

COUNTY OF BRANT COUNCIL MINUTES

Special Events Building
Paris Fairgrounds
May 5, 2008
7:10 p.m.

Present: Mayor Eddy, Councillors Wheat, Schmitt, Haggart, Simons, Atfield, Powell, Chambers, Hodge, Coleman and Gatward.

Staff: Johnston, Compeau, Pomponi and Carman.

Mayor Eddy in the Chair.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by – Councillor Wheat
Seconded by – Councillor Powell

That the Brant County Council agenda and addendum for the May 5, 2008 meeting be approved as distributed.

. Carried

DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS/PETITIONS – OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW

Ella Haley, Brant/Haldimand/Norfolk Chapter of the National Farmers Union

Ella Haley referred to Section 6 of Policy Direction 5.2.1 that states “There is a need to update the agricultural policies of the Official Plan”. She requested that Council include a greenbelt policy within these agricultural policies to provide more protection of agricultural land in the County. The National Farmers Union is concerned with the leapfrogging of development into the County because the eastern boundary of the County abuts the current Greenbelt. If the agricultural polices are to include best practices, inclusion of a Greenbelt should be considered.

Nancy Walthers, Ontario Farmland Trust

Nancy Walthers advised that the Ontario Farmland Trust is dedicated to raising awareness and education to preserve Ontario’s farmland. The agricultural policies included in the County’s Official Plan should recognize that land with high soil capabilities should be used for agricultural purposes and not for development purposes. She noted that ecological systems can be protected, but the land itself cannot. Ms. Walthers suggested that Council should have all facts in hand before allowing farmland to be developed for other purposes. She noted the experience in Oxford County where 3,000 acres have come out of agricultural production and are now being used for the Toyota plant. The Ontario Farmland Trust is proposing an ecological goods and services program to support farmers who have been financially impacted by Greenbelt legislation.

Lin Geary, Sustainable Brant

Ms. Geary pointed out that the community needs information and education on the Places to Grow legislation and the Greenbelt expansion so that they can understand the implications to the County of Brant, including the intensification and infilling aspects. She noted her concern that actions at other levels of government (e.g. immigration policy) impact the plans

3488
Brant County Council
May 5, 2008

for our municipality in that it may not be possible to fill new buildings that are built. Steps need to be taken to retrofit buildings rather than building new in order to protect our environment.

Members of our community need to be knowledgeable about what is happening to our water and food supplies and to support local farmers by buying local produce and products. Ms. Geary suggested that the decision on expanding the Greenbelt should be a community, not Council, decision.

John Bacher, Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society

Dr. John Bacher, PhD. was unable to attend the meeting. A copy of his presentation "Growing the Greenbelt: Draft Criteria for Consultations was distributed for Council's consideration.

Mike Toll

Mike Toll advised that a petition is being circulated within the County to have the Greenbelt expanded to include the County of Brant. He requested that under Clause 6 of Section 5.2.1. of the MMM Growth Strategy and Policy Direction report, Council enter into more education and dialogue with the public on the need for the Greenbelt to be expanded to the County of Brant. This is necessary to protect farmland, water and woodlots and ensure sustainable land management. In response to questions, it was noted that it is important that steps be taken to ensure that farming is a viable occupation for farmers who are included in the Greenbelt. Mr. Toll questioned what may happen from a development perspective in the County of Brant if other municipalities request expansion of the Greenbelt, and the County of Brant does not.

Chris Krucker, Ecological Farmers Association of Ontario

Chris Krucker, a member of the Ecological Farmers Association of Ontario, stressed the importance of preserving farmland to grow food, noting that the demand for locally grown products is growing because of the greater nutritional value, less use of fossil fuels to transport the goods, food security, etc.

Mr. Krucker noted that farmland in Ontario is quickly being lost because of the lack of adequate Provincial farmland preservation policies. The Ecological Farmers of Ontario have approved a resolution calling upon the Province to amend the criteria to expand the Greenbelt to protect all farmland in Ontario and re-evaluate the zoning by-laws adversely affecting farmland that is encroached upon by urban sprawl. He noted that a compensation plan must be developed to compensate farmers for the economic setbacks they face if their properties fall under the Greenbelt legislation. In response to a question, Mr. Krucker indicated that there are five Brant County members of the Ecological Farmers Association of Ontario.

Rhiannon Myers

Rhiannon Myers advised that she was speaking on behalf of the next generation of farmers, noting that a new direction and innovations are required to ensure sustainable farming in Canada. She requested that Council protect farmland as a public good to protect food sovereignty, and create new opportunities for young farmers to be able to purchase affordable land. Ms. Myers provided information on the "Sowing Seeds, Reaping Profits" program of the FarmStart program, which provides support and encouragement to a new generation of farmers to develop locally based, ecologically sound and economically viable agricultural enterprises.

Brant County Council
May 5, 2008

Ms. Myers noted the benefits of Agri-tourism to the agricultural community, particularly with the emphasis on the 100-mile diet to promote locally grown food products.

Henry Stolp

Henry Stolp noted that the Province of Ontario, through the Places to Grow and Greenbelt legislation, has indicated that this area will grow by approximately 4,000 people by 2011. He suggested that the figures included in the MMM report in figures 4.7 and 4.9 are flawed, as they give an incorrect assessment that the County has 74 years of residential supply. Mr. Stolp reviewed the County building permit figures for the years 2004 to 2007, noting that the number of permits has decreased almost every year since 2004 because of sewage and water capacity issues in Paris and St. George. Due to the fact that areas such as Cambridge, Ancaster, Dundas, etc. are being built out and other positive factors such as proximity to major highways, quality of life and affordable housing, development will be directed to the County of Brant. He suggested that it will take some time for new growth to occur because of the need for area studies and infrastructure issues to be resolved in St. George and Cainsville. Mr. Stolp advised that he supports residential growth in all areas of Paris, not just southwest Paris, as well as in St. George and Cainsville to support a more balanced market approach. He also noted his support of Policies 5.2.1 and 5.2.2. of the Official Plan Review, as they improve the current Official Plan document.

Rob Freeman, Planning Solutions, on behalf of Thirteen Cainsville Landowners

Rob Freeman, representing thirteen landowners in the Cainsville Area and Hopewell Developments, made a PowerPoint presentation on Cainsville and Brant East. He suggested that because St. George and Burford have major infrastructure issues, Cainsville and Brant East provides an optimal location for building a compact, vibrant and complete community on existing infrastructure in accordance with Provincial direction. The designated employment area in Cainsville/Brant East is ideally located on the boundary of an existing community in close proximity to Highway 403 in an area that could be easily serviced. The Cainsville area has a transportation capacity greater than other County communities to the north because of the four-lane arterial roads in this area.

Mr. Freeman displayed a map of the land use plan for the Cainsville/Blossom Avenue Settlement Area and reviewed the Planning Policy Framework from the MMM Growth Strategy and Policy Directions Report, noting the opportunity for upscale commercial and mixed-use industrial development. He suggested that there were tremendous opportunities for orderly sequential development in both Cainsville and Southwest Paris areas, Mr. Freeman expressed his concern that MMM did not focus on the opportunities that are available in Cainsville and suggested that there may be support from the Province to increase the urban settlement boundaries in Cainsville.

In response to questions, Mr. Freeman noted that although the infrastructure is already in place in Cainsville, it does require upgrading and it is important to ensure that the development charges are accurate so that development pays for the infrastructure. Councillor Chambers noted that the heavy industrial uses in the Cainsville area are not workable and need to be revisited. Councillor Haggart suggested that due to the constraints of the Provincial Planning Policies and Places to Grow legislation, the County review the Cainsville area in depth over the next five years for the next Official Plan Review

Tony Perruzza and Ron Thomson, First Urban

Tony Perruzza and Ron Thomson of First Urban advised that they did not wish to make a presentation at this time.

Ian Lord, Weir Foulds

Ian Lord of Weir Foulds, on behalf of First Urban, requested that Council reject the recommendations being considered at this meeting as they are premature and inappropriate, and that Council defer consideration of the Five-Year Review until June 2009 when the Places to Grow comprehensive review is required to be completed. He suggested that is unwise to use the simple arithmetic capacity analysis from the MMM report, as this will lead the County to maintain the status quo and close the doors to any review of proposed development outside the current urban settlement boundaries.

Mr. Lord requested that Council look at growth opportunities in Cainsville and Brant East, noting that the status quo proposed in the MMM report does not take into consideration the Letter of Intent for the boundary negotiations with the City of Brantford. He also suggested that there was a need for more public participation and consultation, and that the staff recommendations in the report being considered this evening would limit this involvement. Mr. Lord suggested that a special analysis study was warranted for the Cainsville/Brant East area.

Guy Gillyatt – Petition from the landowners in Area 4 re: Official Plan review

Guy Gillyatt presented a petition from seven landowners in Area 4 (Paris East) who wish to be annexed to the City of Brantford. They requested that the County put a hold on the MMM growth strategy and policy development report, and that the report be received for information purposes only until the outcome of the Land Boundary Adjustment Agreement has been finalized or otherwise terminated. If the boundary adjustments do not proceed, they are concerned about the tax impact that will result from no development in the Cainsville or Brant East area. In response to a question, Mr. Gillyatt advised that the farmers who have signed the petition are in an area between Paris Road and Golf Road, from Powerline Road northerly to Governors Road, encompassing approximately 600 – 700 acres.

Ron Bisailon – Petition from landowners in Area 6 re: Official Plan review

Ron Bisailon presented a petition on behalf of ten landowners in Area 6, which is bordered by Powerline Road, King George Road, Governors Road, and Park Road North. He noted his concern with the infrastructure deficit the County is facing over the next ten years, which will result in a large tax increase to County taxpayers. The provision of increased City water in Cainsville would lead to balanced growth, which would benefit County taxpayers. He requested that the boundary negotiations with the City be completed so that the County would have funds for infrastructure in other parts of the County. He requested Council to make a commitment to no longer support growth that is not properly balanced or has little opportunity to become properly balanced. He also requested that recorded votes be taken on all important matters at Council, including the Official Plan review and negotiations with the City of Brantford.

Mr. Bisailon suggested that Council consider new technology and LEED requirements in order to promote preserving farmland and the growing of local produce (e.g. crops being grown on green roofs, etc.). In his view, Council should be proceeding with development in the Cainsville area to better utilize the four-lane highway and other infrastructure resources.

Brant County Council
May 5, 2008

There are empty lots that could be developed immediately before proceeding with further development. He noted that there are developers who are willing to contribute to the costs to upgrade/install infrastructure in the Cainsville/Brant East area, which would reduce the impact to taxpayers.

Cainsville Ccare Committee re: Official Plan review

Bob Robb, on behalf of the Cainsville Ccare Committee, presented a summary of the 2006 public meeting on development in the Cainsville area. The members of the Ccare Committee agree with the recommendations of the County's consultant that the boundaries of the urban settlement area in Cainsville should not be expanded. He advised that the community wants to be involved in how the Cainsville community grows and develops, noting the importance of balanced growth. The Ccare Committee is requesting a meeting with Council to discuss the plans and vision for the Cainsville area, in light of the fact that Council is negotiating with the City for an additional 120 L/s of water. Councillor Haggart advised that the County does not have a vision for the Cainsville area at this time. Although the County has requested additional water from the City for the Cainsville area, no decision has been made on a vision for the Cainsville area at this time.

Elton Papple

Elton Papple read a letter on behalf of himself and his son, Shelton Papple, noting concern about the proposition in the MMM report to not allow development in the Brant East/Cainsville areas and the tax implications it will cause to the County citizens. He requested that the Council either deny or defer the MMM recommendations until the boundary adjustment agreement between the County of Brant and the City of Brantford is resolved. He noted their concern that although the Cainsville area generates substantial industrial tax assessment, the County is not updating the aging infrastructure in this area. Mr. Shelton requested that more effort and focus be directed to Cainsville as a preferred area of growth in the County. Councillor Coleman pointed out that \$1.5 million has been budgeted for the Cainsville water tower upgrades this year.

Bill Green, GSP Group

Bill Green of the GSP Group advised that he was appearing on behalf of landowners who wish to initiate an area plan for North Paris area, noting that an application for this purpose is to be considered at the May Corporate Development Committee meeting. He noted his concerns about the current Official Plan process and the growth forecast and assumptions that were based on an arithmetic formula and do not make sense. The staff recommendations restrict development beyond the current built boundary which is inappropriate and objectionable. The recently approved area plan process will provide detailed information about specific areas and is more appropriate to determine where settlement should occur.

The North Paris Area Study will be confined to the present urban settlement boundaries. Although there may be concerns about servicing new areas of the County, the area study will provide answers of what growth can be accommodated in this area, how the environmental features can be protected, how many housing units can be accommodated, and the financial commitments that are required from the developer. Mr. Green also noted that an area-rated development charge could be established to ensure that development pays for itself.

Hugh Handy, GSP Group

Hugh Handy of the GSP Group outlined the various ownership/ development groups in the St. George area, including Activa, Empire Homes, Armstrong Hunter, Brant Star Developments, and J. H. Cohoon Engineering. He noted development applications within the current St. George Urban Settlement Boundary that are in the process of being completed, and advised that they are looking forward to proceeding with the Area Plan process for St. George in the near future. Mr. Handy expressed his concerns that only 65 residential units have been allocated to St. George over the next five years in the Official Plan Update. He noted servicing constraints in St. George, and advised that there seems to be a disconnect between the Official Plan Review and the Area Study process. He urged Council to use the area plan process to realize more realistic growth options for St. George, particularly with the large amount of land within the St. George Urban Settlement Boundary that needs to be planned.

Lorna Nowicki-Prime

Lorna Nowicki-Prime advised that protection of the environment in the Official Plan Review needs to be stronger to protect water, natural heritage, moraines, etc., in order to protect the quality of life and habitat we currently have. She suggested that the implementation of a Greenbelt in Brant could support these goals. Specific environmental/natural heritage tourism initiatives can also support environmental protection. She requested that there be clarification in the media on what costs the developers will be required to pay before they can move ahead with development. Ms. Nowicki-Prime noted that it is important to have balanced development that all citizens want and can live with. She also noted the need to support downtown Paris and the other downtown areas in the County

Rick DeGraaf, Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario

Rick DeGraaf, on behalf of the Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario, provided the response of the Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario to the proposed Provincial criteria for expanding the Greenbelt. Their organization is concerned that a haphazard expansion of the Greenbelt will result in development leapfrogging to areas where no Greenbelt exists. They support the approach that the Provincial Government should be responsible for establishing the Greenbelt to protect all agricultural lands, and that this responsibility should not be downloaded to the municipalities.

Brad Rogers, Stantec Consulting, on behalf of Walton International

Brad Rogers of Stantec Consulting, on behalf of Walton International, advised that they do not support the staff recommendations regarding the Official Plan Review as these recommendations are not in the best interest of the County. They support further development in the Tutela Heights and Cainsville/Brant East area, as these are logical strategic areas for growth in the County.

Larry Davis, Brant County Federation of Agriculture

Larry Davis of the Brant County Federation of Agriculture advised that the Ontario Federation of Agriculture does not support the Greenbelt criteria as it is presently written, because it protects farmland, but not the viability of farmers. The OFA supports focusing urban growth within existing urban boundaries utilizing higher density targets than currently exist. In response to a question, Mr. Davis indicated that there are 687 OFA members in the County of Brant.

Brant County Council
May 5, 2008

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Councillor Chambers presented the following report from the April 28, 2008 meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee, it being agreed that the two recommendations would be voted on separately:

1. **(Amended)** That based on the policy recommendations contained within sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 of the Growth Strategy and Policy Directions Report prepared by MMM Group, staff be directed to prepare the necessary resolutions for Council's consideration at the ~~May 6~~ **July 8**, 2008 County of Brant Council meeting;

And that County staff and the County's Consultant prepare a report for consideration at the July 8 Council meeting, taking into consideration the presentations made at this meeting.

2. That the letter from Willie Maertens be received as correspondence and referred to Planning staff and the Official Plan 5 Year Review Consultant, for their consideration as part of the Official Plan 5-Year Review.

Moved by – Councillor Chambers
Seconded by – Councillor Hodge

That Recommendation 1 of the Planning Advisory Committee report from its April 28, 2008 meeting be adopted.

. No Vote – Amendments Follows

Moved by – Councillor Coleman
Seconded by – Councillor Wheat

That Recommendation 1 of the Planning Advisory Committee report be amended to change the date from "May 6" to "July 8".

. Carried

Moved by – Councillor Haggart
Seconded by – Councillor Schmitt

That Recommendation 1 be amended by the addition of the following clause: "That County staff and the County's Consultant prepare a report for consideration at the July 8 Council meeting, taking into consideration the presentations made at this meeting."

. Carried

Mayor Eddy then called for a vote on Recommendation 1, which had been amended to read as follows:

"That based on the policy recommendations contained within sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 of the Growth Strategy and Policy Directions Report prepared by MMM Group, staff be directed to prepare the necessary resolutions for Council's consideration at the July 8, 2008 County of Brant Council meeting;

And that County staff and the County's Consultant prepare a report for consideration at the July 8 Council meeting, taking into consideration the presentations made at this meeting."

3494
Brant County Council
May 5, 2008

. Carried

Moved by – Councillor Chambers
Seconded by – Councillor Hodge

That Recommendation 2 of the Planning Advisory Committee from its April 28, 2008 meeting be adopted.

. Carried

NEXT MEETING

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m. to meet again on **Tuesday, May 6, 2008 at 7:00 p.m.** in the Council Chambers, Paris.

Mayor

Date Minutes Approved

Clerk