

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

11 MAY 1999

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

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

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 13 April 99

CARRIED

PLANNING ITEM

1. PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN (97) AMENDMENT 5 PROPOSED MUNSTER HAMLET WASTEWATER PIPELINE TOWNSHIP OF GOULBOURN

-Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner Director Engineering Division report dated 22 April 1999

At the outset, Committee Chair Hunter read a statement required under the Planning Act, wherein he advised that anyone, whose intention it was to appeal Regional Official Plan Amendment 5 to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), must either voice their objections at the public meeting or submit their comments in writing. Failure to do so could result in refusal/dismissal of the appeal by the OMB.

Jim Miller, Director, Engineering Division; Steve Forestell, Engineer, Engineering Division; Judy Flavin, Planner, Planning and Development Approvals Department; and

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 9 June 99 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 32 (unless otherwise noted)

George Godin, Conestoga Rovers & Associates (CRA), appeared before the Committee and provided them with an overview of the report.

Councillor van den Ham referenced the route map contained in the staff report and asked if the consultant had taken into consideration the impact of going through Richmond, the cost associated with that, as well as the cost associated with running through the wetlands and if the price presented on page 43 of the engineering report included all of these factors. Mr. Godin indicated it did. He stated each route was evaluated based on all the criteria.

Councillor van den Ham asked for assurance that the costs presented in the report are all inclusive and that if Committee and Council agree with the recommendation, the Region will not be faced with additional costs because the costs of going through Richmond were not calculated. Mr. Godin assured Committee what was presented in the engineering report is a fairly accurate estimate on excavation costs and quantities of rocks based on existing information; contingencies have been added for additional variances. Mr. Godin said the price includes the costs right to the pump station.

The Committee then heard from the following public delegations.

Roger Pyper, read a submission on behalf of Gary and Sherry Belding (held on file with the Regional Clerk). In their statement they expressed concern about the amount of pollution leaking from the Munster Hamlet lagoon into the Jock River. They suggested a quicker solution, such as mechanical plant, would be the best option.

Chair Hunter pointed out the issue of route selection was before Committee; the technology issues had been considered at the 10 November 1998 meeting.

Gordon Sample, provided a written copy of his submission, held on file with the Regional Clerk. In summary, Mr. Sample questioned the necessity of the public meeting to consider the Official Plan Amendment. He noted, had the Committee and Council heeded his advice to decommission the Munster Hamlet lagoons and proceed with a sewer during the Official Plan review hearings, this amendment would not be necessary.

Mr. Sample went on to say, at the time he was advocating a sewer, he was not aware of the technology available for on-site treatment. He then referred to the motion (No. 72) approved by Council on 11 March 1998, which directed staff to investigate a “wastewater treatment facility” and not a pipeline. He offered that CRA deviated from the terms of reference set out in Motion 72 and accepted two non-compliant proposals for pipelines and these were subsequently recommended by CRA and Regional staff as the preferred alternative.

At this juncture, Chair Hunter reminded the speaker the issue at hand was the Official Plan Amendment and approval of the recommended route for the pipeline. He noted a public hearing was held in November to consider the technology issues and stated the points raised by Mr. Sample were addressed at that time. The Chair explained this amendment is necessary because any addition of Regional infrastructure in the rural area must be noted in the Regional Official Plan.

Mr. Sample felt the engineers report, which he found fault with, was too readily accepted by both Goulbourn and Regional Council. Chair Hunter offered, if and when there is a request for a “bump-up” to the Environmental Study Report (ESR) Addendum, objectors would have an opportunity to raise these issues again.

Councillor Munter noted the speaker at one point supported the use of a sewer and he asked if his objections would disappear if ROPA 5 were amended to remove the limit on the servicing capacity and the pipeline were oversized. Mr. Sample stated this would not satisfy his objections. He explained he is convinced the alternative on-site treatment technology available would better address the Munster situation.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Munter, Mr. Sample stated although he is in agreement with the growth restrictions in Munster currently, he did not feel it was appropriate to put constraints “on the planners of tomorrow” (i.e. 10 to 20 years in the future).

Werner Daechsel, Vice President, Outreach appeared before the Committee and provided members with a copy of his presentation, together with an Executive Summary of the main points of his presentation (held on file with the Regional Clerk).

Mr. Daechsel began by questioning how Recommendations 1 and 2 were linked. He said the most important decision to be made by the Committee was whether the Official Plan would be changed. He said he was under the impression the present policies of the Official Plan protected watersheds from arbitrary transfer of water.

At Councillor Munter’s request, Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, explained the matter before Committee was the culmination of two different processes that the Region has gone through in lengthy detail: an Environmental Assessment pursuant to the Environmental Assessment Act; and, an Official Plan Amendment pursuant to the Planning Act. The Region has provided for a full process for people to have their input with respect to the choice of the technology. The Official Plan requires, because of the particular technology selected by the Environmental Assessment process, that we have an amendment to detail where the pipeline should be which was the product of the Environmental Assessment process.

Mr. Marc stated if this matter is adopted by Council, there are three possible outcomes. The first is that in the end nobody asks for a bump-up to an individual Environmental Assessment and no one submits an appeal to the Amendment, in which case the Region would be able to proceed. The second possibility, is that someone requests a bump-up and someone requests an amendment and the bump-up is denied but the appeal proceeds to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). In that instance, Regional staff would argue before the board that the authority charged with reviewing the technology (i.e. the Ministry of the Environment), has exercised their authority and found the decision by Regional Council to be satisfactory and therefore his submission to the Board would be that it is clearly a matter of route selection and not the selection of technology at issue. The third possibility, is that both the bump-up request and the appeal go through a full process in which case staff would be appearing before a joint Board composed of a member of the Environmental Assessment Board and a member of the OMB and of course in that instance everything would be on the table.

Mr. Marc then addressed the question of whether or not submissions should be taken on the question of the technology to be utilized and offered, in his opinion, a full and ample opportunity has been provided to those who wished to do so, to make submissions with respect to the technology. He said, therefore this would no longer be an issue before Committee and Council and submissions on this issue would not be in order. Presenters can make submissions with respect to the route of the pipeline and whether or not they believe a pipeline is necessary.

Councillor Munter asked for a response to Mr. Daechsel's question with regard to the existing policies in the Official Plan. Mr. Marc replied the Official Plan does not permit the conveyance of sewage to the Pickard Centre by pipeline at this point in time.

Mr. Daechsel felt that many of the environmental questions had been ignored. As well, he disagreed with the statement that the public had adequate opportunity to provide input, as he felt it had not even been close to adequate.

Mr. Daeschel went on to say the Canadian Institute for Environmental Law and Policy in a recent paper stated "Water transfers between different watersheds... should be banned outright" (i.e. between the Jock River basin to the Ottawa River basin). Mr. Daechsel urged committee to think about this and not rush the matter through.

Councillor Beamish asked if there was any Regional by-law or anything in the Official Plan that says the Region cannot transfer water from one watershed to another. Mr. Tunnacliffe stated he was not aware of any policy that would prohibit this. Mr. Marc pointed out this was in fact done this year, by means of trucking as opposed to a pipeline and that was perfectly in order.

Councillor Stewart had questions concerning the paper referred to by Mr. Daechsel, from the Canadian Institute for Environmental Law and Policy. She asked what the magnitude of the “watersheds” referred to in the paper would be. Nancy Schepers, A/Deputy Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department, indicated she did not have this information but undertook to provide it to the Councillor.

Mr. Daeschel pointed out the amount of water that will be pumped out of Munster in September will be 20 times the flow that is in the Jock River and this body needs water badly. Councillor Stewart noted it is going out of a very small sub-watershed into a larger watershed and it is not really leaving the Ottawa River watershed. She noted this was investigated by CRA and they determined that this was only .2% of the basin of the Jock. Mr. Daechsel opined CRA had given the wrong figure.

Councillor Legendre sought clarification about the first point under “Information Discrepancy” in Mr. Daechsel’s submission. Mr. Daechsel explained by implementing a pipeline, the opportunity to increase the flow of the Jock River (e.g. 20 times what it is in the low flow month of September), will have been missed. He indicated he had a paper to document this and as well, a subsequent speaker would attest to this fact.

Brian Finch, Vice President, Friends of the Jock River, appeared before Committee and began by referencing comments made by Councillor Stewart with respect to the magnitude of the Jock River. He noted the Jock River watershed comprises approximately 561 square kilometres and is a fairly substantial watershed.

Mr. Finch felt Council made the correct decision when it requested a review of the new technologies to solve the Munster Hamlet wastewater problems. The ensuing process called for the siting of that treatment in Munster; the pipeline proposal involves neither new treatment technology nor treatment in Munster. Friends of the Jock River therefore feel the process has been compromised. He also stated since non-compliant proposals were accepted in this instance, they are concerned for the future consultative processes.

Mr. Finch went on to say they do not believe the pipeline is necessary and to speak of the problems that could ensue with the transfer of water from the Jock River watershed into the Ottawa River, such as the lowering of the water table in Munster causing some land owners to drill deeper. The speaker noted the transfer of water from one watershed to another is the subject of an OMB appeal in southern Ontario and Friends of the Jock River will be watching the outcome of this hearing with interest.

Mr. Finch then addressed the issue of the recommended route for the pipeline going through the Richmond Fen to Richmond. He noted the Richmond Fen is a Provincially Significant Wetland and is the largest fen in eastern Ontario. While the proposed route goes through the fen along an existing road allowance, he said he was not aware of any

environment impact study that had been done on this route and he did not believe the pipeline could be constructed along the side of a road without affecting the surrounding areas. He indicated his belief that the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority had expressed concern about this to the Region

With respect to social environment, Mr. Finch said, although it is not of particular concern to the Friends of the Jock, he was puzzled that the RMOC and Goulbourn Township have not considered the constraints that a pipeline would place on the expansion of Munster and Richmond. Once a pipe goes into the ground, expansion in either village is not really possible without considerable expenditures, however, the choice of on site treatment in Munster would allow it to expand by the addition of treatment modules on an incremental basis.

In concluding his remarks, Mr. Finch noted the pipeline option involves the retention of an existing sewage lagoon cell (which must be repaired) for maintenance and emergency use. He said regardless of the purpose, it is still going to be a sewage lagoon and he questioned why the Region would be taking this off the Official Plan schedule. Mr. Finch urged Committee and Council not to rush this issue.

Councillor Munter indicated his agreement that this matter should not be rushed. He expressed surprise that an environmental group would advocate farmland and other non-developed land around Munster to be developed and that a failing of this plan is that it prohibits that from happening. The Councillor pointed out it is not an accident that the Region is prohibiting this from happening rather it is a very specific policy objective. He asked if it was a position of the Friends of the Jock River that there should be more urban development in Goulbourn Township than is already foreseen.

Mr. Finch indicated it was more a statement of fact that development is going to occur and although Friends of the Jock do not actively support the development of the area, if there is development they would like to ensure it is done in an orderly fashion with good environmental processes in place.

Ken McRae, Friends of the Jock River, stated, in speaking with George Godin of CRA, he advised the average annual amount of wastewater being handled by the Munster Lagoons is approximately 220,000 cubic metres. Of this amount, he said that approximately 60,000 cubic metres is lost annually through evapo-transpiration. This leaves approximately 160,000 cubic metres (or 35,200,000 gallons of wastewater) that presently seeps into the deep water table into and through the shallow water table into the Jock River and on some occasions as direct runoff into the Jock River. Mr. McRae then asked what the long term effect would be on the water table for the two communal wells in Munster Hamlet, if no treated wastewater is returned to the local water table year after year for many years.

Mr. Godin confirmed the information stated and noted it is documented in the previous study, the environmental assessment report and the hydro-geological report. He went on to say CRA estimated 153,000 cubic meters of water per year infiltrates into the ground; it takes a variety of paths, it can go down into the deep aquifer, it can also move into the overburden to the Jock River. On the assumption of the worst case scenario, when looking at impact on the Jock River and if it is assumed that all of that 153,000 cubic meters per year moves to the Jock River, it represents 0.2% of the flow of water that passes through the Jock River. When different criteria are taken into account the travel time from the Munster lagoon or the existing spray fields to the Jock River is beyond 20 years. He said CRA feels it is appropriate that the Region look at annual average flows to actually establish the impact of wastewater infiltration that could reach the Jock River. It is necessary to take into account that there is an averaging or dampening effect because of the time lag for the ground water to reach the Jock River.

Mr. McRae asked again if the 35,200,000 gallons of wastewater or at least part of it is no longer going into the water table from which those communal wells draw their water, what would be the long term effect on the communal wells. Mr. Godin indicated he could not answer that question. At this point, Chair Hunter indicated it was not standard procedure for delegations to ask questions but rather the purpose was to make presentations.

Mr. McRae went on to make a comment on the pipeline route, pointing out the direct route would be his preferred option. He indicated he could not understand why the Richmond portion of the route could not be known at this point in time. He said there are residents in Richmond who may have some objection if they knew that the pipeline was going to go down their particular street. Objections might also be made in regards to where the pipeline will cross the Jock River. Mr. McRae said if the public cannot be made aware what the full route would be before the Official Plan Amendment is approved, the window of opportunity for requesting an OMB hearing or an environmental bump-up, would be usurped.

Chair Hunter asked staff to explain the reasons why the route selection, as stated in the recommendation, was not finalized. Mr. Miller indicated, if this route is selected, staff will be working with the Township of Goulbourn and have already given them an undertaking to work with them to optimise the route. He said in an urban area such as this, utility location is a common practice. Staff feel the most appropriate time to deal with the exact location is at the detailed design stage.

Mr. McRae then reiterated his earlier comment about the lost window of opportunity for the public to object. In response to this comment, Mr. Miller indicated the specific routing would be on a street that is already urbanised. Staff will endeavour to mitigate any concerns individuals may have. With respect to the crossing of the Jock River, Mr. Miller

advised staff would be looking for an optimum location for the crossing. Chair Hunter then indicated his understanding the rules for an Official Plan do not require a specific route identification in an urbanised area. Mr. Miller indicated that to his knowledge this was correct.

Richard Bendall addressed Committee and stated Munster Hamlet residents were very concerned with the time factor and that it did not appear in the criteria. As well, he expressed concern with the rush being put on this item, offering his opinion that the matter was being run by the bureaucracy. Mr. Bendall urged every Councillor to read the report he was leaving with the Committee (held on file with the Regional Clerk).

Mr. Bendall went on to say Goulbourn Township was requested two years previous, to come up with realistic pricing of a pipeline to Richmond. At that time, the price quoted was \$8,900,000.00 and engineers had indicated there were several technical problems related to transmission of sewage over long distances through forcemains, due to the relatively small amount of sewage from Munster and the length of the time the sewage would spend in the forcemain. Mr. Bendall offered these technical problems and the costs associated with them, had not been taken into account in any of the estimates provided by CRA. He urged the Committee not to rush this matter and to look at all the technical aspects before it rises to Council.

The speaker then expressed concern about the recommended Route 1A and the fact it goes through a significant wetland. Mr. Bendall stated this wetland demands a proper wetland study. He said the pipeline will go much deeper than the road bed, and there are genuine, legitimate, professional engineering concerns that it will alter water flow.

Councillor Hume expressed offense at Mr. Bendall's comment that Committee and Council were captive of the bureaucracy. He stressed Committee and Council had gone above and beyond to accommodate the concerns associated with the Munster lagoon problem. He pointed out this Council had overturned the original recommendation to implement spray irrigation, revisited the issue and over a million dollars has already been spent.

Councillor Hume referenced a letter written by Mr. Bendall to the Ministry of Environment wherein Mr. Bendall was recommending a hook-up to the RMOC sewer system. As well, he read in the November 5, 1998 edition of the Stittsville News, that Mr. Bendall wanted the Munster sewer system to be hooked into the regional system at Richmond, as the original Certificate of Operation states the system must be hooked up when pipes become available. Councillor Hume expressed great surprise at the fact that Mr. Bendall would not now support any of the routes as he had been in agreement with such an option, a short time ago.

In response to Councillor Hume, Mr. Bendall indicated he was not singling out Councillor Hume for offense and he recognised very diligent work had been done on the part of the Councillors to re-open the issue. Mr. Bendall stated it was unfortunate the bureaucrats and the "so called experts" come up with engineering studies tailored to answer the bureaucracy's requirements and he recognised the tremendously difficult task Councillors face in discerning between the bureaucrat's agenda and the public's requirements. Mr. Bendall indicated he was at one time in favour of a pipeline, as it seemed the "honourable thing to do" given the decrepit condition of the lagoons. However, he said he was not aware of the technology available at that time.

Councillor Hume then asked Mr. Bendall if he lived in Munster Hamlet and if he was hooked up to the Munster system. Mr. Bendall replied he lives in the Munster area, but is not hooked-up to the system. Councillor Hume then asked if the proposed routes go near Mr. Bendall's property. Mr. Bendall indicated the route goes the other way, and pointed out he does not have a vested interest in this matter.

Lois K. Smith appeared before Committee and asked if the pipeline would go on the road allowance all the way, what proportion is road allowance and what proportion is the field allowance, as this would affect her choice of route options. Mr. Miller advised the pipeline would be in the road allowance, except for the connections at each end. Ms. Smith then expressed concern about the chosen route and the fact it goes through the Richmond swamp. Ms. Smith stated she was pleased that the proposed option would not diminish reserved capacity for Richmond.

Susan Springthorpe provided Committee with a written submission (held on file with the Regional Clerk) and asked that Committee members read it before making a decision. She then referenced her document and drew Committee's attention to the fourth paragraph addressing the issue of what the Province would do if a bump-up was requested. Ms. Springthorpe feels there is a considerable lack of will to countervail any local decisions at the present time. She then referenced the 1998 report by the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario documenting the decline of Ontario's capacity to protect the environment and pointed out that Municipalities through transfers of responsibilities are now making decisions regarding the environment.

Lynn Duffy appeared before the Committee and indicated she was on the Public Liaison Committee (PLC) for the route selection process. Ms. Duffy indicated the majority of PLC members feel they have successfully achieved their objectives of communicating and transferring information between the community and the project team. The PLC feels the public was provided with ample opportunity to receive information and had the opportunity to give input during the analysis of factors considered by CRA and the public was also able to bring forward other issues and express their opinion on the process. Ms. Duffy indicated her group strongly supports the final report of CRA and conveyed their

appreciation for the unlimited access to the project team members and Regional staff. She said the majority of the PLC supports the final report and the recommended route.

Being a long time resident of Munster Hamlet, Ms. Duffy stated the majority of her friends and neighbors sincerely appreciate what the Region has done by re-opening the issue, having a fair and open process, and they too support the pipeline. She advised they are anxious to have the pipeline, as they love their rural community and want to protect it.

Joe King appeared before committee and expressed concern about the downloading of environmental concerns from the Province to the municipalities. Mr. King said he was concerned about the fact that Route 1A crosses through a major asset (i.e. the Richmond Fen) and he could not see the difference in cost between Routes 2, 3, 4 and 1A. He felt a very poor value was assigned to the Richmond wetland.

The speaker advised he had seen a letter from an engineering firm in the community that offers on-site treatment at two-thirds of the lowest cost for a pipeline. In Mr. King's opinion, opting for the pipeline, was not managing assets well.

Mr. King advised the Committee, that because Route 1A crosses the Jock River, approval from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans will be required. The speaker felt staff had not been clear on a number of issues associated with this matter, including the environmental impact this crossing will have on the Jock River, and the impact the pipeline will have on the water table. In concluding his remarks, Mr. King expressed the hope that in the least, Committee would not consider Route 1 or 1A and that the pipeline would be moved away from the Richmond wetland.

Councillor Hill asked where Mr. King lived. Chair Hunter pointed out it was irrelevant where Mr. King lived, as he was free to make a presentation to the Committee. Mr. King indicated he did not live in Munster Hamlet, but he is a joint property holder there.

Councillor Legendre asked for confirmation that the pipeline would be placed in the road right-of-way and would not disturb the wetland at all. Mr. Miller confirmed it would be put in the road right-of-way, as close to the road shoulder as possible and mitigative measures (e.g. the proper type of back-fill on the pipe or clay dams to prevent movement of water in pipe beddings) would be taken during construction.

Janet Stavinga, Mayor, Township of Goulbourn, thanked Committee and indicated, on the issue of public consultation, this had been a very participatory process and there had been ample opportunity for public comment. She noted there had been numerous notices in the local and community newspapers and for the public meeting, flyers were sent to every single household in Goulbourn Township.

Mayor Stavinga advised Goulbourn Township's Committee of the Whole was in fact dealing with the issue of route selection that evening. She acknowledged the Region could not at this point advise as to the specific road the pipe will go down in the Village of Richmond, however, as the staff report indicates they are very committed to continuing discussions with the Township. She referenced concerns raised with respect to crossing the Jock River and pointed out there are already crossings for the Jock River and opportunities to link into those crossings.

The Mayor went on to outline the efforts that have been made to preserve the water in Munster Hamlet. She noted Munster serves as a model community, in terms of low-flow toilets and this plays a major role in water conservation. As well, Goulbourn Township invested money in a program to seal leaks in the local collector sewers.

In terms of the transfer of water between watersheds, Mayor Stavinga stated she was aware of concerns in British Columbia with respect to water diversions from that Province to the southern states. She said she could not speak to the paper referred to by a previous speaker, but would be looking into this to see if it was an issue.

On the issue of the limitation on Richmond's growth, Mayor Stavinga stated she had received repeated assurances (from both Regional staff and independent engineers) that the capacity for the Village of Richmond will be maintained and that capacity will be enhanced when there is a booster station added, which is in the Region's capital forecast in the next number of years.

With respect to the growth of Munster, although the pipe certainly limits growth in Munster, the speaker noted there is no intent in the Township of Goulbourn's Official Plan (to the year 2021) for Munster Hamlet to grow.

In conclusion, Mayor Stavinga noted although there is an opportunity to request an environmental bump-up, Goulbourn Council will not be requesting one (as it did in 1996) as they have not heard the same level of concerns raised by the residents this time around. In terms of the routes proposed, CRA, in choosing Route 1A have minimised the impact through the wetland area. Mayor Stavinga urged the Committee to support the staff recommendation and to waive the rules of procedure to request that Council consider this item at its meeting the next day.

Mrs. Sinha, stated she had not come prepared to speak to this item however, after listening to the speakers she felt she had to speak. Mrs. Sinha said it was her understanding that since time began diversion of rivers, creeks and lakes have been done either by human beings for their own requirement or beavers for their own requirement. She noted the Jock River was a river used by the original inhabitants of Canada, the indigenous Indians, to carry logs on big barges as a form of transportation; today not even

a toy barge can traverse the Jock River. In 1976, Nepean under the guise of protecting the farmers from the ravages of the flooding of the Jock River, passed by-law 73-76 freezing 3,000 acres of land as floodplains. Mrs. Sinha offered the real reason for the so-called motherhood words of protecting farmers from the ravages of the Jock River, was to devalue the farmers land.

At this juncture, Chair Hunter interrupted Mrs. Sinha pointing out the issue before the Committee was route selection for Munster Hamlet. He ruled Mrs. Sinha out of order and asked that she please leave the speakers' table. Mrs. Sinha voiced her strenuous objection to the Chair's ruling and the Chair in turn asked if any member of the Committee was willing to move a motion to allow Mrs. Sinha to continue. No member of the Committee was willing to do so.

Bruce Muir appeared before Committee and expressed concern about Route 2. He noted he had purchased land beside what he thought was a public park and nature preserve and now the Region wants to turn it into a sewage works. He said he attended a meeting in Munster last July and was informed of the proposed forcemain from Munster connecting to Richmond. He said he was assured this would not affect the capacity in Richmond. At that time, he proposed to Regional staff, a route directly to a connection between the forcemain that runs from Richmond up the Hazeldean. It was suggested if a wet well was made and the sewage went into the wet well and a pumping station was put in, then this would be possible. Mr. Muir noted there is suppose to be a future booster pumping station on this line anyway, so if the line ran from Munster to that future location then perhaps the future booster pumping station could be built in 2002 or 2001 rather than 2008 (as proposed in the Wastewater Management plan). The two processes could be combined, could be done economically and both problems could be solved at one time.

Mr. Muir stated he came to the meeting in November and asked why the Region was not willing to consider this option and was told the Region was considering it. However, at the next meeting held in Stittsville for the pipeline routes, although there was a route that connected to the pipeline (Route 2) it did not connect to where the future booster pumping station is going to be built. Mr. Muir expressed his disappointment that his comments appear to have been ignored. He asked that Committee modify Route 2 to include a wet well, that both routes then be priced out and when the tenders come in, a decision can then be made. He suggested the Region could find that a pipeline direct to Munster could be built for \$5 million and the future booster pumping station and the pipeline running to it could be built for \$6 million. He said although this option could cost a million more, if one took the \$500,000 that will have to be spent rectifying the problem in Richmond, the total would be reduced by \$500,000 and this would then lessen the amount that would have to be spent in 2008.

At Chair Hunter's request, Mr. Miller stated the Region has a very specific policy of "just in time" provision of infrastructure and Mr. Muir's suggestion would mean advancing this infrastructure. He said considerable analysis of the existing flows in the forcemain and in the Richmond system have been done, and it is with that data that staff are confident in the alternatives that have been looked at and in the recommended Route 1A. He opined this option will meet the needs, and actually improve the operation of the existing pipeline. Mr. Miller also noted there are technical issues related to tying into an existing pipeline. As far as advancing something from 2006, there are significant costs associated with a full fledged pump station there that would have to be replicated on the forcemain and could make this an uneconomical option.

Chair Hunter noted Route 2, in the study, drops out of the top five in its ranking. He suggested there must be many other factors that have caused it to not even be close to Routes 1, 1A and 2A. Mr. Miller noted there are some very significant technical issues of tying into a forcemain but it had been evaluated from a length perspective.

Councillor Legendre had questions concerning Route 2A. Mr. Godin replied Route 2A is a longer pipeline (about 11.5 km to Richmond) and the future booster station will relieve pressure in the forcemain from Richmond; it would be a large pump station with the same capacity that Richmond currently has. The purpose of which is to bring the capacity in Richmond from 160 litres per second up to 260 litres per second. Mr. Godin explained the existing pumps in Richmond have a certain capacity based on its delivery of pressure so it has to send water all the way up to the corner of Hazeldean; by only having to push the water half way (to the new booster pumping station) it can push more water. Mr. Godin stated it was his understanding the conceptual cost of the booster pump station is estimated at around \$2.2 million.

Councillor Stewart noted Mr. Muir had indicated that he had invested in land and then found it would be alongside a sewage works. She asked the presenter to explain this. Mr. Muir advised there is presently an engineers report that Council will be considering, that is recommending that the land adjacent to his property, which was designated as nature preserve or parkland in the Regional Official Plan, be used for sewage works. Councillor Stewart asked, and Mr. Muir confirmed, he was speaking about the decommissioned Richmond Lagoons. He said when he bought the land and reviewed the planning documents, it was suppose to be parkland. As well, a condition of the Ministry of Financing for the new forcemain was that once the forcemain had proved itself, the old lagoons were to be closed off and sold. Councillor Stewart asked staff if we had had more complaints from people who will be adjacent to this re-commissioned lagoon.

Mr. Miller indicated there had been discussions with the community and open houses on this issue. He said he was aware of Mr. Muir's concern and noted there is a study underway (for the last year) and the essence of this study is to protect the Jock River.

Committee Chair Hunter noted the questions were not on the issue of the route selection for Munster Hamlet. He pointed out a report on this issue would be coming to the Committee sometime in the near future.

Mr. Miller confirmed for Councillor Legendre that the re-commissioning of the Richmond Lagoon will occur regardless of where the pipeline goes from Munster to Richmond.

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

Councillor Hill asked that Committee approve the staff recommendations. She referenced the efforts that had been made by the Region to accommodate all of the concerns of the residents of Munster. Councillor Hill pointed out Mayor Stavinga was quite satisfied with the public consultation. She said after listening to a number of speakers, she suspects there is a hidden agenda here today and it is related to development. The pipe from Munster is to accommodate only the number of residents currently there - 480 residents. Councillor Hill indicated she was asking for this item to be waived to Council the next day as it will help to speed up the process. She noted it had been delayed for enough years and the problem must be dealt with.

Councillor Stewart indicated she would be supporting the staff recommendations and indicated she believes there are still outstanding concerns that have been raised today. The Conservation Authority acknowledges that all the questions have not been addressed yet, however, the detailed design stage will address some of the ground water problems and some of the details Committee does not have yet. In her opinion, much time was spent at this meeting rehashing what was done in Munster. She stressed that people have to get beyond the fact that this is not going to be a facility, it is going to be a pipeline. The Councillor referenced Mayor Stavinga's comments and stated she felt confident about supporting this direction.

Councillor Munter indicated he was generally supportive of Councillor Hill's comments, however, he said some of the issues raised during the meeting gave him pause to reflect on the route. He said he would not support the matter being waived to Council, as he would like an opportunity to consider some of the comments about the routing. The two week period would be an opportunity to get answers to some of the concerns raised.

Chair Hunter thanked everyone who appeared before Committee. There being no further discussion, the Committee considered the staff recommendations.

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council:

1. Subject to the public meeting, enact a by-law to adopt Regional Official Plan Amendment 5 to the 1997 Regional Official Plan, attached in Annex A;
2. Approve the pipeline route selected as the preferred option (option 1A) from the Munster Hamlet facility south on Munster Road to Franktown Road and then east into Richmond.

CARRIED

Councillor Hill then put forward the following motion to waive the item to Council the next day.

Moved by B. Hill

That Council be requested to waive the Rules of Procedure to consider this item at its meeting of 12 May 1999.

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, M. Bellemare, B. Hill, P. Hume, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham...6

NAYS: J. Legendre, A. Munter and G. Hunter.....3

2. LAND TRUSTS

-Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals report dated 14 April 1999

Committee Chair Hunter had to leave the meeting and Vice Chair Stewart took the Chair in his absence.

Amy Kempster, Federation of Citizens' Association (FCA) appeared before the Committee and indicated her group strongly supports this initiative in principle. She qualified the FCA's support rests on the understanding that the Region will not download and that it will continue to support all its present efforts and initiatives in this domain. Ms. Kempster suggested a high profile business person (perhaps from the high-tech industry) be recruited to chair the Land Trust committee, as she felt this would be a draw for others to "get on board". This would convey the message that Ottawa is a green community and would make it attractive to high-tech employees. In Ms. Kempster's opinion, many people in the area would support this initiative.

In response to questions posed by Chair Stewart, Nick Tunnacliffe, Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals, confirmed the Land Trust initiative does not replace what is currently being done by the Region. The Official Plan policies will stay in place and the budget will be considered by Council each year. Mr. Tunnacliffe also stated staff agree a community champion is needed to make this initiative work.

Barbara Barr, Greenspace Alliance for Canada's Capital (GACC), made a brief presentation to Committee. She relayed her group's support for this initiative and staff's recommendation as they believe land trusts can be a constructive approach to protecting open space and environmental features in Ottawa-Carleton. The Greenspace Alliance for Canada's Capital hopes something can be created in terms of preserving land that residents in the region can be proud of and serve as a model for other cities. Using land trusts for urban lands is a novel idea in Canada, although it has been used for rural lands.

Ms. Barr conveyed her group's appreciation to the Region for coming up with this idea, and for the collaborative effort between Regional staff and the GACC. She said the CACC would be ready to participate in any future working group if invited to do so.

There being no further speakers, Chair Stewart read a motion put forward by Councillor Munter.

Councillor Munter stated his motion would provide assurance to the public that the land trust initiative would not replace the things the Region is currently doing and it does not mean the Region is going to cut its green space acquisition budget. It should simply state that this in addition to the Region's current effort.

Councillor van den Ham pointed out this is mentioned through out the report and did not believe it was necessary so he would not be supporting this motion.

Moved by A. Munter

Council reiterates its support for its current greening, greenspace acquisition and other policies to conserve the natural environment and that the land trust proposal is intended to supplement and augment existing efforts.

CARRIED
(R. van den Ham and B. Hill
dissented

The Committee then considered staff's recommendation, as amended

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend to Council that:

1. Council support in principle the creation of a land trust organisation focusing on urban Ottawa-Carleton and form a working group of potential partners to define the possible form and mandate of such an organisation;
2. Council provide logistical support and any necessary facilitation and expert advice for the working group from the Environmental Resource Areas Acquisition account.
3. Council reiterates its support for its current greening, greenspace acquisition and other policies to conserve the natural environment and that the land trust proposal is intended to supplement and augment existing efforts.

CARRIED as amended

3. ASHCROFT DEVELOPMENT INC. CENTRAL PARK SUBDIVISION
CLYDE/MERIVALE - CITY OF OTTAWA REGISTRATION PROCESS - PHASE 2
-Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner report dated 30 April 1999

Roger Hunter, Planner, Planning And Development Approvals Department made a brief presentation to Committee on the staff report.

Chair Stewart referenced the letter dated 24 December 1998 attached as Annex C to the staff report and had questions concerning the conditions referred to therein and whether or not they had been met or were close to being met. Mr. Hunter noted one of the conditions stated Ashcroft must fulfill all requirements of prior subdivision agreements between Ashcroft Development and the Region. He said some of the conditions contained in those agreements included that the owner had to advise purchasers beyond Phases 1 and 1B that the Plan of Subdivision they were buying into could not be registered until the stormwater management facility was constructed and operational. Another condition was that the developer had to go back to purchasers in Phase 1 and 1B and amend the Purchase and Sales Agreement to advise that the roads were designed and constructed in such a manner to collect storm water surface which meant that temporary pools of water would accumulate during periods of heavy precipitation. Another condition was that the developer had to provide notice to all purchasers in Phases 1 and 1B and those who had already signed agreements beyond Phases 1 and 1B that he could not rely on paragraph 19 of the original Purchase and Sales Agreement which purported to limit the ability of purchasers to appeal Land Use Planning applications (e.g. subdivisions, severances, zoning amendments, etc.).

Mr. Hunter advised that to date, the developer had not met any of these requirements, although it is in the process of doing so.

Chair Stewart stated she could understand there would be trouble constructing the stormwater treatment pond to operate before this building season, however, the other requirements were basically for notification. She sought assurance these requirements would be fully met before the subdivision is finally registered. Mr. Hunter pointed out this is a requirement set out in Mr. Marc's letter.

Responding to questions posed by Chair Stewart, with regard to the fourth point in his letter, Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, explained when the original Assaly lands were approved, as well as the Official Plan Amendment for the Region's land there was to be a bus link between the two that would allow the bus to go on Central Park Drive and exit somewhere on Clyde Avenue. This would have put the entire subdivision within 400 meters walking distance of a bus route. The concept plan put forward by Mr. Choo for consideration would close off that bus link. While buses could continue to go through Regional land in Central Park Drive, they would no longer go through the former Assaly land. This point was intended to address essentially housing in the Assaly lands no longer being within 400 meters walking distance of a bus stop.

Mr. Marc then indicated Mr. Choo had raised with him earlier that afternoon, the question of the semi-detached units along Clyde Avenue, for which he has applied for re-zoning. Staff are looking at these particular units and Mr. Marc indicated he had not yet spoken with OC Transpo, and therefore did not have a position on this for Committee. He said however, he would provide a position on this when the item rises to Council.

Chair Stewart then asked Mr. Marc to explain an inhibiting order. Mr. Marc advised an inhibiting order is an order under the Lands Titles Act, that, where there is a subdivision agreement on title, allows the Region, as-of-right, to apply to the Land Registrar for an order that is registered on title. This order prevents the conveyance of land and it prevents mortgages from going on title until such time as the inhibiting order is removed. It does not however, stop building permits being issued. Ashcroft, or Clyde Avenue Holdings Inc. (which is the sister corporation which owns the former Assaly lands) would be able to obtain building permits but until such times as they have satisfied the obligations in the subdivision agreement, they would not be able to pass title to the persons who wish to purchase land from them.

Chair Stewart then asked who determines if those conditions have been met. Mr. Marc indicated it would be legal and planning staff jointly.

Chair Stewart then asked staff to explain why the stormwater management facility is needed on site. Mr. Hunter advised it serves two functions: to treat stormwater so that a

better quality effluent comes out of the pipe and for stormwater retention. He explained the Cave Creek Collector was sized with the pond being in place and so without the pond, the pipe is not big enough to handle the stormwater and surcharging and downstream flooding of basements would occur.

Mr. Hunter confirmed for Councillor Stewart that the Region has allowed the developer to build up to 320 units without the stormwater treatment pond being built; beyond the 320 units, problems with stormwater retention will occur.

Responding to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Hunter explained the delay of the pond was a combination of a difference of opinion between the City, the Region and the developer as to what type of parkland should be designed. The design of the parkland affected the integration of the pond and, as a result of the differences of opinion, it took much longer for the City and the developer to reach a solution.

Barry Edgington, Director, Development Approvals, expanded on this, noting the problem has been trying to locate the pond within the Central Park area. Originally the park was intended to be somewhat of a passive park; City of Ottawa Parks and Recreation Department now wants a more active park (e.g. baseball fields, soccer fields, etc.). It has taken them some time to establish the configuration of the design of the park area and as a result of that delay, the delineation of where the pond should go. The issue has recently been resolved to a point final enough to establish the pond construction.

Mr. Edgington added the City of Ottawa passed a zoning by-law for the remainder of the old Regional lands in April and just that morning the City's Planning Committee approved further conditions to draft approval for the balance of the lands. Mr. Edgington opined considerable progress had been made, there had been a number of public meetings in the area and the issues are finally getting resolved. He said there is still the larger issue on the Assaly land with respect to a third access onto Clyde Ave. that will be decided as part of the revised traffic study for the area, in approximately one month.

Councillor van den Ham noted in reading the report, staff are saying this is back on track, they feel the Region has sufficient security through the Letters of Credit, and are recommending that it proceed. Mr. Edgington confirmed this and added as long as the developer meets the requirements of Tim Marc's letter (Annex C to the report).

Councillor Legendre referred to paragraph b) on page 25 of the report, which speaks to the Letters of Credit; the Councillor sought clarification on who would construct the pond. Mr. Hunter noted the intent was that the developer would construct the pond to the satisfaction of the Region. It is only in the event of a default (i.e. after 30 days if he has not commenced construction), the Region will construct the pond and cash the Letters of Credit. He noted staff are anticipating the Region will not have to take this action.

Lois K. Smith appeared before the Committee and advised although she is not a member of any community association in the area, she has lived in the Carlington area for over 20 years. She went on to say the Letter of Intent (Annex B) did not address some of her concerns. She said the Subdivision Agreement shows the environmentally sensitive lands to be in private ownership and she is utterly opposed to that and feels strongly enough about it to take it to the OMB. Although this land was zoned correctly in the Zoning By-law, one of the prior applications did infringe on it. She suggested the matter could be disposed of, if all the parties consented to transferring this land to the City.

Miss Smith then addressed the transit issue and the fact it excludes one-third of the homes in this area. She stated she was in favour of the third exit and suggested one way to get it is to make sure there is a “transit only” connection between the two halves of the subdivision. She said without this link, the subdivision agreement could be appealed to the OMB from a Regional perspective, as well as the City perspective.

On the issue of the stormwater pond, Miss Smith expressed concern that no time line had been set out for the completion of the pond or criteria for what constitutes good progress. She cautioned not including such markers could result in another OMB hearing.

David Kardish and David Choo, Ashcroft Homes appeared before Committee. Mr. Kardish assured the Committee that the developer has been endeavouring over the last year to get the stormwater pond in. He noted the application for the Certificate of Approval is in Toronto and he offered that approval would be granted within the next week. Mr. Choo has the contract tendered, some of the pond has been pre-blasted, the developer is ready to proceed and the Region has all of the securities necessary. He expressed Ashcroft’s support for the staff recommendation and urged the Committee to adopt it.

Councillor Legendre expressed concern about the layout of the development, noting it says to him “stay out unless you live here”. He said this was the type of development he hoped the Region would be moving away from. Mr. Kardish replied the layout was as a result of the Developer’s and the City’s wishes. He noted the issue of access, (i.e. whether or not to have a third access), will be the topic of discussion in the near future when the Assaly subdivision is dealt with. He noted it is Ashcroft’s position, as supported by a study, not to have a third access. Mr. Choo pointed out the current subdivision layout, is actually an improvement from what it was originally. Fundamentally, the ring road was from the previous plan. He said the issue is whether or not there will be a third access onto Maitland and suggested Maitland is currently over capacity right now. He felt the third access would create cut-through traffic through the community.

Having heard from all speakers, the matter returned to Committee. Chair Stewart explained the Carlington Community Association and the Central Park Community Association are concerned with letting things move ahead without being absolutely certain the outstanding administrative and legal points between the developer and the approval bodies are “ironed out”. Councillor Stewart pointed out she is very worried about the fact that the Certificate of Approval for the treatment pond has not been obtained yet and noted it had been imminent for almost one and a half years. In this regard, she indicated she had a motion to address these concerns that she wished to put forward and Councillor Legendre agreed to take the Chair so Councillor Stewart could move this motion.

The Councillor then read her motion.

With leave of the Committee, Mr. Kardish stated although he did not have a problem with the intent of Councillor Stewart’s motion, he asked that it not limit the location of the construction of the homes (i.e. No. 5except for Manhattan Crescent and Yorkville Street). He indicated Ashcroft would be willing to live with the 320 unit cap.

At Committee Chair Legendre’s request, Mr. Edgington advised if the Region keeps the cap that was put on originally, the intent was that nothing beyond the 320 units would be registered until the pond was built and somewhat operational. He said from a staff point of view, where that 320 units goes is irrelevant.

Councillor Legendre asked why Manhattan Crescent and Yorkville Street were specifically identified. Mr. Hunter noted these two streets were identified because Mr. Choo had indicated he wanted to construct “Smarter Starters” townhouse units immediately on that site and therefore staff felt he could proceed with this initial phase, subject to the 320 unit maximum dwelling unit count. Councillor Legendre asked Mr. Choo if his plans had changed in terms of which houses he is marketing first.

Mr. Choo stated his comments were made last December. He said Ashcroft has sold homes in numerous parts of Phase 2 that people are waiting to occupy. He noted the construction season is very short and stressed the importance of being able to construct and deliver those homes this season.

Councillor Stewart asked if it was legal to sell homes when there is not a registered plan. Mr. Marc advised homes cannot be sold without the plan of subdivision being draft approved (which is the case for the lands to the west) but if you have draft approval it is perfectly acceptable and is indeed the standard practice to sell homes well in advance of registration.

Councillor Stewart agreed to amend her motion to remove the words “except for Manhattan Crescent and Yorkville Street”.

Councillor van den Ham noted he was in favour of developers living up to their obligations and conditions but he said he could also understand from the developer's point of view the difficulties involved with having to comply with the requirements of two levels of government (i.e. the pond and park issue). He indicated he would be supporting Councillor Stewart's motion.

Speaking to her motion, Councillor Stewart noted the lands have draft plan approval and the subdivision plan is not that much different from what has been draft approved. She said she did not believe it should be held up and that it should be able to proceed to registration. She felt the two extra conditions (in her motion) would help to give the community the assurance that they are exactly clear on what is expected from everyone. She asked that the Committee support her motion

Councillor Legendre indicated he would be supporting both the staff recommendations and the motion from Councillor Stewart. He reiterated his comments concerning his frustration with the layout of the streets in the development and said he would have liked to see more options for traffic flow and for ease of mass transit service. However, he understood it was not before the Committee at this time.

The Committee then considered Councillor Stewart's motion

Moved by W. Stewart

WHEREAS the Region imposed a condition in the Phase 1 Regional Subdivision Agreement that there would be no further registrations beyond Phase 1 of the former RMOC lands (Clyde Merivale lands) before the Certificate of Approval for the Stormwater Management Facility has been issued by the Ministry of the Environment;

AND WHEREAS the Region allowed the registration of Phase 1B without the Certificate of Approval being issued;

AND WHEREAS the Region imposed a condition in the Phase 1B Regional Subdivision Agreement that there would be no further registration beyond Phase 1B before the Stormwater Management Facility was constructed and operating to the satisfaction of the Region

AND WHEREAS the owner is now requesting the Region to permit the registration of Phase 2, being the balance of the former RMOC lands without having the Certificate of Approval and without having constructed the Stormwater Management Facility;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the following conditions be added to the departmental recommendations as items 4 and 5:

4. That the Regional Subdivision Agreement applying to the final plan intended for registration for the balance of the subdivision application 06T-92026 include the requirement that the Inhibiting Order not be lifted for all or any portion of the Phase 2 lands until the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton has received a copy of the Certificate of Approval for the Stormwater Management Facility.
5. That the Regional Subdivision Agreement applying to the final plan intended for registration for the balance of the subdivision application 06T-9026 include the requirement that the Inhibiting Order not be lifted for any portion of Phase 2, until such time as the Stormwater Management Facility has been constructed to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, and that the total number of occupied dwelling units shall not exceed 320 units until this facility is operational.

CARRIED

The staff recommendations, as amended, were then considered.

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend Council approve the following:

1. That Regional staff be authorized to register the final plan of subdivision for the balance of subdivision application 06T-92026 (former Regional lands), subject to recommendations 2 and 3;
2. That prior to registration of the final plan for the balance of subdivision application 6T-92026, Regional staff ensure that the Owner satisfies all the requirements specified in the letter dated 24 December 1998 from the Region's Legal Department to the Owner's solicitor, and any other conditions it considers reasonable to impose;
3. That the Regional Subdivision Agreement applying to the final plan intended for registration for the balance of subdivision application 06T-92026 include a requirement that the construction of the Stormwater Management Facility will commence within 30-days of receipt of the Certificate of Approval from the

Ministry of the Environment, and that satisfactory progress must be maintained before the Inhibiting Order for any part or parts of the final plan are removed.

4. That the Regional Subdivision Agreement applying to the final plan intended for registration for the balance of the subdivision application 06T-92026 include the requirement that the Inhibiting Order not be lifted for all or any portion of the Phase 2 lands until the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton has received a copy of the Certificate of Approval for the Stormwater Management Facility.
5. That the Regional Subdivision Agreement applying to the final plan intended for registration for the balance of the subdivision application 06T-9026 include the requirement that the Inhibiting Order not be lifted for any portion of Phase 2, until such time as the Stormwater Management Facility has been constructed to the satisfaction of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, and that the total number of occupied dwelling units shall not exceed 320 units until this facility is operational.

CARRIED as amended

4. AMENDMENT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE DISPOSAL OF WASTE DISPOSAL SITE LEACHATE AT THE ROBERT O. PICKARD ENVIRONMENTAL CENTRE

-Acting Deputy Commissioner Environment and Transportation Department report dated 15 April 1999

Councillor Legendre noted in the Conclusion paragraph on page 32 of the Agenda, it recommends that the conditions of approval for Trail Road be amended by deleting the requirement to be in compliance with the parameters of the Regional Regulatory Code within three years and by including a clause authorizing the Commissioner to amend the conditions of approval provided that such amendments do not adversely impact the operation of the Pickard Centre. Councillor Legendre suggested the words “or the environment by discharge from ROPEC” be added to this clause. He asked for staff comment.

Nancy Schepers, A/Deputy Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department, advised the whole intent of the Sewer Use By-law program, is to protect the environment. She indicated staff did not have any problem with adding this wording.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the words “or the environment through discharge from ROPEC” be added to the second last line of the conclusion paragraph.

CARRIED

Mrs. Sinha appeared before the Committee and wanted to address issues related to Trail Road Landfill but not specifically on the issue of the Certificate of Approval to receive leachate at the R.O. Pickard Centre.

At Chair Stewart’s request, Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, advised the matters referred to by Mrs. Sinha would be coming back to the Committee in the near future and opined the submissions Mrs. Sinha wished to make were out of order at this time.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation, as amended.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend Council approve, pursuant to section 5.2.2(9) of the Regional Regulatory Code, an amendment to the Conditions of Approval for the receipt of waste disposal site leachate at the Robert O. Pickard Environmental Centre, dated 27 March 1996, as set out in this report, as amended by the following:

- a) That the words “or the environment through discharge from ROPEC” be added to the second last line of the conclusion paragraph.

CARRIED as amended

5. AMENDMENTS TO BY-LAW 44-96 FOR THE COLLECTION, REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL OF SOLID WASTE

-Director, Solid Waste Division Environment and Transportation Department report dated 22 April 1999

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend Council approve that By-law 44 of 1996 (as amended by By-law 57 of 1997) be further amended as outlined in Annex “A” to this report to reflect changes in collection operations in accordance with contracts CE-8012 and CE-8013, and that Part 5.6 of the Regional Regulatory Code be repealed.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Original signed by Dawn Whelan

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

Original confirmed by Gord Hunter

COMMITTEE CHAIR