



**Planning and Protection Committee Action Report
for the June 7th, 2016 meeting to be held in
the Council Chambers following Physical Environment Committee**

PRESENT: Mayor Antonakos, Deputy-Mayor Flynn, Councillor Black, Councillor Doucett (left before 127243), Councillor Redmond, Councillor Fritz, Councillor Trimble, Duncan Rogers, Clerk, Dee Dee Scissons, Andrew Willows, Plans Examiner/Building Inspector, Brian Gass, Chief Building Official, Dave Young, Director of Public Works, Les Reynolds, Director of Protective Services, Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services, Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer

- 1) **DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY/CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF – now or anytime during the meeting**
 - 2) **PUBLIC MEETING – NONE THIS EVENING**
 - 3) **REGISTRATION OF PUBLIC WISHING TO SPEAK**
 - 4) **PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES AND PAGERS**
 - 5) **COMMUNICATION 126243 IS A CLOSED MEETING**
 - 6) **IF THERE IS AN ADDENDUM, IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 15.2.4 (OF STRIKING REPORT) DOES THE COMMITTEE WISH TO APPROVE THIS ADDENDUM?**
-

The following items are for information only and will not be discussed unless the Committee chooses to do so. The Chair will entertain a motion to receive and file for those items not pulled out for discussion.

COMMUNICATION 127232

Received from	Les Reynolds, Director of Protective Services
Addressed to	Planning and Protection Committee
Date	June 2 nd , 2016
Topic	OWFC Activity Report

SUMMARY

OWFC Activity Report for the month of May is attached.

COMMENT

For Council's Information

127232 Continued

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Receive and Record

COMMITTEE DECISION

Receive and Record

COMMUNICATION 127233

Received from	Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services
Addressed to	Planning and Protection Committee
Date	May 25 th , 2016
Topic	Development Services- Planning Activity

SUMMARY

Committee has requested, from the Planning Department, a monthly review of planning matters received or approved within the department. The following outline represents only those matters that were accompanied by a submitted application. The overview does not represent the numerous inquiries received throughout the reporting period, as these inquiries may or may not come to fruition. In addition the accompanying chart does not illustrate the ongoing efforts with respect to various submitted subdivision files.

COMMENT

For Council's Information

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Receive and Record

COMMITTEE DECISION

Receive and Record

TO BE DISCUSSED

COMMUNICATION 127201

Received from Brian Gass, Chief Building Official
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date April 28, 2016
Topic New Building By-law

SUMMARY

The Town has had the same Building By-law for the past ten years. During those same years the Province has opted to start using the Building Code Act, and its companion regulation, the Building Code, as a means to introduce provincial policy decisions that go beyond regulating the traditional structural and fire/life safety aspects of construction.

For example, the design and construction of Resource Conservation and Environmental Integrity features in buildings have resulted in enhanced inspection protocols. In addition, the new By-law provides the starting point of framework for the Building Department to move towards e-permits. A system where applications would not only be received electronically, but permits also being issued electronically.

The current 2015 permit fee schedule has also been reviewed. Treasury has indicated that this permit fee schedule is projected to adequately cover the costs of the Building Department in the near future. As a result, there are no substantial changes to fees proposed. The changes are summarized as follows;

1. Discontinuation of “Inspection Deposit Fee”

Currently, every permit holder is required to post an Inspection Deposit Fee. The purpose of this deposit is to recover any costs associated with extra inspections. The collection and refund of these deposits are an administrative nightmare and places an unnecessary financial burden on our clients.

2. Introduction of an annual fee rate adjustment.

The reality is that each year operational costs of any organization increase. Therefore, since permit fees are meant to cover the costs associated with administration and enforcement of the Building Code and Act, these fees should be increased accordingly over time. Several years ago, municipalities in western Ontario, after consulting with their local construction, determined that yearly minor (typically under 1%) fee increases can better anticipated by the market rather than being faced with than substantial fee increases (typically between 10% to 25%) every five or ten years. As a result, this by-law proposes an annual fee adjustment based upon the 3rd Quarter Statistics Canada Construction Cost Index for Ottawa.

127201 Continued

3. Introduction of Minimum Fee Deposits at time of permit application.

The Minimum Permit Fee is not an extra or new fee, it is simply a collection of part of the permit fees when an application is applied for. With the abandonment of the Inspection Deposit Fee, we still should be collecting some fees at time of permit application to offset the costs associated with plans review and processing of a permit that may be abandoned by the applicant

4. Introduction of the ability to recover costs associated with third party peer review

The current fee schedule does not provide the Town the ability to recover costs where consultation with a professional is required from time to time. For example, the Building Code now permits an applicant to seek an Alternative Solution (material or whole building system) to a prescriptive requirement of the code.

Sometimes these materials are so new, and innovative, that they perhaps had not fully undergone testing. We would need to hire experts in that particular field to peer review the data submitted by the applicant.

In addition to the above noted changes, the Chief Building Official was asked by the Development Review Team to explore what practices other municipalities use to ensure that the siting of new buildings for location (setbacks), site grading and storm water management / flood mitigation measures are being constructed to the original plans filed within agreements that are beyond the authority of the Building Code Act to enforce. A review of the current operational practices established over the years by staff in both the Public Works and Planning Departments, work relatively well with some minor exceptions.

The greatest challenge appears to be the timing of when town staff receive “as built” survey plans for the building. This drawing does not only ensure the building is actually located on the site where it was proposed, but in addition, can also provide top of foundation wall elevations, to confirm that the foundation is constructed at a height adequate to permit the grading of the lot and driveway to be installed as it was proposed. Currently, this survey information and/or grading certificate are submitted by the builder upon completion of the whole building, when there is little opportunity to easily correct errors, such as inverted driveways, or side yard swales sloped too steep to cut a lawn with a mower, etc... This results in unhappy homeowners which may not only just complain to the town, but they could also initiate litigation against the builder and the Town.

In an effort to assist Planning and Public Works staff manage these challenges. The previously distributed Building By-law has a schedule, governed under the authority of the Municipal Act, not the Building Code Act, to set out a program regarding how vacant lots are to be developed. Essentially, Schedule “D” takes the current practices of Planning and Public Works and establishes a time line of what documents are required

127201 Continued

when. If the by-law is enacted, as written, then a builder will be required to submit to the Town a “top of foundation as built” survey of the building upon completion of the foundation. What is important to note here is that most builders have this survey already done and simply do not submitted it to the town until the project is completed and they are seeking refund of their grading deposit.

COMMENT

The proposed Building By-law is a modernized version of the current by-law. Introducing greater flexibility in the administration of the Building Code to deal with the ever changing technologies and systems of construction, while protecting the general public’s interests of ensuring structures remain safe for their users.

UPDATE – June 7th, 2016

In accordance to the direction received by Council, on May 12 and 19, 2016, staff advertised notice of both an Open House meeting, held on May 26, 2016 at 3:30 pm in Council Chambers, and the Statutory Public Meeting, held on June 7, 2017 at 7:00 pm in Council Chambers, in the local print media page “Municipal Matters”. Also additional notices were posted on the Towns Website, Facebook and Twitter accounts.

In addition, Building Department staff made a point of discussing face to face the proposed changes with contractors that are currently building in town while conducting building inspections. Overall, while it is human nature to initially resist change, after explaining the intent and rational, the contractors seem generally receptive to the proposed changes. Staff, did note some valid concerns with some worthwhile suggestions that will assist us in making operational decisions in regards to implementation of the new changes to hopefully ensure a smooth transition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That By-law be forwarded to Council.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That By-law be forwarded to Council.

COMMUNICATION 127234

Received from Andrew Willows, Building Inspector/Plans examiner
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date June 2nd, 2016
Topic Repointing of Town Hall – 150 Community Infrastructure Program

SUMMARY

On March 22nd, 2016, a contribution agreement was made between the Town and Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Program for the refurbishing of approximately 12 windows, 1 door, and repointing portions of the stonework of the Town Hall. The duration of the agreement is over a two year period in which the Minister agreed to the contribution of an amount not exceeding the lesser of (a) and (b) as follows:

- a) Max 33.3% of total Eligible Costs of the Project incurred and paid by the Recipient; and
- b) \$ 67 000.

Staff posted a call for “Expression of Interest” to contractor for various capital projects. Contractors had until May 15, 2016 to respond. From which, three contractor provided quotations, for the repointing portion based on the scope of work below;

Scope of Work

Contractors quoted on repointing the South wall of the Town Hall, from the corner of Bridge and Mill Street to the Clock Tower, including the first 35 vertical feet of west wall of the Clock Tower. Contractors were to provide material and labor quotations. Contractors also were asked to provide their plan for scaffolding, but not to include within quotation.

Information collected was as follows;

Castle Masonry and Construction Quotation: \$14.00 per square foot

“Castle Masonry combines excellent masonry workmanship with effective project coordination. They can take on challenging projects and get the job done within schedule.” – Lisa Nicol, P.Eng. John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd.

Castle Masonry also completed masonry on the Town Square Washroom Building.

Heritage Brick & Stone Craft Quotation: \$25.00 per square foot

Owner, Colin Coveny, has been the contractor working on the emergency repointing repair which were required from the John G. Cooke report for the past couple years.

Darren Hearfield Quotation: \$30.00 per square foot

127234 Continued

All masons are graduates of the Heritage Masonry Program at Algonquin College, and have been working on Parliament Hill on the restoration of the West Block.

All Contractors are insured, and will ensure working conditions are safe for all. All contractors will complete all repointing in a manner consistent with heritage repointing.

Staff will be addressing the windows and door portion at a later date.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council hereby authorizes staff to issue a Purchase Order to Castle Masonry and Construction, and associated scaffolding company, for the repointing portion of the Town Hall, and for additional capital projects, specifically to repoint and repair the retaining walls found on Townline Road East.

COMMITTEE DECISION

THAT Council hereby authorizes staff to issue a Purchase Order to Castle Masonry and Construction, and associated scaffolding company, for the repointing portion of the Town Hall, and for additional capital projects, specifically to repoint and repair the retaining walls found on Townline Road East.

COMMUNICATION 127235

Received from	Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services
Addressed to	Planning and Protection Committee
Date	May 25 th , 2016
Topic	Extension of Nu Globe Subdivision Draft Plan Approval

SUMMARY

The County has received a letter from McIntosh Perry, on behalf of their client, Nu Globe Developments, requesting the extension of draft plan approval for 09-T-12002 which currently lapses September 21, 2016. Nu Globe has requested a one (1) year extension to September 21st, 2017. Their reasons for request include:

- difficulties with being able to meet draft conditions due to delays in negotiations with neighboring landowners and the municipality, and
- Not being able to obtain engineering approvals from both the municipality and the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority.

They further note that they have on-going negotiations with potential development partners.

127235 Continued

COMMENT

The Planning Act allows for applicants to request for an extension to Draft Approval for up to a period of three years. Extensions past that period are not permitted. The reasons for this are:

- That the validity of the supporting technical reports and studies may be out of date with current trends and growth that has occurred after the issuance of draft approval.
- There is also a concern that if allowed to linger the public is not necessarily informed as the period of time since the public meeting is extensive.

Although the applicant only faced the normal challenges associated with satisfying the draft conditions, staff has reviewed the applicant's request and determined at this time that there is no need to ask for addendums to current technical reports and studies. Also, the public continues to be aware of the pending development of the subdivision so the public consultation remains valid.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT staff forward a recommendation to the County of Lanark for an extension for one (1) year to the Draft Approval of the Nu Globe Subdivision.

COMMITTEE DECISION

THAT staff forward a recommendation to the County of Lanark for an extension for one (1) year to the Draft Approval of the Nu Globe Subdivision.

COMMUNICATION 127236 (previous # 127000)

Received from	Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services
Addressed to	Planning and Protection Committee
Date	May 25 th , 2016
Topic	Development Permit Application DP3-02-2011

SUMMARY

The applicant for development permit application DP3-02-2011, John Gibson, has asked for a further extension to his Development Permit Class 3 application.

COMMENT

Mr. Gibson applied for his Class 3 development permit application in 2011 to demolish the existing single family dwelling and construct a 26 unit, three storey apartment building with access from Franktown Road. The applicant was given a Development Permit Agreement which was never signed.

127236 Continued

October 14, 2014 a letter was sent to Mr. Gibson noting that the application had been ongoing without contact for over a year. The Town asked Mr. Gibson to provide in writing, confirmation that the project was to continue. The Town received a letter from Mr. Gibson October 23, 2014.

October 30, 2014 another letter was sent to Mr. Gibson noting that Council would grant an extension until January 31, 2015 in order to have the new Council review and decide on extension times.

January 6, 2015 Council extended the application until November 30, 2015. Council granted the previous extension and Mr. Gibson was sent a letter dated December 4, 2015 noting the requested extension had been granted until June 1, 2016.

UPDATE

The Town has now received additional correspondence that Mr. Gibson would like to request a further extension to the project of 6 months.

Staff have reviewed the applicant's request and determined that, at this time, there is no need to ask for addendums to current technical reports and studies. Also, the public continues to be aware of the project so the public consultation remains valid.

Given that this is the fourth extension, and provided that we now include a 6 month period in our Development Permit Agreements prior to lapsing of the agreement, it is suggested that this should be the final extension provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That Council grant an extension for an additional 6 months up to December 1, 2016 for Development Permit Application DP3-02-2011 but that this be the final extension granted.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That Council grant an extension for an additional 6 months up to December 1, 2016 for Development Permit Application DP3-02-2011 but that this be the final extension granted.

COMMUNICATION 127237

Received from Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date June 1st, 2016
Topic Amend By-law 13-2015

SUMMARY

When planning applications are approved often the project cannot begin immediately as the Developer needs some time to complete certain details (arrange financing, finalize sales, obtain building permits, fulfill conditions of approval). However, the various technical studies and the public consultation only remain valid for a fixed time. For this reason, planning approvals include a date for proceeding, normally 3 years for a Subdivision and 6 months for a Development Permit approval.

Each request to extend timelines is unique to the project. Extension requests are reviewed by staff of various departments in order to determine if an extension is appropriate considering whether or not the reports are still valid and whether the public is aware of the future development. Staff recommends that this procedure be continued but as there is currently no fee associated with this review, the tariff of fees by-law should be amended to include a fee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the tariff of fees By-law 13-2015 be amended to include a fee \$500.00 for review of extension requests. This fee would apply to all future requests for an extension of planning approvals.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That the tariff of fees By-law 13-2015 be amended to include a fee \$500.00 for review of extension requests. This fee would apply to all future requests for an extension of planning approvals.

COMMUNICATION 127238

Received from Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date May 30th, 2016
Topic MVCA – Wetlands

SUMMARY

Last summer, the Town learned of MVCA's plans to designate new local wetlands and this was reviewed with Council of September 8th, 2015 (126344). Despite the Town's comments it appears MVCA feels that their outreach efforts which reached approximately 40 landowners (of approximately 5000 owners impacted) have been sufficient and they intend to proceed with designation of the wetlands.

127238 Continued

COMMENT

MVCA acknowledges that they created their map of proposed wetlands using dated aerial mapping and that they have not actually visited the sites which they propose to designate as wetlands. Because they have prepared their proposed wetland map based on such poor information, MVCA has offered to refine their proposed map if the property owner can provide sufficient data.

Staff have provided MVCA with actual field data related to the town properties owned by the Town, where wetlands were proposed and MVCA has agreed to refine their map and remove the wetlands proposed on the Town's property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT staff work with the other property owners within Carleton Place, that are impacted by MVCA's proposed new wetland, to have the proposed wetland map appropriately refined to reflect the actual conditions.

ALSO THAT the Town circulate a letter to the other municipalities in the MVCA drainage area outlining the steps the Town is taking to ensure owners within the Town have an opportunity to refine the wetlands map before it is adopted as a regulation by MVCA.

COMMITTEE DECISION

THAT staff work with the other property owners within Carleton Place, that are impacted by MVCA's proposed new wetland, to have the proposed wetland map appropriately refined to reflect the actual conditions.

ALSO THAT the Town circulate a letter to the other municipalities in the MVCA drainage area outlining the steps the Town is taking to ensure owners within the Town have an opportunity to refine the wetlands map before it is adopted as a regulation by MVCA.

COMMUNICATION 127239

Received from	Kory Earle
Addressed to	Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Date	May 25 th , 2016
Topic	AODA

SUMMARY

Kory Earle will be meeting with the Ministry in Toronto to discuss the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and would appreciate some feedback that he can convey at this meeting.

127239 Continued

COMMENT

The AODA sets out numerous requirements that impact both the built environment and how organizations (both public and private) and their staff operate. The requirements are being phased in over a number of years but some of the requirements will be onerous, particularly for small organizations. Little funding has been available to assist with the cost of implementing the AODA requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Kory Earle be asked to encourage the Minister to provide additional support, including financial, to assist small organizations with implementing the AODA requirements.

COMMITTEE DECISION

THAT Kory Earle be asked to encourage the Ministry to provide additional support, including financial, to assist small organizations with implementing the AODA requirements and ensure that the application process is simplified.

COMMUNICATION 127240

Received from	Les Reynolds, Director of Protective Services
Addressed to	Planning and Protection Committee
Date	May 27 th , 2016
Topic	Fire Safety Inspection Charges

SUMMARY

Our Fire Prevention Officers conduct fire safety inspections on various classes of buildings throughout the town. In many cases a single visit confirms that the building is in compliance with the Ontario Fire Code. Unfortunately some inspections reveal contraventions of the Code which must be rectified. When this occurs the inspector issues a Fire Safety Inspection Report and schedules a follow up inspection. If the contravention is not rectified by the time of the re-inspection then a Fire Safety Order is issued, a second re-inspection is scheduled and the property owner may face prosecution.

These re-inspections impact staff time and our ability to carry out scheduled fire prevention activities. Property owners who ignore directions to correct deficiencies should expect to incur the associated enforcement costs. In 2015, 30 buildings required 3 or more visits to bring them into compliance with an estimated cost of \$3500 in staff time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Fees and Charges By-law be amended to include a charge for 2nd and subsequent re-inspections of buildings at a rate of \$75.00 per hour with a minimum 1 hour charge.

127240 Continued

COMMITTEE DECISION

THAT the Fees and Charges By-law be amended to include a charge for 2nd and subsequent re-inspections of buildings at a rate of \$75.00 per hour with a minimum 1 hour charge.

COMMUNICATION 127241

Received from Les Reynolds, Director of Protective Services
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date May 26th, 2016
Topic Supporting Ontario's First Responders Act

SUMMARY

On April 5, 2016 the Legislature passed the Supporting Ontario's First Responders Act which:

1. Creates a presumption that a diagnosis of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in a first responder is work related and expedites access to worker compensation benefits and treatments.
2. Gives the Minister of Labour the authority to request and publish PTSD Prevention Plans from employers

COMMENT

- PTSD is a mental health illness that falls within the category of anxiety disorders
- It occurs as a result of exposure to actual or threatened incidents of death, serious injury or sexual violence
- Onset of symptoms can occur at any time from immediately after the incident to years later. The risk does not decrease until at least 9-24 months after exposure
- A diagnosis cannot be made until symptoms persist for at least 1 month and not until at least 6 months after the incident
- First responders are at least twice as likely as the general population to suffer from PTSD
- We now have not only a moral but a legal obligation to do our best to prevent or mitigate PTSD in our firefighters

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That staff develop a PTSD Prevention Plan for our fire service and present it to Council for approval.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That staff develop a PTSD Prevention Plan for our fire service and present it to Council for approval.

COMMUNICATION 127242

Received from Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services
Addressed to Planning and Development Committee
Date June 2nd, 2016
Topic Consent Application B16/077, 131-133 Elizabeth Street

SUMMARY

A consent application has been received from the applicant in relation to the property known municipally as 131-133 Elizabeth St. The subject lands are legally described as Parts 1 and 2 on 27R-10582 and illustrated below.



This consent application is to sever a 307.1 m² residential lot, leaving a 307.46m² portion of retained residential property. The purpose of the severance is to split the existing semi-detached units into separate ownerships. The semi-detached units were constructed and approved through building permit 14N043.

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) provides direction on matters of Provincial interest pertaining to land use matters and all development proposals must be consistent with the policies therein. The statement believes that long term prosperity for the Province depends upon a “strong, sustainable and resilient community, a clean and healthy environment, and a strong and competitive economy”. The policy statement directs development to settlement areas and protects the resources throughout the province.

127242 Continued

Section 1.0 of the statement, Building Strong Healthy Communities, stresses efficient development patterns by supporting infill development, utilizing existing infrastructure and promoting opportunities to create a varied built form.

Section 2.0 of the statement protects resources and Section 3.0 outlines policies to direct development away from areas of potential hazards.

The proposed severance complies and is consistent with policy directions within the Provincial Policy Statement.

The Official Plan designation for this property is Residential (R). This designation allows for a mix of housing types which complements the existing small town character. The Development Permit By-law also designates the property as Residential (R). The severance will allow the existing semi-detached to be created under individual ownerships. Both the retained and the severed lot meets the minimum frontage required under the Development Permit By-law.

COMMENT

The proposal, if approved, will allow for the existing semi-detached to be under separate ownership. The lots are appropriately designated in both the Official Plan and in the Development Permit By-law. As with any severance application, staff complies a list of conditions that the application must meet before final approval and creation of a new deed.

It should be noted that once the County of Lanark Land Division Committee makes a decision, the applicant must clear all conditions within one year from the date of that decision. The proposed conditions for the application are:

1. The balance of outstanding taxes, including penalties and interest, (and any local improvement charges if applicable) shall be paid to the Town of Carleton Place.
2. The applicant shall provide the Town of Carleton Place with a digital copy of the reference plan (in NAD83 datum).
3. That a deposited reference plan be submitted to the Town of Carleton Place.
4. That a cash-in-lieu of parkland payment of \$640.00 be collected from the applicant.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That staff forward the above conditions to the County of Lanark for consideration.

COMMITTEE DECISION

That staff forward the above conditions to the County of Lanark for consideration.

COMMUNICATION 127243

Received from Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Addressed Planning and Protection Committee
Date June 3rd, 2016
Topic Closed Meeting

SUMMARY

As authorized by the Municipal Act, Council should review selected items in closed session.

COMMENT

The Municipal Act permits discussions about the sale of property to be in closed session so that negotiations can be finalized in confidence. It also allows Council the opportunity to consider an offer, and, if the proposal is not acceptable and not proceeding there is no need to publicize what is not happening. However, regarding 08-03-16-1, the Developer's consultant has chosen to introduce the topic to the public.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT 08-03-16-1 a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality of local board; General Nature – Carambeck Property be discussed in Open Session

THAT in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, that the meeting be closed to the public with the following agenda:

AGENDA

- 19-04-16-1 a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality of local board; General Nature – Beckwith Street Property.
- 07-06-16-1 personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees; General Nature - Staffing
- 07-06-16-2 litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board: General Nature – OCWA Contract
- 07-06-16-3 litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board: General Nature – Water Inspection
- 07-06-16-4 a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality of local board; General Nature – Roy Brown Park

127243 Continued

COMMITTEE DECISION

THAT in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, that the following item be closed to the public with the following agenda and that the Town Realtor and Developer attend.

AGENDA

19-04-16-1 a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality of local board; General Nature – Beckwith Street Property

CARRIED

THAT 08-03-16-1 a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality of local board; General Nature – Carambeck Property be discussed in Open Session

CARRIED

SUMMARY

The distributed offer from Quest Homes Ltd. has been received for property on Bridge Street (Carambeck)

The offer to purchase the property for \$400,000 is conditional on the following items:

- That the seller issues building permits for a semi-detached dwelling on Part 3 and 9 town homes on Part 4, and
- The lot's shall be fully serviced on the closing date
- Closing date is 10 days after the lots are serviced and building permit is ready
- That the seller agrees to pay 5% consulting fee to CP Rental and Property Management upon closing
- That the offer is null and void if the conditions are not met by August 1, 2016.

COMMENT

These properties were advertised for sale in March 2015. In May 2015, Council considered and countered an offer as shown below.

Parcel	Asking Price	Offer May 2015 5% Commission	Counter Offer 2015 2% Commission	Offer February 2016 5% Consulting fee
Part 1 & 2	\$95,000	\$60,000	\$85,500	
Part 3	\$110,000	\$70,000	\$99,000	\$98,876
Part 5	\$335,000	240,000	\$301,500	\$301,124

127243 Continued

The property for sale has been listed by the Town and does indicate that the proposed semi and townhome dwellings would be appropriate and possible. Prior to listing the property staff undertook an exercise to investigate building yield on the lands. The Official Plan requires that a Plan of Subdivision is necessary for the creation of any more than four lots. There are many technical studies and documents that would be required as part of that process at the county prior to any building permit being issued. The timeline outlined in the offer could not be met as the subdivision approval process takes longer than six months.

However, an alternative approach to developing (sale of blocks and severances) could proceed more quickly but this approach will require some effort to properly structure the purchase and sale agreement.

UPDATE – April 19th, 2016

At the April 12th, 2016 meeting Committee instructed staff to counter for \$485,000 for Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4.

UPDATE – May 3rd, 2016

Developer is now proposing significantly denser development that was originally anticipated.

Area	Advertised	Proposed
Parts 1 & 2	1	4
Part 3	2	6
Part 5	Max 9	20

This is a change from the original offer which referred to 1 semi-detached and 9 townhomes.

Two issues should be considered;

- 1) Is the development proposed appropriate? Council should not sell the property knowing the proposed use unless Council is prepared to approve the application for the proposed site.
- 2) Property was advertised with an 'asking price' and stated "Property is suitable for". The proposed development includes significantly more units and property is often valued as a cost/unit. Is the proposed purchase price fair?

At the May 3rd, 2016 meeting Council decided that the proposal to construct 30 units on the lots along Bridge Street was not acceptable and suggested that the developer consider constructing his proposed dense development on part 6.

127243 Continued

UPDATE – June 7th, 2016

When we acquired Carambeck our goal was to create a facility that would benefit the community with little or no cost to the taxpayer. In addition to the pool (that already existed), we wanted the community facility to include multi-use indoor space, dedicated space for the youth centre, accommodation for the School Board's continued use (this provides ongoing rental revenue), outdoor recreational space and an opportunity for a seniors building similar to Elizabeth Court. With these goals in mind, we renovated the building and constructed parking with the intent to recover as much of the cost of this work as possible through the sale of a portion of the property. The property along Bridge St (Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4) offers little opportunity for outdoor recreational use and can easily be developed. If sold for close to the appraised value it would largely achieve the goal of financing the capital cost to date. Intensify residential development on the property to achieve maximum development has not been the goal.

The Developer has proposed a project that was too dense to fit onto Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4 (that are along Bridge St) so we suggested he look at part 6. He is now interested in Part 6 for his version of a seniors style development. When staff first heard the Developer wanted to increase the size of Part 6, staff advised this would not be acceptable. However, the Developer felt that the size of Part 6 should be increased to accommodate his specific development proposal and provided the attached sketch.

Staff feel it is important to maintain open space parkland for community use at the Carambeck Community Centre. Increasing the size of Part 6 as requested would significantly reduce the amount of open space and not allow for the planned splash pad, outdoor rink and other outdoor uses. Last year, staff provided the same answer to a similar proposal from another developer.

Staff would certainly support the creation of seniors housing on the property. The Childcare program currently operates intergenerational programs with Waterside Retirement Residence and would welcome the opportunity to expand the program to a nearby facility. However, the project being proposed is for stacked townhomes – the ground floor would be accessible but ½ of the units would be on the upper floors only accessible via stairs and not suitable for seniors. Also, a key feature for a seniors development is interior halls so the residents can easily move about the building for both exercise and social exchange. A common area would also be important. Stacked townhomes each have their own private exterior entrance so there would not be any interior halls or common area. Stacked townhomes would be more suitable in other locations around the Town (Lansdowne at Arthur, Coleman at MacGregor, etc)

Also, the term 'affordable' generally means that the rent for the units is less than the market rent and this can only be achieved if a grant or a subsidy is provided. On May 20th, 2016, a representative from CMHC explained current funding that is available to create 'affordable' housing. It seems the County is pursuing rebuilding their homes on Edwards Drive and this may address a portion of the affordable seniors housing need in the community. However, it is doubtful there will be any grants or subsidy to create additional affordable units at this time.

127243 Continued

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the developer be asked scope their development plans to fit within the property which has been identified for sale (Part 6)

COMMITTEE DIRECTION

Bring forward

THAT 07-06-16-4 a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality of local board; General Nature – Roy Brown Park be discussed in Open Session

RECORDED VOTE

Mayor Antonakos	Yea	Councillor Black	Yea
Deputy-Mayor Flynn	Yea	Councillor Fritz	Yea
Councillor Redmond	Yea	Councillor Trimble	Yea

CARRIED

SUMMARY

Earlier there had been a general agreement with Cavanagh that the required SWM pond could be located in Roy Brown Park in exchange for compensation. With approval of the Canada 150 grant for signage in Roy Brown Park, it is urgent to finalize plans for Roy Brown Park so that the signage is installed in the correct locations. The attached concept plan illustrates how the park will be developed in phases and has been reviewed with MVCA. It will also be reviewed with the public (Urban Forest/River Corridor Committee and Boundary Road residents) on June 21st, 2016.

It is proposed that Cavanagh be permitted to construct the SWM pond on the Town's property. In exchange, Cavanagh would perform work with a value of \$80,000 x the number of acres occupied by the pond. Note – Roy Brown Park will also drain into the SWM pond so the Town would be responsible for a share of the cost for the pond.

Cavanagh will prepare a detailed construction drawing for Roy Brown Park Phases 1 & 2 and construct Phase 1 in 2016. Cavanagh would construct Phase 2, including installing services for MVCA building and the potential future Community Centre in conjunction with the development of their adjacent subdivision. MVCA will construct Phase 3. The Town would construct Phase 4 in the future when required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT staff finalize an Agreement with Cavanagh whereby Cavanagh performs work in Roy Brown Park for a negotiated price that is equivalent to the area occupied by the SWM pond valued at \$80,000/Ac. Any difference between the value of the property for the SWM pond and the value of the work will be settled with a cash payment.

127243 Continued

COMMITTEE DIRECTION

THAT staff finalize an Agreement with Cavanagh whereby Cavanagh performs work in Roy Brown Park for a negotiated price that is equivalent to the area occupied by the SWM pond valued at \$80,000/Ac. Any difference between the value of the property for the SWM pond and the value of the work will be settled with a cash payment.

RECORDED VOTE

Mayor Antonakos	Yea	Councillor Black	Nay
Deputy-Mayor Flynn	Yea	Councillor Fritz	Yea
Councillor Redmond	Yea	Councillor Trimble	Yea

CARRIED

THAT in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, that the meeting be closed to the public with the following agenda:

- 07-06-16-1 personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees; General Nature - Staffing
- 07-06-16-2 litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board: General Nature – OCWA Contract
- 07-06-16-3 litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board: General Nature – Water Inspection

CARRIED

REPORT TO COUNCIL

- 19-04-16-1 Bring forward
- 07-06-16-1 Bring forward
- 07-06-16-2 Bring forward
- 07-06-16-3 Bring forward



Planning and Protection Committee Agenda
for the June 7th, 2016 meeting to be held in
the Council Chambers following Physical Environment Committee

- 1) **DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY/CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF – now or anytime during the meeting**
 - 2) **PUBLIC MEETING – NONE THIS EVENING**
 - 3) **REGISTRATION OF PUBLIC WISHING TO SPEAK**
 - 4) **PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES AND PAGERS**
 - 5) **COMMUNICATION 126243 IS A CLOSED MEETING**
 - 6) **IF THERE IS AN ADDENDUM, IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 15.2.4 (OF STRIKING REPORT) DOES THE COMMITTEE WISH TO APPROVE THIS ADDENDUM?**
-

The following items are for information only and will not be discussed unless the Committee chooses to do so. The Chair will entertain a motion to receive and file for those items not pulled out for discussion.

COMMUNICATION 127232

Received from	Les Reynolds, Director of Protective Services
Addressed to	Planning and Protection Committee
Date	June 2 nd , 2016
Topic	OWFC Activity Report

SUMMARY

OWFC Activity Report for the month of May is attached.

COMMENT

For Council's Information

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Receive and record

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127233

Received from Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date May 25th, 2016
Topic Development Services- Planning Activity

SUMMARY

Committee has requested, from the Planning Department, a monthly review of planning matters received or approved within the department. The following outline represents only those matters that were accompanied by a submitted application. The overview does not represent the numerous inquiries received throughout the reporting period, as these inquiries may or may not come to fruition. In addition the accompanying chart does not illustrate the ongoing efforts with respect to various submitted subdivision files.

COMMENT

For Council's Information

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Receive and Record

COMMITTEE DECISION

TO BE DISCUSSED

COMMUNICATION 127201

Received from Brian Gass, Chief Building Official
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date April 28, 2016
Topic New Building By-law

SUMMARY

The Town has had the same Building By-law for the past ten years. During those same years the Province has opted to start using the Building Code Act, and its companion regulation, the Building Code, as a means to introduce provincial policy decisions that go beyond regulating the traditional structural and fire/life safety aspects of construction.

127201 Continued

For example, the design and construction of Resource Conservation and Environmental Integrity features in buildings have resulted in enhanced inspection protocols. In addition, the new By-law provides the starting point of framework for the Building Department to move towards e-permits. A system where applications would not only be received electronically, but permits also being issued electronically.

The current 2015 permit fee schedule has also been reviewed. Treasury has indicated that this permit fee schedule is projected to adequately cover the costs of the Building Department in the near future. As a result, there are no substantial changes to fees proposed. The changes are summarized as follows;

1. Discontinuation of “Inspection Deposit Fee”

Currently, every permit holder is required to post an Inspection Deposit Fee. The purpose of this deposit is to recover any costs associated with extra inspections. The collection and refund of these deposits are an administrative nightmare and places an unnecessary financial burden on our clients.

2. Introduction of an annual fee rate adjustment.

The reality is that each year operational costs of any organization increase. Therefore, since permit fees are meant to cover the costs associated with administration and enforcement of the Building Code and Act, these fees should be increased accordingly over time. Several years ago, municipalities in western Ontario, after consulting with their local construction, determined that yearly minor (typically under 1%) fee increases can better anticipated by the market rather than being faced with than substantial fee increases (typically between 10% to 25%) every five or ten years. As a result, this by-law proposes an annual fee adjustment based upon the 3rd Quarter Statistics Canada Construction Cost Index for Ottawa.

3. Introduction of Minimum Fee Deposits at time of permit application.

The Minimum Permit Fee is not an extra or new fee, it is simply a collection of part of the permit fees when an application is applied for. With the abandonment of the Inspection Deposit Fee, we still should be collecting some fees at time of permit application to offset the costs associated with plans review and processing of a permit that may be abandoned by the applicant

4. Introduction of the ability to recover costs associated with third party peer review

The current fee schedule does not provide the Town the ability to recover costs where consultation with a professional is required from time to time. For example, the Building Code now permits an applicant to seek an Alternative Solution (material or whole building system) to a prescriptive requirement of the code.

127201 Continued

Sometimes these materials are so new, and innovative, that they perhaps had not fully undergone testing. We would need to hire experts in that particular field to peer review the data submitted by the applicant.

In addition to the above noted changes, the Chief Building Official was asked by the Development Review Team to explore what practices other municipalities use to ensure that the siting of new buildings for location (setbacks), site grading and storm water management / flood mitigation measures are being constructed to the original plans filed within agreements that are beyond the authority of the Building Code Act to enforce. A review of the current operational practices established over the years by staff in both the Public Works and Planning Departments, work relatively well with some minor exceptions.

The greatest challenge appears to be the timing of when town staff receive “as built” survey plans for the building. This drawing does not only ensure the building is actually located on the site where it was proposed, but in addition, can also provide top of foundation wall elevations, to confirm that the foundation is constructed at a height adequate to permit the grading of the lot and driveway to be installed as it was proposed. Currently, this survey information and/or grading certificate are submitted by the builder upon completion of the whole building, when there is little opportunity to easily correct errors, such as inverted driveways, or side yard swales sloped too steep to cut a lawn with a mower, etc... This results in unhappy homeowners which may not only just complain to the town, but they could also initiate litigation against the builder and the Town.

In an effort to assist Planning and Public Works staff manage these challenges. The previously distributed Building By-law has a schedule, governed under the authority of the Municipal Act, not the Building Code Act, to set out a program regarding how vacant lots are to be developed. Essentially, Schedule “D” takes the current practices of Planning and Public Works and establishes a time line of what documents are required when. If the by-law is enacted, as written, then a builder will be required to submit to the Town a “top of foundation as built” survey of the building upon completion of the foundation. What is important to note here is that most builders have this survey already done and simply do not submitted it to the town until the project is completed and they are seeking refund of their grading deposit.

COMMENT

The proposed Building By-law is a modernized version of the current by-law. Introducing greater flexibility in the administration of the Building Code to deal with the ever changing technologies and systems of construction, while protecting the general public’s interests of ensuring structures remain safe for their users.

127201 Continued

UPDATE – June 7th, 2016

In accordance to the direction received by Council, on May 12 and 19, 2016, staff advertised notice of both an Open House meeting, held on May 26, 2016 at 3:30 pm in Council Chambers, and the Statutory Public Meeting, held on June 7, 2017 at 7:00 pm in Council Chambers, in the local print media page “Municipal Matters”. Also additional notices were posted on the Towns Website, Facebook and Twitter accounts.

In addition, Building Department staff made a point of discussing face to face the proposed changes with contractors that are currently building in town while conducting building inspections. Overall, while it is human nature to initially resist change, after explaining the intent and rational, the contractors seem generally receptive to the proposed changes. Staff, did note some valid concerns with some worthwhile suggestions that will assist us in making operational decisions in regards to implementation of the new changes to hopefully ensure a smooth transition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That By-law be forwarded to Council.

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127234

Received from	Andrew Willows, Building Inspector/Plans examiner
Addressed to	Planning and Protection Committee
Date	June 2 nd , 2016
Topic	Repointing of Town Hall – 150 Community Infrastructure Program

SUMMARY

On March 22nd, 2016, a contribution agreement was made between the Town and Canada 150 Community Infrastructure Program for the refurbishing of approximately 12 windows, 1 door, and repointing portions of the stonework of the Town Hall. The duration of the agreement is over a two year period in which the Minister agreed to the contribution of an amount not exceeding the lesser of (a) and (b) as follows:

- a) Max 33.3% of total Eligible Costs of the Project incurred and paid by the Recipient; and
- b) \$ 67 000.

Staff posted a call for “Expression of Interest” to contractor for various capital projects. Contractors had until May 15, 2016 to respond. From which, three contractor provided quotations, for the repointing portion based on the scope of work below;

127234 Continued

Scope of Work

Contractors quoted on repointing the South wall of the Town Hall, from the corner of Bridge and Mill Street to the Clock Tower, including the first 35 vertical feet of west wall of the Clock Tower. Contractors were to provide material and labor quotations. Contractors also were asked to provide their plan for scaffolding, but not to include within quotation.

Information collected was as follows;

Castle Masonry and Construction Quotation: \$14.00 per square foot

“Castle Masonry combines excellent masonry workmanship with effective project coordination. They can take on challenging projects and get the job done within schedule.” – Lisa Nicol, P.Eng. John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd.

Castle Masonry also completed masonry on the Town Square Washroom Building.

Heritage Brick & Stone Craft Quotation: \$25.00 per square foot

Owner, Colin Coveny, has been the contractor working on the emergency repointing repair which were required from the John G. Cooke report for the past couple years.

Darren Hearfield Quotation: \$30.00 per square foot

All masons are graduates of the Heritage Masonry Program at Algonquin College, and have been working on Parliament Hill on the restoration of the West Block.

All Contractors are insured, and will ensure working conditions are safe for all. All contractors will complete all repointing in a manner consistent with heritage repointing.

Staff will be addressing the windows and door portion at a later date.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council hereby authorizes staff to issue a Purchase Order to Castle Masonry and Construction, and associated scaffolding company, for the repointing portion of the Town Hall, and for additional capital projects, specifically to repoint and repair the retaining walls found on Townline Road East.

COMMUNICATION 127235

Received from Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date May 25th, 2016
Topic Extension of Nu Globe Subdivision Draft Plan Approval

SUMMARY

The County has received a letter from McIntosh Perry, on behalf of their client, Nu Globe Developments, requesting the extension of draft plan approval for 09-T-12002 which currently lapses September 21, 2016. Nu Globe has requested a one (1) year extension to September 21st, 2017. Their reasons for request include:

- difficulties with being able to meet draft conditions due to delays in negotiations with neighboring landowners and the municipality, and
- Not being able to obtain engineering approvals from both the municipality and the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority.

They further note that they have on-going negotiations with potential development partners.

COMMENT

The Planning Act allows for applicants to request for an extension to Draft Approval for up to a period of three years. Extensions past that period are not permitted. The reasons for this are:

- That the validity of the supporting technical reports and studies may be out of date with current trends and growth that has occurred after the issuance of draft approval.
- There is also a concern that if allowed to linger the public is not necessarily informed as the period of time since the public meeting is extensive.

Although the applicant only faced the normal challenges associated with satisfying the draft conditions, staff has reviewed the applicant's request and determined at this time that there is no need to ask for addendums to current technical reports and studies. Also, the public continues to be aware of the pending development of the subdivision so the public consultation remains valid.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT staff forward a recommendation to the County of Lanark for an extension for one (1) year to the Draft Approval of the Nu Globe Subdivision.

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127236 (previous # 127000)

Received from Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date May 25th, 2016
Topic Development Permit Application DP3-02-2011

SUMMARY

The applicant for development permit application DP3-02-2011, John Gibson, has asked for a further extension to his Development Permit Class 3 application.

COMMENT

Mr. Gibson applied for his Class 3 development permit application in 2011 to demolish the existing single family dwelling and construct a 26 unit, three storey apartment building with access from Franktown Road. The applicant was given a Development Permit Agreement which was never signed.

October 14, 2014 a letter was sent to Mr. Gibson noting that the application had been ongoing without contact for over a year. The Town asked Mr. Gibson to provide in writing, confirmation that the project was to continue. The Town received a letter from Mr. Gibson October 23, 2014.

October 30, 2014 another letter was sent to Mr. Gibson noting that Council would grant an extension until January 31, 2015 in order to have the new Council review and decide on extension times.

January 6, 2015 Council extended the application until November 30, 2015. Council granted the previous extension and Mr. Gibson was sent a letter dated December 4, 2015 noting the requested extension had been granted until June 1, 2016.

UPDATE

The Town has now received additional correspondence that Mr. Gibson would like to request a further extension to the project of 6 months.

Staff have reviewed the applicant's request and determined that, at this time, there is no need to ask for addendums to current technical reports and studies. Also, the public continues to be aware of the project so the public consultation remains valid.

Given that this is the fourth extension, and provided that we now include a 6 month period in our Development Permit Agreements prior to lapsing of the agreement, it is suggested that this should be the final extension provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That Council grant an extension for an additional 6 months up to December 1, 2016 for Development Permit Application DP3-02-2011 but that this be the final extension granted.

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127237

Received from Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date June 1st, 2016
Topic Amend By-law 13-2015

SUMMARY

When planning applications are approved often the project cannot begin immediately as the Developer needs some time to complete certain details (arrange financing, finalize sales, obtain building permits, fulfill conditions of approval). However, the various technical studies and the public consultation only remain valid for a fixed time. For this reason, planning approvals include a date for proceeding, normally 3 years for a Subdivision and 6 months for a Development Permit approval.

Each request to extend timelines is unique to the project. Extension requests are reviewed by staff of various departments in order to determine if an extension is appropriate considering whether or not the reports are still valid and whether the public is aware of the future development. Staff recommends that this procedure be continued but as there is currently no fee associated with this review, the tariff of fees by-law should be amended to include a fee.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That the tariff of fees By-law 13-2015 be amended to include a fee \$500.00 for review of extension requests. This fee would apply to all future requests for an extension of planning approvals.

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127238

Received from Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date May 30th, 2016
Topic MVCA – Wetlands

SUMMARY

Last summer, the Town learned of MVCA's plans to designate new local wetlands and this was reviewed with Council of September 8th, 2015 (126344). Despite the Town's comments it appears MVCA feels that their outreach efforts which reached approximately 40 landowners (of approximately 5000 owners impacted) have been sufficient and they intend to proceed with designation of the wetlands.

127238 Continued

COMMENT

MVCA acknowledges that they created their map of proposed wetlands using dated aerial mapping and that they have not actually visited the sites which they propose to designate as wetlands. Because they have prepared their proposed wetland map based on such poor information, MVCA has offered to refine their proposed map if the property owner can provide sufficient data.

Staff have provided MVCA with actual field data related to the town properties owned by the Town, where wetlands were proposed and MVCA has agreed to refine their map and remove the wetlands proposed on the Town's property.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT staff work with the other property owners within Carleton Place, that are impacted by MVCA's proposed new wetland, to have the proposed wetland map appropriately refined to reflect the actual conditions.

ALSO THAT the Town circulate a letter to the other municipalities in the MVCA drainage area outlining the steps the Town is taking to ensure owners within the Town have an opportunity to refine the wetlands map before it is adopted as a regulation by MVCA.

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127239

Received from	Kory Earle
Addressed to	Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Date	May 25 th , 2016
Topic	AODA

SUMMARY

Kory Earle will be meeting with the Ministry in Toronto to discuss the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and would appreciate some feedback that he can convey at this meeting.

COMMENT

The AODA sets out numerous requirements that impact both the built environment and how organizations (both public and private) and their staff operate. The requirements are being phased in over a number of years but some of the requirements will be onerous, particularly for small organizations. Little funding has been available to assist with the cost of implementing the AODA requirements.

127239 Continued

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Kory Earle be asked to encourage the Minister to provide additional support, including financial, to assist small organizations with implementing the AODA requirements.

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127240

Received from	Les Reynolds, Director of Protective Services
Addressed to	Planning and Protection Committee
Date	May 27 th , 2016
Topic	Fire Safety Inspection Charges

SUMMARY

Our Fire Prevention Officers conduct fire safety inspections on various classes of buildings throughout the town. In many cases a single visit confirms that the building is in compliance with the Ontario Fire Code. Unfortunately some inspections reveal contraventions of the Code which must be rectified. When this occurs the inspector issues a Fire Safety Inspection Report and schedules a follow up inspection. If the contravention is not rectified by the time of the re-inspection then a Fire Safety Order is issued, a second re-inspection is scheduled and the property owner may face prosecution.

These re-inspections impact staff time and our ability to carry out scheduled fire prevention activities. Property owners who ignore directions to correct deficiencies should expect to incur the associated enforcement costs. In 2015, 30 buildings required 3 or more visits to bring them into compliance with an estimated cost of \$3500 in staff time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Fees and Charges By-law be amended to include a charge for 2nd and subsequent re-inspections of buildings at a rate of \$75.00 per hour with a minimum 1 hour charge.

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127241

Received from Les Reynolds, Director of Protective Services
Addressed to Planning and Protection Committee
Date May 26th, 2016
Topic Supporting Ontario's First Responders Act

SUMMARY

On April 5, 2016 the Legislature passed the Supporting Ontario's First Responders Act which:

1. Creates a presumption that a diagnosis of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in a first responder is work related and expedites access to worker compensation benefits and treatments.
2. Gives the Minister of Labour the authority to request and publish PTSD Prevention Plans from employers

COMMENT

- PTSD is a mental health illness that falls within the category of anxiety disorders
- It occurs as a result of exposure to actual or threatened incidents of death, serious injury or sexual violence
- Onset of symptoms can occur at any time from immediately after the incident to years later. The risk does not decrease until at least 9-24 months after exposure
- A diagnosis cannot be made until symptoms persist for at least 1 month and not until at least 6 months after the incident
- First responders are at least twice as likely as the general population to suffer from PTSD
- We now have not only a moral but a legal obligation to do our best to prevent or mitigate PTSD in our firefighters

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That staff develop a PTSD Prevention Plan for our fire service and present it to Council for approval.

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127242

Received from Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services
Addressed to Planning and Development Committee
Date June 2nd, 2016
Topic Consent Application B16/077, 131-133 Elizabeth Street

SUMMARY

A consent application has been received from the applicant in relation to the property known municipally as 131-133 Elizabeth St. The subject lands are legally described as Parts 1 and 2 on 27R-10582 and illustrated below.



This consent application is to sever a 307.1 m² residential lot, leaving a 307.46m² portion of retained residential property. The purpose of the severance is to split the existing semi-detached units into separate ownerships. The semi-detached units were constructed and approved through building permit 14N043.

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) provides direction on matters of Provincial interest pertaining to land use matters and all development proposals must be consistent with the policies therein. The statement believes that long term prosperity for the Province depends upon a “strong, sustainable and resilient community, a clean and healthy environment, and a strong and competitive economy”. The policy statement directs development to settlement areas and protects the resources throughout the province.

127242 Continued

Section 1.0 of the statement, Building Strong Healthy Communities, stresses efficient development patterns by supporting infill development, utilizing existing infrastructure and promoting opportunities to create a varied built form.

Section 2.0 of the statement protects resources and Section 3.0 outlines policies to direct development away from areas of potential hazards.

The proposed severance complies and is consistent with policy directions within the Provincial Policy Statement.

The Official Plan designation for this property is Residential (R). This designation allows for a mix of housing types which complements the existing small town character. The Development Permit By-law also designates the property as Residential (R). The severance will allow the existing semi-detached to be created under individual ownerships. Both the retained and the severed lot meets the minimum frontage required under the Development Permit By-law.

COMMENT

The proposal, if approved, will allow for the existing semi-detached to be under separate ownership. The lots are appropriately designated in both the Official Plan and in the Development Permit By-law. As with any severance application, staff complies a list of conditions that the application must meet before final approval and creation of a new deed.

It should be noted that once the County of Lanark Land Division Committee makes a decision, the applicant must clear all conditions within one year from the date of that decision. The proposed conditions for the application are:

1. The balance of outstanding taxes, including penalties and interest, (and any local improvement charges if applicable) shall be paid to the Town of Carleton Place.
2. The applicant shall provide the Town of Carleton Place with a digital copy of the reference plan (in NAD83 datum).
3. That a deposited reference plan be submitted to the Town of Carleton Place.
4. That a cash-in-lieu of parkland payment of \$640.00 be collected from the applicant.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

That staff forward the above conditions to the County of Lanark for consideration.

COMMITTEE DECISION

COMMUNICATION 127243

Received from Paul Knowles, Chief Administrative Officer
Addressed Planning and Protection Committee
Date June 3rd, 2016
Topic Closed Meeting

SUMMARY

As authorized by the Municipal Act, Council should review selected items in closed session.

COMMENT

The Municipal Act permits discussions about the sale of property to be in closed session so that negotiations can be finalized in confidence. It also allows Council the opportunity to consider an offer, and, if the proposal is not acceptable and not proceeding there is no need to publicize what is not happening. However, regarding 08-03-16-1, the Developer's consultant has chosen to introduce the topic to the public.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT 08-03-16-1 a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality of local board; General Nature – Carambeck Property be discussed in Open Session

THAT in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, that the meeting be closed to the public with the following agenda:

AGENDA

- 19-04-16-1 a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality of local board; General Nature – Beckwith Street Property.
- 07-06-16-1 personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees; General Nature - Staffing
- 07-06-16-2 litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board: General Nature – OCWA Contract
- 07-06-16-3 litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board: General Nature – Water Inspection
- 07-06-16-4 a proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality of local board; General Nature – Roy Brown Park

COMMITTEE DECISION

OWFC Activity Report

May 2016

	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	YTD	YOY
EMERGENCY CALLS														
Fire related	1	0	1	10	5								17	-13
CO Alarms	0	1	0	4	1								6	1
False Alarms	8	2	12	10	5								37	2
MVC	1	1	2	0	0								4	NC
Medical Assist	1	2	0	0	2								5	4
Mutual Aid	0	0	0	2	1								3	-2
Other	3	3	4	1	2								13	10
Total	14	9	19	27	16								85	2
Automatic Aid to Miss. Mills (incl. in above calls)	0	1	1	2	3								7	-1
NON-EMERGENCY CALLS														
Meetings	1	1	1	1	1								5	-1
Training	3	3	3	3	3								15	-5
Other	1	2	1	1	0								5	2
Total	5	6	5	5	4								25	-4
TOTAL CALLS	19	15	24	32	20								110	-2
Avg. Response (%) All Calls	54%	58%	59%	59%	54%								57%	-4%
Avg. Response (%) Mon-Fri 6am-6pm	54%	52%	64%	70%	60%								60%	4%
Avg. Response Time (min/sec)	8:15	9:22	8:35	8:43	7:37								8:43	
Fire Loss (\$)	0	0	2500	1000	5000								8500	-177200
Rescues	0	0	0	2	1								3	1
Injuries	0	0	0	0	0								0	-2
Fatalities	0	0	0	0	0								0	NC
FIRE PREVENTION														
Fire Safety Inspections	26	31	49	30	32								168	-28
Orders Issued	0	0	0	0	0								0	
Charges Laid	0	0	0	0	0								0	NC
Public Education (Hrs.)	20	17	17	22	39								115	-121

Items of Interest

So far this year calls for service are totalling almost exactly the same as 2015, as are our response rates.

At the beginning of the month I attended the annual conference of the Ontario Association of Fire Chiefs where I was honoured to be elected to the OAFIC Board of Directors. Later in the month Capt. Al Johns and I attended an investiture ceremony in Ottawa where Fire Marshal Nichols presented Capt. Johns with his 25 year Long Service medal as well as presenting me with my 40 year service bar.

Work is proceeding on construction of our new pumper at Arnprior Fire Truck Corp. with delivery expected around the end of summer.

Planning Application/Stats for 2016

<u>2016</u>	<u>Pre-consultation</u>	<u>PLC</u>	<u>SUB</u>	<u>Consent</u>	<u>DP1</u>	<u>DP1a</u>	<u>DP2</u>	<u>DP3</u>	<u>DP4</u>	<u>DP Agreement Amendment</u>	<u>OPA</u>	<u>DPA</u>	<u>Monthly Totals</u>
January	4	2				2	1		1		1	1	12
February	2			4	1								7
March	3			1		2							6
April	5				2	2							9
May	6	1		2	3		1						13
June													0
July													0
August													0
September													0
October													0
November													0
December													0
<u>YTD Totals</u>	20	3	0	7	6	6	2	0	1	0	1	1	<u>47</u>
<u>2015 Totals</u>	50	10	2	9	9	8	7	1	0	1	1	3	<u>101</u>
<u>2014 Totals</u>	20	10	1	6	4	N/A	6	0	N/A	0	1	1	<u>49</u>