

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

27 FEBRUARY 1996

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

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

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Councillor Stewart drew the Committee's attention to page 22 of the Minutes and pointed out that the third line of the second paragraph should read "Frontenac Axis".

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the meeting of 13 February 1996, as amended.

CARRIED

PLANNING ITEMS

1. City of Kanata Official Plan Amendment No. 35
 - Acting Planning and Property Commissioner's report dated 4 Jan 96
 - Withdrawn from 26 Jan 96 Planning and Environment Committee agenda

Andrew Hope, Manager, Plans Admin. Division, provided an overview of the staff report.

Referring to Minto's request for referral of a portion of Kanata's Local Official Plan Amendment 35 (LOPA 35) to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), Mr. Hope noted that Minto had requested that Kanata apply a dual designation (Institutional/Medium Density Residential) to those lands reserved as a possible future Carleton Roman Catholic School Board (CRCSB) school site (referred to as Area "B"). Kanata Council chose not to introduce a dual designation on this site. Minto has therefore asked the Region to either modify the Amendment to provide the dual designation or refer this issue to the OMB. Regional staff have reviewed Minto's reasons for a referral request and have found they do not fail any of the four tests set out in the Planning Act.

With regard to Minto's request that the Region modify Amendment 35 to allow a dual designation of Area "B", Mr. Hope advised that, although staff do not share the concerns

of the City of Kanata (i.e. medium density development would place a strain on the parks and road network in the South Bridlewood community), there is no Regional Official Plan basis for imposing this modification.

Mr. Hope drew the Committee's attention to a letter from Urbandale Corporation (owner of a portion of the lands in Area "B") requesting that their land in Area "B" be excluded from Kanata Official Plan Amendment 35. He indicated Mr. Paul Van Steen of Urbandale Corporation would be speaking further on this matter.

Responding to questions from Councillor Munter, Mr. Hope advised the Region would normally only modify a local official plan amendment to bring it into conformity with the Regional Official Plan or Provincial policies. In this instance, there are no Regional or Provincial policies impacted and for this reason, staff are recommending the Region not modify LOPA 35.

Councillor Legendre suggested a policy to enable the Region to make such modifications to local official plans, should be considered within the context of the Official Plan Review. This could eliminate the need to refer many matters to the OMB. Tim Marc, Solicitor, Regional Legal Department advised there is nothing in the Regional Official Plan to prohibit modifying a local official plan. However, Kanata would have to be given the opportunity to refer the matter to the OMB before making that decision.

Regis Trudel, Minto Land Development Corp., advised the issue of the school site arose when Minto applied for draft approval for the first phase of the subdivision in 1992. The CRCSB had a proposed school site on adjacent lands to the south; however, it anticipated the school would be needed earlier than development of the lands to the south would permit. Consequently, the CRCSB has indicated their wish to negotiate a school site on Urbandale's or Minto's land.

As a result of these negotiations, Minto requested the land designation be changed from Medium Density to Institutional and Medium Density but the City of Kanata chose not to do this. Mr. Trudel explained Minto's reasons for requesting the dual designation were to ensure that purchasers were aware the proposed site might not be a school and to alert them to what it could be. With regard to the request for Medium Density (as opposed to Low Density), Mr. Trudel pointed out that although the density issue is not great at this time (15 units compared to 29 units), it could be conceived as a large impact once the area is fully developed.

Referring to Urbandale's request to exclude their portion of lands in Area B from LOPA 35, Mr. Trudel suggested that this portion could be deferred until the City of Kanata and Urbandale deal with their outstanding issues.

Responding to questions from Councillor Legendre, Mr. Hope advised it would be preferable for LOPA 35 to proceed with both Minto's and Urbandale's lands. Staff are confident the other applications relevant to Urbandale's land will catch up to LOPA 35.

With regard to Mr. Trudel's suggestion that the lands be deferred rather than excluded, Mr. Hope advised that staff had considered this option, however Urbandale's request was very explicit. It is staff's opinion that Urbandale's request could be accommodated without jeopardizing LOPA 35 or the future development of the school site.

Paul Van Steen, Urbandale Corporation, noted Urbandale owns the land directly north of Minto's Phase IV land as well as 3 acres of the 6 acre school site. Mr. Van Steen advised that in February, 1995 Urbandale raised with the City of Kanata, concerns about Phase VI of their subdivision; issues relating to density, open space designation and other matters that had not yet been dealt with. At that time, Urbandale requested their lands be removed from LOPA 35 as they felt they would be before the OMB on other matters in addition to the dual designation of the school site. However, Urbandale was assured by Kanata's Director of Planning that the draft plan of subdivision, the related official plan and zoning by-law amendments would be processed before the Region dealt with LOPA 35. A year has passed since this assurance was given and these planning applications have not yet been processed. For this reason, Urbandale is reverting to their original request to have their lands removed from LOPA 35.

In response to questions from Councillor Legendre, Mr. Van Steen assured the Committee that, should their lands be excluded from LOPA 35, the 3 acre parcel would remain designated as a potential school site

At this juncture, Regional Chair Clark put forward a motion to exclude the Urbandale lands from Kanata LOPA 35.

Rob McKay, Planner, City of Kanata, referred to page 9 of the staff report and noted Area B is currently designated as Medium Density in Kanata's Official Plan. Minto, in their application to amend the Kanata Official Plan, requested Area B have a dual designation of Medium Density and Institutional and that Area A be designated Medium Density. In 1986 Kanata undertook a comprehensive secondary planning exercise which identified the best locations for schools, land uses, roads, etc. Consistent with this study, it is Kanata's position there should not be two Medium Density designations in the south half of the Bridlewood Community. The Community is currently strained with respect to parks and has some serious traffic problems; as well, the residents do not want increased density. It is Kanata's intent to support only one medium density designation. Regional staff have asked that Kanata impose a non-profit social housing condition which would require a medium density designation and Kanata therefore supports the medium density designation on Area A. Mr. McKay advised that should the CRCSB be unable to exercise its option on the school site, Minto can apply to the City of Kanata at that time to have the land redesignated. It is Kanata Council's wish to have this matter decided by the OMB.

Responding to Councillor Legendre, Mr. McKay confirmed the City of Kanata supports Urbandale's request to remove their portion of Area B from LOPA 35 at this time.

The Committee then considered the motion put forward by Chair Clark.

Moved by P. Clark

That the Urbandale lands be excluded from the City of Kanata Official Plan Amendment 35.

CARRIED
(Councillor Hunter dissented.)

The staff recommendation as amended by the foregoing was then approved.

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council partially approve Amendment No. 35 to the Official Plan of the City of Kanata as amended and refer the balance to the Ontario Municipal Board pursuant to the request of Minto Land Development Corp., as outlined on the approval page attached as Annex I to this report.

CARRIED

2. Draft Plan of Subdivision 06T-92002, Phase IV, Part Lot 27, Concession VI, City of Kanata
 - Acting Planning and Property Commissioner's report dated 8 Jan 96
 - Withdrawn from 26 Jan 96 Planning and Environment Committee agenda

Andrew Hope, Manager, Plans Admin. Division, briefed the Committee on the staff report.

Mr. Hope noted that at issue with Phase IV, are Minto's objections to two Conditions for Final Approval of Draft Plan 06T-92002; namely, Condition 60 (School Site Reservation Condition) and Condition 93 (Affordable Housing Condition).

Regarding Condition 60, Minto objects to the Carleton Roman Catholic School Board's (CRCSB) request for a reservation of the school site for 7 years as they feel it is excessive and could result in a ten year development freeze on this parcel of land. They would prefer a 2 year reservation from the time of registration of Phase IV. Regional staff support the CRCSB.

Referring to Condition 93, Mr. Hope advised when Minto requested Draft Plan Approval on the entire Emerald Meadows subdivision in 1992, Regional staff requested a non-profit housing site (now known as affordable housing) be identified in the subdivision. Staff agreed to defer identification of such a site until after Phase I and II and attempts to identify a non-profit site in Phase III were unsuccessful; therefore it was deferred to Phase IV. Regional staff have done their utmost to accommodate the concerns of both Minto and Kanata. However, Minto has two outstanding areas of concern with Condition 93 which staff do not agree with. Minto would like to add a clause that no public subsidies could be used to build socially assisted housing except for shelter allowances. As well, they would like to maintain control over the architectural and site plan details.

Committee Chair Hunter asked staff what the normal reservation time is for school sites in the Region. Mr. Hope advised 5 years has been the typical reservation period. However, there have not been many school sites reserved in the last few years and elsewhere in the Province 7 years has been used.

Regis Trudel and Roger Greenburg, Minto Land Development Corp. Mr. Trudel, speaking to Condition 93 and the CRCSB's request for a 7 year reservation on the school site, stated that although Minto would prefer a 2 year reservation, they would be willing to accept 5 years as a compromise.

With regard to Condition 60, Mr. Trudel noted Mr. Greenburg had appeared before Kanata Council a year ago and explained Minto's philosophy regarding non-profit housing as being an unwise use of taxpayer's money. This resulted in Kanata Council forwarding to the Region a resolution that the condition on non-profit housing in this subdivision be deleted. Mr. Trudel went on to say that according to Regional policy, no agreement was reached with Minto regarding non-profit housing and he opined that should this matter go before the courts the Region's position would be precarious.

Mr. Trudel indicated much time was spent with Regional staff to reach a compromise, save and except the two areas referred to by Mr. Hope. Minto is asking that any private developer who picks up the option on the land, (if Minto does not build the housing) builds the housing without government subsidy. In addition, Mr. Trudel stated that Minto is spending millions of dollars creating a community of various housing types and would like to protect this investment by having input into the design of any development within the community. It is common practice in the Region for a landowner to maintain design control over land sold to individual builders in order to maintain the integrity of a subdivision. The designs would be submitted to Minto prior to submission to Kanata.

Councillor Munter, referring to an advertisement by Minto for townhouses in the Emerald Meadows, noted the prices advertised were below what is being proposed as affordable housing in this instance (i.e. annual income of \$45,000 corresponding to a house price of \$126,000). Mr. Trudel agreed this was so.

In response to questions posed by Councillor Munter, Mr. Trudel advised the additional clause requested by Minto to Condition 93, is targeted at programs for developers and builders and would not impact on programs for individuals. Councillor Munter felt the wording of the additional clause (i.e. shelter allowance being the only allowable subsidy) would eliminate many subsidized programs.

Mr. Greenburg stated Minto is negotiating in good faith with the Region on the issue of affordable housing, in an attempt find a mechanism that can uphold Minto's moral principles and maintain a development that is in the best interest of the community. Regarding Councillor Munter's comments on the price of townhomes in Emerald Meadows, Mr. Greenburg pointed out the price is "today's" price which reflects the

current costs of materials, development charges and interest rates; the subject land may not be developed for four or five years and it is impossible to say where prices will be.

Referring to Minto's concern that affordable housing blend in with the community, Councillor Cullen pointed out Minto has the option of building the units. Mr. Trudel said Minto's ability to build marketable housing at the predetermined price would be dependent on the cost of materials, development charges, interest rates, etc. at the time of building.

Councillor Legendre expressed his surprise with Minto's opposition to builders/developers receiving subsidies from government, when in fact Minto is receiving significant contributions from at least two levels of government to build Capital Centre.

Councillor Beamish suggested Minto could maintain design control of the units after the property is sold through a condition in the Purchase and Sale Agreement. Mr. Trudel advised Minto wanted to be up-front with the Region and provide information on what they would be looking for from the purchaser. Mr. Greenburg added Minto wanted to be viewed as dealing in good faith.

Ron Friesen, Carleton Roman Catholic School Board, speaking to the Board's request to have a 7 year reservation on the school site, noted that because of funding restraints from the Province this is a reasonable amount of time. He gave a recent example of St. James School in Bridlewood which took 7 years to receive funding and be built (from 1986 to 1993). Mr. Friesen referred to the OMB's 1990 decision which upheld a school board's request for a 7 year reservation. As well, the Carleton Board of Education currently carries 6 and 7 year reservations and The Ontario Association of School Business Officials recently made representations to the Province advocating the extension of the reservation to 10 years. In conclusion, Mr. Freisen advised that the CRCSB is very cost conscious and very seldom has it released school sites; he asked that the 7 year reservation be approved.

Councillor Legendre, referring to Condition 84 which speaks to storm water design plan, asked if cyclist-friendly covers for sewers could be used. Mr. Hope advised that this level of detail could be addressed in the Conditions for Final Approval. Staff agreed to provide the Councillor with the appropriate wording for a such a clause; such wording would however, have to be approved by the City of Kanata.

The Committee then turned their attention to the motions put forward.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Condition 60 be changed to read "for a period of four years".

CARRIED

YEAS: Councillors Beamish, Hume, Hunter, Stewart and van den Ham....5
NAYS: Councillors Cullen, Hill, Legendre and Munter....4

Councillor van den Ham's motion having carried, Chair Hunter ruled the motion put forward by Councillor Cullen (i.e. That Condition 60 be amended to a date specific - 30 June 2003.) to be redundant.

Councillor van den Ham put forward a motion to amend Condition 93 to allow Minto to have design control over the affordable housing units. Chair Hunter suggested this motion should include a proviso that design control disagreements could not be used to achieve the sunset dates. Councillor van den Ham agreed to amend his motion accordingly.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That Condition 93 include appropriate wording regarding design control to the applicant provided that design control disagreements not be used as a means of achieving the sunset dates for the start of construction.

LOST

NAYS: Councillors Beamish, Cullen, Hill, Legendre and Munter.....5

YEAS: Councillors Hume, Hunter, Stewart and van den Ham....4

Moved by P. Hume

That Condition 93 be amended to include the following condition: "3. The purchaser agreeing that the group or company developing said site will not receive government subsidies directed specifically at home construction."

LOST

NAYS: Councillors Beamish, Cullen, Hill, Hunter, Legendre, Munter and van den Ham...7

YEAS: Councillors Hume and Stewart...2

Moved by J. Legendre

That Condition 12(a) be added to read "The owner acknowledges and agrees to provide cyclist-friendly storm and sanitary sewer grates, designed to exclude the possibility of improper installation, to the satisfaction of the City of Kanata's Engineer.

CARRIED

The Committee then considered the staff recommendation as amended.

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve Draft Plan of Subdivision 06T-92002, Phase IV, as outlined in the Draft Plan Approval Report attached as Annex I, as amended by the following:

1. **That Condition 60 be changed to read “for a period of four years”, and;**
2. **That Condition 12(a) be added to read “The owner acknowledges and agrees to provide cyclist-friendly storm and sanitary sewer grates, designed to exclude the possibility of improper installation, to the satisfaction of the City of Kanata’s Engineer.**

CARRIED

3. Summary of Assigned Functions:
Official Plan Amendments, Subdivisions, Condominiums,
Part Lot Control By-Laws, Zoning By-Laws and Severances
- Planning and Property Commissioner’s report dated 24 Jan 96

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council receive this report for information purposes.

RECEIVED

4. Proposed Provincial Policy Statement to Guide Land Use Planning in Ontario
- Acting Planning and Property Commissioner’s report dated 15 Feb 96
- Referred from Planning and Environment Committee meeting of 13 Feb 96
- Acting Planning and Property Commissioner’s report dated 31 Jan 96
available from Committee Coordinator on request

That Planning and Environment Committee approve the staff report and Annex of 13 February 1996, as modified by this report and forward these to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing as Council’s position on the proposed Provincial Policy Statement on land use planning in Ontario.

CARRIED

Moved by A. Cullen

That Council be requested to waive the Rules of Procedure to consider this item at its meeting of 28 February 1996.

CARRIED

5. Regional Plan Review: Detailed Evaluation Phase
- Planning and Property Commissioner’s report dated 29 Nov 95
- Referred back to Planning and Environment Committee by Council at its meeting of 14 Feb 96

Pamela Sweet, A/Commissioner, Planning and Property Department introduced the item to the Committee and pointed out the report was before them for approval of the

guidelines contained in Table 1. Once the analysis is completed, a draft report will be prepared for the Committee's consideration in April; in June, the options (including costs) will be presented to the Committee for approval.

Committee Chair Hunter reminded members the motions tabled at the 9 Jan 96 meeting were before them for consideration.

Chris Jalkotzy, expressed his support for the review. He provided the members with copies of quotations taken from the State of Oregon's Internet Web Page (on file with the Regional Clerk). He expressed hope these quotations would provide the Committee with an impetus to move forward with the Official Plan Review and realize all of the gains that will come from it (i.e. economic, social, environmental).

Councillor Hume asked Mr. Jalkotzy his opinion on whether there is a need to extend Regional servicing (i.e. water, trunk sewers and transportation) to new or existing growth areas. Mr. Jalkotzy stated the Region has so many unclaimed resources in terms of existing services and infrastructure that any expansion would be fiscal insanity.

Councillor Hume asked staff what amount of residential land a municipality is required to have according to the Provincial Policy Statement. Carol Christensen, Manager, Policy Division, advised that a 10 year supply of residential land for development/redevelopment and a 3 year supply of serviced residential units at draft approved or registered plan stage, must be maintained at all times. Ms. Christensen advised the Region currently has enough designated residential land to last to the year 2011 and possibly to 2021. With regard to serviced residential land, the Region has a ten year supply as per Official Plan policy. Responding to further questions from Councillor Hume, Ms. Christensen advised between 1971 and 1991, there were an additional 73,000 dwelling units inside the greenbelt.

Councillor Stewart expressed concern that the majority of the public do not know the Region is in the process of reviewing the Official Plan, nor do they understand the impact it will have on their quality of life. She asked how the public could be made aware of this.

Chair Hunter stated he shared some of the concerns expressed by Councillor Stewart. He noted that until the Region is at the point where it can put specific policies on paper, it is very difficult to advise the public what the impact will be on their community. Presently, there are many ideas and concepts to be tested and he noted some of the motions being put forward recommend that certain situations be ruled out. He suggested all of the options should be considered and the Committee should proceed in the manner they approved at the last meeting. He felt the Region should continue to carry through on the studies and get the specifics on the table as soon as possible.

Councillor Beamish stated he understood the Councillors' frustration, however, he felt the public has no interest in the Region's Official Plan until something takes place which impacts on their lives. He felt there was no way to compel the public at large to participate in the review.

Responding to questions from Councillor Legendre, Ms. Christensen advised once the new Official Plan is adopted and approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, it confers Council's intent to see certain land developed but does not determine the specifics of a development nor does it establish land will be developed within a particular time frame.

The Committee then considered the following motions and disposed of them as indicated.

Moved by D. Beamish

That the report be amended to read that a phasing strategy will be developed but that, in the meantime, all reasonable proposals for development within the existing urban boundaries be considered and brought to the Planning and Environment Committee.

CARRIED
(Chair Clark and Councillor
Munter dissented)

Speaking to the following motion, Councillor Beamish noted that during public consultations held in the Leitrim area, the residents indicated they would like to see the Leitrim area developed. He noted staff at the time stated the Region was open to proposals; they were waiting for developers to make the proposals.

In response to questions from the Committee, Ms. Sweet advised proposals would not normally be brought back to the Committee unless there was a disputed condition of the subdivision agreement.

Moved by D. Beamish

That staff be directed to entertain all proposals for the development of the Leitrim Urban Area and to report back to the Planning and Environment Committee within two months with a report.

CARRIED

YEAS: Councillors Beamish, Cullen, Hill, Hume, Stewart and van den Ham.....6

NAYS: Councillors Hunter, Legendre, Munter and Chair Clark....4

Councillor Cullen withdrew the following motion which was tabled at the meeting of 9 Jan 96. He noted staff have made it very clear they are looking at the criteria and only if there is a need to expand the boundaries, the west will be looked at first.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Step 2, of the steps to develop a preferred regional development pattern to 2021 be amended to read: "If further urban expansion is clearly needed, then examine the merits of urban boundary expansion in the west urban centre first."

WITHDRAWN

Councillor Munter put forward a motion that boundary expansion in the west should not be considered at all. The Councillor felt as there is a 20 to 25 year supply of vacant urban land in Kanata (much of it already serviced) there is no need for further expansion. He felt the Region should be very clear there will be no boundary expansion.

Councillor Cullen suggested that Step 2 (on the top of page 80) should be eliminated. Councillor Munter agreed to add wording to this effect to his motion.

Moved by A. Munter

That the report be amended to read: "Boundary expansions in the west should not be considered because there is significant opportunity for additional units within existing boundaries", and

Further that #2 of the steps to develop a preferred regional development pattern to 2021 - "If needed, examine merits of urban boundary expansions in the west urban centre" be deleted

CARRIED

YEAS: Councillors Beamish, Cullen, Hume, Legendre, Munter and Stewart...6

NAYS: Councillors Hunter and van den Ham....2

Councillor Hume put forward a motion to amend Bullet 1 of Table 1, by replacing 60,000 to 100,000 dwelling units with a maximum of 73,000 dwelling units. He noted that during the baby boom years from 1971 to 1991, 73,000 dwelling units were added. The baby boom has moved past and it is therefore appropriate to limit the testing to 73,000 units. It is not necessary to examine 100,000 units as it is not realistic.

Ms. Christensen pointed out that the 73,000 dwelling units covered a time frame of 20 years whereas staff will be testing for a period of 30 years. As well, the purpose of this next phase of the review is to examine what the actual number should be.

Responding to questions from Councillor Cullen, Ms. Sweet advised staff will report back to the Committee with the results of the tests, indicate why certain tests failed (i.e. too expensive, impact on quality of life, etc.) and make recommendations on what staff feel is the best compromise. Councillor Cullen stated that although he agreed with Councillor Hume that 100,000 dwelling units would not be attainable, he felt it important that the full range of tests be conducted and the results be available to show constituents.

Councillor Legendre questioned staff about the amount of time required to conduct the tests. Ms. Christensen stated it takes approximately one week to develop the numbers for a scenario for input into the transportation and water and waste water models and then another week to run the numbers and analyse the results. She noted staff propose running three or four models, two of which have already been completed.

Given that staff have already completed the tests on two models, Councillor Hume withdrew his motion.

Moved by P. Hume

That Bullet Number 1 be amended by amending the wording as follows: “Begin by testing development levels to a maximum of 73,000 dwelling units inside the greenbelt.

WITHDRAWN

Councillors Cullen and Legendre put forward motions to amend Bullet 3 of Table 1. Councillor Cullen stated the intent of his motion is to ensure those NCC lands currently designated National Interest Land Mass (parkland, not to be developed) are recognized.

Councillor Legendre explained that provincially significant wetlands recognize those wetlands in Classes I to III, in a system that envisages seven classes. His amendment provides for regionally and locally significant wetlands in Classes IV to VII. The Region and local municipalities can later adopt policies to determine which of these classes are significant to them. Councillor Stewart asked that Councillor Legendre include in his amendment a specific reference to Classes IV to VII; Councillor Legendre agreed.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Bullet 3 be replaced with the following: “Assume no development on parkland, lands in Ottawa’s Greenway System, on NCC corridors currently designated NILM (National Interest Land Mass), provincially significant wetlands, and significant natural features within existing urban boundaries.”

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That Bullet 3 be further amended by adding the words “regionally or locally” after the word provincially, so that the bullet would include significance of wetlands at the provincial, regional or local levels (Classes IV to VII) as contemplated by the provincial policy.

CARRIED

Councillor Hume put forward the following motion, noting that Bullet 5 proposes testing scenarios to see where the Region should expand next. The Councillor stated he was of the opinion this does not need to be tested as there is no need to expand nor is there any money available to pay for an extension of services. There is a 20 year supply of land designated residential, which meets the provincial and regional policy statements. As well, there is at least a 7 year supply of serviced land available.

Moved by P. Hume

That Bullet number 5 (Evaluate Servicing Thresholds) be deleted and replaced with the following: "That for the first five year period (1997 to 2002) of the new Official Plan that the RMOC will not extend its trunk services and that new thresholds be considered for review by the first five year review of the RMOC Official Plan."

Committee Chair Hunter ruled this motion out of order as he felt it did not deal with guidelines for testing the distribution of population. Councillor Hume disagreed with this ruling and he challenged the Chair. The Chair was sustained on a vote of 5 Yeas and 4 Nays.

YEAS: Councillors Cullen, Hunter, Legendre, Stewart and van den Ham...5

NAYS: Councillors Beamish, Hume and Munter...3

Councillor Hume then put forward the following motion:

That Bullet number 5 (Evaluate Servicing Thresholds) be deleted and replaced with the following: "That scenarios be evaluated on the premise that for the first five year period (1997 to 2002) of the new Official Plan, the RMOC will not extend its trunk services and that new thresholds be considered for review by the first five year review of the RMOC Official Plan."

At the request of the Committee Chair, Tim Marc, Solicitor, Legal Department advised that in essence, the Regional Development Strategy (RDS) was before the Committee for consideration; one of the aspects of the RDS is the manner in which the Capital Infrastructure Program is carried out. In this regard, Mr. Marc opined that Councillor Hume's motion was in order. He added he was of the opinion that the first motion was also in order but acceded to the ruling of the Committee.

Chair Hunter noted Councillor Hume's motion proposes that Bullet 5, which deals with thresholds for piped services and transportation, be deleted and replaced with his motion which deals only with trunk services.

Ms. Sweet stated staff intend to look at the costs associated with phasing development. She also noted by the time this review is completed and the next five year review is begun, the current supply of serviced land will be depleted. She asked that staff be allowed to

investigate the costs associated with the thresholds for piped services and transportation; the Committee and Council can then decide the sequence through phasing policies.

Chair Hunter ruled this motion out of order as well. Councillor Hume challenged the Chair. The rule of the Chair was not sustained on a tie vote of 4 Yeas and 4 Nays.

NAYS: Beamish, Cullen, Hume and Munter....4

YEAS: Hunter, Legendre, Stewart and van den Ham....4

Councillor Cullen felt Councillor Hume's motion identified another development scenario and he put forward a motion that it be referred to staff for evaluation.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Councillor Hume's amendment to bullet 5 in Table 1 be referred to staff to evaluate as another development scenario.

CARRIED

YEAS: Councillors Beamish, Cullen, Legendre, Stewart and van den Ham....5

NAYS: Councillors Hume, Hunter and Munter.....3

Councillor Cullen withdrew the following motion (tabled at 9 Jan 96 meeting), after being assured by Ms. Sweet that staff, after testing the worst case scenario, would be aggressive in the development of a policy dealing with employment distribution.

Moved by A. Cullen

That Bullet 9 be amended to read: "Assume the "trend" employment distribution as a minimum, but develop additional scenarios to move toward a balanced employment distribution."

WITHDRAWN

Councillor Legendre speaking to the following motion, noted this matter was raised by a delegation at 9 Jan 96 meeting and he felt it important to include this in the guidelines. Councillor Stewart asked that the words "and safety" be added to the motion after the word "health"; Councillor Legendre agreed with this amendment.

Ms. Christensen stated staff feel the areas raised in Councillor Legendre's motion will be covered as a matter of course, in all of the criteria proposed in Table 1. She stated it would be difficult to develop additional criteria to address the Councillor's concerns.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the following be added as a bullet in the guidelines table (Table 1): “Testing of development levels and distributions will consider the resulting effects, positive and negative, on the health of the environment as well as on the quality of life and the health and safety of the citizens of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa Carleton.”

CARRIED
(Councillor van den Ham
dissented)

Moved by A. Cullen

That, in Annex B, evaluation criteria C10 be amended from “TMP” to “ALL”.

CARRIED

The Committee then considered the report as amended.

1. **That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the Guidelines as presented in Table 1 of this report as the basis for further work in the detailed evaluation phase of the Regional Plan Review, as amended by the following.**

- i. **That the report be amended to read that a phasing strategy will be developed but that, in the meantime, all reasonable proposals for development within the existing urban boundaries be considered and brought to the Planning and Environment Committee.**
- ii. **That staff be directed to entertain all proposals for the development of the Leitrim Urban Area and to report back to the Planning and Environment Committee within two months with a report.**
- iii. **That the report be amended to read: “Boundary expansions in the west should not be considered because there is significant opportunity for additional units within existing boundaries”, and**

Further that #2 of the steps to develop a preferred regional development pattern to 2021 - “If needed, examine merits of urban boundary expansions in the west urban centre” be deleted

- iv. **That Bullet 3 be replaced with the following: “Assume no development on parkland, lands in Ottawa’s Greenway System, on NCC corridors currently designated NILM (National Interest Land Mass), provincially significant**

**wetlands, and significant natural features within existing urban boundaries.”
and,**

- v. **That Bullet 3 be further amended by adding the words “regionally or locally” after the word provincially, so that the bullet would include significance of wetlands at the provincial regional or local levels (Classes IV to VII) as contemplated by the provincial policy.**
 - vi. **That the following be added as a bullet in the guidelines table (Table 1): “Testing of development levels and distributions will consider the resulting effects, positive and negative, on the health of the environment as well as on the quality of life and the health and safety of the citizens of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa Carleton.”**
 - vii. **That, in Annex B, evaluation criteria C10 be amended from “TMP” to “ALL”.**
2. **That Councillor Hume’s amendment to bullet 5 in Table 1**

“That scenarios be evaluated on the premise that for the first five year period (1997 to 2002) of the new Official Plan, the RMOC will not extend its trunk services and that new thresholds be considered for review by the first five year review of the RMOC Official Plan.”

be referred to staff to evaluate as another development scenario.

CARRIED

Moved by J. Legendre

That Council be requested to waive the Rules of Procedure to consider this matter at its meeting of 28 February 1996.

CARRIED

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEMS

- 6. Approval to Receive Waste Disposal Site Leachate at the Robert O. Pickard Environmental Centre
- Director, Water Environment Protection Division report dated 6 Feb 96

Councillor Cullen had concerns about the treatment of leachates and in this regard, he submitted a written inquiry outlining his questions (see Inquiries below).

That 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 Trail Road Landfill site at the Robert O. Pickard Environmental Centre in accordance with the conditions and fee structure set out in this report.

CARRIED

7. Conditions of Consent - Capital Hill Filters Recyclers
- Director, Solid Waste Division report dated 5 Feb 96

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve the granting of a consent to 1024487 Ontario Limited operating as Capital Hill Filters Recyclers for the operation of its oil filter recycling facility located 1756 Bantree Street, Ottawa, Ontario, on terms and conditions attached as Annex A to this report.

CARRIED

INQUIRIES

Councillor Cullen submitted the following inquiry which relates to Item 6 of this Agenda (Approval to Receive Waste Disposal Site Leachate at ROPEC)

“The 6 Feb 96 staff report deals with the accumulation of leachate and the need to treat it prior to release to the environment.

- 1) What are the conditions of the leachate that prevent it from being directly discharged to the environment?
- 2) What would be the result of treatment to the leachate at the R.O. Pickard Centre?
- 3) Under what conditions could leachate not be treated at the R.O. Pickard Centre?
- 4) Is the leachate tested for contaminants/toxins prior to treatment? Is there testing for contaminants/toxins after treatment? Does this include chemicals, heavy metals, organic and inorganic materials not normally found in the waste water treatment?

IN-CAMERA ITEMS

Moved by J. Legendre

That Agenda Item 1 of the Confidential Agenda be considered by the Planning And Environment Committee In Camera pursuant to subsection 11(1)(e) (litigation or potential litigation affecting the Regional Corporation, including matters before administrative tribunals), of The Procedure By-Law

CARRIED

The Committee moved In-Camera, discussed the item and then approved the following recommendation.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the Planning And Environment Committee move Out Of Camera and resume in open session.

CARRIED

The staff recommendation was then approved.

That Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council authorize the Regional Solicitor to amend the Minutes of Settlement between the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton (RMOC) and Laidlaw Waste Systems Ltd., Laidlaw Waste Systems (Ottawa) Ltd., and Laidlaw Inc. (together, Laidlaw) to resolve issues related to the quantity of waste which the RMOC is required to send to the Laidlaw landfill.

CARRIED

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1994 Monitoring Program - Trail Road and Nepean Landfill Sites

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's memorandum dated 5 Feb 96

Robert O. Pickard Environmental Centre - Project Management Report No. 84

- Environment and Transportation Commissioner's memorandum dated 12 Feb 96

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

COMMITTEE CHAIR