

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

12 NOVEMBER 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 22 October 1996.

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEMS

1. FINAL REPORT - PILOT, COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT GRANTS PROGRAM (CEPGP)
- Director, Finance and Administration, Environment and Transportation Department report dated 01 October 1996

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend Council approve:

1. **The continuation of the Community Environmental Project Grants Program (CEPGP) for 1997 in the amount of \$40,000;**
2. **That CEPGP's process and guiding principles abide by the terms included in the Corporate Grants Review;**
3. **That the current Allocations Panel members continue for the 1997 program;**
4. **That CEPGP be reviewed following the 1997 program and recommendations be brought forward regarding the renewal of the program and/or program changes.**

CARRIED

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 27 Nov 96 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 46.

2. RIDEAU RIVER STUDY UPDATE
PUBLIC CONSULTATION FRAMEWORK

- Director, Water Environment Protection Division, Environment and Transportation Department report dated 24 October 1996

Councillor Stewart noted Recommendation 2 asked that the Environment and Transportation Commissioner be authorized to proceed with the technical review and discussions with the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MOEE). The Councillor observed this would occur prior to public consultation; she asked that staff expand on this.

Nancy Schepers, Director, Water Environment Protection Division, explained the recommendation deals specifically with reevaluating the criteria. This will involve an evaluation and determination of the appropriate criteria for stormwater facilities but does not necessarily mean there will be any change. The MOEE would be involved in the discussions and evaluation and would have input as to whether it was done appropriately. If the evaluation does support a change in criteria, a report would be prepared outlining the technical recommendation, which would then be tabled at Planning and Environment Committee and public consultation (as outlined in the report) would occur.

The Committee then approved the staff recommendation.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council:

- 1. Accept the Public Consultation plan outlined in this report, including a public information session scheduled for the Spring of 1997;**
- 2. Authorize the Environment and Transportation Commissioner to proceed with the technical review and discussions with the Ministry of the Environment and Energy, in consultation with the Region's Water Quality Partners, on the re-evaluation of the present Rideau River stormwater discharge criteria.**

CARRIED

3. SURFACE WATER QUALITY PROGRAM

- Coordinator, Planning and Environment Committee report dated 06 November 1996

Ms. Nancy Schepers, Director, Water Environment Protection Division, Environment and Transportation Department, introduced Mr. Fel Petti, Manager, Surface Quality Branch, and Ms. Dale Lynch, Superintendent, Surface Water Quality Branch. Staff then presented a video produced by Midday News, which covered many of the elements involved in the

Surface Water Quality issue. Following the video, Mr. Petti provided Committee with background information and an overview of the staff report.

Responding to questions from Councillor Cullen, Mr. Petti replied the Britannia Study report had just been received from the consultants and would be made available to Committee members shortly; discussions with the community could take place early in the new year.

Councillor Legendre said he was impressed with the amount of information accumulating and the way in which it was organized, and he commended staff for their efforts. Regarding the Study's targets in terms of environmental protection, he asked what the program's specific goals were. Ms. Schepers said the target of the overall program is to understand the River and to play a leadership role in protecting the water environment. Mr. Mike Sheflin, Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department, added the bottom line is no degradation of the existing level, and to seek to have improvements over the whole surface water system Region-wide. The Councillor requested, and was assured that specific, measureable, written environmental goals will be provided in future reports and RMOC documentation.

Councillor Stewart said she had concerns over the Rideau River's health and ability to assimilate pollutants from existing land use. She said although the water may look clean, there was still concern in the community about health and the overall quality of water. The Councillor said she was committed to getting the public involved in setting the River water quality goals.

Councillor van den Ham asked whether this is actually a Regional responsibility or whether it is being downloaded from the Province's Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and Ministry of Energy and Environment (MOEE). Mr. Petti replied he did not believe this to be so. He noted the Ministries and local municipalities do not collect this information, which is essential in order to know where and how to protect the river and to allocate the funding properly. Mr. Sheflin added the Region is very involved in the water business, and the long term health of the potable water system is important. He pointed out that every dollar spent has an immediate return to the Region's residents.

Responding to a question from Councillor van den Ham concerning programme funding, Mr. Sheflin noted funding comes from water billing accounts. Councillor Munter, referring to an earlier comment that 90 percent of the work was in urban areas and only 10 percent in rural, pointed out that rural dwellers (who are not serviced, and therefore not charged for water) are not paying a share. Ms. Schepers confirmed comments made by Committee Chair Hunter that the Surface Water Quality Programme's funding was still from a one-percent charge established on the sewer surcharge on water billing accounts approximately eight years ago at the programme's inception, and that if someone were not

paying a water bill, they would not be paying into the fund. The Committee Chair thanked staff for an educational and informative report.

There being no further discussion, Committee then approved the staff recommendation.

That the Planning and Environment Committee receive the attached memorandum from the Director, Finance and Administration, Environment and Transportation Department dated 10 July 1996 for information.

RECEIVED

4. RESPONSE TO OUTSTANDING P&E INQUIRY NO. 18
AVAILABILITY OF BLUE BOXES
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report
dated 03 October 1996

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter, Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division, advised the composters available at the Region for \$10.00, are subsidized two-thirds by Provincial grant money. Once the Region's supply of composters is exhausted, it is unlikely the Region will carry composters, as they will be available (at the same price of approximately \$30.00) at area hardware stores.

Councillor Munter noted he had on many occasions delivered composters and blue boxes to constituents who could not make it to the Region to pick them up. He encouraged staff to market more broadly, the fact that blue boxes are available at other locations, at the same price. Mr. McNally confirmed that once the arrangements with the retailers are finalized, there will be advertisements to make this fact known.

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

CARRIED

5. RESPONSE TO OUTSTANDING P&E INQUIRY NO. 21
APPLIANCE WASTE FEE
- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's report
dated 24 September 1996

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

CARRIED

PLANNING ITEMS

6. CITY OF GLOUCESTER OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 13
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 16 October 1996

Nigel Brereton, Manager, Development Approvals Division, provided an overview of the staff report.

Responding to questions from Councillor Beamish, Joseph Phelan, Manager, Planning and Infrastructure Policy Division, explained that prior to Gloucester Council passing Local Official Plan Amendment (LOPA) 13, Regional staff had communicated their concerns to Gloucester staff and indicated they could not support LOPA 13. Councillor Beamish went on to express concern about the considerable length of time between Gloucester's approval of LOPA 13 and the scheduling of this item on a Planning and Environment Committee agenda.

Councillor Stewart questioned why the entire parcel of land has been designated Waterfront Open Space. Mr. Brereton noted the general principle followed was land between the road and the River was designated Waterfront Open Space. The Councillor referred to a similar piece of land south of Revelstoke Drive which has been redesignated to accommodate 500 housing units, while keeping the shoreline designated as Waterfront Open Space; she asked why the subject land would differ. Mr. Phelan replied, although he was not familiar with details of the Revelstoke application, the principle, in the 1988 Regional Official Plan for the designation of Waterfront Open Space was based on public ownership; recognizing where the Federal Government and municipalities had public land in the area. When the City of Gloucester and the Region were working on the concept plan for River Ridge (LOPA 3) it was considered that opportunities along the waterfront should be looked. This is why there are waterfront designations in the South Urban Centre and specific policies in the Regional Plan. The designations have been approved by the Minister (to Regional Road 19) but the policy has been referred to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) and will be considered at the pre-hearing on December 13.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Stewart, Mr. Phelan advised that Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) 35 included a land acquisition policy, whereby the Region on its own or in cooperation with other agencies (i.e. conservation authorities) could acquire land and/or enter into management agreements of land. He confirmed that it is not necessarily the Region's intent to purchase the subject property.

Councillor Beamish asked staff why a conflict exists between the Regional Official Plan and the Gloucester Official Plan when the two were worked on in tandem. Mr. Phelan explained the Regional Official Plan included the area of Gloucester Glen in the South

Urban Centre whereas the City of Gloucester Official Plan did not. It was acknowledged at the time the Gloucester and Regional teams were working together, that there was a difference in the Plans but it was not a concern; he noted ROPA 35 was supported by both Gloucester's Planning Commissioner and Mayor. Councillor Beamish agreed the Mayor of Gloucester did support the amendment at the time it was passed, however he felt she did so because she thought the two plans were identical. The Councillor felt that maps presented at the public meetings did not show the subject property as being included in the South Urban Centre area.

Councillor Beamish noted that negotiations took place between the larger landowners (e.g. Richcraft and Urbandale) to accommodate the Waterfront Open Space designation; he asked if negotiations had taken place with the smaller landowners. Mr. Phelan advised the Region participated with the City of Gloucester in negotiating with nine or ten smaller landowners. A number of options were looked at, ranging from Waterfront Open Space for the whole site to various development densities (including single detached urban services, multi-residential urban services and country estate development). He advised a further amendment (concerning land south of the subject property) would be before the Committee in the future, which illustrates a favorable outcome to these negotiations.

Councillor van den Ham asked for clarification on the legal status of the designation. Mr. Brereton advised ROPA 35, which was adopted by council and referred to the OMB, designates the subject land Waterfront Open Space; the underlying designation is Interim River Corridor which is a holding designation. The OMB will determine what the ultimate designation will be, however, the holding designation does not allow any new development.

In response to questions from Councillor Hill, Mr. Brereton advised that staff are recommending that no new development take place in this area until urban services are available; he confirmed this could be many years in the future.

Councillor Hume expressed concern with approving Amendment 13 in light of the pending OMB hearing. Mr. Brereton confirmed that, if the Committee approved this amendment, it would be contrary to Regional Council's position on ROPA 35. As well, if the OMB upheld the Region's designation (Waterfront Open Space), the Regional Official Plan would take precedence over the Local Official Plan. Valerie Bietlot, Solicitor, Regional Legal Department added, if it is the intent of the Committee (and Council) to approve LOPA 13, consideration would have to be deferred as it is in conflict with ROPA 35 (presently before the OMB). Modifications to ROPA 35 (to bring it into agreement with LOPA 13) could be suggested to the OMB, which they could choose to accept or not.

The Committee then heard from the following public delegations.

Ann Tremblay, Policy and Environment Planner, City of Gloucester, advised the City went through an extensive review of the South Urban Community to determine what was needed for waterfront open space and how it could be dedicated as parkland. She said the City is concerned about the Region's designation of the subject property, as this land (north of Gloucester Glen) did not form part of the master recreational plan that was done for all of the growth areas in the City. In an attempt to resolve this dispute, Gloucester staff brought all of the parties together (i.e. Transport Canada, Regional Staff, landowners and Gloucester staff) to look at the types of alternative land uses that could be provided for in that location. Ms. Tremblay referenced comments made earlier by Mr. Phelan concerning the types of densities looked at. It was Gloucester's position that a high density mixed use would maximize the amount of waterfront open space that could be retained (Gloucester's policies for parkland dedication dictate the higher the residential density, the greater the amount of land that can be dedicated for parkland use).

The speaker went on to say Gloucester staff feel the proposal (LOPA 13) represents a balance between good planning principles and the community's expectations and needs. Transport Canada has indicated they believe this plan is workable provided conditions are imposed to address their concerns about noise. LOPA 13 incorporates these conditions (e.g. permanent signage on site, standard notification on title and in the agreement of purchase and sale warning of noise impacts and that noise impact studies be conducted to mitigate as much noise as possible) and Transport Canada felt this was sufficient to reduce the risk of impacting airport operations in the long-term.

Ms. Tremblay stated the proposal is very much in keeping with the residential development in the area. She pointed out the City's Official Plan designates the total area residential (as approved by Gloucester and Regional Council) and what LOPA 13 does is pull back slightly to allow for a waterfront open space corridor. In conclusion, Ms. Tremblay asked that the Committee direct that ROPA 35 be modified and that LOPA 13 be approved.

Committee Chair Hunter stated that given the fact that ROPA 35 is before the OMB and, that Local Official Plans must conform to the Regional Official Plan, he questioned why Gloucester was seeking to have LOPA 13 approved. Ms. Tremblay replied Gloucester would very much like to see the matter taken away from the OMB altogether. It is Gloucester's belief that this type of development (7 lots and one severance) is a good compromise for everyone.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter, Ms. Tremblay advised that Gloucester requested, at the time of submission of LOPA 13, that the Region consider modifying ROPA 35. Councillor Munter, referring to comments made by Ms. Tremblay concerning Transport Canada's acceptance of this proposal, pointed out the staff report states that Transport Canada is opposed to this amendment. Ms. Tremblay conceded that Transport

Canada would prefer not to see residential development in this parcel, however, their primary concern is the long term impact on airport operations that residential development would have. They are willing to accept residential development provided there are a number of conditions as set out in LOPA 13.

Harriet Joncas advised she attended the official opening of River Ridge in the spring of 1991, at which time she was advised by both Regional Planning staff and Gloucester Planning staff that the area north of Mosquito Creek (and therefore her property) would not be affected by the Waterfront Open Space designation. Mrs. Joncas stated she has owned her property since 1969 and she only discovered her land was indeed included in ROPA 35 when she made application for severance for a lot for her son. Mrs. Joncas felt that "due course" was not adhered to as the affected landowners were not advised that their land would be affected by ROPA 35. Over the past three years much consideration has been given to resolving the situation; LOPA 13 meets with the approval of all of the landowners. Mrs. Joncas stated the Region's proposal of a Waterfront Open Space designation encompassing the entire area is not realistic. She said she did not oppose the issue of a waterfront corridor and the City has included waterfront open space in Amendment 13. Mrs. Joncas stated her family merely wants a simple severance to allow for a home for her son. She asked that the Committee approve LOPA 13.

Don Boyd, an owner of the land affected by LOPA 13, stated he was upset he was not officially notified of ROPA 35 by the Region, as he was sure that the large development landowners were notified. Mr. Boyd stated the landowners in question are willing to compromise on all major issues and said it would be very expensive for individual landowners to appear before the OMB. He urged the Committee to support LOPA 13.

Murray Chown, representing the Boyd family, advised he was before the Committee to request that LOPA 13 be approved and that staff be directed to prepare the necessary modifications to ROPA 35. The speaker noted the City of Gloucester has spent years trying to resolve this issue and he felt an OMB hearing should be avoided if at all possible. The issues dealt with by the City of Gloucester were presented to the Region at the time they forwarded LOPA 13 to the Region for approval on August 16, 1996. In their correspondence, they requested the Region also deal with the issue of modification of ROPA 35. Now, three months later staff are recommending refusal of LOPA 13 and the staff report does not contain any information about the merits of Gloucester's request. The speaker noted the subject land in the City's Official Plan is currently designated residential; the City is proposing through Amendment 13, to amend that designation to Open Space which conforms with the Region's Waterfront Open Space designation. He stated a lengthy and expensive debate in front of the OMB could be avoided, if the Committee and Council support this compromise.

Responding to questions from Committee Chair Hunter, Mr. Chown advised there is currently one permanent dwelling on the Boyd property and three or four privately owned dwellings at the north end of the site. If the Committee and Council approved LOPA 13, Mr. Chown stated the next step would be a draft plan application for subdivision filed by the Boyds for 7 single family lots. Through this process there would be negotiations between the landowners, the City and the Region to determine what land would be conveyed to either the City or the Region as part of the Waterfront Open Space. The parcel of land is 20 acres and at least 5% (1 acre) will be conveyed for public purposes. Mr. Chown added the Boyd land represents 80% of the waterfront and is substantially undeveloped.

Councillor van den Ham asked staff to expand on the practical intent of utilizing the narrow strip of land along the River as Open Space. Ms. Tremblay replied one of the key objectives Gloucester had in the development of the South Urban Community was to try to maximize the amount of linear pathway systems along the waterfront corridor. She noted in some cases, such as the existing community of Honey Gables, the pathway goes around the community.

Councillor Beamish put forward a motion to defer consideration of LOPA 13 and that Regional staff be directed to make amendments to ROPA 35 to accommodate Gloucester's LOPA 13. Speaking to his motion, the Councillor noted that Gloucester has attempted to resolve the ongoing dispute through LOPA 13. He urged the Committee to support his motion and avoid a long and costly OMB hearing.

Councillor Cullen noted ROPA 35 created policies to accommodate a projected population of 100,000 people who will be living in the South Urban Community. The Amendment addressed a number of issues such as employment areas, airport issues, types of residential development, transitway amenities and waterfront open space along the River. He pointed out the amendment does not change any existing land use but it, very sensibly, does not allow any new development. The Councillor noted ROPA 35 permits the Region to retain the option of acquiring the land and he opined, when the population of 100,000 people is reached, there will be much pressure for this amenity. He felt the "chipping away" of this policy is wrong. In conclusion, Councillor Cullen felt the OMB was the correct place to settle the matter and stated he could not support Councillor Beamish's motion.

Councillor van den Ham felt if the Region wants to have Waterfront Open Space, it should be prepared to buy a parcel of land that is useable, not just a thin strip of land. The Councillor expressed support for Councillor Beamish's motion.

Councillor Munter felt Councillor Beamish had plenty of opportunity to repeal those parts of ROPA 35 that he disagreed with; instead, the City of Gloucester adopted an official

plan amendment that very clearly contravenes Regional Official Plan Amendment 35 and it is before the Committee at the “eleventh hour” (one month before the OMB pre-hearing). The Councillor felt it unfair, to those on the other side of the issue (those who believe the retention of waterfront open space is important), to modify parts of Amendment 35. He felt the issues deserve discussion in a fair and open manner.

Councillor Hill stated the “sterilization” of a few acres of land (which were not originally included in the South Urban Community) is seen all too often in the rural area. She said that unless the Region is prepared to buy all of the properties along the River, the land should be left alone. The Councillor noted the Boyds have lived on these lands all of their lives and now, when they want to do something with it, the Region denies them this opportunity. Councillor Hill felt this was unfair and suggested that more flexibility in the planning process was required.

Councillor Legendre expressed his support for ROPA 35 as approved by Regional Council. He stated it demonstrates good planning for the future community and for the greater public good in having access to the River. To try to fix the situation in the future would prove to be much more expensive. Referring to the issue of noise, Councillor Legendre pointed out Transport Canada has indicated clearly that residential development should not occur in this location. He noted it would not be good planning to put more people in this area, as the airport is getting larger; it makes no sense to work against economic development by surrounding the airport with residential development.

Councillor Stewart felt this was a difficult situation, as there are good arguments on both sides. She said although she would like to support the property owners, the fact that ROPA 35 provides for acquisition of the lands had convinced her to vote against Councillor Beamish’s motion. The Councillor also expressed agreement with Councillor Munter that this matter has not come before the Committee in a fair manner.

Referring to comments made by Councillor Munter, Councillor Beamish stated he felt the negotiations between the Region, the City and the landowners would resolve the dispute and make it unnecessary for the matter to be considered by the OMB. He said if he had known this report was going to be sprung on the Committee at the last minute before it had to get to the OMB hearing, he would have brought it forward to the Committee much earlier. With respect to his motion, the Councillor noted that staff could bring back a report and the necessary modifications to ROPA 35 (to conform with LOPA 13) could be discussed by the Committee. Councillor Beamish went on to say it is not known if the Region needs this land or what it would be used for and he opined the Region would be unable to afford to purchase the land for fair market value.

The Committee then considered Councillor Beamish’s motion.

Moved by D. Beamish

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council defer approval of Gloucester Local Official Plan Amendment 13; and that Regional staff be directed to make the necessary amendments to Regional Official Plan Amendment 35 and the Regional Official Plan so as to accommodate Gloucester Local Official Plan Amendment 13.

LOST

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

Councillor Hill then put forward the following motion.

That Planning and Environment Committee approve the open space designation recommended by Regional staff for Gloucester Local Official Plan Amendment No. 13 to Regional Council and staff be directed to acquire the lands.

Committee Chair Hunter ruled Councillor Hill's motion out of order as it is not a matter that Planning and Environment Committee has authority to deal with. He noted that on the issue of acquisition, there is the precedent of Amendment 12 of the 1978 Official Plan, which designated large amounts of land across the Region as Environmental Resource Lands. The OMB decided that if development rights were being taken away, the land would have to be acquired at fair market value. He stated although OMB decisions are not binding on another hearing, it is strong example of what a municipality can expect when it takes this kind of position.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation

Moved by J. Legendre

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council not approve Official Plan Amendment No. 13, in that it is contrary to the Regional Official Plan.

LOST

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

Committee Chair Hunter noted the report would go forward to Council without a recommendation of the Planning and Environment Committee.

COUNCILLORS' ITEMS

7. RAW SEWAGE DUMPED INTO THE QUYON
AND OTTAWA RIVERS

- Councillor Alex Munter's report dated 21 October 1996

Councillor Legendre asked staff to provide a comparison between what Quyon currently allows to flow into the Ottawa River (as they do not have a sewage treatment facility) and what the Region allows to flow into the Ottawa River by way of overflows. Jim Miller, Director, Engineering Division, advised that the population of Quyon is approximately 850 residents. In comparing the annual volume of sewage generated by Quyon, to the estimated Regional overflows (estimated because the Region does not have flow monitoring on overflows), there is approximately ten times as much volume from the Region's combined sewer overflows (CSO) going into the Ottawa River as would be generated from a municipality the size of Quyon. He pointed out however, that overflows from CSO's are of a diluted nature and are approximately 10% of the strength of regular municipal sewage. It could then be concluded that the net impact on the Ottawa River would be approximately equal.

Councillor Legendre stated although he was not opposed to the recommendation, he expressed concern about the appearance of a large Ontario municipality taking a "holier than thou" position with a much smaller municipality in Quebec. The Councillor went on to point out that if the Region is asking another municipality to clean up what they are allowing to flow into the Ottawa River, perhaps we too should be cleaning up our overflow. Mike Sheflin, Environment and Transportation Commissioner agreed with the Councillor and reminded members of the joint project currently underway (presently going through the Environmental Assessment process) with the City of Ottawa. The City is contemplating spending \$20 to \$30 million to reduce the number of overflow occurrences from 45 to 5.

Councillor Munter expressed agreement with Councillor Legendre that the Region should "tread carefully" regarding this issue however, he pointed out the Province of Quebec is prepared to provide 85% of the funding for a treatment facility and the County of Pontiac (not the Village of Quyon) is to provide the remaining 15%. He opined, in this day and age there is little excuse for having a sewage collection system and then not treating what is collected.

The Committee then considered Councillor Munter's motion.

Moved by A. Munter

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Regional Council express its concern to the Municipality of Pontiac and the Quebec Ministry of Environment and Wildlife about the dumping of untreated sewage into the Quyon River, which flows into the Ottawa River, and calls upon the municipality and province to proceed expeditiously to resolve this problem.

CARRIED

INQUIRIES

Councillor Stewart asked when the last pick-up date for leaf and yard waste would be. Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division advised the original program was to have finished last Friday. However, due to the amount of leaf and yard waste out there, there will be one last pick-up the week of November 18. This was advertised on the Regional page in the weekend newspapers. Responding to further questions from Councillor Stewart, Mr. McNally advised that if homeowners miss this last pick-up, leaf and yard waste will not be collected in the regular waste stream. He advised it would be best for residents to compost the leaf and yard waste over the winter or store it in bags for next summer.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

*Original signed by
Dawn Whelan*

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

*Original confirmed by
Gord Hunter*

COMMITTEE CHAIR