

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

28 SEPTEMBER 1999

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 14 September 99

CARRIED

PLANNING ITEMS

1. SITE PLAN APPLICATION
189-199 MONTREAL ROAD AND 258-276 HANNAH STREET
PROPOSED BURGER KING RESTAURANT - CITY OF VANIER
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 9 Sept 99

Nigel Brereton, Senior Project Manger - District 2, Development Approvals Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department, outlined that this issue was before Committee because the applicant wished to be financially compensated for conveying a road widening to the Region. Mr. Brereton reminded Committee that both the *Planning Act* and the *Regional Official Plan* (ROP) give the Region the legislative authority to require that the necessary widenings as set out in the ROP be taken as a condition of site plan approval. He stated the taking of the widening in this site plan on Montreal Road would not prejudice development, noting the building had been set back to accommodate the 2.5 metre widening asked for. Mr. Brereton said he understood the applicant believed

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 13 October 99 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 42.

that on a matter of principle, the Region should buy the land rather than receive it at no cost.

Mr. Brereton explained if the widening is taken, the Region is prepared to enter into a land use agreement with the applicant. He outlined the applicant was proposing to install a patio which would occupy part of the widening, which staff had no problem with, however, at a future date, it might be necessary for the patio to be vacated. Mr. Brereton noted over time, the Region had obtained widenings on ten properties on Montreal Road. He urged Committee's support of the current practice, as a precedent might otherwise be set for developments elsewhere.

Responding to a question from Councillor Legendre regarding the current width of Montreal Road, Mr. Brereton explained the current width was 9 metres from the centre line to the limit of the property, and that the Region was asking for a widening of 2.5 metres. This would result in a width of 11.5 metres per side, or a 23 metre total. Councillor Legendre said he supported the idea of preserving the principle that when land is taken, that it be taken at no cost to the Region. However, he said he had prepared a Motion which proposed withdrawal of references to the width of Montreal Road as a condition of site plan approval in this case. The Councillor said he believed the original intent of designating the road's width at 23 metres in the ROP was to accommodate its eventual widening, but he noted this was no longer the case.

Mr. Brereton explained the intent was to accommodate uses such as landscaping, sidewalk utilities and snow storage. He said the roadway itself was currently a sub-standard 7.2 metres wide, part of which was used as a bus lane and the public sidewalk is 1.75 metres wide, below the desired width of 2.5 metres.

Committee Chair Hunter suggested that issues such as the ability to place a bus shelter for transit users could be prejudiced if this road widening were not taken.

Mr. Brereton offered the issue was more related to utilities such as fire hydrants and street lighting poles which were currently eating into the 1.75 metre space of the public sidewalk. He suggested other aspects pertained to landscaping, and space-related issues such as where to push snow from cleared sidewalks.

Responding to a query from Councillor Beamish, Mr. Brereton acknowledged the acquisition of land from ten properties along Montreal Road did not seem like much, but he explained that acquisition was a very slow process. He stated the opportunity arose only when something came up for redevelopment, and noted there had not been much redevelopment along Montreal Road in Vanier for many years.

Councillor Beamish felt there was also an issue of fairness to be considered. He noted that in the present case, the proponent was being asked to donate his land. He suggested that if, in future, the Region were to decide to streetscape or widen sidewalks along Montreal Road, landowners would likely be compensated for the loss of their property. Mr. Brereton explained the Region may have purchased land only when it had wanted more than could have legally been acquired under the Planning Act or ROP, but that it had never paid for land within rights of way or within a widening. Mr. Brereton explained the Planning Act and ROP state that if an area is within the widening as established within the Official Plan, the Region would not pay. Mr. Brereton also noted the scenario of streetscaping mentioned by the Councillor would be a lower-tier municipal initiative, and not a Regional one.

Mr. Brereton went on to say the conveyance of land has been a long established requirement of the Planning Act and ROP. He felt the concern raised by the landowner was unique, and explained the Region normally receives these widenings as a matter of course, and without contest. Mr. Brereton said he could sympathize to an extent if the widening was prejudicing the development, but he noted the building had been set back so as not to intrude into the area, and was thus unaffected by the widening. He said he found it difficult to see a hardship in this situation.

The Committee Chair offered that often, due to setback requirements, a property owner is left with unusable land which they can either provide to the Region, or pay taxes on and be incapable of using. He noted these conveyances were rarely, if ever, contested, and were generally accepted as a cost of development. Chair Hunter said the time to object to this policy would have been at the time of the ROP review or when the policy comes up in general terms. He felt it was unwise to pick away at this policy in a piecemeal fashion.

Councillor Beamish felt this viewpoint was valid if there was a reasonable expectation the Region was going to need the property, but he felt this particular stretch of roadway would make no difference in terms of the rest of Montreal Road.

Committee Chair Hunter felt there were other public utility uses to consider, which could include turning land over to the City for landscaping or possible public transit service improvements. Chair Hunter noted the ROP's 25 year timeframe, and emphasized that future considerations had to be anticipated.

Councillor Meilleur said she was surprised to hear debate centering on the property owner's desire for compensation, as she believed the owner's desire had been to retain possession of the property in question. She said it was her intent to ask for an exemption, and asked staff whether any other properties on Montreal Road had been exempted from ROP policy requirements.

Mr. Brereton said an exemption had been granted in the case of St. Margaret's Church, which protruded into the area of the widening. The Region had an understanding with church trustees there would be no further expansion into the widening. In the case of Wilson Office Equipment, at 45 Montreal Road, Mr. Brereton noted the building was very close to the road, and he stated the widening had not been taken when the business sought to extend the building while retaining the same street frontage. In a third case, a widening had not been taken when a building on the same block had undergone an interior reorganization rather than an exterior redevelopment. However, Mr. Brereton noted that this block, on the north side of Montreal Road and west of the Vanier Parkway, had not been exempted from the widening requirement even though no widenings had been taken. He clarified for Councillor van den Ham that exemptions were granted for very specific purposes where nothing else could be done.

Councillor Meilleur circulated photographs of the property in question which included views of the roadway and sidewalk. Councillor Bellemare noted the sidewalk consisted of interlocking paving stones, and included heritage-style street lighting. He pointed out this initiative had been spearheaded by the City of Vanier and Vanier Business Improvement Area (BIA), and asked if the costs of this beautification were known. Mr. Brereton was unaware of the costs, however, he said taking the widening would not force removal of any of the beautification measures, as the Region was not taking rights of way.

Councillor Bellemare felt the purpose of the sidewalk improvement initiative by the City and BIA was to create a better walking environment for pedestrians, and he believed this objective had been achieved. The Councillor felt the issue of primary concern was not whether or not a precedent would be set in compensating a landowner for the conveyance of property to the Region, but rather, whether the Region had any actual requirement to widen Montreal Road. Councillor Bellemare noted the report stated Montreal Road would not be widened to accommodate any new lanes for vehicles, and also spoke of reserving 2.5 metres to allow for a wider sidewalk in future. He felt that in light of the investment which had already been made towards street improvements, it did not make sense to withhold site plan approval from the development proposal. The Councillor offered that the proposed use of a patio for the area adjacent to the sidewalk would be more inviting to a walking experience than would a bus shelter.

Mr. Brereton explained the staff report had been worded as such in response to the applicant's concern with the principle of giving government something for free. He said he was unaware if this situation had changed.

Responding to a question from Councillor Bellemare, Mr. Brereton informed the property in question had approximately 100 feet of frontage. Councillor Bellemare noted there were buildings along Montreal which were in close proximity to the existing sidewalk, for which exceptions had been made from the widening, he questioned the sense of

demanding it of other properties, which could lead to a “zig-zag” appearance for stretches of sidewalk along Montreal Road. Mr. Brereton suggested that from a pedestrian perspective, with Montreal Road being a busy thoroughfare, even inconsistent stretches of widening would be beneficial and more inviting to pedestrian traffic.

Committee Chair Hunter noted there was an issue of protection of a public amenity that had already been built. He suggested if it was turned over to a developer, the new landowner could possibly remove some of the interlocking brick. Mr. Brereton clarified that some of this public amenity was also on private property. Responding to a question from the Chair whether this was protected by any agreement, Mr. Brereton stated he was not aware of the mechanism by which the City of Vanier had established the interlocking brick onto the private property.

Councillor van den Ham spoke in support of the staff report. He felt that an individual opposed to the principle of the Region being able to take land under the planning process had a right of complaint as a prerogative. However, the Councillor felt that if Committee were to consider compensating for this land, it would only be fair to compensate for prior conveyances as well. He felt it would be unwise to vary from a significant policy that had been in effect for many years. He said if there were disagreements with certain Regional Road dimensions contained within the ROP, these needed to be addressed, but felt this was not the time to do so.

Committee Chair Hunter then read Councillor Legendre’s Motion:

That staff be directed to withdraw the condition of site plan approval for 189-199 Montreal Road requiring a road widening to 11.5 metres from the existing centre-line of Montreal Road.

Councillor Legendre noted the Motion had been provided by the Ward Councillor, but that the wording had been drafted by the Region’s Legal staff.

Councillor Meilleur asked Committee to support Councillor Legendre’s Motion. She believed the primary issue was not that of compensating the property owner for the loss of property, but rather of letting the property owner retain ownership of the property in question. The Councillor intoned that all arguments for conveyance of the land to the Region were irrelevant, as neither the City of Vanier nor the Region had any intentions of widening Montreal Road in the future. She also disputed statements which argued the space was needed for snow storage, and said that as Vanier’s main thoroughfare, Montreal Road had adequate snow removal. She also noted the City and BIA had expended a great deal of money on the street’s beautification in this section of Vanier, known as the “French Quarter”. Councillor Meilleur said currently, exemptions were being granted on a lot-by-

lot basis, but she suggested the City intended to ask for an exemption for the whole of the “French Quarter” from ROP policies, as there were no plans for future widenings.

Councillor Legendre also encouraged members of Committee to support his Motion. He believed great efforts had been made towards improving this section of Montreal Road, noting a marked change for the better over the years. The Councillor said this had been accomplished with the support of both the business community and individual property owners. He felt these improvements were a move in the direction in which the Region wanted to go, and were what the Region wanted to accomplish on a practical level. In closing, he said he believed an exemption was well merited.

Councillor Munter suggested that Councillor Legendre’s Motion be amended by inserting a clause stating that the exemption be subject to a legal agreement to maintain all current public uses, e.g. garbage cans, benches, etc., to ensure they would remain. He put forward a motion in this regard.

Moved by A. Munter

That the motion be amended by adding “subject to a legal agreement to maintain all current public uses”.

CARRIED

The Committee the considered the Motion as amended by Councillor Munter:

Moved by J. Legendre

That staff be directed to withdraw the condition of site plan approval for 189-199 Montreal Road requiring a road widening to 11.5 metres from the existing centre-line of Montreal Road, subject to a legal agreement to maintain all current public uses.

CARRIED as amended

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

2. LOCAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT 49
CITY OF KANATA (IRENE FOLEY - GOLF DRIVING RANGE)

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 28 Sept 99
- Annex 4 (Correspondence) issued separately

Mike Boucher, Planner, Planning and Development Approvals Department provided Committee with an overview of the staff report.

Mr. Boucher confirmed at Councillor Munter's request that the current zoning does not permit the proposed use.

Councillor Munter then went on to speak of the role of the Committee and Council in approving this Amendment. He noted it is the responsibility of Planning and Environment Committee and Council to ensure the amendment is in conformity with the Regional Official Plan and as well, under the authority delegated by the Minister of Municipal Affairs it is their responsibility to approve Local Official Plans. He asked what tests (under the Planning Act), the Committee and Council were to use, when approving Local Official Plan Amendments.

Mr. Boucher referred to pages 8 and 9 of the staff report and pointed out the seven criteria to measure conformity were listed there. He agreed with the Councillor that in the role of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, regard must be had for good planning principles.

Councillor Munter sought clarification on the parking issue. Mr. Boucher advised the site plan showed 43 spaces clearly defined and an additional 43 spaces were shown in "dashed lines". The purpose of this was to demonstrate the physical ability to accommodate enough parking on site that cars would not be parked on March Road or Old Carp Road.

Councillor Munter asked if the Transportation Department had done its own traffic analysis or if they simply reviewed the Novatech study. Mr. Boucher advised the Novatech document was submitted to the City of Kanata and the Region. Staff reviewed it and were satisfied with the recommendations. Subsequently, Mr. Kennedy pointed out there was a discrepancy - there were 86 spaces shown but the traffic study was only based on 43. Mr. Boucher then had transportation staff review it again on the basis of 86 parking spaces and they were still satisfied with the recommendations of the traffic study.

Councillor Munter expressed his surprise at this as he had known staff to be very "dogged" when dealing with March Road, because it is such a busy road.

Ed Blaszyński, Officer, Planning Approvals, Planning and Development Approvals Department advised access could not be denied, if the site is approved. All the Region can

do is accommodate it by putting in the left turn lane and making it safer. Legally, the Region has to allow access to the site.

Mr. Boucher added the Transportation Impact Study was based on an analysis of similar type uses in area; from that a peak level demand or a peak trip generation was established and that resulted in the 43 parking spaces. In order to accommodate that type of traffic at this particular location, the traffic consultant sought the latest transportation counts from the Region looking at both northbound and southbound movements. When these counts and the peak trip generation were put into the analysis, it provided an indication of what would be required in the way of geometric improvements, so there would be no issue with safety in terms of access or egress to the site.

He explained what Mr. Blaszyński was referring to was the fact that the zoning would establish the use of the lands. Staff reviewed what was submitted in support of the proposal and this amendment is only to deal with the access issue.

Councillor Munter stated his point was that transportation staff asked “how should this happen” rather than “should this happen”.

Responding to questions from Chair Hunter, Mr. Boucher explained if there were access from the subject land to Carp Road, there would not be a requirement for an Official Plan Amendment. The wording of Kanata’s Official Plan says that for certain industrial and commercial uses, an amendment is required to the Plan.

Committee Chair Hunter asked that the Planner from the City of Kanata respond to questions from the Committee. The Chair asked specifically what the Kanata Official Plan says that requires an OP amendment for this parcel dealing with access, when the law says you have to provide access.

Bruce Finlay, Project Planner, City of Kanata advised that the provision for restricted access to March Road, in Kanata’s Official Plan was inserted at the request of the Region. In this case, even though the property has frontage only onto to March Road, access to that road is for rural purposes. The provision in the Official Plan speaks to the creation of new lands for commercial or industrial purposes and it is looking at a situation where there is an intensification of the use of the land. By natural right, the owner of that land has access to March Road, however, the issue comes up when they wish to intensify that use to a commercial or industrial use which requires a zoning amendment.

In response to further questions from Chair Hunter, Mr. Finlay advised that the interpretation of City staff was that the intention of this policy in the Plan was to encourage commercial and industrial development at intersections of existing or proposed local roads. In this case, there is no existing local road intersecting with March Road and

there is no proposal at the present time to create one. The policy is less than clear as to whether access for a new commercial use is permitted; it was Kanata staff's interpretation that it was not.

Councillor Munter asked Mr. Finlay for his view on the parking issue (i.e. 86 spaces vs. 43 spaces). Mr. Finlay referred to Annex 2 to the staff report (page 15) of the agenda and noted it makes reference to the traffic report which identifies a need for a minimum parking provision on site for 43 vehicles. As well, it indicates that a draft concept plan provided by the applicant identifies that a parking provision for 86 vehicles is possible on site. He said it was the purpose of the Kanata staff report at the time to identify to Council that there was more than adequate parking to be provided on the site and it was identified in the concept plan.

From this, Councillor Munter concluded that what the Planning and Environment Committee would be approving would include this reference to the parking provision for 86 vehicles. Mr. Finlay disagreed saying the Official Plan Amendment found on page 17 of the agenda, simply makes reference to an exemption to the existing policy of the Official Plan to permit a golf driving range, mini-putt golf facility and golf pro-shop located on the subject property.

Mr. Finlay went on to say it was a very large area of land and obviously a lot of parking could be provided on the site. He pointed out the development of the land would be subject to site plan approval (at the City) where such things as conformity to Kanata's zoning by-law, parking and traffic concerns would be looked at and addressed.

The Committee then heard from the following speakers.

John Horowitz, advised he was representing a group of residents of Marchbrook Circle, which is located directly behind the proposed development. He explained these residents had concerns about the actual development and safety issues related to March Road.

Mr. Horowitz, said the residents of Marchbrook Circle feel they are being unjustly hard done by in that these lands were owned by Mrs. Foley; who sold them to Timberlay Developments and then acted as a real estate agent for Timberlay. At that time, she had access to Old Carp Road but chose in the plan of Subdivision not to maintain access into her existing lands. He said the lot at the corner of old Carp Road and Marchbrook Circle also belonged to Mrs. Foley, where she could have had access to old Carp Road but that was sold off as well.

The speaker went on to outline the concerns of the residents of Marchbrook Circle. The residents are concerned with the fencing that would have to go up, noting in Kanata Lakes they have 40 or 50 foot high fences to stop golf balls. The house to the north of the

development will be subject to golf balls and noted when one purchases a house on a golf course, you have to sign a covenant with regards to the golf balls. Residents of Marchbrook Circle did not do that and in fact they signed a covenant to respect the agricultural uses of the surrounding lands, specifically Mrs. Foley's land. The residents are also concerned about the wildlife in the area, such as a great blue heron, deer and other wildlife in the Shirley's Brook area that will be impacted by this development. He urged the Committee to reject the amendment.

Committee Chair Hunter asked the delegate if he had filed an appeal of the zoning by-law that Kanata Council approved. Mr. Horowitz advised he had, on behalf of a number of Marchbrook Circle residents.

Committee Chair Hunter asked if most of the residents' concerns were with the proposed use. Mr. Horowitz advised that access to the road is also of concern and pointed out that because of the high volume of traffic on March Road it can take three or four minutes to turn onto March Road from Old Carp Road and he pointed out there is a school north of the subject site. He felt the left hand turn would also be a problem, given the high speeds at which people travel along March Road. He also expressed concern about what would appear to be a piecemeal approach to planning and stated a number of people that have moved into Marchbrook Circle, would not have if they had known this was going in behind them.

Committee Chair Hunter, noting the issue of zoning will be dealt with at the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), asked if the Official Plan Amendment would not likely end up at the OMB as well, regardless of the Committee's decision. Mr. Boucher confirmed this and noted the zoning by-law had been appealed to the OMB, they are seized with it and are waiting to schedule a hearing until the Region makes a decision on the OPA.

Chair Hunter asked if the Region had to make a decision on this or if the matter could just be forwarded to the OMB. Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law advised the Committee and Council had to make a decision on this. He added, however, unless Committee or Council provided instructions to the contrary, Legal Department staff would not be a party to the hearing. He said this to assure the members of the audience they did not have to be concerned about the Region showing up in opposition to their views.

Des Adam, Solicitor, representing the residents of Marchbrook Circle, advised it is both the land use issue and the access to March Road that is of concern to the residents. Marchbrook Circle was owned by the Foley family; they put the subdivision on the land and it was then sold to Timberlay and Mrs. Foley acted as the salesperson for them. He then referred to the covenants put on the deeds, the majority of which dealt with the

agricultural lands, which left the purchasers of Marchbrook Circle with the impression the subject lands would remain agricultural.

Mr. Adam went on to speak of the problems of light pollution that will accompany a golf driving range as well as the problem of how to control the golf balls on the site. He said the homes immediately adjacent to the subject property, cannot be protected without a 50 foot net. Also of concern to the residents is the effect the golf balls landing in the wetland will have and Mr. Adam noted the Marchbrook Circle deeds also contain covenants concerning the protection of the wetlands.

Mr. Adam felt it was not acceptable to say there is a land use there, therefore the Region has to give them access. He felt the amendment was not in conformity with the City of Kanata's own Official Plan, and the Planning and Environment Committee, as the representative of the Minister, should reject it.

Don Kennedy, speaking on behalf of the residents of Marchbrook Circle, began by saying the issue of access is directly related to the use and felt if a compatible use were being proposed, the amendment would likely have been supported. He suggested if the Region were to approve the amendment to allow access, they were in effect approving the use.

On the issue of parking, Mr. Kennedy stated the site plan provided to him by the applicant showed 86 spaces, and there was "no dotting or dashing" on that particular plan. In addition, at full development, the facility would be similar to the *19th Tee* (another driving range), which has about 100 parking spaces. He said given the intensity of the use of March Road, this is a very important consideration and he felt the traffic impact study should have looked at the ultimate condition.

Mr. Kennedy stated although the General Rural Area designation in the Regional Official Plan (ROP) does allow for recreational and commercial uses, he felt there were other policies in the Plan that should be taken into consideration. For example, a goal in Section 1.4.2 states in part "...to maintain the desirable characteristics and integrity of existing communities..."; Section 3.7.1 of the ROP speaks of respecting existing communities; and Section 3.7.4, says uses for the traveling public will be permitted (this is a destination commercial use). Mr. Kennedy opined if the committee were to approve this Amendment, these Official Plan goals will not have been met.

The speaker noted the objectives in the Kanata Official Plan were very similar to those in the Region's OP (e.g. respect for existing uses, commercial uses allowed only if they do not detract or impose a negative impact on existing uses, etc.). Mr. Kennedy offered that the Region, in its role as the Minister, must take into consideration that the proposed use does not conform to Kanata's Official Plan.

Mr. Kennedy expressed concern about the natural environment area, noting there is a huge watershed study underway, the Shirley's Brook Water Study. He pointed out the proposed development would be partly grassed and suggested there could be a draw down on the wells in the area to make the grass grow and make it look attractive.

In summary, Mr. Kennedy stated he did not know of any type of facility of this nature with access onto a Regional Road that abuts a country lot subdivision. He said the dangers associated with the golf balls, the floodlighting to be used and the violations of the Regional and Local Official Plans, should all be taken into consideration. He asked that this amendment not be approved.

Irene Foley, the owner of the subject land addressed the committee and made the following points.

- She has owned this property for 26 years. With urban encroachment fast approaching, she would like to make some use of the property which consists of fifty acres, over half of which will be the golf centre.
- The owners of the two homes on either side of the subject property on March Road, the most affected and closest, have given letters of support (on file with the City).
- The Region's Official Plan permits open space and recreational uses; the proposed use respects existing communities and would have the least impact of any new use.
- The City of Kanata staff report states "the proposed driving range will meet the Official Plan criteria for commercial uses" and "the proposed development is considered satisfactory in terms of the criteria identified in the Official Plan and the City will use a site plan review process to ensure the recommended measures to reduce light impact and access safety are implemented".
- The City of Kanata's Official Plan lists private recreational facilities requiring only minimal services as a permitted use; this use would qualify.
- The City of Kanata and the Region have accepted the traffic impact study. Concerns of safety are met by requiring a turning lane off March Road, which we agree to.
- The Regional Planning and Transportation Departments support the amendment.
- Impacts on adjacent uses will be minimized because all activity will be located at March Road, away from existing residential areas.
- The distance between Mr. Horowitz's property and March Road is 1,587.92 feet, it is totally treed along the back and cannot be seen from March Road. She felt it would be very difficult to hit a golf ball anywhere near his property.
- The layout will minimize any possible impacts by direction of lighting.
- The existing trees and creek along the rear of the property will be preserved and enhanced.
- There is a building boom on March Road, both residential and commercial, with the City of Kanata moving closer.
- It would be naïve to think that large vacant fields so close to the urban boundary will remain unchanged forever in the wake of rapidly, almost daily growth on March Road.

- Greenspace and passive recreational uses will maintain and even enhance the area.

In concluding her remarks, Ms. Foley asked that the Committee support the approval of Amendment 49.

Responding to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Ms. Foley advised the property in Marchbrook Circle was sold to the developer approximately 10 years ago and she had nothing to do with the covenants placed on the deeds to these properties. Further, Ms. Foley advised it was the City of Kanata that initiated and changed the zoning on the subject land from Agricultural to General Rural.

In response to questions from Councillor Legendre, Ms. Foley advised the piece of property between her land (from the line of trees) and Old Carp Road belonged to someone else and therefore she did not have access to Old Carp Road.

Murray Chown, Novatech, representing the proponent, Ms. Foley, noted the question of the use of the land was correctly dealt with through the application for rezoning, which was approved by the City of Kanata and has been appealed by Mr. Adam on behalf of Mr. Horowitz and the other property owners and is now in the hands of the Ontario Municipal Board. He said all that was in front of the Committee was the request to allow access to this property should a driving range be developed on the property; the Committee was not being asked to approve the driving range, etc.

Mr. Chown went on to say, because the property only fronts on March Road, if the Region were to reject the Amendment and the owner was successful with the rezoning, they still could not develop because the policies of the City's Official Plan prevent them from getting access to March Road even though it is their only access. He noted Regional staff have indicated that access in this location will work and pointed out the reason for a turning lane in this situation is not because the use will generate high volumes but rather for safety reasons (i.e. to avoid rear-enders).

In response to earlier comments made, Mr. Chown offered the number of parking spaces shown on the site plan was irrelevant; pointing out the subject property was a huge piece of land and could accommodate 1,000 cars. He said what was relevant was how many parking spaces were required to serve the proposed use, as established by the City of Kanata zoning by-law. He advised the number of parking spaces would be in the order of 40 to 50, as was confirmed by the transportation study. With respect to the issue of stray golf balls, Mr. Chown pointed out the homes are quite a distance from the driving tees and he felt the whole issue to be a little absurd.

Mr. Chown urged the Committee to support the staff position and not to get caught up in the debate of whether or not a driving range is an appropriate use on these lands.

Councillor Munter questioned, if the business were successful and there were a demand for it, is it the intent of the owner to build an 86 space parking lot. Mr. Chown replied, if the number of tees and the mini putt shown on the site plan are used to their maximum capacity, it would be identical to several other driving range and mini putt operations surveyed, and all of those operations function with 40 or 50 parking spaces. He explained the concept plan (which is not a formal site plan application), in showing 86 parking spaces, simply illustrates there is plenty of room on the site to provide parking.

Councillor Legendre, noting Ms. Foley mentioned in her presentation that the impact of the lighting would be minimized, asked Mr. Chown for his comments. Mr. Chown explained his firm prepared a lighting report which was submitted to the City of Kanata. The lighting report was then circulated to J.L. Richards by the City of Kanata for their review. J.L. Richards provided a very detailed response to the City of Kanata on Novatech's conclusions or recommendations on the lighting of this facility. The comments from J.L. Richards in terms of their area of concern, focused entirely on the mini putt (which is located at March Road and is nowhere near the residential area). Mr. Chown said it would be a simple matter to address the concerns raised by J.L. Richards with respect to the mini putt, by using shorter light standards. He said the proponent has every intention of addressing this through the site plan process.

In terms of the driving range itself, Mr. Chown said the comments from J.L. Richards were that the conclusions of Novatech's lighting study were accurate in that there would be minimal, if any, spill onto the neighbouring properties. He pointed out the modeling exercise did not recognize (because models don't), the existence of trees along that property line. So, although there might be a little bit of light spilling into those backyards, once the trees are factored in, that spill is non-existent. He said he was confident the lighting impact of this use on the adjacent residential properties would be slim to none.

Richard Renaud, a resident of Marchbrook Circle stated in Mrs. Foley's presentation to Kanata, she indicated when the driving range is in use, the lights would likely be on for only one hour after dark or possibly not at all. He said he found this hard to believe as other driving ranges (i.e. the *19th Tee*), they often work late into the night. Mr. Renaud said he had a problem with the light being projected out towards where the ball is being hit (i.e. towards his house) and he felt the lights should be turned in towards where the people are hitting and have them blinded by the light.

Responding to questions from Committee Chair Hunter on the issue of lighting, Mr. Renaud advised the trees along the back of the subject property are not mature trees but rather, are predominantly small scrub trees that have grown along Shirley's Brook and would not provide screening from the lights on the driving range.

Elizabeth O'Neill, Marchwood Community Association, advised her family chose to move to a rural area and thought they had found the perfect area in Marchbrook Circle. Ms. O'Neill advised the area behind Marchbrook Circle is fairly open, with only a few strands of deciduous trees. She said she believed there had been a mistake in approving this plan and she therefore did not think it was erroneous for the Committee to look at the land use issue.

Ms. O'Neill opined the proposed golf range was unnecessary as there are quite a few in the area, at least two within five or seven minutes away. She said this development would mean a constant irritation from noise pollution (e.g. machinery, balls being hit and increased activity from people and cars), from morning to night, seven days a week from April to the end of October. As well, there would also be a visual blight (e.g. the netting and the commercial lighting). Ms. O'Neill felt the whole area should be frozen and properly planned or it would end up like Merivale Road. In conclusion, she stated the proposed use is not a respectful use of the land or the sky and is certainly not neighbourly.

Kevin Rankin, a resident of Marchbrook Circle noted he lives in upper left hand corner of Marchbrook Circle and stated he could look out any window on the front of his house and see traffic on March Road. He felt this should dispel any belief that there are any trees between the houses on Marchbrook Circle and the subject property.

Mr. Rankin indicated he wished to deal primarily with the access issue. He advised he had young children who get on a school bus and use March Road and as well, he works in the high tech sector in Kanata. He said he did not believe that March Road would not be expanded to four lanes within the next ten years, given that the high tech sector (which has many business parks within a kilometre of Old Carp Road) is the engine of job growth in the Region. March Road is extremely busy at both times of the day and anyone who travels that road regularly would recognize it is quite a task to get on and off on Carp Road. Mr. Rankin said he sometimes has to wait five minutes to get onto March Road from Old Carp Road and felt it naïve to believe this is a non-safety issue.

The speaker felt it important to have an appropriate plan for the corridor on March Road out to Dunrobin; he felt to have this type of ad hoc access decision was not appropriate. Mr. Rankin felt the City had made a mistake and he suggested if they had a chance to do it again, knowing that the majority of the people in the area oppose it, they would take a different approach.

On the issue of lighting, Mr. Rankin stated he was very unhappy about this. He felt the use of the subject land as estate residential would be totally appropriate abutting Marchbrook Circle neighbourhood.

Noting a number of speakers had referred to the covenants on the land, Committee Chair Hunter advised these would not have been put on by the developer or agent, but rather would have been required by either the local municipality or the Region as part of the subdivision conditions, to protect themselves from complaints about agricultural operations. The Chair indicated he understood that Mr. Rankin's impression was that this was a rural area for all time, because he was not warned of potential future developments.

Mr. Rankin confirmed this and said if one chose to live in a golfing community, this would be something that you would be well aware of when purchasing the property.

Mark Roberts, a resident of Marchbrook Circle, indicated he purchased his property in April, 1998 and understood he was buying rural estate property, with all the benefits and drawbacks associated with that. In particular, there were two items in the covenants that he signed, that he would respect agricultural uses of adjoining property and that he would protect and preserve the natural beauty of the surrounding property.

Mr. Roberts advised one of the things he liked about Marchbrook Circle was the low key lighting, noting there were only two street lights in the area. He said he knew of no other driving range in the Region that focuses its lights on residential area and he said he was very upset that it had gotten as far as it has. Mr. Rankin pointed out the subject land actually encompasses all of the property that backs onto Marchbrook Circle. He suggested if the Committee were to approve an access to the property, it would be approving an access for the whole piece of property and any future use that it might be put to. He felt therefore that future uses should be considered in the traffic study.

Mr. Roberts went on to say that he was generally disappointed by the lack of planning by City of Kanata in this area. With respect to the traffic; it appears from the staff report, that the Region did not do its own traffic study and took the traffic study that was done on behalf of the proponent, at face value. With respect to Kanata's criteria for the use of the property, he thought it was rather naïve they were satisfied the lighting issues could be resolved, noting lights in a driving range point not at the ground, but straight out. He did not think any amount of screening could prevent the impact of the light on their properties and he felt this type of commercial lighting was inappropriate for a rural neighbourhood.

In response to questions from Chair Hunter, Mr. Boucher advised there had been no application for formal site plan approval yet; what is at the OMB is the zoning by-law and the issue of land use. He advised that under Section 41 of the Planning Act, Kanata Planning Committee would have to hold a public meeting and Kanata, Council would have to make a decision on the matter of site plan approval. Mr. Marc added third parties have no appeal rights with respect to site plans, only the municipality and the applicant.

Committee Chair Hunter sought clarification on a point made by Mr. Roberts in his presentation. He said because the amendment was specifically to allow a golf driving range and ancillary facilities, if for some reason this did not go forward, the amendment could not be transferred to another use, nor could it be transferred to another part of the property. Any other applications that came forward would need a further amendment to the Kanata Official Plan to get access to March Road or they would have to buy from the sliver of property on Old Carp Road to get access that way. Mr. Marc confirmed this.

Bev Brodmann, a resident of Marchbrook Circle, indicated she concurred with the issues raised by the other residents of Marchbrook Circle.

Debra Tigner, advised she lives in the upper left corner of Marchbrook Circle and although she would not be directly affected by flying golf balls, she would be affected by the lighting. She said she is a very active member of the Royal Astronomical Society and she does night photography. She said she and her husband designed and built their dream house on what they thought was their dream country lot and the proposed development would greatly affect her family's lifestyle. She said any amount of lighting, whether it is screened or not, will have an impact, not just in terms of light trespass but also in the sky glowing. It would force her at least another half an hour away to do her work and her photography. She said she would like the neighbourhood to stay the way it is.

Laurie Emerton, a resident of Marchbrook Circle, expressed her support for the comments made by her neighbours.

Henry Brodmann, stated he and his neighbours appreciated the opportunity to address the Committee on this matter and noted the residents were somewhat naïve about not getting more involved with this at the local level in Kanata. However, today, with representation from every home on Marchbrook Circle, all of the issues have been covered. He said the development will impose bad light pollution, a tremendous amount of noise (an average of 10,000 golf balls a day will be hit, as well as the noise generated by large tractors operating at night picking up golf balls) and considerable traffic issues on March Road. He felt the Region should take a closer look at development of all lands on March Road and not take an ad hoc, patchwork approach. He said there are literally a dozen tax-paying subdivisions in rural Kanata, like Marchbrook Circle and he felt the land use that existed when the properties were purchased should be maintained.

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

Chair Hunter advised Councillor Munter had put forward an amending motion, that Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council reject Kanata LOPA 49.

Speaking to his motion, Councillor Munter noted in terms of the transportation and access issue, it was not that the Transportation staff relied on the proponent's transportation analysis but rather that they answered the question, that if there was to be golf course there, how would they get to it. This does not answer questions of what the impact will be of the additional vehicles or what the impact of the deceleration lane will be. He pointed out the Transportation Department has previously tried to limit access to March Road because it is already so busy.

In the Committee's role representing the Minister of Municipal Affairs, they are responsible for ensuring when a municipality amends their official Plan, it does so in conformity with their Official Plan. He noted one of the criteria set out in Kanata's Official Plan is that the use does not detract from or impose negative impact on the use of adjacent land or roads and he felt this to be very much germane to the issue at hand. He suggested if 10,000 balls are hit in the course of day, and one assumes that 99.9% of those balls will stay within the limit, that means one out of every thousand will not. Over the course of a day, that could be 10 or 12 balls and over the course of a summer, that could be 1,500 or 2,000. That is potentially, a lot of balls flying into the back yards of people who are backing onto this development; people who did not choose to back onto a golf course community and who bought their homes with the reasonable expectation that there would not be this kind of use behind them.

Councillor Munter stated this Amendment does not conform to the Official Plan and it also does not adhere to (in the Committee's role as Minister) the principles of good planning. He opined that Kanata Council made a mistake, noting it was a very contentious issue there as well (passing by one vote at Council). He stated he believed the reason it passed is that Ms. Foley is well known and respected in Kanata. The Councillor stated he was certain that if the development did go ahead, Ms. Foley would respect her word and would try to put measures to mitigate the impact on the neighbours.

Councillor Munter urged the Committee to support his motion to reject this Amendment.

Councillor van den Ham agreed it was the Region's duty to deal with the transportation issue. He also agreed the facility, as presented (particularly with the lighting), was not a compatible use, however, he felt that was a decision to be made by Kanata. He said through the Regional Official Plan, flexibility was provided to the area municipalities and while there is a two tier system, whether Kanata has made a mistake or not, that is their role. He felt, given Kanata's history of strict development conditions, they would probably mitigate the lighting problem as much as possible. He suggested if the proposal did not have lights, it would likely be more acceptable to the community and he felt the people who own homes in the neighbourhood have a right not to have lights glaring at them. Councillor van den Ham felt the Region should deal only with what it was

responsible for and in this regard he felt that safe access from the Regional road to the subject lands could be provided.

Councillor van den Ham asked if the proposal were to get to site plan approval stage, would the City of Kanata have the authority to say this can go ahead, but with no lights. Tim Marc advised facilities for lighting are within the jurisdiction of a local municipality on site plans, so the City could include in the site plan agreement a prohibition or a strong restriction on lighting.

Councillor Legendre pointed out the Committee was the approval authority for local official plan amendments. The Regional Official Plan, which local plans must be in conformity with, says that the use must not impact on the existing surrounding uses. He said he did believe the lighting would have an impact on the adjacent properties (given the strength of the lighting and the distances involved) and he did not believe it was a compatible use. He indicated he would be supporting Councillor Munter's motion.

Councillor Bellemare indicated he had reservations about the way this proposal was approved at the City of Kanata, however, the report before the Committee appears to address each point. He felt as the representative of the Minister, the Committee was responsible for ensuring Kanata properly went through its approvals process and he felt it had considered all of the issues. He said although the Committee might not agree with the conclusions the City had taken, he believed the traffic impact study adequately addressed the site condition and is correctly based on the expected number of vehicles that will be visiting the site. The proposal conforms to the Regional Official Plan in terms of use and it meets all of the criteria set out in the Kanata Official Plan. The City of Kanata is satisfied the light issue and the need for screening will be addressed by the site plan review process and Regional staff have advised, in terms of access to the site, traffic safety will not be a problem. He noted the residents focussed primarily on land use issues, which is not the domain of the Committee. Councillor Bellemare felt the Region did not have any reasonable grounds to reject this amendment to Kanata's Official Plan.

Councillor Beamish felt Regional staff should speak with City of Kanata staff to suggest they amend Section 4.1.6.7 of their Local Official Plan. He felt an issue such as this should not be coming to Planning and Environment Committee as it is a local matter that should be dealt with at the City of Kanata.

Councillor Hill, stated she had a problem with this matter. She felt the issue of land use was not before the Committee for consideration, rather it should be dealing with access to the property. She said however, after hearing that the access could only be for a golf driving range and no other use, she would be supporting Councillor Munter's motion, as it would appear a golf driving range is not a compatible use. She said she had intended originally to support the amendment because the owner should be allowed access to her

land. The Councillor felt the residents could not reasonably believe these lands would remain vacant forever and she suggested they would have to resign themselves to the fact that someday they will be built up. Councillor Hill indicated she would be supporting Councillor Munter's motion only on grounds that the driving range is not an appropriate use for this area.

Committee Chair Hunter thanked the delegations for their presentations. He stated he was most troubled by the fact this issue was before the Committee in the first place. On the issue of the policy in the Kanata Official Plan concerning access to March Road, the Chair felt this would seem to put a property owner in a position of double jeopardy; having to satisfy two amendments. He agreed with others who said the Committee was really discussing a land use planning issue, when what was before them (as set out in the staff report) was a transportation and traffic issue. He said it was inevitable, no matter which way the Committee decided, that both matters would be going to the OMB and he said he hoped for the benefit of both the proponent and the opponents that the decision on each issue would be compatible.

Moved by A. Munter

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council reject Local Official Plan Amendment 49 to the City of Kanata Official Plan.

CARRIED as amended

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

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEM

3. SEWAGE MONITORING STATIONS - REGIONAL BY-LAW

- Response to Inquiry No. PEC-14 (99)
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's memo dated 10 Sept 99

Doug Brousseau, Deputy Commissioner, Transportation, Environment and Transportation Department, introduced France Jacovella, Manager, Wastewater Collection Branch, Water Environment Protection Division, Environment and Transportation Department, who provided a general overview of the Regional Regulatory Code requirements for this type of installation.

Ms. Jacovella noted the objective of the Industrial Waste Program is to protect the wastewater infrastructure, wastewater treatment process, water quality and water

environment and the health and safety of sewer workers. As such, discharges going into the sewer system are controlled by inspecting industries and monitoring discharges. In monitoring industries, industries are classified by type of industry and when an industry is deemed to have the potential to be a significant industrial discharger, the Region requires the ability to monitor the discharge, which quite often requires a monitoring manhole at the location. Through that monitoring manhole the discharge is observed and samples taken to ensure that it does comply with the sewer use bylaw.

Responding to questions from Chair Hunter, Ms. Jacovella advised the Industrial Waste Program approach has been to work in cooperation with industries; focusing on education and behavioural changes in an attempt to bring the industry into compliance with the sewer use bylaw. When the discharge is not in compliance, staff will work with the industry to bring their effluent into compliance and then monitoring will be done on a regular basis (e.g. annually, twice yearly, quarterly, etc., depending on the type of discharge).

Chair Hunter asked what a maintenance access cover was. Ms. Jacovella replied it is really like a monitoring manhole. It is a structure where the effluent discharged from that industry will go through this infrastructure and then into the regular sewer system. The infrastructure allows the Department to install an automatic sampler in that location, which will automatically take samples throughout a 24 hour period over a course of seven days. Staff then take composite samples of what was collected and have it analyzed.

Mr. Brousseau added this is not an unusual occurrence, noting the Department has asked over 20 industries to make this installation and they have all complied. He confirmed it would be done at the industry's cost, and according to Regional standards (as stipulated in the Regional Regulatory Code).

The Chair then asked if the authority to do this was under Provincial legislation. Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, Legal Department advised it is done under the *Regional Municipalities Act*.

Victor Grostern, Econome Inc., stated his business does not discharge into the sewer system, all that is discharged from the building is internal requirements by way of the toilets, sinks or wash water from the garage. He explained their waste is trucked to the R.O. Pickard Environmental Centre (ROPEC). He opined the Region could not tax his business both ways; forcing them to truck the effluent created through their industry (basically human toilet waste) to ROPEC, and then force them to retrofit their building for monitoring for a use which there is no basis upon which it can be used.

He said, although he understood there are legal issues (i.e. confidentiality etc.), there is a candy manufacturing factory and a fiberglass industry in the vicinity of his business, and he

had seen no evidence that the manufacturing process in those properties are subject to the same stipulations, the same need to retrofit as his.

Mr. Grostern noted that staff had mentioned “20 industries” had been asked to install this infrastructure and he asked what that meant. He said he knew that Sewermatic, which has the same requirement with respect to trucking to ROPEC, has had to put a maintenance access cover in and he asked if it was just this certain type of industry that was being required to do this. He asked that he be shown that other industries are being asked to do this. Otherwise, he would have to believe he was being discriminated against.

Mr. Grostern stated his second issue was that the building must be retrofitted. It was built prior to the existence of the Regional Regulatory Code and he asked why there was no grandfathering in such an instance, or a provision that the Region would put it in if it is required. Finally, he questioned where the maintenance access cover would go. He said he suspected the asphalt pavement (the parking area) would be torn up to put it in. He questioned if it could go in the Regional right-of-way at the side of the property (a ditch).

Chair Hunter asked staff to explain why information of where installations have been made must be kept confidential. Ms. Jacovella advised this information is deemed confidential under the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (MFIPPA) because it could lead to bylaw enforcement activities. These activities are protected under MFIPPA.

Ms. Jacovella went on to speak of the annual monitoring reports (required by Council) and noted these reports include the number of charges laid and convictions because this is a matter of public record. She said however, where the Region works in cooperation with an industry for the industry to bring its effluent into compliance with the Sewer Use Bylaw, this is done on a voluntary basis, before going into enforcement charges. All of these activities (e.g. the requirements and letters sent to the industry) could be used for bylaw enforcement, should the industry decide not to voluntarily comply with the Sewer Use Bylaw. She explained if the Region were to charge a company for discharging into the sewer system, the case that would be presented before the court would be the fact that it was deemed to be a significant industrial discharger; it was requested to install a manhole location; and what the samples taken at that location revealed. That information would become part of the public record once a company is prosecuted.

Chair Hunter stated he would have thought companies would be proud to proclaim that they were doing their part for the environment in having a monitoring station. He questioned the necessity for keeping this information private.

Ms. Jacovella explained a fundamental principle of the program is that staff work in cooperation with the industry; it facilitates the implementation of the program when

industries can freely give us the information without the fear of the information ending up in a public forum or in the media if the information is not deemed confidential and is not treated confidentially...

Chair Hunter noted it was not this type of information Mr. Grostern was concerned about. Rather, it was the kind of companies being asked to install these devices, to determine whether there is any consistency in the application of the policy.

Ms. Jacovella pointed out the Regional Regulatory Code lists all the significant types of industries, categorized by industrial sector, i.e. food products, textile products, lumber and wood products, paper products, chemicals, etc.. It then goes into more details, for example, inorganics, phosphate manufacturing, plastics, resins, synthetics, pharmaceuticals, etc.

Responding to Mr. Grostern's question regarding the 20 industries that have been asked to install maintenance access covers, Ms. Jacovella stated over the last few years, as a result of the Department's inspections, approximately 38 industries were asked to install them. Of those, approximately 18 found an alternate means of collecting the samples and that was deemed acceptable; the other 20 had to install a monitoring manhole. She said in addition to this, as part of our site plan approval, it is a requirement for any industry to have a monitoring manhole and over the last few years, approximately 50 of these have been required.

In response to questions from Chair Hunter, Mr. Grostern clarified that what he wanted was to know that the requirement to install a monitoring manhole was being applied to all industries where there is a potential for pollution, not just the sanitation industry.

Mr. Grostern went on to say he could not understand why staff were refusing to provide him with the information he requested. Mr. Brousseau clarified this was not a ruling by the Environment and Transportation Department but rather, it was pursuant to MFIPPA, Provincial legislation.

Committee Chair Hunter asked staff why candy factories were not included in the list in the Regional Regulatory Code. Ms. Jacovella stated she could provide Committee with a list of companies where monitoring manholes were requested, however, she said this would have to be done In Camera.

Mr. Grostern then referred to a report considered by Planning and Environment Committee at a previous meeting, with respect to the Region entering into agreements with Canadian Waste Systems on the discharge of leachate into the Regional water system. He questioned why portable toilet waste or septic waste could not be discharged into the sewer system as opposed to being forced to truck it to ROPEC. Committee Chair

Hunter suggested Mr. Grostern discuss this matter directly with staff in the Wastewater Collection Branch, to see if a similar agreement could be reached.

Mr. Grostern then questioned why his building could not be grandfathered. Ms. Jacovella advised the Regional Regulatory Code does not provide for grandfathering. She said staff have to be able to monitor discharges into the sewer system because a building can be sold and used for another type of manufacturing or industry and the effluent could be quite different than its original intention; an industrial site can become a significant discharger at any point in time.

Councillor van den Ham asked if Council had the right to introduce a grandfathering clause, subject to 1) the number of years and 2) if there is a sale or change in commercial use. Mr. Marc confirmed that Council could direct staff not to enforce the requirement for monitoring manholes against a particular development, however, he felt in doing that, Council would have to turn its mind to what problems it might create in the future, (regardless of how long this particular facility or use has been there). The fact that it has been there for a number of years and the fact that it has not changed in use does not necessarily eliminate the need for prospective monitoring.

Councillor van den Ham explained he was not trying to eliminate the need for future monitoring but rather he felt if some industries were feeling a hardship in having to do this instantaneously, he would be prepared to consider an appropriate element of deferral of this requirement (i.e. delay the requirement for a couple of years).

Councillor Beamish expressed a desire to go In Camera and moved the following motion.

Moved by D. Beamish

That this item be considered by the Planning and Environment Committee in Camera pursuant to Subsection 11(1) e) litigation or potential litigation affecting the Regional Corporation, including matters before administrative tribunals.

CARRIED

Moved by D. Beamish

That Planning and Environment Committee move Out of Camera and resume in open session.

CARRIED

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation.

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

RECEIVED

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. Trail Road And Nepean Landfill Sites - 1998 Annual Monitoring Report
- Director, Solid Waste Division, Environment and Transportation
Department memo dated 20 Sept 99
2. New Waste Management Collection Program
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's memo dated 23 Sept 99

Councillor Stewart asked that this item be included on the regular agenda for discussion at the Planning and Environment Committee meeting of 12 Oct 99, to allow members of the public to address their concerns regarding alternate scheduling of the blue box and black box waste collection programs.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Original signed by
Dawn Whelan

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

Original signed by
Gord Hunter

COMMITTEE CHAIR