Committee of the Whole Agenda (AMENDED)
March 26th, 2019, Carleton Place Town Hall, Council Chambers
Immediately Following the Council Meeting

Please silence all electronic devices.

1) CALL TO ORDER

2) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

   Suggested Motion:
   THAT the agenda be accepted as presented.

3) DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY/CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

4) MINUTES TO BE APPROVED AND RECEIVED

   i. Committee of the Whole Minutes, March 12th, 2019

      Suggested Motion:
      THAT the Committee of the Whole Minutes dated March 12th, 2019 be accepted as presented.

5) DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

   i. Jim McCready, Chair, Urban Forest/River Corridor Committee
      Committee Initiative - Bodnar Subdivision

   ii. Bill Slade, Chair, Tracy Kwissa, Environmental Advisory Committee
        Committee Initiative - Anti-Idling

6) REPORTS

   PLANNING AND PROTECTION

   i. DP2-04-2018, 33-35 Mill Street, Boulton House (AMENDED)
      (Communication 130064)
      Tyler Duval, Acting Manager of Development Services
      Suggested Motion (AMENDED):
      THAT the Committee authorizes application DP2-04-2018 for 33-35 Mill Street for the
expansion of the commercial rear yard patio to a maximum capacity of 84 persons and directs Staff to proceed with the drafting of the Development Permit Agreement and issue a Development Permit with conditions attached; and

THAT the site-specific conditions of the Development Permit agreement will include but are not limited to the following:

1. That garbage is stored on site in an enclosure as described in the Development Permit By-law and is removed as appropriate by a contracted waste management firm;
2. That upon completion of the patio, the Town’s Building Department and Fire Chief inspect the emergency egresses to ensure safety of patron; and
3. That an amendment to the Development Permit be required should the owner look to further expand the restaurant use.

---

**ii. DP1A-01-2019 – 112, 114 & 116 Leblanc Street (Block 181)**

**Pegasus Development Corporation**

*(Communication 130065)*

Tyler Duval, Acting Manager of Development Services

**Suggested Motion:**

THAT Council supports Option 1 outlined in the Acting Manager of Development Services Report dated March 26, 2019 requiring the Developer to bring the 3-unit townhome into compliance with the approved plans dated August 10, 2017 for 112, 114 & 116 Leblanc Street (Block 181), Carleton Landing North Subdivision.

---

**iii. Bodnar Subdivision – Urban Forrest and River Corridor Advisory Committee’s Request for Additional Studies**

*(Communication 130066)*

Tyler Duval, Acting Manager of Development Services

**Suggested Motion:**

THAT the March 26, 2019 Report by the Acting Manager of Development Services regarding the letter received by the Urban Forest and River Corridor Committee (addressed to Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services; dated September 27, 2018) requesting a Source Water Protection Study or similar studies be received as information.

---

**iv. Traffic and Parking By-law 46-2003 Amendment**

*(Communication 130067)*

Pascal Meunier, Director of Protective Services

**Suggested Motion:**

THAT Traffic and Parking By-Law No. 46-2003 Section 6(1) be amended to read as follows: “When authorized signs have been erected, no person shall park a vehicle or permit a vehicle to remain parked on any highway or municipal property.”
v. **Adoption of Community Safety Plan**  
*(Communication 130068)*  
Diane Smithson, Chief Administrative Officer

**Suggested Motion:**  
**WHEREAS** the Corporation of the Town of Carleton Place is committed to community safety and well-being for its citizens;  

**AND WHEREAS** Part XI of the Police Services Act, which came into force on January 1, 2019, states that a municipality shall prepare and, by resolution, adopt a community safety and well-being plan;  

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Corporation of the Town of Carleton Place adopts the community safety and wellbeing plan for Lanark County and Smiths Falls as presented by the Community Plan for Safety and Wellbeing Steering Committee.

**COMMUNITY ISSUES**

vi. **Eastern Regional Medical Education Program Social Event**  
*(Communication 130069)*  
Amanda Charania, Communications Coordinator

**Suggested Motion:**  
**THAT** the Communications Coordinator be instructed to coordinate a social dinner for both University of Ottawa and Queen’s University medical students under the Eastern Regional Medical Education Program; and  

**THAT** Council identify who they would like to attend on behalf of the Town/community.

**CORPORATE SERVICES**

vii. **Award of Request for Proposal – Strategic Planning**  
*(Communication 130070)*  
Diane Smithson, Chief Administrative Officer

**Suggested Motion:**  
**THAT** Council award the Strategic Planning Request for Proposal to Big Thinking in the amount of $11,000 plus HST.

viii. **Hospital Foundation Request for Office Space**  
*(Communication 130071)*  
Diane Smithson, Chief Administrative Officer

**Suggested Motion:**  
**THAT** Council authorize the free use of office space for two Carleton Place Hospital Foundation staff members for a period of no more than 1.5 years at the former Train Station on Coleman Street on the provision that all set up costs are the responsibility of the Foundation.
ix.  **Infrastructure Funding Program Application**  
    **(Communication 130072)**  
    Diane Smithson, Chief Administrative Officer

    **Suggested Motion:**  
    THAT Council authorize staff applying for the Central Bridge project as the Town’s priority under the Rural and Northern Fund Program.

7) **NEW/OTHER BUSINESS**

   None.

8) **COMMITTEE, BOARD AND EXTERNAL ORGANIZATION UPDATES**

   i.  **Advisory Committee Minutes and Updates**

      **Suggested Motion:**  
      THAT the following minutes be received as information:
      • Leeds, Grenville & Lanark District Health Unit – Board of Health Meeting February 28, 2019, Summary
      • Urban Forest/River Corridor Minutes dated January 31st, 2019
      • Environmental Advisory Committee Minutes dated February 4th, 2019
      • Environmental Advisory Committee Minutes dated March 4th, 2019

9) **INFORMATION LISTING**

    **Suggested Motion:**  
    THAT the Information Listing dated March 26, 2019 be received.

10) **NOTICE OF MOTIONS**

    Councillor Fritz

    **THAT** Section 5.7 Closed Session (“in camera”) of the Procedural By-law be amended to change that where “in camera” sessions include advice by paid Town consultants or solicitor, the “in camera” session be held at a time suitable to conduct the “in camera” business prior to the start of the regular Council Meeting; and

    **THAT** all other “in camera” items be held in accordance with the current Procedural By-law provisions.

11) **CLOSED SESSION**

    None.

12) **ADJOURNMENT**
Committee of the Whole Minutes
March 12th, 2019, Carleton Place Town Hall, Council Chambers
Immediately Following the Council Meeting

PRESENT
Mayor Black, Councillor Randell, Councillor Seccaspina, Councillor Tennant, Councillor Atkinson

Diane Smithson, CAO, Stacey Blair, Clerk, Trisa McConkey, Treasurer, Dave Young, Director of Public Works, Tyler Duval, Acting Manager of Development Services

ABSENT
Deputy Mayor Redmond, Councillor Fritz (with regrets)

1) CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chair Toby Randell called the meeting to order at 7:20 p.m.

2) APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Councillor Atkinson
Seconded by Councillor Tennant
THAT the agenda be accepted as presented.

CARRIED

3) DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY/CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

None.

4) MINUTES TO BE APPROVED AND RECEIVED

i. Committee of the Whole Minutes, February 19th and 28th, 2019

Moved by Councillor Atkinson
Seconded by Councillor Seccaspina
THAT the Committee of the Whole Minutes dated February 19th and 28th, 2019 be accepted as presented.

CARRIED
5) **DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS**

i. **David Somppi, Municipal Drug Strategy**  
   Planet Youth

   David Somppi of the Municipal Drug Strategy (MDS) Committee made a presentation regarding Planet Youth, an Icelandic youth initiative focused on reducing harmful use of substances among youth.

   Mr. Somppi provided some statistical highlights about Planet Youth’s success in Iceland. He also clarified that Planet Youth is not a program but rather an approach that includes the establishment of long-term, community-driven strategies that promote positive social and environmental change.

   He then provided information on Planet Youth Lanark County, which is a steering committee and outlined their beliefs, goals and the method of achieving these goals. One of the methods described was the collection of data gathered through youth surveys and local actions would then be based on the data obtained.

   At the close of the presentation, Mr. Somppi reiterated the importance for continued support of local MDS Committees and encouraged members of Council to advocate for this amongst their County colleagues.

   The MDS Network Day will be Friday, March 22, 2019 from 9-12 p.m. at the Beckwith Township Hall. As well, a joint meeting of all MDS Committees will be held at the Carleton Place Curling Club on Thursday, April 25th from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

ii. **Stephanie Gray, Coordinator, Lanark County Situation Table**  
    **Staff Sergeant Marc Hemmerick, Carleton Place OPP Detachment**  
    Community Safety Plan

   Stephanie Gray, the Coordinator for the Lanark County Situation Table then gave a presentation regarding the Community Plan for Safety and Well-Being (CPSW) for Lanark County and the Town of Smiths Falls.

   Staff Sergeant Marc Hemmerick provided the background of the Lanark County Situation Table project, program statistics for 2015-2018, its purpose and its two main components, one of which was the development of a CPSW.

   Stephanie Gray then continued with the presentation and advised that the provincial legislation requiring CPSWs was outlined in depth after which the development local CPSW was described in greater detail. The key components of the local CPSW were described as well as priority risk areas. The legislative responsibilities of Council upon the adoption of the CPSW were presented as was a sample municipal endorsement motion.
6) REPORTS

PLANNING AND PROTECTION

i. Monthly Activity Report – January & February 2019
(Communication 130054)
Tyler Duval, Acting Manager of Development Services

Moved by Councillor Tennant
Seconded by Mayor Black
THAT Committee receive and record the monthly activity reports for the Planning Department.

CARRIED – CONSENT

ii. Extension of Approval for 17 Albert Street Development
(Communication 130055)
Tyler Duval, Acting Manager of Development Services

Moved by Mayor Black
Seconded by Councillor Seccaspina
THAT Committee grants a FINAL eight (8) month extension – expiring on November 15th, 2019 – to the conditional approval for DP3-06-07 for the proposed development at 17 Albert Street.

CARRIED

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

iii. Carleton Place Drinking Water System 2018 – Annual Report
(Communication 130056)
Dave Young, Director of Public Works

Moved by Councillor Atkinson
Seconded by Mayor Black
THAT Council accepts the Carleton Place Drinking Water System 2018 - Annual Report as information and directs staff to make the report available for public inspection.

CARRIED – CONSENT

iv. Central Bridge Update
(Communication 130057)
Dave Young, Director of Public Works

Moved by Councillor Seccaspina
Seconded by Councillor Tennant
THAT staff direct R.V. Anderson to develop a proposal for the detailed design of the Central Bridge project which includes the following elements:
• Traffic Management Plan;
• Coordination of utility relocations;
• Detailed design relating to the Gillies Bridge rehabilitation;
• Investigation of storm treatment options for the Bridge Street storm sewer; and
• Development rehabilitation options for Bridge Street

CARRIED – CONSENT

CORPORATE SERVICES

v. 2019 Business Improvement Area (BIA) Budget
(Communication 130058)
Trisa McConkey, Treasurer

Moved by Councillor Tennant
Seconded by Councillor Atkinson
THAT the 2019 Operating Budget for the Carleton Place Business Improvement Area (BIA) be approved;

THAT the levy portion of the Operating Budget for the Carleton Place Business Improvement Area in the amount of $162,843 be approved;

THAT the Treasurer be authorized and directed to prepare the requisite By-law pursuant to Section 208 of the Municipal Act, 2001, to levy the 2019 Budget;

THAT the following schedule of payments for 2019 be approved:
April  $81,443
June   $81,400

CARRIED – MOTION AND BY-LAW PREPARED

vi. Municipal Property Tax Exemptions
(Communication 130059)
Trisa McConkey, Treasurer

Moved by Councillor Atkinson
Seconded by Councillor Tennant
THAT Council approve exemptions from the municipal portion of property taxes for a four-year period 2019-2022 inclusive for the following properties owned by:
• the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada Unit 396;
• the Carleton Place Royal Canadian Legion Branch 192; and
• the Navy League of Canada

THAT the Treasurer be authorized and directed to prepare the requisite By-law to provide for the exemptions.

CARRIED – BY-LAW PREPARED
vii. 2018 Council Remuneration Report
(Communication 130060)
Trisa McConkey, Treasurer

Moved by Mayor Black
Seconded by Councillor Seccaspina
THAT Council accept the 2018 Council Remuneration Report as information, and
THAT Council direct staff to prepare detailed expense, excluding medical and dental expenses, and discretionary fund use in future Council Remuneration Reports beginning in 2019.

CARRIED - CONSENT

viii. Seniors’ Centre – Former Train Station Facility
(Communication 130061)
Diane Smithson, Chief Administrative Officer

Moved by Councillor Seccaspina
Seconded by Mayor Black
THAT Council supports proceeding with the implementation and planning for the Carleton Place Seniors’ Centre as outlined in the CAO’s report dated March 12, 2019 in anticipation of a September grand opening; and
THAT this program be tried on a one-year trial basis with a status report to Council at the end of the first year.

CARRIED – MOTION PREPARED

POLICY REVIEW

ix. Post-Election Report
(Communication 130062)
Stacey Blair, Clerk

Moved by Councillor Atkinson
Seconded by Mayor Black
THAT the Clerk’s Post-Election Report be received as information.

CARRIED - CONSENT

Moved by Councillor Tennant
Seconded by Councillor Atkinson
THAT Council authorize the use of Electronic Voting as the exclusive means of voting for the 2022 Municipal Election

DEFERRED

Communication 130062 was deferred pending further information.
x. Amendment to Town’s Flag Policy (By-law 58-2018)
   (Communication 130063)
   Stacey Blair, Clerk

   Moved by Mayor Black
   Seconded by Councillor Seccaspina
   THAT By-law 58-2018 be amended to add the following:
   • 6.4 e) current or former Citizen of the Year.
   • 6.5 Discretionary Provisions
     The appropriate flag(s) shall be lowered in accordance with this policy, or in
     circumstances not identified herein, at the direction of the Mayor in consultation
     with the CAO (or Deputy Mayor in the absence of the Mayor). The Mayor shall
     notify Council when direction has been provided to staff to lower the flag under
     this provision.

   CARRIED – BY-LAW PREPARED

7) NEW/OTHER BUSINESS
   None.

8) COMMITTEE, BOARD AND EXTERNAL ORGANIZATION UPDATES
   i. Committee Resignations – Kayla Kazda and Patti Sharpe, Environmental
      Advisory Committee

      Moved by Mayor Black
      Seconded by Councillor Seccaspina
      THAT the resignations of Kayla Kazda and Patti Sharpe from the Environmental
      Advisory Committee be accepted with regrets; and

      THAT a letter of thanks be sent to Ms. Kazda and Ms. Sharpe on behalf of the Town
      and Council and the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee.

      CARRIED - CONSENT

9) INFORMATION LISTING

      Moved by Councillor Seccaspina
      Seconded by Councillor Atkinson
      THAT the Information Listing dated March 12, 2019 be received.

      CARRIED

10) NOTICE OF MOTIONS

      The following notice of motion was not addressed as Councillor Fritz was absent
      from the meeting. It will be added to the next agenda for consideration.
Councilor Fritz

THAT Section 5.7 Closed Session (“in camera”) of the Procedural By-law be amended to change that where “in camera” sessions include advice by paid Town consultants or solicitor, the “in camera” session be held at a time suitable to conduct the “in camera” business prior to the start of the regular Council Meeting; and

THAT all other “in camera” items be held in accordance with the current Procedural By-law provisions.

11) CLOSED SESSION

None.

12) ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Tennant
Seconded Councillor Atkinson
THAT the meeting be adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

CARRIED

__________________________
Stacey Blair, Recording Secretary
COMMUNICATION 130064
Received from Tyler Duval, Acting Manager of Development Services
Addressed to: Committee of the Whole
Date March 26, 2019
Topic DP2-04-2018, 33-35 Mill Street, Boulton House

SUMMARY
An application has been submitted for a Class 2 Development Permit for the property locally known as 33-35 Mill Street, legally described as being Part Lot 67, Section D, PL 276 in the Town of Carleton Place. The property is designated as Downtown District in the Development Permit By-law and Mississippi Residential District in the Official Plan. The application proposes to expand the current rear yard outdoor patio space from 22 seats to 84 seats. No modifications to the existing building are proposed by the application. The patio area will be fenced and will provide the appropriate exits as per the Ontario Building and Fire Codes. Site work will be limited to landscaping and fencing. The proposed development will meet or exceed the Development Permit By-Law’s landscaped open space requirements and parking requirements. The Town has received a request to forward the application for review by the Committee of the Whole rather than leave the approval a decision of Staff.

COMMENT
This application’s review is subject to the planning policies of the: Provincial Policy Statement 2014, Lanark County Sustainable Communities Official Plan, and the Town of Carleton Place Official Plan. The development is consistent with the planning policy framework to which it is subject.

The Carleton Place Development Permit By-Law regulates the development standards and site-specific provisions within the Town. The proposed development meets or exceeds the requirements of the Development Permit By-Law with the exception of the maximum height requirement.

Provincial Policy Statement
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.

Section 1.0 of the PPS, Building Strong Healthy Communities, stresses efficient development patterns, utilizing existing infrastructure and promoting opportunities to create a varied built form. Specifically, Section 1.3, Employment states that Planning Authorities shall promote economic development and competitiveness. Lastly, Section 1.7, Long-term Economic Prosperity, states that projects should be supported that provide opportunities for economic development and community investment readiness.
Section 2.0 of the PPS speaks to the protection and management of resources such as natural heritage. The proposed site alterations are adjacent to the Mississippi River. As a result, all required permitting through the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority will be required.

Section 3.0 outlines policies to direct development away from areas of potential natural hazards such as lands adjacent to rivers. As a result, all required permitting through the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority will be required.

This proposal and its supporting studies are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

**Lanark County Sustainable Communities Official Plan**

The County Official Plan delineates the Town of Carleton Place as a Settlement Area. Section 2.3, Settlement Area Policies, encourages efficient development patterns in Settlement Areas to optimize the use of land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities. Further, local land use policies shall provide for mixed use development, including commercial uses, is in areas designated as a settlement area in local Official Plans.

Section 5.5, Natural Heritage, states that Local Official Plans will regulate development and site alteration on lands in or adjacent to natural heritage features by ensuring no negative impacts will occur as a result. The proposed site alterations are adjacent to the Mississippi River. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared in support of this proposal. The EIS concluded that the proposed patio expansion would have no negative impacts to either the Mississippi River or to other nearby natural heritage features.

The proposal conforms to the Lanark County Sustainable Community Official Plan.

**Town of Carleton Place Official Plan**

The subject site is part of the Mississippi District, specifically the Mississippi Residential Sector as per Schedule A of the Official Plan.

Section 3.1 of the Town of Carleton Place Official Plan, Mississippi District, states that the intent of the designation is to “provide for a mix of residential, commercial and recreational uses while maintaining the character of individual neighborhoods”, among other objectives.

Permitted uses in the Mississippi District include: “low density residential in buildings with street level commercial uses” and “commercial and office uses”, among others.

Section 3.2.2 of the Official Plan speaks to the area specific policies of the Mississippi Residential Sector. The list of permitted uses for the Mississippi Residential Sector include those listed in Section 3.1 – low density residential in buildings with street level commercial uses, above – as well as “existing commercial and industrial uses”.

Section 5.2, Flood Hazards, addresses development in the Mississippi River Floodplain. Development, in this case site alteration and landscaping, is to be regulated through the Development Permit By-law and the regulations of the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA). As mentioned, the Applicant has consulted and met the requirements of the MVCA.

Section 6.18, Economic Development, speaks to encouraging development that sustains and builds from the existing strengths of commercial sectors (such as the adjacent Downtown District), and undertaking initiatives that will stimulate employment and tourism in the Town.

This proposal conforms to the Town of Carleton Place Official Plan

**Town of Carleton Place Development Permit By-law**

This property is designated as Downtown District in the Development Permit By-law. A restaurant is a permitted use in this designation. As mentioned, this application proposes no changes to the existing building at 33-35 Mill Street.

The Development Standards for the Downtown District are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARDS NON-RESIDENTIAL USES</th>
<th>REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area (minimum)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Frontage (minimum)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (maximum)</td>
<td>0.0 metres and shall match the median setback of the adjacent blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Side Yard (maximum)</td>
<td>0.0 metres and shall match the median setback of the adjacent blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard (minimum)</td>
<td>0.0 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Depth (minimum)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Landscaped Open Space</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the rear yard (minimum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height (maximum)</td>
<td>25.0 metres (82 feet) Buildings over 3 storeys shall be stepped back with each successive storey at 45.0 degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Encroachment Area from</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>front or exterior side lot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>As per Section 3 of this By-law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking requirements are regulated as per Section 3.31.3, Parking in the Downtown District, which states: "parking requirements in the Downtown District, as shown on Schedule A, shall be reduced to 0 spaces for non-residential uses and 1 space for each permitted residential dwelling unit."
The proposed Site Plan includes one (1) parking space to the east of the property. This parking space is to satisfy the requirement of Section 3.31.3 (above) as the upper floor of the restaurant at 33-35 Mill Street has a permitted, existing, accessory dwelling unit.

Town Staff is of the opinion that the primary use of the subject property is commercial (Boulton House/restaurant). As such, there is no requirement for Usable Landscaped Open Space in the rear yard (as per Table 1 above). However, the Applicant has elected to reserve a 64m² (689 sq. ft.) in the rear yard as usable landscaped open space, exceeding the Development Permit By-law’s requirements for a single detached dwelling which is 50 m² (538 sq. ft.).

One (1) loading space is required for a commercial use building exceeding 250 m² but less than 1,000 m² of floor area. As per the Development Permit By-law, the loading space is provided on the same lot as the building, is not part of the required parking area, nor located within a required front or exterior side yard. The proposal is, however, requesting relief from the minimum loading space width requirement of 3.5 (11'5'') to a proposed 3 m (9'10''). The reduced loading space width is needed to ensure the proper 1 m emergency egress (fire escape route) can be achieved. Staff anticipate no adverse impacts resulting from a reduced loading space width considering that it will help to ensure the safety of restaurant patrons.

Supporting Reports and Plans
The reports, studies, plans and drawings received in support of the application include:

- Environmental Impact Statement
- MVCA Development Permit
- Planning Rationale Report
- Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment
- Site Plan
- Landscape Plan

COMMENT
During the technical circulation of the application, key comments were received by the Town’s Fire Chief and Deputy Chief Building Official (CBO).

Firstly, the proposed patio will require two (2) fire escape exits that are visible from all areas of the patio. As per the most recent revision of the Site Plan (dated February 14th, 2019), the Fire Chief is satisfied with the proposed egresses from the rear yard.

Secondly, the Deputy CBO had made comment regarding the occupancy of the rear yard patio – the proposed 84 seats. Based on their calculations, the Deputy CBO has determined that the maximum occupancy for the building was 140 persons (based on washroom capacity). However, it was further inferred that the maximum occupancy load for the property rear yard patio, based on egress, was 110 persons (50 inside, 60 on-patio). The maximum occupancy load for inside the restaurant is 50 persons.
The proposed 84 persons capacity on a rear yard patio, combined with the 50 persons capacity inside the restaurant, meets fire safety and building code requirements (50 persons inside, 84 persons outside = 134 persons total).

Because Staff is required to enforce the Building Code, the maximum occupancy of the rear yard patio is limited to 60 persons at a time. Let it be known that the occupancy load does not affect the size of the patio: the proposed dimensions can remain as proposed.

Residents have had mixed reactions regarding the expansion of the Boulton House rear yard patio. Of the comments received, many were in support of the proposal as it adds a destination and attraction to the Downtown Core. Other comments, in opposition, had the common themes of “change of use”, “adverse impacts”, “parking” and “traffic”.

This application does not consist of a change in use. All uses are permitted, existing uses as per the Development Permit By-law. The accessory residential unit on the upper floor of the restaurant does not require any landscaping in the rear yard.

Adverse impacts are defined as one or more of the following:
- Impairment of the quality of the natural environment for any use that can be made of it;
- Injury or damage to property or plant and animal life;
- Harm or material discomfort to any person;
- An adverse effect on the health of any person;
- Impairment of the safety of any person;
- Rendering any property or plant or animal life unfit for use by humans
- Loss of enjoyment of normal use of property; and
- Interference with normal conduct of business.

Adverse impacts and non-compatible land uses are a common theme at a designation boundary. When evaluating the permitted patio expansion against the qualifiers for adverse impacts, Staff are satisfied with the proposal. An appropriate 4 m (13'1'”) landscaped area between the extent of the patio and adjacent dwelling will remain, exceeding the requirement of the Development Permit By-law. Further, the restaurant owner has been very accommodating insisting that no lights will spill onto the adjacent property, nor will any sound pollution. The Town’s Noise By-law will regulate any further concerns.

Parking and traffic in this portion of the downtown core is unique. As such, there is no required parking for commercial uses in the Downtown District. The Town’s Parking By-law will regulate any further concerns.

As with any Development Permit application, the Committee has the following options:

a) Refuse the application;
b) Approve the application and issue a Development Permit with no conditions attached;

c) Approve the application and require that conditions be met before issuing a Development Permit;

d) Approve the application and issue a Development Permit with conditions attached; or

e) Approve the application, require that conditions be met before issuing a Development Permit and, when the conditions have been met, issue a Development Permit with further conditions attached.

In accordance with Section 1.3 of the Town’s Development Permit By-law only the Applicant may appeal the decision to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Committee authorizes application DP2-04-2018 for 33-35 Mill Street for the expansion of the commercial rear yard patio to a maximum capacity of 60 84 persons and directs Staff to proceed with the drafting of the Development Permit Agreement and issue a Development Permit with conditions attached; and

THAT the site-specific conditions of the Development Permit agreement will include but are not limited to the following standard clauses to address servicing, grading, landscaping and utility requirements as well as the following site-specific conditions:

1. That garbage is stored on site in an enclosure as described in the Development Permit By-law and is removed as appropriate by a contracted waste management firm;
2. That upon completion of the patio, the Town’s Building Department and Fire Chief inspect the emergency egresses to ensure safety of patron; and
3. That an amendment to the Development Permit be required should the owner look to further expand the restaurant use.

NOTE: Addendums made on Friday March 26th, 2019

All text in bold black underline font has been added to the report.
All text in bold red strikeout font has been removed from the report.
COMMUNICATION 130065
Received From: Tyler Duval, Acting Manager of Development Services
Addressed To: Committee of the Whole
Date: March 26, 2019
Topic: DP1A-01-2019 – 112, 114 & 116 Leblanc Street (Block 181)
Pegasus Development Corporation

SUMMARY
A 3-unit townhome is approved for the subject property as part of the plan subdivision. In an email dated December 21st, 2018, the project’s surveyor disclosed to Town Staff that the foundation for the townhouse block had been poured in the wrong location. Consequently, the building is no longer in compliance with the Development Permit By-Law. The Town’s Building Department issued an Order to Comply and Stop Work Order on January 4th, 2019 and January 17th, 2019, respectively.

As a result, Pegasus Development Corporation (the Applicant) has submitted a Class 1A Development Permit Application to address the following variations to the Development Permit By-Law:

- **6.3.7 Development Standards – Townhome Dwelling:** Increase the Maximum Exterior Side Yard Build Within Area to 7.65 metres (25'1'') from the required 7.5 metres (24'7'');
- **6.3.7 Development Standards – Townhome Dwelling:** Reduce the Minimum Required Parking Spaces to 1 space per unit from the required 2 spaces per unit; and,
- **6.3.8 Additional Provisions, Townhome Dwellings:** Reduce the main garage foundation set back from the front or exterior side lot line to 5.11 metres (16'9'') from the required 6.0 metres (19'8'').
BACKGROUND
In March 2017, a development permit application was received seeking relief from the minimum required 6m setback for a garage from the front lot line (Section 6.3.8 of the Development Permit By-Law 2015) for the townhouse units on Block 181. Upon receipt of the request, Town Staff had informed the applicant that the variance would not be supported as it limited each unit to a single parking space (a standard parking space in the Town of Carleton Place is 6m in length).

After multiple revisions of the site plan for Block 181, Planning Approval was finally granted on August 10th, 2017, according to Revision 4 (dated 17/05/17). The approved site plan showed the units in compliance with Section 6.3.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revision 4</td>
<td>17/05/17</td>
<td>Rev. Unit Type / For Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 3</td>
<td>28/04/17</td>
<td>Rev. Exterior Side Yard Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 2</td>
<td>07/03/17</td>
<td>For Minor Variance / Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 1</td>
<td>28/02/17</td>
<td>For Permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On December 21st, 2018, the developer's surveyor disclosed to Town Staff that the footings were pinned per an unapproved site plan (Revision 1, 28/02/17) where the driveway lengths did not meet the 6m requirement. As a result, Block 181 now has a poured foundation for a 3-unit townhome in the wrong location.

Table 2 (on the next page) displays and describes both the site plan for the unapproved and approved site plans for Block 181.
Fails to comply with;

i. Section 6.3.8, whereas: The main garage foundation shall be set back a minimum of 6.0 metres (19.6 feet) from the front or exterior side lot line and shall be even or setback from the front wall of the dwelling.

ii. Section 3.31.2, whereas: 2 spaces per dwelling unit, one of which can be provided within a private garage.
On January 4th, 2019, the Town’s Building Department posted an Order to Comply (order attached).

Order to Comply posted January 4th, 2019

On January 17th, 2019, upon inspection by the Town’s Building Department, it appeared as though construction had continued at the site. As a result of the inspection, a Stop Work Order was posted on site (order attached).

Stop Work Order posted January 17th, 2019
On February 15th, 2019, the Applicant submitted a Class 1a Development Permit Application requesting the following variations to the Development Permit By-law:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVISION</th>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3.7 Development Standards, Townhome Dwelling</td>
<td>7.5 m (24’7”)</td>
<td>7.65 m (25’1”)</td>
<td>+ 0.15 m (- 6”) + 2% variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Side Yard Build Within Area, Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.7 Development Standards, Townhome Dwelling</td>
<td>2 spaces per</td>
<td>1 space</td>
<td>- 1 space - 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>dwelling unit, one</td>
<td>provided in garage, 1 space encroaching in ROW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.8 Additional Provisions, Townhome Dwellings</td>
<td>6.0 m (19’8”)</td>
<td>5.11 m (16’9”)</td>
<td>- 0.89 m (- 2’11”) - 14% variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main garage foundation set back from the front or exterior side lot line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS**

Although the 3-unit townhome is partially built, it is crucial that when evaluating these variations they are treated as requests prior to construction, as Town Staff did in March 2017 (Revision 1).

Section 3.44 – Variations, of the Development Permit By-law states the following five (5) tests regarding the evaluation and issuance of a Development Permit:

The following regulatory standards, provisions and design requirements and/or administrative provisions shall be evaluated and adhered to before approval and issuance of a Development Permit:

1. Development will be restricted from areas of environmental hazards, and/or physical limitations, such as poor drainage, organic soils, flood
susceptibility and erosion or steep slopes unless the proposal is shown to mitigate the hazard and physical limitations.

2. All development proposals will require demonstration of conformity to the Official Plan of the Town of Carleton Place and the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014. Supporting studies and reports may be required to demonstrate same prior to the approval and issuance of any development permit.

3. All development proposals will be evaluated with respect to adverse impacts as defined herein. The applicant will be required to demonstrate no adverse impact or provide for buffering to mitigate the adverse impact prior to the approval and issuance of any development permit.

4. Development proposals shall be subject to all requirements of this By-law.

5. A Development Permit will be issued by staff when satisfied that all criteria of this By-law have been met or as directed by Council.

The following sections of this report will address the five tests as listed above.

1. Development will be restricted from areas of environmental hazards and/or physical limitations, such as poor drainage, organic soils, flood susceptibility and erosion or steep slopes unless the proposal is shown to mitigate the hazard and physical limitations.

This application is not subject to environmental hazards nor physical limitations. There is no issue with this test.

2. All development proposals will require demonstration of conformity to the Official Plan of the Town of Carleton Place and the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014. Supporting studies and reports may be required to demonstrate same prior to the approval and issuance of any development permit.

All applicable sections of the Town of Carleton Place Official Plan will be listed hereunder followed respectively by Staff Comment.
### TOWN OF CARLETON PLACE OFFICIAL PLAN

#### 2.0 – Community Design Framework

| 2.2 – General Design Policies | 3. Incorporate pedestrian and cycling amenities into new development and public infrastructure projects where appropriate; |
|  | 4. Enhance the pedestrian experience through site design and way finding initiatives where appropriate; |

**Staff Comment:** Pedestrian infrastructure has been provided on the opposite side of Leblanc Street. However, should the Town wish to install sidewalks on the subject side of Leblanc in the future, the second proposed parking space for the units at 12, 14 and 16 Leblanc will directly encroach onto the sidewalk.

| 2.3 – General Design Policies | 1. Proposed developments shall enhance the image of the Town of Carleton Place by complementing and contributing to: |
|  | • the consistency and continuity of the area with its surroundings; |
|  | 6. The design of new development shall: |
|  | • Be complementary to adjacent development in terms of its overall massing, orientation and setback; |
|  | 8. Proposed development within an established neighbourhood shall be designed to function as an integral and complementary part of that area’s existing development pattern by having regard for: |
|  | • position relative to the road; |

**Staff Comment:** On a street with only two (2) townhouse buildings, there will not be consistency in an established building line/street presence.

#### 3.0 – Land Use Policies

##### 3.5 – Residential District

| 3.5.4 – Density Provisions | The following density policies are intended to ensure that new development will include a mix of residential densities in order to address a full range of housing requirements. |

following policies shall apply:

4. The following residential density classifications shall apply:

Medium density: includes town or row houses and apartments in a range of greater than 22 units per net hectare (9 units per net acre) up to a maximum of 35 units per net hectare (14 units per net acre).

Staff Comment: 3 units / 0.1021 hectares = 29 UPH. 29 Units Per Net is a Medium Density Development.

5. New medium or high density residential development shall be subject to the following policies:

- The site is physically suited to accommodate the proposed development;
- Sufficient off-street parking facilities is provided in accordance with the standards set out in the Development Permit By-law; and
- The development can take place in accordance with the policies of Section 2.0.

Staff Comment: This development qualifies as “new medium residential development” (as mentioned above).

The site is suited to accommodate a 3-unit townhouse model, such as the “Jasmine” model that was originally approved for construction in August 2017 (note: the “Jasmine” model was also approved for construction on the adjacent lot).

Today’s Staff echoes the sentiment of the March 2017 pre-consultation with the Applicant in that the “Juniper” model (the model that is currently half-constructed) is not suitable for this lot as it did not provide the required amount of parking.

Further, sufficient off-street parking is not being provided for either of the three (3) units. As per the Development Permit By-law, two (2) parking spaces are required per unit for a townhouse (one (1) space may be provided within a garage). The Applicant is requesting that 0.89 m (2’11”’) of the required parking space encroach into the Town right-of-way.

Section 3.31.2 – Location and number of [parking] spaces, in the Development Permit By-law clearly states that: “All required parking must be provided outside of the municipal right of way and may not encroach on the municipal sidewalk.”

Also, this new development fails to further compliment the established built form of Leblanc Street in regard to a continuous street presence (as described above in Section...
4.0 – Municipal Amenities and Green Infrastructure
4.3 – Built Infrastructure

4.3.3.4 – Local Street

Local Streets are identified on Schedule B. Generally new development and lot creation on local streets may be permitted in accordance with the relevant policies of this Plan and the requirements of the Development Permit By-law. 

In all new developments a sidewalk on at least one side of the street shall be required as will linkages to the Town’s pathway system.

**Staff Comment:** New development may only be permitted on local streets, such as Leblanc Street, in accordance with the Official Plan and Development Permit By-law. At the time of Plan of Subdivision and Building Permit, both the lot fabric and townhouse conformed to the Official Plan and complied to the Development Permit By-law. This application and its proposed variations lessen the degree of this development’s conformity and compliance with applicable planning policies.

Leblanc Street currently has a sidewalk on the opposite side of the street from the proposed development, as per the Official Plan’s requirements. However, the requirement is for “a sidewalk on at least one side of the street” is the minimal requirement. On the subject side of Leblanc Street there will be a 4.5 m (14’9”) grassed strip on the Town owned right of way. Should the Town allow parking in the right of way it may impede on any future desire to install further pedestrian or cycling infrastructure on this 4.5 m strip of Leblanc Street.

6.0 – Implementation
6.7 – Development Control

6.7.3 – Development Criteria

Council shall consider the following development criteria when reviewing the compatibility and appropriateness of any new development or redevelopment, when considering amendments to the Development Permit By-law and in considering, where applicable, the requirements for a Class 1, 2 or 3 Development Permit:

1. Adequate access to, and provision of, off-street parking;

**Staff Comment:** The Development Permit By-law clearly indicates that “All required parking must be provided outside of the municipal right of way” and that for a townhouse unit two (2) parking spaces are required.

The Development Permit By-law does speak to the reduction of required parking via a Cash In-lieu agreement, however this provision is specific to Non-Residential uses, and thus does not apply to the proposed development.

6.14.4 – Technical reports/plans or studies may be required...
Supporting Studies and Reports

in the review process of a Development Permit application. Applications for a Development Permit may be required to submit the following studies or reports; [...]  
• Parking and Loading Study [...]  

Staff Comment: At the time of this application, the figure below was submitted in support of the proposed variations. On the figure, the Applicant has illustrated proposed parking locations for the homeowners of the townhouse units. The vehicles depicted in the figure appears to have a maximum length of 4.42 m (14’6”). This length was deduced using the distance between driveways provided on the Site Plan prepared by the Applicant.

For reference, here are typical vehicle lengths per class:
• Compact Size (Chevrolet Spark): 3.5 m (11’6”)
• Mid Size (Chevrolet Impala): 5.31 m (17’5”)
• Pickup Truck (Chevrolet Silverado): 5.9 m (19’4”)

According to the Site Plan and Figure below, 5.11 m off-street parking proposed will not be able to accommodate a mid-size car without encroaching into the municipal right of way.

The Town can request a more thorough investigation by the Applicant as to the location of off-street and on-street parking including property boundaries, vehicle dimensions and street widths.

Parking figure provided in support of application
The application currently does not conform to the above-mentioned Sections of the Official Plan. Further the Planning Rationale submitted in support of the application did not propose any alternative measures as to how these sections can be pacified or fulfilled.

As per the evaluation process described in the Development Permit By-law, supporting studies and reports may be required to demonstrate conformity prior to the approval and issuance of any development permit.

Committee may request for a more thorough investigation by the Applicant as to the location of off-street and on-street parking including property boundaries, vehicle dimensions and street widths.

2. **All development proposals will be evaluated with respect to adverse impacts as defined herein. The applicant will be required to demonstrate no adverse impact or provide for buffering to mitigate the adverse impact prior to the approval and issuance of any development permit.**

As per the Development Permit By-law, Adverse Impacts are defined as follows:

*Means one or more of the following:*

i) Impairment of the quality of the natural environment for any use that can be made of it; ii) Injury or damage to property or plant and animal life; iii) Harm or material discomfort to any person; iv) An adverse effect on the health of any person; v) Impairment of the safety of any person; vi) Rendering any property or plant or animal life unfit for use by humans; vii) Loss of enjoyment of normal use of property; and viii) Interference with normal conduct of business.

This request for variation of the minimum driveway length may in fact cause Adverse Impacts by means of “loss of enjoyment of normal use of property”. Normal use of property includes storage of personal vehicles on personal private property.

Without registering encroachment agreements in favour of each townhouse unit with the Town, regular off-street parking will most likely not be achieved for either of these units. As previously mentioned, the Applicant has not made any attempt in suggesting alternatives to resolve the potential encroachment issue for these lots. The aforementioned request for additional parking studies may address the Adverse Impacts created by this proposed development.

4. **Development proposals shall be subject to all requirements of this By-law.**

All applicable sections of the Town of Carleton Place Development Permit By-law will be listed hereunder followed respectively by Staff Comment.
**TOWN OF CARLETON PLACE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT BY-LAW**

### 3.0 – General Provisions

#### 3.31 – Parking and Storage of Vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.31.2 – Location and number of spaces</th>
<th>All required parking must be provided outside of the municipal right of way and may not encroach on the municipal sidewalk.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF USE</td>
<td>MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-detached Dwelling</td>
<td>2 spaces per dwelling unit, one of which can be provided within a private garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Comment:** The proposed development is requesting a portion of the minimum required parking to be located in the municipal right of way. Alternatively, the proposed development is requesting a reduction to the requirement of two (2) off-street parking spaces to the proposed single parking space.

Either way the application is evaluated, neither outcome is desirable in the Town’s opinion.

### 6.0 – Residential District

#### 6.3 – Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.3.7 – Development Standards, Townhome Dwellings</th>
<th>SITE PROVISIONS</th>
<th>REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area (minimum)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage (maximum)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Frontage (minimum)</td>
<td>5.5 metres (18.04 feet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Build Within Area</td>
<td>4.5 metres, minimum (14.7 feet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 metres, maximum (24.6 feet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Side Yard Build Within Area</td>
<td>4.5 metres, minimum (14.7 feet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 metres, maximum (24.6 feet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard (minimum)</td>
<td>1.5 metres (4.9 feet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No side yard shall be required along the common property line of common wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Depth (minimum)</td>
<td>6.5 metres (21.3 feet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Landscaped Open Space in the rear yard (minimum)</td>
<td>30.0 square metres (338 square feet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height (maximum)</td>
<td>11.0 metres (36 feet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Dwelling Unit Area</td>
<td>83.1 square metres (900 square feet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Encroachment Area from front or exterior side lot line</td>
<td>2.5 metres (8.2 feet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>2 spaces per dwelling unit, one of which may be provided with garage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Comment:** The proposed development is requesting relief from the required maximum Exterior Side Yard Build Within Area of 7.5 metres (24’7”) to the proposed 7.65 metres (25’1”), a variation resulting in an increased yard of 0.15 m (6”). Leblanc Street and Hurdis Way do not meet at a right angle, as a result, the side yard becomes wider towards the rear lot line.
There is no issue with this requested variation to the Development Standards as similar variations have been granted in the past for the same reasons.

The proposed development is requesting a reduction to the requirement of two (2) off-street parking spaces to the proposed single parking space. This reduction is a result of the requested reduction in driveway length (Section 6.3.8, below). Failing to meet the minimum required 6 m driveway length has an undesirable adverse impact on the lot, limiting the availability of parking.

6.3.8 – Additional Provisions, Townhome Dwellings

The main garage foundation shall be set back a minimum of 6.0 metres (19.6 feet) from the front or exterior side lot line and shall be even or setback from the front wall of the dwelling.

Staff Comment: The proposed development is requesting relief from the required minimum garage door setback of 6.0 metres (19’8’’) to the proposed 5.11 metres (16’9’’), a variation resulting in a reduced driveway length of 0.89 m (2’11’’).

As mentioned elsewhere in this report, a mid-sized car has a typical length of 5.31 m (17’5’’). The result of this proposed development will most likely result in the majority of vehicles (mid-sized cars and any larger vehicles) encroaching into the municipal right of way, which is not permitted as per Section 3.31.2 (above).

5. A Development Permit will be issued by staff when satisfied that all criteria of this By-law have been met or as directed by Council.

A Class 1a Development Permit application can be reviewed and approved by Staff without public consultation or input from the Committee of the Whole. However, in the case of this specific application, Staff has elected to forward the application to the Committee as it would benefit from a Planning Committee review.

The Development Permit By-law allows for variations to be made to its prescribed Development Standards. As per Section 3.44 – Variations of the By-law:

“Approval of variations to By-law standards are subject to the following procedures:

[...]  
2. Council may vary the standards, provisions and requirements of the Development Permit By-law up to 100% of the stated standards subject to the criteria outlined below and provided that the proposal is consistent with and complies with both the Official Plan of the Town of Carleton Place and the Provincial Policy Statement 2014 of the Province of Ontario and any other legislation as applicable.”
A Development Permit will only be issued for this 3-unit townhome development as per Council direction.

**COMMENT**

Although the 3-unit townhome is partially built, it must be stressed that the evaluation of this application was treated as an application made prior to construction, just as Town Staff did in March 2017 (Revision 1) where it was found that this proposed development was not appropriate for units at 112, 114 and 116 Leblanc Street.

It is difficult to support an application resulting in deficiency in a greenfield development. The design of a dwelling, building or structure on a vacant lot should more than often not require variations to the Development Standards of the designation for which it is found. During the Plan of Subdivision, a developer creates the desired lot and block sizes for what is envisioned for the subdivision. As such, the August 2017 Site Plan submitted for Building Permit (Revision 4) was able to meet the requirements of the Development Permit By-law.

It is the opinion of Town Staff that the negligence towards the location of the foundation, whether by accident or not, is unacceptable and fails to meet the intent of the Development Permit By-law. In failing to meet the 6 m garage setback, each unit will fail to meet the minimum parking requirement of two (2) spaces per dwelling unit. This omission has the potential to require residents of the townhome to park vehicles along the street. The loss of normal enjoyment and use of property (in being able to park two (2) vehicles on one’s private property) is an adverse impact that is undesirable and should be avoided when possible. Further, the reduced setback may hinder sightlines as Block 181 is a corner lot.

A variance in relief of Section 6.3.8 (driveway length) of the Development Permit By-law has never been issued in the Town of Carleton Place. Conversely, Town Staff does not have an issue with the proposed variation to the Maximum Exterior Side Yard Build Within Area.

Options available to Committee to address this matter include:

**Option 1 – Require Construction of Approved Units**

Under this Option, the Applicant would be required to bring the footings and foundation into compliance with Section 6.3.8. of the Town’s Development Permit By-law. This option may require the developer to remove the existing footings and foundation and repour in accordance with approved plans. While this is an expensive option, if it was deemed an “error and omission” by the developer’s insurer, it may be something potentially covered by their insurance.

**Option 2 – Grant a Development Permit for the Proposed Units with Conditions**

Under this Option, the developer would be permitted to continue construction of the 3-unit townhome as per the proposed Site Plan submitted in DP1A-01-2019. This Option will result in the Applicant being approved for the construction of exactly what Town advised them they would not support in March 2017.

The Applicant may appeal the decision to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT).
STAFF RECOMMENDATION
THAT Council supports Option 1 outlined in the Acting Manager of Development Services Report dated March 26, 2019 requiring the Developer to bring the 3-unit townhome into compliance with the approved plans dated August 10, 2017 for 112, 114 & 116 Leblanc Street (Block 181), Carleton Landing North Subdivision.
SUMMARY
In May 2017 Lanark County issued the Notice of Decision for the conditional approval of Bodnar Draft Plan of Subdivision (File No.: 09-T-17001).

The approved Draft Plan of Subdivision included 193 lots for single detached dwellings, 26 blocks for townhomes (317 units), and 1 block for apartments (72 units) for a total of 582 residential units on municipal services with frontage on a local street network of 8 new municipal rights-of-way. The draft plan also includes a block for a pump station; a block for sanitary sewer servicing; a block for driveway access from Street No. 4 to the abutting vacant commercial site; an 8.2m wide road widening to be conveyed to MTO and three 0.3m reserves. There are a total of 227 lots and blocks on the draft plan.
During the review of the proposed draft plan, some concerns were raised by Staff, the public and the Urban Forest and River Corridor Committee, particularly with respect to engineering components and the Environmental Impact Statement. During the statutory public meeting related to the application, the Planning and Protection Committee authorized a peer review of the submitted engineering reports and Environmental Impact Statement. A further public meeting was to be held upon completion of the peer review. The Urban Forest and River Corridor Committee nominated three candidate firms for the peer review with the work being awarded to Robinson Land Development and sub-consultant J.F. Sabourin and Associates Inc.

As part of the tasks to be undertaken for the proposed Bodnar Lands Subdivision Stormwater Management Peer Review, Robinson Land Development and J.F. Sabourin and Associates Inc. reviewed the following documents in December 2016:

**List of Reviewed Drawings:**

a) **Existing Storm Drainage Plan**, 1384341 Ontario Bodnar Lands, prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., Drawing No. EXSD-1, Project No.: 160401129, Revision 3 dated 17.11.14.

b) **Conceptual Overall Storm Drainage Plan**, 1384341 Ontario Bodnar Lands, prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., Drawing No. OSD-1, Project No.: 160401129, Revision 3 dated 17.11.14.

c) **Conceptual Overall Grading Plan, Option 1**, 1384341 Ontario Bodnar Lands, prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., Drawing No. OGP-1, Project No.: 160401129, Revision 3 dated 17.11.14.

d) **Conceptual Wet Pond**, 1384341 Ontario Bodnar Lands, prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., Drawing No.: GP-1, Project No. 160401129, Revision 3 dated 17.11.14.

e) **Conceptual Overall Erosion Control Plan**, 1384341 Ontario Bodnar Lands, prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., Drawing No. EC-1, Project No.: 160401129, Revision 3 dated 17.11.14.

**List of Reviewed Reports:**


b) **Environmental Impact Statement - Revised**, Bodnar Subdivision, Town of Carleton Place, prepared by Muncaster Environmental Planning Inc., dated November 10, 12017.
J.F. Sabourin presented the findings of their peer review on a meeting held on the December 19th, 2017. The peer review determined that many of the initial issues raised at the statutory public meeting had been addressed in the reports by Stantec Consulting Inc. and Muncaster Environmental Planning Inc. (listed above). Although some of the issues could be further examined, this would only take place at the time of detailed design. Detailed design occurs after draft approval has been given by the County of Lanark.

Currently, there is still opposition to the findings of the peer review process. Most recently, in a letter dated September 27, 2018 (Appendix 1), the Urban Forest and River Corridor Committee have requested that the Applicant provide a Source Water Protection Study as part of the conditional approval of the draft plan of subdivision.

Further, the Urban Forest and River Corridor Committee have proposed the Town undertake a Cost Benefit Analysis exercise evaluating Stantec’s Proposal against the following alternative measures proposed in their letter:

- Retain the 200 m vegetative buffer along the south side of Lake Ave;
- Do not extend the proposed “Street No. 1” through the 200 m vegetative buffer and Intake Protection Zone,
- Forgo the construction of 9 building units within the 200 m setback,
- Investigate the relocation of the proposed Stormwater Management Pond

Most recently, on February 28th, 2019, a special meeting of the Committee of the Whole was held to inform the Town’s newest Council Members on the status of the Bodnar Subdivision, including presentations by: Lanark County Planning Department, Paul Knowles (former Carleton Place CAO), Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority Staff, Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Staff, and finally Robinson Land Development and J.F. Sabourin. At the meeting, the various agencies discussed the review process, regulations and applicable policy at their various levels of governance. Finally, Robinson Land Development and J.F. Sabourin presented the findings of the peer review exercise, as they did on December 19th, 2017. The peer review team also answered the Committee’s remaining questions.

**COMMENT**

For this application, both the Town and County followed the due review process. The application was circulated to all the required agencies including the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) and Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC). The appropriate notice was posted for the statutory public meeting. All comments and submissions were compiled and presented to the County’s Council for decision.

Moreover, the Committee elected, at the request of the public, that the engineering components and Environmental Impact Statement in support of the application be peer reviewed, which is not a requirement.

To date, the reports and studies in support of the application have been reviewed by qualified professionals from Stantec Consulting Inc., Muncaster Environmental Planning Inc., the Town of Carleton Place, the County of Lanark, Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority and the former Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (now Ministry of Environment, Conversation and Parks).
In consideration of the requests made by the Urban Forest and River Corridor Committee, Committee will consider:

1. **Request for a Source Water Protection Study**  
The MVCA, who are the commenting agency with regards to Source Water Protection policies, made no comments on the Stormwater Management Pond’s proximity to the Intake Protection Zone. The MVCA did make the following comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>MVCA COMMENT</th>
<th>STAFF RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The location of the Roy Brown Park in the Intake Protection Zone for the Town’s water supply, along with the riverine wetland, provide significant educational opportunities to demonstrate best environmental management practices with respect to maintaining a clean water intake and for wetland interpretation.</td>
<td>As per MVCA draft conditions the developer is already required to prepare and distribute educational materials. Further, the Town has already reserved information sign boards within Roy Brown Park that await the MVCA information to be posted in relation to any educational purpose they choose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MVCA committed to building exterior washroom facilities at its office for public use of the trail system and being seen as a conservation center. The proposed location for the SWM pond, to be located directly adjacent to the trail, is not conducive to these pursuits.</td>
<td>It is standard practice in all subdivisions to have a pathway around a SWP. Examples include: Jackson Ridge, Highgate Subdivision, Stonewater Bay, Meadow Ridge and Miller’s Crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MVCA strongly encourages the incorporation of Low Impact Development into traditional stormwater management plans. The use of LID’s is an innovative and effective alternative to traditional methods of SWM that treats, infiltrates, filters and retains runoff at the source (where it falls to the ground). It is anticipated that the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change will soon provide credit for the use of LID’s effectively reducing/replacing various traditional/end of pipe methods. We suggest employing the following hierarchy in the SWM design: 1. LID retention (on site controls) 2. LID volume capture and release 3. Other volume detention and release</td>
<td>The Town of Carleton Place is ultimately responsible for the function and maintenance of this stormwater pond. The advice of the peer reviewer as mentioned above is two-fold: 1. They would not recommend reducing the size of the storm pond based on LID implementation. 2. They question the validity of the MVCA’s condition that requires the Developer to comply with a document that is not accepted by the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition No. 44 of the County’s conditions to final plan approval for registration of this subdivision reads:

“At any time prior to final approval of this plan for registration, the Town of Carleton Place may, in accordance with Section 51 (43) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, amend, delete or add to the conditions and this may include the need for amended or new studies.”
Therefore, the request for additional studies, such as this, is within reason. The request must however be granted by Council. The Urban Forest and River Corridor Committee support their request for the following reasons:

1. To date there has been little or no consideration of the impact of such a development on the “quality” of the water which is the source of the Town’s drinking water.

2. There is a significant gap (timing and intent) between regulations (e.g. MOECC SWMP compliance regulations 2003) and more current policy statements (e.g. Source Water Protection Plan, Provincial policy statements -1.6.6.7- Storm water management) and guidelines (MOECC 2012 guidelines).

3. While technically not required, we believe the apparent lack of interest in any risk management study by MVCA is an oversight given the proximity of this proposed development to our drinking water source. Furthermore, the MVCA, despite their mandate to implement the MV SWPP is still primarily focused on water quantity and flood hazards versus water quality.

4. The C.P. Official Plan (2013) requires a source water protection study (Section 6.14.4) and a cost benefit analyses of engineering works in flood plain areas.

5. The proponents revised E.I.S. (Nov 2017) still has no mention of the Mississippi river as the source of the Towns drinking water.

Committee should know that items 1,2,3 and 5 listed above would have been considered by the qualified professionals at the Town, County, MVCA and MOECC during the review of this file.

Further, item 4 listed above is not a true statement. Section 6.14.4 of the Town’s Official Plan states that supporting studies, such as a Source Water Protection Study, “may be required to assist in the review process of a Development Permit application”.

Section 5.2 of the Official Plan speaks to Council’s consideration of the “the costs and benefits in monetary terms of any engineering works and/or resource management practices needed to overcome any potential impact” when removing lands from the floodplain.

2. Relocation of SWMP
The Urban Forest and River Corridor Committee’s letter further proposes that an additional study be completed. This study would compare the impacts of the subdivision’s SWMP if it were relocated to the east side of Mississippi Road rather than in Roy Brown Park.

With respect to the SWMP’s location, Councilor Black has raised the following motion:

“to ensure that our obligation as municipal councillors is met, we request the following:

1. That LID (low impact development) measures be fully implemented, therefore eliminating or significantly reducing the requirements for a SWP;

2. In the event that a SWP (storm water management pond) will still be required, that
this SWP will be located on the developer’s property;

3. That any discharge outlet for storm water be located downstream of Riverside Park.”

The engineers from Robinson Land Development and J.F. Sabourin and Associates Inc. had the following comments in response the Councillor Black’s motion:

“Both the Town of Carleton Place and MVCA have asked that LID measures be implemented for this project in their draft conditions.

Locating the stormwater management pond on the developer’s lands would be contrary to an earlier agreement signed between the Town and the developer and endorsed by Council. Further, location of the pond on the developer’s property would be closer to the water intake area.

It is not technically feasible to locate a discharge outlet downstream of Riverside Park.”

The options available to Committee include:

1. Accept the letter from Urban Forest / River Corridor Committee as information only. It is Staff’s opinion that peer review, along with the engineering components and Environmental Impact Statement in support of the Bodnar Subdivision satisfy the requirements of qualified professionals at the Town, County, Conservation Authority and Provincial levels.

2. Council may elect to include additional conditions to the draft conditions for the Bodnar Subdivision, specifically to require a Source Water Protection Study or similar studies, as per the letter dated September 27, 2018.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
THAT the March 26, 2019 Report by the Acting Manager of Development Services regarding the letter received by the Urban Forest and River Corridor Committee (addressed to Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services; dated September 27, 2018) requesting a Source Water Protection Study or similar studies be received as information.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Letter from Urban Forest / River Corridor Committee
September 27, 2018

To: Joanna Bowes, Manager of Development Services

Subject: Bodnar – Need for Source Water Protection Study

The Carleton Place Urban Forest / River Corridor Advisory Committee continues to have serious concerns regarding the proposed development on the Bodnar property in close proximity to the source of our drinking water (intake pipe) on the Mississippi River.

As per Condition # 44 (County Draft Conditions of Approval April 18, 2018) the Committee recommends a new study specifically “a source water protection study” for the following reasons:

1. To date there has been little or no consideration of the impact of such a development on the “quality” of the water which is the source of the Town’s drinking water.

2. There is a significant gap (timing and intent) between regulations (e.g. MOECC SWMP compliance regulations 2003) and more current policy statements (e.g. Source Water Protection Plan, Provincial policy statements -1.6.6.7- Storm water management) and guidelines (MOECC 2012 guidelines).

3. While technically not required, we believe the apparent lack of interest in any risk management study by MVCA is an oversight given the proximity of this proposed development to our drinking water source. Furthermore, the MVCA, despite their mandate to implement the MV SWPP is still primarily focused on water quantity and flood hazards versus water quality.

4. The C.P. Official Plan (2013) requires a “source water protection study (Section 6.14.4) and a cost benefit analyses of engineering works in flood plain areas.

5. The proponents revised E.I.S. (Nov 2017) still has no mention of the Mississippi river as the source of the Towns drinking water.

I am attaching additional rationale and a proposal for a cost benefit analyses we believe should be undertaken by an independent non engineering firm in order to more fully assess the qualitative impacts of various alternatives to protect this vital resource. We believe this proposal should be presented to Council for their approval.

If you have any questions please give me a call.

Jim McCready R.P.F./ Certified Arborist
Chair
Carleton Place Urban Forest/River Corridor Advisory Committee.
Whereas:

- One of the largest subdivisions on the books in Carleton Place is being proposed, the north end of which is in a flood plain and only 400 metres from the CP drinking water intake and 65 metres from the Mississippi river—the source of our drinking water; and,

- Part of Phase 1 of the proposed subdivision is in IPZ 9 and the flood plain; and,

- “Ontario’s Clean Water Act was created specifically to protect drinking water at source rather than simply relying on water treatment to deliver safe clean water”; and,

- The Precautionary Principle, endorsed by the Supreme Court of Canada and underpinning the Source Water protection Plan (2014–effective Jan 1 2015), states “lack of scientific evidence is not an excuse for the need to anticipate and mitigate future events which could lead to further contamination of drinking water”; and,

- the SWPP “encourages all residents and businesses in intake protection zones to take voluntary actions to protect the drinking water source”; and,

- the drinking water source can be protected by reducing storm water by not building transport pathways (e.g. S/N road through the subdivision to Lake Ave, widening Lake Ave with sidewalks and a minor storm water system including an oil grit separator in a floodplain) in or in close proximity to vulnerable areas–IPZ 9 and IPZ 10; and,

- The Water Resiliency plan submitted to CP Council on April 24 2018 indicates that an effect of climate change will be “the worsening of microbial activity of the raw water due to man-made pollution” which includes the storm water runoff from the proposed subdivision; and,

- Storm water contains contaminants from roads, sidewalks, and buildings such as phosphorous, oil, salt, feces e-coli bacteria, and other pathogens and the MOE treats this as “sewage”; and,

- The hydrologic regime and surface topography should remain unaltered in order to maintain existing natural flow conditions so as to minimize disturbance to existing wells, as per MOE criteria and guidelines 2012; and,

- The current surface water migration routes include Mississippi Road north to Lake Ave and running down ditches on both sides of the road westward towards the boat launch but stopping at a culvert approximately 150 metres from the boat launch and running north again into Riverside Park, a floodplain; and,

- The north end of the proposed subdivision is currently protected by a vegetative buffer running east to west for approximately 140 metres along the south side of Lake Ave; and,

- Given that the west end of Riverside Park was under water last spring and is often during period of high rainfall (e.g. fall 2017); and,

- There is great uncertainty as to what % of the storm water runoff will be directed to the SWMP in RBP. Given the current drainage patterns it appears about 50% from Phases 4, 5, and 6. Therefore,
most of the runoff and the contaminants therein from Phases 1, 2 and 3 would flow north towards the river; and,

- There are significant restrictions regarding manipulation of the land base in a floodplain: “Modification of the flood plain through filling, excavation, or by other means is prohibited unless permitted by the MVCA and the Ministry of Natural Resources” -Environmental Constraints Section 12.0 CP Development Permit By law;

- There are significant restrictions regarding manipulation of the land base in a floodplain: Lanark County SCOP Sections; 1.2.8 and 5.5.8. Section 4.4.2 (watershed and sub watershed studies required where major developments are planned); and,

- “Average or expected conditions will not be consistent and are expected to be highly variable from year to year due to a higher intensity of rainfall events” -P. Lehman G.M. MVCA, which means more flooding; and,

- SCOP Section 12.1 Strategic Objective states: “Reduce the amount of storm water entering into surface water bodies”; and,

- The fact that engineering solutions aimed at controlling nature as standalone solutions are no longer adequate due to the unpredictability of the climate and weather and are based on outdated metrics; and,

- The cost of these control oriented solutions is becoming exceedingly onerous for taxpayers with questionable environmental benefits.

And not withstanding:

- That under SWPP Policy SEW -10-LB –PI-MC “Future SWMF in Intake Protection Zone Scored 8 to 9 – Prescribed Instrument (Environmental Compliance Approval Ont. Water Resource Act) : A future SWMF that would be a sig drinking water threat as described in appendix B is permitted in the IPZ with a vulnerability score 8.8.1 or 9”. The MOECC “shall ensure…appropriate terms and conditions to manage the threat so that it does not become significant”. These terms and conditions will include a requirement that a new storm water management facility be built to “Enhanced Level Protection Standards” as described in the S.M.P&D.M. MOECC 2003.

The Following Proposal is recommended by the Urban Forest/River Corridor Committee

Activate Condition # 44 (Appendix 1 Draft Conditions for Approval of Bodnar Subdivision) April 18 2018) requiring a new source water protection study as per the OP Section 6.1.4.4.

The Proposal: A Cost Benefit Analyses (OP)

The monetary and non monetary costs and benefits would be evaluated and compared for the two options.

1. The Stantec Proposal Key Elements

- Build South to North Road running into Lake Ave;
- Widen Lake Ave and with additional sidewalks;
• Construct Storm water mgt system including drains and storm scepter system in floodplain;
• Storm water drains into river at boat launch above drinking water intake;
• SWMP in RBP

2. A 200 Meter Eco/Vegetative Buffer – existing and/or enhanced

• Retain the 200 metre vegetative buffer along the south side of Lake Ave - one of the best examples of “Low Impact development”;
• Do not build the part of the S/N road (through the 200 metre setback) in IPZ 9 running into Lake Ave;
• Forgo the construction of 9 building units within the 200 metre setback and the floodplain - a small price to pay in order to help protect our drinking water.

A separate study should also be undertaken comparing the possibility of:

SWMP relocation to east side of Mississippi Road versus the SWMP in RBP

*Transport Pathway “is a land condition caused by human activity that results in faster or more widespread distribution of contaminants in water” SWPP 2014
SUMMARY
The purpose of the proposed amendments to the Traffic By-Law is to include more specific language and details pertaining to prohibited parking with signs and to provide By-law Enforcement Officers additional tools to address illegal occurrences that take place within Town parks.

BACKGROUND
Staff has recently reviewed section 6 “PARKING PROHIBITED WITH SIGNS” of the Traffic and Parking By-Law. Staff identified the need to add “municipal property” to Section 6 (1) to be able to address illegal occurrences on municipal property such as Town parks.

Staff recommends amending Section 6 (1) to read as follows:

“When authorized signs have been erected, no person shall park a vehicle or permit a vehicle to remain parked on any highway or municipal property.”

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no financial implications associated with these changes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
THAT Traffic and Parking By-Law No. 46-2003 Section 6(1) be amended to read as follows: “When authorized signs have been erected, no person shall park a vehicle or permit a vehicle to remain parked on any highway or municipal property.”
COMMUNICATION 130068
Received From: Diane Smithson, Chief Administrative Officer
Addressed To: Committee of the Whole
Date: March 26, 2019
Topic: Adoption of Community Safety Plan

SUMMARY
At the March 12, 2019 Committee of the Whole meeting, Stephanie Gray, Coordinator, Lanark County Situation Table made a delegation to Council regarding the Community Plan for Safety and Well-Being (CSWB) Plan for Lanark County and the Town of Smiths Falls. Recent amendments to the Police Services Act mandate municipalities to adopt a CSWB Plan within two years of the adoption of the amendments. The Act permits municipalities to work in partnership with neighbouring municipalities and/or First Nation communities to develop a joint plan. Given that significant work has gone into the development of the CSWB plan prepared for Lanark County and the Town of Smiths Falls, Staff recommends that Council adopt this plan as the Town’s plan.

BACKGROUND
Legislative amendments to the current Police Services Act were made mandating municipalities to prepare and adopt a community safety and well-being plan (CSWB). These amendments came into effect January 1, 2019. Under the Act, CSWB plans must be adopted within two years of the date of passing of the amendments.

As part of legislation, municipalities are required to develop and adopt their CSWB plan by working in partnership with a multi-sectoral advisory committee comprised of representation from the police service board and other local service providers in health/mental health, education, community/social services and children/youth services. Additional requirements are also outlined in legislation pertaining to conducting consultations, contents of the plan, and monitoring, evaluating, reporting and publishing the plan. This approach allows municipalities to take a leadership role in defining and addressing priority risks in the community through proactive, integrated strategies that ensure vulnerable populations receive the help they need from the providers best suited to support them.

Municipalities have the flexibility to engage in community safety and well-being planning individually, or in partnership with neighbouring municipalities and/or First Nation communities to develop a joint plan. While First Nation communities are encouraged to undertake this type of planning, they are not however, required to do so by legislation.

COMMENT
At the March 12, 2019 Committee of the Whole meeting, Stephanie Gray, Coordinator, Lanark County Situation Table made a delegation to Council regarding the Community Plan for Safety and Well-Being (CSWB) Plan for Lanark County and the Town of Smiths Falls. The process to develop a CSWB Plan for Lanark County and Smiths Falls began in late 2016. A Steering Committee with representation from the justice, community/youth, health care, social services/housing, victim services, education,
Indigenous and local government sectors was established, and consultations and research began. The overall purpose of the plan is to examine assets in the community, assess gaps and develop strategies to enhance the community safety and well-being for residents of Lanark County and Smiths Falls. The development of the plan used frameworks created by the Ontario Working Group and suggested by the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services in order to be consistent with the new Safer Ontario Act adopted on March 8, 2018.

Consultation included surveys, feedback from agencies through representation at the Lanark County Situation Table and a variety of committees and working groups, focus groups, interviews and statistics. The result was the identification of 12 priority risk areas:

- mental health
- substance use
- poverty
- housing
- transportation
- health and well-being
- domestic violence and sexual assault
- youth and families
- seniors
- justice
- Indigenous considerations; and
- culture and diversity

Issues within each risk area were highlighted, as well as strategies to combat them, outcomes and measurables in the areas of social programming, prevention, risk intervention and emergency response. The plan is intended to be a “living” document which will evolve with progress reports and a review in three (3) years.

The Steering Committee approved the CSWB Plan on July 4, 2018 and it was adopted in principle August 29, 2018 by Lanark County Council.

The legislation identifies that monitoring, evaluating, reporting requirements may be outlined in regulations at a later date. The publishing regulation already approved, requires that an approved CSWB Plan be posted on the Town’s website within 30 days of adoption and a printed copy be available for public viewing.

Given that significant work has gone into the development of the CSWB plan prepared for Lanark County and the Town of Smiths Falls, Staff recommends that Council adopt this plan as the Town’s plan. It should be noted that no specific municipal actions are included in the plan beyond advocacy. It is the implementation teams who undertake the actions identified within the plan, who then report to the Advisory Committee, which reports to municipalities through the Coordinator. A report will then be provided to the Province once this is further determined through regulation. The adoption of the plan by
Council would indicate approval of the Advisory Committee/Coordinator moving forward with the Plan’s recommendations.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no financial implications for the Town associated with this recommendation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
WHEREAS the Corporation of the Town of Carleton Place is committed to community safety and well-being for its citizens;

AND WHEREAS Part XI of the Police Services Act, which came into force on January 1, 2019, states that a municipality shall prepare and, by resolution, adopt a community safety and well-being plan;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Corporation of the Town of Carleton Place adopts the community safety and wellbeing plan for Lanark County and Smiths Falls as presented by the Community Plan for Safety and Wellbeing Steering Committee.
SUMMARY
The Town has been contacted by the Eastern Regional Medical Education Program (ERMEP) in Perth to see if the community would be interested in hosting a social event for nine (9) first year medical students who will be visiting Carleton Place as part of the program's community week. Community week is a one (1) week exposure to rural medicine in a supervised learning environment in Eastern Ontario.

University of Ottawa Community Week is May 27\textsuperscript{th} to May 30\textsuperscript{th}.

Queen's University Community Week which is June 3\textsuperscript{rd} to June 7\textsuperscript{th}.

COMMENT
In the past we have facilitated this event, in partnership with the Chamber of Commerce, in the form of a group dinner at a local restaurant. Should Council choose to move forward with hosting an event this year it can be funded out of the economic development support budget line.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
THAT the Communications Coordinator be instructed to coordinate a social dinner for both University of Ottawa and Queen's University medical students under the Eastern Regional Medical Education Program; and

THAT Council identify who they would like to attend on behalf of the Town/community.
COMMUNICATION 130070
FROM: Diane Smithson, CAO
TO: Committee of the Whole
DATE: March 26, 2019
SUBJECT: Award of Request for Proposal – Strategic Planning

SUMMARY
After reviewing the RFP submissions for Strategic Planning, staff is recommending that the RFP be awarded to Big Thinking.

BACKGROUND
On February 5, 2019, Council approved the following resolution:

Motion No. 5-130-04
Moved by Councillor Atkinson, seconded by Councillor Tennant
THAT Council approves proceeding with Option 3 for conducting a Strategic Planning Session with Council and Senior Staff as outlined in the CAO’s report dated January 22, 2019.

CARRIED

The RFP was issued on an invitational basis to five (5) firms with all five (5) firms submitting a proposal by the March 8, 2019 deadline.

DISCUSSION
The five (5) proposals were reviewed and scored. The RFPs were rated in accordance with the evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP as follows:

1. Experience and Qualifications of Team Members (15%)
2. Understanding of Objectives and Completeness of Proposal (5%)
3. Quality of Approach and Methodology (25%)
4. Proposed Work Plan, Schedule and Level of Effort (15%)
4. Fees (40%)

The companies were rated overall from high to lowest overall score based on the scoring model.

Staff is recommending that the proposal from Big Thinking be accepted as they received the overall best score in the evaluation of the RFPs, had the overall lowest
price, have experience in the municipal field and their reference checks were extremely positive.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

$30,000 was included in the 2019 budget for strategic planning.

Five (5) firms submitted proposals in response to the Strategic Planning RFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANY NAME</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL FEES</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL (price does not include HST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GHS Enterprise</td>
<td>$42,900.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Thinking</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Sector Consulting</td>
<td>$21,150.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$22,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDC Management Consulting</td>
<td>$24,150.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$26,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fraser View Group</td>
<td>$38,200.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$38,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION:
THAT Council award the Strategic Planning Request for Proposal to Big Thinking in the amount of $11,000 plus HST.
COMMUNICATION 130071
Received From: Diane Smithson, Chief Administrative Officer
Addressed To: Committee of the Whole
Date: March 26, 2019
Topic: Hospital Foundation Request for Office Space

SUMMARY
The Carleton Place Hospital Foundation will be gearing up to launch its next capital fundraising campaign for the Hospital. They have approached the Town for free office space to house the two fundraising staff members as there is no space available within the Hospital.

COMMENT
The Town has received a request for office space for two fundraising staff members from the Carleton Place Hospital Foundation for a 1 - 1.5 year timeframe. In their request, they are seeking:
• Office space plus room for a small meeting room
• Office furniture, if available
• Assistance with a phone line and other utilities

The only office space currently available to accommodate the request is the mezzanine level in the former Train Station. However, this space will need to be shared with the Mills Community Support Corporation’s Programmer who will also require office space once the new Seniors’ Centre becomes operational this September. Staff has looked at the available space and believes that there is sufficient space to house both needs.

The Town does not have any office furniture available that can be used by Hospital Foundation staff so they will have to make their own arrangements in this regard.

In addition, as the space was formerly used as office space by two private businesses, the phone lines and other utilities are in the space so the Foundation staff will only need to contact Bell Canada to arrange for their phone line to be connected.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
The cost to the Town will be minimal as the space is available and is currently vacant.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
THAT Council authorize the free use of office space for two Carleton Place Hospital Foundation staff members for a period of no more than 1.5 years at the former Train Station on Coleman Street on the provision that all set up costs are the responsibility of the Foundation.
COMMUNICATION 130071
Received From: Diane Smithson, Chief Administrative Officer
Addressed To: Committee of the Whole
Date: March 26, 2019
Topic: Infrastructure Funding Program Application

SUMMARY
The Rural and Northern Infrastructure Projects intake was recently announced by the Province of Ontario. This is a $30 billion infrastructure funding program focussing on roads and bridges, air and marine infrastructure. The program will be open for applications for an eight (8) week timeframe commencing March 18, 2019.

BACKGROUND
The Rural and Northern Infrastructure Fund (RNIF) is one (1) of four (4) funding streams under the Canada-Ontario Infrastructure Bilateral Agreement. It is the first of the four to be announced. The four (4) streams are as follows:
- Rural and Norther Infrastructure Fund
- Public Transit Fund
- Community Culture and Recreation Fund
- Green Fund

The government indicates it plans to open the Public Transit Fund shortly with the Community and Recreation Fund and the Green Fund to open later in 2019. This decision to introduce the various programs at different times was in response to feedback from municipal governments that opening all streams at once presents challenges to municipal administrations.

COMMENT
The RNIF is a $30 billion infrastructure fund providing funding to municipal governments and indigenous communities with a population less than 100,000 of which there are about 500. An application is required to speak to the critical health and safety and technical merits of a proposal project. The government indicates that depending on demand, subsequent intakes may be open to other types of rural and norther infrastructure assets. The total 10-year funding commitment in this stream is $625 million from all three levels of government. The levels of funding available from the three levels of government are as follows:
- federal government will provide additional assistance to very small municipal governments (up to 60%);
- the provincial share is 33% or $10.2 billion spread across the four (4) streams
- Municipal share will be 17% or 7% for very small municipal governments (i.e. under 5,000 population)

The Town will be limited to applying for an amount not exceeding $5 million.
While information to date is limited on the funding program, more is anticipated in the near future from the Minister of Infrastructure. The Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) understands that the provincial and federal governments have taken steps to streamline the project application process. This is to improve review times to speed up project approvals and will help save municipal staff time.

Applications will be accepted through the Grants Ontario website which is a “one-window” source for applicants, handling application intake, review, nomination, reporting and transfer payment management processes all in one place.

The Central Bridge project is the largest and most expensive infrastructure project facing the Town of Carleton Place in the next few years. The Town has had three (3) meetings to date with the Minister of Infrastructure and/or his staff to highlight the importance to and cost of this project on our community. For these reasons, Staff is recommending that the Central Bridge project be the Town’s priority in our application under the RNFP.

Last October, the Town applied for Top-Up funding under the Ontario Community Infrastructure Fund (OCIF) and was waiting to hear back on the application. Last Friday, the Province announced that it would not be proceeding with this program. Instead, they indicated that anyone who would have been successful under that program would be eligible for “fast-tracking” under the new RNIF. Carleton Place was selected to be fast-tracked for its central bridge project and was notified of this fact last Friday. The Town has until April 15, 2019 to submit its application.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**
The estimated cost of the project is $8 million including construction and final designs. The Town will apply for funding in accordance with the program’s parameters.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
**THAT** Council authorize staff applying for the Central Bridge project as the Town’s priority under the Rural and Northern Fund Program.
Summary

The Health Unit will be submitting their Annual Service Plan to the Public Health Branch of the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care on April 1, 2019. The Annual Service Plan outlines programs and services in the following areas:

- Population Health Assessment and Surveillance; Health Equity; Quality Improvement; Research and Knowledge Exchange.
- Chronic Disease Prevention and Well-Being: Healthy Eating; Healthy Active Living; Healthy Bodies Healthy Minds.
- Healthy Growth and Development: Oral Health; Parenting Support; Early Years Community Collaboration to Support Healthy Growth and Development; Prenatal Information and Education.
- Immunization: Assessing Student Immunization Requirements; Vaccine Administration; Immunization Outreach; Vaccine Management with Health Care Providers.
- Oral Health: Healthy Smiles Ontario Program; Student Oral Health Assessment and Follow-up.
- School Health: Healthy Schools Program.
- Substance Use and Injury: Smart Works Harm Reduction Program; Smoke Free Ontario Program; Comprehensive Tobacco Control Program; Cannabis, Alcohol and Illicit Substance Use Information, Education and Community Collaboration; Falls Prevention and Road Safety.
- Emergency Management: Municipal Collaboration; Public Information; Health Unit Preparedness to Detect, Mitigate and Respond.
- Food Safety: Outbreak Management; Food Premise Inspection; Public Information; Incident Response.
- Healthy Environments: Health Hazard Detections and Response; Public and Partner Information; Inspections; Municipal Collaboration.
- Infectious and Communicable Disease: Public and Health Care Provider Information; Sexual Health Services; Case and Outbreak Management; Monitoring Ticks and Mosquitoes; Management of Infection Control Lapses; Animal Bite Follow-up; Inspections.
- Safe Water: Monitoring Beaches, Small Drinking Water Systems; Access to Private Well Water Testing; Public Information; Testing Recreational Water Sites; Responding to Adverse Water Events.
One of the new initiatives is to assign a public health nurse to be a Health Unit liaison to each of the municipalities in Leeds, Grenville and Lanark to support many of the above programs that are directed at the Healthy Communities Goal of the new Health Unit Strategic Plan.

“Individuals and families live in healthy vibrant communities with a natural environment and “public realm” that support health, quality of life and prevent health problems.”

[https://healthunit.org/about/organizational-description/strategic-plan/](https://healthunit.org/about/organizational-description/strategic-plan/).

Information about Health Unit programs and services is available on the Health Unit Website at [www.healthunit.org](http://www.healthunit.org) or by contacting the Health Unit.

More details on Board of Health Meetings can be found at [https://healthunit.org/about/board-of-health/](https://healthunit.org/about/board-of-health/).
Minutes of meeting Jan 31, 2019

7:00 p.m. CP Library Facility

Next Regular Monthly Meeting March 7, 2019 @ 7PM – Carambeck Community Centre

Attendance:
Jim McCready (chair), Gerry Andrews, Mark Smith, Dale Moulton, Andy Kerr-Wilson, Janet McGinnis, Councilor Toby Randell
Absent:

Agenda:

1. Welcome-Approval of the Agenda; (Gerry/Andy)

2. Approval of the Minutes Dec 5, 2018
   a. Already Approved and forwarded to Town Clerk

3. Business arising from Dec 5 Minutes
   a. Most covered tonight
   b. Plan # 7 aii – Beer Store – MVCA has commented – have not seen a copy yet
   c. #5 a-g, Minutes & covering Letter - have not received a reply yet.
   d. #7 c 5 – 33-35 Mill St. - have not received Landscape Plan or response comments yet
      d.i. Landscape Plan should have been submitted for comment prior to second comment period.
   e. Discussed - County Tree Bylaw (other business)

4. Bodnar – Source Water Protection Study
   a. Needs a sober second look with all the players in place, (scheduled).
   b. Gerry will be the spokesperson for the UFR Committee
   c. Would also like to see Rideau Valley CA there as well (Rideau/Mississippi Source Water Protection Plan).
5. **Bill 68 – Tree Canopy**
   a. Protect & Enhance,
      a.i. Covered in Official Plan
   b. Change 3 to 1 tree replacement to 1 to 1 on tree replacement (update to official plan)
   c. Town Tree Planting program covers Canopy Cover enhancement.
      c.i. Enhancement needs to be added Official Plan update
   d. Review Forest Canopy as each development is brought forward as it effects the Towns overall Urban Forest (Official Plan update)
   e. Information has been distributed to Staff and Committee.

6. **Letter to CAO – Conceptual Plan Hwy 7 South**
   a. Sent letter, Concerns and Muncaster Report and map.
   b. Wetlands Status still not determined.
      b.i. Setback of 30mtr or 120mtr setbacks.
   c. Need Lanark County Planning Body determination of wetland status, need the town to request from the County.

7. **Meeting with new Council – tentative for March 26th**
   a. PowerPoint presented by Jim
   b. Presentation to be into Stacey Blair week in advance.

8. **Planning**
   a. 127 Boyd St. DP 03-03-2019 (Caldwell School area)
      a.i. 2 Black walnuts trees on rear side should be retained.
           if removed need a health report done.
      a.ii. IPZ 9 – Storm Drainage to where
      a.iii. Monoculture in front, mix with service berry
      a.iv. Lot of hard surface.
   b. Private School – Industrial Park
      b.i. White Pine preserved, Sugar Maple, needs more trees.
   c. Sale Land – Industrial Park – near Kids World
      c.i. No objections

9. **Changes to Development Permit and Official Plan**
   a. Discussed,
   b. Need to work on DP next (March)

10. **Tree Planting Workshop – Update**
    a. Wed, May 1, 2019 7PM at the Arena
    b. Ads in paper April 1
    c. 100 trees on list
11. Session with Environmental Committee – Mon, Feb 4, 6:30 CP Library  
   a. Paul Lehmen will be in to discuss Climate Change.

12. U of T Visit  
   a. May 6, 2019

13. Regional Forest Health Network – session in Canton NY, Jan 22 2019  
   a. Oncoming Invasive Species  
      a.i. Oak Wilt is our main concern with the number of oak we are planting  
      a.ii. Hemlock Woolly Adelgid- not a real concern as limited Hemlock in town  
      a.iv. Asian Earthworms  
   b. Long term planning for future tree availability from suppliers

14. Other Business  
   a. County Tree Cutting Bylaw  
      a.i. Lower tier Municipalities cannot override the County’s Bylaw need an exemption for certain urban municipalities to County By-law if we want added protection in subdivisions.

Meeting Adjourned

Meeting Dates for 2019
DATES:  
Thursday March 7, Thursday March 28, Wednesday April 24, Wednesday May 22, Wednesday June 26, Summer at call of chair, Wednesday Sept 25 (national Tree Day), Wednesday Oct 23, Wednesday Nov 27,
Minutes of meeting March 7, 2019
7:00 p.m. Carambeck Community Centre
Next Regular Monthly Meeting March 28, 2019 @ 7PM – CP Library Facility

Attendance:
Jim McCready (chair), Gerry Andrews, Mark Smith, Dale Moulton, Ron Wood, Joanne Woodhouse, Andy Kerr-Wilson, Janet McGinnis,
Absent: Councilor Toby Randell

Minutes:
We welcomed two new members to the committee; Joanne Woodhouse and Ron Wood

1. Welcome-Approval of the Agenda; (Andy/Dale)
   a. Climate Change
   b. RV on Hwy7

2. Approval of the Minutes Jan 31, 2019 (Andy/Dale)

3. Approval of Minutes March 7, 2019 (Mark/Andy)

Business arising from Jan 31 Minutes
a. New Beer Store –we got a copy of MVCA comments.
   b. 33-35 Mill St – 2 Trees remain, Planters, Answers Received
   c. Tree Canopy – Bill 68 – Council still proactive in even though province pulled the Bill. This is welcomed by the Committee

4. Bodnar – Information Session Feb 28, 2019 / Questions (Gerry)
   a. Agenda was modified to just an information session for new Councillors.
   b. Only process was discussed, no questions on actual problems.
   c. Need info on what the next steps that will be done (action Item for Jim).
   d. Questions will be discussed at next meeting, March 28.
5. Ontario Clean Water Agency Report (Gerry)
   a. CP DW 2017 report
      a.i. They do monitor the raw intake water Coliform/coli at the Plant
      a.ii. Chlorine can be injected at intake for Zebra Mussel control – does it affect the monitoring.
      a.iii. No values just a range,
      a.iv. Need a graph of raw water quality over time.
      a.v. Dave Young has been contacted for this information availability.
   b. Can the Health Department supply the bacteria levels over time and what locations are sampled? (Gerry to look into it)

6. Meeting with New Council March 26, 2019
   a. Presentation to Council (10 minutes) on Committees Role and what we have accomplished in the past 22 years, what we are currently working on and some of our challenges

7. Planning
   a. 6 Costello Drive DP3-02-2019
      a.i. Landscape Plan not acceptable.
      a.i.1. No trees shown need trees along side and frontage.
      a.i.2. Require trees on rear next to drainage.
      a.i.3. Check DP requirements for trees.
   b. 376-396 Flora St (Mall) DP2-02-2019
      b.i. No landscape Plan
      b.ii. Trees on Street side are Town’s and they are Ash Trees
      b.iii. Residential at rear needs Trees for separation (Cedar) of residents and bar.
      b.iv. Trees/shrubbery between property lines on South side.
   c. 19 Roe St DP3-03-2019
      c.i. Hackberry and Oak proposed.
      c.ii. Plant more trees (4) in rear Corners (North) (White Pine/Red Oak)
      c.iii. Plant Evergreen trees (Spruce) on East side (10mtr wide)
      c.iv. These sites are where we enhance the tree canopy according to the new by-law. All the emphasis should not be on the developer. When such a site can take a number of trees work with the developer and reduce trees in an open area from 60 mm to 50 mm. Trees along roadways will still be 60 mm.
   d. McArthur Island (new proposal coming)
      d.i. Extension not approved
      d.ii. New plan coming in near future.

8. Changes to Official Plan and Development Permit Bylaw
   a. OP changes have been submitted to staff.
   b. Need changes to DP Bylaw.
   c. Need DP changes done soon.
      c.i. Meeting for DP discussion Thurs 11 April, 9AM till noon.
d. We need to know what the County needs to consider/follow in relation to the Town’s Official Plan and DP Bylaw in respect to Subdivisions?

9. Other Business
   a. Climate Change
      a.i. Environmental Committee –
      a.ii. Future meeting –
         a.ii.1. Need more information on what will be on the agenda.

Upcoming Items:
1. Tree Planting Workshop - **Wed, May 1, 7PM at the Arena**
2. UofT Masters of Conservation Visit – **May 6, 2019 9:00-11:30**

Action Items:
1. Need information from the CAO on further sessions/time line/milestones to answer questions on the Bodnar development in relation to water quality. (**Jim**)  
2. By Committee Members – Monitor flood water levels this spring (**All who are available**)  
3. Can the Health Department supply the bacteria levels over time and what locations are sampled? (**Gerry**)  
4. Discussion of Questions from the Bodnar information session (**All**)  
5. Presentation to Council May 26, 2019 (**Jim**)  
6. Book a meeting room for changes to the Development Permits April 11 9:00 am-noon (**Jim**)  
7. Start reviewing changes to the Development Permits (**All**)  
8. Contact Bill Slade to get more information on the Climate Change meeting he is proposing (**Jim**)  

Meeting Adjourned 9:10

Meeting Dates for 2019

**DATES:**
- March 28, April 24, May 22, June 26, Summer at call of chair, Sept 25 (National Tree Day), Oct 23, Nov 27,
a. Welcomed Paul Lehman, General Manager, Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority

b. Climate Change Planning in Mississippi Valley Watershed Presentation: Paul Lehman presented the risks caused by climate change to our local region and ways to mitigate these risks.

c. Ban the Bag – Leadership of this initiative was passed to Leslee Brown, with Dena Comley acting as a resource person.

d. Motions to Council for Ban the Bag and Anti-Idling will be presented to the Committee of the Whole (COW) in March.

e. New Projects:

f. Farewell to Margo Willmot. Bill Slade thanked Margo for 10 years of exemplary service on this committee. Margo wishes to return when a suitable position on a sub-committee becomes available.

h. Adjournment. Moved by Natalika Culhane, Seconded by Mike Villeneuve

Next meeting: March 4, 2019, Carleton Place Library Boardroom, 6:30 p.m.

To be chaired by Mike Villeneuve, Vice Chair.
The Corporation of the Town of Carleton Place  
Environmental Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes  
Monday, March 4, 2019

Present: Michel Villeneuve, Natalika Culhane, Leslee Brown, Patti Sharpe, Randy Martin, Jamie DeBaie, Tracy Kwissa, Jeff Atkinson (Council Representative)

Guest: Jack Havel

a. Approval of Agenda - moved by Randy Martin; seconded by Jamie DeBaie

b. Welcome to the new committee members Jamie DeBaie and Tracy Kwissa.

c. Invitation from the BIA for joint CPEAC/BIA meeting scheduled for March 13/19 @ 6:30 p.m. Location: Carambeck Community Centre. Focus: Joint effort to reduce the use of plastic bags in Carleton Place. Volunteers from CPEAC are requested to attend this meeting to support the presentation to be made by Leslee Brown and Natalika Culhane.

d. Feedback from CPEAC on last month’s presentation by Paul Lehman, General Manager, Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority was favourable, with an appreciation for the complexity of responsibilities facing the Conservation Authority.

e. Projects’ Status:

1. Ban-the-Bag and Single Use Plastics initiatives have merged to form one task group. Presentation to COW (Committee Of the Whole) scheduled for March 26th.
   - Jeff Atkinson reminded the committee that if the presentations are not ready to go, a one week notice to Stacey Blair is required to postpone.
   - Dena Comley has sent a letter to the Chamber of Commerce exploring their willingness to support CPEAC’s initiative to reduce plastic use in Carleton Place.
   - A focus will be on encouraging citizens to change their habits with incentives.
2. Anti-Idling By-Law, Tracy Kwissa. Reviewed the concerns of enforcement and explored alternatives that do not require the labour of By-Law officers.
3. Ontario Environmental Plan, Jamie DeBaie. Specifically the implications of this plan on Carleton Place. Businesses will receive some tax benefits, but minimal subsidies are available for the public.

f. New Project:

1. Michel Villeneuve - The Monarch Project. Motion presented to approach Council with the proposal to understand the delicate and fascinating life cycle of Canada’s most recognized butterfly, and what we, as a community, can do to protect this very delicate and beautiful migrant.
   Motion moved by Tracey Kwissa; seconded by Jamie.DeBaie

g. Farewell to Kayla Kazda and Patti Sharpe - their contributions to the CPEAC were recognized.
h. **Request** for a new secretary. Tracey Kwissa volunteered.
   Motion to support Tracey Kwissa moved by Michel Villeneuve; seconded by Natalika Culhane.

i. Mississippi Lake Association’s request to join CPEAC in future meetings was accepted.
   Moved by Tracey Kwissa; seconded by Leslee Brown

j. Bondar Subdivision - update provided by Jeff Atkinson. The plan is currently at the stage of a technical peer review and will likely be ready for Council in May.

k. **Adjournment.** Moved by Leslee Brown; seconded by Natalika Culhane

**Next Meeting**: April 1, 2019, Carleton Place Library Board room, 6:30 p.m.

To be chaired by **Bill Slade**, Chairperson
MINUTES

CARLETON PLACE ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m., Wednesday, March 13, 2019
Council Chambers, Town Hall

PRESENT:
Mayor Doug Black, Kory Earle, Marvin Whalen, Myrna Pears, Florence Pye, Bobbi-Dee Atterbury, Josh Cohen

ABSENT:
Sydney Hodgeson, Kelly Hillier

I. Call To Order
Committee Secretary, Stacey Blair called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. Declaration of Pecuniary/Conflict of Interest and General Nature Thereof
None.

III. Adoption of Minutes

Moved by Kory Earle
Seconded by Marvin Whalen
THAT the Accessibility Advisory Committee minutes of March 1, 2018, be approved as presented.

CARRIED

IV. Presentations
None.

V. Business

i) Nomination and Election of Committee Chair

The Committee Secretary called for nominations for the position of Committee Chair.

Moved by Mayor Black
Seconded by Bobbi Atterbury
THAT Kory Earle be nominated as chair of the Accessibility Advisory Committee for 2019.

CARRIED

ii) 2019 Committee Goals

A general discussion took place regarding potential items of consideration for 2019:
- Audible lights at every cross walk and ensuring full functionality – reports that some are not functioning properly on County roads;
  o Mayor to follow up with County staff.
- Concerns about follow through with committee initiatives;
- Status of “stop-gap”?
- Mayor Black mentioned that Council will be considering some level of redesign of the Main Street tied in with the rehabilitation of the Central Bridge;
- New planning applications review; and
- Could invite staff from the planning department to come to a future meeting.
- Courtesy cross walks – could consider making them into full fledged cross walk;

**Actions:**
Bobbi Atterbury to prepare a report regarding cross walk at light for the next meeting.  
Josh Cohen to investigate and report back on federal legislation regarding accessibility requirements.

Committee Secretary to send out Ontario.ca Accessibility Advisory Cte. Guide.

Committee Secretary to invite BIA to future meeting.

**Moved by Myrna Pears**  
**Seconded by Josh Cohen**  
**THAT** Marvin Whalen be nominated as the Committee’s plan examiner for planning applications.  

**CARRIED**

Doug Black left the meeting at 4:04 pm

**VI. Next Committee Meeting Date**  
Tentatively scheduled for 3:00 pm Wednesday April 24th.

**VII. Adjournment**  
**Moved by Marv Whalen**  
**Seconded by Bobbi Atterbury**  
**THAT** the meeting be adjourned at 4:30pm.  

**CARRIED**
## Committee of the Whole – Information list

**March 26, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Originator</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019 03 06</td>
<td>Pat Evans, Person with Parkinson’s Disease</td>
<td>Community Issues</td>
<td>Parkinson’s Awareness Month</td>
<td>p69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 03 08</td>
<td>Carleton Place and Beckwith Museum</td>
<td>Community Issues</td>
<td>Doors Open Carleton Place 2019</td>
<td>p71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 03 11</td>
<td>Dr. Paula Stewart, Medical Officer of Health/CEO Leeds, Grenville &amp; Lanark District Health Unit</td>
<td>Community Issues</td>
<td>Health Unit Municipal Public Health Nurses</td>
<td>p70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 6, 2019

Mayor Doug Black and Members of Council
Town of Carleton Place
175 Bridge St.,
Carleton Place, Ontario
K7C2V8

Dear Mayor Black and Members of Council,

April is internationally recognized as Parkinson’s Awareness Month. I am writing to ask the Town of Carleton Place to become one of the many communities across Canada to issue a proclamation declaring April 2019, Parkinson’s Awareness Month. This would assist us with one of our major goals - to increase public awareness of this devastating neurological disorder.

Parkinson’s Disease (PD) is the second most common degenerative neurological disorder after Alzheimer’s Disease but it receives significantly less attention. It is an unforgiving disease, causing tremors, rigidity, instability, speech difficulties and in many cases, depression, anxiety and dementia. Contrary to popular belief, although the average age of onset is 60, PD is not exclusively found in the senior population. It can affect individuals of all ages and genders; men are slightly more likely to have Parkinson’s. Although Lanark Leeds and Grenville has the highest percentage of seniors in Ontario, the number of people being diagnosed does not reflect this. This may be related to the stigma associated with having Parkinson’s and an unfounded fear that nothing can be done.

It is estimated that there are approximately 40,000 people in Ontario, 100,000 in Canada and 4 million around the world living with PD. Those numbers are expected to almost double by 2031.

I have included a sample proclamation and I thank you in advance for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Pat Evans
Person With Parkinson’s Advocate- Lanark North Leeds
(613) 272-3383
MEMO

To: Wardens of Lanark County and United Counties of Leeds and Grenville, Municipal Clerks, CAOs, Mayors, and Reeves in Leeds, Grenville and Lanark

From: Dr. Paula Stewart, Medical Officer of Health/CEO

Re: Health Unit Municipal Public Health Nurses

Date: March 11, 2019

I am pleased to report that a public health nurse has been assigned as a Health Unit liaison to each of the municipalities in Leeds, Grenville and Lanark to support the Healthy Communities Goal of the new Health Unit Strategic Plan

“Individuals and families live in healthy vibrant communities with a natural environment and “public realm” that support health, quality of life and prevent health problems.”

(https://healthunit.org/about/organizational-description/strategic-plan/)

The public health nurse is available to support work you are doing to create healthy communities, and to help you navigate the health unit’s resources and services, provide evidence and best practices on a variety of topics, and collaborate on getting information out to the community. The nurses will be reaching out to you shortly to introduce themselves and set up a time to meet.

• Town of Perth, Tay Valley Township, Township of Drummond/North Elmsley, Township of Athens – Alexis Green

• Township of Lanark Highlands, Municipality of Mississippi Mills, Town of Carleton Place, Lanark County - Danielle Shewfelt

• Beckwith Township, Township of Montague, Town of Smith Falls – Kaitlin Patterson

• Township of Elizabethtown-Kitley, City of Brockville, Town of Prescott, Township of Front of Yonge, United Counties of Leeds and Grenville – Jennifer Labelle

• Municipality of Merrickville-Wolford, Municipality of North Grenville, Township of Edwardsburg-Cardinal, Augusta Township– Kathryn Allwright

• Town of Gananoque, Township of Leeds and Thousand Islands, Township of Rideau Lakes, Village of Westport – Kim Marshall

If you would like to contact any of the public health nurses, please call 1-800-660-5853 and say the name of the nurse.

We look forward to working together to support healthy communities where our residents live, work and play.
Doors Open Carleton Place 2019

“Discover the story behind every door” …

Come on in! The Ontario Heritage Trust has invited communities across the province to open the doors, gates and courtyards of their unique and most fascinating cultural sites so we can see inside. From April to October, explore Ontario’s heritage treasures at free public events across the province. Satisfy your curiosity and get behind normally closed doors to experience intriguing interiors, where you will be inspired by rare and exceptional materials, craftsmanship and design. From historical houses to modern marvels of construction, Doors Open Ontario has something for everyone!

Carleton Place is excited to once again be participating in the Doors Open phenomenon!

Our doors will be open the weekend of September 21 and 22, 2019!

Join us we celebrate the 200th Anniversary of our community. Mark your calendars!

- In 2017, eleven sites in the town of Carleton Place participated in Doors Open.

- These properties ranged from private apartments to our iconic Town Hall.

- The 2017 weekend saw 2,555 visitors through the doors of these sites!

- 22 volunteers from the community helped great visitors at the various sites

- Bridge Street business owners noticed a definite increase in business that weekend!

People really enjoyed the experience and the opportunity to see and learn more about our community. Visitors noted:

- “what a great experience, I learned a lot!”

- “very impressed with the friendly volunteers!”

A list of participating sites for 2019 will be available soon and will be live on the Carleton Place tab of https://www.doorsopenontario.on.ca/

Look for articles highlighting our local properties in the local press and online beginning in May!
Questions? Contact Jennifer or Carol at The Carleton Place and Beckwith Heritage Museum,

613-253-7013 or cpbmuseum@outlook.com

Jennifer Irwin
Manager
Carleton Place and Beckwith Heritage Museum
613-253-7013
www.cpbheritagemuseum.com

This e-mail message (including attachments, if any) is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, proprietary, confidential and exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and erase this e-mail message immediately.
Safe and Clean Drinking Water

**basic right for all citizens of C.P.**


- “Safeguarding drinking water now and for future generations” vital and unique role;
- Municipal councilors have legal obligations;
- Complacency is one of greatest risks;
- A healthy community depends on elected officials fulfilling entrusted social responsibilities;
- Precautionary Principle.
Rationale For SWP Study

- Revised Environmental Impact Study (Nov 2017) Inadequate /Deficient;
- Engineering solutions & Stand Alone Storm Water management ponds –no longer adequate -need to incorporate Green Infrastructure;
- Precedent setting development so close to intake;
- Peer Review In-sufficient;
- Exercise Condition # 44 –Source Water Protection Study.

Source Water Protection Plan

- MOEC&P approved 2014, MVCA to implement
- Identified significant threats to safe drinking water;
- Established vulnerable areas (e.g. IPZ 10 upstream around intake and IPZ 9 –the 2nd highest rated vulnerable area);
- Storm water can be a significant threat in both areas;
- Part of Phase 1 is in IPZ 9 and the floodplain.
The Problem

• Subdivision (582 units) on Bodnar property 400 metres upstream from intake pipe for CP drinking water from Mississippi River;
• Subdivision’s northern boundary 65 metres from the river;
• Significant storm water runoff upstream from intake pipe—directly (Lake Avenue) and indirectly (Storm Water Management Pond in Roy Brown Park)—heavy metals, phosphorous, salt, oil, feces, e-coli, and other pathogens that MOEC&P treats as sewage;
• Climate change - outdated metrics, standards and regulations (e.g. Stormwater Management Planning & Design Manual MOEC&P 2003).
Related Issues

• Climate change- 100 year flood line outdated;
• RBP and negative impacts of SWMP on riverine area (e.g. salts, nitrates and phosphate loadings);
• Undesirable precedent for future developers;
• ICA –Issue Contributing Area – Mississippi Lake –Blue Green Algae.

Questions from February 28 Information Session

• Of the 64 conditions placed on this development how many have been met and what are the timelines for the rest to be met?
• Are they still planning to build in the Flood Plain? MVCA said no!
• After all the presentations who is responsible for Water Quality? This was never addressed.
• If sites are too shallow for LID, why are we building there near the town’s intake?
Recommendation

- Water quality and the town's drinking water has not been addressed to date
- 6.14.4 Carleton Places OP “Supporting Studies and Reports”
  Technical studies may be required to assist in the review process of Development Permit applications. Applicants may be required to submit the following "Source Water Protection Study”
- County’s Conditions to final plan approval of this plan for registration,
  “Condition # 44- At any time prior to final approval of this plan for registration, the town of Carleton Place may amend, delete or add to the conditions and this may include amendment or new studies”
- The committee recommends to Council aSource Water Protection Study be completed as to Condition #44
- This study should be done by qualified scientists
Anti-Idling Bylaw and Enforcement

Motion to Council Presented by Tracy Kwissa March 26, 2019

The CPEAC recommends that council direct staff, with support from the CPEAC, to draft and initiate an anti-idling bylaw for the town of Carleton Place. Council to authorize enforcement by town by-law officers.

Anti-idling signs can be procured and posted at or near schools, public buildings, drive-thrus, municipal parks and recreation facilities.

This is an opportunity for Carleton Place to mitigate our contribution to Climate Change and educate residents about the effects of air pollution caused by emissions.

- The CPEAC recommends a period of six months whereby warnings will be issued with flyers/pamphlets for education and information
- During this six-month period the town and CPEAC will conduct a public education campaign regarding anti-idling
- Following the six-month period, drivers caught idling for more than 5 minutes will be subject to a (small) fine as determined by Council.
- Exceptions will be given when temperatures drop to under -20C or exceed +25C as well as with commercial diesel engines when temperatures are less than -15C
- Exceptions will be given to medical vehicles, vehicles at stop lights, machinery/vehicles engaged in operational activities and transit vehicles at a layover when someone is on board
- The CPEAC recommends the by-law applies to both private and commercial vehicles as well as idling school buses
Idling Facts (22 reasons not to idle): (source: Natural Resources Canada)

- **Idling gets you nowhere – and it can be costly.** Excessive idling wastes a significant amount of fuel and money and generates needless greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. If drivers of light-duty vehicles avoided idling by just three minutes a day, over the year Canadians would collectively save 630 million litres of fuel, 1.4 million tonnes of carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions, and $630 million in fuel costs (assuming a fuel cost of $1.00/L).

- **Warming up the vehicle means more than warming the engine.** The most effective and economical way to “warm up” your vehicle is to drive it!

- **Any more than ten seconds of idling uses more fuel than is required to restart the engine.** Turn off your engine if stopped longer than 60 seconds. This is far more beneficial than idling and, contrary to popular belief, does NOT cause excessive wear and tear on a vehicle’s starter or alternator!

---

**Around our schools**

Children are exposed to a toxic cloud of exhaust fumes from idling vehicles when exiting their schools. These vehicles include school buses and vehicles driven by their parents.
Motivations

a) Human Health Concern - desire to stop idling to reduce negative health effects on human air quality
b) Environmental Concern - desire to stop idling to reduce environmental harm from poor air quality
c) Economic Concern - expectations of saving money on gas, potentially save costs on vehicle maintenance, avoid paying fines

This is not a punitive bylaw, rather a motivational statement.
“Carleton Place is serious about becoming an “environmentally sustainable” community.

Sample of Towns & Cities with Anti-Idling By-laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perth</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Oakville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>Burnaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>Cote St Luc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>Burnaby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Yellowknife</td>
<td>St Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orillia</td>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>Carleton Place (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>