

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

12 SEPTEMBER 2000

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

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

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 08 August 2000.

CARRIED

PLANNING ITEMS

1. PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT 9 - KANATA WEST BUSINESS PARK
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 24 Aug 2000

Committee Chair Hunter began by reading a statement required under the Planning Act, wherein he advised that anyone who intended to appeal Regional Official Plan Amendment 9 to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), must either voice their objections at the public meeting or submit their comments in writing prior to Amendment 9 being adopted by Regional Council. Failure to do so could result in refusal/dismissal of the appeal by the OMB.

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 27 September 2000 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 64.

Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division; Judy Flavin, Planner, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division; Daniel Nixey, Corporate Research Group and Marie Carter, McCormick Rankin, provided Committee with an overview of the staff report.

Councillor van den Ham noted the consultant had stated, regarding his review of existing business parks, that only one-third of the space would be suitable for high tech parks. The Councillor asked if that type of business requires a different kind of land. Mr. Nixey, replied it did. He noted through the interviews, the proponents expressed a desire to see many things come together at once, including lands that have high design standards. This would rule out a large number of parks that have a heavy use or a mix of uses. As well, proximity to the Queensway Corridor or to other 400-level series highways is important, as is the ability to provide high-quality transit service. He noted for larger firms, access to recreation lands is also a key component.

Councillor van den Ham noted the presenters had spoken of migration from the west to the south and around to the east and had stated business development could be shifted to the east. He asked how this shift was going to happen (e.g. through the guidelines set by Council or decided by the developers). Mr. Nixey noted from the survey work conducted it was discovered that a high tech firm already established would expand close to where they are. However, he said he was encouraged that there was no “fixed address” in people’s minds about where they have to be. As well, factors such as proximity to competitors, to supply lines, like businesses, etc. were not signaled very strongly in the survey. He said this would mean there is a fair amount of flexibility and suggested it would be the developers/landlords who will do the shifting.

With respect to the issue of transit, Councillor van den Ham questioned what work had been done to determine the numbers of people in the high tech business that are actually bus users. Ms. Carter advised information was obtained from OC Transpo with respect to surveys they have carried out for the Kanata North Business Park, Nortel at the Carling/Moodie site and information from the JDS Uniphase site in South Merivale Business Park. The latter has 40% modal split and OC Transpo is working hard at providing good bus service to them. The Kanata North Business Park has between 7% and 12 % modal share and this has been improving with more direct routes from the Eagleson Park and Ride facility. Nortel has a program in place to encourage travel demand management. Ms. Carter offered that 10% was reasonable and that 20% was an aggressive target that certainly could not be reached without the facilities in place.

Councillor Munter first acknowledged the work of staff on this Amendment, noting it has been a year of unprecedented development. He stated he was generally supportive of the report, but had concerns about the infrastructure and the issue of transportation. He noted in February he

had asked staff to look into the off-site transportation needs, as well as the on-site needs. However, in the actual amendment, only the construction and expansion of roads within the Kanata West Business Park area is addressed. Councillor Munter asked if any of the transportation infrastructure (e.g. a widened Terry Fox north and south to March Road and Eagleson, a widened Queensway, the Castlefrank overpass, a widened Campeau Drive, an extended Campeau and a widened Hazeldean) were currently budgeted for. Ms. Sweet replied some were included in the Capital budget but forecast for a later date (i.e. 2006 and beyond). Councillor Munter emphasized for the Committee that this was an issue. He said clearly a demand for land has been demonstrated and yet not a cent has been budgeted for the near term to deal with this. He said this will need to be addressed.

Councillor Legendre noted staff had indicated there was land in the east and south of the Region that they would like to see developed. He questioned why. Ms. Sweet advised these lands have been in the ROP for a number of years, infrastructure has been identified in the ROP for them and in some cases the infrastructure is already there and paid for and the land should therefore be utilized. As well, the ROP development strategy states that jobs and housing in those urban communities should be balanced to reduce cross-commuting across the Region.

Councillor Legendre said Mr. Nixey had mentioned that the Kanata phenomenon is historic but not intrinsic and seemed to be saying there could be development in the east and the south. The Councillor questioned how this would ever happen if every time, expansion is allowed where the pressure is. Mr. Nixey said it would be difficult to encourage companies that are already well entrenched to expand very far from where they are. With respect to the second part of the question, Mr. Nixey said there is nothing that ties new companies to a Kanata address. He said he had spoken to people who moved to Kanata because there were people there who had good projects, but that was not their first choice, they would have taken something closer to the centre or to the east.

At Councillor Legendre's request, Ms. Flavin confirmed the Committee was not being asked to approve the elements of the concept plan at this time but rather, the amendment is proposing some principles staff would like to see delivered on.

Councillor Bellemare stated his understanding was that the cost to the Region would be \$40 million to service this business park but he was also hearing that the development industry will pay for the infrastructure. He asked for clarification. Ms. Sweet confirmed the cost would be \$40 million for the infrastructure that includes roads, pipes and transit but it does not include other infrastructure such as stormwater. She pointed out there is a statement in ROPA 9 which says this should be financed by the developers and she clarified this means an area-specific development charge or perhaps some other municipal financing through the Municipal Act or

some other way to be negotiated with the developers and landowners (and approved by Council), once the concept plan is in place.

Councillor Bellemare noted a high demand rate of growth (6.5% annual growth) was used to justify adding this land to the urban area. He questioned how these projections were arrived at (e.g. was the 6.5% rate projected until 2021 or higher early on, then lower towards the end and averaged out). Mr. Nixey confirmed higher growth was projected in the early period, tapering off towards 2021. He added the bottom line was they were looking at how much land would be consumed to 2021, so whether the higher growth occurred earlier or later was irrelevant to the calculation.

The Councillor then pointed out that, from the projections, the conclusion was that 200 to 250 hectares of land was needed for high tech users; however, the recommendation before the Committee is for 330 hectares. He asked if this was too much land. Mr. Nixey explained they wanted to capture the essence of what would happen if there were significant, sustained growth. He advised they came up with the amount of land needed and then took into consideration sensible boundaries and the infrastructure capacity. He opined the area of land proposed in the Amendment was neither too big nor too small.

Councillor Legendre noted the report states the cost of infrastructure, may be paid through area specific development charge. It was his understanding that Council had rejected the notion of such an area specific charge. Ms. Sweet advised Council did in fact approve a type of area-specific charge because it does differ for residential uses inside the Greenbelt versus in the urban area versus the rural area. Councillor Legendre then asked, if this was approved, in light of Council's previous decision, would it leave the Region (new City of Ottawa) open to a successful OMB appeal. Ms. Sweet replied that anyone can appeal the amendment but that staff is prepared to support it at the OMB. Mr. Nixey added, provided the costs are justified and that staff has accurately captured the amount of growth, it would be possible to defend this amendment before the OMB.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen questioned if the Province was at the table to be a partner to respond to transportation needs (i.e. in terms of Highways 417 and 416). Ms. Carter stated she could not speak to the partnership issue, but noted the Province is currently carrying out a preliminary design study for Highway 417 that encompasses the area between the Highway 7 interchange and the Highway 416 interchange, which will be considering opportunities for improving transportation along the Queensway corridor. Ms. Carter advised that McCormick Rankin is carrying out the study and options such as 6 lanes, 8 lanes, park and ride lots, etc. will all be considered. The Ministry of Transportation has stated that they are interested in providing a facility that will help improve the economic growth of Ottawa-Carleton.

With regard to the high design standard the high tech industry requires in its business parks, Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked at what stage in the planning process are the standards set out for the design for business park development. Ms. Sweet advised the concept plan will result in design standards that will be agreed to by the landowners and the industry and will be realistic. She pointed out staff are recommending that the concept plan be approved by Council.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked, when the inventory of current lands was conducted, were currently designated business park lands that could be assembled to accommodate a larger high tech business considered. Mr. Nixey advised this was so. He noted however, it was more of a “filtering out” than a “filtering in”. The lands that were dropped from consideration were those that didn’t have particular hallmarks, for example, if they were developed partially for heavy uses, it would be difficult to circumvent that. He noted the one issue that was open to debate was the delivery of adequate transit because that can change over time. The area most significant in that regard is south of the airport, east of the Rideau River and Mr. Nixey stated in time, those could be developed for high tech purposes.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen then asked for staff comment on a letter received by Judy Flavin from the City of Nepean, with regard to an in-depth cost-benefit analysis for the development of the above-noted land versus other potential sites and the possibility of expanding other assets currently in the Region. Ms. Sweet noted the ROP states that economic opportunities for the Corel lands must be looked at. She said this was done through the Malone Givens Parsons study, and the recommendation was that a business park made sense there. Staff were simply acting on a direction of Council in bringing forward this Amendment. Ms. Sweet went on to say she would recommend that, when next the new City looks at further expanding business park land, the Strandherd area should be looked at because a thorough analysis has not been done on that particular site.

The Committee then heard from the following public delegations.

Bronwen Heins, President, Kanata Research Park advised she was before the Committee to speak on both this item and Item 3 (Growth and Infrastructure in Ottawa-Carleton), as both are inter-related.

Ms. Heins advised Kanata Research Park has no interest whatsoever in the Kanata West Business Park lands but she wanted to relay her support of the expansion of these lands and to shed some light on what is happening in the high tech sector and the growth in the west end of Ottawa. With respect to growth, Ms. Heins referred the Committee to Item 3, Table 5, where the projected employment for 2006 is predicted to be 28,300; a projected growth rate of 8,751 between 1996 and 2006. The speaker stressed that Kanata Research Park Corporation

alone will build 800,000 square feet of space and fill it with 3,200 people by the end of next year, which translates to 40% of the prediction in one year and a half. The speaker opined the numbers in the report were overly cautious and so far out of line with what is happening out there. She emphasized that the additional land was desperately needed and quickly. Ms. Heins offered that with the development that is currently proposed in Kanata and awaiting City of Kanata approval, the projected growth from 1996 to 2006 should be in the neighbourhood of 56,000 jobs. Ms. Heins went on to say the high tech sector is an awesome enterprise that creates 3 to 1 other jobs that will benefit the whole city, and she cautioned the Committee should not risk losing it by “squabbling over 500 hectares”.

The speaker then referred to Table 6 of Item 3, and stated it falls woefully short of meeting the infrastructure needs that Kanata North Business Park and Kanata needs now to meet the needs of the high tech community. She pointed out that March Road, Terry Fox North, Carling Avenue and the Eagleson Road overpass need to be improved and expanded now. Ms. Heins felt that putting money into the Castlefrank overpass and the transitway station for the town centre was wrong as it is too early, whereas there is building happening right now in Kanata North. She also offered that light rail would benefit the entire city, is a lot cheaper than a transitway and is a service that high tech employees would use. She urged the Region to move forward with the light rail.

Terry Mathews, President, March Networks Corporation stated he was interested in making the Region of Ottawa-Carleton a better place, or at least preventing it from losing ground. Mr. Mathews advised he was speaking from the perspective of having first hand knowledge of the high tech sector, noting he had started many extremely successful companies in this area. He pointed out all of these companies were going through growth far in excess of what Regional staff are projecting, and in fact called it “unprecedented growth” which he did not feel the Region understood the magnitude of. Mr. Mathews expounded on the virtues of the high tech industry noting it does not pollute but is “brain power based”, they often become public and spread wealth throughout the Region and they reinvest in the community.

Mr. Mathews went on to say there are many pressures in the Kanata area pointing out transportation pressures on March Road are tremendous and the Queensway is woefully inadequate. He stressed that people in the industry are in great demand and could start companies anywhere they want. Currently in the Region the heat is on in Kanata and this is good for the Region as a whole. Mr. Mathews urged the Committee to encourage the environment the industry has created by supporting the proposed amendment as well as light rail to the west end.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter, Ms. Heins advised Kanata Research Park has 450 acres, and at the rate it is being built out now, it will be gone in five years. She

confirmed that her one caveat to her support of the Kanata West Business Park was that the infrastructure to support what exists now (and what will come) has to be in place.

Bob Stevenson, provided a written copy of his presentation, which is held on file with the Regional Clerk. Mr. Stevenson offered his opinion that ROPA 9 does not offer any advantages that would benefit the community and listed its many disadvantages as being “immoral, unprincipled and financially irresponsible”. He suggested if the Regional Official Plan were being enforced, the Committee would not even be considering ROPA 9. He felt this was the latest step in a series of bad decisions by Council, each one being used to justify the next and referred to the decisions about the Palladium, the highway interchange, the auto mall of Amendment 3 and all the other encroachments such as the Operations garage that have been allowed on good agricultural land. He suggested the Region should be more practical in terms of land use for lands designated as Rural Lands, as he felt there was nothing more practical than saving the region’s food lands.

Mr. Stevenson noted that ROPA 3 allows for 100 acres of farmland to be paved for 12 car lots and showrooms and ROPA 9 expands this to 1,370 acres. He said although the proponents of Amendment 9 speak of a large increase in demand for high tech facilities, there is an estimated 40 year supply of such land in the Region, some of which is already serviced. He said this was paid for as a public investment and is owned by developers who followed the rules. Now another group has bought cheap agricultural lands and wants the rules changed. He pointed out the Provincial Policy Statement indicates that expansion into prime agricultural areas is permitted only where there are no reasonable alternatives: this report does not address this issue.

The speaker felt the consultant’s report was an excellent example of how one “manufactures a need”. He noted for example, the consultant interviewed and surveyed approximately 100 facility managers of local high tech companies and read from the report “according to the survey locating close to other high tech firms or having proximity to the supply chain are not major concerns”. He pointed out Kanata was not rated particularly highly by the majority for the next expansion or relocation, while locating in the Queensway corridor, particularly at a major intersection, was of great interest. Mr. Stevenson also felt there was a distortion of the soil capability of these lands, noting the report focuses on the negative aspects of the property but did not include a map showing the soil capability under the LEAR rating.

With respect to the cost to provide infrastructure estimated at a minimum cost of \$268 million, Mr. Stevenson opined this was a huge expenditure, some of which is totally unnecessary and he felt it unbelievable that Council would consider this expenditure, based on a manufactured need. He suggested traffic generation should promote a policy that disperses growth to all industrial parks in the Region. As well, he felt that light rail should be promoted. Mr. Stevenson noted there would be fear-mongers who will say that if the high tech businesses aren’t allowed to

locate beside the Queensway, they will go to another city but he pointed out there are many high tech firms in the Region that are not located beside the Queensway. He cautioned if ROPA 9 were passed, the taxpayers will be the losers in the short and long term.

Jim Shotton, advised he was a commercial real estate broker and had been involved in the Kanata market for 15 years and in this process since its inception. He began by saying he felt the report fell short in terms of projections and opined the region is about to see growth in the market that will shock everyone. He advised the businesses we are currently involved in are taking up virtually all of the available industrial zoned land in the west end market and he expressed concern that the availability of land will run out over the next 24 to 36 months.

Mr. Shotton encouraged the Committee to also look at the addition of the lands between Maple Grove and Hazeldean Road and especially the lands bordering on the extension of Ivor Road into Huntmar. He felt these lands would be well suited for light, industrial uses that service the high tech companies. With respect to infrastructure, Mr. Shotton felt the process identified in the Amendment was reasonable but he expressed concern about Hazeldean Road.

Merle Nicholds, Mayor, Kanata, introduced Dave Krajaefski, Director of Planning; Ken Foulds, Manager of Planning; and, Rob McKay, Economic Development Manager. Mayor Nicholds advised that Kanata had spent a lot of time on this issue and were appreciative of the report presented to Committee. She advised that the development that is currently in the mill (either already approved, under construction or at some state in the approval process), would equal the size of about four Corel Centres. She noted that Bronwen Heins and Terry Mathews had made it clear to the Committee what the high tech industry needs - a supply of serviced land, a fast-tracked approval process. She felt the key issue for the Committee was infrastructure and the quality of life.

Mayor Nicholds noted Kanata Council had considered a report from its staff on this issue and the Regional staff report. She advised that Kanata Council supported ROPA 9 as presented, however, they felt more information was needed on the financial impact and the phasing of infrastructure before this takes place. She noted the message from the high tech industry is that they know what they want and will go where they can to find it (including other countries and other parts of Canada) and she requested that work begin immediately on the concept plan, to respond to the needs of this industry.

On the issue of infrastructure, the Mayor stated this was a big issue, primarily transportation issues and roadways in particular. She noted there is currently enormous pressure on March Road, Eagleson Road and Terry Fox. When Council looked at the report, they requested one modification, regarding the effect of traffic on existing communities, particularly John Street in Stittsville, and they also supported the extension of Huntmar down to Hazeldean Road. She

expressed her Council's concern regarding the cost of infrastructure to get to this area, particularly roadways and their opinion that more work needs to be done on this. Mayor Nicholds stated the Region could not afford not to proceed with this Amendment but close attention must be paid to providing the infrastructure ahead of any growth.

Mr. Krajaefski stated one of the key roles that municipal government can play in meeting the needs of the high technology sector is ensuring that an adequate supply of zoned, serviced land is available in a location that best suits the needs of high technology. He said it is the City of Kanata's firm belief the land that is part of this amendment is the location the high tech sector finds desirable to locate in. He felt this was confirmed by the consultants retained by the Region. He pointed out the Terry Fox Business Park, located immediately adjacent to this area, is already establishing itself as a location for high tech companies (e.g. Nortel). Mr. Krajaefski expressed Kanata's support for ROPA 9, as they believe this is the appropriate site for high technology and represents good land use planning.

Mr. Foulds spoke of Kanata meeting many of the locational criteria the high tech sector is looking for and also about the shortage of available land suitable to high tech. He said it is clear that the absorption rate for land is significant, and has accelerated in the last five years and continues to accelerate.

Mr. Foulds noted staff had clearly pointed out there is an economic opportunity with the location of the 400 series highway and Huntmar, as well as the existing Corel structure. Also, the infrastructure that is there today supports that notion and it provides a very significant western gateway to the new City. He also noted the proposed Amendment compliments existing planning principles, outlined in the current ROP. The fact that it addresses high tech sector needs solely, and limits the amount of commercial space, does in fact support Kanata's Town Centre, and that policy is consistent with the ROP policies for town centres. By encouraging further employment in the west end, it also promotes a live/work relationship that is also identified in the ROP as a target. As well, there has been consideration for the natural environment, for agricultural resource and the balancing act of weighing these against the proposed use has been made.

The speaker stated there are opportunities for efficiencies within the current infrastructure system which could be achieved by pursuing the infrastructure options in the current amendment. Although there are costs associated with this, there are also a significant number of economic benefits. He recognized there are limits to the infrastructure capacity, and these have helped shape the ROPA boundaries that are proposed: changes to these boundaries would obviously require further reassessment of the adequacy of the systems to support the growth. Mr. Foulds encouraged the Committee to proceed with ROPA 9, resolve the infrastructure problems and continue along with the concept plan process.

Councillor Munter noted the City of Kanata supports the 330 hectares proposed, however, he had heard the delegations say, if it is larger than that, the impact on infrastructure needs to be investigated first. Mr. Foulds stated at year end projections will be accelerating at a faster pace than was anticipated and he stated it was absolutely necessary to address the infrastructure needs related to that.

Councillor van den Ham noted the delegations had touched upon the issue of funding of the infrastructure. He said it was his understanding that Terry Fox and Castlefrank are local roads and the initial two-lane construction of those is the responsibility of Kanata. He said he was sure Kanata had been collecting funds for those undertakings and asked if those calculations had been included in the overall funding for these projects. Mr. Krajaefski advised Kanata's development charges by-law provides for the construction and completion of Terry Fox Road north to March Road as a two-lane roadway, and also provides for the completion of Terry Fox south to Fernbank Road (which is the limit of Terry Fox in Kanata). There is funding for part of the Castlefrank partial interchange, but its also important to remember there is a regional component as well, because of transit.

David McNicoll, resident of Ottawa-Carleton, submitted a copy of his presentation, which is held on file with the Regional Clerk. Mr. McNicoll stated he did not support either the Region's Official Plan nor the current structure of government in Ontario. He advised he was inclined not to support ROPA 9 for the following reasons:

- *Fixed assets*: the Region's Annual Report shows no fixed assets in the balance sheet, either comprehensive or the Region, thus no ongoing value is given for such matters as the water/wastewater system, transportation infrastructure, bridges, buildings and the land itself.
- *Land value*: urbanization of the Ottawa area is occurring at a rate of approximately 1.2 hectares per day. This urbanization is projected for the 25-year timeline of the ROP, and is manifested through legal obstructions such as the designation of land into a business park as in the case of ROPA 9. All ability to sustain bio-diversity, including humans, is reduced inside the study area and it appears impossible to model a human community into the future with this land use philosophy and practice. This amendment would increase the current allowable rate of urbanization by approximately 5%.
- *Economic Development*. The staff report states the purpose of the amendment is to support economic development in Ottawa-Carleton by designating additional land for the high tech industry, yet there is no document before us from the Region's Economic Affairs Office, nor from the Ottawa Centre for Research Innovation and Ottawa Economic Development (both partially funded by the Region). As well, The Ottawa Partnership has yet to produce its Master Economic Development Plan.

- *Physical infrastructure carrying costs*: the Region does not value or project the carrying costs in a standalone fashion. ROPA 9 will increase such carrying costs.
- *Region's agricultural resources*: at the pre-hearing conference on May 5, 1998, before the OMB on his appeal of the entire ROP, Council, addressing the matter of resources, stated verbally that it was absurd to have to demonstrate per capita resources. He questioned whether this was still consistent with Council's view and operations.
- *Global business standards*: He asked if it was fair to say that a current designation of business park carries with it no direct assertions of global business standards such as the ISO series 9000 and the environmental series 14000?
- *High tech environmental audit*: He questioned whether the Region has ever carried out an environmental audit of the so-called high technology sector.
- *Rail/Rapid Transit*: He questioned whether any of the background studies that Council has authorized have looked at any rail transit operations.
- *Infrastructure expansion*: He said he understood the proposed changes in designation through ROPA 9 carry no direct implication for public financial involvement in the business park per se. Nevertheless, is it fair to say the amendment carries the direct, legal obligation for public funding of infrastructure expansion? He felt the associated costs were substantial and more appropriately discussed during budget process.
- *Overall conformance of policy and law in Ontario*: Is it the position of Regional Council, although totally silent on the matter, that through its comprehensive ROP and related policies manifest the direct will of the government of Ontario and conforms to all pending international protocols, conventions and treaties, that the government of Canada and Ontario have signed.

Mr. McNicol stated he would not be supporting ROPA 9 and does not support the ongoing destruction of where he lives. He said that although his comments may appear odd to some Councillors and citizens he was attempting to plan to global standards for an adequate, sustainable human community, in the context of bio-diversity. He said he stood by the characterization of the ROP "as a plan of global death".

Janet Stavinga, Mayor, Goulbourn Township and Danny Page, Director, Planning and Economic Development (a copy of Mayor Stavinga's presentation is held on file with the Regional Clerk). Mayor Stavinga expressed Goulbourn Council's support for ROPA 9. She said ROPA 9 makes eminent sense, as there is truly an economic opportunity at this location and it should be acted upon collaboratively to maintain this region's stature as the country's pre-eminent high tech centre. Mayor Stavinga said Goulbourn Council was pleased with the amendment and encouraged the Committee to incorporate the following improvements to it:

1. Introduce concrete assurances that this development will not adversely impact the residential areas surrounded by Brianston Gate (located in the northeast quadrant of Stittsville and borders on the study area). Ever since the Corel Centre and the Huntmar exchange became operational, this community has had to deal with increasing amounts of through

- traffic. She said the proposed Huntmar extension alignment appears to provide a direct route through the residential streets of Brianston Gate and would seriously degrade the quality of life in this community. Although Regional staff had proposed some text revisions to the amendment to address this need, she urged the Committee to amend Schedule 3 so that the new road goes easterly into Maple Grove.
2. A more explicit requirement in the text of the amendment to ensure the Huntmar extension is constructed before any new development occurs south of the 417. This could best be accomplished by expanding Policy 7 to recognize that the road be in place as a pre-condition to the development of lands south of 417. Given the existing pressures of cut-through traffic now being faced in the Stittsville area, it is imperative that the Environmental Assessment process for the construction of Huntmar extension begin immediately.
 3. The boundaries of ROPA 9 be rationalized. The boundaries should encompass lands along both sides of the Huntmar extension to reflect a more efficient distribution of land that recognizes the local landscape and makes more efficient development and use of the infrastructure.
 4. Should the Committee deem it appropriate to include all lands south of Maple Grove, and not just those immediately adjacent to Huntmar, she asked that a concept plan be approved, integrating effective visual, spatial separations from the proposed business park and residential areas to the west, as well as the existing boundaries of Kanata to the east. In another area north of Hwy. 417, a portion of the expansion area abuts a quarry operation expected to operate for another 60 to 70 years. The noise, vibration, dust and esthetic considerations in this area might not be appropriate for high tech but could be considered for light industrial uses.

The Mayor referred to a page of proposed amendments she had provided to assist the Committee in their deliberations and asked the Committee to approve ROPA 9 without delay.

Michael O'Rourke a resident of John Street in Stittsville, introduced other residents of John Street who had accompanied him. They were Nick DeAngelo, Maxine McConomy and Nancy Beauchamps. Mr. O'Rourke submitted a copy of a consultant's report accepted by Goulbourn in April 2000 on setting safe speeds for Stittsville, as well as data on John Street concerning the problems with traffic (i.e. speed and volume) (held on file with the Regional Clerk). He then described the problems with traffic the residents of John Street have incurred since the opening of the Corel Centre. He noted prior to the Corel Centre, John Street averaged a dozen cars a day. In a study he conducted in May 1999, the counts averaged 4.3 cars per minute on non-event days at the Corel Centre, with two-thirds of the traffic at any time going south, i.e. Maple Grove to Hazeldean. Traffic before and after an event at the Corel Centre adds up to 1000 more cars to our daily traffic load of 2500 cars. As well, the speed limit of 40 kms per hour is largely ignored. Sixty five percent of traffic exceeds the speed limit with 6% at 15 kms per hour or more over the limit.

Mr. O'Rourke said he realized that development is necessary for the continued growth of the community, however, he was also of the opinion that growth and development must respect the rights of all residents to maintain the quality of their lifestyle without undue interference from such development. He said he and his neighbours were concerned about the negative impact of proposed ROPA 9 which will, as presently drafted, add to the problems on John Street. These problems are the result of the lack of proper infrastructure in the area surrounding the Corel Centre and the lands between Terry Fox Drive, Hwy. 417, Hazeldean Road and Huntmar Drive.

He outlined the problems associated with ROPA 9, as follows: Schedule 3 references new and modified roads that are required as a result of the proposed development. This road network includes a road leading from the Palladium interchange to Maple Grove Road. The road joins Maple Grove Road a few hundred feet east of the intersection of John Street and as, it presently is detailed, it can only cause further traffic worries for the residents. There are references in the staff report that acknowledge the difficulties on John Street, however there is no timeframe, other than a loose reference to "short term" measures required to address the problems. The construction of the Huntmar extension is included in the plan, but not as a priority. He said additional north-south corridors are required between Kanata North, Hwy. 417 and Stittsville. He felt the Huntmar extension should be built immediately and should be included as a condition for rezoning the lands. As well, short term measures to return John Street to its original purpose (a roadway designed for its residents) must be formalized and implemented immediately. These measures could include road closures, road calming measures, additional enforcement of traffic by-laws, etc. The Terry Fox-Hazeldean interchange should be modified to include a dedicated right-turn lane onto Hazeldean heading west. Hazeldean Road should be widened from Terry Fox to Carp Road. Maple Grove Road should be extended to Carp Road and a north-south link to the Palladium interchange to Main Street to the existing Goulbourn Business Park should be built.

Ms. McConomy advised she was before the Committee representing the children of Stittsville, specifically those residing on John Street. She noted traffic volumes have restricted their childrens' ability to play safely in their front yards, to be able to cross the street to play with friends, to go to the park, to walk and wait for the school bus, to deliver newspapers or to ride their bicycles. She advised cars regularly fail to stop at stop signs, drive too fast and recklessly. This once quiet residential street has become a through-way for commuters to and from work and to the many events at the Corel Centre. Ms. McConomy stressed the importance of finding solutions to restore safety and the quality of life to residents of John Street. She said although her community supports development, the planners and developers must design their projects to protect the safety and integrity of their community. In closing, she expressed support for the position expressed by Mr. O'Rourke.

Peter McNicol, President, Katimavik-Hazeldean Community Association, said the majority of the residents represented by his Community Association are to the east of Terry Fox and a few are in the farm lands about to be affected. Mr. McNicol stated the Community Association was mildly in support of ROPA 9 as they see it as an answer to some of their problems in that it will speed the development of some of the needed roads. However, if these roads are being used by the new business park, his community will have lost all the benefits the new roads would provide. He also expressed concern that development on the Corel Centre lands has already been a threat to the Town Centre development. Mr. McNicol said his Community Association does support the Huntmar extension and the Terry Fox extension but not the widening of Eagleson. As well, Mr. McNicol expressed support for the concerns of Goulbourn about John Street.

Mr. McNicol went on to express a number of concerns, including: the cut-through traffic on Katimavik Road on Corel Centre nights; traffic congestion on Hazeldean Road; high tech businesses taking up space in community shopping malls; problems with transit and the threats posed by landbanking; and, traffic congestion on the Queensway.

In conclusion, Mr. McNicol urged the Committee to proceed with the development of the Kanata South Business Park and to complete the Terry Fox overpass and widen Terry Fox to four lanes before any more building is allowed in this area.

Mark Wakeland, Staubach Company, Dallas, Texas. Mr. Wakeland provided a bit of background on his company, noting it was founded 25 years ago by Roger Staubach on one guiding principle, that they would focus on the specific needs of tenants and users of space. He advised that in 1999, they completed 2,500 assignments for over 1,000 clients (many of whom were on the Fortune 500 list) in the United States and abroad and felt this demonstrated the Staubach Company was truly representative of users of space.

Mr. Wakeland expounded on the virtues of Ottawa, noting it is a beautiful city with a high quality of life; the workforce is abundant, well educated and highly skilled; it has a very expansive technology sector; and, most importantly, there are plenty of lands available and suitable for development at reasonable prices. Mr. Wakeland said these factors form the key ingredients for corporations when choosing new expansion locations and for making Ottawa a world class city.

The speaker went on to say that in April of this year, the Staubach Company purchased 65 acres of land located between Maple Grove Road and Hazeldean Road, under the assumption that the initial plan for the RMOC would include these lands south of Maple Grove. He noted the Staubach Company is not a developer but rather is focused on users; this land simply

creates an opportunity for them to react quickly and deliver sites ready to go when one of their clients chooses Ottawa. Mr. Wakeland felt that as Ottawa continues to grow and becomes a world class City, much more than the current 7% of new growth will come from companies across Canada, the United States and abroad. He opined an initiative to include all of the lands around the Corel Centre, down to Hazeldean Road would fit the strategy.

In conclusion, Mr. Wakeland stated the Staubach Company is in Ottawa because they see exceptional opportunities here and want to continue to put Ottawa on the map as an opportunity for their clients. He emphasized that the Staubach Company is 100% committed to participating with the Region (and the new City of Ottawa) to make this happen.

Tim Chadder, West Carleton, advised West Carleton had been involved in this process since the 1997 decision to look at this area. Mr. Chadder conveyed the Township's support for additional employment in this area and noted as well they supported the Auto Park which is also within this area. He noted as the Township is a proponent of the "developer pay" scenario, they were happy to see this aspect built into ROPA 9 and would definitely promote their continued contributions, not necessarily just through development charges but also through the subdivision process and off-site agreements. As well, West Carleton was pleased to see the area around the Spratt Quarry was recognized for protection.

Mr. Chadder advised that the area north of the Amendment, where Richardson Side Road lies, was a concern to West Carleton Council in terms of the ability for the traffic to be connected back into the City of Kanata. He pointed out Richardson Side Road does become Castlefrank Road and once there is more growth north of the Queensway, they anticipate problems with traffic cutting through rural roads. Another issue raised by West Carleton Council concerned the Carp River. He noted West Carleton is currently doing the subwatershed study and they believe this is an area that should be promoted and enhanced as part of this overall development scenario as it does form a unique feature in the area.

In concluding his remarks, Mr. Chadder stated West Carleton Council supports this amendment and the proposal from Goulbourn Township to have a connection from Hazeldean Road to Maple Grove Road along the Huntmar Corridor. He expressed sympathy for the residents of John Street, noting residents on the West Carleton side of Maple Grove Road were suffering from the same kinds of traffic impacts. He conveyed the Township's support for an amendment to ROPA 9 to show a corridor of development along the extension of Huntmar Road.

Brian Black, indicated he was representing his family who owns property on Huntmar Drive, being the north half of lot 4 and the south half of lot 5, a total of 200 acres (80 hectares), immediately north of the proposed park. Mr. Black submitted a written document on behalf of his family and asked that it be distributed to members of the Committee and held on file with the

Regional Clerk. He expressed support for Amendment 9 but requested that his family's land be included in the business park.

Ignatius Pepprah, provided a written copy of his comments. Mr. Pepprah noted the Kanata North Business Park has been very successful and he thought that any additional increase in business park would have been along March Road from Kronkite to the Kennedy Junction. He said there is sufficient land (about 200 hectares along the March Road) and he felt it would be more logical to build in this prestigious high tech location, rather than to develop another business park. Referring to comments made by Terry Mathews and others with respect to the high demand for business park land, Mr. Pepprah commented once the present proposal is approved, consideration will be given to further expansion of the North Kanata Business Park along March Road for cost reasons. He noted this area would not incur many of the infrastructure costs the present proposal is demanding and could therefore be done very quickly. Mr. Pepprah suggested that consideration should be given to the expansion of the Kanata North Business Park, simultaneously with ROPA 9.

Paul Laughton and Amy Kempster, Federation of Citizens Association (FCA). Mr. Laughton noted in 1991, the FCA appeared before the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) opposed to the diversion of agricultural land and stated they are opposed to this expansion as well, because of the loss of agricultural land. He referred to a statement made by the OMB at that 1991 hearing, noting they said "that lands designated agricultural in an Official Plan, are to be reserved indefinitely and regarded as such, as part of the overall agricultural resource for future generations". He said the use of agricultural land to expand urban areas may sometimes be a necessary evil, but unless it is necessary, it is to be avoided. The speaker pointed out that of the 330 net hectares in ROPA 9, 209 are agricultural resource lands. Mr. Laughton noted the staff report states that urban development next to agricultural land has a deleterious effect on it; so as urban areas expand into each section of agricultural area, this condemns the next layer to future changeover to urban lands.

Mr. Laughton stated ROPA 9 does not conform with the Regional Official Plan policies which encourage denser, more compact and more balanced development and development in town centres, primary employment centres and at transitway stations. He opined the Amendment does not meet the requirements of the Official Plan hierarchy of transportation (i.e. walking and cycling). The Region as a whole has an estimated thirty year supply of land already approved suitable for high tech development and he gave as examples of land within the greenbelt, the City Centre, Lebreton Flats and Cyrville Road. All of which have transitway stations near them and are already serviced. As well, if ROPA 9 is allowed to go forward, the development of some of the areas slated for development under the Official Plan will be delayed. Mr. Laughton also pointed out that the \$39.5 million infrastructure costs, are in addition to what is already

approved in the Transportation Master Plan, which he offered would be a cost to the taxpayer unless somebody else pays for it. He urged the Committee not to support ROPA 9.

Ms. Kempster, noted as an economist, she was well aware of the whole phenomenon of business cycles. She noted the region happens to be almost at the top of a business cycle and suggested a recession could happen at any time in the next two to five years. For this reason, she felt the projections offered were not valid, as they do not take into account the possibility of a recession. The speaker opined the justification of need is not very strong, as there is no real model behind it. The projections were based on existing growth in the last two years, which have been boom years and this was not real modelling of growth.

Councillor Stewart asked the delegations to quantify who the FCA represents. Ms. Kempster advised there were at least 20 to 25 members in the FCA. The membership runs from St. Laurent Community Association in the east to Ottawa South Community Association and Glabar Park in the west and many of the central area community associations. She noted although the FCA's mandate is the Region, they did not have any community associations outside of the City of Ottawa.

Councillor Stewart then asked, in coming to the position presented by Mr. Laughton and Ms. Kempster, if they had polled their associations or had any input from the community at large. Ms. Kempster advised they sent an e-mail to their members, with a copy of their draft letter stating their position. Councillor Stewart then asked the delegation if she would characterize the position presented, as being representative of the average resident in those communities the FCA represents. Ms. Kempster offered that many people in the Region are very interested in preserving the environment. As well the position presented was consistent with the earlier FCA position regarding the Corel Centre.

Ted Fobert, Fotenn Consultants, advised he was representing several landowners in this area including Terrace Investments, the MacKenzie Family, the Polowin family and Mr. Maynard Dennison, who together own over 500 acres of land on the north side of Highway 417. He noted Mr. Leder (Terrace Investments) had to leave but had provided Committee with a letter outlining his position.

Mr. Fobert stated he understood there were a number of motions that would be coming forward dealing with the boundary, the next steps with respect to concept planning and the opportunity of looking at future residential requirements that are generated as a result of the business park development. He expressed support for these motions on behalf of Terrace Corporation and the group he represented.

The speaker noted his clients' land was included within the proposed boundaries of the expansion area north of Highway 417 and stated they were generally in support of the principles and the approach that is recommended in ROPA 9. He commented that the amendment would add 330 net hectares of land to the urban area or 400 to 450 net hectares if the lands between Maple Grove and Hazeldean Road were included (which he felt was a logical and appropriate addition to the boundary of this amendment). He pointed out in the context of the new city with an overall land mass of 681,720 acres this expansion represents about .2% of the land area of this Region. A very small amount, considering the opportunities it represents.

Mr. Fobert stated, in light of the burgeoning needs of the high tech sector and the serious shortage of available land in this part of the Region, it makes sense to plan for an appropriate land supply to be able to accommodate the current and future business needs and to allow the landowners and developers who are being asked to finance this development, to share the high costs of the required infrastructure. He urged the Committee to move forward quickly to keep pace with the high tech industry and stated ROPA 9 is the appropriate first step as it identifies the land for future business use and it sets out the next logical phase for concept planning.

In closing, Mr. Fobert strongly urged the Committee to support ROPA 9 together with its expanded boundary to Hazeldean Road. As well, he asked that the landowners be allowed to take charge of the concept planning exercise. And finally, on behalf of another of his clients in this area, Palladium Auto Park, he requested a change to policy 4.4.7. He referred to a motion which had been distributed, that clarified that the financial contribution of the Palladium Auto Park for future infrastructure would be based on the range of uses that are permitted on their lands (i.e. an autopark) and agreements that have already been entered into to pay for the right to service their lands through the Terry Fox Business Park. He indicated the amendment had been reviewed by Regional staff and they were in support of it.

Ron Richards, representing North American Property Group, the beneficial owners of approximately 40 acres of land on the north side of Hazeldean Road in the Township of Goulbourn. Mr. Richards indicated he was in support of the comments made by Mr. Fobert, Mr. Wakeland and Mr. Mathews. He said it was his belief that a common sense look at the lands proposed to be included in ROPA 9 would bring one to the conclusion that the lands south of Maple Grove Road should be included within the business park area and subject to the types of ongoing study through the concept plan, secondary plans (if necessary) subdivision plans, site plans and zoning. He felt the issues raised by Mayor Stavinga could be addressed through that process. He urged the Committee to support this unique situation, where all of the landowners in this area have come forward in support of the amendment, as amended.

Ray Essiambre, speaking on behalf of George Gaty, advised Mr. Gaty is part owner of 95 acres south of Maple Grove, north of Hazeldean and in between the Staubach property and

Mr. Richards' property. He noted, between the three owners, they have the bulk of the land between Hazeldean Road and Maple Grove Road and the Carp River and the boundary of Stittsville. Mr. Essiambre expressed Mr. Gaty's support for the amendment and expanding the boundaries south to Hazeldean Road.

Graham Bird, Graham Bird & Assoc., Peter Nesbitt, President, Brookfield Homes and Mr. Stephen Upton, President, Dell Corporation. Mr. Bird echoed the words expressed by the previous speakers, who he has been working with in the Kanata area. He said he was part of an industry that is recognizing and dealing with incredible pressure to serve the high tech community and he felt that everything should be done to help out in a timely fashion. Mr. Bird referred to his letter (held on file with the Regional Clerk), and noted the time frames of four and five years to get through processes were just not good enough. He indicated he and his colleagues were willing to work with the Region and asked that the Committee support the notion of allowing them to do the conceptual planning work. He suggested this could be accomplished in a steering committee method.

Mr. Bird went on to address the issue of infrastructure and its costs. He asked that the corporations in the area be allowed to come together and find the solution for the Region. He said his group was anxious to come to the table, to work with the Region to find the answers to causing the infrastructure to get in place and, where it has to be, in advance of the development. The speaker stated it was crucial to understand the proposed ROPA 9 puts a lot of the pressure on the back of one group. By allowing the other corporations to come to the table, they will bring with them enormous power, money and an ability to get this infrastructure in place. He noted the subject properties will bring forward approximately \$50 to \$60 million dollars in development fees and tax revenues in the order of \$45 million per year.

Mr. Nesbitt advised that Brookfield Homes is a North American based home building and development company, with much experience and expertise in the development of master planned communities throughout North America, including San Francisco Bay area and Fairfax County Virginia, where there are similar growth patterns happening because of the high tech industry. He commended the Region for taking on this task and for initiating this Amendment, which he felt was a very important step for the community. He expressed Brookfield's commitment to participating in the work to make the infrastructure happen and find solutions to pay for it.

Mr. Upton advised Dell Corporation, has been active in the Ottawa area for 25 to 30 years in terms of land ownership, development and building. He said he was very cognizant of how communities will grow and what it takes to make a community grow in terms of infrastructure. He advised his company has been very successful in their developments in creating large communities, to play a major role in the solution of infrastructure dilemmas. He expressed his

company's commitment to the Region and to the City of Ottawa to work with them and be part of the team effort to solve the problems on the costs of infrastructure.

Councillor Munter asked the delegations to clarify what infrastructure they were willing to pay for (e.g. the \$40 million, cost of infrastructure for the expanded boundaries, the infrastructure that is leading to the area e.g. the Terry Fox Drive, the transit way, the Queensway, etc.). Mr. Bird replied they had had many meetings with their colleagues such as Terrace Investments, Mr. Mathew's organization and other companies involved, and he said it was their pledge and commitment to be involved in all of the aspects of it. He indicated all corporations involved could be brought to the table through the conceptual planning process and allowed to work out an appropriate allotment of the infrastructure dollars.

Councillor Munter said he heard the delegation saying, "we will pay for some of the off-site infrastructure, if we pay less for the on-site infrastructure", which really does not leave the Region further ahead. Mr. Bird said this was not what he was saying. He said having all of the players come and bring their financial power to the table and they will be able to find ways to get the \$100 million dollars or whatever amount is necessary for the needed infrastructure.

Councillor Beamish asked if the delegation was asking that their land be included in the Amendment as well. Mr. Bird replied that was what they were saying.

Having heard from all delegations, the matter returned to Committee for discussion.

Councillor van den Ham referred to page 30 of the staff report, policy 6 c), regarding transportation, and asked for an explanation as to why it refers specifically to the development of a transitway, as he felt this reduced the flexibility of the Region. Ms. Sweet replied the statement was fairly open in terms of the types of transit that could be envisaged here. She confirmed it would not preclude other methods (i.e. a light rail corridor), nor does it impose the transitway's exact location (i.e. on the north side of 417 or the south side), which will be studied as part of an environmental assessment.

Councillor van den Ham then referred to the last sentence of policy 6 d) which read "Golf courses are not permitted within this area". He said he did not agree with staff's reasoning for including this statement and he felt it to be too restrictive. Having heard some of the concerns of the residents, the Councillor felt a golf course could provide a needed buffer zone and as well, high tech companies traditionally like to have recreational facilities around their buildings. He asked for staff comment. Ms. Flavin noted staff's primary concern was that the job target established for this area might not be realized if a large area of land was set aside for a golf course. As well, golf courses sometimes use chemical management, which would be a concern located near the Carp River. Ms. Flavin went on to say, however, that during the concept

planning, once the densities were worked out, there could be some opportunity for a scaled down golf facility (not a full 85 acre golf course). Councillor van den Ham pointed out the statement read “not permitted” and so the concept plan would not even address it. He indicated he would be moving an amendment to change the wording to read “Golf courses should be discouraged”.

With respect to policy 7, which deals with the cost of infrastructure, Councillor van den Ham noted in the last line it stated “or by other means exclusive of property tax”. He said the new City Council may recognize this development as being beneficial across the new City and offered, as an individual living in the east end, he would not object to paying a few extra dollars if necessary, to support this development. The Councillor said he agreed with the intent that this development should pay for itself or a good portion of it anyway but he felt this statement removed flexibility from future Councils. Mr. Tunnacliffe noted the lead in to this statement said the infrastructure will be funded primarily by the development, which would leave a small portion to be funded from taxes, however, he agreed there was conflict in the two statements.

The Councillor then drew staff’s attention to policy 8 on page 31, where it speaks about the approval of Ottawa Council “or its designate”. He asked for an explanation of this. Ms. Sweet advised that in certain instances at the present time, certain approvals are delegated to staff and this will be a decision the new Council will have to make.

Councillor Hume noted, after listening to the delegations, the Committee had heard an overwhelming request for an expansion to what was recommended by staff. He asked what the incremental cost (in terms of infrastructure) would be, of adding that portion south of Maple Grove Road, into the area under consideration. Ms. Flavin advised she would have to review her documents and respond to the Councillor. Councillor Hume emphasized the importance of knowing this because if the proposed area is going to cost \$40 million to develop and the additional area costs \$3 million but there are 10 additional landowners, this would make it that much more affordable for everyone, with a very small incremental cost to the entire process. Ms. Flavin stated she would agree it would be a modest incremental cost but she would have to verify this.

Ms. Sweet pointed out that in addition to some piped infrastructure, if the lands down to Hazeldean Road were included, transportation infrastructure would also be required and, at a minimum, this would include six-laning Hazeldean Road.

Councillor Beamish asked for staff reaction to the concept of adding lands further south in Goulbourn for residential purposes. He asked if it would not help solve some of the transportation problems, by building houses in this area for the people who will work there. Ms. Sweet noted staff feel residential land uses should be looked at in the context of the review

of the Official Plan because people might want to live here or they might want to live in other communities in the new city (i.e. the South Urban Centre or Orleans). She said it is necessary, when examining the need for more residential land, to look at the projected need, the demand and the supply that is currently available. Ms. Sweet advised such a study (for this area or anywhere else in the Region) had not been carried out and staff could therefore not respond to the Councillor's question.

Chair Hunter noted one of the motions put forward, addresses the issue of a study regarding the need for residential land in the area because of the ROPA 9 lands.

The Committee Chair then drew the Committee's attention to the motions put forward.

The first motion, put forward by Councillor Munter, was to amend policy 4.4.6 c) to add "and that transportation studies required to support development applications include the transportation impact on existing roads and communities and propose measures to mitigate those impacts."

Councillor Stewart asked of staff whether this was not done as a matter of course. Brendan Reid, Manager, Transportation Planning, advised that quite often those issues are addressed. But he understood this to be important, in light of what the Committee had heard regarding the impacts on John Street and Katimavik Road. He confirmed this would not add anything that staff would not have anticipated in carrying out the amendment but ensures the issues will be addressed.

Moved by Councillor Munter

That policy 4.4.6 c) be amended to add "and that transportation studies required to support development applications include the transportation impact on existing roads and communities and propose measures to mitigate those impacts."

CARRIED

The next motion, also put forward by Councillor Munter was to add a section h) to policy 4.4.6 to read, "If necessary roads and transit facilities are not in place to accommodate the traffic generated by this development, to the satisfaction of Council, subdivision and siteplan approval will be withheld."

Councillor Munter explained the point of his motion was to ensure that as the development proceeds, if the necessary infrastructure is not in place, to the satisfaction of Council, Council could withhold subdivision and site plan approval. He noted this is in fact the current practice of

the Region. He felt his motion spelled out clearly, so that everyone understands it from the outset, that the Region is not prepared to simply designate land and worry about the infrastructure later. This basically forces it before the new City of Ottawa Council, who can then make the determination as to whether or not the services that are there are adequate.

Councillor Stewart stated she was concerned that if, for whatever reason, the transit facilities are not in place, exactly when the Councillor expects them to be then it would be over. Councillor Munter clarified “transit facilities” is a very generic term and his intent was not that the entire system has to be built, but rather there has to be enough infrastructure to accommodate the development that is happening and noted this would be different from day 1 to year 5 and to the satisfaction of Council.

Chair Hunter felt that there had to be a clarification on the amendment because a simple reading of it might suggest that everything that is necessary to accommodate the roads and transit facilities at the end of development has to be in place before the start of development. He suggested this be left to the concept plan. Councillor Munter agreed to move this motion to be considered as part of the concept plan.

Moved by A. Munter

That the following motion be considered as part of the Concept Plan:

“If necessary roads and transit facilities are not in place to accommodate the traffic generated by this development, to the satisfaction of Council, subdivision and siteplan approval will be withheld.”

CARRIED

The next motion from Councillor Munter was to add a policy 9 to section 4.4, to read “Council shall require (in approving the construction of the extension of Campeau Drive, the extension of Huntmar Drive, the new road from the westerly ramps of the Palladium Drive interchange to Maple Grove Road, and a regional road generally in the Maple Grove right-of-way) that any necessary mitigation measures are in place, or have funding allocated therefore in the capital budget, to ensure the existing roadways can handle the additional traffic generated by the Kanata West Business Park. ”

The Councillor noted this was the crux of the whole infrastructure issue. He referred to an e-mail he had received just prior to the meeting, from a resident saying that although she was supportive of building in Kanata (given the shortage of office space), she was concerned about the impact it would have on Terry Fox Drive as it is already overloaded and dangerous.

Councillor Munter said he receives comments such as this everyday and he stressed the importance of the issue. He noted the key to the community's confidence that this development will be properly planned, is that when the development is happening there is the money to build these off-site roads and measures are in place to protect the residential communities (e.g. John Street, Katimavik Road).

Councillor Stewart asked for staff comment on the amendment. Mr. Reid advised the primary effect of this approach is really to ensure that the widening of Hazeldean Road, the widening and/or extension of Terry Fox Drive and the Castlefrank overpass are reflected in an upcoming budget to indicate to the community that these facilities will be in place in a reasonable timeframe.

Councillor Beamish indicated he would not be supporting this motion. He said it was a great idea in theory but questioned whether this would be done for every growth area in the Region - every business park and every residential growth area. He felt this motion would, in effect, be giving preferential treatment to one ward.

Councillor Hume asked if an environmental assessment (EA) would not have to be done for all of these roads and would it not predict what is going to happen on those roads and therefore propose mitigation measures. Mr. Reid responded the EA process will address all of those issues, however, the motion endeavours to confirm the actual construction will occur. He noted many times EAs are done but the roads do not get built.

The Committee then considered the motion.

Moved by A. Munter

That a section 4.4.9 be added to read "Council shall require (in approving the construction of the extension of Campeau Drive, the extension of Huntmar Drive, the new road from the westerly ramps of the Palladium Drive interchange to Maple Grove Road, and a regional road generally in the Maple Grove right-of-way) that any necessary mitigation measures are in place, or have funding allocated therefore in the capital budget, to ensure the existing roadways can handle the additional traffic generated by the Kanata West Business Park."

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, M. Bellemare, B. Hill, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham...5
YEAS: P. Hume, A. Munter and G. Hunter.....3

The Committee then considered the following motion put forward by Councillor Hill.

WHEREAS the Palladium Autopark development has been approved for site specific land uses and servicing arrangements;

AND WHEREAS agreements have been entered into with landowners in the Terry Fox Business Park concerning the payment of costs associated with these services;

AND WHEREAS it is appropriate to consider the range of permitted uses in these agreements when establishing the funding arrangements for infrastructure improvements related to the Kanata West Business Park;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Policy 4.4.7 of ROPA 9 be changed to read: “The costs of infrastructure required to support development in the Kanata West Business Park (exclusive of infrastructure on Table 6 of the Plan) will be funded primarily by the development through such means as the *Municipal Act* Section 221, a special area development charge levied within the area or by other means exclusive of property tax. The contribution to these costs by the Palladium Auto Park development shall take into account the nature of the uses permitted on these lands by Policy 10.3.3.2 and the contributions already made, or agreed to, for the servicing of these lands. This policy shall not apply to development approved for the Corel Centre in Policy 3.5.2.10.”

At Chair Hunter’s request, Ms. Sweet noted this clarifies staff’s original intention, however, the original wording caught the Auto Park in the same contribution as everyone else in the new expanded Amendment 9 area. Recognizing that the Auto Park amendment has been approved by Council and is in the plan as a separate policy, if the Auto Park decides to change its designation and go for straight business park with high tech employment, they would have to go through another Official Plan Amendment and at that time the new City could address the financial consequences of that. What this motions says is that, depending on what they are doing with the Auto Park, they have already made some arrangements on the sewer capacity, that they may also have to contribute to other areas depending on them coming to the table and negotiating that as well. She confirmed that staff did not have a problem with this motion.

The Committee then approved the motion.

Moved by B. Hill

That Policy 4.4.7 of ROPA 9 be changed to read: “The costs of infrastructure required to support development in the Kanata West Business Park (exclusive of infrastructure on Table 6 of the Plan) will be funded primarily by the development through such

means as the *Municipal Act* Section 221, a special area development charge levied within the area or by other means exclusive of property tax. The contribution to these costs by the Palladium Auto Park development shall take into account the nature of the uses permitted on these lands by Policy 10.3.3.2 and the contributions already made, or agreed to, for the servicing of these lands. This policy shall not apply to development approved for the Corel Centre in Policy 3.5.2.10.”

CARRIED

The next motion put forward by Councillor Hill dealt with the boundaries of the proposed amendment.

WHEREAS, Council on February 23, 2000 authorized the preparation of an amendment to the Regional Official Plan to expand the urban boundary of the West Urban Area, including lands between Maple Grove Road and Hazeldean Road; and

WHEREAS the land between Maple Grove Road and Hazeldean Road was included in the review of the expansion area and supported by the City of Kanata, the Township of West Carleton, and the Township of Goulbourn at the meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee on February 8, 2000; and

WHEREAS, the land between Maple Grove Road and Hazeldean Road is an appropriate location for additional employment uses, will distribute infrastructure costs over a broader area and will assist in keeping the Region competitive; and

WHEREAS, there has been unprecedented co-operation between industry leaders, developers and local and regional governments to meet the growing needs of our community;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the schedules of ROPA 9 be changed to include the land between Maple Grove Road and Hazeldean Road and between the existing urban boundary on the east and the urban boundary of the Village of Stittsville on the west, with the appropriate buffers established between residential and employment areas, during concept planning.

Councillor Hume then asked staff to respond to his earlier question with respect to the incremental cost of adding this land in. Ms. Sweet advised the cost would be \$5.5 million to \$6 million and would be in addition to the \$40 million. She noted staff did not have a calculation for the square foot development charges; the figure quoted in the report of \$5 to \$6 per square foot, was a rather soft estimate. She said one of the things staff want to do through the concept planning is find out if there are other charges, for example the stormwater issues for the local

jurisdiction might come into play. There may be other ways to finance it besides the development charge and so staff would like to examine the total package.

Councillor Munter then proposed an amendment to Councillor Hill's motion. He proposed that all of the "Whereas's" be left as is and simply to substitute a new "Be it resolved", to read : "That Regional Council designate the rural land between Maple Grove Road and Hazeldean Road as Future Urban Area on Schedules A and B. Council shall consider an amendment to redesignate the land to allow urban development provided the amendment is supported by studies which address the following matters:

- appropriate land uses for the area;
- the infrastructure requirements and costs of providing water, wastewater, stormwater management, road and transit systems to serve the proposed development;
- a plan for phasing development in the context of development of the larger area;
- funding arrangements for the required infrastructure;
- the desirability of maintaining a buffer between the urban areas of Kanata and Stittsville;
- impact on resource areas and the natural environment;
- other matters as required elsewhere in the Plan.

The Councillor noted the Committee had heard from a number of the landowners in this area who wanted their land designated because they were looking for assurance (in terms of their investment) that this will be urban land. He explained his suggestion was that it be designated as future urban land in the ROP but that it be phased to develop the 330 net hectares in the current ROPA 9 and then deal with these lands. He suggested this was a compromise between the staff position and what Councillor Hill is proposing.

Committee Chair Hunter noted there would be further studies done on the boundary and felt it could be found that the best and most economical way to proceed would be in the southern area of the ROPA 9 first. He felt this to be true for a couple of reasons. First, the east/west arterials (i.e. Maple Grove Road and Hazeldean Road) are already in place, meaning a fair amount of transportation infrastructure does not have to be built. Secondly, there is a need for the Huntmar extension which goes through these lands. Before an extension can be built, the entire part of that extension has to be acquired. He said it can either be purchased for \$200,000 or it can be required to be dedicated to the Region at no cost as a result of development on adjacent lands. The Chair stated if the development is put into a "never, never zone" the Region (or the new City) will end up paying for it and then when development does take place it will be an off-site cost that is not necessary. He said pragmatically it makes sense to include it all in the same amendment and he urged the Committee not to support Councillor Munter's amendment.

Councillor Stewart indicated she would not be supporting Councillor Munter's amendment but would be supporting Councillor Hill's amendment. She referred to the many delegations talking about the growth that is taking place and felt that it would be better to err by putting too much land out than to get caught short with not enough land. She said it piecemeals the land and would destroy the financial incentives that will help the Region get the Huntmar extension (and other infrastructure) built and it makes sense to include the lands that are adjacent to that new roadway in this package.

Councillor Beamish felt this to be a replacement amendment and suggested that Councillor Hill's motion be voted on first.

Moved by B. Hill

That the Schedules of ROPA 9 be changed to include the land between Maple Grove Road and Hazeldean Road and between the existing urban boundary on the east and the urban boundary of the Village of Stittsville on the west, with the appropriate buffers established between residential and employment areas, during concept planning.

CARRIED

(M. Bellemare and A. Munter
dissented)

Councillor Hill's motion having carried, Chair Hunter ruled Councillor Munter's motion redundant.

The next motion from Councillor Hill concerned concept planning and read:

WHEREAS it is critical that the next steps in the planning process proceed expeditiously to deliver employment lands consistent with market demand;

AND WHEREAS the landowners are prepared to finance and coordinate the preparation of the concept planning exercise, identified in policy 4.4.8 of ROPA 9;

AND WHEREAS the landowners are positioned to initiate the above-noted concept planning exercise in a timely manner particularly in light of delays anticipated by the current transition to the new City of Ottawa;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that ROPA 9 be changed to include a new policy 4.4.9 as follows: "That the Concept Plan identified in Policy 4.4.8 above, shall be prepared and financed by the area landowners, for approval by Regional Council or the new City of Ottawa Council,

or its designate, in consultation with municipal staff, other interested parties and the public. The Concept Plan shall include the means by which the cost of infrastructure required to support development in the benefitting area can be funded and apportioned among the landowners.”

Councillor Hume referred to the letter from Terrace Corporation, which stated they support the concept planning process but it read “we support this landowner initiative under the guidance and review of Regional staff”. He noted guidance and review were quite different than consultation. He asked staff how they would view this amendment. Ms. Sweet said she saw the amendment as very minimally involving staff. She said she understood this had been done in many local municipal jurisdictions, where they have received financial contributions to do major planning studies (e.g. Kanata North, South Urban Centre), where developers had contributed but it was led by the planning staff. She noted staff have the overall information readily at their fingertips and they can play the role of mediator between land developers, neighbours, the community and the public. She saw this proposal as being quite a different approach and felt staff would have some problems trying to be party to the whole thing. Councillor Hume proposed that Councillor Hill’s motion be amended by inserting (after the word designate) “under the guidance and review of municipal staff and in consultation with other interested parties and the public”, and put forward the following motion to replace Councillor Hill’s.

Moved by P. Hume

That a new policy 4.4.9 be added to ROPA 9 as follows: “That the Concept Plan identified in Policy 4.4.8 above, shall be prepared and financed by the area landowners, for approval by Regional Council or the new City of Ottawa Council, or its designate, under the guidance and review of municipal staff and in consultation with other interested parties and the public. The Concept Plan shall include the means by which the cost of infrastructure required to support development in the benefitting area can be funded and apportioned among the landowners.”

CARRIED

The next motion from Councillor Hill, read:

WHEREAS the Regional Development Strategy as set out in the Region’s Official Plan seeks to maintain an appropriate balance between jobs and households;

AND WHEREAS the number of jobs anticipated by ROPA 9 will increase the demand for housing and therefore generate an increased need for residential land;

AND WHEREAS new housing should be situated close to new centres of employment to reduce commuting and greenhouse gas emissions and serve employment areas;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that ROPA 9 be changed to include a new policy 4.4.10 as follows: "That a study be undertaken to assess the housing demand and required residential land supply resulting from the employment numbers generated by the expanding West Urban Area and, specifically the Kanata West Business Park. The study shall review the appropriate balance of jobs to households and shall identify the locations where required residential land can best be accommodated in close proximity to the expanding employment area, in a manner consistent with the policies of the Region's Official Plan."

Councillor Munter indicated he had a motion to refer this motion to the new city with a request that it review residential needs and jobs and housing balance in the context of the new Official Plan for the City of Ottawa. He said he felt it important to consider just a few months ago Committee and Council approved the Kanata North Urban expansion which added approximately 1,500 new housing units. There is now in the City of Kanata, the capacity for some 17,800 new residential housing units and, as a point of reference, advised there are currently approximately 20,000 dwelling units in the City of Kanata. In other words there is enough land designated for urban development to practically rebuild the entire City of Kanata. The Councillor felt that as the new City will be undergoing an Official Plan review, it made sense as part of that exercise to do this review.

At Councillor Stewart's request, Ms. Sweet advised she would support Councillor Munter's approach. She noted even if the amendment were approved, staff would have to follow the policies of the Regional Official Plan, and would have to examine whether there was a need for these extra housing units, what the population projections were and are there other areas where people might want to live. She agreed the best time to do this review would be in the context of the Official Plan review and noted it would be preferable than to expect staff to respond in the next few months, as this is a very big exercise.

Councillor Hill stated she felt this was the appropriate time to put this forward and asked that the Committee support her motion.

Councillor van den Ham indicated he would be supporting the motion from Councillor Hill. He said although he could understand staff's comments with respect to doing it the way they see fit, the owners of the land in question had indicated their desire and willingness to be part of the whole process and in terms of funding the business park, the Councillor felt this was an important component of that.

Councillor Hume asked when the study would get underway. Ms. Sweet advised this study would likely get caught up in the mix of the new Official Plan in any event because in all practicality she did not think this study could be done by the end of this year. She noted the concept plan will take a bit of time and be brought to the new council and she felt this component would be part of the concept plan.

Moved by A. Munter

That Councillor Hill's motion regarding the residential study be referred to the New City, with a request it review residential needs and jobs and housing balance in the context of the new Official Plan for the City of Ottawa.

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, P. Hume, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham.....5

YEAS: M. Bellemare, A. Munter and G. Hunter....3

The Committee then considered Councillor Hill's motion.

Moved by B. Hill

That a new policy 4.4.10 be added to ROPA 9, as follows: "That a study be undertaken to assess the housing demand and required residential land supply resulting from the employment numbers generated by the expanding West Urban Area and, specifically the Kanata West Business Park. The study shall review the appropriate balance of jobs to households and shall identify the locations where required residential land can best be accommodated in close proximity to the expanding employment area, in a manner consistent with the policies of the Region's Official Plan."

CARRIED

(M. Bellemare and A. Munter
dissented)

The Committee then considered the following motion from Councillor Munter.

Moved by A. Munter

That staff be directed to consider the following recommendations from the City of Kanata, in the development of the Concept Plan:

- a) increasing the upper threshold of the employment target in the Concept Plan to 26,000 jobs to enable possible development within the lands adjacent to the Limestone Resource area on the western boundary;**
- b) requiring the Concept Plan to preserve the opportunity to maintain a prominent gateway feature on the westernmost limits of the Huntmar Road/417 interchange.**

CARRIED

The Committee then turned their attention to the following motions from Councillor Munter.

That staff be directed to include the following recommendations from the City of Kanata in ROPA 9:

- a) moving the southwestern boundary (south of the #417) to a point northeastward to enable a more definitive buffer with the existing urban area and to assist in accommodating the most prominent aspects of the Environmental Feature;
- b) revising the road pattern to add Huntmar Road and Richardson Road widenings at the north end of the Kanata West Business Park. Also identify roads south of the Palladium/Huntmar as conceptual to enable further consideration of an appropriate urban buffer and practical road pattern, to be implemented through the Concept Plan.
- c) identifying new recreational pathways as conceptual until further consideration can be given to appropriate locations and local links, to be implemented through the Concept Plan.
- d) considering a size reduction rather than a deletion of the eastern portion of the Schedule 'K' Environmental Feature and seeking ways to incorporate this as an urban buffer while maintaining appropriate preservation requirements.
- e) confirming in the Regional Official Plan Amendment that zoning is the primary implementation vehicle once the Concept Plan is approved.
- f) restricting any development south of Maple Grove Road, if it should be permitted, to corridor development fronting along Huntmar Road.

Committee Chair Hunter ruled items a) and f) of Councillor Munter's motion redundant as Councillor Hill's motion with respect to the boundaries, had been approved by the Committee. As well, he ruled item d) out of order. With respect to item e), Chair Hunter asked for staff comment. Ms. Sweet said the motion is confirming that it is not some other system such as development permits, that the new City will perhaps institute for certain areas. She said the intent of Councillor Munter's motion, is the current practice of the Region. Councillor Munter asked that sections b) and c) be referred to staff for consideration in the development of the Concept Plan.

Moved by A. Munter

That staff be directed to consider the following recommendations from the City of Kanata, in the development of the Concept Plan:

- **revising the road pattern to add Huntmar Road and Richardson Road widenings at the north end of the Kanata West Business Park. Also identify roads south of the Palladium/Huntmar as conceptual to enable further consideration of an appropriate urban buffer and practical road pattern, to be implemented through the Concept Plan.**
- **identifying new recreational pathways as conceptual until further consideration can be given to appropriate locations and local links, to be implemented through the Concept Plan.**

CARRIED

Moved by A. Munter

That it be confirmed in ROPA 9 that zoning is the primary implementation vehicle once the Concept Plan is approved.

CARRIED

The Committee then considered a motion from Councillor Beamish to include in the boundaries of ROPA 9, all of Lot 4, Concession 1 in West Carleton (Brian Black's land). Chair Hunter noted Mr. Black had made a brief presentation to Committee to include his land in the Kanata West Business Park. He noted the land is to the west of Huntmar Road near the aggregate area.

Councillor Beamish noted Mr. Black's family has owned the land for many years and he said he could see no rationale for not extending the boundary straight across. He said his motion did not propose that the whole of the Black's parcel be included but rather half of the farm that they own (approximately 40 hectares). He said this would basically extend the northern boundary so that it would become one straight line across the top.

At Councillor Munter's request, Ms. Sweet advised inclusion of this land would add approximately 35 net hectares and advised one of the biggest problems with adding all of this land is how will it be serviced from a transportation point of view. There may be some solutions to that but they would cost more money. The Councillor noted this could mean for example, that Richardson Side Road which is not on the list to be expanded, might have to be.

Moved by D. Beamish

That the boundary of the Kanata West Business Park include all of Lot 4, Concession 1, in West Carleton.

LOST

NAYS: M. Bellemare, P. Hume, A. Munter and G. Munter....4

YEAS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham....4

Moved by R. van den Ham

That policy 4.4. 6 d) be amended by replacing “Golf courses are not permitted within the area” with “Golf courses should be discouraged within the area.”

CARRIED

(M. Bellemare and A. Munter
dissented)

Commissioner Tunnacliffe pointed out, as the Committee had dealt with the Official Plan, on page 31 of the Agenda and increased the 24,000 jobs in 8 a) to 26,000, he felt the additional land should also be considered. He explained that as it is written, the same number of jobs and the same amount of office space will be spread out over a larger area.

Chair Hunter noted the Committee had heard from the delegations that the Region is underestimating the demand for businesses that will want to go in this area and the businesses bring with them employees. He agreed that because the Committee had dealt with the land issue, they should also deal with the employment issue as well.

Councillor Munter stated the issue is that all of the analysis around roads and transit is based on how many people will need to be moved around, so it is necessary to know that when the planning is being done. He agreed with the Chair that because the Committee added an extra 144 hectares, the jobs should also be increased. Based on the 144 additional hectares, Ms. Sweet advised a rough calculation would be to add about 10,000 more jobs. Mr. Tunnacliffe stated 8 a) should then read 31,000 to 36,000 jobs. Councillor Stewart agreed to move a motion to this effect.

Moved by W. Stewart

That policy 4.4.8 a) of ROPA 9 be amended to replace “21,000 to 24,000 jobs” with “31,000 to 36,000 jobs”.

CARRIED

The Committee then considered the report as amended.

Moved by B. Hill

1. That, having held a public meeting, Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council enact a bylaw to adopt draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 9 to the 1997 Regional Official Plan, attached as Annex A to this report, as amended by the following:
 - a) That policy 4.4.6 c) be amended to add “and that transportation studies required to support development applications include the transportation impact on existing roads and communities and propose measures to mitigate those impacts.”
 - b) That policy 4.4.6 d) be amended by replacing “Golf courses are not permitted within the area” with “Golf courses should be discouraged within the area”
 - c) That policy 4.4.7 be changed to read “The costs of infrastructure required to support development in the Kanata West Business Park (exclusive of infrastructure on Table 6 of the Plan) will be funded primarily by the development through such means as the Municipal Act Section 221, a special area development charge levied within the area or by other means exclusive of property tax. The contribution to these costs by the Palladium Auto Park development shall take into account the nature of the uses permitted on these lands by Policy 10.3.3.2, and the contributions already made, or agreed to, for the servicing of these lands. This policy shall not apply to development approved for the Corel Centre in Policy 3.5.2.10.”
 - d) That the Schedules of ROPA 9 be changed to include the land between Maple Grove Road and Hazeldean Road and between the existing urban boundary on the east and the urban boundary of the Village of Stittsville on the west, with the appropriate buffers established between residential and employment areas, during concept planning.
 - e) That policy 4.4.8 a) of ROPA 9 be amended to replace “21,000 to 24,000 jobs” with “31,000 to 36,000 jobs”

- f) That a new policy 4.4.9 be added to ROPA 9, as follows: That the Concept Plan identified in Policy 4.4.8 above, shall be prepared and financed by area landowners, for approval by Regional Council or the new City of Ottawa Council, or its designate, under the guidance and review of municipal staff and in consultation with other interested parties and the public. The Concept Plan shall include the means by which the cost of infrastructure required to support development in the benefiting area can be funded and apportioned among the landowners.
 - g) That a new policy 4.4.10 be added to ROPA 9, as follows: That a study be undertaken to assess the housing demand and required residential land supply resulting from the employment numbers generated by the expanding West Urban Area and, specifically, the Kanata West Business Park. The study shall review the appropriate balance of jobs to households and shall identify the locations where required residential land can best be accommodated in close proximity to the expanding employment area, in a manner consistent with the policies of the Region's Official Plan.
 - h) That it be confirmed in ROPA 9 that zoning is the primary implementation vehicle once the Concept Plan is approved.
2. That the following motion be considered as part of the Concept Plan:
"If necessary roads and transit facilities are not in place to accommodate the traffic generated by this development, to the satisfaction of Council, subdivision and siteplan approval will be withheld."
3. That staff be directed to consider the following recommendations in the development of the Concept Plan:
- a) increasing the upper threshold of the employment target in the Concept Plan to 26,000 jobs to enable possible development within the lands adjacent to the Limestone Resource area on the western boundary.
 - b) requiring the Concept Plan to preserve the opportunity to maintain a prominent gateway feature on the westernmost limits of the Huntmar Road/#417 interchange.
 - c) revising the road pattern to add Huntmar Road and Richardson Road widenings at the north end of the KWBP. Also identify roads south of the Palladium/Huntmar as conceptual to enable further consideration of an

appropriate urban buffer and practical road pattern, to be implemented through the Concept Plan.

d) identifying new recreational pathways as conceptual until further consideration can be given to appropriate locations and local links, to be implemented through the Concept Plan

CARRIED as amended
(A. Munter dissented)

2. PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN
AMENDMENT 15 - WEST CARLETON ESTATES RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 24 Aug 2000

Committee Chair Hunter began by reading a statement required under the Planning Act, wherein he advised that anyone, whose intention it was to appeal ROPA 15 to the Ontario Municipal Board, must either voice their objections at the public meeting or submit their comments in writing prior to Amendment 15 being adopted by Regional Council. Failure to do so could result in refusal/dismissal of the appeal by the OMB.

Joseph Phelan, Senior Project Manager, Planning and Development Approvals, then provided Committee with an overview of the staff report.

Michael Walters, Divisional Landfill Manager, Canadian Waste Services, advised he was responsible for all landfill operations within the north-eastern Ontario division, including the West Carleton landfill site comes under that jurisdiction. Mr. Walters introduced David Harding, Water and Earth Sciences, the consultant responsible for implementation of the CSW environmental monitoring program since 1991 and noted Mr. Harding had reviewed the documents provided by the proponent to substantiate his claim. A written copy of Mr. Walter's presentation is held on file with the Regional Clerk.

Mr. Walters noted CSW was not opposed to this development as a company, rather they actively support the orderly development of the industrial, commercial and residential growth within the communities that they serve. However, he said he was before the Committee to oppose proposed amendment 15. He explained the reason for CSW's opposition is that the proponent claims wrongly that groundwater on the proponent's property has been affected by leachate from their West Carleton landfill and that this creates a public health hazard, thereby justifying a connection to the existing watermain on Carp Road. Mr. Walters stressed that the claim made by the proponent is completely unsubstantiated and untrue. CSW West Carleton Landfill site is having absolutely no impact on the proponent's property.

Mr. Walters went on to say that over \$1.2 million has been spent on CSW's ground water and service water monitoring program since 1987 and can clearly state that the CSW landfill is having no impact on this property. He noted Mr. Harding of Water and Earth Science had reviewed the documentation submitted by the proponent and provided Committee with some of the highlights of that review. The proponent's hydrogeologist report does not provide any factual data to substantiate the claim. The proponent's consultant conducted no testing or calculations or collected any information which could be used to substantiate the inference that is stated in the documents. More importantly, Mr. Walters noted the groundwater flow direction from the landfill site is not oriented towards the proposed subdivision but rather in an easterly/north-easterly direction from the landfill. The proponent's consultant conducted no groundwater flow measurements for the preliminary hydrogeological report. There were no similarities between the chemical analysis for the groundwater collected by the proponent's consultant and the leachate indicators that are monitored at the West Carleton landfill.

Mr. Walters went on to say that until a week and a half earlier, he had no knowledge of this matter. He said at no time did the proponent have any discussion or voice concerns with Canadian Waste Services on any of these issues.

In conclusion, Mr. Walters stated CSW was not opposed to the development, however the taxpayers of the Region do not need to subsidize this private undertaking by providing water connection to the Regional system. CSW has been a proven supporter of this community and they take their responsibility seriously in operating a safe and secure landfill site. The proponents unsubstantiated claims attempt to undermine this unique working relationship that CSW has with their community. He felt the proposed amendment would become precedent setting within the Region and should be denied.

Murray Chown, Novatech Engineering, appeared before the Committee on behalf of the proponent and advised he had been involved with this property in excess of three year and noted he had first approached Regional staff on this project two years ago (September, 1998) to discuss the approach to the development of this piece of land. Mr. Chown referred to a package of documents he had provided to Committee members and is held on file with the Regional Clerk.

Addressing the issue of whether or not this is an appropriate site for the development of an estate lot subdivision and golf course, Mr. Chown advised when he first saw the subject property he was overwhelmed by the attractiveness of the site, its location and its good access to the Queensway, the Carp Road and reasonable proximity to the Corel Centre. He offered his opinion this location is ideal for a small estate lot development and a golf course. Mr. Chown went on to say staff have gone out of their way to speak in terms of the incompatibility of this residential development with some of the existing adjacent uses. However, they have

failed to point out that there is a substantial amount of residential development in the immediate vicinity of the subject property, some of which is even closer to the Carson Quarry than this site is. Mr. Chown pointed out the estate lot subdivision and golf course, are uses permitted under both the Regional Official Plan and the Township of West Carleton's Official Plan.

The speaker said initially it was thought that this development would proceed on private wells and private septic systems. However, given the concern with contamination of the groundwater in this vicinity along Carp Road and directions from the Ministry of Environment not to develop on private wells, and given the proximity of the watermain, Mr. Chown's client decided to consider the possibility of hooking up to the municipal water. Despite this, the proponent was directed by Regional staff, to carry out testing to determine whether or not there was an adequate quantity and quality of groundwater to service this development. This work was undertaken by J.D. Patterson and Associates and the studies concluded there is more than sufficient quantity of groundwater to service a residential development and in fact the water quality meets the Ontario Drinking water objectives. He said on this basis, his client could make application for development of this subdivision on full private services (and in fact has done so). Mr. Chown went on to say however, the analysis done by J. D. Patterson identified some trace elements of chemical compounds in that groundwater, that are a threat to health.

He said his client was faced with the decision of whether to accept there is nothing wrong with the groundwater there and go ahead and develop on private services or do they connect to the very large (16 inch) watermain that is already there. Mr. Chown felt the decision was very simple and logical but it had taken two years to get before the Committee for a decision on whether or not his client should be allowed to connect to that watermain.

Mr. Chown then addressed a couple of points in the staff report that he felt needed to be dealt with. The first concerned the discussion about where and how his client was going to be able to build septic systems on this site. The report in several locations makes reference to poorly drained soils, organic soils, etc. places where you should not build septic systems. Mr. Chown noted there are two terrains on the site - one is truly poorly drained organic soils, not a good location for septic systems. He referred to the coloured aerial photos he had provided to members of the Committee and noted all of that land is set aside for a golf course and his clients were not proposing to build septic systems on that land. The reference to the site being unsuitable for septic systems is not only misleading, it is wrong. Half of that site is in fact suitable for septic systems and the reports submitted to the Region in support of the draft plan of subdivision, confirm that.

The speaker noted the second comment that keeps recurring in the report is the suggestion that the test well results are incomplete. He indicated he had two concerns with that issue. Firstly, the information about the wells was made available to staff in January, 2000, yet the first he

heard that they thought it was incomplete was when he read the staff report the previous Friday. His second point was that the test well put down was at the extreme west end of the site and very close to the lots that are set back off of the Carp Road. If his clients were to develop on private services, there would be half a dozen private residential wells located in the immediate proximity of that test well and that is the test well that identified the trace elements that are a risk. He said he was reasonably confident if wells were put down at the east end of the site, they would not find any of these trace elements. He noted as well, the golf course could be irrigated from surface water or groundwater, yet the wording of the amendment would prevent his client from irrigating from municipal water.

Mr. Chown pointed out that all of the existing homes on Lloyd Alex Crescent (adjacent to the subject property) are on municipal water and private septic systems, as are all of the existing businesses on Carp Road and many of the existing businesses in the industrial park. He opined this development would be no different than Cedar Hills Golf Course in Nepean and is not a unique situation. He cautioned the Committee that if his client were to proceed with private wells, it is possible that the Region or his client could face legal action in the future.

In conclusion, Mr. Chown asked the Committee to modify the recommendation before the Committee to recommend to Council that they approve ROPA 15. As well, he requested a minor modification to the amendment to provide water services to the club house as well as the 60 residential units.

Councillor Beamish asked what the available capacity would be within the watermain on Carp Road, as he felt it would not be likely that capacity would be used up. Mr. Phelan replied this was probably true, but he could not say for certain. He noted the watermain was designed for existing development in the Lydia and Reid subdivisions, that were experiencing or faced the possibility of experiencing water contamination. He said it was not meant for future growth.

Councillor Beamish asked if there were some kind of contamination on the other side of the Queensway, was it expected that the watermain would be extended to service those properties. Mr. Phelan advised the way the legal agreement was set out, if it were demonstrated that leachate was shown to come from the CSW site, and the MOE agreed with that determination, then CSW could be liable to extend the pipe.

Councillor van den Ham asked if this application was based on the proponent paying their associated costs for the water hook-up. Mr. Chown confirmed this, noting there was no expectation of CSW to pay for this.

Elizabeth Ginn, advised she has lived on Lloyd Alex Crescent for over 35 years. She noted originally they were on wells and septic, then were hooked up to the municipal water in the

1980's. She said she had an acre of land and her son had an acre of land. According to the proponent's plan, the first hole of the golf course would be right at the back of her property. She said she has spoken with several people in the real estate field who advised a golf course would increase the value of hers and her neighbours lands. Ms. Ginn pointed out the water is right at the corner of Lloyd Alex Crescent and Rothburn Road and the proponents would not have to go up to Carp Road to connect.

Tim Chadder, Planner, Township of West Carleton, advised this subdivision is permitted by the West Carleton Official Plan. He noted it would permit one acre lots instead of two acre lots provided they are building in a recreational feature, such as a golf course. This is subject to their ability of providing full rural services on a normal basis. As such the applications were filed with the Township to amend the plan and noted as being a partially serviced subdivision (i.e. water), because of the direction the Township had received with respect to the concern about potential groundwater contamination. Mr. Chown advised West Carleton Council had not yet reviewed the details of the application, as it is scheduled to go to a public meeting on October 3. They did however review the proposed ROPA 15 and felt it appeared logical under the Township's Official Plan to continue with this application as it is. He said they had no objection to it going on water servicing based on the information they had at the time, concerning the safety issue.

Mr. Chadder advised, in discussions with the Township of Goulbourn, it was agreed this would be a compatible use, to existing residential and the business park to the south and in fact would create a buffer for existing residential uses on the West Carleton side. When West Carleton looked at the subdivision plan, the idea of providing the link from Carp Road which would create a four way intersection where the industrial park currently enters onto Carp Road, appeared to be a logical connection point. As well, the connection to Maple Grove provided a link for the residential traffic. In summary, Mr. Chadder stated West Carleton Council was supporting the intent of the amendment and, although he had not discussed with them proceeding without the water service, it would still meet all of the requirements of West Carleton's official Plan.

Committee Chair Hunter asked if the proponent would have to do any improvements off-site for the connection at the east end. Mr. Chadder advised there would have to be upgrading to the existing area where it is built up. There is John Street and one other street to the west of John Street where it has been approved to (just past that intersection) and then where ever the connection is, the proponents would be responsible for the upgrade. West Carleton reviewed the development charges last year and deleted any contribution for off-site in the development charge itself. This is all done through the subdivision agreements.

Councillor Munter indicated he would be moving the staff recommendation that ROPA 15 be refused.

Councillor Beamish stated he would like to see this issue deferred. Chair Hunter noted a Regional Official Plan Amendment must be deferred to a date specific.

Councillor Beamish felt that Canadian Waste Services had been caught off-guard by this application and he wondered if they might be able to be convinced by Novatech and the consultants to be supportive of this application or at least withdraw their objection to tapping into that watermain. He felt there was some discussion that could happen with Canadian Waste and Regional staff about the possibility of tying into that watermain.

The Chair noted that although deferral was possible, he pointed out that Canadian Waste did not have any influence at all on the position of staff. He said it was simply a matter of those in the urban area must connect to the water supply and those outside of the urban area do not get the urban water supply. He noted the Region had been very strict on drawing that line because of the precedential nature of it.

Councillor Beamish commented that a 16 inch watermain is a large watermain and could serve many properties, far more than there is built out there now. He offered his opinion that it would be better to allow a connection to a readily available watermain, than to put 60 wells down, which may become contaminated at some time.

On the issue of the timing of the deferral, Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law noted that the last meeting that Regional Council can adopt a Regional Official Plan Amendment is October 25th. After that no new amendment can be adopted until the new city Council is in place.

Councillor van den Ham indicated he would not be supporting a motion for deferral. He said although it was clear that the guidelines dictate one does not hook up to municipal water in the rural area, he felt that a little common sense should be used. He noted no one has any idea what will happen down the road and he felt that in spite of the guidelines, this was a special circumstance and the safety of everyone concerned should be considered. He felt the Committee should proceed with the Amendment and indicated he would be supporting it.

Moved by D. Beamish

That consideration of this item be deferred to the Planning and Environment Committee meeting of 10 October 2000

CARRIED
(R. van den Ham dissented)

3. GROWTH IN OTTAWA-CARLETON, 1996-1999 AND
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated
16 Aug 2000

Given the late hour and the importance of this item, Councillor Stewart put forward a motion to defer consideration of this matter to the next meeting of Planning and Environment Committee (i.e. 26 September 2000). Mr. Tunnacliffe advised the Committee a report was going to the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee meeting of 19 September 2000, asking for money to get on with the design of these pieces of infrastructure. Councillor Stewart stated it would be possible to fast track this item to Council and she preferred to give it the time and attention it deserved.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen indicated she had waited the entire meeting for this item and said it would be her preference to deal with it now, however, she said she would leave it to the Committee.

Councillor Beamish noted that some members of the development community had concerns about some of the numbers presented in the report. Many of these people had left at this point and he felt it should be deferred.

Councillor van den Ham felt that the delegation should be heard from and then the item could be dealt with at the next meeting.

Moved by W. Stewart

That consideration of this item be deferred to the Planning and Environment Committee meeting of 26 September 2000.

CARRIED

(G. Hunter, A. Munter and
R. van den Ham dissented)

4. REVISED DRAFT PLAN CONDITIONS - HISTORIC ELMWOOD
COUNTRY LOT SUBDIVISION - TOWNSHIP OF WEST CARLETON

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated
20 Aug 2000

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the revised draft conditions (attached as Annex A) for draft plan of subdivision 06T-98025.

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEMS

5. DELEGATION ON SPREADING OF BIOSOLIDS

- Chair, Planning and Environment Committee's report dated 31 Aug 2000

Gary Stewart and Jacqueline Stewart appeared before the Committee. Mr. Stewart advised that five months earlier he had been oblivious to any water problems in Ontario. He said he and his wife had just come back from Walkerton, where the water is still not drinkable nor are they able to bathe in it.

He advised that because he was a layman and this is a very complex subject, he could only touch on a few aspects of it. Mr. Stewart noted there are three types of biosolids: Type A which is the most processed there is, it usually gets rid of all viruses, pathogens, e-coli, etc. but it does not get rid of heavy metals. Type A processing is done very little in the city. Type B, is processed but still can carry salmonella, e-coli, hepatitis B and various other pathogens. Type C, which is the worst type is plain septic tank residue or the residue from portable toilets or in the smaller villages, lagoons and this is being spread directly on farm fields.

The speaker went on to say that according to the staff report of 12 September 2000, there is a requirement for set back distances - as if you could set back the application of biosolids so far from wells that there would be no problem. He said even the experts do not know the direction the aquifer will go in. Mr. Stewart then referred to a book he had which reported that all of the municipalities in Ontario discharge raw sewage into the rivers, including Ottawa. This process is called by-passing and is done when there are very high water levels on the streets and so on. He advised that Ottawa in 1996, by-passed the system twice. In 1999, it did not improve, in fact they by-passed the system seven times. Mr. Stewart pointed out that Ottawa is actually doing pretty well, compared to Niagara Falls, Ontario who in 1996 by-passed the system 94 times.

Mr. Stewart questioned how Ontario's fresh water supply, the envy of the world, could be allowed to deteriorate in the last few decades to the point where much of the public is buying bottled water from selected sources. He felt this defied the imagination. In closing, Mr. Stewart questioned whether the Committee members would have an answer when in the future, their grandchildren ask them "why can't we drink the water", "why did you not do something".

That Planning and Environment Committee receive this report for information.

RECEIVED

6. COUNCIL INQUIRY - EXTERNAL ANAEROBIC DIGESTER
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner' report dated 15 Aug 2000

That Planning and Environment Committee receive this report for information.

RECEIVED

7. TRAIL ROAD LANDFILL SITE - LEACHATE PRE-TREATMENT RESEARCH PROGRAM
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner' report dated 15 Aug 2000

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee and Council approve the following research on leachate pre-treatment initiatives, for a total provision of \$466,903.01:

1. **Three grant requests from the following universities to do research on the pre-treatment of leachate from the Trail Road Landfill, for a total contract provision of \$119,000:**

• University of Guelph, Alfred, ON	\$25,000
• Carleton University, Ottawa, ON	\$46,000
• University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON	\$48,000

2. **The appointment of the following consulting firms, RFP No. 00200-92535-P01, to undertake leachate pre-treatment research for a total contract provision of \$347,903.01 (which includes professional fees, disbursements and GST):**

• SAIC Canada, Gloucester, ON	\$106,163.26
• GPEC International Ltd., Ottawa, ON	\$ 66,259.75
• Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, Ottawa, ON	\$ 69,550.00
• Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, Ottawa, ON	\$105,930.00

CARRIED

8. MOE DRINKING WATER REGULATIONS
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner' report dated 15 Aug 2000

That Planning and Environment Committee and Council receive this report regarding the new Provincial Drinking Water Regulations, for information.

RECEIVED

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. BIOSOLIDS UTILIZATION PROGRAM STATUS UPDATE
- Director, Water Environment Protection Division's report dated 29 Aug 2000

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

COMMITTEE CHAIR