

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

13 APRIL 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 23 March 99.

CARRIED

POSTPONEMENTS / DEFERRALS PLANNING ITEM

1. BROOKSIDE GARDENS, PLAN OF SUBDIVISION TOWNSHIP OF RIDEAU
- Deferred from the Planning and Environment Committee meeting of 23 March 1999
- Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department report dated 09 March 1999

Leslie Paterson, Senior Planner, Development Approvals Division, provided Committee with an overview of the staff report. She reminded Committee that under the Planning Act, the Region is the approval authority for plans of sub-division. Normally, this responsibility is delegated to staff unless there is a contentious issue, a disputed amendment or a disputed application. In this case, Brookside sub-division is a disputed application. The Planning Act permits the approval authority to do only two things: it can approve the subdivision or refuse it. In the past, the Region could have referred the application to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) or acted on someone else's request to refer it to the Board; presently, the OMB decides whether an appeal has merit or not.

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 28 April 99 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 30.

Ms. Paterson noted staff are recommending Planning and Environment Committee refuse the application. The Township has raised a number of concerns, the key one being the development is incompatible with the adjacent development and therefore, they have recommended that it be refused. Traditionally, the Region has relied on the municipalities to make decisions regarding compatibility. In terms of technical issues, Regional staff are of the opinion the sub-division meets all of the requirements, however, the incompatibility issue is still outstanding and should be decided by the OMB. She said the Zoning By-law is already going to the OMB, regardless of Committee and Council's decision on the sub-division, and it is staff's view all of the information should be together before the OMB.

Chair Hunter pointed out compatibility and conformity are two separate issues. He noted the current zoning approved by the Township of Rideau is .5 acre lots and the application to amend the zoning was turned down by the Township. The Chair felt the Region could not do anything but refuse a sub-division application that does not conform with the zoning in place, notwithstanding the merits of conformity.

In response to Chair Hunter's comments, Ms. Paterson concurred and reiterated that if all of the issues are forwarded to the OMB together, it will be easier for them to make a decision on the zoning by-law.

In response to further questions from Chair Hunter, Ms. Paterson advised normally, the Region could approve a subdivision subject to the zoning being approved, however, in this instance the applicant had first applied to the Township for the zoning change, which was turned down. The decision on the zoning application has been appealed to the OMB and a hearing date has been set. Ms. Paterson stated once the matter is before the OMB, it is important for the Region and Township to have prepared draft conditions, in the event the Board approves the subdivision.

Councillor Legendre referenced a letter from Rob Fraser, a Councillor with the Township of Rideau (held on file with the Regional Clerk) which stated in part, "that townhomes are going to be adjacent to estate homes on executive lots, where a number of homes are worth more than one million dollars and therefore buffering will be needed". Councillor Legendre suggested in this instance the buffering referred to, was not for environmental purposes but rather a visual buffer to block the lower priced homes from the view of the high priced homes.

Councillor Legendre then asked if the compatibility issue referred to the fact the owners of the estate homes do not want to be next to the proposed subdivision. Ms. Paterson indicated that when referring to compatibility, she was simply quoting the Township of Rideau, as the Region does not determine compatibility at a local level. Ms. Paterson offered, in her view, the Region is deferring to the judgment of the Township. The Region

would not be agreeing or disagreeing but rather is allowing the decision to be made by the OMB.

Councillor Hill, referring to comments made by Councillor pointed out the compatibility issue has nothing to do with the price of the houses. Rather, this is a rural township and row houses are entirely different from the usual single family residential houses.

There being no further questions of staff, the Committee heard the following speakers.

Bob McKinley representing the West Manotick Community Association, began by expressing his thanks to Mr. Edgington and Ms. Paterson for meeting with him to discuss some of his concerns. Mr. McKinley indicated his agreement with the staff position and offered the Committee could only deal with the subdivision by letting it go to the Board with the conditions.

Mr. McKinley noted the proposed development is very close in proximity to a tributary of the Rideau river (i.e. the Wilson-Cowan Drain). It is a high density development for private services; well and septic tank services are being proposed here for fifty units on densities that are one unit per .1 hectare or ten units per hectare. The Rideau Valley Conservation Authority has approved the peat based system that will allow this development to occur. He stated his concern was that treatment of sewage (in what he considered somewhat of an experimental technology) in this location, may not in fact prove to be the ultimate solution and it could fail.

Mr. McKinley went on to explain the plan of subdivision proposes townhouses on the easterly side of subject property, which is immediately adjacent to the Wilson-Cowan Drain. This waterway flows year round directly into the Rideau River and he offered there may in fact be discharge that leaves the peat based system and flow through the water course into the Rideau River. This is a very sensitive river and there are higher performance standards needed here than exist almost anywhere else. In particular, waste that discharges in this system in the nature of phosphate and nitrate are very highly controlled. Mr. McKinley referred to the Village Court subdivision in Manotick which is using the most advanced technology known in North America to get water effluent standards down to an acceptable level, at an extremely high cost.

The speaker expressed concern with the proposed density of this project and said if the system, as is being proposed, fails then, pursuant to the Region's subdivision agreement, the condition looks to the owner of the household to affect the remedy. He said there is no accountability on the part of the developer and or his engineers.

Mr. McKinley noted with traditional servicing, the Region seeks security for the performance and installation of all services and it must be satisfied before it releases the

letter of credit that the developer posts as security for those guarantees that the system is properly installed and functioning. Where that method breaks down is that services are traditionally installed before housing. Mr. McKinley proposed that, rather than leave the owner and possibly the public without a “safety net”, the Region impose some obligation on the part of the developer and/or the civil engineer that says the system is going to work. He suggested an amendment be made to condition 24 requiring the developer’s engineer to give opinions that the system will function in a way that is necessary.

Chair Hunter inquired if the subdivision agreement contained a condition that would address Mr. McKinley’s concerns. Mr. Tunnaclyffe advised condition 29 would address this issue. Ms. Paterson added condition 31, as a general condition, would allow any number of things to be added.

Mr. McKinley felt these conditions did not address his clients’ concerns. Chair Hunter indicated Councillor Hill had put forward an amendment incorporating the wording suggested by Mr. McKinley.

Councillor Stewart offered the proposed system is more efficient and would take less space than other septic systems and she did not agree with the speaker’s opinion that it was experimental. She said it would take years before the peat moss bed is fully utilized and she asked if Mr. McKinley truly expected such a system would fail, resulting in the migration of the nutrients a couple of hundred meters into the Rideau River.

Mr. McKinley pointed out Manotick has the highest septic system failure rate under the Ontario New Home Owner Program. He said if there is a failure, it should be addressed by someone other than the home owner. Mr. McKinley stated the OMB would ultimately decide whether or not this is an appropriate condition and he said he would rather not go to the Board in a contest with the Region over whether the developer or the home owner should pay for a mistake.

Councillor Stewart asked staff if they were concerned about the proposed system. Ms. Paterson advised septic systems are the responsibility of local municipalities under the Building Code. The Conservation Authority, as their agent, reviewed the application using both a peat system and a traditional system. They have indicated they are confident that either one would work in this location.

Councillor Legendre asked staff to comment on Mr. McKinley’s comparison of the proposed system and that used in the Village Court development. The Councillor noted there were serious environmental concerns with Village Court and because of these, conditions were imposed. He said it would appear staff are much less concerned in this instance.

In response to Councillor Legendre's comments, Ms. Paterson advised this is an entirely different type of system and it is a larger area than Village Court. Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, added the technology originally proposed for Village Court had not been proven at full scale anywhere in the world, whereas the peat based system is a proven technology.

Responding to further questions from the Councillor, Ms. Paterson indicated Village Court was a public a communal system and the Region is required to own and operate all public communal systems. In this instance the septic systems are private systems.

Bill Holzman, Planner, Simmering and Associates, retained by Beaver Road Builders. Mr. Holzman referred to his letter to the Committee dated April 6 1999 (held on file with the Regional Clerk). He stated he was before the Committee to ask that the staff recommendation be overturned.

Mr. Holzman pointed out Regional staff have indicated all technical matters have been addressed, and, during the zoning by-law process the applicant addressed all issues raised. As well, a Certificate of Approval has been obtained for the sewage system. The speaker pointed out the issue of compatibility is a local municipal responsibility and not a Regional matter. This is a vacant piece of property surrounded by some lovely homes, but there is also a bona fide application for zoning to change the use on these lands and this matter will be addressed by the OMB. Mr. Holzman stated it would be most expedient to have the subdivision application before the Board at the same time.

Referring to page 9 of the staff report, wherein it states staff will be required to attend the OMB hearing, Mr. Holzman questioned on what basis staff will defend the Region's position as there are no outstanding technical matters. He said the Region has been delegated authority by the Ministry to approve or turn down subdivisions. On this basis, Committee has to judge if the process has been followed and if there are any technical matters outstanding. Mr. Holzman stated it is evident the process has been followed and there are no technical matters that have not been answered either by way of studies or by conditions. He said although there is some sensitivity to the local municipality opinion about the use on these lands, this should not undermine the Region's approval authority to consider draft approving the subdivision subject to standard conditions.

Councillor Munter asked staff if the Region could defer to the municipality's ability to carry the issue, and not participate in the OMB hearing other than to answer questions if called. Ms. Paterson advised the Region would probably have a very small role, if at all, at the OMB. She suggested the Region might want to defend some of the conditions, should someone argue that they be removed.

Councillor Munter asked if not going to the hearing could be an option. Mr. Marc indicated that subdivisions are brought forward to the OMB by an owner applicant and, unless otherwise instructed by Committee and Council, the Region (i.e. the Legal Department) does not typically appear at subdivision hearings. He said it is possible that Ms. Paterson may be subpoenaed by one of the two parties..

In response to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Holzman indicated the original plan of subdivision was for an estate lot subdivision and was approved in August, 1993. Since that time there has been some change in philosophy (both at Provincial and Regional levels) with respect to intensification and making better use of existing services and facilities, as well as a change in the market. When the owners looked at all the factors they concluded estate lots were not selling and were not the best use of this land.

Councillor van den Ham then asked if there was any consultation with the area residents to discuss this change. Mr. Holzman indicated although an open house per se, was not held, the public did have opportunity to participate through the zoning process, the secondary planning process and the subdivision process. He said the local municipality has requested the applicants meet with concerned individuals before they came to a final conclusion however, attempts to arrange such a meeting were not successful.

Councillor Legendre advised he had asked Legal staff to draft an amendment to conditions 30 or 31 with respect to financial security for the sewage system and asked for Mr. Holzman's comment. Mr. Holzman stated although his clients had concerns with a couple of conditions proposed by staff, they felt the matter would end up at the Board, where there would be discussion on the specific conditions. Mr. Holzman opined at issue is the zoning and it should be left to the OMB to decide if anything other than single family homes should be allowed in a village that has over 98% single family homes. Councillor Legendre stated he did not have a problem with compatibility; his only concern was with the impact on the environment should the system fail and who should pay for it.

Councillor Stewart stated she could not understand Councillor Legendre's concern. She offered the peat moss system would outlive a traditional septic field because of the aerobic activity. She said if the system failed, sewage would not be discharged into the river (as would happen with Village Court). There could be some migration of the nutrients or some ponding, but it would likely only require that the septic tank be pumped out more regularly and there would be no impact on the river.

Chair Hunter then read a motion put forward by Councillor Hill and, at Councillor Munter's request, Mr. McKinley explained the intent of the amendment. He said there should be accountability and assurance by the owner or his professional advisor that this system will achieve the performance requirements of the Province for the discharge of

phosphate and nitrate. He felt the groundwater, as it discharges into the river, should achieve the same standards imposed by the Region for Village Court.

Councillor Munter indicated he had constituents who had experienced septic failures and were responsible for remedying the situations; he asked what was different in this instance. Mr. McKinley offered the public assumes when they buy a property that the authorities have taken all reasonable care to ensure there will not be failures and if there are, that they will be addressed somehow.

Responding to questions posed by Chair Hunter, Ms. Paterson advised a septic system is typically reviewed to ensure the lot is large enough so that all nitrates are attenuated on site; she offered Mr. McKinley's amendment would have the engineer who does the study, certify it. Mr. McKinley added the owner's engineer would be asked to state an opinion, upon which he could be pursued if his opinion was wrong and the system fails.

There being no further discussion, the Committee considered Councillor Hill's motion.

Moved by B. Hill

That condition 25 be amended by the addition of the following: "This analysis shall be supported by the opinion of the civil engineer of the owner that the quality of groundwater will conform with the standard applicable to the Rideau River for nitrate and phosphate."

LOST

NAYS: A. Munter, G. Hunter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham.....4

YEAS: M. Bellemare, B. Hill, and J. Legendre.....3

Councillor Legendre then presented an amendment to condition 31 which would require the Township to require financial security from the developer to guarantee the performance of the sewage treatment system. He said legal staff had confirmed the Region could ask the Township to require financial security and noted this was essentially what was done in the case of Village Court. The Councillor felt this would provide the people of Manotick with a level of comfort.

Councillor Stewart pointed out there is a world of difference between Village Court and Brookside Gardens. The system proposed for Brookside Gardens will be privately owned and operated and the upkeep is entirely the responsibility of the homeowner, whereas Village Court has a communal septic system for which the Region is ultimately responsible for the ownership and operation and would therefore certainly want to have some financial safeguards in place. Councillor Stewart indicated she could not support Councillor Legendre's amendment.

Councillor van den Ham noted the proposed project is for 50 units over 10 acres while Village Court has approximately 100 units within one building serviced by one communal system. Mr. Marc offered the initial phase of Village Court was approximately 96 units with a possibility for a further phase of approximately 24 units with a small scale commercial development.

Responding to further questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Marc explained the money the Region still hopes to receive as security for Village Court, was meant to help defray the cost should there be any default in the initial installation and secondly to help defray any cost of dealing with any malfunction of the system.

Chair Hunter referred to condition 32 and offered his opinion this condition says the owner may be required to provide financial security as part of the conditions Rideau Township "could" impose under maintenance and legal responsibilities with respect to the sewage treatment system. He asked if the proposed amendment to condition 31 would be interpreted as Rideau Township "shall" require. Mr. Marc offered the purpose of the motion, as he understood it, is to take away the discretion and to ensure there is something available to a public authority to help deal with any costs should the system malfunction.

Councillor Legendre confirmed Mr. Marc's interpretation and added the intent of his motion was to remove any ambiguity and protect the home buyers.

There being no further discussion, Committee considered Councillor Legendre's motion.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the following words be added to condition 31: "In addition, the Township shall require financial security to guarantee the performance of the sewage treatment system".

LOST

NAYS: D. Beamish, B. Hill, A. Munter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham.....5

YEAS: M. Bellemare, P. Hume, G. Hunter and J. Legendre.....4

Councillor van den Ham stated he agreed with almost everything in the staff report, except for the recommendation that the subdivision be refused. He asked staff what harm there would be in approving the subdivision. Ms. Paterson pointed out even if the Committee approved the subdivision, it would still end up at the OMB and offered perhaps there would be no harm in approving it. She explained the reasoning behind staff's recommendation to refuse the subdivision was that the Township, who has responsibility

in matters of compatibility and neighbourhood impact, had requested it be refused on that basis.

Councillor van den Ham expressed his concern, that in turning down the subdivision application, the Committee may be sending a message to the OMB that the Region is not in favour of the whole situation when in fact the technical issues (for which the Region has responsibility) have been addressed. Mr. Tunnacliffe offered the difficulty is that the subdivision cannot simply be referred to the Board; the Committee has to decide whether to approve or refuse it. Staff felt the Township's concerns were legitimate and therefore sided with the Township on that one issue (i.e. compatibility); on all other issues, staff agree with the developer.

Councillor van den Ham suggested if Committee and Council approve the staff recommendation, the appropriate wording should accompany the decision to the OMB. Basically, it should state the technical issues have been addressed and the sole reason for not approving is because of the issue of compatibility. Mr. Tunnacliffe referred to page 8 of the staff report and noted staff had attempted to do this.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation. "Yeas and Nays" were called.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council refuse the proposed Brookside Gardens subdivision so that it may be considered by the Ontario Municipal Board with the associated zoning by-law that has been appealed to the Board by the developer, and that the Regional Clerk issue the 'Notice of Decision' attached as Annex D.

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, M. Bellemare, B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, J. Legendre, A. Munter, W. Stewart and R. van den Ham.....9

NAYS:0

PLANNING ITEM

2. PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT 4 - SOUTH NEPEAN AREA 8

-Commissioner Planning and Development Approvals Department report dated 22 Mar 99

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 4 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.

Councillor Legendre noted the designation of the subject area was being changed from Business Park to General Urban Area. He asked where business development would now occur. Judy Flavin, Planner, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, advised in the detailed plan for the South Urban Centre (Local Official Plan Amendment 7), the planning areas in the South Urban Centre were all reviewed individually to estimate the employment potential. The activity centre alone is estimated to have opportunity for over 12,000 jobs; as well, there is the South Merivale Business Park on the east and the remaining extensive business park on the west between 416 and Strandherd Drive. Staff are satisfied that, with approval of this Amendment, the Nepean Official Plan is identifying an opportunity for over 40,000 which would more than satisfy the Region's requirement for 1.1 jobs per household.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Legendre, Pamela Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, advised Regional Development Charges (RDCs) would be payable by the developer when a building permit was applied for. Ms Sweet noted it would likely be many years before houses are built in the subject area and whatever RDC by-law is in effect at that time would be applicable.

The staff recommendation was then considered.

That, having held a public meeting, Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council enact a By-law to adopt draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 4 to the 1997 Regional Official Plan, attached as Annex A to this report, and that staff be directed to issue the required Notice of Adoption.

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEM

3. APPROVAL TO RECEIVE WASTE DISPOSAL SITE LEACHATE AT THE ROBERT O. PICKARD ENVIRONMENTAL CENTRE
-Acting Deputy Commissioner Environment and Transportation report dated 24 March 1999

Councillor Legendre noted the Region was ordered by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) to receive leachate from Huneault Waste Management Site and he asked if this meant the Region had resisted. France Jacovella, Manager, Wastewater Collection Branch, responded the Region had not resisted, however, at that time, there were issues with odour at the Huneault Landfill Site and the Ministry wanted to address the situation in an expeditious manner. Ms. Jacovella explained, normally, the Regional Regulatory

Code requires Council approval before the Region can receive wastewater at the Pickard Centre. As well, a technical review of the characteristics of the leachate would be undertaken and the details and conditions for the receipt of the leachate would be negotiated. In this instance, there was not time to do this, so the MOE issued an order. They did however consult with Regional staff on the wording of the conditions.

Councillor Bellemare had questions concerning the levels of chemicals in the leachate from Huneault and the testing done by the Region. Ms. Jacovella advised it is standard procedure to audit all waste hauled to the R.O. Pickard Centre. With respect to the levels of Boron in the leachate, she noted there is no specified limit in the Regional Regulatory Code. Staff established a limit of 25 mg/l based on the limited information available; when additional research is done, this limit could be revised. Ms. Jacovella noted the Pickard Centre is a biological treatment plant and does therefore not treat all parameters; she said that which is not treated could end up in either the effluent or the biosolids. The effluent from the Pickard Centre is regulated by the MOE and the Certificate of Approval specifies what can be discharged into the River. Ms. Jacovella noted the Region has a surface water quality program which monitors the environmental effect of the facility.

Councillor Bellemare expressed concern about accepting chemicals from a third party without being fully aware of the impacts on the public's health. He said with this long term agreement, a comfort level should be built in and in this regard, he said he would be putting forward a motion that the Medical Officer of Health provide on-going monitoring and analysis to assure the public the Region is not doing anything to affect their health.

Committee Chair Hunter asked if this was an area in which the Medical Officer of Health would have expertise or would an expert have to be hired. Ms. Jacovella stated she could not really comment on this, however, she offered the Health Department may be able to comment on the impact of certain parameters on human health. She noted when parameters are established in the Regional Regulatory Code, staff look at not only the impact on humans but also the impact on fish habitat, plant life, etc.

Jim Miller, Director, Engineering Division, drew the Committee's attention to the work plan contained in the staff report and offered staff could certainly involve the Health Department in the discussions with the MOE.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked if the MOE standards were as high as other provinces with regard to processing leachate at wastewater treatment plants. Ms. Jacovella replied staff could look into this and report back to the Committee on sewer use by-laws of different provinces. The Councillor felt it would be useful to distribute such a report to all members of Councils.

Councillor van den Ham asked what would happen if the Region chose not to accept Huneault's leachate. Ms. Jacovella replied Huneault would have to explore other options

such as on-site treatment or hauling to another location but there is also the possibility the MOE could order the Region to continue to accept Huneault's leachate. Ms. Jacovella also pointed out this is not an unusual practice, as a number of municipalities in Ontario accept leachate for treatment at their plants. She noted once Huneault's long term plan is in place and Council has given its approval, the Region will no longer be under an order from the MOE and will then have better flexibility with what it can do with the leachate and the conditions it can impose.

The Committee then considered the following motion from Councillor Bellemare.

Moved by M. Bellemare

That the conditions for the receipt of Huneault waste leachate to the Robert O. Pickard Environmental Centre include ongoing monitoring and reporting to Council by the Region's Medical Officer of Health.

CARRIED

(D. Beamish, P. Hume and
R. van den Ham dissented)

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, the receipt of waste disposal site leachate from the Huneault Waste Management Landfill Site at the Robert O. Pickard Environmental Centre in accordance with the conditions and fee structure set out in this report, as amended by the following:

a) **That the conditions for the receipt of Huneault waste leachate to the Robert O. Pickard Environmental Centre include ongoing monitoring and reporting to Council by the Region's Medical Officer of Health.**

CARRIED as amended

4. **CONDITIONS OF CONSENT -GREELY SAND & GRAVEL INC.**

-Acting Deputy Commissioner Environment and Transportation Department report dated 26 March 1999

Councillor Legendre noted the staff report sets out that the Region's goal for granting Consents for waste facilities and services is to ensure waste diversion from the landfill, to protect the landfill capacity. He noted the Consent form (at Annex A) did not contain such a statement and he suggested that one be added. He explained, should a dispute arise, the Region's intent would then be clear.

Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, stated the Councillor's point was well founded and said there was in fact a recent case in Essex where a municipality lost on its consent because they did not have the type of policy the Region has, specifying what the goals are. He said he would fully support amending the "Whereas" section at the beginning of the Consent form, to identify the Region's goal and indicated staff would take this as a direction to do so. Councillor Legendre concurred.

Councillor Legendre went on to express concern, that the facility will accept leaf and yard waste within a 200 km radius of Ottawa-Carleton. He noted he was not terribly concerned in this instance, because of the "low ceiling", however, he felt it ran counter to the Region's goal of protecting the landfill site and could set a poor precedent.

Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division, pointed out this application is for a composting facility and each one is reviewed on its merits. A composting facility would require a larger area to draw in sufficient materials to be financially viable. On other applications, staff are much more stringent with respect to the service areas. Mr. Marc added this would set a precedent only for other composting facility proposals.

That the Planning and Environment committee recommend Council approve the following:

- 1. The granting of a Consent to Greely Sand & Gravel Inc. for the operation of its leaf and yard waste composting facility located at the South Half Lot 16 and Part of the East Half Lot 17, Concession 3 in the Township of Osgoode, municipally known as 2260 Stagecoach Road, Greely, on the conditions set out in Annex A to this report;**
- 2. Authorize the Environment and Transportation Commissioner to include in the standard conditions of Consent a compensation fee in the amount of \$16 per tonne on all residual waste generated from waste management facilities or services located in the Township of Osgoode until such time that the compensation fee issue, under by-law 234, is resolved.**

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Original signed by Dawn Whelan

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

Original confirmed by Gord Hunter

COMMITTEE CHAIR