

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

8 FEBRUARY 2000

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

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

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 25 January 2000.

CARRIED

PLANNING ITEMS

1. COREL AREA STUDY

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 11 Jan 2000

Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning began by acknowledging the work done by Marni Cappe, the Steering Committee and the consultants.

Marni Cappe, Manager, Policy Planning Branch, reminded Committee the reason this report was before them, stemmed from the final meetings of Regional Official Plan Review and the public meetings held in the Spring of 1997. She noted there was much discussion at that time about the need to recognize the Corel Centre as a unique facility in the Region. As a result of

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 23 February 2000 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 51; Council was requested to waive the Rules of Procedure to consider Item 2 at its meeting of 9 February 2000 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 50.

those discussions, Council decided to include in the Official Plan a policy directing staff, along with landowner and municipal representatives, to undertake a study to determine if in fact the Corel Centre could be used as basis for generating further employment in the Region. The study was launched in September, 1998 when the Steering Committee was formed. Ms. Cappe then introduced members of the Steering Committee who were present at the meeting. They were: Cyril Leeder from Terrace Corporation, Jocelyne McKenzie, Mike Moore, and Ray Essiambre (landowner representatives). From the municipalities, Tim Chadder (West Carleton), Danny Page, (Goulbourn) and Rob McKay (Kanata) and from the Region; Catherine Lindquist, (Economic Affairs), Judy Flavin, (Planning and Development Approvals) and Ms. Cappe. Ms. Cappe noted Malone Given Parsons (MGP) were retained as consultants and introduced Lee Parsons of MGP and from Delcan, Ron Jack and Ron Clarke.

Mr. Parsons then provided an overview of the study (a copy of Mr. Parsons' Power Point presentation is held on file with the Regional Clerk).

Councillor Munter noted in the sports/leisure area, the potential uses listed are theme/retail/sporting goods/ marine/recreational vehicles, etc. He said these would appear to be "big box" type uses. He asked for clarification. Mr. Parsons explained these would be uses that are land extensive, that are visited relatively infrequently and that would not be appropriate to the Town Centre, for example.

Councillor Munter commented these uses would be land extensive because they require people to drive there and therefore have parking lots. He asked if a transportation analysis was done to see what these types of uses would generate in terms of car trips. Ron Jack, Delcan, advised a macro analysis was done but not a detailed traffic impact study as it would be far too premature for that. He said a macro level of traffic generation was done on the four different options presented (based on estimates of employees or square footage) as a starting point, to see what capacity was needed and what further transit, TDM or other initiatives would be needed to get people out of their cars.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Munter, Mr. Jack confirmed that any of the four options would generate a great deal of car traffic. He further advised that \$6.3 million estimated for transportation costs (in the recommended option) included the extension of the Transitway from Terry Fox Drive into the site; the extension of Campeu Drive from Terry Fox into the site and the extension and widening of Huntmar Road. He stated the widening of other Regional roads, such as Hazeldean Road, Terry Fox Drive or Castlefrank Road were not costed, nor was the widening of Highway 417 included.

Councillor Munter felt it was very important to flag this fact that the infrastructure that was included in the estimate was only for roads internal to the subject area and that the roads leading to and from the site, and any capacity that is required was not part of the figure presented.

Councillor Munter asked if there was any thought given to intensifying the uses on the Corel Centre site itself. Mr. Parsons replied he had not made any attempt to look at the lands in micro detail. He felt it was important to ensure that if there were to be major leisure/entertainment type uses around the Corel Centre, that they would be as close as possible. He said other than flagging this as an association objective, intensification on the Corel site was not looked at.

Councillor Munter stated that given that the Corel Centre lands are nearly 10 % of the study area, if they were developed more intensely than currently anticipated, this could potentially reduce the requirement for other lands elsewhere. Mr. Parsons replied if this happened, the parking for the Corel Centre would have to be relocated elsewhere on the site and would not necessarily reduce the requirement for land.

Councillor Legendre asked if the Ontario Municipal Board decision concerning the Corel Centre area had envisioned a hotel on the Corel lands and if so, was a size mentioned. Mr. Parsons recalled it was 400 rooms for the hotel, 5,500 square metres of retail and 12,000 square metres of office space.

Councillor Legendre, referring to Option 3, commented the introductory statement “surprised” him. It said in the Region’s current Official Plan, there was a shortfall of several hundred hectares of developable land. He asked the speaker to expand on this. Mr. Parsons stated the study did not look at the entire Region in terms of employment lands, but rather it looked specifically at the western municipalities. He said he looked at the amount of land that was there, the amount of land that was vacant or could be available over the time frame of the plan and he looked at the potential for additional employment in Nepean, Kanata and Stittsville area. He advised they found approximately 600 to 900 hectare shortfall over the timeframe of the Official Plan, in the west end.

Responding to questions from Councillor Legendre, Ms. Cappe explained the purpose of the consultants’ study was to examine what has been happening in the west end of the Region. She noted the study included assumptions about increased levels of activity and the number of employees per hectare to generate the 600-900 hectares. Ms. Cappe advised the department is in the process of updating its vacant business park land inventory across the Region, however, no distinction will be made between high tech business parks and other types of vacant industrial land. Region-wide, the department has determined there is approximately a 40 year supply of vacant business park land.

Ms. Cappe went on to note the department was hoping to determine the nature of locational criteria for high tech businesses, which might be quite distinct from the general population of business park locations. To this end, she informed the department would hire a marketing consultant to perform key interviews with leaders in the high tech field to try to understand what

it means to have overall a 40 year supply of vacant business park land in Ottawa-Carleton, compared to what may be demanded in the west end of the Region for the hi-tech business.

Councillor Legendre said he did not necessarily agree with the campus approach to hi-tech business parks. He said he did not see this as a marketing exercise, and he hoped that rather than a marketing consultant, someone would be hired who could determine the technical requirements of hi-tech parks. He acknowledged some hi-tech businesses might require a certain acreage and consume it at a certain rate, and he said he wanted this information to determine if this fit in with the Region's supply of business park lands. The Councillor asked what the 40 year supply would be in hectares, as he wanted to translate the 600 to 900 hectare shortfall figure quoted by Mr. Parsons into years.

Ms. Cappe explained the urban area contained 2,179 hectares of vacant business park land, which translated into a 40 year supply, based on average rates of consumption. She said the upcoming departmental report would include a look at consumption rates over the last five and ten year periods.

Mr. Parsons said land is absorbed by people who want to absorb it where they want to go. He emphasized the Region has a rare opportunity to continue to attract businesses that have particular locational desires and attributes. The issues were more complex than acreage or access to transportation, and included elements such as access to human resources. Mr. Parsons suggested the western communities should be allowed to take advantage of this unique opportunity. He warned that having the wrong land for an area of high growth would not provide a 20 or 40 year supply, but rather an unlimited supply, as supply was related to demand. He said if an area did not have the type of land, sites and locations these types of industries wanted, they would not choose to locate in such an area, and that an industry's decision not to locate would not even be known to a community which had been deemed undesirable.

Mr. Parsons clarified for Councillor Legendre that by "western" municipalities, he was referring to the areas of Kanata, Nepean and Stittsville, and that the areas of direct competition for these municipalities were not necessarily only in Ontario, but elsewhere in the United States and in the world.

Responding to another query from Councillor Legendre as to whether hi-tech firms only want to locate in the western part of Ottawa-Carleton if they want to come to the Region at all, Mr. Parsons explained that this was not necessarily the case, but he noted this area had the attributes found most desirable by many types of companies.

Councillor van den Ham referred to a projected \$28 million cost for transit, and asked for an explanation of what kind of work this figure represented. Mr. Jack explained this would be the cost of extending the Transitway from the Kanata Town Centre underneath the Terry Fox

interchange and having a two lane Transitway on the north side of Highway 417 with a transit station in the vicinity of Huntmar Road. Mr. Jack said this figure was determined by multiplying the total distance by the historic rate of what it has cost the Region to build a normal Transitway under normal circumstances.

Responding to a question from Councillor van den Ham about the need to locate a transit station in the vicinity of Huntmar Road, Mr. Jack explained that once development began north of the highway, road infrastructure problems would be experienced that could not be accommodated in the long term with buses on roadways.

Referring to the “Next Steps” contained in the staff report on page eight of the agenda, Chair Chiarelli asked what terms of reference had been provided to the marketing consultant. Ms. Cappe replied the consultant had been directed to prepare interviews with senior hi-tech business people in the Region who had recently made locational decisions to expand. The questions are meant to obtain a glimpse into the thought process that led them to their decision to locate in Ottawa-Carleton.

Chair Chiarelli asked if the consultant would also be examining whether the needs of the hi-tech community could be accommodated on lands already serviced in the east end. Ms. Cappe confirmed this and noted the department would try to match the answers in terms of location decision with what already exists in Ottawa-Carleton.

Chair Chiarelli asked for further clarification of the wording of the locational questions that potential interviewees were to be asked, as he felt the issue was one of either providing land to accommodate industries who wanted to locate in the western part of the Region because of the location of clusters, or whether the Region should be using its resources to move the industries into areas which were already serviced. Ms. Cappe explained the department had studied many draft questions, and the intent was to be as non-judgmental as possible. The questions would not be leading, and would be asked in a neutral way to learn what an industry’s reasons would be for locating in Ottawa-Carleton. At Chair Chiarelli’s request, Ms. Cappe stated the terms of reference could be provided to the Committee.

Referring to “Determination of Additional Land Requirements” on the same page, Chair Chiarelli asked what was specifically meant by “more study”, and what time frames were involved. Ms. Cappe explained the department presently had a small contract with the marketing consultant and, as an outcome of this study, staff would have an idea of the locational criteria for business park land, in conjunction with work staff were performing to update the vacant business park land inventory. From this, a determination would be made of the amount of additional land required to the year 2021. She said the intent was to primarily rely on consultants for the technical pieces of work needed to get to the next stage, and she felt the department would be redirecting some of its priorities to put more staff time into the study in order to come to a decision more expeditiously.

Chair Chiarelli explained his concern was with the appearance of transparency with regard to communications, noting there were many in attendance interested in this issue. He felt it was important to be able to clearly communicate exactly what the corporation was doing or planning on doing. He noted the corporation had an obligation to be precise in terms of the direction on this particular issue.

Referencing the “Detailed Planning and Engineering Work” section on page nine of the agenda, Chair Chiarelli asked what the time frame was for determining this need for an urban boundary expansion. Ms. Cappe expected that following the justification work, staff would be in a position to know whether there was a basis for an amendment in about eight weeks time. She said a determination of the exact location of the boundaries of the urban expansion area would take a bit longer.

Referring to “Detailed Financial Assessment” on the same page, Chair Chiarelli noted the provision of servicing and other infrastructure would be expensive. He asked whether the department would examine different ways of providing financing (e.g. public/private partnerships), and whether these could include the possibility of area local improvement charges or site-specific charges. Ms. Cappe replied staff would look at different options for funding arrangements prior to asking for Council approval of an Amendment to the Plan, and that these could include the Chair’s suggestions.

Responding to the Chair’s question as to when an Official Plan Amendment could be ready to submit to Committee and Council, Ms. Cappe stated staff were prepared to come back in September with an Amendment that would address, at a basic level, the elements laid out in Steps 1-5 of the staff report. She explained this would set out the boundaries of the urban expansion area, consistent with the justification work the department was currently undertaking, and would include generalized land use designations which might also include a new designation specifically for hi-tech business parks.

Chair Chiarelli’s next question pertained to the “Auto Park” initiative, proposed for the west side of the Highway 417/Palladium Drive interchange, and which preceded the Corel Area Study. He asked if the Auto Park lands would be subsumed in the Corel Area Study, whether there would be a delay in the initiative’s implementation, or whether there would be an opportunity for it to be moved forward in a separate Amendment as originally contemplated before the Corel Study Area process was undertaken. Ms. Sweet informed the Committee the Auto Park Amendment application would be discussed at the Committee’s next meeting on 22 Feb 2000. She said this would be a formal public meeting, and the Committee would be given a report with a recommendation at that time. Ms. Sweet said staff were awaiting the outcome of the present meeting to see what issues were brought forth. She outlined the primary issue pertaining to the Auto Park’s application was access to urban services (water and sewer), which were being requested of land currently designated General Rural. She noted the

recommendation for an Urban designation for the Corel Area Study lands, which could include the Auto Park lands, might render the Auto Park Amendment application redundant. Responding to another question from Chair Chiarelli whether Committee approval of the recommendations contained in the Corel Area Study report would preempt an independent application and process for the Auto Park in terms of an Official Plan Amendment, Ms. Sweet noted various options for these lands would be discussed at the Committee's next meeting.

Following the questions to staff, Chair Hunter read the following motions he had received from the Committee.

Moved by B. Hill:

- 1. That Committee and Council support in principle the Malone Givens Parsons report: "Economic Study of the Corel Centre Area";**
- 2. That the draft Official Plan Amendment for the Corel Area be brought back to Planning and Environment Committee in June 2000, and in particular shall:**
 - determine the specific boundaries of the urban area expansion around the Corel Centre consistent with the justification analysis;**
 - designate land uses in accordance with the identified studies;**
 - address the timing, cost and funding arrangements for infrastructure, including the extension of Huntmar Road;**
 - assess the implications for the capital budget and development charges; and**
 - include opportunity for public comment prior to September;**
- 3. That the final Official Plan Amendment be brought back to Planning and Environment Committee in September of 2000.**

Moved by B. Chiarelli:

That staff be directed to include within the "Detailed Financial Assessment" of the "Next Steps" an analysis of the extent to which it would be appropriate to raise funding for existing or new infrastructure through the *Local Improvement Act*, the *Municipal Act, Section 221* and/or area-specific development charges.

Councillor Munter gave notice he would be moving a motion to add the following to Item No. 2 (third bullet) of Councillor Hill's Motion wherein she specified the extension of Huntmar Road, to include...

...Terry Fox Drive, the Transitway, Highway 417 and any other off-site transportation infrastructure required to service these lands.

He explained he wished staff to investigate the transportation issues relating not just to the roads within, but to the roads leading to this proposed development.

Councillor Legendre referenced the 1991 Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) decision that approved the Corel Centre site with some strict conditions. He inquired of staff whether these conditions were still applicable and could limit expansion of the urban area. Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, Regional Legal Department, commented that the 1997 Official Plan was in force, and one of the policies contained therein was to look at the area in the vicinity of the Corel Centre. With respect to the OMB decision on the Palladium (as it was known in 1991), Mr. Marc said it was his belief the Board over-reached its authority in making this decision. He stated the Region and other municipalities had an obligation to deal with planning applications as they came forward and he felt, if the OMB decision was taken to suggest that urban expansions could not be discussed, this was beyond the Board's authority. Mr. Marc stated he did not believe the OMB decision of 1991 would be an impediment to urban expansion.

The Committee then heard from the following public delegations:

Janet Stavinga, Mayor of the Township of Goulbourn, Mayor Stavinga stated Goulbourn Council supported the general findings of the study and noted the study confirmed their expectations that there is a tremendous economic opportunity present around the Corel Centre. This opportunity is capable of delivering tremendous economic benefits to the Ottawa-Carleton Region, including significant job creation, construction jobs, additional property tax revenue as well as peripheral benefits including the health of the Kanata town Centre, bolstering the Stittsville Business Park and further improving Ottawa-Carleton's stature as the information technology centre.

Mayor Stavinga noted Mr. Lee had indicated the Corel Centre is a powerful draw but by itself, it does not have the critical mass to generate sufficient, direct spin-offs to support adjacent development. She felt this was very important for the Committee to understand. As well, she felt it important to highlight the shortage of business park lands in the western portion of Ottawa-Carleton and, from the Township of Goulbourn's perspective, the associated infrastructure needs and in particular that of the Huntmar extension.

While the Township of Goulbourn supports the general thrust of the recommendations, Ms. Stavinga stated they were unable to support the recommended development option proposed by MGP. The recommended option defers any development south of Maple Grove Road until the northerly campus is developed and this could effectively withhold these lands from development for another decade despite the obvious potential benefits to Stittsville, Goulbourn and the Region as a whole, if these lands were brought on stream at this time. Mayor Stavinga stated Option 4 was Goulbourn's preferred option and, as well, the Councils of Kanata and West Carleton also support this option. She went on to outline the five main reasons why they support Option 4. They were:

1. the demand for light manufacturing, hi-tech lands exists at the present time and there is a scarcity of suitable 10 to 15 acre sites in the Region;
2. the uses proposed in this area do not need to rely on a supply chain relationship, which is exclusively tied to the campus style uses targeted north of Highway 417;
3. the cost-benefit analysis clearly supports Option 4. Compared to the recommended Option, Option 4 generates an additional \$1.2 million in infrastructure costs but results in a direct benefit of 4,900 direct jobs, 1,300 indirect jobs, \$5.5 million in development charges and \$7 million per year in tax revenue.
4. Option 4 makes the most efficient use of infrastructure by enabling development along the Huntmar extension, which needs to be built under any of the options; and
5. the designation of some 360 hectares of hi-tech lands, north and south of the Corel Centre, helps to ensure that the expansion needs of the Region's information technology sector are met on a sustained basis.

In concluding her remarks, Mayor Stavinga reiterated Goulbourn Council's support for the general findings of the study and specifically for Option 4, which they feel will generate the greatest economic benefit for the Region. Referring to the motion put forward by Councillor Hill, Mayor Stavinga asked that the Committee consider an amendment to item 1, replacing the words "Committee and Council support in principle the Malone Givens Parsons report" with the words "Committee and Council support in principle Option 4 of the Malone, Givens Parsons report".

Merle Nicholds, Mayor, City of Kanata, explained her presence at the meeting was to illustrate the unanimous position of the three western municipalities in regards to their response to this report. Mayor Nicholds conveyed Kanata Council's appreciation that this study was done and stated they recognized the important opportunity this represents to realize the full potential of significant infrastructure that is already in place (the Corel Centre and the Highway 417 interchange). She said a unique opportunity exists, as the study points out, to take advantage of continuing the momentum that the Region is experiencing right now. The Mayor emphasized the importance of being in a position to meet the needs of the hi-tech industry, otherwise the opportunity may be lost to other centres in North America or the world. She also pointed out the study recognized the opportunity to get on board with other fast growing industries such as tourism and the leisure industry, which could be of significant benefit to the whole Region.

The Mayor went on to convey Kanata Council's full support for the findings of this study and in particular Option 4, which ensures there will be the supply and diversity required (not just for the hi-tech industry but also the supply chain businesses and industries that will spin-off from the hi-tech industry). She also noted City Council requested that the Region initiate and approve a Regional Official Plan Amendment this year, and requested that the Region proceed as soon as possible with the studies that have been identified.

Referencing a concern raised by Councillor Munter regarding the transportation needs not included in the projected costs, Mayor Nicholds stated Kanata is also very concerned about Terry Fox Drive and what will happen as more development comes to the area. She indicated she would support Councillor Munter's proposal to add that a specific focus be placed on looking at Terry Fox Drive and Campeau Drive and stressed the importance of ensuring that all the right studies are done and all the issues have been examined.

In concluding her remarks, Mayor Nicholds referenced a comment made earlier in the discussion concerning an Official Plan Amendment for the Auto Mall. She said she was aware a report would be coming to Committee at its next meeting and advised that Kanata Council's position on this matter was that this proposal was premature and should be included as part of this process. Mayor Nicholds conveyed her support for Councillor Hill's motion and the amendment suggested by Mayor Stavinga with regards to Option 4.

Tim Chadder, Township of West Carleton, explained that Mayor Eastman was unable to attend the meeting and stated he was there on the Mayor's behalf. Mr. Chadder indicated he had reviewed Councillor Hill's motion and the amendment proposed by Mayor Stavinga, and advised these would be consistent with the position taken by West Carleton Council. He conveyed the Township's full support for proceeding in this way.

Chair Chiarelli thanked the delegations and commended Mayors Stavinga, Nicholds and Eastman for their leadership and cooperation on this issue and stated it was an excellent example of working together. He said it was necessary for the community to collectively respond to needs of the hi-tech sector and he indicated the Region would do everything it could to cooperate in this regard. Chair Chiarelli also expressed the hope that the opportunity would arise in the near future, to share with those in the east end of the Region, the economic boom that is occurring in the west area.

Councillor Hill referencing Option 4, noted this was her first choice and stated she had initially included it in her motion. She said staff recommended against this and she asked that staff explain their reasoning for this to the Committee.

Ms. Cappe stated she felt it was important to reflect the momentum this study has picked up and suggested it would be best not to reference a specific option, in order to maintain as much flexibility as possible. In this way, when staff returned to Committee with an Amendment, based on the amount of additional land they felt was needed and what those additional lands would be used for, they would have the flexibility to recommend for example more business park land south of Highway 417, if it were determined the leisure/sport/entertainment option was not as strong in the absence of the Central Canada Exhibition. She said by referring explicitly to Option 4 in the motion, it could reduce staff's flexibility and their ability to respond to the main task, which is to carry out further planning studies.

Mayor Stavinga stated the reason for their concern about supporting the report in principle, was that the report recommends a modified Option 4 which excludes the business park south of Maple Grove. She said if it is staff's intent to maintain flexibility, Option 4 provides the greatest flexibility.

Responding to questions posed by Committee Chair Hunter, Mr. Tunnacliffe confirmed that the entire area would be looked at.

Councillor Hill pointed out that Goulbourn has land zoned south of Hazeldean Road that can be developed without a Regional Official Plan Amendment, once Huntmar Road is extended.

Bill Davidson, suggested the issue should be looked at from a global perspective, noting many people present at the meeting had a personal or indirect interest in this area. He felt the matter should be considered in the context of what the new City of Ottawa will look like and what this area will look like in the long term (i.e. 20 years, 30 years, 60 years, etc). He felt this should be viewed as a strategic frame work, and cautioned that if this land is not developed in this context, it could result in a "hodgepodge of evolution", as demand requires development. Mr. Davidson stressed the necessity of thinking this out in the context of the global situation and maintaining momentum for this community.

Rob McKay, Manager, Economic Development, City of Kanata Mr. McKay stated he had worked in Kanata for 12 years as a planner and as the Economic Development Manager, working directly with the hi-tech and other industries that are locating in Kanata. He noted there are unique opportunities in this area, that will allow the Corel Centre to provide more of a service to the community of Ottawa-Carleton. Mr. McKay stressed it was very important to understand Mr. Parsons' recommendations, that the leisure/entertainment component and the hi-tech component must be a package. The expanded leisure theme will work if there is a significant employment node nearby.

Mr. McKay went on to note Kanata began with approximately 1,300 acres of land for business parks; approximately half of this land has been absorbed and 600 acres of land remains. He stated it was important for the Committee to understand how much of this land does not meet the needs of the industries that are locating in the west. He stated the hi-tech industry typically wants ground oriented buildings that are land extensive (e.g. 10 to 15 acres), with surface parking lots and very specific locational requirements. The majority of land available in the three main business parks in Kanata does not meet the requirements of the hi-tech industry.

Mr. McKay went on to point out there are about 25 site locators (i.e. real estate agents, lawyers, developers who work with the hi-tech sector) working in the Ottawa-Carleton Region and they know exactly what sites are available, what the approval processes are and how long they will take. Referencing a point raised by Mayor Nicholds, Mr. McKay reiterated that if the Region is not careful, it will be passed by because the sites available in the inventory are no

longer the sites the industry wants. He offered by way of example, Nortel's fibre optic facility in the Terry Fox Business Park. He said they had both Ottawa-Carleton and Colorado Springs on their short list and, if the site in Kanata had not been building permit ready, zoned, serviced, no vibrations and close to Corkstown Road (where their main clean rooms are), Kanata would have lost that opportunity.

In closing, Mr. McKay stated staff must do some very careful analysis with the consultants on the locational requirements of the industry and they must ensure that the information they receive is not biased (e.g. developers who will say they want uptake on their land before any urban expansion). Mr. McKay stated although the Region will probably be able to get by in the next few years with the current supply of land in the west, he cautioned the situation will be critical in five years,.

Chris Fleming, C. Fleming Development Limited advised he was representing the owners of the West Barrhaven Industrial Park in Nepean South. This industrial park is made up of approximately 350 acres of land recently approved by the Region (October 1998) as an extensive employment and prestige business park area. He noted he had written to the Committee (copy held on file with the Regional Clerk) to express his clients' strong reservations about the logic and conclusions of this study.

Mr. Fleming explained West Barrhaven Business Park was located immediately west of Highway 416 at the Standherd interchange. The decision to service these lands was studied over the summer and the City of Nepean has offered interim capacity (as of 18 November 1999). These lands are ideally suited to firms looking for large blocks of land in the west end, upon which they can expand. The average land holding is over 40 acres in size and there are approximately 10 separate landowners interested in competitive pricing and offerings, in terms of either build to suit or leased buildings. Mr. Fleming posited therefore, West Barrhaven meets the key criteria set out in the Corel Area study.

The speaker went on to say the Corel area is attractive because of its west end location and good highway access but West Barrhaven is also in the west end and has direct highway access. In addition, this business park is closer to the airport and is located across from the future bridge that will extend from the airport and link Riverside South (another growth area). The West Barrhaven Industrial Park does not remove Class 1 agricultural land from inventory or production and more importantly, it is located in a part of the Region that has a significant shortfall of employment. As well, West Barrhaven requires no further studies as it is already designated for development under the Official Plan and has all the roads and services it currently needs (either built or budgeted for).

Mr. Fleming stated should Committee and Council believe there is a need for further acceleration of business park development, the West Barrhaven landowners would be willing to examine opportunities to do so. He said they have considerable resources in terms of both land

expertise and development expertise. However, he did not believe the need to accelerate had been proven but rather it still needs to be looked at.

Referring to the issue from a cost benefit standpoint, Mr. Fleming stated much had been made by the consultants about the benefits of employment growth and tax revenue growth. He pointed out those exact same employment and tax revenue benefits were used to support the investment and approvals for West Barrhaven. He said Regional Council had made significant decisions over the last two years to extend services to West Barrhaven, to approve Official Plans, to build roads and to provide services in order to attract employment and tax revenue growth. He said they were only now beginning to see some of the benefits of these decisions and already others were looking to jump ahead to look at what else might be done. Mr. Fleming said, as a business man and a former municipal employee, scarce public dollars could not easily be directed to competing initiatives and felt the West Barrhaven park should be allowed to come to fruition.

In conclusion, Mr. Fleming felt the Committee must question whether there is a demonstrated need to consider a possible expansion of the urban area with the costs and other implications this would entail. Particularly when the Region only approved the West Barrhaven expansion to its employment land in the west end, less than 18 months ago. He said should the Committee and Council feel this expansion needs to be considered further, he would suggest the focus for any further studies be broadened to determine what practical initiatives might be needed to facilitate employment growth throughout the Ottawa-Carleton Region. As well, he suggested that land owners and municipal officials from Nepean and Gloucester should be invited to participate.

Chair Hunter noted the studies that would be done, insofar as justification of the urban expansion, would have to take into account the very concerns raised by Mr. Fleming. He asked staff how Mr. Fleming and the people he represents could be involved in making sure it is a fair study and inclusive enough to ensure their concerns and investments are taken into consideration.

Ms. Cappe replied, although there will not be a lot of public meetings (given the compressed time frame), Mr. Fleming could be advised of any public meetings held as the study progresses. Ms. Cappe went on to say the next step in the process will be to determine what lands are currently designated for business park and how well they meet the criteria for hi-tech industry, as identified through the interview process. She said it is quite likely that as Mr. Fleming has indicated the West Barrhaven business park would likely contend with some of the lands in Kanata. However, she pointed out in the study conducted by Mr. Parsons, all of the business park land designated in western part of the Region (including Nepean), was taken into account.

Chair Hunter noted the major part of the justification in considering an expansion to the urban boundary, is that it does not leave land already in the urban boundary area undeveloped,

thereby hurting the investment of the taxpayers and the property owners for some time. This study would have to show there is enough business to go around. Ms. Cappe confirmed this and pointed out an outcome of the study may be that the Region try to bring on stream sooner, the Regional services that are required to facilitate West Barrhaven Business Park.

Mr. Fleming stated if Regional staff would agree to involve, in a formal way, City of Nepean and Gloucester staff and look for owners to participate, he felt that such things as financing options (e.g. partnering, long term financing, bond issues, etc) might be identified by them, that perhaps Regional staff and consultants might not be aware of. He felt this was an opportunity to “partner better”.

Councillor Munter noted the Committee had been hearing that one of the factors driving this proposal is that companies want to locate on larger blocks of land in Kanata, to be near their competitors and be part of the cluster. He said if this is the case, (and the study will determine this) then it is an issue of supply and demand (i.e. the demand for land in Kanata is greater than demand for land elsewhere). He felt if the Region is going to respond to that demand, by putting land into the urban envelope, servicing it and putting infrastructure in place, then it would seem to him that it would not make sense to also service other lands where clearly there is not a demand. The Councillor felt in fact, it would make sense to rearrange the Region’s infrastructure priorities and put the emphasis instead on infrastructure and servicing for lands in Kanata, to reflect this demand.

Mr. Fleming stated this scenario would occur only in a perfect world where you had unlimited dollars and could simply respond to the demand. He suggested a rational Council, would have to look at tradeoffs and he felt demand could be controlled to an extent. He pointed out the West Barrhaven park is approximately five minutes from Nortel’s main campus, while West Carleton’s lands are as far if not further in time.

Councillor Legendre noted a few years ago when OCEDCO wanted to attract a microchip plant to Ottawa-Carleton, a few pieces of land were identified throughout the Region. He said he hoped this data would be part of the consultants information that comes back to the Committee. Ms. Cappe said staff would not direct the consultant, but would make him aware of other reports that have already been prepared. She said it was not her intent to have the consultant re-invent that study.

Councillor Legendre noted the earlier study had determined the suitability of the lands by asking those outside the Region what they would need if they wanted to locate in Ottawa-Carleton. He said he hoped the current survey would not just go to the existing Ottawa-Carleton hi-tech community asking what they wanted to expand, but would go further afield and ask people from outside what they needed to come to the Region. Ms. Cappe explained that given the time and budget, the intent was to contact existing hi-tech companies within Ottawa-Carleton.

Phil Sweetnam, representing the Goulbourn Chamber of Commerce, said the Goulbourn Chamber of Commerce agreed with Councillor Hill's Motion to support the MGP report, and based its support on the faith that if a needs assessment was undertaken, there would be favourable consideration for Option 4, and that lands within the Township of Goulbourn would be included. Mr. Sweetnam also noted the new city structure would mean all parts of Ottawa would benefit equally from the development in the Corel Centre Area, so he felt it wise to encourage development where it was most likely that hi-tech industries would be attracted. The speaker noted if the Official Plan Amendment creating a road between the Corel Centre and Hazeldean Road is approved, 35 acres of publicly-owned industrial land will be available in the Goulbourn business park, and will be a Region-wide asset, and will become attractive and marketable to hi-tech industries.

Mr. Sweetnam warned that attempting to expand the hi-tech sector in the east rather than the west end where it was mostly located at present would be detrimental to staff recruitment, and could increase commuting times, cited as a factor in Nortel's decision to locate in Kanata. He also echoed Mayor Nicholds' comment that in today's competitive global economic world, government cannot dictate where hi-tech industries locate.

Mr. Sweetnam also felt it was crucial to move quickly with regulatory framework to allow new development to occur. He said speedy approval for development was crucial to today's highly competitive development atmosphere. He said he was also pleased to see the Planning and Environment Committee responding quickly to the goal of bringing forth an Official Plan Amendment by September, 2000. In conclusion, he asked staff and Committee to allow industry to build on the tradition established in Kanata by developers such as Teron and Campeau, and by industries such as Mitel and Newbridge.

Caroline Ladanowski representing the Region's Environmental Health Advisory Group, said the Advisory Group felt strongly this study and the proposed Amendment for the Palladium Auto Park needed to be considered collectively rather than individually, and recommended that no further action be taken until these two review processes were carried out collectively. She said a single approach would allow for better development of these lands, and would take other aspects into account, such as environmental factors. Ms. Ladanowski pointed out the document noted that environmental studies had been performed in the area, but not specifically for the purpose of evaluating the effects of the proposed development, which she felt needed to be done before development issues could be pursued. She noted a number of evaluation criteria, including marketability, relationship to the Corel Centre, economic development, urban structure, infrastructure, and public funding had been mentioned in the Study, but she felt there was a need for greater emphasis on the environment as a criterion.

The speaker stated that with an increase in infrastructure, there would be more cars and buses on the road and she was not sure how this would fit into the Region's initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Although she said she appreciated this was an unique economic

opportunity, she felt the potential economic benefits to the Region should not be at the expense of the environment. She also emphasized the extensive and ongoing need for public engagement.

In comparing the experiences of other cities to the Corel Centre Area development, Ms. Ladanowski noted the report had referred to the cities of Chicago, Washington and Cleveland. She emphasized in these cases, the cities in question were re-developing existing places in their inner cores and not in suburban areas. The speaker felt that when making comparisons, it was necessary to compare like developments. She offered that perhaps it was necessary to revisit other existing areas in the Region, which already possessed infrastructure, and which could deal with some redevelopment and growth.

Ray Essiambre, a member of the Steering Committee which had worked with the Region and area municipalities, informed he also represented landowners who owned about 450 acres south of Highway 417. Mr. Essiambre stated the Steering Committee supported the direction of the Study and its recommendations, and also supported the direction of Councillor Hill's Motion. He emphasized this strategy was being driven by a group of developers and investors. Mr. Essiambre noted that with the exception of Terrace Investments and the backers of the proposed Auto Mall, all of the ownership in this area was retained under the original ownership or passive investors. The speaker said that in order to bring the vision to reality, it was necessary to get developers to the table and to buy into the process. Mr. Essiambre felt it was important for the Committee to send a clear message to the investment community, the community at large and to the end users that the process would move forward. In closing, the speaker said the Steering Committee supported the Committee's direction, and the work staff were recommending as part of the "Next Steps", and that bringing an amendment forward in 2000 was critical.

Responding to a query from Councillor Beamish as to the role of the Steering Committee, Mr. Essiambre explained the Committee provided advice and clarification on the issues it felt the study should address. Although the speaker acknowledged Mr. Parsons had the study's terms of reference to work with, Mr. Essiambre felt the Steering Committee brought a necessary perspective and a balanced viewpoint. He noted the Steering Committee had included Planning Directors from the three municipalities, and that staff had a good understanding of the technological requirements of the industry.

Councillor Beamish questioned the impartiality of a land use study when landowners, who stand to make large profits, sat on the Steering Committee. Ms. Cappe said staff had followed Council's explicit direction in including landowners on the Committee and noted the contractual relationship with Malone Givens Parsons was with the Region. Ms. Cappe said the balance of the Committee included members from the municipalities and the Region, and she added the four landowner representatives offered a perspective that would otherwise have been unavailable without having general public meetings. She said this provided the consultants with

quick and useful feedback, and said she did not believe the study was in any way distorted. She pointed out as well, that Regional Council would ultimately decide whether there was an adequate basis to expand the urban boundary.

Councillor van den Ham, noting Mr. Essiambre represented a number of landowners, pointed out that when an Official Plan Amendment is usually requested, it is at the cost of the applicant, including the cost of all studies. Noting the present report was recommending further study, the Councillor asked if those Mr. Essiambre represented, along with the investors and developers, were prepared to contribute to this process. Mr. Essiambre emphasized that when this process began two and a half years ago, it was the landowners who had been prepared to proceed on a cost-share basis. He said he had been approached by people who wanted to invest heavily in this area, but were waiting for a signal or message that would attract investment.

Ted Fobert, FoTenn Consultants, representing the interests of the owners of the Palladium Auto Park site, Fern Turpin, John Mierins, Tony Graham and Jean-Yves Laberge, offered the group's support for the recommendations set out in the Corel Centre Study. He provided a perspective on how the broader study complemented and impacted the Auto Park application. Mr. Fobert noted the Auto Park proposal had a long history, which had included several delays. He explained the owners had been advised to await approval of the Regional Official Plan to allow the area to be designated General Rural, which had been done in October of 1997. Later servicing studies found there was no water on-site, which required approval to extend water, available on Huntmar Road, to the site. Mr. Fobert noted this would require a Regional Official Plan Amendment, as the central service cannot go to a rurally-designated piece of land. The speaker stated in January of 1999, his clients were asked to further defer consideration of their application pending the completion of the Corel Centre Study. Mr. Fobert noted the Study which Committee was finally dealing with, released in December of 1999, strongly supported economic growth in the vicinity of the Corel Centre, and specifically supports automotive retail uses as one of the components of Options 2 and 4.

Mr. Fobert urged the Committee to endorse the recommendations of the Corel Area Study and to commence as quickly as possible with the additional studies required to implement the broad approach it envisioned. However, he reminded the Committee the scope of development proposed in the Study was comprehensive, with up to 2,000 acres of additional land coming on-stream. Mr. Fobert felt this would involve a lengthy review process in spite of efforts to fast-track the application. He offered that the Palladium Auto Park lands consisted of 84 acres of land in the interchange area, and that other similar individual projects would continue to come before the Committee for consideration. He suggested that notwithstanding the additional work required for the broader initiative, applications like the Auto Park, which could demonstrate they would not prejudice the outcome of the broader expansion area or jeopardize other development in the area should not be delayed for the broader study. In closing, the speaker urged Committee to move quickly on the recommendations of the Corel Area Study and the work that would be required to implement it.

Gordon Taylor, an agent with Royal LePage Commercial Real Estate whose stated specialty was selling land in development sites in and around the Region, said he had been involved with numerous transactions in the Kanata-Goulbourn area. He sounded a warning about a looming shortage of land in the Kanata area suitable for hi-tech development. The speaker noted there were five locations in Kanata which could accommodate medium to large companies on land that was currently zoned, serviced and development-ready. He said these consisted of about 726 acres. Out of this, 662 acres were (net) usable, and 324 were being or had already been committed. He said this left 338 acres, and noted that out of the 324 acres already committed, 274 of these had been committed within the last 36 months. Mr. Taylor said the figures indicated a supply of land sufficient for approximately another three to four years. He added that the rate at which land was being absorbed for hi-tech development had been increasing in the last few years, and it was possible the current supply would not last three years.

Mr. Taylor said with a current vacancy rate of existing space in the Kanata market of less than 3%, high tech companies seeking additional space had no choice but to build, often on a short time frame which did not allow for the normal Official Plan Amendment and rezoning processes. Mr. Taylor felt the current situation had to be addressed quickly or the Region would risk losing hi-tech development. While acknowledging the Region's concern regarding balanced development throughout the Region, Mr. Taylor felt if industry could not be provided with an adequate supply of available land in this area, it was likely that hi-tech development might go outside the Region rather than be forced to locate in Gloucester or Cumberland. He asked for Committee's consideration of Option 4 of the submitted proposals, and of the extension of Huntmar Road and the business development section to Hazeldean Road.

Clarifying the question of a company's preferred location for Councillor Munter, Mr. Taylor explained that most hi-tech companies want to locate near competitors. To this end, he echoed the Councillor's view that it made sense to concentrate investment and infrastructure on areas where there had been an expressed desire on the part of industry to locate. However, he acknowledged the east end might be attractive for companies with specific requirements which this area could accommodate, and he suggested it might be possible to target-market specific uses for this and other areas.

Mr. Cyril Leeder, also a member of the Steering Committee, said he represented the Terrace Corporation, which owns 350 acres of land north of the Queensway. He said he was also the Corel Centre's Chief Operating Officer, and was also representing the Centre's interests. Mr. Leeder commended Ms. Cappe, Regional staff, and the consultants for the work they had performed on the report, which he said had addressed many of the concerns expressed at the present meeting. Referring to the public meetings held, he stated he had never before encountered such a level of unanimous support for any project, from members of the business community, landowners, residents, and adjacent competitors. Mr. Leeder said as a landowner in the area, Terrace supported moving the initiative forward. He vowed if the initiative moved

forward, the Corporation would lead the design, development and implementation of a world-class hi-tech business park to ensure the Region could continue to attract the major multinationals now relocating to the area, and to ensure adequate growth area for the Region's existing companies.

Mr. Leeder noted the Region possessed over 1,000 technology companies, and this number was growing. He felt it was incumbent upon the Region to get not just its fair share of this growth but more than its fair share. The speaker felt Ottawa was well positioned to acquire as much of the growth in technology over the next ten years as possible, and he believed that if managed properly, the Region would see a technological revolution not unlike the industrial revolution. Mr. Leeder believed that with the Corel Centre and the Ottawa Senators, the next ten years would see explosive growth for the Region. The speaker said Terrace Corp., as those responsible for the Corel Centre, would support the initiative even if it did not own land in the area, as adding an employment base next to the building would be important in terms of long-term viability for future growth. In summary, Mr. Leeder said he was encouraged by the September, 2000 date, and urged the Committee to move forward.

Jim Shotten stated he had been a commercial real estate agent for 15 years, with a focus on the hi-tech area and, specifically the Kanata/west end market. He noted the Kanata North Business Park, made up of 950 acres is approximately 80% committed and commented on the phenomenal amount of growth that has occurred in the last five years. Mr. Shotten also referred to the growth that has occurred in the area in the last few years with the widening of March Road. He pointed out of the 1,000 high tech companies in Ottawa-Carleton, only about 200 reside in Kanata; the rest of them are spread around the Region. He stated Nortel is the catalyst for the hi-tech movement in the west, noting other hi-tech companies want to be located near them. As well, some 250 companies have been spawned out of Nortel alone over the last 15 years and most of those have located in the west end. Referring to the east end, Mr. Shotten opined development will happen there. He noted there had been a lot of industrial growth in the east in recent years, and those companies will start to get larger in size.

With reference to Mr. Fleming's land, Mr. Shotten stated it was a tremendous site but it is only 300 acres and it will be developed in the next 10 to 15 years. The land in Corel Centre area, is land that is going to be coming on in the next five to ten year time frame, and that is exactly when it will be needed.

Mr. Shotten noted another issue that was raised earlier in terms of environment and he said one of the most appealing things about Ottawa-Carleton is a person is able to live within ten to fifteen minutes of their workplace and this is a real selling point to companies in California, Texas, etc.. The Kanata, West Carleton and Carp areas are a beautiful environment and gas, time and energy are saved by having people living in those areas and working close by.

In summary, Mr. Shotten stated he was in favour of the report and suggested the Region should probably be thinking bigger, not smaller. He said this was an ideal opportunity to set aside an area of 800 to 2,000 acres and send a message to these companies that the Region is very serious about hi-tech and is encouraging them to locate and grow within this area.

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

Councillor Munter noted Councillor Hill's motion asked that an Official Plan Amendment be brought back to Committee by June 2000. He asked staff if this was possible. Ms. Cappe replied she was somewhat uncomfortable with the earlier deadline (ie. June versus September) and the added requirements. She said her concern was that if pressed to come back with a Draft Amendment in June, staff would be bringing forward an Amendment that is a bit of a shell outlining the elements that are being worked on but perhaps all the studies would not be completed by then.

Councillor Munter indicated he would be putting forward an amendment to change the date from June to September, 2000.

Councillor Munter went on to say he felt the study was a good one and recognized the tremendous amount of work that went into it. He said there were both pros and cons to the proposal. On the pro side, the Councillor noted clearly there is a great market demand and the success of the technology sector is what is driving this. As well, he noted the area, being adjacent to Highway 417, will be much better supported by the infrastructure that is in place than the Kanata North Business Park was. On the downside, Councillor Munter pointed out the infrastructure that is in place cannot support this development. Using Terry Fox Drive as an example, he noted there is a "concept" in the Regional Official Plan to widen Terry Fox Drive, but it is not an actual project to be done in the next 10 years and there is no money in the Capital Budget to do so.

Councillor Munter stated the big flaw of the proposal is that it does not analyze the costs of the required infrastructure. He said he would support Councillor Hill's Motion and noted he had some amendments that he felt would improve it. He indicated he was prepared to go to the next step and to see the Official Plan Amendment that results from all this work. However, he emphasized he would not be prepared to support a Regional Official Plan Amendment that designates all of these lands urban, if there is not the infrastructure in place to support the development.

Referring to his motion concerning the affordability of infrastructure, Councillor Munter stated it would appear to him that if the Region is considering redesignating this land in the Official Plan, to respond to market demand, then it follows that other things in the Official Plan should also be changed. He said his motion asks staff to analyze whether or not the Region needs to re-orient its priorities for infrastructure, if in fact growth and development is going to happen on the

subject lands. He said this was an issue of affordability, as the Region cannot afford to do it all. The Councillor reminded Committee that Regional Development Charges (RDC) collected do not cover the cost of new infrastructure. Option 4, the most intensive development, will bring in \$21.6 million in RDC, which is nowhere near what the cost of the infrastructure will be required.

Councillor van den Ham stated he was in support of proceeding to the next step, however, in reference to Councillor Munter's motion concerning infrastructure, he said he was not prepared to have some of the projects in the east end, that have been needed for a number of years, "get knocked off the table". The Councillor stated he did not want to miss the opportunity that this proposal presented, so in order to achieve something that will work for everyone, he said options such as front-end financing by the developers should be considered.

Councillor Hill, speaking to her motion, stated she wanted to see the Region move forward on this and maintain the momentum that is occurring in Kanata. She felt it important not to miss this great opportunity just because it is not yet known where the money will come from; there are many ways to get money and she felt this should be left to the staff responsible for this aspect. She also pointed out that in addition to the \$21 million in RDC, development would generate tax revenue in the years to come. She urged the Committee to support her motion.

Responding to a question from Councillor Beamish, Mr. Parsons clarified the annual property taxes shown, represent a combined revenue (Regional, municipal, and educational).

Committee Chair Hunter thanked staff, the consultants and members of the public who presented their views on this very important issue. The Chair went on to speak of the importance of the Highway 417/Palladium Interchange, noting it is the transportation structures (i.e. the roads and highways) that are the spines of economic development in the community. He said the fact the Corel Centre was required to put an interchange there has made economic development in this area not only possible, but attractive. Chair Hunter pointed out that many of the interchanges in this area onto both Highways 417 and the 416 are hindered from economic development because they are in the greenbelt. He felt it important therefore, that when an opportunity for enhanced development on land in this area, on an interchange, presents itself it should be seized.

The Committee then proceeded to consider Councillor Hill's motion, item by item, together with the proposed amendments.

Moved by B. Hill

- 1. That Committee and Council support in principle the Malone Givens Parsons report: "Economic Study of the Corel Centre Area".**

CARRIED

Moved by A. Munter

That Item 2 of Councillor Hill's motion be amended by replacing "June 2000" with "September 2000", to read:

- 2. That the draft Official Plan Amendment for the Corel Area be brought back to Planning and Environment Committee in September 2000.**

CARRIED as amended

Yeas: D. Beamish, M. Bellemare, G. Hunter, A. Munter and W. Stewart....5

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

Moved by B. Hill (Bullets 1 and 2 of Item No. 2):

- **determine the specific boundaries of the urban area expansion around the Corel Centre consistent with the justification analysis;**
- **designate land uses in accordance with the identified studies;**

CARRIED

Moved by A. Munter

That item 2 of Councillor Hill's motion be amended by adding the following to the third bullet: "Terry Fox Drive, the Transitway, Highway 417 and any other off-site transportation infrastructure required to service these lands", to read:

- **address the timing, cost and funding arrangements for infrastructure, including the extension of Huntmar Road, Terry Fox Drive, the Transitway, Highway 417 and any other off-site transportation infrastructure required to service these lands;**

CARRIED as amended

Moved by B. Hill (Bullets 4 and 5 of item 2)

- **assess the implications for the capital budget and development charges;**
- **include opportunity for public comment prior to September;**

CARRIED

Moved by W. Stewart

That the following bullet be added to item 2 of Councillor Hill's motion:

- **include analysis of the development of a business park south of Maple Grove;**

CARRIED

(A. Munter dissented)

Moved by A. Munter

That the following bullet be added to item 2 of Councillor Hill's motion:

- **address the environmental impacts of such development;**

CARRIED

Referring to the next motion put forward by Councillor Munter, Councillor Bellemare stated he did not understand the last part of it that read: "...if the focus of development should shift to the west..." He said this makes an assumption that there is going to be a decision that we will change the focus to growth in the west. He indicated he would prefer if this portion of the motion (after the word "Region") were deleted and staff would then just analyze what the impact will be on other infrastructure projects across the Region. Councillor Munter agreed to accept this as a friendly amendment...

Moved by A. Munter

That the following be added to Councillor Hill's motion:

- 3. That staff analyze whether adding Corel Centre lands to the urban area means it is necessary to defer infrastructure in other parts of the Region.**

CARRIED

Moved by B. Hill (on behalf of B. Chiarelli)

That the following be added to Councillor Hill's motion:

- 4. That staff be directed to include within the "Detailed Financial Assessment" of the "Next Steps" an analysis of the extent to which it would be appropriate to raise funding for existing or new infrastructure through the *Local Improvement Act*, the *Municipal Act, Section 221* and/or area-specific development charges.**

CARRIED

Committee then considered the report, as amended.

That Planning and Environment Committee and Council approve the staff report with the following amendments:

- 1. That Committee and Council support in principle the Malone Givens Parsons report: “Economic Study of the Corel Centre Area”;**
- 2. That the draft Official Plan Amendment for the Corel Area be brought back to Planning and Environment Committee in September 2000, and in particular shall:**
 - determine the specific boundaries of the urban area expansion around the Corel Centre consistent with the justification analysis;**
 - designate land uses in accordance with the identified studies;**
 - address the timing, cost and funding arrangements for infrastructure, including the extension of Huntmar Road, Terry Fox Drive, the Transitway, Highway 417 and any other off-site transportation infrastructure required to service these lands;**
 - assess the implications for the capital budget and development charges;**
 - include opportunity for public comment prior to September;**
 - include analysis of the development of a business park south of Maple Grove; and,**
 - address the environmental impacts of such development;**
- 3. That staff analyze whether adding Corel Centre lands to the urban area means it is necessary to defer infrastructure in other parts of the Region which may not be required as quickly; and**
- 4. That staff be directed to include within the “Detailed Financial Assessment” of the “Next Steps” an analysis of the extent to which it would be appropriate to raise funding for existing or new infrastructure through the *Local Improvement Act*, the *Municipal Act, Section 221* and/or area-specific development charges.**

CARRIED as amended

2. UNIFORM URBAN DEVELOPMENTS,
CARLING AVENUE SUBDIVISION - CITY OF NEPEAN
Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 25 Jan 2000

Committee Chair Hunter noted two of the speakers, Michael Wall and Mary Bush, who were opposed to the subdivision had to leave and had requested that the item be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee. No member of the Committee was willing to move deferral.

The Chair then read the brief submissions provided by Mr. Wall and Ms. Bush (held on file with the Regional Clerk).

Don Kennedy, representing the proponent of the subdivision advised he concurred with the staff recommendation and asked that the Committee consider waiving the matter on to Council at its meeting of 9 February 2000.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve Draft Plan of Subdivision 06T-99019 as outlined in the Draft Plan Approval Report attached as Annex A.

CARRIED

Councillor Stewart noted she had received e-mails from the dissenting parties and had considered their objections carefully. However, she noted the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority had a comprehensive look at this subdivision and they had no concern about the environmental issues. Councillor Stewart said although she could understand the community not wanting to see a development in this area, she felt their concerns did not have environmental merit. The Councillor indicated she would be willing to move that the item be waived to Council on 9 February 2000.

Moved by W. Stewart

That Council be requested to waive the rules of procedure to consider this item at its meeting of 9 February 2000.

CARRIED
(G. Hunter dissented).

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEM

3. RURAL CLEAN WATER PROGRAM

- Director, Water Environment Protection Division,
Environment and Transportation Department report dated 21 Jan 2000

Councillor Legendre noted on page 37 of the agenda, one of the program objectives was to monitor the improvements in water quality as a result of this program. He said although this was a laudable objective, he wondered if this had not been done all along. He explained the reason that he was asking this question was because of what had occurred in West Carleton and the lead in the tailings and for this reason, he questioned the seriousness of the monitoring objective.

Nancy Schepers, Director, Water Environment Protection Division, noted in order to meet the objectives of the program, it is essential to know the improvements being implemented (e.g. erosion control, improved septic systems) are working. In addition, as part of the baseline water quality monitoring program, some specific monitoring could be undertaken to ascertain if there is an improvement in some of the rural creeks and waterways.

Councillor Legendre asked if monitoring of well water was done as a matter of course, on an ongoing basis. Ms. Schepers advised that drinking water testing is done on the central system and the communal wells regularly and extensively. With respect to private wells, there is some monitoring that can be done through the Health Department as a service for rural landowners, but the Region does not specifically monitor individual drinking water supplies. Ms. Schepers noted the Planning and Development Approvals Department was working on an initiative that speaks to aquifer management and which will, on a broader scale, ascertain the quality of the water aquifers, individual wells rely on.

Committee Chair Hunter pointed out this program is specifically a surface water quality program; water that is on the surface, near the surface and running off into the water courses, (e.g. the Rideau River and the Ottawa River) and not the deep aquifers.

Ms. Schepers confirmed this is what this program is geared to, but because of the linkage between surface and groundwater, there will be an indirect benefit to groundwater where an improvement is instituted, that is a feed area to groundwater.

Councillor Legendre stated he was a little disappointed, that the Region would not take, as a matter of course, some responsibility for the monitoring of private wells, to ensure that residents are not subjected to contamination. He went on to say he found it surprising the situation in West Carleton existed for decades before it came to anyone's notice and, although it is not yet known whether anyone has been seriously affected, he found it an aberration that even the possibility of this exists.

Committee Chair Hunter thanked staff, in particular Leslie van Clieff and Nancy Schepers for their work on this program. Although staff had not given their presentation, the Chair asked that copies of this presentation be provided to members of Council.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve:

- 1. The Rural Clean Water Program Terms of Reference and Operating Procedures as set out in Appendix A;**
- 2. The Rural Clean Water Program Incentive Structure as set out in Appendix B; and,**
- 3. Staff entering into an agreement with local conservation authorities for components of the administration of the Rural Clean Water Program at an upset limit of \$20,400.**

CARRIED

(D. Beamish and B. Hill
dissented)

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

COMMITTEE CHAIR