

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

09 FEBRUARY 1999

9:00 A.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

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

Regrets: W. Stewart

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 12 January 1999.

CARRIED

OTHER BUSINESS - ELECTION OF ACTING VICE-CHAIR

Prior to beginning consideration of the Agenda items, the Committee elected an Acting Vice-Chair, as Councillor Stewart was absent, as advised.

Moved by P. Hume

That Councillor Betty Hill be elected as Acting Vice-Chair.

CARRIED

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 24 February 99 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Numbers 25 and 26.

PLANNING ITEM

1. SUMMARY OF ASSIGNED FUNCTIONS OFFICIAL PLAN
AMENDMENTS, SUBDIVISIONS, CONDOMINIUMS, PART LOT
CONTROL BY-LAWS, ZONING BY-LAWS, SITE PLANS AND
SEVERANCES

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated
18 January 1999

Andrew Hope, Senior Project Manager, Development Approvals-District 3 and Brian Faddies, Planner, appeared before the Committee on this item. Mr. Faddies provided the Committee with an overview of the appeal of City of Kanata's Committee of Adjustment's approval of an application for severance made by the Estate of Edna Maxwell.

He noted since the report was written, staff met with the proponents of the severance and became aware the purpose of the severance was to rationalize the property boundaries of the two dwelling units and to establish a right-of-way. As a result of this meeting, the proponent and Regional staff feel the situation can be resolved by Kanata agreeing to address the minimum lot size in their new Official Plan (which is currently under review); Kanata agreeing to assume the sub-standard public road to be upgraded at a future time should there be future severances or a plan of subdivision put on this land; and also, once the new Kanata Official Plan is adopted, by revising their zoning By-law 74-79 to conform with the new Official Plan.

Mr. Faddies went on to note the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) has scheduled a hearing for 08 March 1999 and, in view of the hearing date, staff and the proponent feel the situation can be resolved at the OMB.

In response to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Faddies advised staff of the City of Kanata, Public Works Department are generally in agreement with the right-of-way being upgraded at a future time. He confirmed Regional staff were satisfied with the direction the negotiations were taking, noting no further development could occur except by severance or plan of subdivision. At that point a development agreement would have to be registered on title and the road would then be up-graded to Kanata standards.

Councillor Legendre noted the staff report stated the severance was contrary to both the Regional Official Plan and the Kanata Official Plan and he asked if, in addition to the modifications to the new Kanata Official Plan, an amendment to the Regional Official Plan also be necessary. Mr. Faddies advised the way in which the severance did not conform with the Regional Official Plan was that it was not a farm consolidation. However, the lands in the proposed severance are Class 6 soils, while the retained lands are Class 2 and

these are going to remain in Agricultural Resource. He said therefore the objection, insofar as the Regional Official Plan was concerned, could be removed.

Brian Ward, appeared on behalf of the Estate of Edna Maxwell and noted the severance was requested in order to carry out a provision of Mrs. Maxwell's will and enable the appropriate settlement of her estate. He noted Regional staff have advised they do not disagree with the family's objective but have some difficulty with the method chosen to achieve it.

Mr. Ward, referring to the issues of minimum lot size and zoning, pointed out the property is surrounded by 7 rural subdivisions. He said staff's solution to bring the lot size around the residence into conformity with the surrounding locations and still allow the maximum retention of agricultural land for the designated heir is acceptable. With respect to the 20 metre frontage not being adequate for access to a Regional Road, the speaker advised that 20 metres is a standard rural road right-of-way width. Mr. Ward went on to explain the frontage at this location exists due to historical circumstances. Mrs. Maxwell's late father and grandfather donated land for St. Isadore School and St. Isadore Cemetery, both of which took a considerable portion of the frontage of the property away. He felt it ironic that the family's past generosity to the community has created some difficulties. Mr. Ward stated the staff proposal that the right-of-way be assumed by Kanata as an existing sub-standard public road, may be acceptable to the family, if satisfactory terms for the assumption can be agreed upon with Kanata.

In conclusion, Mr. Ward advised the family has no plans to engage in any future subdivision activity and are only interested in settling the estate. There will be no increase in traffic as a result of this severance (the two residences at this location have been in existence since 1970 and 1990) and he felt the severance would have no adverse effect upon the community. Mr. Ward expressed his support for the staff recommendation to proceed with negotiations with Kanata and to achieve a solution.

Councillor Munter pointed out if the proponent were trying to meet the letter of the Official Plan, in terms of the minimum lot size for this severance, they would have to sever off a larger parcel than what is proposed, which would mean the remaining agricultural land would be infringed upon. The Councillor clarified for the Committee, the appeal would go forward and, the staff proposal as supported by Mr. Ward would be put before the OMB; he indicated he would be putting forward an amendment to the staff recommendation to set out this intent. Councillor Munter felt this to be a good compromise that protects the interest of the Regional Official Plan and allows the family to deal with the outstanding matters of the estate. He urged the Committee to support it.

Moved by A. Munter

That the staff recommendation be amended by adding “and further that staff proceed to negotiate a compromise solution, as per the staff presentation in order to both protect the Regional interest and accommodate the estate of the late Edna Maxwell.

CARRIED

Referring to page 15 of the staff report, Councillor Legendre asked staff to provide an explanation with respect to the extension by the OMB of the Draft Approval for the CMHC, Carson Grove Subdivision. Nick Tunnacliffe, Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department advised this subdivision went to the OMB and they are seized with it. He said the subdivision must have been coming to the end of the draft approval and the developer would have asked for an extension. Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law advised it is anticipated this subdivision will be registered by the end of February. Councillor Legendre indicated that he would have appreciated being informed in advance of this, to enable him to answer queries from constituents.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation, as amended.

That the Planning and Environment Committee and Council receive this report for information purposes and confirm the Planning and Development Approvals Department’s appeal of one severance as noted in Annex V and further that staff proceed to negotiate a compromise solution, as per the staff presentation in order to both protect the Regional interest and accommodate the estate of the late Edna Maxwell.

CARRIED as amended

2. RURAL TOWNSHIPS PROPOSAL - CREATION OF A LAND DIVISION COMMITTEE TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE GRANTING OF SEVERANCES

-Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner’s report dated 12 Jan 99

Nick Tunnacliffe, Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department, provided Committee with a brief overview of the staff report.

Responding to questions from Councillor Legendre concerning the anticipated cost savings that will result from the proposed rural Land Division Committee, Mr. Tunnacliffe noted currently fees are charged which cover approximately 65% of the cost. He said it was his understanding the rural municipalities intend to levy a fee to cover the entire cost,

so there will be no cost to the taxpayers. He said however, he could not say with certainty this proposal would be more efficient.

Referring to a letter received from Mayor Glenn Brooks, Township of Rideau (held on file with the Regional Clerk), Councillor Legendre asked staff to respond to the questions (concerning Recommendation 1 of the staff report), contained therein. Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law stated the Planning Act does grant authority to the Region to bring local official plans into conformity one year after the Regional Official Plan comes into force (i.e. 28 September 1999), however, this power has never been exercised by Regional Council. He explained the reason for including the provision that the four municipalities bring their Official Plans into conformity with the Regional Official Plan is to avoid any "political unpleasantness" if the Region were to exercise the power. It was felt the Region should give them a reasonable amount of time (i.e. two years) to bring their Plans into conformity and then if they have not done so by that time, the Region would do so at its cost. He said if authority is delegated to the rural municipalities, then of course the Region would no longer have any authority over the Land Division Committee. With respect of question c) of Mayor Brook's letter, Mr. Marc advised conformity to the Region's Official Plan was not a requirement of the Township of Cumberland when they assumed responsibility for their Land Division Committee. Mr. Tunnacliffe added the reason for this was that Cumberland had brought their official plan into conformity prior to assuming responsibility for the Land Division Committee.

Councillor Legendre then asked why, when local municipalities are required by law to bring their Official Plans into conformity with the Regional Official Plan, would the four municipalities object to having this provision included in the motion. Councillor Hill responded the four municipalities object to this condition because it has never been imposed on any other municipality and they do not feel it is necessary. Mr. Tunnacliffe pointed out it was staff's original position that the municipalities bring their Official Plans into conformity prior to delegating authority for the Land Division Committee. The four municipalities did not agree with this proposal and staff felt this was a compromise.

In response to a question posed by Councillor Hill, Mr. Tunnacliffe advised none of the municipalities are in conformity with the new Regional Official Plan. Councillor Hill felt this further illustrated why the four rural municipalities should not be singled out by including this condition.

Councillor Legendre then had questions concerning the proposed scenario and the role the Region would play. Mr. Marc advised the authority to grant consents is vested in Regional Council and this has traditionally been delegated to the Land Division Committee. In this instance it will be delegated not to the Rural Alliance but to the four individual Townships, who have agreed to work together to set up one committee (legally

it is four committees). The Region can impose conditions on the operation of the Committees and retains the right to appeal any of its decisions.

Councillor Beamish asked if the same condition (i.e. that the four municipalities must bring their Official Plans into conformity with the Regional Official Plan by 31 March 2001) will be applied to all municipalities in the Region. Mr. Tunnacliffe replied this would not happen because there is not an opportunity to do so, as there is in this instance. Councillor Beamish felt all municipalities should be treated the same..

At Councillor Munter's request, the Commissioner confirmed that a significant proportion of the development that happens in the rural townships is by severance (i.e. approximately 35%) compared to the other municipalities where the majority of development occurs by plan of subdivision. Because the Region has approval authority for subdivisions, it has direct control over the larger planning issues.

Committee Chair Hunter read a motion from Councillor Hill to amend Recommendation 1 by deleting everything after the words "West Carleton" and to delete Recommendation 2.

Councillor van den Ham asked staff to comment on the effect of this motion. Mr. Marc, advised that if, at a subsequent time, Regional Council chose to exercise its authority under Section 27 of the Planning Act, to bring the Official Plans into conformity with the Regional Official Plan, there could be difficulties with the area municipalities (e.g. "political unpleasantness").

Councillor van den Ham indicated he would be supporting Councillor Hill's motion. He said although it could be a mistake to remove this function from the Region, (in light of the expertise that exists here), the four rural municipalities have indicated they want to look after the Land Division Committee function and they should be allowed to do so. The Councillor indicated he did not feel the Region would encounter any great problem with respect to exercising its authority and he reminded members that Regional staff would still be reviewing the severance approvals.

Councillor Munter stated he would not be supporting the motion. He said he could not understand why the municipalities (as indicated in the letters received from the Townships of Rideau and Goulbourn) were not willing to accept this condition when it is in fact a requirement under the Planning Act. He felt it important to state this on the record to avoid any possible problems or confusion should their plans not be in conformity by 2001 and the Region must exercise its authority to do so.

Committee Chair Hunter said although he would agree that Local Official Plans should be in conformity with the Regional Official Plan, he was not convinced this should be a condition of this delegation of authority. He stated delegating authority to these

municipalities to grant severances would not permit them to abuse the system because the policies and regulations of the Regional Official Plan will still apply and in fact, in many cases the local regulations concerning lot creation are more stringent than the Regional policies. Chair Hunter felt that including this condition could only be construed as a “slap in the face” to the four rural municipalities and he indicated he would be supporting Councillor Hill’s motion.

Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, confirmed at Councillor Legendre’s request the current Regional Official Plan is more detailed than the previous ROP in order that the rural municipalities would not have to address such things as agricultural and wetland policies in their plans. She estimated approximately 75% of the rural municipalities’ Official Plans would be covered off in the Regional Official Plan.

Councillor Legendre advised he would not be supporting Councillor Hill’s motion. He stated although he would have preferred that staff not include such a condition, by removing it at this point, he felt this would “send a signal” to all municipalities that the Region would never carry out its right under the Planning Act to bring their plans into conformity.

Councillor Hume stated it is the Region’s obligation to ensure the local municipalities’ Official Plans are in conformity. He said he could understand why staff have included this condition, because the Region has never exercised its authority to bring local official plans into conformity and he felt the first time the Region attempted to do so, they would meet with great resistance. He pointed out other municipalities (i.e. Cumberland) that have received delegated authority to grant severances have had to have their Official Plans in conformity prior to the Region delegating said authority. The Councillor felt this condition should not be an issue unless the municipalities did not intend to bring their Official Plans into conformity with the Region’s. He urged the Committee not to support Councillor Hill’s motion.

Councillor Hill pointed out the Regional Official Plan only received approval on 28 September 1998 and none of the local municipalities are 100% in conformity with the Regional Official Plan. She indicated her displeasure with the Region “singling out” these four rural municipalities by requiring them to bring their plans into conformity within two years and stated if this is what staff want, they should bring forward the same recommendation for all eleven municipalities. She asked that the Committee support her motion.

Councillor Munter then put forward a motion to add wording that would clearly set out the Region’s intent to ensure all local municipalities’ official plans conform to the Region’s and it is prepared to exercise its authority to do so.

The Committee then considered the motions before it.

Moved by B. Hill

That Recommendation 1 be amended to remove that portion beginning “after the Region has received resolution from these municipalities” and that Recommendation 2 be deleted.

CARRIED

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

Moved by A. Munter

That the following be added to the amended Recommendation after the words “West Carleton”; “...with the clear understanding that it is the intent of Regional Council to ensure that all local official plans conform to the Regional Official Plan and that the Region is prepared to use its authority under the Ontario Planning Act to accomplish this legal requirement.”

CARRIED

The recommendation as amended was then considered.

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend to Council that authority to grant severances be delegated by by-law to the Townships of Goulbourn, Osgoode, Rideau and West Carleton with the clear understanding that it is the intent of Regional Council to ensure that all local official plans conform to the Regional Official Plan and that the Region is prepared to use its authority under the Ontario Planning Act to accomplish this legal requirement.

CARRIED as amended

BUDGET

3. 1999 PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT BUDGET REVIEW
 - 1999 Draft Estimates tabled with Regional Council 25 November 1998
 - Committee Co-ordinator's report dated 28 Jan 99

At the outset, the Committee heard from the following delegation.

Chris Bradshaw, Ottawalk, provided a written copy of his presentation, which is held on file with the Regional Clerk.

Mr. Bradshaw stated he was before the Committee to address issues related to implementation of Regional Official Plan policies. He commended the Department on the light-rail pilot project and their review of regional road design guidelines that will implement the "feet-first" hierarchy of the Plan on regional rights-of-ways. However, he urged the Committee to support a more active approach in addressing land use changes needed to make the strategy work, by firstly not deleting the planning position needed to implement the transit-oriented street patterns. Secondly, he asked that the Committee direct staff to begin a program of working with municipal planning departments to bring the message about the transit-oriented street patterns strategy to community groups and industry associations. He stressed the importance of involving the residents of the Region in the much necessary land-use shifts in order to put the community vision into practice.

In closing, Mr. Bradshaw asked that the Committee direct staff to hold a meeting each fall with the community groups to discuss its work plan and budget, well in advance of the Committee budget review.

Prior to the staff presentation, Councillor Bellemare referred to page 70 of the Draft Capital Estimates and declared an interest, noting his spouse is employed by a sub-contractor of Teranet.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPROVALS (PLANNING)

Nick Tunnacliffe, Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals and Kathryn Ennor, Manager, Finance and Operations appeared before the Committee. Mr. Tunnacliffe provided Committee with an overview of the Planning and Development Approvals (Planning Section) budget with the aid of a slide presentation. In concluding his remarks, the Commissioner referred to the supplementary report (Item 5 of the agenda) which outlines the impact of the budget reductions on Planning programs. He noted the reductions (of seven positions) will result in reduced levels of service in some areas and reduced ability to respond to emergency and ad hoc items, however, the core mandate of the Department (e.g. Official Plan, Master Plans, Environmental Assessments,

development approvals, deploying GIS, and surveys and mapping) will continue to be taken care of.

Councillor Hume noted the Region has had a 0% budget increase policy in place since 1993; he asked the Commissioner to explain the cumulative effect the reductions have had on the Planning and Development Approvals budget. Mr. Tunnacliffe advised that over \$2 million in cuts have occurred since 1993.

Councillor Legendre, referring to the proposed reduction of one staff person from the Transportation Planning section, asked how it was decided that the position in support of the Travel Demand Management (TDM) was the position to be cut. Mr. Tunnacliffe advised the subject position does work on a number of areas in addition to TDM, such as the Sidewalk Priority Program and Investigation into Greenhouse Gas Initiatives. He explained staff are proposing the Environment and Transportation Department establish a unit which will operationalize and apply policies that are developed (in the Planning and Development Approvals Department). Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, added other Planners within the Division will be working on TDM, for example, the Sustainable Transportation Planner).

The Councillor stated he was troubled by this proposed cut, stressing the importance of Travel Demand Management for the future. He indicated he was considering putting forward a motion to retain this position and to direct that a cut be made to the Finance and Operations Division instead.

In response to questions from Councillors van den Ham and Legendre concerning the increase in 1999 Salaries, Wages and Benefits to the Geomatics Section (page 29 of the Operating Budget), Mr. Tunnacliffe explained this could be accounted for through the increase in pay in the Union agreement and as well, this item includes temporary salaries.

Councillor van den Ham indicated he would be moving the Planning and Development Approvals (Planning Division) Operating Budget, as amended by the Budget Subcommittee report.

Councillor Munter submitted a motion to retain the position in Transportation Planning. He stated this is an extremely important function and felt the long term consequences of neglecting this area are serious.

Chair Chiarelli questioned how this position would be funded (i.e. tax increase or cuts in other areas). Councillor Munter stated he would like to see the Provincial Government pay for the shortfall of services and referred to comments made by the Chair at the Transportation Committee meeting, that it appears funding will be coming from the Province to pay for the downloading shortfall.

Councillor Legendre suggested a friendly amendment to Councillor Munter's motion that cuts be found elsewhere in the Department to fund this position. Councillor Munter agreed to this amendment.

In response to questions from Councillor Legendre concerning the impact the cutting of the Transportation Planning position will have on the Greenhouse Gas Initiative and the Sidewalk Program, Mr. Tunnacliffe advised the cut would likely result in delays, but work would still continue on these initiatives. He pointed out the Greenhouse Gas effort is currently bogged down in Federal/Provincial negotiations and until the Region knows what the parameters are, there is no point in "spinning our wheels". Once the parameters are set, then the appropriate resources can be put to this program.

The Commissioner noted the Sidewalk Priority Program is a similar situation, in that sidewalks are a local responsibility. He referred to the Regional Official Plan policy which states the Region would like to get sidewalks on Regional roads where there are no sidewalks, however, the area municipalities are not willing to cooperate on this at this time. He said in order to carry through on this policy, it will be necessary to either obtain agreement from the local municipalities or have the legislation changed, both of which will take time.

Following up on this issue, Councillor Hume asked staff to clarify who owns the sidewalks on Regional roads. Mr. Marc advised sidewalks on Regional roads are owned by the Region, however, maintenance (and the liability for failure to maintain) lies with the area municipalities. Councillor Hume then asked if the Region decided to proceed with sidewalks on Regional roads, could it assume the responsibility for maintaining them. Mr. Marc advised he would look into this and get back to the Councillor.

Councillor Hume expressed his opinion that the Region should be taking back everything associated with Regional road allowances, including maintenance and the revenue sources. This would resolve the restriction problems the Region currently faces.

Chair Hunter stated he would not be supporting Councillor Munter's motion, noting all of the policies, plans, etc. coming forward have regard to the "walking, cycling, transit first" policy in the Official Plan, as a matter of course. He said therefore, he could not see a need for a position specific to this policy.

The Committee then considered the following motion.

Moved by A. Munter

That one Full Time Employee (FTE) for Transportation Planning be retained in the 1999 Operating Budget and that cuts be found elsewhere in the Department in order to retain the FTE in Transportation Planning.

LOST

NAYS: M. Bellemare, B. Hill, P. Hume, R. van den Ham and G. Hunter.....5
YEAS: J. Legendre, A. Munter and R. Chiarelli.....3

There being no further amendments, the Committee then considered the Planning Divisions, Operating Budget.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the Planning and Development Approvals Department (Planning Section) 1999 Draft Operating Budget, as reduced by the Budget Sub-Committee report in the amount of \$458,000 (Program Adjustments/Reductions) and \$51,000 (Purchased Services Reductions).

CARRIED as amended
(J. Legendre dissented on the reduction of 1 FTE in Transportation Planning)

The Committee then turned their attention to the Planning Division Capital budget and approved the applicable sections (i.e. the projects set out on pages 56, 58, 64, 70, 72, 248, 250 and 330 of the 1999 Draft Capital Estimates.)

ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT (ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES SECTION - WATER, SEWER AND SOLID WASTE)

Mike Sheflin, Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department, Nancy Schepers, Director, Water Environment Protection Division (WEPD) and Deputy Commissioner, Environment Section and Doug Shannon, A/Director, Finance and Operations Support Division appeared before the Committee. A copy of the slide presentation used by the presenters is held on file by the Regional Clerk. Mr. Sheflin provided a general overview of the Environment Section budget.

Ms. Schepers then presented the Water Environment Protection Division operating budget. She drew the Committee's attention to the replacement page of reductions to the

Sewer - WEPD Program Area and noted the total reduction on the replacement page is \$138,000, while pages 84 and 85 of the Agenda show a total reduction of \$306,000. She explained staff are proposing to make up the additional \$168,000 reduction through cuts to the WEPD envelope

Councillor Munter asked if staff would be reporting back to Committee on these cuts. Mr. Sheflin replied staff, over the course of 1999, will be looking at the water and sewer accounts (both of which are on the same rate utility) and the cuts will be generally in materials/supplies and not program based. He advised a report would not be forthcoming.

In response to a question posed by Councillor Hume, Mr. Sheflin indicated staff was not recommending any change to the sewer rate.

Committee Chair Hunter commended staff for their efforts in combating the upward pressure on the budget, through improved planning and maintenance efficiencies.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the Water Environment Protection Division budget as reduced by the amount of \$138,000 (Program Adjustments/Reductions) (Budget Sub-Committee report replacement page tabled with the Planning and Environment Committee on 09 February 1999) and \$157,000 (Purchased Services Reductions).

CARRIED

André Proulx, Director, Water Division joined the presenters at the table and Ms. Schepers then provided an overview of the Water Division Operating Budget.

Councillor Hume questioned why the Division was proposing an additional reduction of \$700,000 (as set out in the CAO and Finance Commissioner's joint report, page 83 of the Agenda) over the original \$215,000 reduction proposed in the 1999 Draft Operating Estimates (page 97) when, presumably revenues would either remain at \$227,578,000 or increase.

Mr. Sheflin indicated these reductions (and those achieved over the last number of years) were not in the pursuit of a specific target but rather, the goal is to be the "the best of the best". To achieve that, the Department will seek out reductions and efficiencies until the bottom of the cost curve is reached. He explained that Mr. Proulx has identified some opportunities for reductions, while still being able to deliver water of the highest quality at the lowest cost. When the bottom of the cost curve is reached, the Department will advise that no more reductions can be made.

Councillor Hume inquired if the department was recommending a reduction in the water rate. Mr. Sheflin indicated that no reduction was recommended.

Jack LeBelle, Finance Commissioner, drew the Committee's attention to page 10 of the Capital Budget book and noted the Water Capital reserve fund would not be in as good a position at the end of the 10 year forecast as it was at the beginning; a \$17 million forecast reserve balance at the end of the 10 years is fairly low for an operation as large as this. Mr. LeBelle explained the budget proposes that cuts be made from the operating side to allow additional funds to be put into the pay-as-you-go contributions and replenish the capital reserves in water to a more appropriate level.

Councillor Hume then asked what impact the cuts would have on customer service. Mr. Proulx replied the department does not anticipate any reductions to service. He advised the budget was prepared last September and the reductions were done later in the fall; it is now anticipated the \$700,000 in savings may not be all in FTE's but rather in equipment and material. As well, staff in fleet and operations for example are being cross-trained and this will result in savings without reductions in service.

Mr. Sheflin added that since the budget was prepared, supervision has been flat lined and five supervisory positions have been reduced to two.

Referring to page 83 of the Agenda, Councillor Hume questioned if the reductions to the meter testing program would result in less accurate water meters and the possible loss of revenues. Mr. Proulx replied since this document was prepared, staff have had an opportunity to review where cuts should be made and, although the dollar amount will remain the same, cuts or efficiencies will be made elsewhere in the Division; therefore, the level of service will not be reduced. He assured the Committee that should a program be chosen for cuts, that would result in reduced levels of service, staff would report back to the Committee. Mr. Sheflin added that under no circumstances would the Department put forward or carry out an activity that would jeopardize the delivery of the safest and highest quality of potable water.

Referring to page 91 of the Operating Budget book and a slide in the staff presentation, Councillor van den Ham asked staff to account for the discrepancy between the revenues for the sale of water (i.e. \$49 million) and the amount of water delivery per day (i.e. 365,000,000 liters). The Councillor indicated by his calculations it should amount to approximately \$65 million.

Mr. Sheflin advised there is some water usage that is not metered, such as fire supply and main flushing and as well, there are always leaks in every water system and in 2,500 km, even very small leaks could result in a large amount of lost water. Mr. Sheflin went on to

say the Department is trying to identify the unaccounted for water and to find the level at which it will be cost effective to capture it; once it does so, the Department will then develop a program that cost effectively reduces that number (i.e. the Department does not want to be in a situation where \$ 1 is spent to save \$0.50.)

In response to questions posed by Councillor Legendre, with respect to pages 95 and 96 of the Operating Budget book, Mr. Proulx advised the 0.495 cents is the actual cost charged to customers per cubic meter of water; the figure of 0.059 cents shown on the previous page is what it costs the Region to treat the water at the plant. It does not however, include all the maintenance costs, the distribution system, the maintenance of meters and the ongoing capital infrastructure replacement.

Referring to another item on the Agenda, under "Information Previously Distributed", entitled "Response To Federal Government Report On Chlorine By-Products", Councillor Legendre offered his opinion that one possible solution would be a greater distribution of the chemicals at various points through the system.

Mr. Proulx indicated the Region does not have a problem with chlorine at this time but agreed the Councillor's suggestion is one option. Mr. Sheflin stressed the fact that potable and healthy water is a non stop continuous program of research and the Region's Water Division is one of the leaders in this area.

The Committee then approved the Water Division Operating budget, as amended.

Moved by A. Munter

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the Water Division budget as reduced by the Budget Sub-Committee report in the amount of \$700,000 (Program Adjustments/Reductions) and \$84,000 (Purchased Services Reductions).

CARRIED

Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division, joined Mr. Sheflin and Ms. Schepers and Ms. Schepers then made a presentation on the Solid Waste Division Operating Budget.

Mr. Sheflin indicated the Division expects to receive more money than what was anticipated in the budget (i.e. approximately \$125,000 more) due to additional funding from the Province, for the blue box program.

Mr. Sheflin confirmed at Committee Chair Hunter's request, a change in consultant services represented a reduction in the Solid Waste budget.

There being no further questions concerning the Solid Waste Division, the Committee considered their operating budget.

Moved by J. Legendre

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the Solid Waste Division Budget as reduced by the Budget Sub-Committee report, in the amount of \$165,000 (Program Adjustments/Reductions) and \$140,000 (Purchased Services Reductions).

CARRIED

The Committee then turned their attention to the Environment Capital Budget. Jim Miller, Director, Engineering Services Division came forward and Ms. Schepers then made a short presentation. She stressed the single most important guiding principle in spending for the capital budget is the protection of the assets the community already has in place. The water, waste water and solid waste infrastructure is valued at over 4 billion dollars. As well, capital investment is also needed to meet regulatory requirements and environmental protection, while bringing on new infrastructure just in time to support growth, in accordance with the Official Plan.

Councillor Munter had questions concerning the March Road Sewer/Tri Township Collector Rehabilitation project (page 295 of the Capital Budget book). Mr. Miller indicated this is the basin presently serviced by the March Road pump station. The project goes beyond future development, as it is the rehabilitation of the existing infrastructure and possibly eliminating that pump station now that the growth scenario has been reached. He advised the intent is to do a feasibility study this year to determine the optimum.

Councillor Munter went on to ask if the growth projected, is the growth approved in the Official Plan. Mr. Sheflin indicated it is a requirement to meet the Wastewater Master Plan, as approved by Council and each of these projects has to be submitted to the Planning and Development Approvals Division to confirm that they do conform to the Official Plan.

Councillor Legendre questioned why the authority requested for the 1999 Water Fund (i.e. \$39 million) was significantly above the usual 1/10 of the 10 year capital authority amount of \$268 million. Ms. Schepers indicated "authority" has to do with bringing on the funds and not necessarily the spending plan for any given year; one year the division may request double authority but do only a portion of the projected work. Mr. Sheflin concurred, noting the amount varies from year to year, depending on the projects and their scope.

Councillor van den Ham referred to the project on page 266 of the Capital Budget (Forest Valley Pumping Station, Forcemain and Gravity Sewer) and drew the Committee's attention to a memorandum he had circulated earlier (held on file by the Regional Clerk). He noted the amount of \$3.575 million has been identified for the year 2001, however, in order for construction to occur in 2001, preliminary work needs to commence in 1999. In this regard, the Councillor indicated his intent to move that \$500,000.00 be identified in 1999 for this project.

At Chair Hunter's request, Mr. Sheflin spoke to the Councillor's motion and advised a portion of the \$3.575 million should have been shown the year 2000, as design and construction in the same year is not the usual approach. He suggested, if it was the will of Committee, that \$250,000 be placed in 1999 and \$250,000 in the year 2000.

Mr. Miller added the Department is working with the Planning and Development Approvals Department on an early servicing agreement for this area and agreed the Commissioner's suggestion would be acceptable and workable.

At Councillor van den Ham's request, Mr. Miller stated he believed the proposed alternative of \$250,000 in each of the years 1999 and 2000 would accomplish what needs to be done. He stated once the early servicing agreement work has been finalized, a "just-in-time" approach would be recommended.

Councillor van den Ham then put forward a motion that \$250,000 be identified in 1999 and \$250,000 in 2000 for this project.

In response to questions from Councillor Hume, Mr. Miller replied, since the budget was put together last summer, a number of developers have expressed interest in developing in this area. As a result, preliminary discussions about an early servicing agreement, (which would encompass water, sewer and transportation needs) have begun in conjunction with the Planning and Development Approvals Department and in keeping with the objectives of the Regional Official Plan. Once finalized, the Department will be bringing a recommendation to Committee and Council. Mr. Sheflin interjected, approval of Councillor van den Ham's motion would not advance construction as shown in the budget (i.e. before 2001).

Ms. Sweet added, acceleration of the engineering portion of a project would be in conformity with the Official Plan. She assured the Committee that should the possibility of moving capital forward for construction arise (which would bring into question conformity with the Official Plan), this would be done through the early servicing agreement and would require Planning and Environment Committee and Council approval.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That \$250,000 be identified in 1999 and \$250,000 be identified in 2000 for Capital Project No. 932-42034, Forest Valley Pumping Station Forcemain and Gravity Sewer (page 267 of the 1999 Draft Capital Estimates).

CARRIED

Responding to questions from Councillor Legendre, Mr. Miller advised the Woodroffe Collector Flow Diversion project (page 280), would be the first of three projects to create additional capacity in the interceptor sewer along the River. The second will be Crystal Beach (page 276) and the third is Mooney's Bay (page 282) and these projects are phased to go in sequence each year, beginning in 1999.

The Councillor then asked if, once these projects are completed, development at the Rockcliffe Air Base lands would be able to go ahead as there would then be additional capacity created in the other interceptor. Mr. Miller indicated these projects would assist in the area of the Rockcliffe Air Base, but as well, other work is contemplated in that area (i.e. on page 298, the RCMP Pullback and Pumping Station) that will assist with the present overflow conditions that occasionally happen.

Councillor Hume, referring to page 304, Pickard Centre Outfall project, asked whether given the new competition in the electrical generation area and the potential for diversion credits, if there was potential to advance this project to take advantage of this. Mr. Miller indicated it would be worth re-evaluating from that perspective, once the deregulation issues are clarified. He said there may be some advantage but it is likely the power that would be generated here would be used on site.

There being no further discussion, the Committee approved the Sewer System Capital Budget, as amended.

Moving on to the Water Capital budget, Councillor Hume sought clarification with respect to page 396, Hurdman Bridge Pumping Station to Billings' Bridge Pumping Station Feedermain. Mr. Proulx explained this project has been delayed because the Official Plan did not address the new Alta Vista tank, which will be quite a bit larger than the existing one. The Division wants to examine the entire configuration of piping and storage in that zone and until the exact location of the Alta Vista tank and the timing of it is known, no work will be done on this project.

In response to further questions from Councillor Hume, Mr. Miller advised a report on the Alta Vista tank would be before the Committee in the near future, likely at its meeting of

23 February 1999. He advised the work plan for the Hurdman Bridge/Billings Bridge project envisaged a feasibility study would be done, starting at the third quarter of 1999.

Councillor Hume suggested the project should then be showing a spending plan for 1999. Ms. Schepers agreed the budget page should be up-dated.

The Committee then approved the Water Supply System Capital Budget.

Turning to the Solid Waste Capital Budget, Chair Hunter inquired whether the Acquisition of Recycling Bins/Containers (page 430) should be in the Compensation Fund instead of the Solid Waste Capital. He felt because it was a landfill diversion issue, it could be covered out of the Compensation funds. Mr. McNally replied the black boxes are coming out of the Compensation Fund but the Compensation Fund has been primarily used for long term landfill replacement or for programs that extend the lives of landfills. The bins/containers referred to on page 430 will be used primarily in the apartment program, however, this funding issue could be looked at.

Committee Chair Hunter observed the compensation fund is built mainly from contributions by the private sector and therefore is not a draw on the levy, while the Capital budget is. Mr. Sheflin confirmed the Department would look into this issue.

Councillor van den Ham had a question concerning page 420, Trail Road Capping Programme. He wanted to know if a different capping method was being proposed for stages 3 and 4 than was used for stages 1 and 2 and if so why. Mr. McNally replied the capping proposal for stages 3 and 4 is very similar to that used in stages 1 and 2. The \$15 million identified covers the cost of the caps for stages 3 and 4. He agreed the "Scope and Justification" comment in the budget book was somewhat misleading.

Councillor Legendre referenced pages 426 and 427, Landfill Leachate Treatment project and felt the comment under "Scope and Justification" did not match the dollars requested; namely, a feasibility study could not possibly cost \$3.339 million. Mr. Miller advised the comments on page 426 were out of date and that a report on this project would be brought to Planning and Environment Committee the first meeting in March. He confirmed the dollars requested would include construction of the pipeline and not just a study.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen referenced page 420 and asked staff how long it had taken to fill stage 3 and what the anticipated lifespan of stage 4 was. Mr. McNally replied the Region started to use stage 3 in 1991. With respect to stage 4, it is anticipated (as set out in the Optimization Study, based on current waste diversion projections), it will be full in the 2008 to 2009 range.

At Chair Hunter's request, Mr. Sheflin advised the life expectancy of Trail Road landfill is 10 years.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked why these projections were not reflected in the Capital program (i.e. why could the amount set out in the years 2004 to 2008 not be pushed further back). Mr. Sheflin indicated the period 2004-2008 is a period beyond the actual commitment the Region is making and advised adjustments will be made each year as the department goes forward.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen then asked how many other budget items in the 10 year Capital are the same as this, in that whatever changes that have been made or efficiencies that have been found in recent years has in fact pushed them beyond the 10 years. Mr. Sheflin indicated this is the only one and noted it is because of the waste diversion. He went on to say in this regard, the Department is not meeting the Official Plan requirements for Capital.

The Committee then carried the Solid Waste Capital Budget as presented.

The Solid Waste Compensation Fund was approved without discussion.

Committee Chair Hunter thanked staff from both the Planning and Development Approvals and the Environment and Transportation Department for the clear documents and their presentations.

The following summarizes the motions approved.

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the 1999 Draft Operating Estimates, the 1999 Draft Capital Estimates and 10 Year Capital Forecast for the Planning and Environment Committee, as presented to the Committee on 09 February 1999 and as amended by the following:

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT APPROVALS (PLANNING)

- 1. That Council approve the Planning and Development Approvals (Planning Section) Budget, as reduced by the Budget Sub-Committee report in the amount of \$458,000 (Program Adjustments/Reductions) and \$51,000 (Purchased Services Reductions).**

ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT (WATER, SEWER AND SOLID WASTE)

2. That Council approve the Water Division budget as reduced by the Budget Sub-Committee report in the amount of \$700,000 (Program Adjustments/Reductions) and \$84,000 (Purchased Services Reductions).
3. That Council approve the Solid Waste Division Budget as reduced by the Budget Sub-Committee report, in the amount of \$165,000 (Program Adjustments/Reductions) and \$140,000 (Purchased Services Reductions).
4. That Council approve the Water Environment Protection Division budget as reduced by the amount of \$138,000 (Program Adjustments/Reductions) (Budget Sub-Committee report replacement page tabled with the Planning and Environment Committee on 09 February 1999) and \$157,000 (Purchased Services Reductions).
5. That \$250,000 be identified in 1999 and \$250,000 be identified in 2000 for Capital Project No. 932-42034, Forest Valley Pumping Station Forcemain and Gravity Sewer (page 267 of the 1999 Draft Capital Estimates).

CARRIED as amended

4. 1999 BUDGET SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT

-Committee Co-ordinator's report dated 26 Jan 99

-Joint Chief Administrative Officer and Finance Commissioner's report dated 18 Jan 99

The Budget Sub-Committee was constituted to review the 1999 Regional budget in an effort to maintain the net taxation requirement for Regional programs at 1998 levels;

The Budget Sub-Committee acknowledges the 1999 budget challenges and reduction initiatives as outlined in the Chief Administrative Officer and Finance Commissioner's Joint Report dated 18 January 1999 entitled "1999 Draft Estimates - Budget Reductions and Adjustments Options";

The Budget Sub-Committee recommends the Standing Committees consider the 18 January 1999 Joint Report, the Budget Sub-Committee comments of 20 January 1999, and any other initiatives or alternatives that the Standing Committees deem advisable to reduce the departments' 1999 budgetary requirements in an effort to maintain net taxation requirements at 1998 levels.

CARRIED

5. 1999 DRAFT ESTIMATES - IMPACT OF BUDGET REDUCTIONS
ON PLANNING PROGRAMS

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 25 Jan 99

**That the Planning and Environment Committee and Council receive and consider
this report as part of their consideration of the 1999 Budget of the Planning and
Development Approvals Department.**

CARRIED

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. RESPONSE TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REPORT ON
CHLORINE BY-PRODUCTS

- Response to Planning and Environment Inquiry No. 13-98
- Environment & Transportation Commissioner's report dated
05 January 1999

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

COMMITTEE CHAIR