

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

09 JULY 1996

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

Members: D. Beamish, A. Cullen, 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 June 1996.**

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEMS

1. HUNEAULT WASTE MANAGEMENT LTD. - APPLICATION FOR AN
AMENDMENT TO CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL #460702 FOR A
DISPOSAL, PROCESSING AND COMPOSTING FACILITY
CITY OF GLOUCESTER

- Director, Solid Waste Division, Environment and Transportation
Department report dated 25 June 96

Councillor Legendre asked for clarification on the Region's role in approving these types of reports. He questioned whether, since the Region does not do a technical review, there might be matters of concern to the Region. Joe Vincelli, Manager, Approvals Branch advised the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MOEE) requires the Region's comments prior to issuing a Certificate of Approval. The wording used in the report (i.e. decline to object) is consistent with the requirements of the MOEE. Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division, confirmed that the Region does not do a technical review, rather the MOEE undertakes this type of review. He noted that in this instance, staff have reviewed the application in terms of compliance with the Region's 3R's mandate and to ensure such facilities (e.g. transfer stations) do not proliferate in Ottawa-Carleton.

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 10 July 1996 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 39.

1. That the Planning and Environment Committee on behalf of and acting in its delegated authority from Regional Council, decline to object to the application for an amendment to Certificate of Approval #460702 by Huneault Waste Management Ltd. dated 12 April 1996 to permit:
 - a. an annual volume increase for landfill disposal;
 - b. service area increase for processing and composting to include Hastings, Frontenac and Renfrew Counties and the United Counties of Lennox and Addington;
 - c. daily leaf and yard waste tonnage increases at their facility located at 3354 Navan Road, in the City of Gloucester, provided that the amended Certificate of Approval issued by the Ministry of the Environment and Energy (MOEE) is in accordance with the written information provided to the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton;
2. That the Planning and Environment Committee on behalf of and acting in its delegated authority from Regional Council, decline to object to the application for an amendment to Certificate of Approval #460702 by Huneault Waste Management Ltd. dated 11 June 1996 to permit receipt of any organic materials suitable for composting (including food wastes) sourced from anywhere in the Provinces of Ontario or Quebec, provided that the amended Certificate of Approval issued by the Ministry of the Environment and Energy (MOEE) is in accordance with the written information provided directly to the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton;
3. That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm that recommendation number one and two of this report are contingent upon the support for the facility of the local municipality in which it is located.

CARRIED

2. DEEP RIVER - LOW LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE FACILITY
 - Director, Finance and Administration Division Environment and Transportation Department memorandum dated 30 May 96 (Memo issued as "Information Previously Distributed" - 25 June 96; request from Committee member to add this item to the Agenda)

Committee Chair Hunter drew the Committee's attention to the News Release from Natural Resources Canada dated 4 July 1996 (on file with the Regional Clerk) which

announces the government's intent to carry out a detailed evaluation of the suitability of developing a disposal facility in Deep River.

Councillor Legendre noted the first staff report highlighted four types of Environmental Assessments; he asked if staff would be requesting a particular type. Joe Vincelli, Manager, Approvals Branch, advised staff had requested in a letter to the Siting Task Force, that they proceed with either the panel type or the mediation type of Environmental Assessment. Mr. Vincelli went on to say the panel review method is the most detailed type of assessment and that funding is available to agencies that want to participate for either of these two types of assessment. He noted staff are not yet aware which method the Government will proceed with.

Referring to page 2 of the News Release, Councillor Legendre expressed concern that the Federal Government appears to have already made its decision and the onus will be on objecting parties to provide very strong reasons why that decision should be changed. He stated he was shocked to learn the prospective site was located approximately 300 metres from the banks of the Ottawa River. He stated radioactive contamination cannot be removed by chemical means which makes a radioactively contaminated water system virtually unusable. The Councillor said the only solution to making nuclear power generation practical is in finding solutions for the storage of waste but to situate it so close to a major river serving many communities, raises many concerns.

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

RECEIVED

PLANNING ITEMS

3. PRESENTATION BY CITY OF OTTAWA STAFF -
NATURAL OPEN SPACE STUDY (NOSS)
- Verbal presentation

Debra Irwin and Susan Costello, City of Ottawa Environmental Management Branch, Department of Engineering and Works appeared before the Committee.

Ms. Irwin made the presentation on the City of Ottawa's Natural Open Space Study (NOSS) and provided the Committee with material on the process and tentative work schedule (on file with the Regional Clerk). She noted the study was initiated in the fall of 1995 and began in February of 1996; the final report is to be submitted June 30, 1997. The study is intended to fulfill the Official Plan requirement for a secondary Planning

Study to address the boundaries of and potential additions and deletions to the Greenway system. It will also provide additional information for ongoing studies such as the Municipal Environmental Evaluation Process (MEEP) and the Greenway System Management Plan.

The presenter explained the objective of the Study is to develop a classification framework for natural and open space areas within the City that addresses both environmental and social values. Targets and standards will be accomplished and determined for the retention of natural and open space areas within the City of Ottawa, and management guidelines for various classes of natural and open space areas will be determined.

Comparing the Regional Natural Environment System Study (NESS) and NOSS, Ms. Irwin pointed out the two studies are basically complementary processes, but differ in the scale at which the processes are applied. A key difference between the NOSS and the NESS is that the NOSS will be incorporating social values in its ranking system. The speaker noted the Region will be using data collected in the NOSS to address environmental values within the City of Ottawa.

Referring to the process chart, Ms. Irwin explained the study was at the third level. Field inventories were undertaken in May and June of this year and will be continuing in the fall; the balance of the lands (Federal, Regional and privately-owned lands) will be studied in the spring of 1997.

Speaking to the public consultation strategy, Ms. Irwin noted one public open house was held on April 17th of this year. As well, two committees have been organized which will provide input to the Study. The Steering Committee is comprised of representatives from the three levels of Government, as well as some of the agencies that have an interest, such as the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA). The Peer Review Committee is comprised of local community members that are considered to be experts in the field of either environmental values or social values. A master contact list is being compiled which contains the names and addresses of owners of natural and open spaces, environmental consulting firms within the City, community associations and interest groups and any other individual who has expressed interest in the Environmental Management Branch's initiatives and programs to date. An invitation to participate in the study will be sent to everyone on the master contact list.

Ms. Irwin went on to say three community workshops were conducted in June of this year in the west end of Ottawa. These workshops were conducted in tandem with another parallel study called the Greenway System Management Plan. These community workshops are "hands-on" workshops where individuals identify natural and open space features they are aware of in the area they live and, as a group, they are asked to prioritize any issues and features within that community they feel are important. This data will be

added to the social values portion of the study. In the fall, another five of these workshops will be held to cover the central and east portions of the City.

In addition to the community workshops, public workshops will also be held. The first will be held in October, and will deal with the draft classification framework. The second public workshop will deal with the application of the framework to lands within the City and consequently will deal with the prioritization and ranking of lands. The third will deal with targets, standards and management plans.

Ms. Irwin noted a number of drop in centres will be operated City-wide that will capture the values of the youth, seniors and other groups. Focus groups may be held on an “as needed” basis to deal with issue resolution and a technical workshop towards the end of the study is being considered. As well, the first information bulletin will be distributed in August to everyone on the master contact list to inform them of the study’s progress.

In conclusion, Ms. Irwin invited the Committee to attend the first public workshop to be held 22 October 96 at the McNabb Community Centre beginning at 7:00 p.m.

Responding to questions from Councillor Stewart concerning the incorporation of social values, Ms. Irwin advised the study will attempt to get individuals to relay the interests of their communities. Also, the Peer Review Committee has suggested that a phone survey be undertaken to allow a broad demographic base to be reached.

Councillor Stewart asked what power the City will have to protect land identified as highly valued in the study, when the City does not own the land. Ms. Irwin stressed the results of the NOSS will be used as a planning tool to make informed and rational planning decisions. She noted the Greenway System Management Plan, rather than the NOSS, deals specifically with landowners and stewardship agreements. Ms. Irwin advised there is some money available for the City to purchase some of the lands.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Stewart, concerning the National Capital Commission’s (NCC) National Interest Land Mass Study (NILM), Ms. Irwin felt as a result of the NOSS, City of Ottawa Official Plan Amendments will indicate to the NCC, the City’s intent to protect certain lands.

In response to questions from Councillor Cullen, Ms. Irwin explained the NOSS will look at more than just environmentally-sensitive lands, it will also include waterway corridors, open space, the National Interest Land Mass and other green space.

Councillor Cullen asked the Planning and Property Commissioner what stage staff were at in developing policies to protect green space. He reminded the Committee this had been identified as important through the community visioning process. Planning and Property

Commissioner Nick Tunnacliffe advised that staff are working diligently on this and a draft will be released for public comment in the near future.

Councillor Beamish, referring to an earlier comment by Ms. Irwin, expressed surprise that the NOSS would be looking at lands already covered by the NCC's NILM. Ms. Irwin explained lands within the NILM will be evaluated and ranked within the classification framework designed for the NOSS to ensure compliance with the City of Ottawa Official Plan (e.g. environmentally sensitive areas, waterway corridors, linkages, agricultural areas, open space, etc.). Responding to further questions from the Councillor, Ms. Irwin advised the cost of the NOSS is \$150,000.00.

Councillor Stewart noted the Experimental Farm is identified as a "special area for study"; she asked what the City expects to be able to do to protect the Experimental Farm as a result of this study. Ms. Costello responded by saying the NOSS will indicate the Farm's environmental value, social value and what functions it serves in both these regards. As well, through the prioritization and ranking exercise, its importance within the City as a whole will become evident. It is hoped that through this exercise, partnerships with the Federal Government will be a possibility to protect this land. Ms. Costello confirmed that the City would not be in a position to purchase the land from the Federal Government. Committee Chair Hunter added it was his understanding that the majority of these lands were donated to the Federal Government by the Booth family for agricultural research purposes only and the land would revert back to the Booth family if it ceased to be used for this intended purpose.

In response to further questions from Councillor Stewart, Ms. Irwin advised the potential for financial revenue generation on any of these lands will play a role in the decision making process. Ms. Costello added all reports to City Council contain an environmental impact statement and an economic impact statement; it is hoped the decisions made by the politicians will strike a balance between the two.

4. **BRIEFING ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND RENTAL HOUSING REPORTS**

- Verbal presentation
- The Housing Series of Background Papers issued previously (Information Previously Distributed - 28 May 96)

Marni Cappe, Manager, Housing and Sylvie Grenier, Regional Planner briefed the Committee on the background papers on affordable housing and rental housing. As well, they provided members with a "Fact Sheet on Affordability and Rental Housing" (on file with the Regional Clerk). Ms. Grenier noted as part of the Official Plan Review, a series of Background Papers on housing issues were prepared to form the basis for a

Regional/Municipal housing report and future housing policies. The papers were prepared by members of the Regional/Municipal Housing Working Group which includes staff from various municipalities. This process is part of a pilot project to better coordinate planning policies among local municipalities.

Councillor Cullen, referring to the background paper on rental housing, noted it stated clearly there is a crisis in rental housing. He asked what could be expected from this crisis in rental housing if policies are not put in place to create new affordable housing. Ms. Cappe noted some of the effects are already being seen as people are doubling up in apartments and young people are going back to live with their parents. Councillor Cullen asked what the Region's interest in this should be. Ms. Cappe replied nearly half of the constituency of the Region are renters. As well, there is also the issue of the Region's responsibility for social services and ensuring the shelter allowance component for GWA clients is spent on decent housing that will enable these people to have money left over to buy food and clothing. Ms. Cappe went on to say statistics from social services show a large majority of their clients are in the private market (approximately 75%) and of those, the vast majority are spending half of their income on housing.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Cullen, Ms. Grenier advised that policies exist in the current Official Plan to ensure a variety of options for people to choose from in terms of housing. Although there are no Provincial targets required, the Region must still ensure planning practices are used to provide a variety of housing options; the Regional/Municipal Working Group is currently looking at different ways to do this. Ms. Grenier stated that since 1991 ownership of housing, has showed an increase in affordability. Currently, the problem is mainly related to rental housing and the Region does not have as much influence on this aspect.

Councillor Cullen asked what effect the government's proposal to privatize public housing would have on low income clientele and the Region's interest in the possible privatization of public housing. Ms. Cappe replied she had not yet seen a proposal from the Province on what they plan to do. However, the fear is that if the more than 8,600 plus units of Ontario housing in the Region were to be sold to the private sector without any conditions attached pertaining to the tenancy, a huge number of people could be left on the street looking for affordable housing. Councillor Cullen said it was his understanding that a proposal would be released by the Province, for comment in the fall of this year.

Vice Chair Stewart took the chair in Committee Chair Hunter's absence.

Councillor Beamish observed the presentation had a very pessimistic outlook of the rental situation and suggested this was because the report was written prior to the new Provincial Government's direction with regard to rent control. He felt a more positive attitude should prevail as the removal of rent controls will facilitate the building of new

rental stock. Ms. Cappe advised that representatives of the building community were consulted during the preparation of the background papers and they indicated many things must happen in addition to the lifting of rent controls to make the construction of rental housing economically affordable. Councillor Beamish said builders had indicated to him that rent control was the single biggest consideration in the construction of rental units.

Councillor Munter remarked that in speaking with builders, he was advised rent controls are only a small factor; such things as development charges, the fact that rental property is taxed at a much higher rate than single family homes (20% greater) and the fact that land values are starting to change are cumulatively much more important than rent controls.

The committee then heard from the public delegations.

Ellen Lougheed, President of Cooperative Housing Federation of Eastern Ontario (CHFEO), and a member of the Board of Directors of the Cooperative Housing Federation of Canada. Ms. Lougheed explained that CHFEO is an organization that represents the interests of over 35 Federal and Provincial housing coops in Eastern Ontario. It provides services to its members to help maximize their operational efficiency and maintain their financial viability. As well, CHFEO helps its member coops to develop coop housing environments in which people want to live and contribute.

Ms. Lougheed expressed alarm that social and non-profit housing has been placed in such a precarious predicament recently, which she said will result in an increase in the number of people needing such housing. She advised of the long waiting lists for most coops in the Region, particularly for subsidized units, which confirms many more people would like to live in a housing coop, if only more units and more subsidies were available.

Ms. Lougheed stated the Board of CHFEO believes many of the initiatives proposed in the background papers, to develop more affordable housing, are worthy of consideration. She suggested partnerships should be formed between the private and non-profit sectors, community based organizations and all levels of government to produce affordable housing. Unfortunately, over the past 12 months, both the Federal and Provincial governments have indicated their intent to get out of the social housing business. The Provincial Government has sent notices to all 260 provincially funded coops demanding that each coop cut thousands of dollars from its operating budget; these cuts could force most provincial coops out of business.

The speaker went on to say CHFEO has been working in cooperation with the Cooperative Housing Federation of Canada and its Ontario regional office to inform federal and provincial politicians about how coops provide quality affordable housing at a minimal cost to tax payers. The coop sector has put forward a proposal to the Federal and Ontario governments that would see the coop sector taking over the administration of

operating agreements between the federal and provincial governments and housing coops. Currently, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) administers coop operating agreements from their local offices in each province, with each office having a different interpretation of how to administer these agreements. The coop sector's proposal recommends that CHF Canada would set up a new, non-profit agency to do the job using only two offices; one in Ottawa, and the other in Montreal. The agency would be controlled by the coop sector but would be accountable to government by way of a multi-year contract. This proposal would save government money and give coops better service. Ms. Lougheed pointed out the proposal is described in the "Saving Money Through Self-reliance" brochure provided to the Committee (on file with the Regional Clerk). She asked the Committee to support this proposal by writing letters to the Federal Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

In conclusion, Ms. Lougheed informed the Committee the Ontario Region of CHF Canada has commissioned two studies that relate to the Region's review of affordable housing. The first of these studies, called "A Place to Rent" is a three part study that considers the availability of rental housing in Ontario, the demographics of the provincial rental market, as well as the prospects of new supply. The second study deals with the British experience of selling public housing to the private sector. She indicated these studies, once completed, could be provided to those that were interested.

Bonnie McKenzie, President, Britannia Woods Community Association Ms. McKenzie explained that Britannia Woods is a social housing development, known as Ritchie Street Project, where she has lived for five years. She said after having worked for a financial institution for 21 years, her income was reduced by 40% on January 24, 1995. Ms. McKenzie stated although she knew this was going to happen, she did not appreciate the impact of how drastically it would affect her lifestyle. Because public housing rent is geared to income, one of the few things she was able to keep when her income dropped was her home. Ms. McKenzie relayed to the Committee how important her home is to her. She emphasized the importance of supporting the retention of public housing and added the majority of people living in public housing are on social assistance and are living on almost nothing.

Councillor Beamish questioned why this item was on the agenda. Councillor Cullen advised he had requested this item be put on the agenda for discussion. He noted as part of the Official Plan Review, it is important Councillors be afforded the opportunity to provide input regarding affordable housing and also to understand the impact of policies implemented by other levels of government.

Responding to questions from Councillor Beamish, Ms. Cappe confirmed the concept of taking over social housing was not being contemplated within the context of the Regional Official Plan Review.

Councillor Cullen pointed out the Kirby Commission's review of Regional Government recommended the Region take over social housing operated at the municipal level and Regional Council at that time, endorsed this position. As well, one of the options of the Ernst & Young study on the restructuring of Ontario Housing is to look at municipalities taking over this responsibility.

Committee Chair Hunter stated he shared much of Councillor Beamish's frustration. With all due respect to the public delegations, he noted nothing new was being said and, as all Councillors are aware of the situation, the legislation and had read the various reports, it was not necessary to educate them in this regard.

Dorothy Vallilee, a resident of Regina Towers, stated the situation in her community is very pessimistic and uncertain. She said since learning of the possible privatization of public housing eighteen months ago, no additional information has been relayed to those affected by this. Ms. Vallilee advised the Committee that the psychological and physical health of many of the residents in her building has been affected by this situation. She related stories of desperate people and suicides blamed mostly on their housing and financial situations. She noted she is one of the people, that if public housing is privatized, could no longer afford to live where she is. She has lived at Regina Towers for nine years and really loves it; the residents of the building look after one another which she feels is helping the financial situation in the Province.

Responding to questions from Councillor Cullen, Ms. Vallilee stated she and other residents of Regina Towers would expect the Regional politicians to represent their interests to the Provincial Government.

Dan McIntyre, Executive Director, Federation of Ottawa-Carleton Tenants' Associations, and Chair of the Our Homes/Chez Nous Coalition. Mr. McIntyre provided a written copy of his presentation, which is on file with the Regional Clerk. He began by reading from a statement issued by the Mayor of Toronto dated 25 June 1996 which speaks to the Province's "New Direction - Tenant Protection Legislation". Mr. McIntyre commended the leadership position taken by the Mayor of Toronto on this housing policy.

Mr. McIntyre stated he was before the Committee to ask them as leaders in this Municipality, to show leadership, and to represent all of the constituents who live in rental housing. He suggested this could be done by taking a stand and working with the tenant community to prevent the Provincial Government from undertaking harmful policies. The speaker pointed out there are 8,600 households served by the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Housing Authority and every one of these households pays taxes to the RMOC at the multi-residential rate. Mr. McIntyre referred the Committee to material he provided from

David Hulchanski, Professor, Housing and Community Development, University of Toronto, who speaks very directly about the value of Ontario Housing Corporation units.

Mr. McIntyre went on to say the Region's constituents are worried; they want to feel their homes will remain affordable, secure and reasonably well maintained. The majority of those affected are senior citizens, single parents, the disabled and the unemployable. An objective review will clearly show the current affordability crisis will worsen with the changes contemplated by the Province. This will lead to further erosion of disposal dollars by tenants, reduced spending in the local economy, and a further decline of quality of life.

Michael Wilson, Housing Help noted he had sat on the Advisory Committee reviewing the Background Papers, and expressed his appreciation for this opportunity. Mr. Wilson stated his main concern is with the group below the 30th percentile. He advised that in 1995 approximately 32,000 contacts came to Housing Help for assistance with housing issues, compared to 9,000 in 1989. This is a clear indication the situation is getting worse. Households with low incomes are extremely hard-hit, and they have very limited housing options. He pointed out the affordable rental housing stock is at least 25 years old and is frequently in a state of deterioration, often poorly maintained and the stock is being depleted. Mr. Wilson opined that the cost of market housing for low income people below the 30th percentile is not really based on value for dollar. He referred to the situation that arose last fall when social assistance payments were lowered and almost immediately, private market rents were also lowered because people did not have the money to pay their rent.

Mr. Wilson pointed out the number of households below the 30th percentile (people earning less than \$16.00 per hour) makes up a fairly large constituency and he asked the Committee to consider policies to ensure there is a viable affordable housing stock in Ottawa-Carleton in the future. Further, he suggested Regional staff should be directed to monitor change in Provincial policy and the impact of these policies on housing stock and affordability in Ottawa-Carleton. He also urged the Committee to request that Council inquire of the Provincial Government what their plans are.

Responding to questions from Councillor Beamish, Mr. Wilson stated he was not in favour of the shelter assistance program because the market will charge whatever the government is willing to pay, regardless of the condition of the housing. He stated the program can be very costly to the taxpayers and it is not possible to monitor the housing or make the market accountable.

Commissioner Tunnacliffe confirmed at Councillor Cullen's request that staff would report to Committee on any Provincial changes or proposals regarding shelter allowances and privatization and provide the opportunity for input.

5. AMBERLAKES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION 06T-93018
TOWNSHIP OF GOULBOURN (STITTSVILLE)

- Planning and Property Commissioner's report dated 25 June 96
(deferred from Planning and Environment Committee meetings of 23 Apr 96
and 11 June 96)

Andrew Hope, Manager, Plans Administration Division, provided the Committee with an overview of the staff report. He noted this report was deferred from the meetings of 23 April 96 and 11 June 96 at the request of Amberlakes Development Corporation. In the interim, staff have had the opportunity to further discuss the matter with the applicant, staff of the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA). Mr. Hope advised the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) has scheduled a prehearing for 26 August 96 and the hearing will follow sometime thereafter.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter, Mr. Hope confirmed staff are of the opinion the OMB is seized with the draft plan of subdivision application (Council dealt with this in January 1995) and therefore any revisions thereto are also before the Board. He noted the applicant revised the draft plan of subdivision prior to Regional Council taking a position on the referral request and nothing precludes the developer from revising the draft plan of subdivision until the matter is before the Board for consideration.

Councillor Munter noted this seemed to be more of an administrative interpretation rather than the spirit of the agreement. He said Goulbourn Council had not approved the development and its view is that matters of the zoning and local official plan amendment (LOPA) should be disposed of before the subdivision is considered. Mr. Hope felt it to be prudent and the best use of the Board's time if all matters are before it at once; should it choose to approve the LOPA and zoning by-law, it can deal with the subdivision as well.

Councillor Hill mentioned the MNR and MVCA were not satisfied with the work done to date and she asked how staff could say that all of the issues or conditions have been satisfied. Mr. Hope replied two technical agencies (Goulbourn Township and the Ministry of the Environment and Energy) have to provide regional Planning Department with draft plan approval conditions for Phases I and II of the subdivision. He went on to say that the MNR, as a cautionary move, and in case the OMB approves the subdivision, has provided the department with a number of draft plan conditions. These conditions relate to a fish habitat compensation agreement, concerns about the flood fringe and the constructive wetland and have yet to be completed. Mr. Hope noted the Ministry recognizes that much has been done, however it does not have agreements that address all their concerns: Ministry officials have expressed the hope these outstanding issues will be resolved prior to the commencement of the OMB meeting.

Councillor Hill asked whether conditions should not normally be agreed upon before the OMB hearing. Mr. Hope said the applicant maintains the issues would have been resolved had Goulbourn Council dealt with the LOPA and the zoning by-law that came before them. As a result of this omission, the matter has languished for some time. Regional staff have not been apprised of Goulbourn's position, however there are indications the Council will be reviewing the matter.

Councillor van den Ham, referring to Recommendation 2, asked whether the intent is for regional staff to present its conditions to the OMB. Mr. Hope replied staff will be defending Regional Council's position and will be addressing any Regional Official Plan (ROP) policy issues that may arise. Mr. Tim Marc, Solicitor, Regional Legal Department, explained that, should Regional Council approve the report in its present format, legal department staff will appear before the Board to argue that the LOPA and the zoning by-law conform to the ROP and that the appropriate conditions to be imposed are those attached to the report. Mr. Marc added this is conditional upon the concerns of the MNR and the MVCA having been met; should this not be the case, regional staff would argue that the subdivision application should not be approved.

Chair Hunter felt that, given the dwelling unit cap, the effect of the additional units of Phase II seems to have been downplayed. Mr. Hope recalled a previous report to the Committee concerning outstanding development applications and the number of dwelling units which could be developed within the Stage One envelope for Stittsville was revealed to be well in excess of 6,000. This was the reason staff agreed, with reluctance, to impose controls on building permits being issued. Mr. Hope added, while draft plan applications were not restricted to a specified number of dwelling units, staff did indicate it would only support the draft plan applications that were before it at that time. A number of appellants present today contend Amberlakes Development's revision of the draft plan of subdivision is not in keeping with the agreement made in the fall of 1994.

Chair Hunter said it was his understanding the staff's position only applied to Phase I of the Amberlakes Development. Mr. Hope replied staff did not affix a unit number to any of the draft plan applications but fully expected the units would be built as described in the application process. He noted the Amberlakes application went from 131 units to 261 units and there were zoning concerns as to whether Phase I could accommodate more than 131 units. This is mixed use zoning, therefore that which is not used for commercial purposes would likely be used for residential purposes. Staff have indicated that whatever Phase I can accommodate in terms of Goulbourn's zoning interpretation can be used for the purposes of the Amberlakes Development. Mr. Hope said while this interpretation troubles some parties, there are hopes these matters will be addressed through the Regional Development Strategy (RDS).

Councillor Legendre, referring to the draft RDS, asked whether this document could contribute to modifying the number of dwelling units allowed. Mr. Hope stated that Stittsville could grow to 8,000 units with the job target being lowered from 7,000 to 5,000. He noted this is contingent upon Stittsville and Kanata becoming increasingly intertwined and being considered as one unit for job creation purposes.

The committee then heard from the following delegations.

Bill Burrows, Nelligan Power, Solicitor for Amberlakes Development Corporation The speaker said the only matters before the Committee are the conditions themselves and the position the RMOC will take before the OMB. He noted he and his client and regional staff have spent a considerable amount of time trying to agree on the draft plan conditions and only minor adjustments remain.

Mr. Burrows clarified a number of points raised by Committee members, firstly the matter of dealing with LOPA and local zoning by-laws prior to dealing with subdivision plans. He noted, in site specific applications, these matters are routinely dealt with concurrently; should any of these need to be referred to the OMB, it would be counter-productive for the Board to consider them separately. Secondly, Mr. Burrows noted Councillor Hill was correct in saying there should be negotiated settlements with all the approving agencies before draft conditions are agreed upon; however, if it appears this cannot be done, the Planning Act provides for an arbitrator to be named.

With respect to the conditions imposed by the MNR, Mr. Burrows said there are times when the requirements of any approving agency are seen as simply too arduous or inappropriate and that is when the Board decides whether the conditions are appropriate.

Speaking to the issue of Phase I and Phase II of this development, Mr. Burrows indicated the entire package was presented by his client's consultant to the Regional Planning Department at the outset. He added the difference between the phases of development was that Phase I had an Official Plan designation and a zoning by-law that permitted residential development of potentially 261 dwelling units. Phase II required a LOPA and a zoning by-law amendment before residential development could occur. Mr. Burrows said the original intent was to ultimately develop that number of units at the same time.

Mr. Burrows pointed out matters have dragged on for an inordinate amount of time. This is the reason why Goulbourn's refusal to enact the LOPA and the local zoning by-law has been referred to the Board, along with the plan of subdivision plan. Mr. Hope clarified the Region is not on record as supporting any particular number of dwelling units at this time; this determination is being left to the Township of Goulbourn.

Ken Murchison, Low, Murchison, Solicitor for Woodside Acres Development Corporation reviewed his client's position, outlined in a letter dated 27 June 1996 (on file with the Regional Clerk). He indicated he was acting on behalf of Woodside, largely in connection with the allocation of the units.

Mr. Murchison expressed concern on behalf of his client and other developers south of Fernbank Road. He said he was before the Committee to ensure the Region does not inadvertently or otherwise fail to honour the arrangements it has previously agreed to. He said he thought it was incorrect for Mr. Burrows to suggest that "everything was on the table" at the outset, since the sole application related to Phase I lands consisting of 131 units. He put forth the view that the Committee is being asked to approve 261 units and this negates Mr. Hope's contention the department has taken no position on the number of units it is prepared to support.

Mr. Murchison reminded those present the department decided to deal with the question of allocation not by way of draft plan approval but by issuing building permits. A report to the Planning Committee dated 5 October 94 stated only four applications were approved, including Amberlakes, and that any other application would be refused. In Report No. 74, the Planning Department limited draft plan approvals to those applications currently in process; four numbered plans were listed as well as existing draft plans of subdivision requiring modification (as long as the proposed modifications did not exceed the current unit total). Following meetings with Goulbourn officials, it was agreed the four applications would be grandfathered on the basis of their existing conditions.

Mr. Murchison said regional staff recognized this was approved by Planning Committee, and brought the matter forward for discussion at the 23 April 96 meeting. The report states the number of units in the Amberlakes Draft Plan is to be determined by Goulbourn through its interpretation of the prevailing zoning provisions that apply to Phase I of the Amberlakes Draft Plan application only. As Phase II of Amberlakes draft plan application represents new lands for residential development in Stittsville's Stage I urban envelope, Regional staff have limited development over Phases I and II of Amberlakes Draft application to that which is allowed under only Phase I; this will ensure that Amberlakes does not secure more servicing than has already been earmarked for its Phase I lands

Mr. Murchison pointed out the wording in the staff reports of 11 June and 9 July has been subtly changed and does not include any reference to not being allowed to have more servicing. He put forth the view this means the staff position has changed and it is asking the Committee not to carry out the undertaking it agreed to initially. Mr. Murchison said this is significant to his client and to others who, in good faith, have been co-operating with these arrangements. He stated if the Region is prepared to submit this material to the OMB, to be consistent it should say there is no entitlement beyond the original 131 lots.

Responding to questions from Councillor Legendre, Mr. Murchison felt that Amberlakes should be entitled only to the original 131 lots until such time as other developers in the area had exhausted their entitlement to their assigned number of lots, by way of building permits or until the increase to 8,000 units as proposed in the RDS is put in place, whichever should first occur. Mr. Burrows noted there have only been 3,789 building permits issued in Goulbourn, with a further 2,200 building permits left to be issued. He said that Goulbourn has not issued 100 building permits a year for the last number of years and therefore this is a situation that will occur sometime in the next millennium. He also pointed out Mr. Bell has taken the same position with respect to every other subdivision proposed in that area for the last 10 years.

Mr. Hope clarified that although Mr. Murchison's client (Woodside Acres) would be satisfied with 131 units, Mr. Bell, the individual behind the OMB referral request, would not be and the matter would still have to proceed to the OMB.

In response to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Hope advised that based on assumptions related to prevailing zoning, there is a total number of units committed or existing of 6,185. As well, there are approximately 1,400 units left to be developed in both Stage I and II for a total of 7,600 units. Staff are monitoring the situation and a freeze on development will be imposed once the 6,000th building permit is issued.

Councillor van den Ham asked Mr. Murchison to expand on his client's concerns, as it appears it could take many years before the limit of 6,000 units is reached. Mr. Murchison stated although there are building permits available, there is an upper limit and this limit has already been exceeded on the basis of the draft plans approved and the four applications previously mentioned. He explained it is a serious matter to any developer to work and spend money on a subdivision only to find there are no building permits available when the time comes. Mr. Murchison stated the original arrangement was made in good faith with the Region and it should be prepared to uphold it.

Mr. Ray Bell, speaking on his own behalf, noted he had requested referral to the Ontario Municipal Board of the draft conditions for Phase I of Amberlakes' subdivision and these conditions applied to 12 blocks and 131 street homes in the general urban area of the C7 commercial zone; Regional Planning Committee and Council agreed to refer it to the Board. Referring to comments made by Mr. Hope, Mr. Bell opined that a revision cannot be used as a pretext to substitute an entirely different plan for one already before the OMB. Mr. Bell drew the Committee's attention to page 12 of the Agenda, wherein it states that Phase II of Amberlakes' Draft Plan application represents new lands for residential development. In this regard, he provided the members with an extract of the recommendations contained in Planning Report No. 74 and approved by Council. He highlighted in particular Recommendation No. 4 which speaks to staff recommending that

draft approval not be granted to any new draft plans within the Stittsville Stage I area until servicing constraints are addressed in the Region's Water and Wastewater Master Plan.

Mr. Marc advised the plan of subdivision had clearly been revised at the time that Regional Council referred it to the OMB. He noted the revised application was submitted by Amberlakes on 3 October 1994 and the referral by the Region to the OMB took place in January 1995. Mr. Hope added the production of the report on the Stittsville dwelling unit allocation was done in a compressed time frame. Staff were involved in significant negotiations with all of the parties and the new draft plan application was not addressed in the report simply because of the sign off dates.

Mr. Hope confirmed at the request of Chair Hunter that both the current and the proposed (subject to the concerns of the MNR and the MVCA are satisfactorily addressed) Local Official Plan designations and zoning by-law designations are in conformity with the Regional Official Plan. In light of this answer, Chair Hunter felt it unnecessary for the Region to take a position on this matter, as its interests will be satisfied no matter what. Mr. Hope noted it was the draft plan approval conditions before the Committee for their consideration. Mr. Marc added that, based upon this report, it would be the Region's position that the OMB could approve the subdivision on Phases I and II as requested by the applicant, provided that the MNR and the MVCA's concerns are resolved. He suggested that if the Committee's position is that the Plan of Subdivision or Phase II of the Plan of Subdivision not be supported, a motion to this effect would be in order.

Councillor Hill put forward the following motion for the Committee's consideration: "That Recommendation 1 be amended by adding: "subject to the following changes: (a) The Region oppose the approval of Phase II until such time as additional units are allocated to Stittsville and (b) the dwelling units being limited to 131 units."

Speaking to her motion, Councillor Hill noted the development approved is over the cap of 6000 units. By approving the 261 units, people that have already received approval will be knocked out of the queue and this is unfair to those developers.

Councillor Munter asked what the effect of rejecting the staff recommendation would be. Mr. Marc advised there are two possibilities. If the entire report were defeated, the Region would not attend the OMB hearings. If Recommendation 1 were replaced with a negative recommendation and Recommendation 2 were left as is, legal staff would appear in opposition to Amberlakes and outside planning consultants would have to be retained. Mr. Marc noted that he could not advise whether or not a planning consultant could be found to support this position. Mr. Tunnacliffe cautioned that if the report is defeated and the Region is not represented at the hearing, the Region would need certain conditions approved if the Board decided to approve the subdivision. Mr. Marc advised the Committee that Regional staff should be at the OMB hearing for this reason.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Munter, Mr. Hope advised that Goulbourn Council has issued draft plan conditions for Phase I which currently has an appropriate designation under Goulbourn's Official Plan. Phase I has all of the appropriate approvals save and except for the subdivision which has been referred to the Board. He noted it is Phase II that Goulbourn Council has a problem with.

Councillor Hume asked on what basis staff could oppose Phase II. Mr. Hope replied that based on a strict question of ROP conformity, subject to MNR and MVCA concerns being satisfactorily addressed, staff would have to indicate that Phase II is in conformity with ROP policies. He noted the number of dwelling units is a matter to be decided between the Township of Goulbourn and the Ontario Municipal Board.

Responding to questions from Councillor Stewart, Mr. Tunnacliffe advised the MNR and the MVCA will be in attendance at the OMB hearings to represent their concerns.

Committee Chair Hunter made the suggestion that consideration of the draft conditions could be deferred; he asked staff how important the draft conditions would be to the pre-hearing. Mr. Marc replied the draft conditions would not be the most significant issue at the pre-hearing; however, one of the major purposes of the pre-hearing is to allow the Board to organize its time, to know which parties will be present and how many witnesses they intend to call. It would be very difficult for the Region to advise the Board in this regard, if staff did not know what position the Region would ultimately be taking.

Councillor van den Ham noted he would support the staff recommendations with the understanding staff will take a neutral position at the hearing regarding the subdivision application. He felt the Region's interests (draft conditions) should be represented at the hearing; deferring consideration of the draft conditions would just delay things. Mr. Marc suggested if this was the Committee's wish, the report should be amended to state the Region takes no position on whether or not the subdivision should be draft approved.

At this juncture, Councillor Hill amended her motion by changing the word "oppose" to "defer" and the Committee then considered the motions put forward.

Moved by B. Hill

That Recommendation 1 be amended by adding:

"subject to the following changes:

- (a) The Region defer the approval of Phase II until such time as additional units are allocated to Stittsville.**

(b) **the dwelling units being limited to 131 units.”**

LOST

NAYS: A. Cullen, P. Hume, G. Hunter, J. Legendre and R. van den Ham....5
YEAS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, A. Munter and W. Stewart....4

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Recommendation 2 have added after interests “regarding draft plan of approval conditions only.”

CARRIED

The Committee then considered the staff recommendations as amended.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Request the Ontario Municipal Board to impose the draft plan of approval conditions attached as Annex II to Amberlakes Development Corporation’s Draft Plan of Subdivision 06T-93018 should the Ontario Municipal Board choose to approve Draft Plan of Subdivision 06T-93018 as well as the Township of Goulbourn’s Official Plan Amendment No. 121 and Zoning By-law 26/94; and**
- 2. Direct Regional staff to appear before the OMB on the above-noted matter to represent Regional Council’s interests, regarding draft plan of approval conditions only.**

CARRIED

(B. Hill and A. Munter
dissented)

6. **FINALIZATION OF THE PROVINCIAL TRANSFER OF PLAN REVIEW FUNCTIONS TO THE RMOC**

- Planning and Property Commissioner’s and Environment and Transportation Commissioner’s joint report dated 17 June 96

Councillor Stewart asked for clarification on Recommendation 2. Nick Tunnacliffe, Planning and Property Commissioner advised staff will make a judgment call when deciding whether or not a change to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is

substantial. He said he hoped there would be no changes, but felt this was something that should be covered just in case. Mr. Tunnacliffe said he anticipates the agreements will be finalized in the fall, however, much of the data being transferred from the Province is in somewhat questionable format. Until staff are satisfied the data transferred is in a useable format, none of the agreements will be signed.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Stewart, Mr. Tunnacliffe confirmed there would be no transfer of funds from the Province for these responsibilities. Staff are looking at the possibility of charging the developers user fees where skills are not available in-house or from another agency (e.g. Conservation authorities) and private sector services must be obtained.

Councillor Hill noted the MOU states the intent of this exercise is to eliminate duplication of plan review, yet the Region will still be approving site specific local municipal Official Plan amendments. Mr. Edgington, Director, Plans Administration Division, clarified the need to circulate local Official Plan Amendments to seven or eight different Ministries will be eliminated. The Region will be doing the Provincial Plan Review on behalf of the Ministries and this is where duplication is eliminated.

Councillor Hill went on to say the report speaks of the Region consulting with the Ministries; she noted this gives the impression the Province will still be very much involved. Mr. Edgington replied the Province will likely monitor the Region's implementation of Provincial Policies on site-specific planning applications and will also require the Region to inform them of any Provincial issues. He felt for the most part, the Province will allow the Region to use "made in Ottawa-Carleton" solutions in the implementation of the various new Provincial Policies. If the Province feels their interests are not being protected and they intervene, it will be up to Regional staff and Council to decide whether their reasons for involving themselves again are justified. Councillor Hill expressed concern that the Province will still have a very strong interest and influence on everything the Region does. She indicated that although she had no specific problems with the staff recommendations, she was very concerned with the MOU and would therefore be dissenting on this report.

Referring to page 35 of the staff report, Councillor Cullen asked if the Province would be providing the Region with the mapping for wetlands, as well as details of their policies. Mr. Edgington advised that a protocol for data sharing, which has yet to be finalized, will be attached to the MOU. He noted the MNR will continue to provide the Region with base mapping as well as updates as the wetlands change. As well, the data sharing agreement will require a number of the Ministries to provide the Region with, at their cost, a continuous source of Provincial-related data. The Province has advised that they will be available to provide as-needed technical assistance.

Councillor Cullen, referring to the list of attachments on the bottom of Page 43, noted only Appendix A was attached; he asked if the Committee would be seeing the others (i.e. Ministry-by-Ministry Operational Procedures and Guidelines, Protocol for Data Sharing, Training and Educational Scheduling Requirements and Performance Measures Appendix). Mr. Edgington advised staff were still working on these appendices but, when they were available, they could be tabled for the Committee's information. He went on to say that it is staff's intention to complete as many of the attachments as possible. However, the Data Sharing Protocol is the most important agreement and once it is completed, the Department will proceed in assuming the Provincial planning review functions prior to the other agreements being finalized.

Councillor van den Ham noted the Province will no longer be commenting on Zoning By-law Amendments, Site Plans or Minor Variances and he asked if responsibility for these would be delegated to lower-tier municipalities. Mr. Edgington replied the Province has not clearly indicated whether this will be the case. However, Regional staff have made it very clear in the MOU that the Region will not assume the Provincial role for these three Planning Act functions.

Responding to questions from Councillor van den Ham concerning the use of other agencies (e.g. Conservation Authorities), Mr. Edgington advised that rather than delegate responsibility to these agencies (as is done with a Committee of Adjustment), an agreement would be reached with the agency whereby they would perform certain duties on the Region's behalf, while the Region would keep some degree of control with respect to the criteria under which they would operate.

Councillor Munter observed this process, rather than "liberating" municipalities, is simply an exercise of downloading from the Province; municipalities will have to do the work the Province is presently doing and pay for it. Mr. Edgington agreed, however, he noted the additional responsibilities will be undertaken (as per Council's direction) at no cost to the Region and will be absorbed within existing staff resources or through the use of user fees.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendations.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Regional Council:

- 1. Endorse the "Memorandum of Understanding between the Province of Ontario and the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton regarding Municipal Plan Review" (see Annex 1) as the basis for the Region assuming the Provincial planning review functions;**

2. **Authorise the Commissioner of Planning and Property to amend this Memorandum of Understanding in cases where the amendment does not substantially change the intent or purpose of this memorandum. Where the Commissioner deems that the change is substantial, then a report will be submitted to Planning and Environment Committee and Council; and**
3. **That a copy of this Report be forwarded to the Area Municipalities and the Conservation Authorities for their information.**

CARRIED
(B. Hill dissented)

7. AMENDMENT NO. 20 TO CITY OF OTTAWA OFFICIAL PLAN AND DEFERRAL NO. 14 TO CITY OF OTTAWA COMPREHENSIVE OFFICIAL PLAN
- Planning and Property Commissioner's report dated 10 June 96

That the Planning and Environment Committee:

1. **Authorize that notification be given in accordance with Section 17(22) of the Planning Act of the intent to approve Official Plan Amendment No. 20 as per the Approval Page attached as Annex A;**
2. **Authorize that once the period for submitting a request for referral has expired (which period will be specified through action taken under Recommendation 1) that, unless a referral request is received, a recommendation to approve with modifications Official Plan Amendment No. 20 be forwarded to Council; and**
3. **Recommend that Council at the same time as it deals with Recommendation 2, lift Deferral No. 14 to the City of Ottawa Official Plan, 1991 and approve the pertinent text as per the Approval Page attached as Annex B.**

CARRIED

8. RENAMING PORTIONS OF CEDARVIEW AND FALLOWFIELD ROADS CITY OF NEPEAN
- Planning and Property Commissioner's report dated 18 June 96

That Planning and Environment Committee (acting as the Regional Street Name Committee) recommend that Council approve the following:

1. That the old alignment of Cedarview Road (Regional Road 23) south of Baseline Road and west of Highway 416 be renamed “CASSIDY ROAD”;
2. That the old alignment of Fallowfield Road (Regional Road 12) be renamed “O’KEEFE COURT”; and
3. That the new aligned portion of Fallowfield Road (Regional Road 12) intersecting with the new “Strandherd Drive” be named “FALLOWFIELD ROAD”.

CARRIED

9. PLANNING ACT REFORM - PROCEDURES AND POLICY UPDATE
- Planning and Property Commissioner’s report dated 25 June 96

Councillor Munter, referring to page 9 of the report, noted public meetings will be held in the area municipalities. He expressed concern that residents will mistakenly believe that once an issue has been dealt with by a local council, it will be final, when in fact the final decision rests with the Region. He asked what mechanism would be utilized to ensure that at the local meeting it is clear to people the final decision on an issue will be made at the Region. Mr. Hope suggested this could be addressed through an opening statement at the public meeting advising that the local council or committee would deal only with issues within the purview of the municipality. Issues such as potable water, transportation facilities, etc., within the purview of the Region would be decided by Regional Council if the matter were disputed or by staff if it were not disputed (there would not be any further opportunity for public discussion if it were not disputed). As well, Mr. Hope suggested such a statement could be included in the Notice of Public Meeting.

Councillor Cullen stated he would like assurance that ward Councillors are informed of planning applications that are not disputed (and therefore would not require consideration by the Planning and Environment Committee) in a timely fashion. He suggested that an E-Mail notification would suffice in this regard. Councillor Cullen put forward a motion to this effect. Mr. Tunnacliffe noted that applications are currently circulated.

Councillor Beamish also asked that Councillors be informed of the public meetings in the local municipalities. Mr. Hope agreed this would not be a problem.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Regional Councillors be informed in a timely manner of all Planning Act applications in their ward.

CARRIED

Mr. Hope advised there was an error in Annex 3 that was circulated with the report, dealing with the tariff of fees. The amended page which incorporated the 1996 processing fee increase was circulated to the Committee.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendations, as amended.

Bill 20 was proclaimed on 22 May 96. Coincident with the proclamation of Bill 20, the new Provincial Policy Statements and notice regulations came into full force and effect. Bill 20 however, imposes a number of procedural changes which Council needs to accommodate in order to streamline planning approvals in Ottawa-Carleton. Accordingly, Planning and Environment Committee and Council are asked to:

- 1. reaffirm the existing delegation of consent granting approval authority to the Regional Land Division Committee for the Townships of Goulbourn, Osgoode, Rideau and West Carleton and the Village of Rockcliffe Park;**
- 2. reaffirm the existing delegation of consent granting approval authority to the Councils of the Cities of Ottawa, Nepean, Gloucester, Kanata, Vanier and the Township of Cumberland;**
- 3. reaffirm the existing delegation of approval authority to Regional staff for undisputed local official plan amendments, undisputed plans of subdivision and condominium and part-lot control by-laws;**
- 4. request the area municipalities give notice of applications and public meeting as well as hold the public meeting for subdivision applications;**
- 5. request the area municipalities give notice of condominium applications;**
- 6. adopt a by-law outlining the prescribed and other information required for Regional Official Plan Amendments, draft plans of subdivision and condominium and consents attached as Annex II;**
- 7. reaffirm the amendments made to the Regional Corporate Policy Manual on the 14 June 95 that delegate the approval authority for undisputed local official plan amendments and undisputed draft plans of subdivision and condominium and part-lot control by-laws to Planning and Property Department staff; and**
- 8. adopt amendments to the Regional Regulatory Code including the establishment of a new tariff of fees for processing Regional official plan**

amendments, draft plans of subdivision and condominium, part-lot control by-laws and consents attached as Annex III.

9. that Regional Councillors be informed in a timely manner of all Planning Act applications in their ward.

CARRIED

OTHER BUSINESS

Moved by A. Cullen

That Council be requested to waive the Rules of Procedure to consider Items 5, 6, 8 and 9 at its meeting of 10 July 1996

CARRIED

Councillor Hill stated she had a motion that should have been dealt with when the Goulbourn Official Plan was considered by the Committee (11 June 96). She then put this motion forward for the Committee's consideration. Commissioner Nick Tunnacliffe noted the direction contained in the motion is currently carried out.

Moved by B. Hill

That the rules of procedure be suspended to consider the following motion.

CARRIED

Moved by B. Hill

That the review of the "Mineral Resource Areas" designation applicable to any new areas in the Regional Official Plan include the examination of land use and socio-economic consideration such as existing residential development, land fragmentation and existing businesses.

CARRIED

INQUIRIES

Councillor Munter put forward the following inquiries:

1. What measures are taken or could be taken to make information about garbage and recycling available to the visually -impaired and other persons with disabilities (for example, providing documents in alternate formats)? What steps are taken or could be taken to make the community aware that such services exist.

Councillor Munter provided staff with material from the Canadian National Institute for the Blind (CNIB) regarding their National Transcription Service. The Councillor noted he was raising this issue as a result of a visually-impaired resident of Kanata, being unaware of the garbage and recycling booklet distributed to her doorstep.

2. At what locations, other than 111 Lisgar Street, are blue boxes and composters available to the general public at the same cost as the region provides them? has there been any consideration given to making these products even more widely available, given the expansion of recycling service.

Pat McNally, Director Solid Waste Division, advised he would be responding in writing to these inquiries, but offered the following comments. With regard to the issue of the visually impaired, staff received a similar request when the program started in Gloucester. Staff subsequently followed up with the CNIB and are making progress in this area.

With respect to blue boxes and composters, Mr. McNally advised they are available at Window on the Region as well as many hardware stores in the various communities. The Department keeps track of the stores where they are available and makes them aware of possible increases in demand. He noted generally, retail distribution is a function well handled by the private sector.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Munter, Mr. McNally noted the price of the blue boxes in the hardware stores would be very close to the \$5.00 charged by the Region. However, the composters sold by the Region are still two-thirds subsidized by the grant program; so, while the Region's composters would cost \$10.00, those sold in the hardware stores would cost approximately \$30.00 or more.

Councillor Munter pointed out that until a year and half ago, the composters could be picked up from the local municipalities; now people are required to travel downtown to pick them up from Lisgar Street between the hours of 8:30 to 4:30.

Responding to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. McNally advised the contract for the delivery of blue boxes recently approved at Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee, relates only to first time blue boxes or replacement of damaged blue boxes. Delivery would not be made to people wanting a second or third blue box.

Councillor Cullen noted he had received a communication from RLF speaking about the issue of mercury contamination in municipal landfills by the improper disposal of lighting waste (the long fluorescent tubes). According to the MOEE, there is a regulation that says the number of lamps that can be disposed of in the regular waste stream is only 17 four foot lamps per month. He asked what the situation is with respect to accepting these kinds of lamps at the landfill site and whether staff is aware of the situation in Peel which restricts the number of lamps that can be disposed of in solid non-hazardous waste.

Mr. McNally advised that staff have received information dealing with the heavy metals in the lamps. The regulation deals with office buildings and the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) sector, who to a large degree handle their own waste disposal. The Region basically provides residential curb service and there are very few residents that generate anywhere close to the MOEE's regulated level. As a result, the fluorescent lights are acceptable in regular garbage. Mr. McNally also noted the Region's landfill facility is highly engineered and is capable of handling the heavy metal from light ballasts that do get into the landfill. He stated it would be impossible to monitor this situation at the tipping phase. Responding to further questions from Councillor Cullen, Mr. McNally advised that staff are aware of what is in the leachate coming from Trail Road and being treated at the Pickard Centre through the regular monitoring. He said the Certificate of Approval for the Pickard Centre would address the acceptable level of mercury.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Original signed by
Dawn Whelan

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

Original confirmed by
Gord Hunter

COMMITTEE CHAIR