

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

22 SEPTEMBER 1998

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

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

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 11 Aug 98.

CARRIED

PLANNING ITEMS

1. RMOC RESPONSE TO NCC'S
*A CAPITAL FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS - A VISION
FOR THE CORE AREA OF CANADA'S CAPITAL REGION*
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 25 Aug 98

Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department, introduced the delegation from the National Capital Commission (NCC), consisting of Messrs. Curry Wood, Vice President of Capital Planning and Real Asset Management; François Lapointe, Director of Planning; Richard Scott, Senior Planner; and Daniel Miron, a planner involved with the NCC's *Vision for the Core Area* report.

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 14 October 98 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 14.

Mr. Wood first spoke to the NCC's Draft *Plan for Canada's Capital* (Item 2), and then presented the NCC's *A Capital for Future Generations - A Vision for the Core Area of Canada's Capital Region* (speaking notes on file with the Regional Clerk).

Councillor van den Ham felt, as the NCC had put forward and was seeking input on a first draft of its Plan, there was no necessity for the Region to delay in submitting its comments, as requested in a letter from the NCC Chair to the Regional Chair dated 21 Sept 98. The Councillor asked Mr. Wood to explain the nature of this request.

Mr. Wood said the NCC was happy to receive the Region's comments, and that those contained in the staff report would be beneficial. He explained the Commission was requesting it be given the opportunity to gather and address the Region's comments, but was asking that the comments, particularly those regarding Metcalfe Street, not be formalized at this time.

Councillor Munter felt the NCC's Plan contained many good elements, but the Commission, in making its request, was playing with words. He emphasized many in the community were puzzled by the Metcalfe Street proposal, which would entail the destruction of many buildings, and offered that most members of Committee viewed this aspect of the Plan as a bad idea. He pointed out the purpose of the staff report was to give advice to Committee, which, if taken, would be forwarded to the NCC as input the Commission deserved to hear from Committee and Council on behalf of the community.

Responding to Councillor Hill's concern that the millions of dollars spent on Wellington Street rehabilitation would go to waste should the Metcalfe proposal be implemented, Mr. Wood said he did not foresee this occurring. He noted the Commission had deferred some of its own work with respect to improvements to its Visitor Centre foyer pending the outcome of consultations, and that detailed planning would give some indication as to what work would be required, but said it was not his intention to see work destroyed that the Commission had spent much time and effort putting into place.

Responding to another query from Councillor Hill regarding a time frame, Mr. Wood informed the consultation process would give some guidance, but that no time frame had been identified for the Plan's implementation, as the vision document was conceptual in nature, and represented a long term vision for the development of the core.

Councillor Doucet also voiced his opposition to the Metcalfe Street proposal. He noted the NCC's media relations representative had called the proposal an "idea", but said that when he saw the degree of detail the plans went into, it did not have the feel or look of a mere idea. The Councillor asked for clarification whether it was an idea, a concept or whether the Commission was already preparing to tear buildings down.

Mr. Wood reiterated the plan was a vision for what might happen in the core, a vision that took a particular corridor with the objective of opening up the vista for Parliament Hill. He emphasized there were no detailed plans *per se*, only that the Commission had developed some concepts and presented some graphic material at public meetings in order to try and get some public feedback and response. Mr. Wood said that subsequently, the Commission would be examining what further views or options could be developed.

Councillor Doucet then asked if the Metcalfe proposal would be withdrawn if the public consultation proved overwhelmingly opposed.

Mr. Wood answered the NCC would take all received comments into account when developing further options, offering there might be a time when withdrawal of the proposal was required. The speaker said the Commission had started thinking about how to address the views it had received, but was waiting until the end of its consultation period. Mr. Wood said he felt the Commission could not help but start thinking about what adjustments could be made when hearing this degree of opposition .

The Committee Chair noted previous documentation and visioning exercises undertaken by the NCC over the last century had focused on the removal of lumberyards, match factories, and pulp mills from the waterfront, with a view to replacing these with public structures or publicly accessible open space. He questioned what was meant by the phrases 'private development' and 'residential development' in reference to the development of Chaudière Island and a section of Taché Boulevard in Hull, and asked if this was a new thrust or direction for the NCC regarding the core area.

Mr. Wood explained that many public agencies were currently looking for ways of involving the private sector in order to save public money. He offered the NCC had had other successful partnering arrangements with respect to property development, such as the redevelopments of 489 Sussex Drive, the Chambers Building, and the Dow's Lake Pavilion. He said these initiatives involved the private sector, with public end results. He said he did not believe this was a new direction, but represented a change in focus of public/private sector investment.

Chair Hunter then asked if the NCC team did not view the uses of private housing, with public access to the same lands, as incompatible.

The speaker said the Commission would have to examine these issues to see how different components would fit together in terms of compatibility. He said the NCC was not ruling out the possibility of housing, as it was felt areas such as the Byward Market and others in the downtown core thrived because of the involvement of housing. Mr. Wood stated the relationships between LeBreton Flats, the Chaudière and nearby islands and the Brewery Creek in Hull had been studied to find a suitable mix of public uses and residential

accommodation so that a broad range of mixed uses would exist to ensure the building of a vital community over time.

In reference to the Chaudière and Victoria Islands, Councillor Legendre asked whether the proposed commercial and industrial activities envisioned by the NCC referred to existing and continuing uses, or whether the NCC had notions of introducing other industrial uses. The Councillor noted staff's view that the proposal was not detailed enough to know whether the proposed uses would fit within those permitted under the Region's Waterfront Open Space designation.

Daniel Miron explained the plan of vision, with respect to Chaudière and Victoria Islands, foresees the industrial activities remaining for the next 25 years, during which time there could be discussions with the companies as to the possibility of phasing out these activities or retaining some activities for interpretation. Because this is a vision, the NCC is trying to set up a framework to seize on opportunities over the next 50 years. Mr. Miron stated the NCC is cognizant of the fact that historically, Ottawa-Hull developed because of the industrial water activities.

Councillor Legendre commented he would not classify interpretation activities as industrial activities. The Councillor went on to express his disappointment with the staff comment at the end of their response, namely, "The proposals for the Islands should include the explicit intent to open up new public views of the Falls as soon as possible...". He felt this comment was included as a result of media attention, which he acceded was fine, but he would have liked staff to comment on the possibility of locks to permit bypassing the falls. He felt Canada was missing out on the potential resources and felt it deserved, at the very least, some discussion.

The Committee then heard from the following public delegations.

Amy Kempster, Federation of Citizens' Association (FCA), provided Committee with a written copy of her presentation (held on file by the Regional Clerk). Ms. Kempster expressed FCA's general agreement with the staff report, but offered a number of suggestions which she felt would improve the staff response. Included was the suggestion the staff response contain the provision that greenspace land not be sold to fund the NCC's proposals (e.g. for Metcalfe Street and the North Shore). As well, Ms. Kempster offered the following suggestions: staff's comments on lower quality rural lands should specify that this not be interpreted to include waterway corridors; the word "encourage" be substituted with the words "Work with" in the policy dealing with Urban Design; staff should be more critical of the locating of National Cultural Institutions along parkways with no transit; the policy dealing with Federal Offices and Research Facilities should specifically mention cycling and walking in addition to public transit; and, a policy be added to the sections dealing with Capital Parkway Network and Capital Pathway

Network which states “retain and protect all existing natural areas in Parkway and Pathway corridors”.

Barry Padolsky, advised he was an architect, a heritage consultant and an urban planner in Ottawa. Mr. Padolsky stated he has been an admirer of the NCC’s efforts in the Capital area since coming to Ottawa in 1961. He stated that, on the whole, he supported the recommendations and concerns contained in the staff report. As well, he expressed support for the NCC’s commitment to Chaudiere Falls, Victoria Island, Bank Street access and the Lebreton Flats proposals.

However, Mr. Padolsky advised he was before the Committee to address the issue of the Metcalfe Street widening proposal. He urged the Committee to strongly and unequivocally reject the Metcalfe Street proposal in its entirety, including all of the options proposed. The speaker offered the reasons for rejecting this proposal include transportation issues, loss of housing, loss of employment, the impact on Sparks Street Mall and specifically the impact on heritage and urban design.

Mr. Padolsky went on to say this initiative conflicts with the heritage policies of the Federal Government, noting between twelve to fifteen properties designated by the Federal and Municipal Governments as heritage buildings would be demolished. With respect to urban design, Mr. Padolsky suggested the proposal does not conform with the NCC’s vision for the core area, and it conflicts with their vision for Parliament articulated in their Parliamentary Precinct Plan.

Mr. Padolsky referred to the 1950 Greber Plan which also addressed the widening of Metcalfe Street and rejected it for a number of reasons, the principal one being aesthetics. According to Mr. Greber the architectural characteristics of the Parliament Buildings (essentially gothic with Victorian adaptations) were best viewed at an angle, allowing the Parliament Buildings to retain their picturesque character even if future architectural modifications should be carried out on the east and west blocks. As well, viewed from an angle, the Peace Tower does not appear as elongated as when viewed head on.

In conclusion, Mr. Padolsky urged the Committee to firmly reject the entire proposal, including the partial compromise. He advised the partial compromise would include demolition of seven federally designated heritage buildings along Metcalfe Street between Wellington and Sparks Street. He noted all seven buildings are or will be owned by the Federal Government and this is the only portion of the plan that could be implemented without consultation with the Region or other agencies.

Bob McKinley, Solicitor, acting on behalf of Trustcan Property Corporation, a subsidiary of Canada Trust, the owner of the World Exchange Plaza, located at the corner of

Metcalfe and Albert Streets. Mr. McKinley expressed his client's concern with the proposed widening of Metcalfe Street.

The speaker went on to provide the Committee with details of his client's situation. He noted when the property was acquired in 1988, four components were envisaged; they were 1100 spaces of parking, the first phase of the high-rise office tower, 150,000 square feet of retail space and the last phase being a 250,000 square foot office building. This last phase has been approved by the NCC, and the City of Ottawa has approved the site plan application for the building. Mr. McKinley's client is now preparing working drawings for the purpose of obtaining a building permit.

Mr. McKinley explained this new office building will be of a unique design aimed at attracting a high level of clientele. The capital cost of the building will be in excess of \$50 million and will generate approximately \$1.5 million in annual property taxes. He advised the proposal to widen Metcalfe Street would materially impact the building's potential (in the millions of dollars) and he felt it unlikely any concrete proposal would come forward prior to the building's completion. Mr. McKinley urged the Committee to follow the staff recommendation and deal as quickly as possible to eliminate the proposal to widen Metcalfe Street, in order to alleviate any future uncertainty with respect to this project.

Lois K. Smith, confined her comments to the staff reports and indicated she would be forwarding her comments on the NCC reports directly to them. She expressed her general support for the ideas proposed by Regional staff but did address concerns she had with three specific areas. Referring to page 3 of the staff report, Miss Smith stated she was very concerned with staff's suggestion that the NCC include a residential component on Victoria Island. She commented the public has the right to have somewhere free from residential interference for their activities and gave the example of the problems with Landsdowne Park and the Glebe. As well, public space is being cut back in LeBreton Flats and she felt this intensified the need to keep Victoria Island free.

With respect to McCarthy Woods, Miss Smith commended the Region for asking the NCC for open space between McCarthy Woods and the Rideau River. Finally, on the issue of the widening of Metcalfe Street, Miss Smith urged the Committee not to consent to the NCC's proposal and expressed her concurrence with the views related by previous speakers. She felt the views and architecture in the Capital area are uniquely Canadian and any attempt to imitate other countries would not work here.

Having heard from all public delegations, Chair Hunter then brought the matter back to Committee for debate; he read two motions that were before Committee for consideration.

Moved by M. Bellemare

That further to the National Capital Commission's request, consideration of this report be deferred pending the findings of its public consultation process.

Moved by A. Munter

That Regional Council request that the NCC delete all elements of the Metcalfe Street widening from its plans.

Committee Chair Hunter then invited Councillor Diane Holmes to speak first on this matter, as it is her ward that is affected.

Speaking to the issue of the proposed widening of Metcalfe Street, Councillor Holmes stated that since being elected to public office, she has made it an objective that Ottawa not become a Washington, D.C.; a national capital, where the federal precinct is magnificent, but the city is dangerous, dirty and poor. She noted she had previously written to the NCC and indicated she could accept Metcalfe Street being widened south to Albert Street where the regional transitway would bisect the pedestrian precinct. However, after discussing this issue with the businesses and residents in the area (who are absolutely opposed to the entire Metcalfe Street widening), the Councillor advised she had moved away from her original view and was now speaking against the entire proposal.

The Councillor noted one of the main reasons for the community's opposition is the blighting effect the proposal would have, and she referred to comments made by the representative of the World Exchange Plaza. As well, she indicated she had heard from businesses in the area that Public Works is not granting leases longer than five years due to the Metcalfe Street widening. Councillor Holmes stated, with this uncertainty, businesses are not able to enjoy long term planning stability and are discouraged from making major capital investments.

Councillor Holmes also pointed out the loss of residential capacity that will occur if the widening is carried out to the Museum of Nature and noted this is in direct conflict with the Regional Official Plan's goal of intensifying residential capacity in this area. The Councillor went on to speak of the joint reconstruction (the Region and the NCC) of Elgin Street due to begin next year that would see it become part of Confederation Boulevard that leads to Parliament Hill; she questioned the wisdom of doing the same to Metcalfe Street only one block away. The Councillor noted the proposal would see Metcalfe Street widened to the same width as King Edward Avenue and she found this to be a devastating thought, citing concerns of pedestrian safety and community division. As well, Councillor Holmes expressed concern that parking under the square would be used by employees of

Parliament Hill and not as short term parking for tourists. She found this particularly disturbing, given the close proximity to the Transitway.

In closing, Councillor Holmes drew the Committee's attention to other projects undertaken by the NCC such as Lebreton Flats, the Daly Building and two blocks of buildings in New Edinburgh, where buildings have been demolished and have yet to be replaced. She voiced her fear that, given the NCC's history, the buildings along Metcalfe would be torn down and the sites will be hoarded or used for parking lots. She urged the Committee to support deletion of this proposal.

Councillor Munter, referring to his motion, stated this amendment to the report would state quite clearly to the NCC, the Region would like them to remove all elements of the Metcalfe Street widening from their plan. He went on to say, with some exceptions (as referred to by Councillor Holmes), Ottawa is better place because of the NCC and, if most of what is in their plan is implemented, Ottawa will be an even better place. However, the Councillor felt the notion of knocking down residential units, businesses, restaurants, and heritage buildings to widen a road was a very bad idea.

Councillor Munter felt it was necessary to point out to the NCC that such a plan was in contravention of the Regional Official Plan, and would negatively impact on residential and business communities in the core, and on the Region's and the Commission's goals of having a Capital that was livable, walkable and safe. He believed the Region should clearly express to the NCC that the Metcalfe Street demolition plan would not be supported, and that Council wanted to see it out of the NCC's vision for the community.

Councillor Bellemare, referring to his motion to defer consideration of the reports until after the NCC had completed its public consultation process, stated if this motion were to fail, he would move that the paragraph in the staff report which addressed the proposed Metcalfe Street modifications be deleted. He explained he was in favour of the NCC proposal to widen the street, which would open up a view of the Parliament buildings. The Councillor felt the issue was one of a clash of both municipal and national perspectives. He said Committee had to realize the National Capital Region (NCR) was not just another city or region in Ontario, but was the Capital of Canada, and a Capital for all Canadians, not just for local residents. He noted the NCC's mandate was to have a national perspective. Councillor Bellemare felt the plan was an interesting, if controversial, proposal which merited public debate in both the Region and across the nation. Regarding high project costs and the destruction of heritage buildings, the Councillor noted the structures might be relocated, and that financing would be borne by all Canadian taxpayers. He said his inclination was to err on the side of a national perspective rather than a strictly municipal one.

Councillor Bellemare then submitted the following motion, to be considered should his first motion fail.

That the staff report be amended by deleting the second last paragraph of the Conclusion.

Councillor van den Ham said he would support staff's comments, and not Councillor Bellemare's motion or the notion of a widened Metcalfe Street. He said the letter from the NCC Chair was worthy of consideration, but felt that the Region had a responsibility to put its comments on record.

Councillor Stewart said she could not understand why the NCC did not want the Region to take a formal position on the matter at this time. She noted the Committee meeting was the proper forum and process in which to ratify the staff position and to forward the Region's comments. The Councillor also pointed out Committee and Council were not voting to approve or disapprove of the whole NCC Plan at this time. Councillor Stewart felt approving Councillor Munter's Motion would be a good direction at the present time.

Councillor Holmes urged Committee not to agree with Councillor Bellemare's deferral Motion. She felt it was inappropriate for the NCC to ask the Region to change its normal process and to wait until after the Commission's public consultation process was over. Councillor Holmes said she hoped the normal Committee and Council processes would be used for comment on this Plan as for any other.

Chair Hunter commented there was less conflict and antipathy expressed towards the NCC by municipal representatives today than in the past, largely because more planning and more activities were being done in concert with municipalities. He believed the NCC has, over time, become more flexible in its positions without jeopardizing the goals and objectives of its plans for the National Capital. The Committee Chair said this has resulted in benefits to both the town and the crown, and has helped lead to a much easier acceptance of, and trust in the Commission's vision for the future of Canada's Capital.

Committee then considered the following Motions:

Moved by M. Bellemare.

That further to the National Capital Commission's request that consideration of this report be deferred pending the findings of its public consultation.

LOST

Nays: P. Hume, G. Hunter, J. Legendre, A. Munter, W. Stewart, and
R. van den Ham....6
Yeas: M. Bellemare and B. Hill....2

Moved by A. Munter.

That Regional Council request that the National Capital Commission delete all elements of the Metcalfe Street widening from its plans.

CARRIED

Yeas: B. Hill, G. Hunter J. Legendre, A. Munter and W. Stewart....5
Nays: M. Bellemare, P. Hume and R. van den Ham....3

As Councillor Munter's motion carried, the Committee Chair ruled Councillor Bellemare's second Motion redundant.

Committee then considered the staff report as amended.

- 1. That Council request that the National Capital Commission delete all elements of the Metcalfe Street widening from its plans.**
- 2. That Council approve this report, as amended, as the RMOC response to the National Capital Commission's *A Capital for Future Generations - A Vision for the Core Area of Canada's Capital Region*.**

CARRIED as amended

2. RMOC RESPONSE TO NCC'S DRAFT *PLAN FOR CANADA'S CAPITAL*

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 2 Sep 98

Curry Wood, Vice President of Capital Planning and Real Asset Management, National Capital Commission (NCC) thanked Committee for the opportunity to speak and to introduce the draft *Plan for Canada's Capital*. He also thanked Planning staff for their feedback regarding the NCC initiative. Mr. Wood then read from a prepared statement regarding the NCC report (on file with the Regional Clerk).

Councillor Legendre offered he had found some elements of the report encouraging, but said he had often thought the river focus of the National Capital was being ignored, uncared for and underutilized. He noted World Capitals elsewhere were frequently on

shorelines which were put to better use. The Councillor referred to some of the Ottawa River's non-navigable sections of rapids, and said he was glad to see some discussion on the matter. Councillor Legendre said he would have liked to have seen discussion regarding timelines, and he asked the speaker to comment.

Mr. Wood replied the NCC had been working with a group which envisioned opening up the Ottawa River from Temiskaming to Arnprior. He said the Commission had invested in some of the initial planning work the group had undertaken, and that the group had more work to do in trying to develop its own funding and program. Mr. Wood noted other organizations would have to contribute funding to the initiative in order for it to carry on, but that the NCC was prepared to be a part of the group that foresaw the opening up of the Ottawa River to encourage the flow of traffic and public use.

Councillor Legendre said he was disappointed by this response. He said he had been present when this group was created, and felt it was a stop gap measure. The Councillor said he was discouraged that the lead Canadian agency was putting the thrust of making this project go forward onto the group's shoulders.

Councillor Legendre also noted in the "Urban Design" section of the NCC's report, the policy spoke to protecting the views and symbolic primacy of the Parliament Buildings. He said similar words had long been used in the NCC's vision documents, yet he felt when a project or specific proposal came forward, the NCC offered no support. The Councillor said the most recent example of this was the new American Embassy. He recounted he had been on City Council when the proposal came forward, and the NCC had offered no support with regard to protecting the views and vistas of Parliament Hill, particularly from the Byward Market along Clarence Street looking toward Parliament Hill.

Mr. Wood said the NCC had engaged in significant work with the Region and the City of Ottawa to try to come up with a plan that would satisfy people, and felt the objective of identifying and protecting viewpoints had been achieved. Mr. Wood offered other viewpoints had been protected, such as those of the Daly Building project, newly-opened vistas on George Street and the York steps, whose construction would commence in the Fall. Mr. Wood said he believed the Commission had gone a long way towards fulfilling its stated objectives.

Councillor Holmes commended the NCC on the work being done in partnership with the Region on Confederation Boulevard. She called the effort a success story, with the Commission providing the urban design detailing, and the Region doing the sewer and water work; a good partnership with a successful end product. The Councillor then referred to Chapter 6 of the NCC report, Capital Links, which made reference to Capital Gateways, including road, rail and river entries at the edge of the National Capital Region (NCR), and major rail, bus and air terminals. Councillor Holmes asked for comment on

the kind of entries the Region had an interest in, such as King Edward Avenue coming into the NCR, and such as Nicholas and Kent Streets, where she saw opportunities to improve the landscaping and urban design elements to the roadways without changing road capacity.

Mr. Wood explained that in terms of Capital Gateways, the Commission had been focusing on the entrances to the Capital more than on the downtown core areas, in terms of how people entered the Capital, how they felt when they entered the Capital, whether they felt the Capital had the right attributes, which Highways they used to enter the Capital, and so on. Mr. Wood stated it had been brought to his attention that areas like Kent Street might be considered in the Gateway category, and that the NCC would be prepared to study these suggestions.

Richard Scott, Senior Planner, NCC, said an example of where Gateway Policies had already been implemented was with Highway 416 through the Greenbelt where the NCC had worked closely with the Province to come up with appropriate landscaping to announce the entrance to the Capital. He said the Commission was encouraged by what it saw in the new Regional Official Plan with regard to entranceways into the Capital so that the NCC could extend the philosophy beyond the Greenbelt to the edges of the NCR.

Councillor Stewart said she would move an amendment to the RMOC response under "Capital Urban Green Spaces". Referring to the Waterfront Open Space in her ward, Councillor Stewart noted that during the ROP review, much had been done to preserve land that had no right of development. She commended staff on an excellent job on Moffat Farm, and said she agreed with the staff position. She then pointed out she believed the fifth line of the second paragraph of the staff response should read "...the Southern Corridor between the Rideau River and *Riverside Drive*" instead of *River Road*. Councillor Stewart said her amendment would alleviate uncertainty in the area resulting from the City's neighbourhood plan for the Southern Corridor area just to the south. Her amendment would add "that proposals to add uses or development for southern corridor lands which were inconsistent with the Region's Waterfront Open Space designation would require a Regional Official Plan amendment".

Councillor van den Ham said he viewed this as a given, as something that would happen in any case if there were any change. Ms. Sweet replied although this could be generally assumed, this was a matter of caution, and would provide an element of safety.

Having completed discussions, Committee considered Councillor Stewart's Motion.

Moved by W. Stewart.

That the RMOC response under “Capital Urban Green Spaces” be amended to include “that proposals to add uses or development for southern corridor lands that are inconsistent with the Region’s “waterfront open space” designation will require a Regional Official Plan amendment.”

CARRIED

Committee then considered the staff report as amended.

1. **That the RMOC response under “Capital Urban Green Spaces” be amended to include “that proposals to add uses or development for southern corridor lands that are inconsistent with the Region’s “waterfront open space” designation will require a Regional Official Plan amendment.”**
2. **That Council approve this report, as amended, as the RMOC response to the National Capital Commission’s Draft *Plan for Canada’s Capital*.**

CARRIED as amended

Chair Hunter pointed out the NCC’s deadline for receiving comments was 28 September. He noted the reports would normally rise to Council at its meeting of 14 October, and suggested that waiving the reports to the Council meeting of 23 September would allow for Council’s view to be forwarded to the NCC by its deadline. Councillor Munter then moved that this be done.

Moved by A. Munter.

That Council be requested to waive the rules of procedure to consider items 1 and 2 at its meeting of 23 September 1998.

CARRIED

(M. Bellemare dissented)

3. **LAND ACQUISITION - MARLBOROUGH FOREST, RIDEAU**
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner’s report
dated 25 Aug 98

That Planning and Environment Committee approve the following action:

1. **Recommend to the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee the acquisition of 128 acres, described as being the rear part of Lot 27,**

Concession 8, former Township of Marlborough, now Township of Rideau from the Estate of Joseph L. Purdy as an addition to the Marlborough Forest for a consideration of \$37,580;

- 2. Planning and Development Approvals Department make application to the Ministry of Natural Resources to approve the addition of these lands to the Marlborough Forest Management Agreement;**
- 3. Upon receipt of approval of the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Marlborough Forest addition be brought to Council for confirmation and a by-law adding the land to the Management Agreement be submitted for adoption.**

CARRIED

JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES,
PLANNING AND HEALTH ITEM

4. RURAL SERVICING STRATEGY
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner and Medical Officer of Health's report dated 26 Aug 98

Committee heard from Miss Lois K. Smith, who said she supported the Region proceeding with the study. Miss Smith went on to offer her thoughts on rural servicing. She noted on a farm, a tile field can be moved to another spot on the farm if it does get plugged; it is not convenient, but it can be done. However, infill in villages is a different story and she felt it important to ensure that infilling is not done to such an extent that lot sizes end up too small and are susceptible to septic system failures. Miss Smith stated when lot sizes are small, it is necessary to have a communal system (controlled by persons with knowledge of this type of system) or considerable space for a buffer must be provided. Miss Smith concluded by saying she encouraged the Region to carry out the study and asked that she be kept informed.

Councillor Hill referring to the 1997 Drinking Water Quality Report, stated she was astonished at the number of customer complaints (e.g. 61 complaints related to health, 42 related to taste or odour, 29 related to appearance, 16 about rusty water, 15 about lead, etc.). She noted these complaints were about drinking water in the area served by Regional water and not about rural water. She opined that rural water would appear to be safer than Regional drinking water.

Chair Hunter stated his concern lay with the fact that a rural servicing strategy study was recently carried out in cooperation with Ontario Municipalities Adjacent to Ottawa-

Carleton (OMATOC). He said the current report says the Region will be building on what was learned in the previous study, but it appears what was learned is that we have to go right back to the beginning and start again. He felt the anticipated cost of \$300,000.00 would be a great deal of money to spend in this regard and questioned how much had been spent on previous studies.

Joe Vincelli, Manager, Engineering Services Branch, Engineering Division, advised in 1992 a report on private individual services in the rural area was done, this was followed up with a report in 1993 on a rural servicing strategy, and in 1995, staff presented the final report dealing with the private services program. He noted a consulting firm was retained to assist staff in carrying out the 1992 study at a cost of less than \$50,000.00; all of the other studies were done in-house, costing only staff time.

Councillor van den Ham commented he was expecting to see a rural servicing strategy report rather than a request for additional funding. He then asked staff to expand on the "rural settlement strategy" mentioned in the staff report.

Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, advised the rural settlement strategy was a piece of work that staff want to do in conjunction with the local municipalities, after completion of the rural servicing strategy. She noted village growth and development was one of the areas staff felt was not given sufficient consideration as part of the comprehensive Regional Official Plan review. Ms. Sweet pointed out many villages have been frozen because of servicing restraints; staff would like to look at alternative growth strategies for those villages (e.g. Cumberland village) to see if there are opportunities for growth.

Councillor van den Ham stated he too was concerned with spending some \$300,000.00 to update what he considered to be quite a good study and stated he needed to be convinced this was necessary.

Mr. Vincelli explained pursuant to the 1993 report (as approved by Planning and Environment Committee and Council), staff proceeded to assemble three working groups each working in specific areas, namely, communal services, Amendment 47 to the 1988 Regional Official Plan, and private services. Mr. Vincelli then provided examples of areas of these three reports that require updating or additional work. He noted the communal services working group, adopted a principle of user-pay; however, it did not clearly define what user-pay would mean. The proposed study would involve work to better define user-pay. As well, the communal services working group recommended allowing communal services in the rural area (previously, development in the rural area was allowed only on the basis of private services). Committee and Council approved this and two demonstration projects (Village Court and the Donwell subdivision) were established. It was staff's intent to allow these demonstration projects to gain some experience as to the

capital, maintenance and replacement costs, and then return to Committee and Council with more firm policies for consideration. Continuing with the rural servicing strategy would allow staff to develop these principles in more detail.

Responding to further questions posed by Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Vincelli advised the 1995 Private Services Program report, approved by Planning and Environment Committee and Council, contained several elements, one of which was aquifer management. In order to proceed with aquifer management, staff will require assistance and part of the \$300,000.00 would be used to retain external consultants.

Councillor van den Ham noted that four rural municipalities have indicated they do not want to be part of the Region, yet staff are proposing undertaking a \$300,000.00 study which is basically for the rural area. He asked staff for their response to this.

Mr. Vincelli pointed out the Region would be participating in the study with the United Counties of Prescott and Russell and Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry and there is an opportunity for the Region to “piggy-back” with them on their request to the Ministry for funding. He commented that underground aquifers do not recognize municipal boundaries. Mr. Vincelli stated when the governance issue is addressed, staff may be back before the Committee with a different proposal.

At Councillor Legendre’s request, Ms. Sweet confirmed the rural servicing strategy *per se*, was not before the Committee. Rather, staff require Committee and Council’s approval to request funding to carry out the rural servicing strategy and approval to participate with the neighbouring counties in a Ground and Surface Water Resource Management Pilot Project.

There being no further discussion, Committee considered the staff report.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the following:

- 1. A request for funding to the Ministry of the Environment under the Water Protection Fund to assist in the funding of the proposed rural servicing strategy for the rural areas in Ottawa-Carleton;**
- 2. A request for funding to Agriculture Canada to assist in the collection of background data for the rural servicing strategy;**
- 3. Participation with the United Counties of Prescott and Russell and Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry in their Ground and Surface Water Resource**

Management Pilot Project for those areas where the United Counties and the RMOC have overlapping watersheds and aquifers.

CARRIED
(D. Beamish dissented)

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEMS

5. MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT - APPROVALS REFORM
- Director, Engineering Division's report dated 20 Aug 98

At the outset, Chair Hunter read a motion put forward by Councillor van den Ham.

That staff report to Planning and Environment Committee and Council within a year following the implementation of this report in conjunction with reports that are coming, on planning processing fees and legal fees for processing subdivision applications. Prior to reporting, staff are to consult with the Ottawa-Carleton Homebuilders Association.

Councillor Legendre asked that staff provide a brief overview of the staff report.

Jim Miller, Director, Engineering Division, Environment and Transportation Department, advised in 1992 the Province established and mandated that 2% of the construction cost of water and sewer infrastructure would go to those agencies that review the plans. In order to make this a revenue neutral situation, staff recommended and Council approved that the fees for inspection be suspended and the planning processing fees be reduced. The current Provincial government has now established a new fee schedule effective October 1, 1998; this new Regulation removes the 2% charge the Region was receiving and establishes fixed costs for various approvals. He explained this means that as of October 1, the Region will experience a revenue shortfall. With this report, staff are recommending the Region reinstate the past practice of charging for the inspection of watermain infrastructure on a cost basis.

Referring to Councillor van den Ham's motion, Mr. Miller advised staff met with the industry (Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Association) who have requested the inclusion of this motion, which staff are very comfortable with. Staff are confident what is recommended will result in revenue neutrality.

Joe Vincelli, Manager, Engineering Services Branch, in an effort to clarify Recommendation 1, advised that prior to 1992 (and the introduction of Regulation 503/92), Certificates of Approval were issued by the Province at no charge. The AMO position is the Province should revert to the pre-1992 regulation and not charge for

Certificates of Approval. Further, when Regulation 503/92 was adopted, municipalities were exempted from the fee; the new Regulation that was enacted on June 25, 1998 basically imposes a fee not only on the private sector but also on the municipalities. Referring to page 57 of the staff report, the estimated impact on the Region as a result of this new Regulation will be \$50,000 dollars.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Legendre, Mr. Miller confirmed that the shortfall the Region will experience will be approximately \$190,000.00 (the sum of \$50,000 in fees plus \$140,000 as a result of the changed fee structure, as shown on page 57 of the staff report). With respect to Recommendation 2 of the staff report, Mr. Miller confirmed the intent was to make the process revenue neutral (full cost recovery).

After hearing this response, Councillor Legendre indicated he would support Recommendation 2, however, he questioned Recommendation 1, saying he could not understand why a municipality (as a developer) would not be treated in the same manner as other developers. Tim Marc, Solicitor, Regional Legal Department explained the difference staff see between a developer and the Region, is private sector developers can choose whether or not to become involved in the field. This is not a choice open to the Region; it must supply people with water and collect the sewage from their homes. On that basis, staff felt it inappropriate that a fee be imposed against municipalities.

Councillor Legendre asked if the costs a municipality would cause to be incurred by the Province, would be "real costs". Mr. Marc confirmed actual reviews are done by the Province of the technical submissions. Councillor Legendre then indicated that, because there is a cost to the Province to carry out the reviews, he could not support Recommendation 1.

Chair Hunter asked staff if the Province applies the same fee structure to its own development projects. Mr. Marc indicated he did not know but would find out and forward the response to members of the Committee prior to the matter being considered by Council. Chair Hunter felt if Crown Corporations and other provincial agencies were exempt from the fee, AMO could use this as an argument for exempting municipalities.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That staff report to Planning and Environment Committee and Council within a year following the implementation of this report in conjunction with reports that are coming, on planning processing fees and legal fees for processing subdivision applications. Prior to reporting, staff are to consult with the Ottawa-Carleton Homebuilders Association.

CARRIED

Committee then considered the staff report as amended.

1. **That the Planning and Environment Committee, in support of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, recommend that Council direct staff to inform the Minister of the Environment of the Region's objection to the proposed fees to Municipalities for Certificates of Approval.**
2. **That, in order to maintain the principle of revenue neutrality with respect to development applications, the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council also approve:**
 - a) **The amendment of Part 4.1 of the Regional Regulatory Code to include watermain inspection fees, on a full cost recovery basis, for all developments commencing 01 October 1998;**
 - b) **The reinstatement of subdivision legal agreement processing fees, in accordance with Schedule 'A' of Part 6.2 of the Regional Regulatory Code concurrent with the implementation of Standardized Approval Regulations (SAR) by the Province.**
3. **That staff report to Planning and Environment Committee and Council within a year following the implementation of this report in conjunction with reports that are coming, on planning processing fees and legal fees for processing subdivision applications. Prior to reporting, staff are to consult with the Ottawa-Carleton Homebuilders Association.**

CARRIED as amended
(Councillor Legendre dissented
on Recommendation 1)

6. **EASTERN ONTARIO WASTE HANDLING FACILITY REQUEST TO RECEIVE LEACHATE**
- Director, Water Environment Protection Division's report dated 3 Sep 98

Councillor Stewart noted this facility is located in a Class 1 Wetland in the South Nation River Watershed and asked staff if, Lafleche Environmental Inc.'s (Lafleche) request to the Region to accept its leachate is denied, how would they then treat the leachate.

France Jacovella, Manager, Wastewater Collection Branch, advised Lafleche could have on site treatment at their landfill site and, in fact, have indicated in the environmental

assessment that hauling the leachate to a wastewater treatment site was only a short term solution and they are looking at on site treatment for the long term.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Stewart, Ms. Jacovella advised no technical information on the quality of leachate that would be produced was provided. Therefore staff were not able to comment on whether the leachate would be treatable at the wastewater treatment plant or on the downstream effects to the Region

Councillor Stewart stated she did not disagree with the staff recommendation however, she was concerned about what would happen if the Region does not accept the leachate and the effect it will have on the downstream communities and the watershed. Ms. Jacovella noted the Ministry of the Environment and Energy would require a leachate management plan as part of the environmental assessment, prior to issuing a Certificate of Approval for the construction of the landfill site.

In response to questions posed by Councillor van den Ham, Ms. Jacovella replied, if the Region were to commit to being identified as the leachate management option, the MOEE would likely grant Lafleche the Certificate of Approval on that basis. If Lafleche then installed on site treatment and there were problems with it, the MOEE could direct the Region to take the leachate for treatment. The Region wants to encourage pollution prevention at the source and, because no technical information was provided, staff would like to encourage Lafleche to exhaust all potential options for treating their leachate on site.

Councillor van den Ham then asked if the R.O. Pickard Centre had the capacity to accept Lafleche's leachate. Mr. Jacovella advised accepting Lafleche's leachate could increase the amount of leachate currently received by 50% and additional facilities would likely have to be built. With respect to the treatability of the leachate, it would depend on the quality of leachate and when the trucks would be coming.

Councillor Stewart stated it was her understanding that Lafleche has committed to investing a million dollars, through the Ministry of Natural Resources, to the area (such as the Rideau River) to compensate for damage to the wetland. She asked if the Region was in a position to take advantage of this. Nancy Schepers, Director, Water Environment Protection Division stated she was not aware of the availability of funds the Region could take advantage of. Councillor Stewart urged staff to look into this.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend Council deny the request from Lafleche Environmental Inc. located in the Township of Roxborough, County of Stormont, to identify the Robert O. Pickard Environmental Centre as a

leachate management option for their proposed Eastern Ontario Waste Handling Facility.

CARRIED

INQUIRIES

Committee Chair Hunter asked what staff's intention was with respect to reporting on the South Ottawa Collector (i.e. will reports go to Planning and Environment Committee (PEC) or Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee (CSEDC). Nancy Schepers, Director, Water Environment Protection Division, advised, subject to council approval, staff would be utilizing a fast track approach to implement this project. It is staff's intention to have the contract award going to CSEDC at end of this year or January of next. Chair Hunter felt, although contract matters should be directed to CSEDC, issues of a technical nature should be reported to PEC. Ms. Schepers agreed, once staff have the proposals, a report on the technical solution could be provided to PEC

Committee Chair Hunter asked if there would be opportunities for additional public input into the solutions for cleaning the pipe. Ms. Schepers advised the process being followed is a design construction process whereby it is hoped the ideas and the innovation that might be out there could be harnessed. A prequalification process will be held to ensure the individuals responding will have the capability and the financial backing to undertake this project. The project has been advertised and the closing date is October 6th.

Councillor Beamish asked staff to explain the urgency of this project. He noted the new report does not imply any greater urgency than the report submitted by Gore & Storrie in 1995. He expressed concern about Council being asked to approve the spending of some \$17 million outside of the normal budget process. Ms. Schepers stated the situation with the South Ottawa Collector has always been unusual. Since May of 1995, when the Region had to close the facility and change the operation of it, staff have been looking for solutions to arrive at "normal" sewer operations but unfortunately have not been successful in finding an easy solution. She went on to explain the urgency is that the situation is risky and each time the facility is used, the risk of having some of the potential impacts occur, increases. She noted a leak has been discovered and when not using the pipe, staff must lower the hydraulic grade line but this is not a workable solution. Ms. Schepers stated she could not recommend any approach other than the fast track solution.

Councillor Beamish stated he remained unconvinced of the urgency of this project, citing the similarities between the current report and the 1995 report. Ms. Schepers agreed there were similarities; however, the Gore & Storrie report recommended investigations which have been carried out and some of the solutions contained in that report have been tried and failed. She also pointed out the new report by Montgomery Watson contains

extensive detailed hydraulic analysis and as well, the 1997 Regional Official Plan contains information that was not available in 1995.

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. 1997 Drinking Water Quality Report
- Director, Water Division, Environment and Transportation Department memo;
distributed early July by ETD staff

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

COMMITTEE CHAIR