

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING

MINUTES

Brant County Council Chambers
7 Broadway Street, Paris
Thursday, May 21, 2009
7:00 p.m.

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

Regrets: Councillors Hodge and Coleman

Staff: Johnston and Lehmann

Councillor Schmitt in the Chair.

Approval of Agenda

Moved by – Councillor Powell
Seconded by – Councillor Wheat

That the agenda and addendum for the Special Planning Advisory Committee meeting of May 21, 2009, be approved.

.Carried

Reports from Staff

The Director reported that based on materials recently received, it is staff's recommendation that Submissions F-21, H-33 & H-38 and H-39 be deferred.

PA-09-40 – Municipal Comprehensive Review of Employment Lands – D. Johnston

The Director of Development Services reviewed the history and origins of the Municipal Comprehensive Review of Employment Lands ("MCREL") and provided Committee with a power point presentation, noting the following:

- The County should concentrate its efforts to develop infrastructure on those lands that are serviceable along Highway 403, in close proximity to the interchanges;
- Lands not close to Highway 403 should be used to meet local needs or needs of a dry industrial nature;
- Not all employment lands need to be fully serviced. To require full services for all Employment Lands would be contrary to the efficient use of municipal infrastructure and as such, contravene Provincial Policy;
- At such time as the Province is reviewing the Provincial Policy, the County should make one or more submissions to the Province, with a view of having greater flexibility with

respect to the use of individual services and partial services to meet the servicing needs of local employment land users;

- The County and the general economic development of the area would benefit from the County developing an Economic Development Strategy;
- The County should review with neighbouring municipalities the opportunities for the joint servicing of Employment Lands;
- The County should review its engineering and design standards with a view to lowering some of the standards to allow for greater efficiency in the uses of the current infrastructure;
- There are a number of areas where there is no logic for the industrial designations that appear in the current Official Plan;
- The County should implement the recommendations dealing with the rezoning of Industrial lands using the “h” holding provision to ensure orderly development and being that much closer to be “shovel ready” for prospective industrial users.

The Director reviewed with Committee the lands for possible conversion to non-employment lands.

- **Committee Questions and Comments**

Committee discussion focused on lands for possible conversion, servicing, area studies, joint operation of Employment Lands, the protection of Employment Lands, alternate uses, source water protection, re-designation, sustainability, capture zones, economic development, the need for flexibility with regard to partially serviced Employment Lands, Rest Acres Road, *Places to Grow* and Provincial Policy Statement.

In response to questions and comments, the Director noted that:

- there exists no detailed calculation for the amount of land being recommended for conversion to or from Employment Land status;
- staff is of the opinion that those lands that are prone to flooding should be excluded from the calculation of the total amount of developable Employment Lands;
- in an effort to protect lands that have high potential for employment type use, but are not presently designated, it is important to not allow an alternate use to establish that would be counterintuitive to future Employment use;
- there is a significant difference between wellhead protection areas and source water protection areas as defined in the two year travel zone and that in some instances a wellhead protection area would be much larger than a source water protection area;
- in discussions with Provincial staff, the County has been advised that with regard to such lands it would be prudent to use language such as “reserved for long term employment use” in the text of the Official Plan, rather than formally designating lands as Employment;
- the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horse Shoe provides language to the effect that the County “must conform with” the policies contained therein, Provincial Policy Statement provides language to the effect that the County “must be consistent with” the policies contained therein and that previously, the language utilized in Provincial Policy was that the County “must have regard for” the policies contained therein.

It was noted that there is not an abundance of industrial development currently taking place in the County. In response to questions regarding the notion that a conversion of Employment Lands to Residential Lands would be more desirable from a source water protection point of view, the Director noted that although converting Employment Lands to Residential Lands represents an environmentally sensitive approach, sound financial planning and balanced growth on behalf of the County must also be considered.

Members of Committee stressed the importance of protecting an adequate water supply for the future employment lands and it was noted that perhaps the prohibition of development, employment and / or residential, along the Grand River front might be a means by which the environmental protection can be ensured in east Paris.

Discussion took place with respect to the importance of flexibility within the Official Plan, in order that the County is able to take advantage of a variety of circumstances, as they relate to Employment Lands. Committee concurred that MMM be directed to ensure that the policies contained within the Official Plan be as flexible as possible to facilitate interpretation rather than a document that simply directs Council.

In response, the Director noted that there are facets of Provincial Policy Statement, the *Places to Grow Act* and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horse Shoe that do not provide for any measure of flexibility. He further noted that to the extent which there is room for flexibility, both within the Official Plan and the MCREL, he would convey Committee's desire for same to MMM.

It was noted that an example of inflexibility is the notion that industrial development must occur on full services and that there are places within the County that can support industrial development on partial services.

Delegations / Presentations / Petitions

Mr. Howard Snodgrass, Snodgrass Consulting Re: Part of Lots 11 and 12, Concession 2 (Gurney Lands) and Various Lands located within the Brant West Area

- Part of Lots 11 and 12, Concession 2 (Gurney Lands)

With respect to Part of Lots 11 and 12, Concession 2 (Gurney Lands), Mr. Snodgrass requested that:

- the 30 acres of land currently designated as Highway Commercial for a service centre be designated as Highway Commercial or Commercial in the new Official Plan;
 - the portion of the Gurney Lands that is located east of the Twin Pad Arena site between Pit Haul Road and Powerline Road be included in the Residential designation in the new Official Plan;
 - for property located between Pit Haul Road and the Twin Pad Arena site, the lands be included in the Commercial designation in the new Official Plan;
 - the lands south of Pit Haul road and east of the service centre (the "West Pit") be designated Industrial in the new Official Plan.
- Various Lands located in the Brant West Area

Mr. Snodgrass introduced members of the West Brant Business Group and the Burford Revitalization Committee.

Mr. Snodgrass reviewed with Committee a copy of correspondence dated May 21, 2009 and discussed site servicing, growth opportunities in Brant West and the sustainability of the Burford commercial core.

With respect to the MCREL, Mr. Snodgrass reviewed servicing in growth areas, long term servicing in the Burford Village Urban Area, communal site services, municipal site services, the designation of additional Employment Lands wherever possible, the maintenance of industrial designations, "shovel ready" business properties, range of industrial serviced lands, priorities of Brant West business areas, future growth opportunities and ongoing meetings.

In response to questions and comments, Mr. Snodgrass reviewed the history of the Burford Agricultural Society lands and requested that the present industrial designation be left as is, noting that if the designation is removed, it will result in approximately fourteen to eighteen acres of industrial lands lost. Mr. Snodgrass noted that if the industrial designation absolutely must be removed, that it be transferred to other lands in the Brant West area, rather than deleted entirely.

Mr. J. Bacher - Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society

Mr. Bacher advised that for the most part, he is pleased with the information contained in the MCREL. He expressed concern with respect to the Cainsville and Garden Ave. area and requested that a clear statement be included in the Official Plan that ensures that the settlement area in that location will not be expanded. He noted that if any settlement area is expanded, it should be to facilitate industrial development.

Mr. J. Hitchon on behalf of Walker, Nott & Dragicevic (Schuyler Hill Orchards)

Mr. Hitchon reviewed the various presentations that he has made to Committee and Council with respect to Submission H-19 (Schuyler Hill Orchards) and reiterated that the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe does not require the County to prohibit commercial (retail, warehouse or large format) from its Employment Areas, but rather that it establishes that if the County chooses to prohibit commercial development, then any future re-designation to permit same is considered a conversion and must meet the appropriate requirements (i.e. Municipal Comprehensive Review).

Committee discussion focused on the existing Official Plan, the Southwest Paris Secondary Plan, servicing, the concept of "de-malling", market studies and the protection of the downtown Paris core.

In response to questions and comments, Mr. Hitchon stressed the importance of flexibility within the Official Plan and requested that the Schuyler Hill Orchard lands be maintained as Employment Lands within the new Official Plan, with an inclusion for commercial and institutional uses. Mr. Hitchon expressed his willingness, as well as the willingness of Walker, Nott & Dragicevic, to work with MMM in reviewing the subject lands in relation to the draft Official Plan.

In response to further questions, Mr. Hitchon noted that the inclusion of residential units located above industrial units is a trend in planning and is something to be considered.

Ms. E. Haley – Sustainable Brant

Ms. Haley expressed her belief that additional Employment Lands are not required within the County. Ms. Haley expressed concern with respect to source water protection, the protection of prime agricultural land and the Greenbelt. Ms. Haley requested a copy of the Employment Lands Request Survey and information with regard to which industries were surveyed. Ms. Haley expressed her belief that the residents of Cainsville need to be surveyed in order to truly understand the needs of the Community. Ms. Haley expressed concern with respect to the funding of the MCREL.

In response to comments, the Director noted that although he would be glad to provide a copy of the Employment Lands Request Survey, the survey answers provided by individuals were collected anonymously and cannot be distributed publicly.

Mr. R. Thomson – First Urban

Mr. Thomson advised that his firm would be formally submitting its critique of the MCREL at a later date. He noted that although the MCREL contains a number of positive attributes, there is room for improvement, refinement and reconsideration. Mr. Thomson discussed the history of the Growth Plan prepared by MMM and noted that at the time that the report was authored, there was a Letter of Intent in place with the City of Brantford. He expressed his belief that the Letter of Intent governed MMM's decisions with respect to growth in the Brant East and Cainsville areas and as the Letter of Intent has now been withdrawn, the report needs to be refined. Mr. Thomson noted that sustainability and balanced communities are most important.

Mr. Thomson requested that Submissions H-33 & H-38 and H-39 be deferred until a later date, to allow further discussion and consideration.

● **Committee Consideration**

Moved by – Councillor Gatward
Seconded by – Councillor Wheat

That the Municipal Comprehensive Review of Employment Lands and accompanying Staff Report PA-09-40 be received as background material for the Five year Official Plan review;

That the County attempt to resume discussions with the City of Brantford with respect boundary related issues including joint servicing of industrial properties on the City/County Boundary;

That the recommendations dealing with County Development Standards and related background reports be referred to County staff for consideration as part of the Development Standards Review which will be considered separately by Council;

That the County of Brant make a submission to the Province with respect to the level of servicing required for employment lands. The submission should urge the Province to change Provincial Policy as part of the Provincial review to allow individual services and partial services

to be permitted where the municipality has demonstrated that there is a need for such areas and the lands are properly designated in the local planning document.

.Carried

Committee discussion focused on the importance of a County-wide economic development strategy. Members of Committee expressed their belief that delaying the discussions regarding the strategy until 2010 budget deliberations is not in the best interests of the County and requested that the strategy be elevated in terms of priority.

In response to comments, the Director expressed his concurrence with Committee and noted that the reason for staff's recommendation to defer the strategy until 2010 budget deliberations was that in trying to comply with current budget constraints, there are no funds available for the additional staff person(s) that would be required to complete the background work required for the strategy.

Moved by – Councillor Haggart
Seconded by – Councillor Chambers

That the identified need of developing a County-wide Economic Development Strategy be elevated to a priority status, effective immediately.

.Carried

Consideration of Outstanding Industrial Related Requests – 5 Year Update of the Official Plan

Members of Committee expressed concern that given the volume of information contained in the outstanding individual submissions relating to industrial lands and given the late hour of the evening, it may be difficult for Committee members to fully consider the submissions.

Moved by – Councillor Haggart
Seconded by – Councillor Atfield

That the consideration of the various submissions related to the Official Plan, as to their conformity with the Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, consistency with Provincial Policy and adherence to the Growth Management Study prepared for the County by MMM and the general principles of the Municipal Comprehensive Review of Employment Lands **be tabled** until such time as the May 21 special meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee is reconvened, at the call of the Chair, in consultation with Development Services staff; and

That the recommendations dealing with possible policy adjustments to the Official Plan **be tabled** until such time as the individual submissions related to the Official Plan have been referred to MMM for their consideration as part of the 5 year review.

.Carried

It was noted that the public portion of the evening's meeting was now closed and accordingly, at such time as the meeting is reconvened, Committee will be discussing and deliberating the recommendations dealing with possible policy adjustments to the Official Plan, as well as the various individual industrial-related submissions to the Official Plan.

Reports from Staff

PA-09-39 – Area Studies – Planning Peer Review Consultants – Paris North and Nith Peninsula

Moved by – Councillor Gatward
Seconded by – Mayor Eddy

That the County of Brant agree to use Labreche Patterson & Associates Inc., as the County's Planning peer reviewer for the Area Studies for Paris North and the Nith Peninsula;

And that all costs associated for the peer review be borne by the development parties conducting the Area Study.

.Carried

Adjournment and Continuation of Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 10:24 p.m., on a motion of Councillors Gatward and Powell, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.

Secretary