

MINUTES  
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON  
CHAMPLAIN ROOM  
20, 21 AND 22 MAY 1997

**PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER  
DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN,  
DRAFT WATER AND WASTEWATER MASTER PLANS, AND  
DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENTS**

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

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

Regrets: B. Hill

Tuesday, 20 May 1997 - 9:00 a.m.

Committee Chair Hunter began this session (and each subsequent session) by reading a statement required under the Planning Act. He advised that anyone, who intended to request referral of the Draft Regional Official Plan to the Ontario Municipal Board, must either voice their objections at the public meeting or submit their comments in writing. Failure to do so could result in refusal/dismissal of the referral by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the Ontario Municipal Board.

Pamela Sweet, Director, Planning and Infrastructure Policy Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department and Kim Eaton, Senior Project Manager, Environment, Planning and Development Approvals Department, provided overviews of the staff reports on the Draft Regional Official Plan and the Draft Water and Wastewater Master Plans, respectively.

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
  2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 09 July 97 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 61.

### PUBLIC DELEGATIONS

Bob Jarvis, speaking on behalf of Canril Corporation (938966 Ontario Ltd.), (Submission No. 297) the proponents of a regionally-centred power/entertainment complex at the south-east quadrant of the intersection of Highway 416 and New Strandherd Drive, Nepean, to be known as Carleton Capital Centre. Mr. Jarvis explained the centre was to be a Regional destination centre including cinemas, sports complex, entertainment facilities, hotel, outlet mall and box retail facilities. The speaker noted that because the proposal did not conform with either the Regional Official Plan (ROP) or Nepean Official Plan which envisioned Regional scale retail facilities limited to the “Town Centre” (or “Activity Centre”), the proponents have had to proceed with care.

Mr. Jarvis advised that a market study was undertaken (completed in May 1997 and to be available to Nepean and Regional staff shortly) which concluded there was room in the market place for both the Carleton Capital Centre and the Activity Centre, provided the Carleton Capital Centre is phased and scaled back in its first phase. The study suggested the first phase of the Canril proposal should be limited to 490,000 to 520,000 square feet with retail facilities limited to 310,000 to 325,000 square feet. The balance of the first phase (190,000 square feet) would include cinema facilities, entertainment facility, sportsplex, a hotel, auto-centre and restaurants.

Mr. Jarvis explained the land is currently designated as “Business Park”; in order to proceed with this proposal, Canril requires the land to be designated “Regional Scale Retail Facility” (for an Urban Entertainment Centre). He stated the proposal is incompatible with the Business Park designation because it does not meet the established criteria and also there is no demand for business park uses in this area. He noted the proposed development meets the criteria established in Section 4.1.2.12 (Economic Development) of the Draft ROP (page 45) in that it would provide economic benefit to the Region, would have access to regional and local services (e.g. located adjacent to Highway 416), would not impact on the environment or agricultural or mineral resource lands and is compatible with surrounding development. He pointed out Regional power centres are “car oriented” and should therefore be located on major arterials; he noted this type of facility is not transit-dependent.

Mr. Jarvis asked that, as per Section 4.7.3.1 (Retail Facilities and Commercial Services, page 57), Canril’s land be designated on Schedule B as Regional Retail Warehouse Facility with an Urban Entertainment component. Further, he asked that Section 4.7.3.3 be amended by eliminating the requirement for this facility to be adjacent to an existing or proposed transitway station. The speaker also took issue with Section 4.7.3.8 (the cap established for build-out of the Town Centre) and Section 9.4.3 (transit requirements for business parks and retail facilities).

In conclusion, Mr. Jarvis stated the proposed development would generate a tremendous amount of tax revenue (both for the Region and Nepean), would create jobs, provide good economic spinoffs and attract people from outside of the community. He urged the Committee to support this proposal.

Murray Chown, Novatech, (Submission Nos. 189, 205 and 253) advised he was appearing on behalf of a number of clients. Referring to comment 628, on page 234 of the staff report (which deals with capacity problems of the sanitary sewer system), Mr. Chown noted the policy sets out, where sanitary flows from new developments are entering into older sanitary sewers in Ottawa and Nepean, removal of equivalent flows from the existing system is required before the development can proceed. He noted that developers have no means or rights by which to do this and he asked that the policy be modified to explain exactly what is expected of developers when they are proposing site-development where capacity is an issue.

Speaking on behalf of North American Realty, which has an interest in property in the Terry Fox Business Park in the City of Kanata, Mr. Chown advised his client was satisfied with the policies proposed. He noted however, his client wished to reserve his right to appeal the Draft ROP to the OMB, in the event the Plan adopted by Council places limitations on small to big box uses (retail warehouses) in business parks.

Mr. Chown then addressed his third item, namely, the property owned by the Boyds in City of Gloucester, immediately to the north of Gloucester Glen. He noted the property is the subject of an Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) hearing scheduled to commence on 27 May 1997, dealing with Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) 35 and City of Gloucester OPA 13. The Draft ROP designates the site as part of the General Urban Area, which is consistent with a compromise that has been worked out between the property owners, the Region and the City of Gloucester; among other things, this compromise deals with the issue of the opportunity for this property to develop on private services. Referring to page 25 of the staff report, Comment 59, Mr. Chown asked for clarification of the last paragraph which reads in part "the policy was introduced to allow minor uses such as a church or a small store...". Mr. Chown noted it was his understanding the policy would allow for his client's proposed development of seven single family lots on private services.

On the issue of airport noise, Mr. Chown expressed concern about Policy 5 of Section 11.6.1 which states 'Council shall seek the advice of the Airport Authority...', as he felt the Airport Authority would not be flexible about the interpretation of Policy 4.

At the Committee's request, Ms. Sweet clarified, with respect to the Boyd property (which is being considered by the OMB in the context of the existing Official Plan), whatever decision is rendered by the OMB will be reflected in the new Official Plan. Mr.

Chown asked that staff further clarify whether Section 2.4.1, Policy 9 b), the reference to “single building” applies only to commercial, institutional and public uses or whether it applies to residential infilling as well. Mr. Tunnacliffe indicated staff would review this and provide clarification at a later time.

Mr. Chown then spoke on behalf of Mr. Charles Delahunt, who owns property at the intersection of the Thomas Dolan Parkway and Dunrobin Road. He expressed concern that because the boundaries of villages are conceptual (i.e. not clearly defined) in the Draft ROP, it is unclear whether Mr. Delahunt’s property is within the boundaries of the Village of Dunrobin. Mr. Chown noted the Municipal boundary between West Carleton and Kanata runs east-west through the Village of Dunrobin; Mr. Delahunt’s property is located on the south side of that boundary in the City of Kanata. The current proposed Schedule A only shows the Village designation on the north side of the boundary line in the Township of West Carleton. Mr. Chown asked, if there is to be a conceptual designation applied to the Village of Dunrobin, it should be applied both to West Carleton and Kanata, and allow Kanata to decide whether or not they wish to include a village designation in their Official Plan.

Responding to questions posed by Councillor Munter, Ms. Sweet advised the villages are recognized on Schedule A but the boundaries are shown as a general boundary and that local official plans would show the precise boundary. She confirmed there was nothing in the new Official Plan that would prohibit what Mr. Chown is suggesting, provided Kanata went through the required steps. Mr. Chown stated although this offered him some comfort, he was still concerned because even though the policy indicates the village boundary is conceptual, on Schedule A it is shown as following the Thomas Dillon Parkway. He was unsure how this might be interpreted by future Councils. At Councillor Beamish’s request Ms. Sweet agreed staff would look at this area again and consider “rounding out” the boundaries to make them more conceptual. .

Mr. Chown then spoke on behalf of his clients Mr. and Mrs. Greer, owners of property in Goulbourn, which is designated General Rural on Schedule B, but subject to an “overlay” designation on Schedule K. This overlay designates the lands as “Environmental Features” and establishes a number of requirements the property owner must address if they wish to develop the property. Mr. Chown questioned the basis on which the designation has been applied to the property. He noted his clients were pleased to have the designation changed from Rural Resource to General Rural, however, he stated he would be meeting with staff (prior to the Committee deliberation of this matter in June) to determine the basis of the overlay designation and if he is not satisfied with staff’s justification, his clients will be appealing the matter to the OMB.

Finally, Mr. Chown spoke on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Yzenbrandt owners of Lots 14 and 15, Concession 9, Township of Goulbourn. He noted that parts of the property are

designated General Rural, parts Rural Resource and a large portion is designated Limestone Resource Area. While the area to the north of Fernbank Road is an active, licensed quarry, the area to the south has a fair amount of residential development and for this reason, Mr. Chown requested that the Limestone Resource designation be removed from the lands south of Fernbank Road and replaced with a General Rural designation.

Danny Page, Township of Goulbourn (Submission No. 87) commended Regional staff for their work on the Draft ROP. Mr. Page then went on to suggest changes he felt would improve the Plan and reflect the aspirations of the residents of Goulbourn.

Mr. Page then spoke of an issue not raised in Goulbourn's submission, that dealt with a site for a combination recreation complex for the Township and a high school for the Carleton Roman Catholic School Board. He advised they had been unable to locate a suitable site within the boundaries of Stittsville and had recently entered into an agreement to purchase 50 acres on the north part of Lot 25, Concession 10. He asked that the site be incorporated within the urban boundaries of the Village of Stittsville to bring it into the realm of urban services.

Mr. Page referred to an issue raised in Goulbourn's submission, namely, the need for a study in the vicinity of the Corel Centre. He spoke of the unique opportunities that exist around the Corel Centre, that are not recognized in the Draft ROP; he felt this to be short-sighted in light of the 25 year nature of the Plan. He noted that under Section 4.1.2, (Economic Opportunities) staff are recommending studies in the vicinity of the two airports in the Region and he stated that Goulbourn is looking for the same type of recognition that a study is needed in the vicinity of the Corel Centre.

The third point raised by Mr. Page related to the inclusion of the Huntmar extension in Schedules C1 and D1. The Township feels the fact Huntmar has not been included is an unfortunate oversight because in the long term, transportation will be the constraining element as Stittsville approaches build-out. Mr. Page then itemized the benefits of the extension of Huntmar Road; it would provide a connection between two Regional roads, a direct link with the Corel Centre and Highway 417, as well as linking the Corel Centre to Stittsville and also provide a direct link to the end of the Transit line (the Corel Centre). In addition, the extension would help to alleviate a traffic problem that has existed in the Bryanston Gate Community since the opening of the Corel Centre.

With respect to Policy 2.6.1, Mr. Page opined it created limitations to growth within Stittsville and ties it to the provision of Transit services. He noted the Policy has been significantly modified in the transmittal report and although this modification is preferred over the version in the Draft ROP, Goulbourn would prefer that it be eliminated.

Mr. Page then spoke to the timing of the Hazeldean pump station, noting it is Goulbourn's position this facility is needed before Stittsville can go beyond the 4,500 dwelling unit build out, which is expected to be reached in 1999. Staff are proposing this facility not be brought on stream before the year 2002. He suggested the Hazeldean pump station should be bumped to first priority in Table 6.

Finally, Mr. Page urged the Committee to support staff's recommendation of 8,500 units within Stage 2 for Stittsville. As well, he urged the Committee to approve the deletion of many of the Mineral Resource designations within Goulbourn, as recommended by staff.

At Councillor Beamish's request, staff responded to some of the points raised by Mr. Page. With respect to the study of the Corel Centre Area, Ms. Sweet advised the OMB decision allowed the Corel Centre to proceed with 100 acres for ancillary development, without expansion. She believed if a comprehensive study were undertaken for a different proposal in the area, it could supersede the OMB decision. With regard to the extension of piped services into the rural area to service the site proposed for the recreation centre and high school, Ms. Sweet stated if it is the will of the Committee and Council, staff would prefer to see it go as a "notwithstanding" clause but permit it to be fully serviced. The boundaries would then be changed to include the site in the urban area. Brendan Reid, Manager, Transportation Master Plan spoke to the issue of the extension of Huntmar Road, which he noted was tied to the OMB decision on the Corel Centre and was explicitly forbidden; until the issue of development at the Corel Centre is reopened, the issue of the Huntmar extension should not be revisited. As well, Mr. Reid added there is the issue of whether it would be a Regional Road, as it could be built by the municipality.

Brian Humphries, Township of Rideau and Andy Robinson, Engineering Consultant Mr. Humphries thanked staff for their work on the Draft ROP and noted many of the Township's concerns had been addressed. He stated he would be providing additional written comment once the Regional staff report had been fully reviewed.

Mr. Robinson provided Committee with an overhead presentation which outlined Rideau Township's concerns with respect to servicing issues and their impact on the Village of Manotick. He addressed the historic connection to Manotick, the fact Rideau would like to see capacity confirmed in the West Rideau Collector and their preference that the pumping station forcemain (the primary pumping station) be considered a Regionally significant facility.

Mr. Robinson noted since 1970, a connection to Manotick on the West Rideau Collector has been proposed, however, in the draft Water and Waste Water master Plan it is no longer shown. Mr. Robinson advised a Servicing Options Study has just been completed for Manotick which illustrates the existing problems and the significant need for servicing. Referring to page 240 of the staff report, in response to Section 10.3.8, Mr. Robinson

pointed out that Rideau Township has believed all along that there was a commitment from the Region for capacity to Manotick, the only question was how much that capacity should be. Referring to page 31 of the staff report, the speaker questioned the relevancy of staff's statement that "Manotick is a village and not part of the urban area", when in fact the Villages of Richmond, Carp and Munster are either connected and/or serviced. In the original McLarens-Richards report in 1970, Manotick was the only Village proposed to be connected to the central system. Mr. Robinson noted Rideau would like to see the pumping station considered a Regionally significant facility as the anticipated size of it (sufficient for existing and proposed population) fits within that category and in this way, funding from Regional Development Charges and other sources could be made available.

In response to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Robinson explained Manotick needs sewer servicing because most of the lots are small and are serviced by individual septic systems or holding tanks which are old and are not large enough to accommodate upgrading. As well, a study completed in 1992 indicates there is significant fecal contamination in ditches from malfunctioning sewage systems, which poses potential health problems. Councillor van den Ham asked staff why the Village of Manotick, which was included in previous budget documents, has now been deleted. Ms. Eaton advised staff have in fact left the allocation available for Manotick, without saying which servicing option would be best, pending the results of Manotick's detailed Servicing Study.

Leonard Lee, Lee Valley Tools, stated his concern was with Section 10.1.4 of the Draft Regional Official Plan, Policies for Wastewater Servicing. This Policy requires that anyone wishing to build must reduce the flows into the wastewater system by 125% of expected demand at the new facility. Mr. Lee found this policy to be extremely onerous and unreasonable as it places the responsibility completely with the builder, without examining other alternatives that are available. He noted the Policy deals only with increasing capacity and not with reduced demand.

Mr. Lee went on to provide details of his specific situation. He stated approval had been received from the City of Ottawa and the Region to erect a 75,000 square foot building at 1090 Morrison Drive and that the employees from the existing building at 1080 Morrison Drive would be transferred to the new facility (the old building will be used primarily as a warehouse). Mr. Lee pointed out, of the 200 people employed in Ottawa on Morrison Drive, all but 13 live within the Region and 142 are inside the Greenbelt. He suggested the new building would not increase the demand on the sewer system, but rather it was a question of whether his employees "flushed at home or at work". Mr. Lee emphasized this Policy has caused the property (that was to be sold to finance the new building) to be devalued and has placed his company's financial viability in jeopardy. He suggested, because he holds the Region responsible for devaluing his property, it should offer some relief in the form of reduced taxes.

Mr. Lee advised he had offered to the Regional Chair in early March, 1997, and later to all Regional Councillors, the services of Lee Valley Tool's Research and Development Department, to develop at no charge reservoir volume reducers for existing toilet tanks at two dollars per installation. He felt this alternative would be much more cost effective than expanding the sewer system, however, "the response has been less than enthusiastic".

Mr. Lee questioned the legal status of the Draft ROP and how the Policy can be enforced. Commissioner Tunnacliffe advised the Policy is a proposal in the Draft Plan and is not in force. He went on to add, that in the case of the development on Morrison Drive, which was done under a site-plan application, Section 41 of the Planning Act, permits various conditions to be imposed concerning water and sewer and access to Regional Roads.

Ms. Sweet pointed out the staff report is recommending a change to the Policy as set out in the Draft ROP and referred to Page 234 of the staff report for the new wording, which adds "in consultation with the area municipalities". Ms. Eaton explained the rationale behind the change in the policy (as a result of the public consultation), was to have a better coordination between the Region and the area municipalities, to implement a program to alleviate the capacity problems and the onus on the builders, until such a time as the other works have been built (approximately two to three years).

Councillor Cullen asked that staff advise him of the particulars of Leon's, which recently erected a new building in this same area.

Responding to questions from Councillor Legendre concerning Mr. Lee's comments on reservoir volume reducers, Ms. Eaton clarified the Water Master Plan was premised on a reduction of water demands (i.e. Wise Use of Water Program) and would include the retrofit of existing systems with reservoir volume reducers, as well as low flow systems for new development (pursuant to the Plumbing Code requirement). The focus of the proposed Policy is on the wastewater system and in particular reducing the wet weather flow that goes into the system. Although staff recognize there would be some impact from water conservation, it is not sufficient to address the wastewater problem.

Councillor Munter asked that staff provide both to Mr. Lee and to the Committee, prior to the Committee deliberation of the matter on 12, 13 and 16 June, the exact meaning of the Policy. Further, he asked that Mr. Lee, once he is clear on the Policy's intent, advise the members of the Committee whether or not it addresses his concerns.

Arnie Faintuck, (Submission No. 165) appeared on behalf of the Carlingwood Shopping Centre with respect to Item 252, on page 89 of the staff report. Mr. Faintuck referred to the revised page 89, distributed by staff, and expressed his support for the staff amendment. He went on to say the item deals with Section 4.7.3, Policy 4 and relates to the requirement of a market study associated with an application required to designate a



new retail facility. Carlingwood's comments are listed as Item b) and he noted in their submission, they asked that the market studies assess the impact of proposed development, not only on the Central Area and the Town Centres, but also on the Regional Shopping Centres located within the Greenbelt. Staff have now agreed with this recommendation and he urged the Committee to support it.

Karen Ostafichuk, Director, Planning, Township of Osgoode (Submission No. 227) commended staff for their work on the Draft Official Plan, as well as on the amount of public consultation that has taken place. Ms. Ostafichuk advised that further written comments would be submitted by the Township of Osgoode.

Ms. Ostafichuk addressed the issue of the General Rural designation; she noted that economic development is high on the list of priorities for the Township and relayed the difficulties it has, as a rural municipality, in attracting businesses. In this regard, Ms. Ostafichuk suggested that a broader definition of the types of industrial and commercial uses that can locate in the General Rural area be incorporated in the ROP.

With respect to the Rural Resource designation, Ms. Ostafichuk noted Osgoode was pleased with some of the changes that have been made from the original Draft ROP (e.g. with respect to the severance policies), however, Osgoode Council is concerned that, even though Rural Resource is no longer a designation, the policy still exists in another area (i.e. Schedule K). The speaker relayed Osgoode Council's objections to this designation and stated the existing ROP contains adequate policies to promote developing with nature.

Finally, Ms. Ostafichuk conveyed Osgoode's concern with the definition of "agricultural use". She suggested Regional staff consult with Ontario Federation of Agriculture and with the Economic Development Branch of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs about the wording of the definition. She referred to page 162 of the staff report, noting Osgoode feels the definition is too narrow as it does not recognize agricultural activities such as farm-stay vacations and the production and sale of value-added products.

David McNicoll, (Submission No. 264), referred to the nine points raised in his submission as follows:

1. He has not received any comment from staff on his submission.
2. The current ROP contains planning goals, yet roughly \$1 million was spent on the review without doing a serious assessment of the current planning goals; he suggested the Region needs to move forward on the accountability side.
3. All of the mapping tends to be on a "future-think" basis"; suggested there should be a reality check each year at budget time.
4. The current review was triggered by a Provincial time-line requirement for an environmental review however, there is no environmental masterplan.

5. The terms of reference for the environmental review were independently written by Dr. Middleton, Brock University and approved by Council, yet there is no variance compliance document for the terms of reference; felt this to be very poor science.
6. Council did not create an environmental advisory committee to review ecosystem planning
7. The Region is a corporate box not connected to other governments for public debate and felt this to be inadequate governance. Suggested the “constituent assembly” model, used by Hamilton-Wentworth, would be a better method.
8. The research base was unbalanced. Land-use planning should be done on the basis of the 300,000 hectares of the globe.
9. Called for an independent scientific peer review panel to comprehensively review the effect of the seventy-two proposed infrastructure expansions.

Mr. McNicoll then provided an overhead presentation to expand on his points concerning the “Global Perspective”. He noted, in his view, Ottawa-Carleton is going to urbanize another 11,000 hectares, however, to maintain the lifestyle, another 1.5 million hectares of global resources will be used. Mr. McNicoll emphasized that this has not been discussed and he urged the Committee to look at the global resource flow and deal with the Official Plan in some sense of reality.

Responding to questions posed by Councillor Cullen, with respect to the terms of reference for the Environmental Review written by Dr. Middleton, Ms. Sweet advised this document was used extensively by staff. She noted the document could be used in setting up the monitoring aspects of the Plan. The Councillor indicated his intention to direct staff to do so, at the appropriate time.

Councillor Legendre questioned why Mr. McNicoll’s submission was not commented on. Ms. Sweet stated although the points raised by Mr. McNicoll were very valid, his comments were not restricted to the Region but rather were from a “global” perspective, which made it very difficult to incorporate into a detailed document such as the ROP. She noted staff would be preparing a third transmittal report for the Committee meetings in June and comments on Mr. McNicoll’s submission would be included in that report.

Pierre Dufresne, Ottawa-Carleton Homebuilders Association (OCHBA), (Submission No. 145), referred to the concern raised in his submission, namely what effect will the new Official Plan have on the development business; particularly, the development approvals process. Mr. Dufresne noted many of OCHBA’s concerns had been addressed in the staff report, however, he indicated he would be continuing a dialogue with Regional staff to address outstanding concerns and if necessary he would submit additional comments in writing to the Committee prior to the deliberation on 12, 13, and 16 June.

Mr. Dufresne went on to speak to the requirement of various reports for development applications (e.g. tree audit, etc.) and requested that more information be provided concerning the guidelines on when and how these reports will be used and in some instances, clarification of what is required for specific reports (e.g. archaeological audit).

Referring to pages 245/246 of the staff report (airport noise), Mr. Dufresne asked that consideration of Section 11.6.1, Policies 4 and 5 be deferred or at least be recognized that it could be subject to change. He noted it is the intention of OCHBA and the Airport Authority to convene a meeting of local municipal and Regional staff to discuss this matter once the new detailed contour mapping is released by the Province (anticipated to be the week of 26 May 97). He stated it is his belief that these discussions will resolve many of the outstanding issues regarding airport noise and development.

Murray MacLean, Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk, Village of Rockcliffe Park, (Submission No. 346), drew the Committee's attention to the last point in his submission concerning Kettle Island Bridge and indicated he would provide a copy of the submission presented to the Transportation Committee (on file with the Regional Clerk).

Mr. MacLean relayed Rockcliffe's main concern which centred around the issue of housing. Specifically, he referred to Provincial policies which "encourage", "recognize", or "suggest"; the Region is proposing policies that go beyond the Provincial policies by "requiring" a number of things (e.g. infilling, townhomes, group homes, lodging homes, rooming houses, etc.) that will cause the Village some difficulty Mr. MacLean stated the Village is somewhat unique in terms of its property situation and property values and the development that has occurred thus far has given the residents the privilege of living in a park and they want to maintain this. The speaker went on to point out the Provincial Policy Statement does not provide any authority for the Region to define "affordability" nor to require a municipality or developer to build housing addressed to a specific population. With respect to home-based businesses, Mr. MacLean suggested these be "encouraged" rather than required.

Finally, with respect to Section 5.4 (Policies For Natural Environment Areas), Mr. MacLean expressed concern that properties around MacKay Lake (particularly a large piece of land owned by the British High Commission) would be adversely affected by these policies.

Don Kennedy, (Submission No. 108), advised he was appearing before the Committee on behalf of a number of clients. Mr. Kennedy raised the following points:

- concerned with the issue of development inside versus outside greenbelt
- would have liked to have seen an intensification schedule and a breakdown of transportation cost components within the road considerations;
- commitment to review Plan on a five year basis is good, as is the monitoring plan;

- found this plan to be a “land consumptive” plan. Region should examine the range of opportunities available with communal services in the rural areas and villages that could have more efficient clustering of development
- more involvement of the development industry. Provided example of the Region proposing to strike a task force of municipal and Regional staff to discuss issue of accessory units, stressed the importance of involving the stakeholders;
- Referring to Items 88 and 89, the statement that because something has been in the previous Official Plan, is not good enough
- required audits/reports, concern among his clients that have already spent considerable amounts of money on studies that they will have to start again;
- land acquisition to meet land policies - taking of lands to meet transitway through subdivision process not sure Region can do this.
- General Rural designation is fine but clarification of Environmental Features is needed.

In summary, Mr. Kennedy stated he was pleased with how far the Draft Official Plan has come, but reiterated there are issues that still need to be dealt with.

David Makin, March Rural Community Association, (MRCA) (Submission No. 272), stated he was pleased to see that many of the items raised three years ago by the MRCA, as part of the Community Visioning Process, have been dealt with.

Mr. Makin went on to address some outstanding concerns. He noted that flexibility in the application of rules (i.e. development standards) is important to rural areas and gave the example of development opportunities for cluster developments in exchange for broad open spaces to be made available to the general public. Mr. Makin asked that the concept of flexible development standards be added to the rural section of the Plan or alternatively, a statement on flexibility could be introduced to apply to the whole Plan.

The speaker stressed the importance of a “level playing field”, noting all citizens of the Region should be treated with fairness and equity in the ROP (e.g. both urban and rural). He suggested the goal of fairness and equity should be set out at the beginning of the Plan.

Mr. Makin noted that referrals to the OMB are all too frequent and he put forth the suggestion that the Region adopt a mediation process (similar to that which is required in OMB prehearings) to be used when parties to a development process reach an impasse. He opined this process would save the taxpayers of the Region a great deal of money.

Mr. Makin then addressed the issue of “the right to farm”. He advised there are members of the MRCA who have been farmers in March Township for many years. These people, who are very proud of what they do and want to continue to farm, are very worried about the pressure that will come from new rural housing subdivisions and will infringe upon their right to pursue their livelihood. In the Draft ROP the policy that deals with

severances in poor soil areas suggests that a covenant should go on the deed acknowledging that there is noise, dust and odors that flow from farming and could be a problem. The MRCA suggests this type of acknowledgment should apply generally to any subdivision or severance in the rural area and also to any new developments in the urban area which are adjacent to or down wind of a farm.

Mr. Makin then touched on a number of areas. With respect to home-based businesses, he felt this issue was too specific for an Official Plan and he urged the Committee to drop any reference to this issue from the Plan. In the alternative, he suggested that urban and rural home-based businesses be differentiated between. Regarding development in the General Rural area, Mr. Makin expressed concern about the vagueness of the phrases “attractive sites” and “visually dominant” and suggested that photographs be used as guidelines to illustrate specifically what the Region finds attractive or not. Finally, with respect to Natural Environment Areas, what is missing is the ability of the Region to participate with private enterprises to carry this out the acquisition of these lands.

At the Committee’s request, staff responded to some of the concerns raised by Mr. Makin. With respect to mediation by the Region, Ms. Sweet referred to a policy on page 8 of the new Draft ROP, which states that whenever possible, Council will try to resolve planning disputes through mediation. Mr. Tunnacliffe added most of the Planners in the Development Approvals Division have been trained in mediation and this skill is used when the Region is not a party to a development process. On the issue of the “right to farm”, staff agreed to make information (i.e. legislation and initiatives in other jurisdictions and in the United States) referred to in the MRCA’s brief, available to members prior to the 12 June meeting. Concerning home-based businesses, Ms. Sweet stated it was staff’s intent to be very encouraging of them in the rural area and said staff would review the policy to ensure this was the message imparted. Mr. Tunnacliffe noted as well, the policy was worded to ensure that local zoning by-laws permit home-based business and the local municipality can decide how to implement it. With respect to the issue raised concerning Natural Environment Areas and the potential for the Region to partner with the private sector, Ms. Sweet stated staff are in favour of this and would review the policy to clarify the wording to reflect this.

Susan Springthorpe, (Submission No. 328) stated her main concern with plan related to groundwater protection for everyone in the Region, including the rural residents. She said although many of the points in her submission had been addressed in the staff report, she still had concern and stressed that “groundwater cannot be brought in as an afterthought”, as it is fundamental and relates to many aspects of the Plan (e.g. aggregate resource areas, lot sizes, etc.). She felt therefore that groundwater should be addressed at the outset of the Plan.

Referring to page 182/183 of the staff report, Ms. Springthorpe felt item D, was inadequate and suggested it is necessary to assess the effects on water wells, etc. whenever dealing with an aggregate resource extraction and not just when it is below the groundwater table. Ms. Springthorpe referenced a report prepared for the Region in 1991 on Private Individual Services in the rural area. She noted there was extensive detail in this report on the probability of groundwater recharge areas and she expressed her belief that some of the current and proposed aggregate resource areas are actually in groundwater recharge areas, making the groundwater very vulnerable to contamination. The speaker suggested a proper review of the Plan, with respect to the aggregate resource areas and possibility of groundwater recharge areas was in order. Ms. Springthorpe noted in the same report on rural servicing, there were recommendations concerning lot sizes (as a result of modeling done on different types of soils) and she expressed dismay these were not reflected in the Draft ROP.

Richard Bendall (Submission No.268), advised he would be addressing the issue of wastewater for Munster Hamlet and referred to page 293 of the staff report. Mr. Bendall asked that the words “to Munster Hamlet” be removed from the first paragraph under the heading “Munster Hamlet”, noting this was not the wording used in the original Certificate of Approval.

Referring to the second paragraph of this section, on page 293, the speaker stated, if the proposed expansion of the Lagoons is carried out, the Region will be in constant violation of Clause 2 of the Certificate of Approval, namely “The operation of the sewage treatment facilities are to be controlled in such a manner that sewage is not discharged either directly or indirectly to a tributary of the Jock River”. Mr. Bendall then used an overhead presentation to illustrate this point, noting the spray effluent being put on the field (which is very saturated) leaks very rapidly to the ditch and down to the Jock River. The proposed spray field corners on the Jock River and will only worsen the situation.

Mr. Bendall noted the field is tile drained and he said his understanding of tile drainage is that it is for agricultural use to rapidly drain subsurface water to the quickest outlet (i.e. through the ditch to the Jock River). He stated there are many reports showing this is incompatible with sewage treatment. He then referred to a report from the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural affairs which speaks to soil macropores (continuous pores in the soil that help ariate and drain the soil) which provide a direct link between the soil surface and tile drains. He suggested these macropores could, under certain conditions, supply a pathway for the liquid effluent to the tile drains and contaminate surface water and should therefore be considered seriously.

Mr. Bendall noted there are several options the Region should consider, including connection to the sewer system, a snowfluent system or a closed ecological system. He

advised he had received estimates for sewer connection in the neighbourhood of \$2.5 million, which is comparable to the cost of the new spray field.

Gordon Sample, also spoke to the issue of the Munster Hamlet Lagoons. Mr. Sample noted when the Lagoons were built in the late 1960's, they were to be a temporary measure until the Greens Creek Plant and the trunk sewer system could be put into operation. He advised the 1970 Certificate of Approval had a stipulation that when the trunk sewer was extended, the Lagoons were to be taken out of service; he pointed out this has not been adhered to. He stated the Region is now interpreting this clause as meaning when a sewer was built to Munster Hamlet, the Lagoons would be decommissioned and he opined this was a "bastard interpretation". Mr. Sample advised it was clearly understood in 1970, that it meant when the trunk sewer was built to accommodate Stittsville, Glen Cairn, Kanata, etc., the Lagoons would be disconnected.

Mr. Sample went on to advise that the cost of a sewer from Munster to Fernbank and Eagleson Roads (approximately 80 to 100 feet), would be approximately \$3 million with additional dollars for pumping stations. He suggested the Committee should question the much higher estimate referred to by Regional staff.

In conclusion, Mr. Sample relayed his concerns about groundwater contamination, noting he has already experienced problems with nitrates in his well water. He urged the Committee to include a provision in the Wastewater Master Plan to decommission the Lagoons immediately.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

**Tuesday, 20 May 1997 - 7:00 p.m.**

Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department, provided an overview of the staff report, focusing on issues in the rural area. Following the presentation, Committee heard from the following public delegations:

Steven Lewis, Councillor, Township of Goulbourn, commended Regional staff for implementing changes suggested by the Township, particularly with regard to rural resource issues. Mr. Lewis' remaining concern was with staff report Item 499 (p. 193), regarding a section of property between Flewellyn and Fernbank Roads designated Mineral Resource. The Councillor said there was a strong desire among the residents to make Fernbank Road the boundary for this area, rather than proceeding to Flewellyn Road which has several houses along it. Mr. Lewis acknowledged Regional staff had cut back the zone a small amount to reflect the minimum setback from houses. The Councillor acknowledged the subject site is currently zoned Mineral Resource in the Goulbourn

Official Plan, but offered if the Region changed the Regional Official Plan, he would undertake a Local Official Plan Amendment to bring the Goulbourn Plan into conformity. Mr. Lewis also thanked staff for their efforts regarding their work on Township of Goulbourn Deferrals 14 and 15.

Michael Brownell, Northwest Goulbourn Community Association (Submission No. 199) gave a brief history of the Community Association and went on to outline the community's main concerns. He advised he would be submitting his comments in writing..

Mr. Brownell felt the timing between the Transmittal Report's release and meetings did not allow adequate time for comment by the public, and eliminated Goulbourn Council's participation in reviewing this report. He asked Committee to defer adopting the proposed Regional Official Plan until there has been adequate time and opportunity for public input on the changes recommended in the Transmittal Report. For Mr. Brownell's clarification, Councillor Munter noted the Committee would be deliberating the Official Plan in June, and Council would do so in July, prior to which there would be time for the Township to submit further written comments.

Mr. Brownell described his community as a mixture of farming operations, natural areas, residential development and recreational businesses such as golf courses and equestrian facilities. Using an overhead presentation, he showed an increase in quarry activity could result from expansion of the Mineral Resource designation area, offering there had been no public support for expansion; the only factor acknowledged in public discussion had been pressure from the Province. Mr. Brownell believed expansion of mineral extraction was detrimental to quality of life, and was incompatible with future socio-economic development in the area. Mr. Brownell asked the Region to pro-actively defend the community's interests against the dictates of the Province regarding the expansion of Mineral Resource designations, and asked that lands newly designated as Limestone Resource in the Draft Official Plan revert to a General Rural designation.

Mr. Brownell challenged the proposed Limestone Resource designation on lands in the Ferbank and Jenkinson Roads area, as he felt the Region had either not been following, or was changing its own guidelines with respect to designation in areas where overlap occurred. He also felt a decision to designate certain areas based on their 1988 designation should not take precedence over current studies and information. Mr. Brownell suggested guidelines on overlap be respected, that the area to the south of Ferbank Road revert to a General Rural designation, and that staff consider changing the designation of the area to the north of Ferbank Road to General Rural.

Bill Holzman, Simmering and Associates (Submission No. 127) provided Committee with background information on his firm's experience with implementing subdivisions within ROPA 47 (Fall of 1994), which allowed demonstration projects to proceed on the basis of



communal servicing technology. He said ROPA 47 seemed to be moving in the right direction with regard to Provincial policies and the encouragement of development of settlement areas, but noted his firm had encountered difficulties. Mr. Holzman said his firm was recommending Section 10.3.6, dealing with communal services and demonstration projects be removed, or be included with generic statements. He noted the Region has a proactive policy allowing communal services to proceed, but the process is highly bureaucratic and overly cautious, offering that in one development, over 50 out of 59 draft conditions need Regional approval. Mr. Holzman believed this approval process might drive some business opportunities outside the Region, and is in need of review.

While acknowledging some progress had been made, the speaker felt projects were being unnecessarily held up for reasons such as the Communal Working Group wishing to see the results of one demonstration project using a specific technology prior to allowing another to proceed. Mr. Holzman suggested having multiple projects on the go was better; with the former approach, obstacles holding back the first project would preclude development on subsequent ones, and would discourage development. The speaker agreed there was some need for scrutiny, but felt the process had gone overboard.

Councillor Legendre expressed concern that issues raised by Mr. Holzman did not seem to have been addressed in the Transmittal Report. Carol Christensen, Senior Project Manager (Land Use), Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department, explained many of Mr. Holzman's concerns were shared by others, and thus had been dealt with elsewhere in the report. Ms. Eaton noted the designation regarding demonstration projects had been removed, and felt most of Mr. Holzman's comments had been addressed.

Lois K. Smith (Submission No. 110) emphasized the necessity of conserving agricultural land for food production. She felt there was pressure to develop agricultural land into residential developments or quarries due to the proximity of urban areas, and warned that once development was allowed to proceed, it was difficult to revert the land to agricultural operations. The speaker believed it was important to conserve natural habitat and natural environment areas as buffers against environmental disease. While there is a requirement for quarries, she felt in areas where overlap occurred, the agricultural and natural environment areas should prevail. She said care must be taken on how development is allowed to proceed into agricultural land in poor pockets, as there may be conflicts between existing operations and people who want to live without animal odors.

Ms. Smith proposed the Region could control communal servicing expenses by having buffer zones around small clusters of dwellings. She felt if buffers were gone, expanding development would necessitate installation of these communal services. As well, the speaker felt more precision is required in details of what is permitted for farm severances, and in definitions and guidelines pertaining to ownership of property or land.

Leonard Purdy (Submission No. 57) said he spent a number of years and several thousand dollars in an effort to obtain a pit and quarry designation on his farm in Rideau Township, situated on the east half of Lot 26, Concession 8. Mr. Purdy informed Committee the Township has no gravel pits or quarries, and felt this unfortunate as the Township paid to have stone trucked in for road construction when an ample supply was available locally. Mr. Purdy said he had been informed his is one of the only properties containing hard rock deposits, yet to date, he has been denied the designation he seeks by the Township.

The speaker also felt his property was suitable for development, citing features such as a high elevation, plenty of water, and rock for good foundations, but said he was told he could not get building permits because his land is in forestry. Mr. Purdy suggested the Region could purchase the property for either a quarry or residential development, as it already owns most of the surrounding land. He said he originally purchased the land intending to sell, but felt he could not now get its full value. He would, however, be satisfied with a pit and quarry designation, and was therefore seeking Committee's help.

Ms. Christensen referred to Item 736 (p. 19 of the second addendum report) and clarified originally, the department had looked at these properties in terms of their sand and gravel potential, but after receiving Mr. Purdy's brief, staff requested a geological review which confirmed the area's Limestone Resource potential, but had not been mapped due to the depth of a removable sand and gravel overburden. Ms. Christensen affirmed the most recent staff advice would give Mr. Purdy's property (E1/2 Lot 26, Conc. 8) a Limestone Resource designation in the ROP, making it eligible for a quarry operation.

Bonnie Brown (Submission No. 150), a resident of Goulbourn for 25 years, said the designation on her land, Lot 2, Concession 8, has changed many times over the years, including Marginal Rural, Conservation Rural, an element of Wetlands, and an attempt at Greenspace 2000, and noted every time the land was re-designated, its value fluctuated. Having been contacted that her property designation had been changed once more, she expressed a desire to put an end to the variability of designating land over time, and believed it was necessary to have a long-term designation which would remain unchanged. The speaker said at the last meeting she attended, the designation was Limestone Resource, and wondered how long the present designation (General Rural) would remain. Ms. Brown believed those who purchase the land should be able benefit from it and to have some kind of guarantee.

Ms. Christensen advised that under the previous plan, the Mineral Resource Policies were based on protecting a 20 year supply, necessitating periodic reviews to ensure an adequate supply of resource was designated. She said staff were now proposing to find and designate what is currently, realistically possible to protect, so the issue would not have to

be revisited. Ms. Sweet confirmed staff were recommending the subject lands be designated General Rural.

Anne Carter and John Caris, Cedarhill Community Association (Submission 335). Ms. Carter provided Committee members with a handout highlighting the Community Association's concerns (on file with the Regional Clerk). She noted investigations into noise emissions from three quarries to the east of the community showed that no public body has jurisdiction over hours of operation and noise emissions associated with quarry operations.

She said municipalities cannot enforce noise bylaws over quarries, and the Ministries of the Environment and Energy (MOEE) and of Natural Resources (MNR) are unable to do so under their legislation; these bodies feel it is a Regional responsibility. Ms. Carter informed Committee that MNR, which administers the Aggregate Resources Act, only regulates quarries according to the quarries' site plans, which are registered under the quarries' licenses. This license is granted for the life of the quarry and does not require renewal. Ms. Carter quoted documentation from MNR which said no site plans for quarries in the Region included hours of operation or noise emission guidelines. The speaker pointed out the fourth objective of the Draft Plan's Mineral and Aggregate Resources section seeks to "minimize community and environmental disruption from aggregate extraction activities", but none of the proposed policies help existing communities near quarries. Ms. Carter asked that the Draft Plan be modified to fully meet this objective.

Mr. Caris, whose home is nearest the quarries, said operations often begin at five a.m. and run as late as eleven p.m., the quarries' asphalt plants sometimes running in the middle of the night to meet production requirements. He said the only quiet time was in winter when operations were shut down. The speaker felt it was important to place restrictions on the quarries' hours of operation for residents to be able to enjoy their homes and properties.

Responding to a query from Councillor Hume regarding possible solutions available to the Region, Tim Marc, Solicitor, Regional Legal Department, referred to the Aggregate Resources Act, and noted one of the matters the Ministry would consider was the effect of the operation of the pit or quarry on nearby communities. As well, the Act appears to allow the Ministry to issue revised conditions that would control the hours of operation of the quarry, however. he added the caveat that some quarries may have been granted licenses prior to adoption of the Act, and may be grandfathered under old legislation. If this is the case, Mr. Marc recommended the community approach the Province to have the legislation amended, and offered to intercede, if necessary, on the community's behalf.

Ms. Carter believed the ROP should regulate quarry hours of operation and noise emissions to conform with MOEE model noise bylaws. The Committee Chair believed a new policy could not be applied retroactively to an existing operation, and Mr. Marc said he doubted the Official Plan could control the nature of the operation of a pit or quarry.

Councillor Legendre asked if a section dealing with mineral extraction operation could be inserted in the ROP to specifically control quarry noise. Ms. Christensen said in future, according to proposed amendments to the Aggregate Protection Act, the Province would be establishing hours of operation for new licenses, however, existing operations would be unaffected. Mr. Marc offered a noise policy could be included, however, he pointed out the policies in the Official Plan that protect for noise (e.g. near airports), accept that noise exists and subsequently restricts residential development in the vicinity. Mr. Tunnacliffe said the department would try to address this problem, but noted that noise bylaws are implemented by local municipalities.

David Underwood (Submission 31), referring to the report's belief that "clear language is appropriate and desirable", felt such terms as "attractive", "visually dominant", "mature tree cover" and "wildlife habitat" found throughout the Draft ROP were too imprecise and subjective. He believed the policies should be reviewed to more precisely define what terms mean.

The speaker felt Section 5.4.3, proposed to replace Section 5.5, (p. 95) dealing with subdivisions, should address specifics in terms of what currently exists in Natural Environment Areas, not what "may" exist. He also felt the word "significant" should be properly defined when referring to woodlands, wildlife habitats, etc., emphasizing interpretation is important, and language should be as precise as possible. The speaker also felt the term "development" was too loosely defined, and could refer to a subdivision, or an individual who wished to build a house on a piece of property. Ms. Sweet clarified this section does not apply to Lots of Record, but to subdivision development at the time of lot creation, adding an EIS would only be necessary for subdivisions or other non-residential development. Ms. Sweet said this would be reflected in a subsequent revision.

Frances Johnston (Submission No. 219) urged Committee members to base decisions on the merits of facts rather than emotions, and said she hoped the principles used to underpin the nation's laws were used as guidelines. She opined the Region's actions in passing ROPA 61 (Provincially Significant Wetlands) were contrary to these guidelines, and she requested reconsideration of the inclusion of the Provincially Significant Wetlands policy. Ms. Johnston addressed two problems with the methodology used by groups attempting to protect the environment. First, she believed the reasoning behind the types of proposed protection was flawed, incomplete, and based on alarmist scientific studies which could, in the long run, be disputed. Second, she felt those who wished to

accomplish their stated purpose have not treated others as they would want to be treated themselves.

Ms. Johnston felt the Region's designation of land without owner compensation was equivalent to stealing, and found insulting the suggestion that tax rebates were sufficient for loss of property value. She said land ownership was a form of investment, and that normal market-driven fluctuations of land value were far different from loss of land value due to an external body's restrictions on land use. Quoting a Ministerial letter that said "...changes have been made to the Planning Act that gives Planning authorities more flexibility to balance Provincial Policy objectives with local needs...", Ms. Johnston felt the Province had given the Region more flexibility in recognizing and respecting landowners' rights. She also quoted a corresponding staff response which said it was inappropriate to highlight the rights of individual landowners in view of balancing public and private interests. She offered that while it might not be appropriate to highlight landowners' rights, it would be appropriate to acknowledge them.

Responding to a query from Councillor van den Ham, Ms. Johnston affirmed that an ultimate goal would be for the Committee to recommend removal of Schedule K.

Marcel Bisson (Submission No. 10) drew Committee's attention to Schedules C1 and C2, on which Regional Road 47 was represented, stretching from Innes Road north to the Navan Road. Mr. Bisson felt inclusion of these Schedules in the Official Plan could lead to the future extension of the Regional Road through the Mer Bleue area, for which he felt the Region could obtain land from landowners for rights-of-way for free. He also noted a proposal for widening Regional Road 47 would take away another 30 foot wide strip of land 2,200 feet long from his land in Lot 4, Concession 11 in the Township of Cumberland. The speaker felt it was unfair for certain landowners to have to subsidize Regional Roads to this extent. Mr. Bisson said prior to the Region's formation in 1969, there were no restrictions on land use and no accompanying problems, but since, problems have become bountiful.

The speaker also raised concerns regarding Schedule G. Mr. Bisson noted a large part of his property, had been designated Flood Plain, but disputed this did not exist in reality. He had purchased the land in 1970 from an individual whose family had owned it since the 1800's, and claimed no-one had ever seen flooding to justify this designation.

Since the Transmittal Report was not available in French, Mr. Bisson felt that French Canadians had not been accorded the same opportunity to evaluate it as their English counterparts, and were thus being treated as second class citizens.

Referring to soil capabilities defined by the Ontario Institute of Agrology (1983), the speaker disputed the Class 3 rating of his soil due to the difficulty in growing crops, and

its Agricultural Resource Area designation due to his property's proximity to both residential and commercial/industrial areas. He felt the rating system effectively sterilized some agricultural lands while forcing the landowners to keep them, due to decreased commercial values. Mr. Bisson also noted the community of Notre Dame des Champs had been split in two, one half rural, the other urban, despite provisions in the Official Plan to maintain a buffer zone between active agricultural operations and urban areas.

The speaker said he had applied to the Township of Cumberland for a severance to allow the construction of greenhouses for fine herbs, edible flowers and vegetables for local markets and restaurants, but was told the Region and Ministry of Agriculture would not allow it. He felt this was sterilizing agriculture land use, and tying farmers' hands if they could not start new businesses. Mr. Bisson believed the 1,600 farmers who control 48% of the land within the Region should have more freedom in determining the use of their land than people who leave urban centres to establish themselves in rural areas.

Responding to questions regarding the Floodplain designation, Ms. Sweet clarified mapping was provided by the South Nation Conservation Authority, which had shown the subject areas as a unique "one in a hundred year" floodplain on flat farmland overlying a clay soil that did not absorb water. She noted the Draft ROP provided circumstances under which development might be possible, involving remedial measures and discussions with the Conservation Authority. Ms. Eaton added mapping for the Bearbrook area, which affected Mr. Bisson, had been completed in the early 1990's and explained an owner's property could be mapped as a floodplain even though a flood might not be seen in the owner's lifetime. Ms. Eaton said the subject land was at the upper end of the watershed, and was on a very broad floodplain with low velocity water flow. She said discussions with the Conservation Authority could help determine if the area could be considered as being in the flood fringe, which might allow some restricted development.

Clarifying for Councillor Legendre, Ms. Sweet outlined that under the Planning Act, the Region is obligated to indicate in the Official Plan, where road widenings may be needed in future, to give notice to landowners. At the time of development, the Region through the subdivision or site plan process, can request that land be deeded to the Region, at no cost to the Region. In terms of rural roads, a general right-of-way has been established in the Plan to protect rural roads should they be required. Committee Chair Hunter clarified, as long as a farmer continues to farm, the Region would be obligated to pay for the farmer's loss of the land should it be required for Regional purposes. Ms. Sweet confirmed this, adding so long as the farmer was not doing anything in terms of new development or subdivision, he would not be penalized or be required to dedicate the land.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Legendre, Ms. Eaton said she would look into Mr. Bisson's concern that a watermain designated on Schedule H, in existence since 1974, serviced only the urban area of Notre Dame des Champs. Mr. Bisson's felt

that as it only serviced the urban area, it should not be on the Schedule denoting rural servicing extensions.

The Councillor also noted Mr. Bisson's concern that information material pertaining to the Regional Official Plan had not been available in French; he offered the only explanation for this was there had not been enough demand from the Francophone community.

Paul Kruyne (Submission No. 126), a Kanata resident and landowner (Lot 26, Concession 7), requested clarification on his property's redesignation from Rural Resource to General Rural, and on the designation "Environmental Features" found in Schedule K. Ms. Christensen suggested Mr. Kruyne meet with David Miller, Environmental Planner, to clarify which environmental features exist on this property.

Noting 1600 feet of his property fronted onto the Ottawa River, Mr. Kruyne was also concerned about what he felt were inconsistencies in the Transmittal Report regarding recreational pathways. He said his main concern was in giving up his property to allow a pathway for general public access. Ms. Christensen explained the proposals for continuous pathways apply in urban areas and in villages, and would not affect Mr. Kruyne's rural property. The speaker requested that this exclusion of rural areas be clarified and written into the Official Plan. Ms. Christensen agreed with this.

Peter Smith, the owner of Lot 19, Concession 5 in Constance Bay, objected to the Regional Official Plan's Environment B designation because he felt no-one could explain why his land was being so classified. Mr. Miller explained this property is designate at Environment B because it is within the limits of the Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) as defined by the MNR, which the Region was using as a guide. In previous studies undertaken by Mr. Smith for development purposes, the consultant opined most of the property did not exhibit core ANSI characteristics. Mr. Miller said part of the property did meet these characteristics, and he was now in correspondence with the Ministry to try to clarify the ANSI boundary. Mr. Miller also noted staff are suggesting the Environment B designation revert to a designation which would allow Rural Estate subdivision subject to environmental work, and which would also be in conformity with Provincial Policy statements.

Responding to a suggestion from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Miller said staff would assist Mr. Smith in gaining information from the Province on removal of the ANSI designation.

John Yarmo, a resident of Ottawa and rural property owner, reminded those in attendance, "environment" means different things to different people, with wide ranging definitions, and views ranging from short to long term. Mr. Yarmo, a building environmental engineer, said his concern with the state of the environment was part of his

reason for joining the Riverview Community Association. He felt there was an epidemic of short-sightedness in understanding the importance of the environment's effects on the economy, families, health and future generations, and he described it as uncaring, distrustful, confused, dysfunctional, polluted, stressful and continuously worsening. The speaker also felt it was necessary to work together to make changes. He offered examples of stressful daily rituals which included threats of heavy traffic, pollution from various sources and threatened job losses due to downsizing or fiscal mismanagement. Mr. Yarmo said our landfills are in effect, time bombs for future generations, offering that in other countries, solid waste is used for generating energy. In closing, he said a healthy mind requires a healthy body, noting this cannot be achieved in an unhealthy environment.

Vern Rampton (Submission No. 28) believed the Rural Resource designation should be deleted from the ROP. He noted in essence, part of it had been deleted with the inclusion of Schedule K, but admitted he had not yet had a chance to peruse it fully. The speaker believed the Rural Resource designation originated from the Natural Environment System Strategy (NESS) process, which commenced in 1995. Mr. Rampton believed this process was flawed from the start, and the Committee had accepted staff criteria for significant areas as policy. This led to a maximum number of areas qualifying for protection designation, although the public was told data was only being collecting to decide criteria.

Mr. Rampton said appropriate significant features in areas of population growth and development, surrounded by large natural areas, had never been publicly discussed at any stage. The speaker felt if reasonable, acceptable criteria had been decided prior to implementation of the Rural Resource designation over a wide area, there would be less objection from the areas so designated, particularly if those desiring compensation were accommodated. Mr. Rampton felt the criteria should have taken economic, social and environmental factors into consideration rather than solely addressing the environmental.. Mr. Rampton felt the Environmental Feature (EF) overlay was equivalent to Rural Resource; he suggested a better solution would be to change more of the Rural Resource to General Rural without the EF overlay. He noted this designation is not justified in areas of population growth or in areas where the environmental justification is weak.

Mr. Rampton believed it would be acceptable for "frontage" for rural areas to be redefined from 500 metres to 60 - 100 metres, with a reduced hectarage. The speaker also had difficulty in accepting that woodlands may be considered uncommon because some species exist beyond their natural range and believed they should not be given special protection. He also felt it necessary to review certain aspects of the Plan to minimize bureaucratically protected areas, believing there were sufficient "large, high quality examples of common woodlands" in the Region (e.g., Marlboro forest). Mr. Rampton also believed plans made by individuals for their long-term subsistence should not be jeopardized by a change in designation allowing environmentalists to stop development.



Mrs. Sinha, an owner of two 50 acre parcels of land in the East half of Lot 20, Concession 5, Leitrim, said she had recently learned of her land's redesignation from General Rural to Rural Resource, to which she was objecting. In 1974, she said the land had been designated Marginal Resource, and was changed by the 1988 ROP to General Rural.

Mrs. Sinha said prior to purchase, various authorities had been contacted, and informed that based on Provincial and RMOC environmental constraints, the lands did not qualify as wetlands. In addition, she said the South Nation Conservation Authority was unaware of any flooding problems, and an MNR reference dated 1991 said that based on a 1982 Geological Survey of Canada map, the Ministry was not aware that any portion of this land had been identified as organic soils. She also said to the best of her knowledge, the area in question had no significant trees, habitats or significant features, and was close to an urban development in Leitrim. Therefore she wondered what criteria had been used by the RMOC in designating her lands Rural Resource and Natural Environment (Schedule K). Mrs. Sinha offered that rural areas require active land use to maintain interest in conservation, and the implementation of Rural Resource zoning in a General Rural area would sterilize land use. The speaker also objected to a policy which placed the onus on landowners of disproving the existence of significant features on their own land.

Mrs. Sinha questioned the criteria used to determine appropriate water-supply systems, citing the example of Carlsbad Springs and Manotick, both communities being a similar distance from the nearest watermain, the former of which would receive a trickle-feed water supply system, the latter, city water.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

**Wednesday, 21 May 1997 - 9:00 a.m.**

John Harkness, advised he was appearing before the Committee, as the only registered candidate for Mayor of Kanata, to speak in support of a proposed development (i.e. WestPark) in Kanata, which was the subject of a meeting the previous night at Kanata Council. He explained WestPark is comprised of approximately 126 acres, to the west of Terry Fox Drive, on which the proponents would like to build between 2,200 to 2,500 houses with a totally integrated, wired community. Mr. Harkness emphasized that Kanata needs jobs and noted both the Chamber of Commerce and the Board of Trade support this proposal. It is estimated that within the next 10 to 15 years, the current 15,000 high-tech jobs in Kanata will increase to 40,000. Mr. Harkness endorsed this unique "wired community" development for Kanata, as he felt it would "dove-tail" well with the existing high-tech industry in Kanata and it would stimulate the Kanata South Business Park.

The speaker noted in his address to the Transportation Committee on 16 May 97, he suggested that the realignment of the Hope Side Road include an on-ramp south to Highway 416. As well, he noted that should he be successful in his bid for Mayor of Kanata, it is his intention to extend Terry Fox Drive to Fernbank Road, which would complete the “missing link” between Fernbank Road and Hope Side Road. In conclusion, Mr. Harkness urged the Committee to include the amendment for the WestPark development in the Official Plan.

Ted Fobert, spoke on behalf of Relocatable Homes Limited. (Submission No. 315) Mr. Fobert explained that Relocatable Homes Limited is a business located in Stittsville, as well as the owner of approximately 120 acres of land within the urban boundary. He advised he would be addressing general concerns that Relocatable Homes had with the Official Plan.

Mr. Fobert conveyed Relocatable Homes support for the proposed increase in the number of dwelling units in Stittsville (from 8,000 to 8,500, Item 67, page 28 re Section 2.6 Table 5). As well, he expressed support for Section 2.4.1.5, which establishes Kanata and Stittsville as one economic unit (in terms of jobs per household) and stated this policy recognizes Stittsville as a village, unable to achieve the ratio of jobs to housing that has been set in other urban areas.

Mr. Fobert went on to express support for the recommendation contained in Item 71 (p. 29 of the staff report) relating to transit service in Stittsville. He explained the original policy would not have allowed draft approval of subdivisions in Stittsville until transit service was provided to it at a level equivalent to other urban areas in the Region. The speaker felt the proposed policy was less prescriptive and a more balanced approach.

Finally, Mr. Fobert addressed the issue of the Iber Road (Hunt Mar Road) extension and the need for the study of the lands in the vicinity of the Corel Centre. He noted that although the Draft Official Plan contains statements concerning the need to update the role of the Plan in supporting and directing the location of economic activity and recognizes that a greater portion of Regional economic activity is occurring in the new suburbs, (especially in the west), the only specific policy outlined for supporting economic activity in the west end is the study proposed for the Carp Airport. It is Relocatable Homes’ position that the new economic reality for the west end is the Corel Centre and specific effort should be made to enhance activities in the vicinity of the Corel Centre.

Mr. Fobert stated the extension of Iber Road from Hazeldean Road to Maple Grove Road would service the Corel Centre and the employment activities permitted in the corridor, address local traffic issues and is crucial to the economic prosperity of all three west end communities. He suggested the developers who would benefit from increased economic activity in this location would be in a position to pay for cost of the road (estimated at \$4

million). Relocatable Homes recommends a study be undertaken (similar to the study suggested for the Carp Airport) in conjunction with the Corel Centre, the City of Kanata, the Townships of Goulbourn and West Carleton and other interested agencies. In closing, Mr. Fobert pointed out that \$2.1 million of government investment has gone into the Carp Airport and it is being recommended for a study, while \$285 million dollars of private investment has gone into the development of the Corel Centre; he felt this important economic opportunity should be recognized.

Don Booth and Harold Keenan Mr. Keenan referred to an Agricultural Survey carried out by Dillon Consulting Limited on his property and that of Mr. Booth and Mrs. Mowatt all in the area of River Road and Spratt Road (on file with the Regional Clerk). He went through the significant portions of the report, noting that based on the detailed site-specific evaluation of the property, Dillon concluded that the original LEAR scores overestimated the agricultural potential of the lands.

Mr. Keenan noted the poor soil capability of the subject property was due in large part to the drainage conditions and the stoniness of the land. He advised that drainage companies have estimated the cost of tile drainage on his property (100 acres) to be \$80,000 as pumping would be necessary because the ditches are higher than the land.

Referring to the LEAR scores, Mr. Keenan noted the highest points a property can receive is 200; 130 points or more indicates good potential for agriculture; less than 130 points indicates poor potential for agriculture. The LEAR scores assigned by the Region were: 142 for the Booth property, 150 for the Keenan property and 191 for the Mowatt property. After Dillon completed its field investigation and detailed study, it arrived at LEAR scores of 112 for the Booth property, 112 for the Keenan property and 132 for the Mowatt property. Mr. Keenan asked that the LEAR scores contained in the Dillon report be accepted by the Region as a better assessment of the agricultural potential of these three properties and that this block of land be redesignated appropriately to fit in with the surrounding growth areas (i.e. Riverside, Osgoode and Manotick).

Mr. Booth added he purchased his farm in 1980 to raise standard bred hoes and has had to purchase grain and straw the entire time he has been there, as the land cannot even produce hay. He spoke of the considerable amount of money and time he has expended dealing with the stoniness of the property and the poor drainage and he voiced his support for all of the points raised by Mr. Keenan.

Councillor van den Ham asked that staff review the Dillon report for evaluation and recommendation of an appropriate designation, prior to the Committee deliberation in June.

Alison Platt, Walker, Nott & Dragicevic, Planning Consultants spoke on behalf of Clearnet Inc. (Submission No. 160), a Canadian owned telecommunications company, that will soon be moving into the Ottawa-Carleton areas. Ms. Platt advised that Clearnet's telecommunications installations consists of a series of antenna installations mounted on multi-story buildings or towers. She noted the number of tower installations required throughout the Ottawa area is not significantly large (4 to 6), but the search space for potential tower sites is sometimes constrained by the proximity of residential areas or hamlets. Ms. Platt stressed the tower installations would not be located in areas that are environmentally significant or are identified as resource areas, however, agricultural lands are often suitable for tower installations in rural areas because they are away from built up areas. She noted the land consumption for tower installations on agricultural lands is minimal (1/15 of an acre) and therefore would not negatively impact or interfere with continued livestock or farming operations.

Ms. Platt referred to Sections 1.6.3, 1.6.4 and 1.6.5 which address public utilities. She noted Regional planning staff have confirmed telecommunications facilities are considered to be a public utility and would be subject to these policies. In this regard, Ms. Platt asked that section 1.6.4 of the Draft Official Plan be modified to permit telecommunication installations on lands designated agriculture resource areas.

At the Committee's request, Ms. Sweet advised that staff, when writing the policy, had in mind larger utilities that might have an impact on agricultural land (i.e. a landfill site). She stated, in view of Ms. Platt's presentation, staff will review this policy and return with a new recommendation.

Henry Benoit, (Submission No. 118), provided members of the Committee with a written copy of his presentation (on file with the Regional Clerk). He advised he is a resident of rural Rideau Township and expressed his concern with how little consideration was given to rural residents in the drafting of the ROP, in spite of the course of fairness and equity established by the "Shared Principles". He opined the goals of the Draft Plan are driven by a central vision which ignores longstanding land stewardship and cultural traditions and he offered a number of objections relating to how rural residents will be affected if the Draft ROP as proposed is implemented. He noted rural residents will have to endure such things as the elimination of opportunities for a diverse economy, no quality of life improvements, loss of cultural heritage and no rural network (e.g. communications).

At Committee Chair Hunter's request, Mr. Benoit explained the first three points of his submission. With respect to loss of cultural heritage, Mr. Benoit advised he was referring to the restrictions placed on severances (in terms of cost) that prevent him from being able to have his son live near him. On the issue of a diverse economy, he noted he would like to be able to work out of his home but cannot because he is unable to use his cell phone. He suggested that until policies are put in place that allow more people to live in the rural

area, they will never receive cellular phone service. This applies too, to his comment on quality of life improvements, and he gave the example of inadequate police service.

Chris Bradshaw, Ottawalk, (Submission No 142) provided the Committee with a copy of his detailed presentation (on file with the Regional Clerk). Mr. Bradshaw advised he was also representing the Ottawa Pedestrian Advisory Group. The following is a summary of some of the points raised by Mr. Bradshaw:

- should think of walking as the “glue” of the Region’s transportation system; it is a part of every trip and therefore the 9.6% modal share under-represents its importance to the Region’s transportation goals;
- walking represents the cheapest mode to accommodate and is the most complementary mode to transit;
- reductions to growth on the fringes should be even greater; delay any road widenings or construction projects by ten years; enhance the 4% increase forecast and promote walking; the EMME2 does not account for the ROP’s policies that will bring services and goods within walking distance of most residences;
- agree with recommendation submitted by cyclists (but rejected by staff) re: no Regional roads be expanded over four lanes;
- reasons given by staff (e.g. motor vehicle pollution would increase or road capacity would be decreased) for rejecting/qualifying many of Ottawalk’s suggestions for street designs (e.g. traffic calming, elimination of right-turn cut-offs) were spurious;
- the Region should offer subsidies to local municipalities, or cover costs of public or private landowners, for the provision of walking infrastructure;
- the Region should be pro-active and do an in-depth modeling exercise into the optimum distribution of goods in the community; bring goods and services closer to where people live and work and start saying “no” to the big-box stores;
- urged formation of alternative modes coordinating committee with membership from transit, cycling, walking, taxi, car-rental and delivery sectors;

Linda Hoad, Federation of Citizens’ Association (FCA), advised she would be addressing the Association’s concerns with respect to the transportation aspects of the Plan. Ms. Hoad stated one of the strengths of the Draft ROP is the very clear link between land use decisions and transportation decisions and stressed the importance of the Committee not losing sight of this inter-relationship. Ms. Hoad advised she would be submitting these comments in writing.

Ms. Hoad then listed a number of staff recommendations the FCA strongly supports:

- sidewalks on both sides of new roads where transit is provided, however, suggest modifying policy to include rebuilt or rehabilitated roads;
- bicycle parking and parking requirements at transit stations;
- traffic calming on Regional roads.

The speaker went on to advise of areas of the Plan the FCA feels requires modification:

- feel the modal share targets need to be reexamined to increase walking/cycling aspects;
- for monitoring purposes, urge staff to develop targets and to monitor on an area basis (referred to a report done in 1993 on Land Use Transportation and the Environment)
- staff decided not to accept the FCA's recommendation to change order of transit/walking/cycling to walking/cycling/transit (page 22, Item 47).
- FCA disagrees with staff's position on transit priority measures on the Champlain Bridge not being important enough to be considered; FCA strongly endorses the inclusion of a two-lane bridge as a candidate for transit priority measures;
- commuter rail should be moved to a high priority item and a pilot study should be implemented immediately;
- FCA supports the community associations who are requesting the removal of the Kettle Island Bridge corridor and community associations who are opposed to the widening of Bronson Avenue and the twinning of the Parkway;
- requested that the Region establish maximum allowable truck lengths and weights;
- concern that implementation of the Official Plan will not meet the written words
- road spending (widening and new construction, but not maintenance of existing roads), particularly in the Greenbelt, be delayed for 10 years to give the alternative modes the opportunity to "take hold"; money should be spent on transit instead.

Brett Delmage, Citizens for Safe Cycling, (Submission No. 303) advised he would be providing in writing, his detailed comments. Mr. Delmage, by way of an over-head presentation, made the following points:

- 161,000 cycling trips are made during the cycling season in the Region. These are existing trips not being made by car - saving on infrastructure and congestion;
- RMO residents appreciate opportunities provided in the Region for walking and cycling but want more;
- cycling supports residents' desired values for their communities, e.g. clean environment, air and water, quiet neighbourhoods, preservation of greenspace, promotion of personal health and savings in tax dollars;
- safety is a major concern among cyclists. Region must eliminate conflict between cyclists and other major road-users, e.g. six-lane roads are impediments to safety;
- noted for the next five years \$20 million proposed to be spent on regional roads and only \$0.4 million for cycling. The capital forecast worsens with \$70 million for roads and only \$0.5 million for cycling'
- urged review of roads not slated for cycling improvements (e.g. Robertson Road, Innes Road, etc.);
- targets for cycling are too low. Suggested an 8% (as opposed to 3%) target modal share would be more realistic; monitoring should be area specific;
- should be allowed to carry bicycles on buses, great way to bring cycling and public transit together;
- support walking/cycling/transit first policy;

- support policy re education and enforcement of all road users;
- support continued emphasis on maintenance of the existing road infrastructure before building new infrastructure;

Peter Vice, appeared on behalf of Les Filles de la Sagesse D'Ontario and C.G. Belisle Holdings Ltee., the owners of land on Montreal Road, between Church Street and St. Laurent Blvd. Mr. Vice explained his clients' concern was with the rights-of-way protection policy, Schedule C-2 (Urban Regional Roads Rights-of-Way Protection Policy Plan), which shows a right-of-way being protected from the centre line of Montreal Road of 17 metres for the lands on the south side (his clients' land), and only 9 metres on north side (Notre Dame Cemetery).

Mr. Vice offered that this widening is not needed and he stated it is his understanding that Vanier does not want the road widened. He went on to say, if the widening is needed, it is unfair to take 17 metres from the centre line, from his clients' land and only 9 metres from the other side of the street. Therefore, in the sense of equity and fairness, at worst, 9 metres should be taken from both sides of the road.

Councillor Legendre pointed out the property on the south east corner of this intersection was recently redeveloped and is tight to the right-of way; he stated he could not see how, logically, the road could be widened on the west side and then shift to a narrower road on the east side. He indicated he would be moving a motion to address this problem, when the Committee reconvenes in June.

Lambert McCarthy, (Submission No. 209), a resident of Rideau Township, indicated he wished to speak to an area referred to as "Natural Area 504", which he advised was caused by a man-made dam. Mr. McCarthy opined these natural areas always grow and he referred to a 1977 map which showed the wetlands to be 5,000 feet to the east, 4,000 feet to north of his land; the wetland is now on his land.

Mr. McCarthy advised his land was originally designated Rural Resource; staff are recommending a designation of General Rural with an overlay designation of Environmental Features, on the new Schedule K. Mr. McCarthy stated this redesignation makes no difference if the same restrictions are applied. He went on to say staff have advised that, because it is on Schedule K, the sections in the Draft Official Plan relating to the Natural Environment (page 59 to 76) will not pertain to his land. David Miller, Environmental Planner, Planning and Development Approvals Department, clarified there are a number of general policies in the Natural Environment Section that are applicable to all land throughout the Region. However, with respect to those areas shown on Schedule K, staff are recommending it would apply only when a plan of subdivision or a non-residential development are proposed (i.e. would trigger the requirement for an Environmental Impact Statement). Mr. McCarthy suggested that the Plan be amended to

reflect that unless a plan of subdivision or industrial-commercial development are proposed, the polices of the General Rural designation would be applicable to those lands in Schedule K.

Mr. McCarthy went on to point out that in the Natural Summary report on his land, he had received, it was noted that two plants were found on his property (i.e. Downy Rattlesnake Plantain and Large Fruited Snakeroot, however, no one is able to explain to him what they are. As well, in this same report the soil was classified as clay, when in fact it is sand.

Grant Lindsay, Planning Director and Larry Morrison Director of Infrastructure, City of Gloucester. After first commending staff on the work done on the Draft Official Plan, Mr. Lindsay went on to highlight the City's concerns.

- requested deletion of Table 2.6 (p. 20 and 30 of the Draft ROP), noting if it is intended only as a guide for Regional Council, it should not be included as part of the legal document.
- with respect to the provisions added to allow front-end financing of services (p. 29, Item 72), City of Gloucester reserves its right to comment on this issue when the Region reviews the new Regional Development Charges Act
- expressed agreement with the elimination of the Rural Resource Designation, however, concerned with what environmental features the Region wants to protect. The Region should identify to landowners what the features are, and why they should be protected;
- urged Region to consider an acquisition policy for some of the environmental features (e.g. if Environmental Impact Statement shows that no development can proceed);
- suggested that approval of the areas designated under Schedule K be deferred pending resolution of the concerns of the affected property owners;
- the City had asked for revision to policies so that for any new institutional use to occur in the Greenbelt, there should be a Regional Official Plan Amendment process. They feel this is necessary for the Region to assess its ability to service any new use and that such use should not take away from any existing capacities for lands designated beyond the greenbelt;
- requested clarification of Policy 16, Section 9.4 of the Draft Official Plan (Item 560, page 212 of the staff report) regarding reduced parking requirements near transit stations. The speaker found this policy confusing when read in conjunction with the Policy 15;

In conclusion, Mr. Lindsay reserved the City of Gloucester's right to provide further written comments on the staff report, given the short amount of time to review this document.



Mr. Morrison then relayed the City's concern with regard to Policy 1, Section 9.2 (Item 532, p. 204 of the staff report), which requires sidewalks on both sides of roads with transit routes. He advised the City has encountered difficulties in the new subdivisions with having sidewalks on even one side of road. He said the problem is as a result of a number of things, such as the narrowing of road allowances, coordinating with the utility companies where their plants will be located (i.e. they do not want them located under a sidewalk) and also because builders are frequently requesting reduced setbacks.

At Councillor Legendre's request, Mr. Tunnacliffe addressed the issue of Policies 15 and 16 of Section 9.4, noting that both of these policies are to be in the Official Plan. He advised that Policy 15 applies to "rapid" transit service (i.e. in the area of transitway stations), while Policy 16 deals with areas that receive transit service (e.g. main streets, community centres, etc.).

Councillor van den Ham noted the Township of Cumberland also had concerns about the interpretation of Policies 15 and 16, Section 9.4 and he asked staff to review the wording to see if it could be made more clear.

David Kardish, representing The Regional Group, (Submission No. 296), provided members with a letter outlining The Regional Group's concerns about Section 3.3.2(9) of the Draft Official Plan, which deals with rental conversion policies. He noted The Regional Group is one of the most active proponents of rental conversion in Ottawa-Carleton. Mr. Kardish stated their main concern with the policy related to the lifetime guarantee of security of tenure and noted although, the policies are proscriptive, they could create unrealistic expectations in tenants.

Mr. Kardish went on to describe the rental conversion projects The Regional Group has been involved in, stressing the affordability of these homes (i.e. units in one location sold for an average of \$78,000, making them affordable to households with a combined income of \$27,000). He noted he viewed favourably, the portion of the proposed policy that deals with the change from a municipal vacancy rate to an Ottawa CMA vacancy rate as it will allow for conversions in municipalities other than the City of Ottawa. However, he expressed strong disagreement with the portion that dealt with encouraging municipalities to enter into agreements with the proponents of conversions to provide lifetime security of tenure to all sitting tenants. He felt this requirement would mean the demise of many viable conversion projects.

The speaker noted he could not find any written submissions suggesting that security of tenure be increased from six months (as originally proposed by staff) to lifetime. (NOTE: staff circulated to members of the Committee a page that was missing from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing's submission, which suggested this change). He suggested

lifetime tenure is a Metro Toronto solution to a Metro Toronto problem, noting the vacancy rate in Metro Toronto is less than 1%; while the rate in Ottawa-Carleton is between 5% and 8%.

Mr. Kardish suggested that Section 3.3.2.(9) c) be replaced with the following: “guarantee a security of tenure to sitting tenants not willing to buy their respective units based on the following formula:

- where the vacancy rate is greater than 3% but less than 4% - 3 years security of tenure
- where the vacancy rate is greater than 4% but less than 5% - 2 years security of tenure
- where the vacancy rate is greater than 5% - one year security of tenure”

Mr. Kardish, in concluding his presentation, expressed support for the staff recommendation that the dwelling unit count in Stittsville be increased to 8,500.

Chris Jalkotzy, advised he would be submitting his comments in writing. He expressed his agreement for comments made by earlier speakers Chris Bradshaw, Brett Delmage and Linda Hoad, dealing with the inter-relationship between land-use planning and transportation issues, and he urged the Committee recognize the importance of their comments. As well, he urged the Committee to consider planning from the view of operating expenditures as well as capital expenditure. He gave as an example, three roads in the Region that have recently been built but are already in rough shape and will need extensive work in the future; they are Innes Road between Highway 17 and Blackburn Hamlet, Walkley Road between Bank and St. Laurent, and Hunt Club between Merivale and Prince of Wales.

Mr. Jalkotzy felt the Draft ROP did not take seriously the vacancy rate on industrial/commercial lands and how this will affect changes in the way goods and services are produced. On the issue of expansion to the urban boundaries, Mr. Jalkotzy reminded the Committee to bear in mind the new Development Charge legislation is intended to force more of the cost for these developments on the general revenues.

The speaker felt the public participation process was less than adequate (e.g. polling and other similar processes were not used) due to the lack of funding provided by Council. Mr. Jalkotzy stressed the importance of forging an alliance between the development community, the community associations and the municipal and Regional Councils to attain all of the established goals.

Ronald Charlebois, (Submission No. 90), advised he was the owner of Lot 17, Concession 1, in rural Kanata, which as been designated as part Environmental B (1/4) and part General Rural (3/4). He requested that the entire parcel be designated General Rural.

Mr. Charlebois advised that in the current ROP, the rear quarter of the property is designated as Marginal Resource Restricted and was intended as a buffer to the Carp Hills wetland. He felt the Environmental B designation should be removed as the wetland no longer exists and therefore a buffer is not required. As well, an Environmental Impact Study, a Terrain Analysis and a Hydrogeology study have been carried out on the property and reveal the property conforms with the General Rural designation.

The speaker went on to note that on 22 April 1997, Kanata Council approved his request for a consistent designation of General Rural on the whole property and they directed their planning staff to incorporate this request in their comments on the Draft ROP. He advised the portion of his property designated Marginal Resource Restricted had been offered to the Region twice for purchase, however, the Region indicated it had no interest in it.

In conclusion, Mr. Charlebois pointed out in Item 331, page 126, staff have agreed to change the designation on the Loch March Golf Course (Lots 13 & 14, Conc. 1, Kanata) from Natural Environment B to General Rural; he asked for fairness and equity.

Mr. Miller noted initially the Environmental B designation contained policies that went further than the previous Marginal Resource Restricted policies, however, based on input received, staff are recommending changes to the Environmental B policies, which would not preclude the type of development Mr. Charlebois is proposing for this property. He noted that although Carp Hills is not considered a Provincially Significant Wetland, it is still a shield wetland.

The session adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

**Wednesday, 21 May 1997 - 7:00 p.m**

Lois K. Smith, (Submission No. 110) offered a number of points, as follows:

- suggested that abbreviations used in the Plans be explained at the outset of the document;
- referring to three new elevated tanks proposed in the Water Master Plan, she suggested cladding the tanks to have them resemble lighthouses to make them more esthetically pleasing and potential tourist attractions;
- emphasized the importance of openspace and its distribution, as the population increases;
- on Section 3.2, Policy 7 (page 25, Draft ROP), suggested adding the words "where applicable requirements can be met";
- questioned the logic of Section 4.3.1, Policy 2 d); felt there were instances (i.e. Billings Bridge Shopping Centre) where parking lots existed well between transit stations and business entrances;

- with reference to Section 9.9, Policy 2 f), suggested where there is an overhang or a pillar on a building, there should be a required minimum clearance;
- requested the ROP Plan include a direction that whenever a tree of a certain quality (either by age or by girth) is removed for a road widening, vital statistics be taken for research purposes.

Phil Smith, (Submission No. 185), the owner of Part Lot 16, Concession 3, Township of Rideau, appeared before the Committee to request that his property be acknowledged as a Poor Pocket and that it be designated as General Rural. Mr. Smith commented that the General Rural designation would not conflict with any agricultural activity, as the property is bordered to north by hardwood bush, to the south is a trailer-storage area, to the west is a treeline and a berm and to the east is a road and a subdivision. Mr. Smith went on to advise the property is 8.5 acres, it has soil capability of Class 5 (very poor) and the current land use is residential. He felt a General Rural designation, which would allow him to develop the property, would harmonize with local development in the area and noted the property is within close proximity to the Village of North Gower.

At Committee Chair Hunter's request, Ms. Sweet referred to the staff response contained at Item 459 on page 177, and noted the property is not large enough to warrant a General Rural designation and is surrounded by better quality agricultural land.

Responding to questions posed by Mr. Smith, Ms. Sweet advised there is a 2 hectare minimum required for a Poor Pocket designation. She confirmed if Mr. Smith were to amalgamate his property with neighbouring land to meet the 2 hectare minimum, and meet the other criteria proposed in Section 7.4, Policy 1, he could then apply to the local municipality for a Poor Pocket designation (which would allow for a severance).

Committee Chair Hunter suggested it would be best for Mr. Smith to discuss his particular concerns with both municipal and Regional planning staff and then, when his plans for development were more firm, he could proceed with an Official Plan Amendment.

Mr. Sinha, advised the main thrust of his presentation was to complain about how the new Draft Official Plan was merely a follow-through of the previous Plans. Mr. Sinha provided a written copy of his presentation, which is held on file with the Regional Clerk.

Mr. Sinha provided the Committee with a history of Regional Official Plans dating back to 1974 and raised the following points:

- 1974 ROP stressed development inside the Greenbelt and indicated a population of between 620,000 and 750,000 could be accommodated within the Greenbelt; proposed ROP now coming back to this;
- the Region has been spending money needlessly on infrastructure for areas outside the Greenbelt when growth could have been accommodated within the Greenbelt;

- the Region has failed to implement its Plans and policies and has allowed itself to be “hijacked” by local municipal amendments;
- allowed Orleans to grow to a population of 100,000 when it was only suppose to be 35,000 which has caused major traffic problems;
- since 1965 Leitrim has been identified as an urban centre, while urbanization of Stittsville was not incorporated into the ROP until 1988, yet priority for development appears to be given to Stittsville;
- suggested that growth in Kanata has been slowed to give preference to Nepean and Orleans;
- objected to the proposal in the Draft ROP to protect land around Kettle Island for a future interprovincial bridge;
- in light of the multitude of amendments to the ROPs, he questioned the necessity of a Regional Official Plan and suggested each municipality be allowed to do its own planning;
- contrasted the Region’s views on the building of the Palladium (i.e. objected to it) with its views on a number of amendments carried out in Nepean, which the Region has supported.

Mrs. Sinha, provided a written copy of her presentation, which is on file with the Regional Clerk. The following points are highlights of Mrs. Sinha’s presentation:

- felt the City of Ottawa has achieved far less in 10 years in partnership with other jurisdictions (provided examples) than the Region has achieved in 25 years;
- suggested the Region has not respected the vision set out in Jacques Greber’s plan for the Nation’s Capital, in terms of such things as containing development within the Greenbelt, location of a waste disposal site and uses of the Greenbelt lands.
- feels Region is violating its own mandate in terms of the location of Trail Road Landfill Site i.e. it is located on permeable sand and gravel and is less than a quarter mile from the Jock River;
- holds Region responsible for such things as the absence of a zoo and the unswimmable beaches;
- objected to the Region allowing Nepean to locate development (residential and industrial) along the Rideau and Jock Rivers and along scenic routes such as Highway 16.
- criticized the Region for hiring outside engineers and consultants to conduct research for the Draft ROP when it could have made use of the resources available at the Department of Energy and Mines, local municipal staff and Regional staff.

Harold Carswell, Copeland Park Community Alliance (Submission No. 202), advised that Copeland Park is a community situated on both sides of Maitland Avenue between Baseline and the Queensway. A copy of Mr. Carswell’s presentation is held on file with the Regional Clerk. Mr. Carswell addressed three points that were included in his original submission, which the Alliance feels strongly about, but were not accepted by staff.

The first point related to the importance of considering environmental and greenspace concerns when making development decisions. In this regard, Mr. Carswell recommended that Section 2.3, "Guiding the Direction of Growth" be amended to include an additional factor, namely, "Environmental and Greenspace Considerations".

Mr. Carswell then addressed the Alliance's concern that wording used in relation to the long-term protection of the environment and greenspace was too ambiguous and/or vague. He gave examples of phrases, such as 'significant natural features', 'important natural environment' and 'those with the most significance'. The Alliance recommends that terms such as these be defined and clear, firm statements be used to preserve the natural areas. As well, the Mr. Carswell suggested the criteria used by the consultants to identify regionally significant natural areas either be included in the Plan or annexed to it.

Finally, Mr. Carswell voiced concerns about Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs). He noted the Alliance's submission recommended a separate designation for ESAs be included in Sections 1 and 5 of the ROP, however, staff felt other designations in the Plan addressed the concerns raised. Mr. Carswell argued that significant natural areas, such as Clyde Woods (deemed to be so by the Ontario Municipal Board) are not included as a Natural Environment Area A or B, or as Sensitive Natural Areas. He urged the Committee to approve the Alliance's recommendation that there be a separate designation for ESAs, that they be shown on the appropriate Schedule and that the same statement proposed for the Rural Resource Area, regarding endangered, threatened and rare species, be applied to all parts of the Region, including the urban area.

Richard Stead, Manordale/Woodvale Community Association, (Submission No. 340), advised the Association represents the area bounded by Woodroffe Avenue, Greenbank Road, Knoxdale Road and Hunt Club Road. Mr. Stead stated the Community Association's concern was with proposed General Urban Area designation of the Hunt Club Greenbelt lands located at the north east corner of Hunt Club Road and Greenbank Road, as well as a small piece of Greenbelt land in the Tanglewood Community. He provided a copy of a letter addressed to the Committee Chair which outlined his concerns in detail (on file with the Regional Clerk).

Mr. Stead said the Association strongly opposes the designation and use of these lands for any purpose other than the Greenbelt use they were expropriated for in the 1950's. He went on to say these lands are an integral part of the community and the residents have chosen to live there based on their belief these Greenbelt lands would be protected. The speaker advised in 1996 the Community Association proposed a plan for a combination of passive and recreational uses of the Greenbelt lands, which received great support from area residents, Ottawa-Carleton sports organizations, the Girl Guides of Canada and the Crestview/Meadowlands Community Association. As well, Mr. Stead noted a major

commercial sponsor had indicated serious interest, however, the plan could not proceed without a long-term commitment from the Region that this land would remain available for Greenbelt uses.

Mr. Stead also advised of a motion approved by the City of Nepean wherein they requested that the Region retain the subject land under a Greenbelt designation in the new ROP. He referred to a similar situation in Rideau Township where the Region purchased land at the north end of Long Island for use as a park to be administered by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority. As well, he pointed out the Region's own policy for Greenbelt lands released by the National Capital Commission, whereby it would be covered by the ROP Greenbelt policies and protected from incompatible development. He opined this policy should be applied retroactively to the Hunt Club Greenbelt lands.

Kent Currie, (Submission No. 182) advised he was representing himself and four other landowners of a block of land in Osgoode Township (Lots 31, 32 and 33, Concession BF, Osgoode). Mr. Currie noted in the original Draft ROP, staff had recommended the subject land be designated General Rural, which the owners were content with. He advised that four separate studies have been done on the land (two independent and two by OMAFRA), and not one of these studies indicated sufficient soil capability to push the designation from General Rural to Agricultural Resource.

Mr. Currie went on to say, as a result of six letters of opposition, staff are now recommending the land be designated Agricultural Resource. He discounted the validity of two of the letters written by one family, as these people previously owned a portion of the subject property and were themselves at one time, proposing an estate subdivision on this land and undertook a soil study to justify its lack of agricultural potential. He conceded the four remaining letters expressed valid concerns about the well water quality and traffic issues, however, he advised the MOEE's well records indicate the quality and quantity of the wells in the area to be very good and the traffic issues are more appropriately addressed at the site plan or subdivision stage. Mr. Currie urged the Committee to support staff's original designation of General Rural.

At Committee Chair Hunter's request, Myles Mahon, Planner, Planning and Development Approvals Department advised, according to the LEAR evaluation, the area does not rank highly. The subject land is a small parcel within a larger agricultural area, with a mix of land uses (e.g. sod operation, woodland, hay, farming, etc.). He noted at least two of the letters received were from owners of nearby farms who were concerned about the impacts from non-compatible uses on this land. Mr. Currie advised these two letters referred to, were from the family who had previously pursued an estate lot subdivision on this land.

Mr. Currie then commented on the Draft Official Plan as a member of City of Ottawa's Environmental Advisory Committee. He offered the following points:

- expressed support for the City of Ottawa's recommendations and comments regarding the environment;
- expressed support for the recognition of the greenway system on Schedule I of the Draft ROP but pointed out the omission of Elmhurst Park, Frank Ryan Park and the linkage from these two environmentally sensitive areas to the NCC system;
- requested that the LEAR system be used as the bench mark for evaluating poor pockets of agricultural land;
- referred to a program carried out by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) to try to clean up the rivers of E-coli bacteria, and they identified the primary source of that pollution was agricultural operations abutting the River and its major tributaries. He expressed surprise that the Draft ROP still shows agricultural resource lands abutting the river corridor. Urged the Committee to move the agricultural designation back from the rivers

Councillor Legendre asked for staff comment on the last point raised by Mr. Currie. Ms. Sweet, referring to the submission from the RVCA (Submission No. 229), advised the RVCA disagrees that agricultural runoff is the primary cause of pollution in the Rideau River. She suggested the agricultural community would also disagree and noted they are trying very hard to limit the runoff into rivers. She went on to say the agricultural designation permits less development along the rivers because it does not allow as many severances as General Rural.

Robert Copeland, (Submission No. 318) advised he was the President and Owner of Subspace Inc. which owns Lot 5 and Part Lot 6, Concession 1, Fitzroy; as well he owns Lot 4, Concession 1, Fitzroy. The property is made up of 500 acres surrounded on all four sides by unopened road allowances.

Mr. Copeland went on to say that Subspace is a proposed underground development, that will extract the mineral while leaving the surface undisturbed and would lead to providing rental space for organizations such as Archives Canada that require a "constant environment". In this regard, Mr. Copeland appeared before the Committee to request a Limestone Resource designation for the property. He noted the site is near the future Highway 417; the Region in 1982, supported this project by resolution; the Township of West Carleton recently passed a resolution in support of this project and the Ministry of Natural Resources show it as a protected aggregate resource. Mr. Copeland stated that in view of the twenty-five year lifespan of the Official Plan, he felt it important that the land be designated Limestone Resource so the project will not be compromised by ad hoc development in the immediate vicinity.

The speaker then went on to address the issue of environmental features on his property and he noted as Vice President, Technical American Institute of Environmental Sciences, he had knowledge in this area. Mr. Copeland took issue with the environmental



evaluation undertaken for his property; he felt no field work took place, many species were missing (i.e. poplar, white birch), species that do not exist on his property were recorded as being present, much of the data was incorrect and many species that were noted as rare are actually abundant in the Ottawa-Carleton area, as well as across Canada. From this evaluation, Mr. Copeland concluded the process is defective and he felt it unfair that as a landowner, he would be required to undertake an Environmental Impact Study to disprove it. As well, with less than 10 acres of Panmure Alvar, he questioned how the re-designation of 1400 acres could be justified.

As a concluding remark, Mr. Copeland stressed the importance, particularly from a business perspective, of having the agenda, Draft Official Plan, etc. available in both French and English. (Note: Mr. Copeland provided a written summary of his comments, which is held on file with the Regional Clerk).

Amy Kempster, Federation of Citizens' Association, provided the Committee with copies of her presentation (held on file with the Regional Clerk), which included the following points:

- pleased with the recommendations regarding urban greenspace;
- pointed out the absence of the "southern corridor" of NCC lands and questioned what was proposed for these lands;
- commended the recommendations on monitoring;
- suggested amending the recommendation for Item 32 (page 17 of the staff report) by replacing the word "client" with "stakeholders";
- voiced concern about the population projections, FCA feels they are too high;
- recommended policy 2.3.8 be amended by adding the phrase "if affordable" before the word "services", to clarify;
- suggested the schedules be amended to include the Museums of Science, Aviation and Natural Science as Major Community Facilities;
- suggested ways in which the cultural industries (e.g. records, books, movies) might be recognized in the Official Plan;
- requested clarification of item 310, questioning if it was meant to replace Section 5.2.1.3;
- pointed out Riverside Park had been credited as the author of the FCA's responses regarding Section 10, in the staff report.

Janet Bradley, Gowling, Strathy & Henderson, solicitor for St. Laurent Shopping Centre (Submission No. 247). Ms. Bradley provided members of the Committee with correspondence, which outlined her client's concern (on file with the Regional Clerk). She noted St. Laurent's concerns centred around Section 4.7.2 (Policies for Retail Stores and Commercial Uses), Policy.2(a), which defines gross leasable areas as those "designed for shopping and commercial services" and goes on to state that "space for offices and

other uses that cannot easily be converted to retail and commercial services will not be included in the calculation”.

Ms. Bradley then went on to detail her client’s concerns. She pointed out the Draft ROP sets out that St. Laurent Shopping Centre is limited to 77,000 square metres of gross leasable area, and noted it has no plans to expand. However, the Centre is made up of 102,000 square metres including corridors, offices and storage space, with a portion of the former storage space in the basement of the mall having been converted to accommodate entertainment type uses (e.g. movie theatres, Nautilus Centre, etc.). Ms. Bradley stated this is where the problem lies; if all of the space which can easily be converted to retail and commercial services is included in the calculation, there is approximately 90,000 square metres of gross leasable space in existence at St. Laurent Shopping Centre.

The speaker advised her purpose in appearing before the Committee was to ensure that the Centre complies with the Official Plan and that its right to continue to use the basement space is not jeopardized. In this regard, Ms. Bradley proposed the following three alternatives:

1. Provide that, with respect to St. Laurent Shopping Centre, no space below grade is taken into account in determining gross leasable area; or
2. Change the definition of “gross leasable area” to exclude certain uses such as entertainment and lifestyle uses; or
3. Increase the gross leasable area to recognize the current 90,000 square metres of gross leasable area in the Centre.

In response to questions from Councillor Legendre, Ms. Sweet agreed the Draft Plan puts into question the ability of St. Laurent to expand in the basement for entertainment type uses; she suggested staff would review the situation and the three alternatives offered by Ms. Bradley and report back to the Committee.

Cyril Leeder, President of the Corel Centre and Ted Fobert, Foten Consulting appeared before the Committee on behalf of the Corel Centre and its parent company Terrace Corporation. A copy of their presentation is held on file with the Regional Clerk.

Mr. Leeder advised that in addition to the Corel lands, Terrace Corporation owns 365 acres on the north side of Highway 417, across from the Corel Centre, separated only by Huntmar Road. He noted the lands within the Palladium Drive interchange are to be designated General Rural Area in the new Official Plan, while the remainder of the lands (which have been out of active farming production for over ten years) are to be designated Agricultural Resource. He went on to say that Terrace Corporation would like to at some point in the future, develop these lands to accommodate recreation, entertainment and tourist based activities.

In this regard, Mr. Leeder echoed the requests of the Townships of West Carleton and Goulbourn and the City of Kanata, in requesting that the Region coordinate a study of the subject lands (in conjunction with the key stakeholders and other interested agencies); similar to the studies proposed in Section 4.1, Policies 13 and 14 for the Carp Airport and the MacDonald Cartier Airport. He stated it is Terrace Corporation's belief that the lands around the Corel Centre provide an opportunity for increased economic activity and stressed that the study is warranted and necessary. Mr. Leeder went on to outline the principles which Terrace Corporation feels should guide the study.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter, Mr. Marc confirmed the Ontario Municipal Board required the Region to withdraw from the study of the west urban expansion area, concluding there was no significant need for any additional urban area for an extended period of time. However, he respectfully submitted that the OMB overreached themselves when they imposed that condition and at the time, the Region stated that, in accordance with the Planning Act, it would deal with any development application that came forward.

Al Speyers, Alliance to Save our Greenbelt, (Submission No. 330) expressed concern about NCC severed lands in the Tanglewood Community, that are in close proximity to a proposed commercial development (big box retail store of approximately 417,000 square feet) on the north-west corner of Hunt Club and Merrivale Road. He advised the residents of the community are very concerned about these lands (which now belong to the Region) because of indications in the concept plan for the proposed development. He urged the Committee to maintain these lands as greenspace.

Referring to Section 5.6.1 (Policies for Provincially Significant Wetlands), Policy 4 of the Draft Official Plan, which states "That council shall not permit development and site alteration within Provincially Significant Wetlands", Mr. Speyers drew the Committee's attention to Schedule B, Area 59 which identifies the Stoney Swamp area as a Provincially Significant Wetland. With this in mind, the speaker pointed out that Schedule C2, (Urban Regional Roads), identifies a proposed road widening through these Class 1 wetlands; he suggested this would be in clear conflict of Section 5.6.1.4 and he asked that this section of the roadway be deleted from the Draft Official Plan.

Finally, Mr. Speyers spoke of the Greenbelt and the fact that, as a result of amendments to the National Capital Act, the NCC is permitted to sell any of these lands, to anyone, for any reason and keep the money. He suggested this makes the NCC the "de facto owner of these lands" and changes the nature of their role from that of guardian, protector and steward of the Greenbelt to an organization that is forced to sell lands to help make ends meet. He went on to note that because the Greenbelt is a Federal designation, it is not governed by the Planning Act and in this regard, he requested that RMOC petition the Provincial Government (particularly the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing) with

an amendment to the Planning Act through regulation to recognize the Greenbelt status and its significance.

Peter Williams, Chairman, Goulbourn Economic Development Committee and Paul Bradley, Mayor, Township of Goulbourn

Mr. Williams advised that the Goulbourn Economic Development Committee (GEDC) is a volunteer committee (formed three years ago), whose purpose is to make recommendations to Goulbourn Council on economic development matters. One of the first activities of the Committee was to recognize the opportunities that would be created by the Corel Centre project; it was also recognized that without an appropriate access, very limited success in capitalizing on this opportunity would be realized.

The speaker went on to commend staff for recommending that the dwelling unit count in Stittsville be increased from 8,000 to 8,500 and also for recognizing the unique transportation requirements of Goulbourn. As well, he expressed the GEDC's endorsement of the statement in the Draft ROP that spoke to the need to update the traditional role of the Official Plan in supporting and directing the location of economic activity, to reflect new economic realities. Mr. Williams noted there is acknowledgment in the Draft Official Plan that a greater proportion of Regional economic activity is occurring in the newer suburbs, especially those in the west and also there is a commitment to give priority to servicing areas associated with emerging technologies and business. Yet, in spite of these policies, the only specific policy related to this general direction for the west end is Policy 14 which suggests a study for the Carp Airport.

Mr. Williams stated the GEDC believes the Huntmar Road extension from Hazeldean Road to Maple Grove Road is necessary in order to service the Corel Centre, to enhance local transportation requirements (i.e. divert traffic away from local residential streets) and further, that it is crucial to the prosperity of the three west end communities. He advised that Goulbourn Council had included the Huntmar Road extension in its Official Plan. The GEDC recommends a policy statement (similar to Policy 13 concerning the MacDonald Cartier Airport) be included in the new ROP to the effect, "That the Region undertake a study in conjunction with the Corel Centre, the City of Kanata, the Townships of Goulbourn and West Carleton and other interested agencies, to investigate and propose how the Corel Centre could be used as a basis for increased economic activity."

In support of these recommendations, Mr. Williams pointed to the \$35 million investment in an interchange at Huntmar Road and Highway 417 that is not being used effectively; the \$250 million in private investment the Corel Centre has attracted; the role the Corel Centre has played in creating community spirit and in gaining visibility for Ottawa-Carleton; the desirability of this location for commercial interests wanting high profile locations; overall increased business activity; and increased tax revenue for the Region.

Mayor Bradley added that, in addition to the economic benefits, the extension of Huntmar Road would alleviate existing and anticipated traffic problems on Regional Road 5, through Stittsville. He stated he did not share Regional staff's view that this road has at least a 10 year span, given the rate at which Stittsville is developing and growing.

Judith Lishman, Communities Before Bridges in Manor Park first read a submission on behalf Derek Chase. A copy of Mr. Chase's comment is on file with the Regional Clerk.

Mr. Chase's comments centred on the Draft Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and the effect it will have on the communities in the area of New Edinburgh, Lindenlea, Rockcliffe Park, Manor Park and parts of Vanier. He noted the Draft TMP assigns Beechwood-Hemlock Road Regional Road status and he expressed concern about the negative impact increased traffic density on this road will have on the subject area. Further, Mr. Chase pointed to the potential future development of the Department of National Defense lands and the proposal to preserve a corridor for a future bridge crossing at Kettle Island as plans that would increase traffic in the area to intolerable levels, and are of paramount concern to the community. He noted hundreds of area residents had signed a petition opposing the Kettle Island bridge. In this regard, Mr. Chase urged the Committee and Council to oppose the Kettle Island crossing and direct staff to delete Section 9.5, Policy 9 of the Draft ROP, as well as pages 49 to 57 of the Draft Transportation Master Plan.

Ms. Lishman then went on to present her views. She advised that Communities Before Bridges has been in existence for approximately five years and noted its main purpose has been to fight any proposal to build a new bridge at Kettle Island.

Ms. Lishman expressed agreement with the key principles upon which the Draft Official Plan and Transportation Master Plans are based, namely, the encouragement of walking, cycling and transit use, that communities are the building blocks of the Region and should be pedestrian friendly and the measures proposed to protect the environment. However, she pointed out the proposal for the Kettle Island bridge contravenes all of these principles; this bridge would disrupt several communities, ruin pedestrian and cycling paths, destroy an urban openspace and adversely affect the natural environment. A bridge at Kettle Island would result in the conversion of the Aviation Parkway, an NCC scenic parkway to a high speed, four lane truck route with an interchange at Hemlock Road, spewing heavy traffic through residential neighbourhoods.

She stated the ROP and TMP are being devised for the benefit of citizens of the Region and should therefore be a reflection of their wishes; the residents of this area are opposed to a bridge in this location. Ms. Lishman noted Rockcliffe Park Council has requested that the Region remove this bridge from the Official Plan; as well, the City of Ottawa, the Township of Cumberland, Gilles Morin, the Provincial MPP and Mauril Belanger, the

Federal MP are also opposed to a bridge at Kettle Island. She further advised that the aforementioned are all in agreement with the protection of a bridge corridor in Cumberland. In conclusion, Ms. Lishman requested that all references to a bridge at Kettle Island be deleted from the Regional Official Plan and Transportation Master Plan.

T. P. Vorobej (Submission No. 52) Mr. Vorobej advised that when he purchased his farmland 15 years ago in Goulbourn Township (Lot 16 and 17, Concession 11) it was dry; it now has a minimal amount of wet areas, due to beaver activity and has been designated as a Provincially Significant Wetland in the Regional Official Plan. He noted he had never given the MNR permission to enter onto his land and he questioned how the Region could designate it as wetland, without his approval. He noted he had not received any satisfaction in response to his queries to the MNR.

Committee Chair Hunter clarified the Region was required to notify land owners of the official plan designations (re ROPA 61), which it did; permission of the owner to designate the land is not required. Mr. Miller noted Council approved provisions in ROPA 61 for the reevaluation of wetland boundaries, and suggested this might be of some assistance in resolving Mr. Vorobej's concern. Councillor Munter asked that staff meet with Mr. Vorobej and advise Committee of the outcome at the 12 June meeting.

Ken Dubuc, Co-Chair, Save Pinecrest Creek Corridor Committee (SPCCC), (Submission No. 243) advised the SPCCC is dedicated to the preservation of open public greenspace in the urban area generally, and in the Pinecrest Creek Corridor in particular. Mr. Dubuc felt the Draft ROP offered little protection for open public greenspace in the general urban area, except for riverfronts and environmentally sensitive areas. He stated the SPCCC, in its submission, made three specific recommendations for the preservation of open public greenspace in the general urban area, which he was pleased to see largely addressed in the staff report.

Mr. Dubuc advised the SPCCC recommended that Section 6 explicitly include policies to protect, preserve and enhance significant natural open spaces in the general urban area and that these areas be designated as such on Schedule B. He stated the staff response (Item 344) addresses this recommendation, however, he expressed concern about Policy 2 of Section 6.5. which states that the boundaries for Urban Open Space may be refined "without amendment to this Plan". He felt this phrase substantially weakens the recommendation and would prefer to see it deleted and replaced with a requirement that any change to the greenspace boundaries in the general urban area, require a Regional Official Plan Amendment. As well, he stated he was concerned the staff response to Section 6 mentions the City of Ottawa greenspace system however the Official Plan itself does not. Referring to Schedule I, Mr. Dubuc requested that the wooded areas along Elmhurst and adjacent to Frank Ryan Park be included and protected as greenspace.

Referring to Item 383, Mr. Dubuc advised the staff response satisfactorily addressed the SPCCC's second recommendation concerning the Draft ROP's failure to recognize that the location of recreational pathways along open greenspaces, is intrinsic to their value.

Finally, the third recommendation of the SPCCC concerned the absence of concrete requirements for natural open spaces in Section 3.2, Policies for Urban Communities. Mr. Dubuc noted although the staff response (Item 78) does suggest some language to address these concerns, the SPCCC would prefer to see the policy go further, with more concrete direction. By way of example, he referred to Policies 13 (Layout of Roads) and 14 (Personal Security and Safety) and suggested wording such as "When reviewing development applications, ensure that openspaces are accessible by walking from residences". As well, he suggested that some sort of quantifiable measure about the accessibility and quantity of open greenspace be used.

Keith Langley (Submission No. 26) advised he is the owner of Lots 9 and 10, Concession 2, Goulbourn, and noted the land is proposed to be designated General Rural, with nearly 50% designated Environmental Features. He requested that this designation be removed and noted the Region has failed to provide him with any information as to what is significant about his property. He explained the subject property is agricultural land that is used for hay and a woodlot; he asked that he be treated in the same manner as his neighbours who have had the Environmental Feature designation removed.

At the Committee's request, Mr. Miller advised that based on the information staff has, without field work being done (Mr. Langley has not provided permission to enter his property), there is nothing to ecologically distinguish the subject property from the area south of Soldiers Line Road. Committee Chair Hunter suggested if Mr. Langley gave staff permission to enter his property, perhaps the designation could be deleted. Mr. Langley would not agree to have staff enter his property, however, he did extend an invitation to walk the property with the Committee Chair.

Bill Davidson, advised he owns Lot 7, Concession 1, Fitzroy, which is adjacent to property owned by Mr. Copeland, who is proposing an underground mineral extraction operation on his property. Mr. Davidson advised he had only learned of this proposal from Mr. Copeland's presentation earlier in the evening and he expressed his strong opposition to the proposal and would oppose a redesignation of the property from General Rural (with Schedule K) to Aggregate Resource.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

**Thursday, 22 May 1997 9:00 a.m.**

After Committee Chair Hunter read the statement required under the Planning Act (See 20 May 1997 - 9:00 a.m.), the Committee heard from the following delegation.

Adam Bilecki, advised he was the development consultant for Westpark, the proponents of Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) 65. Mr. Bilecki stated he was before the Committee to make a statement on behalf of the Limited Partnership. He advised that Kanata Council earlier in the week, voted against ROPA 65 in spite of a report from City of Kanata staff recommending support of the Westpark application. Mr. Bilecki went on to say the Westpark team has spent over three years developing alliances with senior levels of government, the technology industry and institutions and noted these alliances are premised on the ability of this region to recognize the future potential of its information technology industry. Refusal of the Westpark application by the Region could be seen by the alliance of government and industry as a lack of confidence and disregard for economic potential that exists in this region. Accordingly, the proponents have made the decision to withdraw the Westpark application for ROPA 65, at this time.

Following this delegation, Judy Flavin, Planner, Planning and Development Approvals Division, provided an overview of the staff report, for the remaining eight Draft Official Plan Amendments.

Chair Hunter reminded members and the public that this meeting was to hear public delegations; the Committee will reconvene on 12 June 1997 to deliberate and make recommendations for Council approval.

Danny Page, Township of Goulbourn, advised he was before the Committee to convey the Township's position on the various ROPA's in Goulbourn. With respect to ROPA 67, (Fernbank Estates), Mr. Page indicated his comments were also applicable to ROPA 68 (Silver), ROPA 48 (Gibson) and ROPA 69 (Davidson). He noted that Goulbourn regards these areas as very logical areas for development when expansion is desirable for the community, however, the Township does not support these applications at this time. He stated, based on Goulbourn's current rate of land absorption, there is an estimated 20 year supply of residential land. He said, if the Region does approve the applications, additional capacity (i.e. additional dwelling units and infrastructure) would have to be provided.

On the Hoddinott application, ROPA 52, Mr. Page stated Goulbourn is seeking the Region's support for a study in this area. He stated Goulbourn recognizes this general area presents a unique economic opportunity to develop lands, while at the same time, they recognize the very serious development constraints of these lands (e.g. agricultural status of the land, servicing and transportation limitations) that need to be looked at



comprehensively. In this regard, Mr. Page advised it is Goulbourn's position that this application be deferred pending the completion of the requested study.

Finally, with regard to ROPA 51 (Relocatable Homes), Mr. Page indicated Goulbourn supported this application, however, the proposal the Township reviewed did not involve the complete conversion of the lands (i.e. the southerly 9.3 hectares were to remain in the Industrial designation). He noted Goulbourn supported the application for a number of reasons, such as: the conversion of the lands from industrial to residential would improve the land use disposition for the area; there would be no additional demand for infrastructure (i.e. converts industrial capacity into residential capacity); and, there was wide-spread community support for the proposal. With respect to the southerly 9.3 hectares of land, Goulbourn would prefer to see these lands used for industrial purposes, as there is concern about the short term supply for industrial lands in the community.

Ted Fobert, advised he was representing Relocatable Homes Ltd., the proponents of ROPA 51. He explained ROPA 51 proposes to redesignate approximately 120 acres of vacant land (bounded to the north by Fringewood Village, to the west by Forest Creek and to the east by the Ottawa/Goulbourn Business Park) from Extensive Employment area to General Urban.

Mr. Fobert provided some background information on the property, noting it was purchased by the Sweetnams in 1968. The land was zoned for industrial use in 1975 and subdivided in 1983; to date, close to a million dollars has been invested in local improvements to build both roads and services for the industrial subdivision. He felt it important to note that Forest Creek (to the west of the subject lands) was redesignated from industrial to residential in 1989 and is now fully developed as a residential area. Mr. Fobert went on to say that in 1992, Safety Kleen Canada proposed to purchase three acres of this land from Mr. Sweetnam, however, the proposal was met by very strong community opposition, resulting in Safety Kleen Canada choosing to locate elsewhere. Because of this community opposition and the difficulty in attracting industrial users for the property, the owners of the land decided to consider alternate uses for the land. He noted prior to making application to amend the local and Regional Official Plans, the proponent held meetings in the community to discuss the appropriate re-use of this land. Following these meetings, amendment applications were submitted to the Region and Township of Goulbourn, to redesignate 96 of 120 acre parcel for housing and retain 23 acres on the southern boundary for business employment activities.

Referring to the lands for employment uses, Mr. Fobert felt it important to recognize the market for traditional industrial uses is declining, with a shift to high-technology, information and service-oriented activities; these companies are generally seeking smaller parcels of vacant land, with high visibility and accessibility. He pointed out the removal of the subject lands from the industrial designation, will leave in excess of a thirty-five year

supply of vacant industrial land; and, including the 23 hectares at the bottom of the parcel, there will be a ten year supply of serviced, industrial land. He opined that having a General Urban designation on the 9.3. hectares does not threaten Goulbourn's opportunity to control the use of the land for business employment; the proponent intends to proceed with zoning that reflects the business employment designation.

Mr. Fobert offered that because of the money invested in servicing capacity for the industrial subdivision, there is no threat to the net residual capacity of Stittsville. As well, with the proposed increase in dwelling units, this proposal does not impact on the Stage 2 lands in Stittsville.

J. Ray Bell, (Submission No. 220), provided members with copies of documents in support of his presentation (on file with the Regional Clerk) Mr. Bell addressed the issue of the proposed increase in dwelling units in Stittsville. He stated he could not understand where the additional units have come from, but if there are to be 2,000 additional units allocated, he requested on behalf of Grace Bell (Part Lot 23, Conc. 9, Goulbourn) and Sid Bradley (Part Lot 22, Conc. 9, Goulbourn) that their lands be included in the new boundary extension proposed to accommodate the new dwelling unit allocation. Mr. Bell went on to outline the reasons to justify this request (included in his document submission), including such things as the removal of a large acreage of industrial land in the Village of Stittsville will increase sanitary sewer capacity for residential development in Stage II; the draft approved plans of subdivision to the north have sites designated for public and separate elementary schools, parkland and a collector road; and the subject land will support the use of infrastructure that will be in place for Stage I lands.

Mr. Bell clarified he was not asking for an amendment to the existing Official Plan but rather that the boundaries of the Village of Stittsville be expanded in the new Official Plan to include the lands of Grace Bell and Sid Bradley.

Ray Essiambre (Submission No. 263) Mr. Essiambre appeared before the Committee on behalf of Gerald Moore (who was also present) one of the applicants for ROPA 71 and Camvest Holdings (formerly Hoddinott Holdings), the applicant of ROPA 52 (Areas 8 and 6 on Annex J). He stated the properties abut one another and the issues relating to both applications are similar. Mr. Essiambre provided a copy of his presentation, which is held on file with the Regional Clerk. He noted both applicants are requesting an Extensive Employment designation under the 1988 Official Plan and in the new Official Plan they are looking for a designation of Future Development.

Mr. Essiambre referred to the staff report on page 318 which outlined the basis for staff's recommendation that the Amendments be refused. He countered the first argument of the Regional Development Strategy by noting these applications were made under 1988 Official Plan which does permit expansion of urban areas. With respect to the argument

that there is enough land to meet the demand to the year 2001, he pointed out there is land in the 1988 Plan that goes well beyond a thirty year time period (referred to Exhibit I of his submission). As well, he cautioned that if sufficient land for long range planning is not provided, the Region will be constantly faced with “piece-meal” amendment applications.

On the issue of employment land versus residential lands, Mr. Essiambre expressed his belief that one of the reasons Stittsville has had low employment and has been unable to achieve Regional objectives, is the parcels of land that are designated for employment use are poorly located. He noted the Sweetnam property is the only serviced piece of employment land in Stittsville at this time. He referred to Stittsville’s consideration of 50 acres of land outside the urban boundary for a high school site because of its proximity to the centre of town; his clients’ property has to be considered in the context of its location relative to employment and economic development.

Mr. Essiambre noted the area surrounding his clients’ land is largely committed to development and he felt it appropriate that the Huntmar extension go through Area 6. Further, he suggested the ROP has largely ignored Township of West Carleton’s Growth Management Strategy, which views Area 8 as their opportunity for long term economic development and the Township of Goulbourn’s Economic Development Strategy which recognizes Area 6 and the extension of Huntmar road as vital parts of their economic development strategy. Mr. Essiambre referred to Exhibit 4 of his handout, a Council Motion from West Carleton, dated 20 May 97, which requests that the Region designate Area 8 as Future Development. As well, he noted the Township of Goulbourn, on 6 May 1997, supported the designation of the Hoddinot Lands (Area 6) as Future Development.

In conclusion, Mr. Essiambre asked the Committee to support the applications for designating both Areas 6 and 8 as Future Development and that the Region initiate future studies in this area.

Murray Chown, Senior Planner, Novatech Engineering, (Submission No. 283) introduced Steven Upton, Director of Development for Dell Corporation, the proponent of ROPA 72. and distributed copies of a map highlighting the subject property (held on file with the Regional Clerk). He noted many of the issues raised by Mr. Essiambre are relative to this amendment as well.

Mr. Upton advised that Dell Corporation has owned this 235 acre parcel of land for twenty years and noted it was acquired for its future development potential. With the Corel Centre having been established, Mr. Upton stated the opportunity now exists to examine how the surrounding lands can be developed over a period of time. He noted the Township of Goulbourn recognizes the subject land as the entrance into the Township of Goulbourn and he referred to a suggestion that the Dell lands be isolated and kept as a greenbelt buffer from Kanata. He said, although Dell does not disagree with utilizing the

lands as some type of buffer, they do disagree that the land should be frozen, without any potential for development.

Referring to the possible extension of Huntmar Road, that could potentially go through a portion of the subject lands, Mr. Upton stressed the economic development spinoffs from such a transportation node cannot go unrecognized. He conveyed to the Committee the point that Dell wants to be a part of the urban expansion area and are looking for the opportunity for some sort of responsible development. He stated once the Region indicates there is interest in this, Dell will proceed with the necessary studies.

Mr. Chown stated Dell's preference would that the land be designated as part of the Urban Area on Schedule A and Urban Development on Schedule B; realistically, however, they do not believe this will happen and are therefore requesting a Future Development designation (similar to the designation applied to the expansion area in South Nepean) which would allow the proponents a reasonable level of confidence to initiate the necessary planning studies. He stated this would be with the full understanding that development would not occur in the immediate future but around the time when Stittsville has achieved development close to the 8,500 units proposed.

Mr. Chown went on to suggest that the designation of the land in this area cannot be evaluated using the same criteria as other urban land; this area, in terms of its location and proximity to the Corel Centre, Highway 417 and the Huntmar Interchange, represents a unique opportunity for development and he urged the Committee to take this into consideration.

In conclusion, Mr. Chown expressed strong support for the applications presented by Mr. Essiambre; for the Township of Goulbourn's request in terms of initiating studies of the opportunities for development around the Corel Centre; and, also for the designation of Huntmar Road extension as a future Regional Road in the ROP. He stated although it would be preferable to have a General Urban Area designation on the Dell Corporation lands, he requested as a compromise, the lands be designated as part of a future expansion area for the Village of Stittsville.

Bill Davidson, (Submission No. 65 & 74), the applicant for ROPA 69 (Lot 25, Concession 9, Goulbourn) provided an overview of the land uses in the area of his property. He referred to the community centre and high school that are proposed to be built on 50 acres of land located in Lot 25, Concession 10, noting although this land is now outside the urban area, prior to 1972 it was within the boundaries of Stittsville; on the same property, in 1990 there was approximately six acres severed to build church. On the east side of the lot is a road easement that could potentially connect Shea Road with Abbott Road, in the future. Mr. Davidson opined, from a community perspective, the strategic positioning of the school is important, not only for Stittsville but also the rest of Goulbourn.

Mr. Davidson went on to speak about the community meetings that were held in Stittsville in the summer of 1996 and made observations about the difficulty the consultant would have had in distilling the needs of people of Stittsville; on the one hand, the community's wish to minimize change (which he believes was reflected in the Draft ROP) and on the other, planning from a global perspective. The speaker stressed the lands between Kanata Goulbourn and West Carleton cannot be ignored in a strategic framework. He cautioned if a long-term framework, envisioning how this area will evolve over the next twenty years is not developed, Kanata, Goulbourn and West Carleton will have no choice but to plan within their own agendas and guarantee demarcations between the three communities.

The speaker expressed his belief that this area has been somewhat "castrated", in terms of population and service restrictions, compared to areas such as Barrhaven and Cumberland. He stressed the importance of not having limitations on the next generation of service infrastructure in these communities as they evolve and the Region should plan now to implement larger infrastructure (e.g. in terms of pumping stations, larger pipes, etc.).

With regard to the Corel Centre, Mr. Davidson contrasted it with other high-tech parks and communities all over the world and he urged the Committee to take a global perspective in terms of planning for this area. He cautioned decisions on this area should not be done in a piecemeal manner, and suggested an "economic template" be created with a framework in place that would enable the Region to accommodate international companies wishing to locate here. Further, he stated if the Region does not keep pace, it will lose the opportunity to retain its high-tech status in Canada. Mr. Davidson stated he would like to see more inter-relationship in the Official Plan for high tech, in terms of such things as the "virtual office" and personal communications services and their effect on the lives of the residents, demands on infrastructure, etc.

In conclusion, Mr. Davidson urged the Committee to take advantage of the unique opportunities the Corel Centre offers and carefully examine what can be done in this area. He also expressed his support for the Huntmar Road extension and the road infrastructure between Shea Side Road and Abbott Road.

Tim Chadder, Township of West Carleton (Submission No. 163) referred to West Carleton's motion that was circulated to members of Committee, that expressed the Township's support of ROPA 71. He stated if ROPA 71 does not receive approval, the Township would like to see, in the new Official Plan, provisions for a study on future development in this area, to be carried out jointly by the Region, West Carleton, Kanata and Goulbourn. He advised that the application filed by Mr. Moore to amend the Local Official Plan, will not be proceeded with until the Regional Official Plan is dealt with.

Mr. Chadder then offered comments on the Draft ROP. With respect to the proposed Schedule K, the speaker conveyed West Carleton's concern that some of the areas shown on this schedule are not supported by studies and therefore feel that Schedule K should be limited to the areas where the information is known to be solid. As well, Mr. Chadder suggested, the significant features defined in the policy should be taken into account for development proposals in all General Rural areas and not just those on Schedule K.

The speaker suggested the policy dealing with the creation of individual severances in Section 3.7.4 be clarified, as he felt there were inconsistencies between the introduction and actual wording of the policy. Referring to Schedule A, Mr. Chadder noted the Trans-Canada Pipeline had not been shown and also, the Natural Environment Area B is shown as including part of the Westwood Subdivision outside of Carp. In conclusion, Mr. Chadder advised that West Carleton Council had not had enough time to study the transmittal report prior to the public hearings, however, they will be reviewing it in detail and will be submitting written comments.

Ed Balys (Submission No. 306) advised he was speaking on behalf of six landowners whose lands start on the western boundary of the Kanata Lakes development, run to Huntmar Road, Richardson Side Road and north to the railroad. He advised the owners have been environmentally-conscious stewards of these lands and are cognizant of the fact the area is of the most scenic in Ottawa-Carleton; the land includes the highest point on the Hazeldean Escarpment and the Carp River runs through the western boundary.

Mr. Balys went on to say most of the land had been designated Marginal Restricted, which permitted some development with due consideration to environmental studies. The Draft ROP designates the land Environmental B, which further restricts development to 10 hectare lots with 300 metre rights on public roads. He acknowledged the staff recommendation in the transmittal report, allows for some flexibility, basically making the lands Marginal Restricted, which Mr. Balys felt would limit the owners in achieving the vision they have of the lands.

The speaker explained the owners envision a development centred around a large undivided tract of environmentally sensitive land, which would include the Carp Ridge outcrops and old growths of white pine and oak (400 to 600 acres of the total 842 acres). The homes could be built on 1/4 acre to 1/2 acre lots, with 4 to 6 homes on cul-de-sacs (on independent septic systems) around the periphery of the natural area. There could be a scenic road circling around the site, coming in on Richardson Side Road and also on Huntmar Road at the railroad. He explained a volunteer trust arrangement could be worked out to ensure the natural area is protected (e.g. consisting of the landowners, public authorities and special interest groups).

Mr. Balys added the public would benefit in that these lands that are currently private and off limits would become available for their enjoyment and protected for future generations. He commented that it is becoming impossible to keep the land in its pristine, natural state as each year problems with skidoos, motorbikes, ATVs, bonfires and garbage increase.

To make such a development economically possible and feasible, Mr. Balys stated many of the current restrictions must be removed and in this regard, he requested that all of the lands south of the railroad tracks be designated General Rural Area, with restrictions regarding environmental studies.

Councillor Munter asked that staff comment on Mr. Balys' proposal. Ms. Sweet advised the changes suggested in the staff report are as a result of public input; these changes would allow certain types of subdivisions in Environmental B Areas, provided an EIS is carried out to show that development could be clustered and the natural areas left open. This Policy also refers back to country lot provisions in Section 3.7.4 (page 41, Draft Official Plan) which allows for country lots of less than 0.8 hectares, provided the overall density is 0.8 hectares. Ms. Sweet offered, in her opinion, what Mr. Balys is proposing would be permitted by the recommended changes to the plan. Mr. Balys stated he would be satisfied with these provisions, as long as cluster development is permitted on less than 1/2 acre lots. Ms. Sweet stated in this regard, the communal system polices would be applicable but would not preclude what Mr. Balys is proposing.

Ted Robinson and Jack Ferguson, City Of Ottawa (Submission No. 109) provided a written copy of their presentation, which is held on file with the Regional Clerk. Mr. Robinson acknowledged staff's resolution of many of the items raised in the City's original submission. He stated however, there were a few areas that were still of concern to the City of Ottawa and he proceeded to review these, as follows:

- many of the areas of the Plan are too detailed and prescriptive in areas of local jurisdiction (i.e. providing direction for growth within the Region, revisiting inter-municipal land use issues, depicting major land use categories, and setting broad direction for local official plans);
- referring to page 8 of the staff report and the recommended changes to Section 1.5, questioned how the Region will "influence municipalities" in terms of the Region's review, consideration and approval of development applications;
- the Draft Official Plan's use of the word "require" goes beyond influencing and becomes prescriptive (e.g. Item 92, Page 37, replace "require" with language that encourages area municipalities to selectively allow mixed use development in the identified locations in support of Regional objectives);
- feel there is insufficient recognition of local official plans in the Draft ROP;
- ROP should state its detailed policies would only apply where the area municipality does not have the equivalent;

- feel reference to the local official plan is needed in Section 3.4.2, Policy 2, as the term “visual integrity and symbolic primacy” has been quantified by detailed study and has no context outside of the City of Ottawa’s OP;
- expressed concern with the statement “policies for the Central Area apply to both sides of the road boundaries” (Item 113, page 46), as the City applies exterior boundaries of the Central Area as firm boundaries;
- felt Recommendation III.A. (page 142) did not address the issue raised. Concerned that a municipality would be unable to obtain active recreational lands because the land dedication requirement has been used for an area next to the river;
- suggested the proposed wording “open air recreation” in Section 6.4, Policy 3 be replaced with “open space and recreation uses;
- several components of the Greenway system are missing in Schedule I. Suggested an urban open space network would be preferable and felt the Schedule should indicate how Sections 5 and 6 of the Plan work together to form an integrated network;
- requested that Regional Council lift Deferral No.s 21, 24 and 25 to the City of Ottawa Official Plan;
- staff report does not include an Annex containing a summary of changes to Schedule B, Urban Policy Plan - provided a list of revisions the City had requested;
- referred to twenty-three comments contained in the City’s original submission that have not been responded to.

Andre Hauschild, (Submission No. 14) advised he has been a resident of Fernbank Road for twenty-two years and stated he was before the Committee to express concerns about greenspace in this area. Mr. Hauschild advised he has, over the years, watched the continued deterioration of the condition of the land between Stittsville and Kanata and he expressed his belief that the major cause of this has been absentee landowners. He noted in the area of Fernbank Road, between Main Street and Eagleson, there is not a single farmer that has not retired and has either sold or is in the process of selling his land; he suggested this would likely result in more absentee landowners. Mr. Hauschild offered, by way of a solution to retain the green corridor in this area, that a provision be made in the Official Plan whereby the creation of hobby farms or estate lots (between 2 and 10 acres) are permitted; in exchange the landowners would be required to retain/convert at least one-third of the property as woodlot (could be regulated through the issuance of a building permit). Mr. Hauschild urged the Committee to look very closely at this area and to seriously consider his suggestion; he cautioned if nothing is done, there will be no end to the development applications coming forward and the green corridor will have been lost.

Diane McIntyre And Lester Johnson, Glebe Community Association Ms. McIntyre advised that the Association has been active in a number of planning issues over the last few years and she conveyed the incredible strain the volunteer members have had placed on them in trying to assess the various studies, plans, etc.



Ms. McIntyre stated the communities in the core of the region are the major contributors to the image of the City of Ottawa and the Region; and the well being and health of these communities is critical to the well being and prosperity of the whole Region. She drew attention to the high residential density in the core (in some areas, in excess of 13,000 residents per kilometre) and the heavy load on the infrastructure and amenities, not only from the core residents but also from businesses, tourists and other residents of the Region commuting downtown for entertainment and other purposes.

The speaker noted that each proposed change to the Official Plan should be evaluated in its total context, for example an environmental assessment cannot be done on just one small area, without looking at the downstream impacts. Referring to Section 6 of the Draft ROP, Regional Open Space policies, Ms. McIntyre urged the inclusion of general Regional guidelines that would ensure the total population that uses an area is considered. Ms. McIntyre suggested staff review the study undertaken by the City of Toronto, entitled City Plan '91 which set guidelines for greenspace in the downtown core and created designations based on business population and the residential population.

Referring to public transportation, Ms. McIntyre stated she believes the Region has been proactive with its infrastructure, but has been underactive in the access to the infrastructure and also in the service on the infrastructure. She urged the Committee to make service and access to public transportation for pedestrians and cyclists the priority, rather than the expansions of the roads.. She felt the Plan did not contain policies to back up its objective of changing the ratio of use from the private automobile to alternate forms of transportation. She stressed the importance of planning for the survivability of the entire Region and the core and felt the emphasis should not be on growth, but rather on providing well for the residents that are already here.

Mr. Johnson then addressed traffic issues, particularly the access ramps that are being built on the Airport Parkway and the inherent change for Bronson Avenue and the Parkway from being a one way access to the airport to a major collector road. Mr. Johnson questioned whether all of the necessary processes were followed and if all of the environmental impacts had been considered, particularly on the central city. Mr. Johnson expressed concern because in reviewing the environmental impact studies for the Hunt Club on-ramps, only the particular area was looked at and not the downstream effects; similarly, south-east sector study uses the Canal as its boundary line.

Mr. Mckinley advised he was representing one of the applicants for ROPA 67 and appeared before the Committee to urge them to approve this amendment. Referring to earlier delegations' comments on applications in the Stittsville area, he noted there was consistency in the applications in that they were generally urging the Region to give some

form of study designation to the subject area as opposed to simply refusing the applications and he stated this was consistent with his client's expectations.

Mr. McKinley provided a brief history of the subject property, noting his client acquired the 663 acres known as Fernbank estates based on assurances that the Western Growth Study (initiated by the Region and included Kanata, Golbourn and West Carleton) would be carried through to its conclusion. However, in connection with the Palladium lands Official Plan Amendment, the OMB directed that the Region withdraw from the study of this area. Mr. McKinley opined that, from the number of amendment applications in this area, there continues to be a need to study this area.

The speaker went on to address staff's argument that a twenty-five year supply of residential land currently exists. He pointed out the cycle of the ROP has historically been greater than nine years and so by the time this ROP has reached its conclusion, there will not be an adequate land supply, as is required. He stated it is his client's preference to get started under some sort of designation and he noted the Region would be committing to nothing except that a study will be undertaken.

Mr. McKinley then spoke to the issues of Stage I and II lands, and dwelling unit allocation in Stittsville and referred to a suggestion in the staff report that part of the new allocation of 2,500 units is being made to service Stage II lands. He stated this was totally inconsistent with every Regional document to this point in time and felt it would lead to further problems between land owners in the future. He noted one of the reasons Stittsville is faced with this type of anomaly is that Goulbourn has refused to do a comprehensive study that would deal with the fact that the servicing capacity available, does not match up with capacity of the urban development area.

Mr. McKinley stated the suggestion in the staff report that it would cost approximately \$75 million to extend the population beyond 8,500 people in Stittsville, was not consistent with information he had. As well, he referred to the Westpark lands (ROPA 65) which are immediately east of his client's lands and noted staff had indicated in the report that development of this land would have no impact on downstream availability of service for Stittsville. He felt it was very difficult to rationalize these two statements.

In conclusion, Mr. McKinley stated the objections to his client's application proceeding are fundamentally flawed and are not founded on good planning principles. As well, he said the "need issue" cannot be adequately assessed without a study that includes recognition that in the Region, 10% of all housing has always occurred outside of traditional urban areas and need is not simply one that is addressed in terms of unit count. Mr. McKinley also advised that he would like to meet with Regional Planning staff to discuss the designation of portions of his client's land as agricultural resource.

Councillor Beamish asked for staff response on Mr. McKinley's comments on the costs for infrastructure upgrades of one piece of land over another one. Ms. Sweet explained that staff's calculations of \$75 to \$100 million, included the Westpark amendment and all of the other applications. She advised the break down of costs for Westpark would be estimated at between \$20 to \$30 million for transportation and the water and wastewater at approximately \$1.7 million.

W. Ellwood Pritchard and Prabha Singh-Sinclair, Riverside Park Community and Recreation Association (RPCRA) (Submission No. 329) Mr. Pritchard advised he was speaking on behalf of the President of the Board of Directors of RPCRA, Peter Freemo. Mr. Pritchard conveyed the Board's support for full access to the Airport Parkway at Walkley and Hunt Club. Further, he noted at public meetings and open houses held recently for three traffic studies, widespread community support for this access was evident. The communities are being inundated with transient traffic with the attendant pollution, speeding and disregard for traffic signs. He noted the large and growing population in the south end, needs this north-south artery to move traffic.

Ms. Sinclair, advised she is a member of the Executive of RPCRA and lives at the corner of Mooney's Bay Place and Flannery Drive. Ms. Sinclair advised that Submission No. 305, which was purportedly submitted on behalf of the RPCRA is inconsistent with the long standing position of the Community Association. In particular, an item on the second page in the detailed comments appended to the RPCRA's Development Committee Submission regarding Confederation Heights, which refers to Table 6 on page 20 of Volume 1 of the Draft ROP and deals with transportation projects. Ms. Sinclair noted in this table are key infrastructure projects of first priority, two of which are absolutely essential to restore the quality of life in the neighbourhood, namely, the ramps that will complete interchanges at the Airport Parkway at Hunt Club and Walkley Road. Ms. Sinclair noted Submission 305 was not endorsed by the Community; the official and sanctioned comment from the RPCRA is contained in Submission No. 329. The speaker advised the RPCRA will be submitting a letter to clarify the status of its submission .

Ms. Sinclair then commented on the issue of traffic in the neighbourhood. She noted on a daily basis the traffic situation is unacceptable for a residential neighbourhood as it is unsafe for all residents and especially children. She advised there is constant disregard for most traffic signage, including stop signs and speed limits and it has been identified that people are using this residential street as a Regional Road. Ms. Sinclair concluded by saying the residents and local community associations strongly support the construction of full interchanges at the Airport Parkway at Hunt Club Road and Walkley Road..

Lois K. Smith appeared once again before the Committee and made the following points:

- Urged support for the preservation of the greenspace between Stittsville and Kanata;

- regarding the developers' argument on the proximity of their lands to the Corel Centre, noted high-tech does not need prime agricultural land;
- support Chris Bradshaw's comments with regard to walking;
- encouraged inclusion of ramps, etc. in sidewalks for wheelchairs;
- where there is a sidewalk that has vertical wall higher than 4.5 feet, suggest adding extra foot of width to standard width sidewalks as a safety feature;
- recommend against staff proposal to close off Walkley Road, west of Bank Street to truck traffic as it is an access road for the shopping centre;
- Suggested on page 49 amend phrase to read "parking lots shall not be located between *pedestrian access routes* to transitway stations and business entrances";
- no indication on the Water Master Plan map where Julia Gardens are;
- ROP Schedules - should be verification of boundaries between Kanata and Goulbourn;
- reference in OP (page 12) that the Greenbelt Boundary is indicated on the Schedule A and B. The "white box" greenbelt indicator is missing from Schedule A. On Schedule B should be a darkening on the line of the exterior parts;

In conclusion, Ms. Smith left the Committee with this verse "In the realm of planning and building, not everything is strife. Good planning and fine craftsmanship enrich our human life."

Having heard from all public delegations, Committee Chair Hunter deemed the public hearings closed, and reminded members the Committee would meet to deliberate the Draft Official Plan, Draft Water and Wastewater Master Plans and proposed Regional Official Plan Amendments, beginning on 12 June 1997.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

Councillor Legendre asked that staff clarify how they foresee the Committee proceeding at the meetings beginning 12 June 1997. Ms. Sweet advised a third transmittal report (second addendum) will be produced by staff covering input received (both at the meetings and in writing); as well, a second Draft of the Official Plan, with all additions in italics, will be before the Committee. Ms. Sweet agreed it would be reasonable to proceed through the Draft ROP (second version) page by page. Councillor Legendre suggested Councillors with administrative amendments meet with staff prior to the finalization of the second Draft ROP. Chair Hunter also suggested Councillors provide as much advance notice as possible to staff and Committee, of any motions they intend to put forward.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

*Original signed by*  
Dawn Whelan  
COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

*Original confirmed by*  
Gord Hunter  
COMMITTEE CHAIR