rezoning or as an Environmental Feature on Schedule K), the only difference being that the designation on Schedule K "flags" the property as having significant environmental features.

Moved by P. Hume

That, given the requirement for Environmental Assessment before any rezoning, the Environmental Features overlay Schedule K be deleted for West Carleton (Huntley), Concession 5, Lots 11 and 12.

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume and A. Munter....4

NAYS: A. Cullen, G. Hunter and J. Legendre....3

Mr. Miller, referring to Councillor Beamish's motion to redesignate property owned by Mr. Copeland, from General Rural to Limestone Resource, drew the Committee's attention to page 100 and 195 of the original transmittal report. He advised that a General Rural designation would not prohibit subsurface mining as proposed by Mr. Copeland. Ms. Christensen added it is Mr. Copeland's position that a designation of Limestone Resource would prevent conflicting uses being allowed in the area.

Moved by D. Beamish

That Lots 3, 4, 5 and 6, Concession 1, (Huntley), Township of West Carleton be redesignated from General Rural to Limestone Resource.

LOST

NAYS: A. Cullen, B. Hill, P. Hume, J. Legendre and A. Munter....5
YEAS: D. Beamish, G. Hunter and R. van den Ham....3

The Committee approved Schedule A, as amended by the foregoing and the items listed in the “Summary of Additional Changes to Schedules”.

Moving on to Schedule B, the Committee considered the following motion put forward by Councillor Cullen. Ms. Christensen noted this area is identified in the Greenbelt Master Plan to respond to local municipalities’ requests for recreational facilities; if it is deleted from the ROP, a Regional Official Plan Amendment would be needed to use this land for anything more significant than a small scale recreational facility.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Schedule B be amended to delete “Greenbelt Institutional Area - Conroy Pit”.

CARRIED

The next motion put forward by Councillor Cullen dealt with the deletion of the RCMP/LETE South lands from the Greenbelt Employment Area. He noted this land is not serviced and deletion of this land from Greenbelt Employment Area would be consistent with the Region’s position on protecting Greenbelt lands from development.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Schedule B be amended to delete “Greenbelt Employment Area - RCMP/LETE South”.

CARRIED

Councillor Cullen put forward the following motion, noting the Greenbelt Employment Area designation for the Shirley’s Bay Communication Centre on the north side of Carling Avenue, extends to the south side of Carling Avenue as well. The City of Nepean has asked that the Region not designate the golf range on the south side of Carling as Greenbelt Employment Area; Councillor Cullen proposed that the land be designated Greenbelt Rural Area.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Schedule B be amended to change “Greenbelt Employment Area - Shirley’s Bay Communication Research Centre” for the golf range south of Carling Avenue to “Greenbelt Rural Area”.

CARRIED

The Committee approved Schedule B, as amended by the foregoing and the changes outlined in the “Summary of Additional Changes to Schedules”.

The Committee then turned their attention to Schedule C1. Councillor Hume took the chair and Councillor Hunter put forward a motion to delete the Hope Side Road extension from Schedule C1. He noted although the NCC is against any road widenings through Stoney Swamp, the Hope Side Road alternative would have more of an impact on the environment as well as an impact on an existing community.

The Ward Councillor, Vina Waddell expressed her agreement with Councillor Hunter's motion, noting an extension of Hope Side Road would destroy the existing community and she urged that the West Hunt Club Road extension be pursued instead.

At Councillor Munter's request, Mr. Reid noted the NCC strongly indicated that the widening of Hunt Club Road would have a detrimental effect on Stoney Swamp and they would not be favourable to giving the Region the right-of-way. Therefore staff have identified Hope Side Road as an alternative and would recommend that this extension remain in Schedule C1.

Moved by G. Hunter

That the Hope Side Road Extension be deleted from Schedule C1.

LOST

NAYS: B. Hill, P. Hume, J. Legendre and A. Munter....4
YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen and G. Hunter....3

Councillor Hill proposed the following amendment to Schedule C1 to add Huntmar Road.

Moved by B. Hill

That the extension of Huntmar Road be added to Schedule C1.

LOST

NAYS: A. Cullen, G. Hunter and J. Legendre....3
YEAS: D. Beamish and B. Hill....2

Schedule C1 was approved as presented; Schedule C2 was approved as amended by the change noted in the "Summary of Additional Changes to Schedules"; Schedule D1 was approved as presented (G. Hunter dissented on the Hope Side Road Extension); Schedule D2 was approved as presented.

Referring to Schedule E, Councillor Beamish moved the following motion (in keeping with a motion approved by Transportation Committee).

Moved by D. Beamish

That the CP Rail Line from Billings Bridge south to Hunt Club Road be shown on Schedule E.

CARRIED
(G. Hunter dissented)

Schedule E was approved as amended by the foregoing. The Committee also approved Schedules F, G and H as presented. Turning to Schedule I, Councillor Legendre took the Chair, and Councillor Hunter put forward the following motion, noting his main concern rests with the Hunt Club Surplus Lands.

“Whereas the National Capital Commission has changed the boundaries of its Greenbelt and disposed of some of its lands, and

Whereas the current (1988) Regional official Plan contains a policy to keep such lands in their “essentially open and rural character” if the NCC should dispose of “all or part of the Greenbelt”, and

Whereas the Regional Development Strategy called for retaining as open space all open space land ‘in and inside the Greenbelt’, and

Whereas communities have grown up adjacent to these lands and many have paid a premium for their properties to be adjacent to the open space,

Therefore be it resolved that lands that have been removed from the NCC Greenbelt, including but not limited to the so called “Hunt Club Surplus Lands’, and the Blackburn Hamlet By-Pass lands and other such parcels be designated as Urban Open Space (Espace Verts Urbains) on Schedule I of the new Regional Official Plan.”

At Councillor Hunter’s request, Ms. Sweet advised the Hunt Club Surplus Lands were acquired by the Region at the time the Hunt Club Road was expanded in 1993. At that time, Council dealt with a report that looked at the potential uses that could go on those lands. She noted there are no real environmental qualities to these lands, other than a small wooded area, which the original land-use plan indicated should be retained for parkland. Ms. Sweet also referred to a motion passed by council at that time which resolved that the cost of the residual lands be absorbed by the local municipality if these lands are to be maintained as parkland and not deemed to be of Regional interest. She went on to say the Hunt Club lands are presently owned by the Region and were never intended to be used for open space; it was always understood they would be surplus to the Region’s needs and would eventually be sold.

Commenting on the other lands affected by Councillor Hunter’s motion, Ms. Sweet noted staff do not have a problem with the Blackburn By-pass lands as the local municipality has agreed they will keep it as a recreational space, except for the small portion of land occupied by the

fire station and church. However, the other lands (e.g. Hunt Club/417 East lands, Blossom Park, Lietrim at Limebank) all have different circumstances and staff are of the opinion they should be excluded from this motion.

Councillor Hunter agreed to amend his motion to apply only to the Hunt Club Surplus lands and the Blackburn By-pass lands (exclusive of the lands occupied by the church and fire station). He stated he did not agree that his motion was contrary to the previous motion passed by Council and noted there are a number ideas that have been proposed for the Hunt Club lands for some recreational purposes.

Acting Committee Chair Legendre stated he would like to see the Blair-Innes lands included in Councillor Hunter's motion. Councillor Cullen agreed to move an amendment to Councillor Hunter's motion on Councillor Legendre's behalf. Councillor Cullen, noted the zoning application on these lands has gone through Gloucester Council and has been referred to the OMB; he asked, if the designation of the Blair-Innes lands is changed, would it catch up to what has already happened (at the OMB). Mr. Marc advised this was unlikely, as any decision made on the new Official Plan would not likely make it to the OMB before 1998/99.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Councillor Hunter's motion be amended to include the Blair-Innes Residual Lands.

CARRIED
(D. Beamish dissented)

Moved by G. Hunter

That lands that have been removed from the NCC Greenbelt, including the so called "Hunt Club Surplus Lands", Blair-Innes Residual Lands and the Blackburn Hamlet By-Pass Lands (excluding the church and fire station) be designated as Urban Open Space (Espace Verts Urbains) on Schedule I of the new Regional Official Plan.

CARRIED

The Committee approved Schedule I, as amended by the foregoing and the changes listed on the Summary of Additional Changes document and Schedule K as amended by the changes outlined in the Summary of Additional Changes document.

Yeas and Nays were called on the following motion.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council adopt the proposed Regional Official Plan, as amended.

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, J. Legendre and
A. Munter....7
NAYS:0

4. RESPONSE TO P&EC INQUIRY NO. 33
LEGAL AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
OF DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 26 May 1997

That the Planning and Environment Committee and Council receive this report for information.

RECEIVED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Original signed by
Dawn Whelan

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

Confirmed by
Gord Hunter

COMMITTEE CHAIR