

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

14 APRIL 1998

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 10 March 98.**

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEM

1. MUNSTER HAMLET WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY STATUS REPORT

- Commissioner, Environment and Transportation Department  
report dated 7 Apr 98

Mr. Jim Miller, Director, Engineering Division, Environment and Transportation Department (ETD) introduced Messrs. Mike Benson, Tony Crutcher and George Godin of the consulting firm of Conestoga Rovers and Associates (CRA), who gave a short overview of the staff report.

Committee Chair Hunter questioned the need for 60 days to be built into the process for a bump up request. He pointed out that although anyone has a right to request a bump-up, it seemed that any request would be rejected by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) in this situation as the bump up request for spray irrigation was rejected and the Region is

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
  2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 22 April 98 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 4.

looking to replace spray irrigation with improved technology. He asked if the process could be reduced by two months in light of this.

Mr. Tim Marc, Solicitor, Legal Department explained it has been the Region's experience that it usually takes longer than two months with respect to bump up requests. He felt however, because of the points raised by the Committee Chair, if there is a request, the response should be received within the 60 days.

Councillor Hill noted the letter received by Committee from Janet Stavinga, Mayor, Goulbourn Township, indicating her satisfaction and support of the staff report.

Councillor Stewart commented the objective of this project is to have a better level of treatment for Munster Hamlet wastewater that will afford a higher level of protection for the Jock River and surrounding environment. She noted the direction to staff had some conditions regarding timelines and cost effectiveness and inquired if these conditions are addressed in the proposal.

Mr. Miller indicated the proposal's schedule is the quickest possible; duties will run concurrently and staff were, on an ongoing basis, keeping the MOE appraised. He pointed out that Task 4, Interim Measures, is intended to address the potential compliance issue and set up an action plan. With respect to cost effectiveness, Mr. Miller explained until the process is completed, it would be difficult to determine which technology or solution would be most cost effective without knowing what other proposals may arrive.

Councillor Stewart felt the timeline and cost effectiveness conditions had not been dealt with, although she felt the public consultation component was excellent. She also felt there should be a great deal of support from the residents in Goulbourn Township and elsewhere.

The Councillor questioned the possibility of direct discharge into the Jock River of tonnes of phosphorus, whereas it is currently protected. Mr. Godin indicated the options presented involve three methods of disposal of the wastewater, with regulations in place for each regarding performance and water quality objectives that need to be achieved. He explained that water quality and performance objectives are the criteria for use of that treatment technology. He confirmed the Jock River is an option that will be looked at, however, he pointed out that it had been looked at previously in the Environmental Study and ruled out earlier.

Councillor Stewart observed at a recent meeting of Ontario Conservation Authorities that policies respecting water bodies are interpreted differently and noted there is not a level playing field across the Province. She was concerned that the Region not end up with a

solution that the Region felt was acceptable on the basis that the solution was allowable, but that the public might not agree with.

Councillor Legendre, referring to Hydrogeological Investigations referred to on page 3 of the Agenda, questioned the need for such investigations as he assumed these types of studies would already have been completed and could be researched.

Mr. Crutcher explained some hydrogeological work has been done, however, when a previous proponent came before the Region, CRA was asked to review the proposal. From this review, it was discovered there was not a complete base of hydrogeological information to make an evaluation. He clarified the reason these studies are recommended in this report is to provide a level playing field so complete information is available for all proponents to look at. He noted these studies would help determine the technical feasibility of various disposal methods.

Councillor Legendre noted an additional \$10,000 for Interim Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring, also on page 3, and inquired if this work is not already ongoing because of the leakage problems. He questioned why additional funds were being added to this project.

Ms. Nancy Schepers, Director, Water Environment Protection Division, ETD, explained this would be an enhanced water monitoring program beyond that which is currently in place and will assist in developing the interim measures, therefore it is project specific.

Councillor Legendre asked, if the process finished ahead of schedule, whether work could begin during the winter months. Mr. Miller felt if there were no bump up requests, staff would attempt to move items forward and possibly tender some components early. Depending on the solution selected, some components could be pre-fabricated off-site, however, significant earth works could not be done during the winter months.

Councillor Legendre, referenced page 2 which states: *“The schedule has been shortened by six to eight weeks by initiating the detailed design phase during the Environmental Assessment review period, with the risk of additional design costs should the review require modifications.”* He felt there was an additional risk not stated: that increased resistance to any change coming out of that review if it means costs may increase.

Mr. Mike Sheflin, Commissioner, ETD, disagreed, indicating the project is a good example that significant work has been done on the other proposal and it has not influenced the decision to look at a more environmentally secure system. He felt none of the work would prejudice the final decision.

Councillor Legendre questioned the value of the public consultation noted in Task 7 of the Project Schedule as many other tasks will be ongoing once the public consultation is completed. He felt the schedule may be too compressed to be effective.

Mr. Godin responded the intent was to fast-track this project which is why many tasks are occurring simultaneously. The schedule provides for two major public consultation times. He explained the first one, Task 7, is to solicit and obtain input from the public with regards to identifying alternatives and developing criteria to evaluate the alternatives. Task 13; the second public consultation time provides another opportunity for the public to review and provide input.

Responding to Councillor Legendre, Mr. Miller further indicated there is already a great deal of information out in the public and a high public awareness of this issue. He also noted there is a Public Liaison Committee mentioned in the report to assist in this process. Mr. Miller added the schedule is an aggressive and difficult one, but one staff believe is achievable.

Councillor Legendre requested background on why the existing system is so undercapacitated. Mr. Sheflin explained the system had its origin in the late 1960s and that building occurred in the early 1970s and was simply undersized. Mr. Marc noted the Region had not been involved; the growth in Munster Hamlet was approved before approval for subdivisions was granted to the Region.

Councillor van den Ham, referring to page 2 under the heading Environmental Mitigation, noted the statement: “...at an estimated cost of approximately \$500,000 in 1998 and potentially a similar amount in 1999...” The Councillor inquired if the Committee had not directed staff to reopen the process, would those costs be there.

Mr. Miller explained some removal would have to be done, however, it was incorporated into the construction costs. He noted the previous proposal was to rehabilitate the lagoons by emptying one, rehabilitating it and then rotating the effluent as the other lagoons were rehabilitated; the amount under those circumstances was considerably less.

Councillor van den Ham remarked that had he known re-opening this issue would cost the Region 1.2 million extra, he might have had different thoughts. He agreed, however, if it was open to one proponent, it should be open to everybody.

Councillor Beamish inquired as to the amount spent a couple of years ago on the Water Reduction Program the Region started. Mr. Miller indicated the Water Reduction Program was approximately \$125,000 and was very well received by the community.

Ms. Schepers, in response to Councillor Beamish's question, told the Committee that the Region did not truck effluent from Munster Hamlet to ROPEC in 1997. The Councillor asked why it would be necessary to truck in 1998 if there are reduced volumes. Ms. Schepers explained that staff anticipated at the end of last year construction was to go ahead and just by sheer volume there was a full lagoon at the end of the year. Since staff were anticipating hauling as part of the construction staging, it was delayed until construction start up, otherwise it would have been necessary to haul last year

He then asked how much the Region would have spent on hauling last year had it been done. Ms. Schepers said \$100,000 just by volume alone. She noted staff have been working very closely with the MOE and anticipated that there would be more volume because the lagoons as stated are undersized as are the spray irrigation fields.

Mr. Miller informed Councillor Beamish that \$5.5 million is the current approved authority for this project and confirmed the funds needed for hauling would come from the capital program.

In reviewing the technology proposed by Delta, Councillor Beamish noted the advantage to this technology is the disposal of effluent during cold weather.

In response to questions from Councillor Stewart, staff indicated it is possible that costs would be higher once the review is over, however, it is impossible to quantify at present.

Councillor Munter asked if staff could indicate the per household cost for this work to be done. Mr. Sheflin indicated there are approximately 480 houses in Munter Hamlet which would be about \$12,000 per house. He noted this is not unusual in village situations. He pointed out the per household cost for the water and sewer system in Carp was \$20,000 a unit.

Chair Hunter added the MOE assumed 85% of those costs at that time.

Councillor Munter pointed out that when a builder builds a subdivision and pays those costs they pass the costs on to the purchasers.

There being no further discussion, the Committee then received the report.

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

RECEIVED

PLANNING ITEMS

2. APPEALS # 14 AND # 26 TO THE MINISTER'S  
NOTICE OF DECISION OF 1997 REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN  
AIRPORT NOISE POLICIES  
- Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department  
report dated 31 Mar 98

**That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council:**

1. **Approve a request to the Ontario Municipal Board, to modify the Airport Noise policies of Section 11.6.1 of the Regional Official Plan (1997) as shown in Annex A as amended by the following, attached to this report”:**

**“That the second paragraph of Section 11.6.1 Policy 3c) of the Regional Official Plan (1997) be modified to delete the phrase “may consider” and replace with “in lieu of a detailed noise control study” and add at the end of the first sentence “shall be implemented”, and;**

2. **Approve a request to the Ontario Municipal Board, with respect to the “Policies for Road, Rail and Rapid Transit Noise” of Section 11.6.2, to modify the Regional Official Plan (1997) as follows:**

**“That Policy 7 be modified to delete the reference to “and Energy’s” and that the date of “October, 1995” be replaced with the date “October, 1997”.**

CARRIED as amended

3. CITY OF GLOUCESTER OFFICIAL PLAN  
PARTIAL LIFTING OF DEFERRAL NO. 1  
(CYRVILLE CORE ACTIVITY AREA &  
INNES / HWY 417 ACTIVITY NODE)  
- Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department  
report dated 26 Mar 98

Mr. Grant Lindsay, Director of Planning, City of Gloucester addressed the Committee. He requested that the Committee not support Recommendation 2 of the staff report and declare the request for referral to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) from Aird and Berlis, Barristers and Solicitors on behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited, as frivolous and vexatious and only for the purpose of delay. He further requested if the Committee felt

this should be referred to the OMB, that it be approved quickly and the request from Aird and Berlis, dated April 13, 1998, to defer the matter to allow time to consult with City of Gloucester staff be disregarded. Mr. Lindsay indicated he had not heard from Aird and Berlis or their client, Loblaw Properties Limited, in over a year. He informed the Committee the City of Gloucester's position was that this referral request was frivolous and not based on planning issues but one that was market driven. He added the issue had been ongoing for a number of years; the City was in receipt of some development proposals for these lands and would like to proceed with the lifting of Deferral No. 1. He noted the City had worked with the Region on this issue and both were in concurrence with the modifications suggested.

Mr. Jack Toppari, Regional Planner, Planning and Development Approvals Department (PDA), outlined Regional staff's position. He stated staff agree with City of Gloucester in that there were no real planning merits to Aird and Berlis' request to have this matter referred to the OMB and it was frivolous and vexatious and only for the purpose of delay. He explained in determining the best way to proceed and when speaking to Aird and Berlis, who indicated they would apply for a judicial review if the Region dismissed the referral request, Regional staff felt the timeliest way to deal with the matter would be to send it to the OMB.

Mr. Tim Marc, Regional Solicitor, Legal Department, informed the Committee of a similar request for referral in 1997 from Loblaw Properties Limited regarding the site that is now Jet Form Park. In that case, the Committee declared the request to be frivolous and vexatious and Loblaw had not provided any input prior to that particular Official Plan being adopted. He stated the Region's case in 1997 was very strong, however, he is unsure the Region is in a similar position with respect to this matter. He added Aird and Berlis did not apply for a judicial review with respect to the case in 1997; however, he did not know if they would in this case.

In response to questions from Councillor Bellemare regarding the outstanding issues between the City of Gloucester and Loblaw Properties Limited, referred to in Aird and Berlis' letter of April 13, 1998, Mr. Lindsay explained the only correspondence on file was their request that the City of Gloucester conduct a market study to determine the impact of a possible location of grocery facilities in the Cyrville and Innes/Hwy 417 area. He indicated City of Gloucester staff conduct planning studies and infrastructure reviews, not market analyses, to look at the planning merits of having a particular activity come to a particular property. Mr. Lindsay told the Committee he is unaware of any other outstanding issues and felt that Loblaw Properties Limited are using the planning process as a form of convincing or not allowing these uses in certain areas which he believed interferes with free market forces.

Councillor Bellemare inquired if deferring this item for two weeks would provide enough time to resolve these issues. Mr. Lindsay informed the Committee he did not believe the issues could be resolved in two weeks. He stated that Loblaw Properties Limited is looking for the City of Gloucester to pass a resolution not to allow a supermarket use in either the Cyrville or Innes/Hwy 417 deferral areas and he would not be recommending Gloucester Council support such a resolution.

Mr. Marc added if the Committee did not deem the referral request to be frivolous and vexatious, then he recommended the issue be sent on to the OMB right away. He indicated there is no reason to delay as the City of Gloucester and Loblaw Properties Limited can negotiate until the day of the Board hearing. Mr. Marc felt the Committee should be aware that Loblaw Properties Limited have had costs awarded against them.

Councillor Bellemare questioned if the outstanding issues Aird and Berlis referred to applied only to the Innes/Hwy 417 area and not the Cyrville Core area. Mr. Lindsay understood the request for referral was for the entire lifting of the deferral area; Cyrville and Innes/Hwy 417. He added that one area could not be separated from the other as both form part of Deferral No. 1 in the City of Gloucester's Official Plan.

Mr. Toppari clarified Loblaw Properties Limited's main issue was the absence of a marketing study which is not required in the Gloucester Official Plan. He further clarified that correspondence over the past year with Aird and Berlis had not always specifically referred to both areas and it had been difficult for staff to determine if their outstanding issues applied to both areas. He believed in light of their correspondence of April 13, 1997, they were requesting both areas be referred to the OMB as they specifically stated both areas in their letter.

In response to questions from Councillor Bellemare, Mr. Marc informed the Committee one or two referral requests per Council term were refused by the Region; most requests were forwarded to the OMB. He felt the possibility of a judicial review should not influence the Committee's decision; a decision should be made on planning principles.

Councillor Bellemare indicated he felt the Committee had a clearer picture of the situation and it was his opinion that this was a negotiating tactic on the part of Loblaw Properties Limited. The Councillor noted staff had indicated there was the possibility of a judicial review request, however, that this should not influence the decision. He further pointed out market studies for this area were not done as a matter of course in determining planning and infrastructure issues. Councillor Bellemare indicated he would be putting forward a motion to recommend deleting Recommendations 2 and 3 from the report and dismissing the request as frivolous and vexatious and only for the purpose of delay. He felt the City of Gloucester should be allowed to move forward in these development areas



and it would set a bad precedent to automatically refer this to the OMB because of the threat of a judicial review.

Councillor Legendre inquired if the Committee dismissed the referral request as frivolous and vexatious, would the Region be prejudiced based on the fact that Recommendation 2 of the report is recommending referral to the OMB.

Mr. Marc, referring to page 32 of the report and Mr. Toppari's statements, indicated the Committee could, on the basis of planning merits, declare the referral request frivolous and vexatious and the Region would not be prejudiced in any way by Recommendation 2. He clarified Regional staff were concerned over the delay that might be occasioned by judicial review and, therefore, recommended referral to the OMB. Mr. Toppari added that staff felt the quickest way to resolve this matter was to send it to the OMB rather than risk judicial review with the time and costs involved in that.

In response to Councillor Legendre's questions, Mr. Toppari confirmed that staff were in agreement with lifting Deferral No. 1 at this time and provided the Committee Chair with a revised Approval Page to that effect.

Councillor Legendre, noted on page 29, under *Cyrville Area Master Transportation Study*, phrases such as "*provided that Modifications to the Regional Road network necessary to support the level of development are undertaken*", "*widening Innes Road*", and "*widening Blair Road*". He inquired if any of these phrases, should the report be carried, affected the Region's budget and whether these infrastructure changes must be completed on a given schedule. Mr. Nick Tunnacliffe, Commissioner, PDA, informed the Committee the Region had the option to defer and there was no set schedule for these infrastructure changes. He commented the report recognized the need for future road modifications, which have all been identified.

Referencing page 31 of the report, Councillor Legendre, whose ward is adjacent to the subject lands, was concerned with the statement "*...reconstruction of Cummings Avenue to four lanes to provide improved access.*" He noted Cummings Avenue continued in his ward where it was mainly residential and had a somewhat different character from the portion of the road in Gloucester. The Councillor was concerned with the impact on the residential section of Cummings Avenue in his ward if the road was increased to four lanes. He asked if this reconstruction would be on the Gloucester section of the road only.

Mr. Tunnacliffe indicated that the section of Cummings Avenue from Cyrville Road to Ogilvie Road was identified in the Regional Official Plan for reconstruction.

Councillor Bellemare explained he had recently spoken to Regional staff regarding this issue and it was anticipated the portion of Cummings Avenue between Cyrville Road and Ogilvie Road would become a Regional Road. He further explained the portion of Cyrville Road between Ogilvie Road and Cummings Avenue would then be turned over to the City of Gloucester, who projected a promenade development along that area. He added it was not his understanding that Cummings Avenue north of Ogilvie Road would be widened to four lanes.

Councillor Legendre, referring to page 31, “w) iv) *Promotion of hospitality industry uses as the focus for development in the Cyrville core south of Cyrville Road and north of the Queensway through improved access to peripheral residential development...*”, requested clarification on how the hospitality industry is assisted with improved access through residential areas.

Mr. Lindsay explained it was the upgrading of LaBelle Street, mentioned on page 31, ii), to provide access off Hwy 417 by LaBelle Street and extend through to Cummings Avenue and Cyrville Road, thereby allowing direct access when traveling Cyrville Road into the area where the existing Chimo Hotel is. LaBelle Street runs south of the Chimo Hotel and would also provide access from the opposite direction allowing easier access into that quadrant. He told the Committee upgrading LaBelle Street to tie in with the Cyrville Road/Cummings Avenue intersection would provide easier access to the proposed developments in the area.

In response to questions from Councillor Beamish, Mr. Marc confirmed that he was aware of other cases where Loblaw Properties Limited had attempted to delay planning matters and cited an ongoing matter before the OMB regarding the City of Kanata. He added that Loblaw was known to take a very aggressive approach with respect to planning appeals and referral requests.

Councillor Beamish indicated his support for Councillor Bellemare’s motion to dismiss the Loblaw referral request as frivolous and vexatious on a matter of principle. He felt this was an abuse of the planning process and noted the added staff time and costs, should the issue end up in the courts, were justified and should not affect the Committee’s decision.

In response to a request from Committee Chair Hunter, Mr. Toppari provided Committee members with a copy of the letter from Aird & Berlis, dated May 5, 1997, requesting referral to the OMB on behalf of Loblaw Properties Limited.

Mr. Lindsay explained the main emphasis of the May 5, 1997 letter is that the City of Gloucester did not conduct a market study, which is not a requirement as part of planning process in the Gloucester Official Plan. He noted City of Gloucester staff look at

compatibility, serviceability, and transportation issues, and these issues are all addressed in the modifications in the report to have the deferral lifted.

The Committee Chair thanked the speaker and there being no further discussion, the Committee then considered Councillor Bellemare's motion.

Moved by M. Bellemare

**That recommendations 2 and 3 be deleted and that the request that this matter be referred to the Ontario Municipal Board of Aird and Berlis, Barristers and Solicitors representing Loblaw's Properties Limited, be dismissed as frivolous and vexatious and only for the purpose of delay.**

CARRIED

The Committee then carried the staff report as amended.

**That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve that:**

- 1. The City of Gloucester Official Plan, which was approved in part on April 8, 1992, be further approved by the partial lifting of Deferral No. 1 pertaining to the designation of the Cyrville Core Activity Area and the Innes/Hwy 417 Activity Node, as outlined on the revised Addendum Approval Page V attached as Annex 1;**
- 2. The request that this matter be referred to the Ontario Municipal Board of Aird and Berlis, Barristers and Solicitors representing Loblaw Properties Limited, be dismissed as frivolous and vexatious and only for the purpose of delay.**

CARRIED as amended

4. CITY OF OTTAWA COMPREHENSIVE OFFICIAL PLAN  
LIFTING OF DEFERRED SECTIONS PERTAINING TO  
LEBRETON FLATS  
- Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department  
report dated 24 Mar 98

**That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council lift Deferral Nos. 4, 16, 21 and 24 to the comprehensive Official Plan of the City of Ottawa and approve the corresponding parts of the Official Plan according to the Approval Page attached as Annex 1.**

CARRIED

5. APPOINTMENTS TO THE LAND DIVISION COMMITTEE  
- Acting Co-ordinator, P&E Committee report dated 8 Apr 98  
- Acting Co-ordinator, CSED Committee memorandum dated 8 Apr 98  
- Regional Clerk's report dated 4 Mar 98

**That this item be deferred until the next regular meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee to allow comment from the municipalities comprising the Rural Alliance.**

CARRIED as amended

6. REQUEST BY THE VILLAGE OF ROCKCLIFFE PARK TO LEAVE  
THE REGIONAL LAND DIVISION COMMITTEE AND ASSUME  
RESPONSIBILITY FOR LAND SEVERANCES (CONSENTS)  
- Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department  
report dated 10 Mar 98

**That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council:**

1. Delegate the authority to grant consents to the Village of Rockcliffe Park,  
and;
2. Adopt the by-law attached as Annex I.

CARRIED

7. RESPONSE TO OUTSTANDING MOTION NO. P&E 14  
ENVIRONMENTAL LAND ACQUISITION POLICY  
- Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department  
report dated 3 Mar 98

Committee Chair Hunter requested clarification on the report. He understood the request for a restudy of this issue was as a result of the new Regional Official Plan (ROP) combined with the Provincial Policy Statements eliminating the need to purchase lands, such as the Marlborough Forest and other areas, when the owner wanted to sell. He felt the report was indicating a need for the Region to acquire more lands.

Ms. Carol Christensen, Manager, Land Use Policy, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, PDA, indicated with respect to the Marlborough Forest South end, there tends to be wetlands interspersed with lands designated Natural Environment Area A. Most of the properties have some wetland on them. The report states, in that circumstance, the Region would continue to acquire the entire property as it would be difficult to separate the wetland from the Natural Environment Area A land. She noted, other than this type of situation, staff do not intend to continue to acquire wetlands as per the Provincial Policy Statement.

Committee Chair Hunter requested clarification on the intention with respect to river corridors. Ms. Christensen indicated there is no change from the 1988 ROP in that Council may consider acquisition in those areas. She stated, however, there is not a firm commitment that the Region would purchase in the areas that are designated Recreation Area and, if needed, to protect properties that are designated Waterfront Open Space, most of which are already in public ownership.

Committee Chair Hunter noted the direction to staff was to bring forward an amendment to the ROP, however, the report indicates there is still work to be done on a number of issues and asked for clarification.

Ms. Christensen explained the Region's land acquisition policy is in the ROP; there is no other separate document. The ROP indicates the intent to buy Natural Environment Area A lands and to consider acquisition in Natural Environment Area B lands, along the waterfront and in recreation areas. She explained the Region's new ROP includes new policies on urban open space, and generally higher protections for the environment, and if the Committee wanted to consider an even broader acquisition policy, then staff felt there would have to be some further identification of what those additional areas were. She informed the Committee this is not additional work but will be carried out in conjunction with work that must be undertaken by staff when the City of Ottawa's Natural and Open Space Study (NOSS) is released.

Councillor Legendre reviewed his intention when he put the Motion forward at the Committee meeting of October 14, 1997. He understood there was a separate policy for land acquisition and the policy would need to be modified following the adoption of the new ROP. It was his perception that the new ROP would further protect other areas of green environment, including the urban area, than the Region had in the past. He noted his motion asked staff to include in the 1998 budget some additional funding. The Councillor did not see any particular site to acquire that would come up urgently, however, if the need arose money would already be allocated to the fund. The Councillor was unaware that this would require an ROP Amendment however, as staff have indicated, this does not entail any additional work for staff.

Mr. Tunnacliffe added that staff have provided for some additional funds in this year's budget which will be reviewed at the Committee's Budget Review meeting of April 28, 1998.

Councillor Stewart recounted recent discussions with the Chair of the NCC regarding lands owned by NCC in her ward, such as the McCarthy Woods. She indicated the NCC does not expect to continue to own these lands indefinitely. The Councillor voiced her concern regarding protecting urban forests, particularly in the City of Ottawa where in 1997 20% of the remaining urban forest was developed. She felt the Region will be looked to more often to purchase and protect the urban forests and believed the NCC expects the Region to acquire their lands from them at some point. The Councillor indicated her support for allocating money into land acquisition in the urban area, as she felt there is tremendous pressure with the governance issue to develop these lands. The Councillor considers some of the lands extremely important to the quality of life that ranked so high in the Regional vision.

There being no further discussion, the Committee then considered the following recommendation.

**That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve that:**

- 1. Staff be directed to bring forward an amendment to the Regional Official Plan pursuant to Policy 2 of Section 5.4.5 of the 1997 Regional Official Plan;**
- 2. Based on the Regional Official Plan amendment, staff prepare a report on revisions to the environmental land acquisition budget as part of its 1999 Budget submission.**

CARRIED  
(G. Hunter, B. Hill and  
R. van den Ham dissented.)

### INQUIRIES

Councillor Munter raised the issue of water trucks and other private contractors using R.M.O.C. fire hydrants to get water; an issue he had raised in the past. The Councillor was advised previously that new systems were going to be brought into place to ensure that water taken from public hydrants is fully paid for, and he asked for a status update. He further inquired if the new systems were not yet in place, what measures were being investigated and how soon could they be implemented.

Mr. Andre Proulx, Director, Water Division, ETD, responded that staff are working with the Legal Department to put by-law officers in place to regulate the illegal use of fire hydrants. This will be implemented in approximately 6 months due to requirements at the Provincial level. Mr. Proulx added the second component is a report dealing with the use of fire hydrants and any other components of the water system, the results of which will be forthcoming in a report to Committee, between June and September 1998, recommending options on how to monitor water system uses.

Councillor Legendre noted the briefing on April 6, 1998 regarding the new solid waste collection contract and asked what the next step in the process is.

Mr. Pat McNally, Director, Solid Waste Division, ETD, indicated the solid waste report will be coming forward to Committee at their next meeting on April 28, 1998.

Councillor Legendre wanted to flag for staff his concern with the number of zones indicated at the briefing. He noted Council had previously given input as to its opinion that some of the difficulties with the first solid waste contract was the fact that the Region was split into three large zones and he felt the report did not address this adequately.

Mr. Sheflin explained, as was noted at the briefing, staff consulted with the waste industry, including small haulers, and the recommendations in the report were a result of that consultation.

Mr. McNally offered to meet with Councillor Legendre before the next meeting to review the rationale behind the recommendations.

Chair Hunter noted the volume of branches to be picked up by the Region and asked if the initial estimate of 25,000 tons had been revised.

Mr. McNally responded that all available packer trucks are on the road and chipper trucks continue to be added. Once pickup proceeds for a few days staff will have a better idea of the how large a volume is actually out there as compared to their estimate.

In response to concerns from Councillor Munter as to the delays that might be caused by this increased volume, Mr. McNally indicated that staff will continue to have as much equipment in use as is possible to ensure the schedule is maintained.

Councillor Munter indicated the ROP includes two pages of policies regarding development in floodplains, in large measure dealing with such development on a site-by-site basis. He inquired if, given mounting evidence about climate change and extreme weather occurrences, the Provincial guidelines at the basis of the ROP were adequate to deal with issues regarding flooding, and asked if there were steps the Region could take to be more active in preventing the future flooding of homes through preventative planning measures. The Department will look into the issue and report back to Committee.

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. RESPONSE TO INQUIRY NUMBER PEC 1-98  
DEVELOPMENT PLANS - "FRIENDS OF PETRIE ISLAND"  
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's memo dated 12 Mar 98
  
2. TOWNSHIP OF OSGOODE - SPRINGHILL LANDFILL SITE  
APPLICATION FOR AN AMENDMENT TO  
CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL #A461402  
- Director, Solid Waste Division, Environment and Transportation Department  
memo dated 1 Apr 98

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

*Original signed by*  
*Kim Johnston*

\_\_\_\_\_  
COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

*Original confirmed by*  
*Gord Hunter*

\_\_\_\_\_  
COMMITTEE CHAIR