

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

14 SEPTEMBER 1999

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

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

Regrets: W. Stewart

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

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

CARRIED

PLANNING ITEMS

1. SUMMARY OF ASSIGNED FUNCTIONS  
OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENTS, SUBDIVISIONS,  
CONDOMINIUMS, PART LOT CONTROL BY-LAWS,  
ZONING BY-LAWS, SITE PLANS AND SEVERANCES  
AND APPEAL OF HASBRON AND SCHOUTEN SEVERANCES  
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report  
dated 18 Aug 99

Jeff Ostafichuk provided Committee with an overview of the staff report on the Hasbron appeal.

Councillor Hill indicated she would be moving a motion that the appeal against the Hasbron severance be withdrawn. The Councillor went on to say the land in question 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 September 99 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 41.

not in a large agricultural area; there is considerable development in the area, including a small subdivision. The parcel is only 9 acres and would not be a viable agricultural entity. She stated it was unfortunate, with the Regional Official Plan (ROP), the only way to obtain a severance in the rural area, is by way of a farm retirement (having farmed for 20 years) or a surplus home. She said the only option left to the landowners is at the political level.

Councillor Legendre noted the staff report did not indicate what the rationale of the Land Division Committee was in granting this severance. He asked if staff were able to respond. Mr. Ostafichuk stated it was his understanding the Land Division Committee was of the opinion this parcel of land was in an area of poor agricultural land. He confirmed for the Councillor there were no studies to support this.

Councillor van den Ham observed from the aerial photographs, the subject lot would appear to be totally treed. Mr. Ostafichuk confirmed the parcel of land the applicant would like to sever is treed.

Councillor van den Ham advised he would be supporting Councillor Hill's motion. He said although he understood staff had no option but to recommend the severance be appealed pursuant to the policies of the ROP, the Councillor noted severing the subject property would have no impact on agricultural operations. Councillor van den Ham suggested the ROP could use some minor modifications to deal with these small parcels of land.

Committee Chair Hunter had questions concerning the history of this parcel of land, noting it would likely have been part of the 200 acres that made up the concession. He asked if staff, in taking a position to oppose the severance, examined previous severances. Mr. Ostafichuk advised staff do look at adjacent properties and try to establish when they were created. He said the Department's computer records go back to 1986 and there has only been one in-fill lot created north of Pierce Road. The remaining lots may have been existing lots of record prior to Regional Government.

The Chair then asked Joseph Hasbron, the owner of the subject property, how his 9 acre parcel came to be. Mr. Hasbron advised he was not a party the creation of the lot. He noted he bought the lot in 1972 and built his home on one portion of it. His intent was to use the other portion of the lot for small animal ranching, however, this did not work out. He explained there was a by-law that required the grass in the whole area to be cut and because the grass was of such poor quality and could not be used by farmers for hay and he could not afford to keep the grass cut himself, Mr. Hasbron planted trees in this area.

Mr. Hasbron went on to explain he is now 65 years old and retired and the purpose of the severance was to create additional income for his retirement. He explained the lot is

divided naturally along an existing ditch and he felt this would be a good dividing line for the severance; the severed parcel would be five acres and the retained lot would be four acres.

Councillor Legendre stated although he could understand why the applicant was coming forward, he felt staff were correct in appealing the severance, as the policy is clear. He said if the policy is not supported, agricultural land would not be protected and he indicated he would be voting against Councillor Hill's motion

Moved by B. Hill

**That the appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board of the Hasbron severance be withdrawn.**

CARRIED

YEAS: D. Beamish, M. Bellemare, B. Hill, P. Hume and R. van den Ham....5

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

The Committee then turned their attention to the portion of the staff report dealing with the appeal of the Schouten severance. Mr. Ostafichuk gave a brief overview of the staff report.

Councillor Hill advised she was putting forward a motion to withdraw the appeal on this severance as well. She indicated Mr. Adrian Schouten, the applicant was present to answer any questions the Committee might have. The Councillor noted this case was the same as the Hasbron severance, in that in accordance with the ROP policies, staff have no choice but to appeal these severances.

Committee Chair Hunter noted the lots proposed to be severed appear to be tree covered and not good agricultural land. He said it would seem the owner of the lands was being careful not to sever land that is under active cultivation. Mr. Ostafichuk stated although the lands are not under active cultivation, they have been in the past.

Councillor Hill commented the Chair was correct in that the proponents have chosen land that is not productive. She noted the land owners farm 2000 acres and they do not want to take any good land out of production. The Councillor advised this is the second generation in this family farming the land and between them (Adrian and Arnold Schouten) they have five sons. She explained the family is severing these three lots in the hopes that eventually the sons will build houses and remain to farm the land. She pointed out the applicants applied for these severances in 1995 when the ROP allowed farm help or son/daughter severances to help work the farm. When the Land Division Committee of

the Region was cleaning out their files, they came across these files and asked the Schoutens if they wished to pursue it or drop it.

Adrian Schouten one of the owners of the land, advised the subject property has been a hay field for as long as he could remember. He said the land is very unproductive, with a very stony, gravelly type of soil. The previous owners felt there was no income to obtain from it as evidenced by the fact they left it in old pasture and that is the way it remains. In the area where the lots have been applied for, the land is stony and has always been treed.

Responding to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Schouten advised in 1995, (although the lots were not needed at that time), the family applied for the severance because the Province was doing away with farm help lots. The Land Division Committee advised the applications should be submitted and when the time came that they were needed the family could proceed. He confirmed he was not in need of farm help at this time, as they have three full-time employees as well as the family members. However, because the Land Division was changed to the Rural Alliance, these applications had to be dealt with and because the family had paid the fee, they decided to proceed with them in anticipation of the five sons needing the lots at some point in the future. Mr. Schouten advised the family chose the lots to be severed carefully and felt of all the land owned by the family this was the best location.

Councillor van den Ham indicated he would be supporting Councillor Hill's motion. He said it would be reasonable to expect that people who farm in excess of 2000 acres would need help and approving this severance would encourage the viability of farming. The Councillor felt, since the Province had removed the possibility of obtaining a severance for farm help, they should be the ones objecting to this.

Councillor Legendre asked for a legal opinion on whether not objecting to this severance would set a precedent. Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law advised each application is reviewed by the Land Division Committee and, if appealed, by the Ontario Municipal Board, on its own merits. However, should Regional Council withdraw this appeal but appeal something similar in the future, he was certain that party would bring up these appeals in front of the Board. Consistency in actions and appeals is something the Board does consider in making their decisions.

Councillor Legendre said he suspected this to be the case. He said he would not be supporting Councillor Hill's motion.

Nick Tunnacliffe, Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department, referencing comments made with respect to the Province being the appropriate body to object to this severance, advised under the Memo of Understanding agreed to by Council

and the Province, the Province has delegated the function of upholding policy statements to Council.

Responding to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Ostafichuk advised the Province would not likely be aware of consent applications because they are not circulated; the Region is delegated the authority to monitor agricultural resource areas. He said if the Province were aware of it, they could, through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, appeal if they were strongly against this severance.

Committee Chair Hunter asked the delegation if he owned the land around the subject property (bordered by Malakoff, McCordick and Harbison). Mr. Schouten advised his family owns a dairy farm approximately 2 miles south on Malakoff, but does not own the land directly to the east of the subject property. He said the property had been a 50 acre parcel for as long as he could remember and most of the land in the area is not good agricultural land

Responding to questions from Councillor Bellemare, Mr. Ostafichuk confirmed this application was made in 1995, prior to Bill 163 (which prohibits the creation of Farm Help lots). Councillor Bellemare felt rather than establishing a precedent, the severances should be grandfathered under the previous policy. He indicated he would be supporting Councillor Hill's motion.

Councillor Legendre had questions concerning the circumstances under which the Province would be advised of a severance or would intervene. Mr. Ostafichuk replied if the Region continued to approve lots in an Agricultural Resource Area, the Ministry would likely become aware of it. He noted under the Memo of Understanding, there was to be a monitoring process put in place and the Province would periodically (e.g. every three or four years) review the various planning activities. Mr. Ostafichuk stated previously the Department had provided the Province with a quarterly report, however, he could not say with certainty whether this was still being done.

Councillor Legendre asked that staff clarify this situation and as well, that Council be provided with a summary of the decisions made in this regard over the years (i.e. a cumulative report). Chair Hunter asked if this information would be readily available to staff. Mr. Ostafichuk advised a record of severance is kept by application but not by approval.

Councillor Hill expressed concern with the suggestion that the Province be involved in such matters, as this is the Regional Official Plan and Council should be making the decisions with respect to the policies.

Moved by B. Hill

**That the appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board of the Schouten severance be withdrawn.**

CARRIED  
(J. Legendre and A. Munter  
dissented)

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation, as amended.

**That the Planning and Environment Committee and Council receive this report for information purposes and withdraw the Planning and Development Approvals Department's appeal of two severances as noted in Annexes V and VI.**

CARRIED as amended

2. APPLICATION FOR PLAN OF SUBDIVISION-  
HISTORIC ELMWOOD COUNTRY LOT SUBDIVISION  
TOWNSHIP OF WEST CARLETON  
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report  
dated 25 Aug 99

Committee Chair Hunter referred to correspondence from Mr. Vern Rampton, the proponent of the subdivision and from Mr. Paul Webber, the solicitor for a group of ratepayers opposed to the subdivision, both of which were requesting that this item be deferred for 30 days to allow negotiations to continue. Councillor Hill indicated she would be moving a motion to this effect.

Moved by B. Hill

**That this item be deferred for 30 days.**

CARRIED

Councillor Legendre pointed out although the staff recommendation is that the subdivision be approved, the Notice of Decision (Annex B) states that the subdivision was refused. Myles Mahon, Planner, Development Approvals Division advised this would be corrected.

3. GUIDELINES FOR EARLY SERVICING

- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 01 Sept 99

Councillor Munter sought clarification on how the policy would work. Jennifer Phillips, Planner, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division advised, for water and wastewater projects that are advanced and if the Region decides not to advance it in the budget, and therefore the developer needs to pay it up front, the developer would be reimbursed in the latter of the year in which the project was included in the budget or a specified number of units have been built. The developer would also pay development charges. When the developer is reimbursed, the Finance Department would look at how the project is funded and it is likely at that time that certain monies would be brought from the development charges reserve to help fund the project.

Councillor Munter explained his concern was that the developer would be reimbursed for the full amount of the cost of the servicing, even if the Regional Development Charges (RDCs) collected were less than this amount. Ms. Phillips confirmed this and noted that when the project is approved under the Early Servicing Agreement, the authority (for the full amount of the project) would be put in the capital budget in the year the agreement was arranged.

Nick Tunnacliffe, Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department added the Finance Department would determine the source from which the developer would be reimbursed (e.g. RDCs, reserves or debt).

Councillor Munter felt this agreement would force the Region either into debt or levy-supported contributions to make up the difference between the cost of the project and the RDCs collected and on a timetable driven by the development industry as opposed to the phasing originally set out by Council.

Ms. Phillips advised it is contemplated at this time, allowing only water and wastewater projects to be the subject of Early Servicing Agreements; not transportation projects. The money would have to be available in the water and wastewater reserves. She explained to date when agreements have been arranged with developers, they have been based upon the water or wastewater servicing being advanced and the impact on the rest of the Regional services and the Region's financial plan have not been taken into account. The purpose of the Early Servicing Agreement is to ensure the full range of those implications are assessed at the time. If the development requires the Region to bring forward transportation infrastructure in order to service the development, the development would be turned down.

Committee Chair Hunter pointed out each of these agreements would be subject to approval by Committee and Council. He also noted infrastructure has never been paid for up front and likened it to a mortgage on a house, where the capital costs are paid for over a number of years. Municipal infrastructure creates opportunity for new development, development creates a tax base and the tax base helps to pay for infrastructure. The Chair noted it is a relatively new phenomenon that development charges have been paying a sizeable portion of the costs of infrastructure at the Regional level.

Councillor Legendre sought confirmation that should Committee and Council not approve this policy, the status quo would remain. The status quo being each application is looked at in isolation, whereas this policy forces staff to look at the total effect of the application. Ms. Phillips confirmed this. The Councillor felt this policy to be an improvement over the existing method and he congratulated staff on bringing this report forward. He pointed out the report states quite clearly (point 5 on page 72) monies to support the full cost of the works, must be available in the appropriate Regional reserve. Elsewhere in the report it sets out that the full impact the development could have on land use issues, development or other proposed or existing Regional services, must be examined. Councillor Legendre indicated he would be supporting the staff recommendation.

There being no further discussion, the Committee considered the staff recommendation.

**That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the Guidelines for Early Servicing contained in this report.**

CARRIED  
(A. Munter dissented)

#### ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEMS

4. CANADIAN WASTE SERVICES INC.  
FRANCHISE AGREEMENT - LEACHATE PIPELINE  
- Director, Engineering Division, Environment and Transportation  
Department, and Acting Regional Solicitor's joint report dated 7 Sept 99

Councillor Legendre asked staff to explain Recommendation 3. Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law advised the Municipal Franchise Act is a very old Act of significant history and under that Act, there is a provision that any granting of a municipal franchise would have to be assented to by all of the electors in the Region. He said previously this could be avoided by going to the Ontario Municipal Board for approval. Pursuant to amendments made to the Municipal Act by the current government, it is now possible for Council simply to waive the need to obtain the electors assent, but it is necessary that Council make this decision.



Councillor van den Ham noted the report requires the integrity of the pipe to be tested annually by Canadian Waste Services. He asked if this was necessary and if this was something the Region does to its own pipes.

Jim Miller, Director, Engineering advised the test would be a pressure test that staff do not feel would be too onerous; staff were trying to be prudent by including this requirement. He advised the Region does not have the same type of pipes proposed to be used. He said the Region has carried out some testing programs on its pipes, but could not say if they were conducted on a regular basis.

Councillor van den Ham stated he was concerned with keeping costs reasonable for those concerned and he suggested that once the pipe is constructed and tested for a few years, staff could perhaps amend the agreement so that annual testing is not required. Mr. Miller replied staff would take this under advisement for future consideration.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendations.

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

- 1. The grant of a franchise to Canadian Waste Services Inc. permitting the construction, operation and maintenance of a leachate forcemain from the Canadian Waste Services Inc. Landfill Site located within the SE 1/2 of Lot 4, Conc. 3, in the Township of West Carleton, south within Regional Road #5 (Carp Road) and west within Regional Road #36 (Hazeldean Road) in accordance with a franchise agreement;**
- 2. That the Environment and Transportation Commissioner be delegated the authority to approve revisions to the Franchise Agreement where such revisions are substantially in accordance with the principles of this report, and;**
- 3. That the requirement to obtain the assent of the electors for the granting of the franchise be waived.**

CARRIED

5. APPROVAL TO RECEIVE WASTE DISPOSAL SITE  
LEACHATE FROM THE CANADIAN WASTE LANDFILL SITE  
- Director, Water Environment Protection Division, Environment  
and Transportation Department report dated 01 Sept 99

Councillor Legendre felt the staff report should have included conditions that describe the allowable contaminants and their concentrations. It was his recollection such information was provided when Committee dealt with the Trail Road leachate pipeline matter.

Nancy Schepers, Deputy Commissioner, Environment, ETD, advised this proposal is consistent with how leachate has been dealt with within Ottawa-Carleton and would be consistent with the Region's approach to Trail Road, Huneault and Canadian Waste. She said this is consistent with what has already been brought before Committee with respect to the receipt of leachate from Canadian Waste in terms of the limits established for the leachate and the ability for the Commissioner to impose and change conditions. The agreement does speak specifically to staff adjusting the parameters and this would be done if there was new research or issues that staff became aware of that required the parameters established for leachate to be re-examined.

Councillor Legendre commented on Ms. Schepers remark that this is consistent with the permissions the Region has already granted Canadian Waste. He said however, Canadian Waste currently trucks the leachate but now that a pipeline is to be connected, he presumed the quantities would be increasing. He felt it would have been prudent to identify the contaminants and include quantities and concentrations as well.

Ms. Schepers advised, with respect to the Trail Road leachate matter, there was some discussion and information provided on the concentrations of the Trail Road leachate but there was no discussion of approval of the limits for various parameters. Staff follow the Regional Regulatory Code, which spells out the limits for various parameters, as well as the Model Sewer Use By-law issued by the Ministry of the Environment. In addition, staff use the best research available, as well as assessing treatability of those parameters and have set limits based on that. These limits are applied consistently to all leachate received at the R.O. Pickard Centre. She advised that Canadian Waste does not exceed any of the limits established for leachate.

Councillor Legendre asked that staff provide him with a copy of the limits, concentrations, etc. for his records.

Councillor van den Ham noted Condition 1 on page 86 of the report indicates the term of the agreement will be for one year, automatically renewable on an annual basis, unless otherwise terminated. He asked who could terminate the agreement and asked for a comment with respect to this agreement and the issue of governance.

Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law advised the typical agreement would include a clause for termination by either party on notice, at the end of each year. He said when there is a revision to the governance in Ottawa-Carleton, because the agreement is annually renewable, there will be an opportunity at that time for both sides to discuss what the price structure should be.

The Committee the considered the staff recommendation.

**That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve, pursuant to section 5.2.2(9) of the *Regional Regulatory Code*, the receipt of waste disposal site leachate from the Canadian Waste Landfill Site located on Carp Road in the Township of West Carleton into the regional wastewater collection system in accordance with the conditions and fee structure set out in this report, subject to the granting of a municipal franchise to Canadian Waste Services Inc. by Regional Council.**

CARRIED

6. RESPONSE TO 10 JUNE 1999 COUNCIL INQUIRY -  
FLUORIDE IN DRINKING WATER

- Acting Deputy Commissioner, Environment and Transportation  
Department report dated 20 Aug 99

Councillor Munter indicated he had no problem with the report and he stated he strongly supports the fluoridation of drinking water. He advised he would be moving a motion that any changes to the limits of fluoride be brought before Community Services Committee and Council for approval, given the significant public interest in this issue. He referred to the report and noted the decrease in the amount of fluoride in the Region's water is well within the drinking water guidelines set out by Health Canada but pointed out that in other jurisdictions the bottom end of their guideline is lower (e.g. Calgary and Australia). He said that in the event that at some point the Federal guidelines change again and there is a desire to change the amount of fluoride in the drinking water, he would like that to come before Committee for discussion.

Committee Chair Hunter felt the Councillor's motion should direct staff to report back to the Planning and Environment Committee rather than the Community Services Committee, as it is a matter of operations of the Environment and Transportation Department. Councillor Munter agreed to amend his motion in this regard.

Councillor Bellemare felt this to be an issue of public health and thought the staff report should have been co-authored by the Medical Officer of Health. He asked if anyone from the Health Department was present to answer questions on this issue.

Andre Proulx, Director, Water Division, introduced Dr. Aaron Burry, Senior Dental Manager, Health Department.

Chair Hunter asked why the change in the fluoridation levels occurred. Dr. Burry advised it was the Health Department's recommendation based on a series of studies both from Health Canada and, most recently, the Province. The Province legislates where the water must be controlled and what the levels are. The recommendation was to reduce it to .8 to

1.0 mg/L and the Health Department was aware this was going happen. Dr. Burry confirmed he foresaw further changes coming over the years.

Responding to questions from Councillor Legendre, Mr. Proulx advised the quantity of fluoride ions (naturally occurring) in the River source fluctuates slightly; the Water Division adjusts their addition of fluoride (slightly) to meet the 0.8mg/L standard. He confirmed he understood Councillor Munter's motion did not refer to these changes in the fluoride level.

The Committee then considered Councillor Munter's motion.

Moved by A. Munter

**That any changes to the fluoridation of drinking water be henceforth brought before Planning and Environment Committee and Council for approval, given the significant public interest in this issue.**

CARRIED

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation.

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

RECEIVED

ADDITIONAL ITEM

7. ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD APPEAL  
RE: TANDEM PARKING IN THE CENTRAL AREA  
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 3 Sept 99

Tim Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, advised Committee this report was brought forward to Planning and Environment Committee on the understanding that the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) hearing was taking place on 21 September 1999, and this would not allow time for the matter to go to Council. The hearing has now been adjourned, at the request of the applicant, to some date after 15 December 1999, so this report should now rise to Council.

Committee Chair Hunter stated he was opposed to the staff recommendation as he felt the Region was involving itself in an area where it has no business. He felt to relate tandem

parking to an aspect of the Regional Official Plan (ROP) for fear of it discouraging people from riding their bikes downtown, would be ridiculous.

Carol Christensen, Senior Project Manager, Land Use, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, explained there was an application to the Committee of Adjustment to permit tandem parking by OMERS at Constitution Square, which the Committee turned down. The City of Ottawa is in the process of having a parking study done including whether or not tandem parking should be permitted and in fact, OMERS request to adjourn the hearing is because this study is being done.

Ms. Christensen felt the ROP had drawn a link between parking and transit use, in particular and she referred Committee to the policy quoted in the staff report at the top of page 2, which speaks to setting parking requirements in zoning by-laws to level which encourages transit. Tandem parking tends to be long term parking so a lot of permission for tandem parking in the central area would result in a substantial increase in the parking supply. As indicated in report, staff have advised the City of Ottawa in their comments on the draft Central Area zoning by-law, that tandem parking is not in line with either the ROP or the City's Official Plan. Ms. Christensen stated it is therefore staff's recommendation to participate in the Board hearing.

Responding to questions from Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Marc advised the City of Ottawa Legal Department does not automatically appear to defend Committee of Adjustment decisions. He opined therefore, if the Committee and Council were of the view that there is a Regional interest at stake, this would be a valid reason for Regional staff to appear at the hearing.

Councillor Legendre had questions with respect to why OMERS had requested additional parking. Ms. Christensen noted OMERS had indicated to the Committee of Adjustment that their parking garage fills up early in the morning. She confirmed that there had been no additional construction on the site to necessitate additional parking. Councillor Legendre felt this would suggest they are merely looking to increase their revenues.

Councillor Hume referred to a statement in the Committee of Adjustment decision which said the new zoning by-law would permit this type of parking arrangement. Ms. Christensen advised although this statement was contained in the decision, it was not a statement of fact. Delcan is in the process of completing a study for the City, which will be brought to their Planning Committee and Council sometime this fall and only at that time will the contents of the zoning by-law be known.

The Committee then heard from the following delegation.

Linda Hoad, Federation of Citizens' Associations (FCA) advised the FCA has taken part in the development and watches with interest, the implementation of both the City of Ottawa Official Plan and the Regional Official Plan. She said the FCA is particularly interested in the success of the transportation policies, particularly in the shift from automobile transportation to the alternatives. Ms. Hoad advised many of FCA members are inner-city and older suburban neighbourhoods that face serious and growing traffic problems that affect quality of life. For this reason, the FCA has taken an interest in requests for tandem parking.

Ms. Hoad noted the City of Ottawa did not comment on the subject application and it was her understanding that their staff would not be appearing at the hearing.

The speaker said the new City zoning bylaw, for all areas except the central area, does permit 10% of required parking to be provided in a tandem fashion, but public parking cannot be provided in a tandem manner. She said the study underway is to determine if tandem parking would be suitable for the central area. Ms. Hoad said the FCA feels quite strongly that the provision of more and cheaper parking does impact on the effectiveness of the transit service. She urged the Committee to support Regional staff appearing at the OMB hearing.

Committee Chair Hunter asked the speaker if she could provide any evidence of the impact increased parking would have on transit use. Ms. Hoad replied the background study prepared for the OC Transpo review provided estimated figures of the loss of ridership due to an increase in the supply and the decrease in the price of parking. She noted the City of Calgary did studies in this regard and as well, evidence shows that when the Federal Government went to flexible hours in the 1970's and the cost of parking tripled in the downtown area, transit ridership in the Region increased.

At Councillor Munter's request, Ms. Hoad advised she was not aware of any jurisdictions in North America where attempts to make parking as cheap and available as possible, led to an increase in transit ridership.

Chair Hunter offered his opinion that OMERS/Constitution Square was merely trying to provide a service to its customers. He pointed out the designated spots were not intended for parking for the general public. Ms. Hoad countered the tandem parking would free up parking spaces for the public and she believed their intention was to generate increased revenues.

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation.

**That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve that Regional staff appear at the Ontario Municipal Board in opposition to permitting tandem parking in the Central Area.**

LOST

NAYS: B. Hill, J. Legendre, R. van den Ham and G. Hunter...4

YEAS: D. Beamish, M. Bellemare and A. Munter...3

(Note: This item will rise to Council without a Committee recommendation.)

### INQUIRIES

Councillor Legendre referenced a memo sent to all members of Council, from the Deputy Commissioner, Environment dated 19 August 1999, entitled "Sierra Legal Defense Fund Attacks Municipal Sewage Treatment Practices". He asked that this item be placed on a future Planning and Environment Committee agenda for discussion.

### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Original signed by D. Whelan  
COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

Original signed by G. Hunter  
COMMITTEE CHAIR