



this dam as being impacted. He advised it is apparent that the dams and fish are two unrelated Federal departments.

- 154 The Concerned Citizens of Sunderland – Questions from the July 18th 2005 Public Meeting; and Additional Questions – January 17th 2006
- 203 UDI to Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal – Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe – November 2005 – Comments from Durham Region Chapter Urban Development Institute (UDI)
- 213 Durham Clerk's Department to Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing - EBR Reference #AF05E0001 – Ontario Municipal Board and *Planning Act* Reforms: Bill 51, the *Planning and Conservation Land Statute Law Amendment Act, 2005*
- 221 Alteng Inc. – Request for Resolution of Permitted Use Letter for Value Propane Inc. – Part of Lot 10, Concession 10, Durham Road 50, Gamebridge, ON
- 231 Durham Planning Department to Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal – Durham Region's Response to the November 25, 2005, Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe
- 232 Durham Clerk's Department to Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal – Province's Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe
- 234 Durham Planning Department - Application for Approval of a Plan of Subdivision S-B-2005-01 – The Kaitlin Group Limited – Part Lot 11, Concession 6, Township of Brock (Sunderland)

Councillor Allan Simpson commented that communication 234 references 100 lots for development within the Kaitlin Subdivision proposal vs. capacity for the development of 140-150 homes as the committee has previously been advised. The Deputy Clerk-Administrator advised that the 140-150 homes is based on sewage capacity and that an additional well site is being sought on the Kaitlin property. Councillor Simpson enquired whether the additional well site will come before the Brock Council and was advised by the Deputy Clerk-Administrator that this is a regional issue, however that the municipality is usually notified as a courtesy. Councillor Simpson enquired whether the number of homes to be developed could jump from 100 to 140 or 150 if a new well is brought on stream and was advised in the affirmative. Councillor Simpson enquired when further information in this regard would be forthcoming and was advised we do not know at this time.

- 256 Durham Clerk's Department – By-law #01-2006 – tariff of fees for planning applications
- 271 Town of The Blue Mountains - advising of resolution re: new renewable and non-renewable energy projects
- 272 Municipality of Grey Highlands - requesting support of resolution re: new renewable and non-renewable energy projects

Councillor John Grant requested an explanation with respect to the information on renewable and non-renewable energy projects as contained within communications numbered 271 and 272 and was advised by the Deputy Clerk-Administrator that this information pertains to Bill 51 which has had first reading only and which proposes an amendment to the Planning Act which would exempt all energy projects from official plan amendments, zoning amendments and site plan control. Councillor Grant requested further information in the form of a staff report in this regard.

- 320 Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing – *InfoSheet* – Affordable Housing – Fall 2005

- 329 City of Pickering to Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal - Director, Planning & Development, Report PD 09-06 – *Places to Grow – Better Choices: Brighter Future* – Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe – November 2005 – EBR Registry Number: XR05E0002 – Informational Notice – File: A-2611-001-06
- 338 Herb Goldie to Durham Region Planning Committee – enclosing three documents: 1) One Size Fits All ... Doesn't Work; 2) Cannington's Eastern Boundary; and 3) Comments to Durham Region – February 15, 2006
- 349 Staples, Swain & Gunsolus – Value Propane Inc.

Resolution No. 2-4

MOVED BY John Grant that the Planning Committee receive communications 60, 154, 203, 213, 221, 231, 232, 234, 256, 271, 272, 320, 329, 338 and 349 for information and file.

MOTION CARRIED

- 173 T.G. Gettinby – Report 2006-PL-02 – Value Propane Site Plan Agreement – Part Lot 10, Concession 10 (Thorah) – Township of Brock

Councillor Karen Windatt advised that the report speaks to the issues and that she feels the owner has taken action respecting the lighting issue. She is concerned however insofar as the completion of the landscaping and thus has included the July deadline. She feels it is appropriate at this time to release the compliance letter being requested.

Councillor Allan Simpson requested some clarification with respect to the public meeting previously held in conjunction with this property and the TSSA compliance letter being requested, and was advised that these are two separate issues, the public meeting having been held as part of the rezoning process which was subsequently approved, vs. the TSSA compliance letter.

Councillor John Grant enquired whether staff approve of the July 31, 2006 deadline and was advised in the affirmative.

Resolution No. 3-4

MOVED BY Karen Windatt that the Township of Brock Planning Committee receive communication # 173 and approve the recommendation in Report 2006-PL-02 and also ask staff to monitor the progress of the landscaping with the intent to act on the letter of credit if this is not completed by a deadline of July 31, 2006.

MOTION CARRIED

- 286 Valerie Cranmer & Associates – Report 2006-PL-04 – Places to Grow: Better Choices, Brighter Future – Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Horseshoe (Nov. 2005) - Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal

Municipal Planning Consultant Valerie Cranmer of Valerie Cranmer & Associates provided the committee with the following report:

SUBJECT

PLACES TO GROW: BETTER CHOICES, BRIGHTER FUTURE  
PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN FOR THE GREATER HORSESHOE (NOV. 2005)  
MINISTRY OF PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE RENEWAL

---

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Council receive Report 2006-PL-04 for information;

2. That Council endorse Report 2006-PL-04 as the Township's comments and concerns on "Places to Grow: Better Choices, Brighter Future – Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe; and,
  3. That Report 2006-PL-04, be forwarded to the Ontario Growth Secretariat, Ministry of Public Renewal and the Planning Commissioner of the Region of Durham and the area municipalities in Durham Region.
- 

## **REPORT**

### **1. Background**

On November 24, 2005, the Province released Places to Grow: Better Choices, Brighter Future – Proposed Growth Plan for the Golden Horseshoe. The Growth Plan was prepared under the Places to Grow Act 2005 and provides a framework for implementing the province's vision for building stronger, prosperous communities by better managing growth to 2031. The Plan is intended to guide decisions on a wide range of issues – transportation, infrastructure planning, land-use planning, urban form, housing, natural heritage and resource protection – in the interest of promoting economic prosperity.

This report provides a brief summary of the Proposed Growth Plan and the potential implications on the future development in the Township of Brock. The Proposed Growth Plan for the Golden Horseshoe Area is available for viewing in the Clerk's Department.

The Growth Plan provides policy directions that:

- direct growth to built-up areas where the capacity exists to best accommodate the expected population, household and employment growth while providing strict criteria for settlement area boundaries;
- promote transit-supportive densities and a healthy mix of residential and employment land uses;
- preserve employment lands for future economic opportunities;
- identify and support a transportation network that links urban growth centres through an extensive multi-modal system anchored by efficient public transit and highway systems for moving people and goods;
- plan for community infrastructure to support growth;
- ensure sustainable water and wastewater services are available to support future growth; and,
- identify a natural system and prime agricultural areas, and enhance the conservation of these valuable resources.

### **2. Implications to Brock Township**

There are a number of areas where the provisions of the Proposed Growth Plan could have a major impact on development in Brock Township, when the province proceeds with implementation. These include the basic principle of building compact, vibrant and complete communities; intensification of built up areas; conversion of employment lands to other uses; and the infrastructure identified for Moving Goods through the Greater Horseshoe Area.

#### **2.1 Complete Communities**

The first guiding principle identified in the Proposed Growth Plan that provides the basis for guiding decisions on how land is developed, resources are managed and public dollars invested is "**build compact, vibrant and complete communities**".

Although all the growth centres in Durham are in the southern part of the Region, both the Province and the Region cannot ignore existing historical communities that provide essential services to the surrounding agricultural area. The Plan “recognizes and promotes the traditional role of rural settlement areas as a focus of economic activity for surrounding rural and agricultural areas. The three urban centres in Brock, Beaverton, Cannington and Sunderland must be developed over the next twenty five years as complete communities so that they can continue to be a focus of economic activity in the Township. The existing servicing constraints must be addressed and resolved so that growth can continue in the Township. The province must provide assurances that infrastructure investment will not by-pass municipalities that are not identified for growth, to assist in creating complete communities for all settlement areas.

## **2.2     *Intensification***

The Proposed Growth Plan requires that by 2015 and for each year after, a minimum of 40 percent of all residential development occurring annually will be within the built-up area. This level of intensification is not realistic for Brock Township and cannot be supported. The Region is suggesting that 20 percent is more appropriate. Achieving even 20 percent intensification in Brock Township would be extremely difficult since a large portion of the designated vacant residential land is covered by plans of subdivision and condominium. At anticipated rates of growth, the supply of un-built draft approved units will continue to build out at the current rates for at least the next fifteen years. For two of the urban centres, servicing capacity constraints urgently need to be resolved so that even limited intensification can occur.

The majority of housing in the Township is single detached housing which is not easily redeveloped nor has the necessary infrastructure to accommodate intensified redevelopment on a major scale. The Township is not adverse to residential intensification as is evidenced in the permissions granted in the Zoning By-laws for secondary suites. People come to the Township with the dream of owning their own house. What actions will be proposed by the Province to encourage a larger majority of residents to abandon this dream and accept denser forms of housing in the more rural areas of the Greater Golden Horseshoe?

## **2.3     *Employment Lands***

An important component of being a complete community is having appropriately located and designated employment lands. The proposed Growth Plan states that “providing opportunities for business and employment is fundamental to using land wisely and ensuring a prosperous economic future. A recently completed study has concluded that the majority of the designated Employment Lands in the Brock are inappropriately located and in some cases extremely difficult and expensive to service. In order to attract economic development, the Township must have Employment lands that have visibility and access to major transportation facilities. The designation of additional employment lands in Beaverton, the Beaver Avenue Employment Area, though the comprehensive review of the Brock Official Plan, must be supported by both the Region and the Province.

The conversion of designated Employment Lands that are inappropriately designated should be encouraged to be converted to other uses. These uses may include other urban uses. Another option may be to remove the subject lands from the Urban Centres and designate them for rural uses.

## **2.4     *Transportation Infrastructure***

Existing major highways and future extensions are depicted on Schedule 6 – Moving Goods. The future extension of Highway 404 extension to Highway 12/48 and north to Orillia should be shown. This corridor is important to the movement of goods through the Township, particularly as a future aggregate haul route between north Durham, Simcoe County and Kawartha Lakes and much of the Greater Toronto Area. The commitment by the Province to the future extension of the 404 through Durham is essential to the continued economic vitality of the Township.

## **3.       Next Steps**

The Province intends to finalize the Growth Plan early in 2006.

It is recommended that this report be submitted to the Ontario Growth Secretariat of the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal as Council's comments on the Proposed Growth plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

The report should also be submitted to the Planning Commissioner of the Region of Durham for consideration during the review of the Brock Official Plan.

Councillor Debbie Bath thanked Ms. Cranmer for the report and enquired whether action should be taken by this committee to pressure Durham Region to expand service capacity in light of the fact that development in Cannington and Sunderland is non-existent or very limited because of limited service capacity.

Ms. Cranmer advised that the survival of the three urban areas within Brock is a concern that was addressed during the Brock O/P Review, and that it is important that the Region support Brock's historical communities. She advised that the Places to Grow document is the first of several documents that have been detrimental to Brock.

Ms. Cranmer advised that she has met with the Region regarding servicing and has stressed that expansion in 20 years is not good enough and that appropriate populations for Sunderland and Cannington are needed before an EA is undertaken, as the targeted populations in the O/P are insufficient for developed areas. She noted that a large portion of Cannington's residential lands are being taken out due to the Greenbelt Legislation. She advised that we need to stress that Brock is a viable part of the GTA and that Durham Region needs to address service constraints.

Councillor Debbie Bath commented that servicing has not been a past issue due to slow growth, however it is currently not the case and Brock needs to be able to develop. Employment lands are minimal but as residential lands change and when the 404 comes, we will see change and development. Currently both the Province and the Region are holding Brock hostage and we need to take action now to protect our survival in the future.

Ms. Cranmer advised that the issue of employment lands was discussed with Durham Region just last week at which time it was pointed out that Brock did not require additional employment lands as it already has sufficient. The support of Durham Region will be essential insofar as the designation of Beaver Avenue as employment lands.

Ms. Cranmer advised that the last meeting of the Brock O/P Steering Committee will be held on February 21, 2006, and although it is not a sure thing, the plan will be presented with Beaver Avenue being part of the employment lands. A further study may be required to update the previous employment land study undertaken by Ms. Cranmer on behalf of the municipality. It was again stated that Provincial and Regional awareness needs to be raised insofar as the Township of Brock.

Councillor Debbie Bath advised that Mayor Shier and Regional Councillor O'Connor need to pressure regional staff to look at this issue seriously especially for future generations and keep the committee updated in this regard.

Councillor John Granted thanked Ms. Cranmer for her report, commenting on the impact of the Places to Grow Plan and Greenbelt Legislation, neither of which are compatible. He commented on the major constraint issues causing the municipality to struggle and requested that Mayor Shier and Regional Councillor O'Connor make strong representation at the Region.

Councillor Allan Simpson enquired where the employment lands are located in Sunderland and Cannington and was advised that in Sunderland they are in the southern most portion of the urban lands, however are mostly developed. There is another area on Hwy. 12 between the old creamery building and the cemetery, however the size of this land has been reduced to the point where it is too small for employment uses as the result of SLSCA floodplain mapping.

In Cannington there is a small portion of employment lands south of the sewage lagoons inclusive of a draft industrial plan of subdivision, the owner of which does seem anxious at all to develop. There is another section of land south of the Cannington Community Centre in the park, a portion of which has been changed to the open space designation. The three wells in this area which are located on township land create a large well head protection area and consume the employment lands. We

cannot and do not want to take these lands out of the Cannington urban area. Further more they cannot be changed for residential use due to capacity constraints.

The employment lands designated in Beaverton have bedrock close to the surface making them very expensive to develop.

Councillor John Grant reiterated the need to ensure that a strong voice from Brock is heard at the Regional and Provincial levels, suggesting that regional staff could make a recommendation to regional council. Regional Councillor O'Connor advised that there is a good flow of information at the regional level, however that regional council does not always support staff recommendations. He further advised that our concerns in this regard have been raised at regional council.

Resolution No. 4-4

MOVED BY John Grant that the Planning Committee receive Report 2006-PL-04 for information and approve the recommendations contained within, reference communication 286.

MOTION CARRIED

302 Township of Brock Committee of Adjustment – Notice of Hearing re: Minor Variance Application File No. A-1/06 – Rhead

Resolution No. 5-4

MOVED BY Debbie Bath that Planning Committee has no objection to the request from Wendy and David Rhead – communication # 302, Application File No. A-1/06, Rhead.

MOTION CARRIED

308 Valerie Cranmer & Associates – Report 2006-PL-03 – Durham Region Official Plan Review – Proposed Amendment for the Transportation, Commercial, Rural and Environmental Components of the Regional Official Plan Review – Recommended Arterial Corridor Guidelines

Municipal Planning Consultant, Valerie Cranmer of Valerie Cranmer & Associates undertook a review of Report Number 2006-PL-03 as follows:

**SUBJECT**

DURHAM REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW – PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR THE TRANSPORTATION, COMMERCIAL, RURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENTS OF THE REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW.

RECOMMENDED ARTERIAL CORRIDOR GUIDELINES

---

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

4. That Council endorse the recommendations contained in this report on the Proposed Amendments for the Transportation, Commercial, Rural and Environmental Components of the Durham Region Official Plan;

5. That Report 2006-PL-03, be forwarded to the Planning Commissioner of the Region of Durham for consideration in the Review of the Durham Region Official Plan; and,

6. That Report 2006-PL-03, be forwarded to the area municipalities in Durham Region.

---

**ATTACHMENTS**

- No. 1: Durham Region Report 2005-P-92
- 2: Report 2004-PL-15
- 3: Extracts from the Proposed Amendment
- 4: Schedule C – Map C3 Transit Priority Network
- 5: Schedule A – Map A1 Regional Structure
- 6: Schedule B – Map B1 Key Natural Heritage & Hydrologic Features

---

**REPORT****1. Background**

The present Durham Region Official Plan was approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing in November 1993. The Region initiated a review of the Official Plan in 2000. Since that time, the Township of Brock has been afforded three opportunities to provide formal comments to the Region. In September of 2000, Council considered Report No. 2000-PL-03 which identified a number of issues that have been of concern to the Township which should be addressed in the Regional Official Plan Review. Following the release of an Issues and Direction Report and four Discussion Papers, a report was prepared for the consideration of Council in February 2004. (Report 2004-PL-06). In November 2004, Council considered Report 2004-PL-15 addressing the Recommended Directions Report. The comments contained in these reports and the discussion of Council form the basis for this report. A copy of the November 2004 report is attached to this report for ease of reference (Attachment No. 1). The previous reports are available in the Clerk's Department.

In November 2005, the Region released the proposed amendment to the Durham Region Official Plan and initiated the statutory public consultation process. The proposed amendment deals with the Transportation, Commercial, Rural and Environmental components of the Official Plan Review. In addition, the amendment addresses Greenbelt conformity as it pertains to the Agricultural designations (Attachment No. 2).

The amendment does not address the Population, Employment and Land Needs component of the Official Plan Review. A Recommended Directions Report for Population, Employment and Urban Land was released by the Region in January 2006. This report will be subject to special meetings to be led by Planning Committee in February for discussion and will be subject of a subsequent report.

A report containing the Recommended Arterial Corridor Guidelines was forwarded by the Region for comments. This document forms the basis for portions of the Transportation component of the proposed Amendment. This document has been reviewed concurrently with the proposed amendment.

**2. General Comments**

Many of the proposed amendments ensure that any new urban development will only occur in recognized settlement areas and that a clearly distinct rural area in which the population growth is limited, is created and maintained. New policies and restrictions have been incorporated in the Official Plan with regard to Well Head Protection Areas. There are a number of terminology changes that are being proposed, the most significant of which include replacing the Major Open Space System with a Natural Heritage System, replacing Permanent Agricultural Reserve and General Agricultural Areas with Prime Agricultural Areas, and Central Areas with Centres and Corridors.

The majority of the proposed revisions to the Durham Regional Official Plan can be supported. This report will focus on issues previously identified by Brock Council and specific revisions that may be problematic to the Township if they become incorporated in an approved Official Plan. A summary of each component, any implications on Brock Township and specific recommendations are provided. Extracts of the proposed amendments, as discussed below, are contained in Attachment No. 3.

### 3. Specific Comments

#### 3.A Transportation

##### i) *Proposed Amendment*

The proposed amendment implements the Transportation Master Plan Study and the Arterial Corridor Guideline Study (ACG). Specifically, the directions of these studies are implemented by:

- Promoting travel choices by emphasizing transit and the development and implementation of Transportation Demand Management measures across the Region;
- Establishing a 'Transit Priority Network' comprised of Transit Spines, Commuter Rail and Freeway Transit that connect key Transportation Hubs;
- Designating a 'Strategic Goods Movement Network' to accommodate commercial vehicles on a year round basis, and connect major generators of goods movement traffic;
- Adding policies to address future by-passes of historic downtowns and Hamlets;
- Introducing new performance and design criteria for the Type A, B and C arterial road classifications developed through the ACG;
- Introducing policies supporting development patterns promoting pedestrian connectivity to arterial roads reflecting the ACG; and,
- Adding policies recommended by the ACG addressing the preparation of corridor plans that will provide a vision for the development of Regional Road corridors over time.

##### ii) *Implications to Brock Township*

- Policies are required to be incorporated in local official plans regarding mixed use corridors along portions of Regional Roads. Although the existing Brock Official Plan does not address mixed use corridors, the proposed Brock Official Plan contains policies addressing corridors.
- In response to Brock Council's previous comments regarding the lack of recognition of Highway 404 in the Durham Regional Official Plan, a reference to the Highway 404 extension and the related widening of Highways 12 and 48, has been added to Section 11.3.7.
- Section 11.3.32 identifies criteria that will be used to evaluate development adjacent to arterial roads. Sub-section c) addresses the use of noise attenuation walls or fencing. The use of such walls should be avoided where possible.
- Transit related information has been deleted from Map B1 – Transportation System and a new Map C3 – Transit Priority Network has been included. The transit spine is depicted on Highway 12 to Regional Road 15 and the portion of Regional Road 23 between Beaverton and Port Bolster. The transit feeder service to Cannington is no longer recognized (Attachment No. 4).
- Arterial Road Criteria is presented in Schedule E –Table E7. This chart allows for exceptions in right-of-way widths in Central Areas and Hamlets. In Brock Township, this exception should also apply to the Corridors.

##### iii) *Transportation Recommendations*

- Section 11.3.32 c) should be amended to ensure that noise attenuation walls or fences will only be permitted to a limited extent where noise issues cannot be addressed through urban design and landscaping.
- Schedule C – Map C3 Transit Priority Network should be amended to show a transit spine on the portion of Regional Road 12 between Highway 12 and Regional Road 2 (Simcoe St) and south on Simcoe Street to Port Perry. (refer to Attachment # 3).
- Schedule C – Map C4 Strategic Goods Movement Network should be amended to delete the rail line through the southern portion of the Township as it is now owned by the conservation authority and part of the trail system.
- Schedule E – Table E7 should be amended to permit exceptions to arterial road rights-of-way in Central Areas, Hamlets and Corridors.

### **3.B Commercial**

#### *i) Proposed Amendment*

- Strengthens Regional Centres as the focal point of urban development in the Region, connected with supportive Corridors of intensive mixed use development focused on transit routes;
- Defines the Regional interest in commercial planning as any commercial proposal of 56,000 square metres or larger, or any proposal that would negatively impact a Regional Centre;
- Enables Local Centres consisting of Urban, Community and Neighbourhood Centres to be planned and designated in the area municipal Official Plans;
- Enables planned function to govern the scale of Central Area development by removing Central Area floor space allocations; and,
- Only requires retail impact studies where there is a Regional interest.

#### *ii) Implications to Brock Township*

- The changes in terminology have been incorporated in the proposed Brock Official Plan
- The required policies for intensive mixed use Corridors have been incorporated in the proposed Brock Official Plan
- The definition of Regional interest in commercial applications results in an increase in the Township's autonomy in considering the majority of commercial applications.

#### *iii) Commercial Policy Recommendations*

- No specific modifications are recommended to the commercial policy as these have been and continue to be supportable.

### **3.C Rural**

#### *i) Proposed Amendment*

- Merges the "General Agricultural Areas" and "Permanent Agricultural Reserve" designations to create a single agricultural land use designation, naming it "Prime Agricultural Areas", to reflect those areas in the Region where agricultural lands and agricultural uses predominate;
- Adds policies to permit a full range of agriculture, agriculture-related and secondary uses within the Prime Agricultural Areas and Natural Heritage System, consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan;
- Adds policies to prohibit the establishment of new golf courses and cemeteries in the Prime Agricultural Areas;
- Deletes policies for the creation of retirement lots and non-abutting surplus farm dwelling lots;
- Adds policies to establish a firm limit to Hamlet development and clarifying policies to reflect the form, type and limited scale of development intended for Hamlets;
- Adds policies to restrict the growth and establishment of new rural settlements, such as country residential subdivisions, rural residential clusters, 4 hectare (10 acre) lots and rural employment areas;
- Deletes policies and designations as they pertain to Regional Nodes in Urban Areas; deleting policies related to the establishment of new Regional Nodes in the rural area; and adding policies to "grandfather" existing rural Regional Nodes, to allow for their continued recognition and planning status; and,
- Clarifies and updates policies related to the development of Aggregate Resource Extraction Areas and their rehabilitation, including replacing the High Potential Aggregate Resource Areas Map to illustrate the most current geological information.

*ii) Implications to Brock Township*

- Section 5.2.1 identifies that health facilities shall only be permitted in Urban Areas. In a municipality such as Brock, there are a number of locations outside of the Urban Areas that are within a zoning category that would permit health facilities.
- Section 5.2.2 permits the establishment of recreational community facilities in any designation other than Prime Agricultural Area. This policy would allow a central facility to be located in the Natural Heritage System in Brock. However, due to the restrictions on development in the Natural Heritage System, it may be difficult for Council to find an appropriate central location that did not impact any key natural heritage feature or function. With the elimination of General Agricultural Areas the opportunities have been even more reduced.
- Section 5.3.6 addresses the expansion of cemeteries. It would be appropriate to permit minor expansions, inclusive of lot line adjustments, to existing cemeteries subject to recognition in the zoning by-law and meeting the provisions of the Cemeteries Act.
- Section 9.A.2.10 encourages the consolidation of farms, provided that the farms are merged into a single parcel. This policy does not accept the reality of farm consolidations. It is often very difficult, if not impossible for a farmer wishing to expand his farm operation, through the purchase of abutting lands. Even unopened road allowances would prohibit the merging of two seemingly abutting properties.
- Section 9A.2.11 does not permit the severance of a surplus dwelling due to consolidation of non-abutting farm parcel. This policy is more restrictive than the Greenbelt Plan. Such a policy will result in farmers becoming landlords.
- Section 9A.2.12 does not permit retirement lots. This policy reflects the Provincial Policy Statement and Greenbelt Plan.
- Section 9A.2.13 only permits minor lot lines adjustments for technical reasons. Minor lot line adjustments should also be permitted that would allow the transfer of land that does not result in lots that do not conform to the respective zoning by-laws.
- Section 9B.1.5 requires that in the event that services are to be extended to a rural settlement, the onus is on the area municipality to conduct a study that would identify any impacts arising from such an extension, as well as establishing any implications for further development on private sewage disposal systems. The Region is responsible for water and sewage systems and health issues and therefore study should be conducted by the Region with consultation with the area municipality.
- Section 9B.2.7 establishes a firm limit to hamlet development of 25% of existing residential units as of year end 2000. The 25% should be based on the entire hamlet in the case of hamlets located within two adjacent municipalities. In the case of Brock, this would allow four of the Hamlets to be developed in depth rather than in strips along the arterial roads.
- Section 9D.2.16 places the onus on the area municipality to pursue rehabilitation of abandoned pits and quarries through direct participation in the Rehabilitation Program administered by the industry.
- The merging of the General Agricultural Areas into the Prime Agricultural Areas for the most part, reduces the flexibility that the Township may have in permitting some additional uses in the rural area. In addition, much of the lands within the General Agricultural Areas cannot be considered to be prime agricultural lands.

*iii) Rural Policy Recommendations*

- Section 5.2.1 should be amended to add the words “areas that are appropriately zoned” to the sentence “Health facilities for such purposes as hospitals shall only be permitted in Urban Areas
- Section 5.2.2 should be amended to delete the restriction “except the Prime Agricultural Area”
- Section 5.3.6 should be amended to revise the 4<sup>th</sup> sentence so that minor expansions to existing cemeteries would be permitted subject to recognition in the zoning by-law and meeting the provisions of the Cemeteries Act.
- Section 9A.2.10 should be amended to encourage farm consolidations without the caveat that they be abutting or merged.

- Section 9A.2.11 should be amended to permit the severance of a farm dwelling rendered surplus as a result of a farmer acquiring a non-abutting farm as per the provisions of the Greenbelt Plan.
- Section 9B.1.5 should be amended to indicate that the study shall be undertaken by the Region, in consultation with the respective area municipality.
- Section 9B.2.7 should be amended to acknowledge that the 25% refers to the total hamlet, even if it is located in two municipalities.
- General Agricultural Areas should remain as presently designated on the land use schedule. The Greenbelt Act allows for the consideration of rural lands in addition to prime agricultural lands and environmentally significant lands.

### **3.D Environment**

#### ***i) Proposed Amendment***

- Strengthens policies protecting water resources addressing watershed planning, review of water taking permits, infiltration and aquifer vulnerability areas, and wellhead protection areas;
- Introduces mapping of aquifer vulnerability areas and wellhead protection areas;
- Adds policies to deal with emerging environmental concerns including minimizing light pollution, increasing woodland coverage, improving air quality and support of land securement for conservation purposes; and,
- Strengthens the Natural Heritage System by introducing enhanced mapping recognizing significant wetlands, areas of natural and scientific interest, fish habitat, wildlife habitat, valleylands and woodlands.

#### ***ii) Implications to Brock Township***

- The Major Open Space System has been replaced with the Natural Heritage System, the Permanent Agricultural Reserve has been replaced with Prime Agricultural Areas and General Agricultural Areas have been deleted. In addition there is an overlay with additional restrictions on portions of the Prime Agricultural Lands where there may be some natural heritage features. The deletion of the General Agricultural Areas and their subsequent inclusion, for the most part, in the Prime Agricultural Lands is not appropriate as many of these lands are not considered to be prime lands due physical characteristics and general ownership pattern. In addition, the use of a Natural Heritage overlay in the Prime Agricultural Areas adds an unnecessary complexity to the land use controls in these areas. The Official Plan already permits very limited uses in the Prime Agricultural Areas and any expansion or new uses must consider the impact on the natural heritage features in the area.
- Light pollution abatement measures have been addressed in the Brock Official Plan
- The increased area of influence adjacent to railway corridors from 300 metres to 750 metres would mean that virtually any application that requires a Planning Act approval in Beaverton or the beaches would need a noise and vibration study prepared. Such a study would be appropriate for a plan of subdivision but not in the case of an infilling severance
- The new section regarding Watershed Planning indicates that watershed plans will be prepared for each watershed on a priority basis.
- Area municipalities are encouraged to prepare Urban Tree Strategies. Some policies regarding the planting of street trees have been incorporated in Brock Official Plan.
- Section 2.3.12 requires that stormwater management and watershed plans and their components in the lands governed by the Greenbelt Plan, meet the requirements of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. Section 4.2.3 of the Greenbelt Plan contains policies that apply to stormwater management infrastructure proposals. In addition, the Greenbelt Plan identifies the required components of watershed plans. The requirement that lands within the Greenbelt Plan also be subject to the provisions of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan is inappropriate and an unnecessary duplication of policies. It is questioned whether the Region has the legislative authority to require the additional restrictions.

- The wellhead protection areas and policies impact the Sunderland and Cannington areas. Policies regarding the wellhead protection areas have been incorporated in BOP and areas are recognized on the Maps. The Township's zoning by-law is also required to be amended to add the detailed restrictions related to wellhead protection. The potential development of the employment lands in Cannington are greatly diminished by the wellhead protection restrictions on land use activities that are detailed in Schedule E – Tables E5 and E6. In the wellhead protected areas, it would appear that only residential and some existing agricultural uses would be permitted.
- Section 2.3.20 encourages owners and operations of existing land uses that are prohibited or restricted in the wellhead areas are encouraged to submit and implement site management and contingency plans to protect the well head areas. Existing uses in these areas, such as Strongco, are protected with their zoning rights as legal non-conforming uses (relative to the OP).
- Section 2.3.25 requires that high aquifer vulnerability areas are to be detailed in area municipal official plans. It should be clarified that such mapping will not include the designated settlement areas.
- Section 2.3.35 details the requirements for Environmental Impact Studies. This policy extends the requirements and distances detailed in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan across the entire Region, including Brock Township. This is inappropriate as there are sufficient requirements for Environmental Impact Studies in the Greenbelt Plan as implemented through the Conservation Authorities.
- Section 14.7.14 indicates that only one new lot can be created if land is acquired by a municipality or conservation authority for natural heritage conservation purposes. The creation of one lot does not provide sufficient financial incentive for a land owner to give lands to a public agency. It is suggested that a maximum of two lots be incorporated in the policy.

**iii) *Environment Policy Recommendations***

- Schedule A – Map A1 (Attachment No. 5) be amended to recognize the existing Major Open Space System and the General Agricultural Areas. The natural heritage features are already identified on Schedule B (Attachment No. 6) and do not need to be identified as an overlay on Schedule A.
- Section 2.3.3 should be amended to require the noise and vibrations studies within 750 metres of a railway corridor for plans of subdivision/ condominium only. Such studies should not be required for rezoning or consent applications unless it is determined to be appropriate by the area municipality.
- Section 2.3.12 e) should not be amended as proposed. The policy should only refer to the lands within the Oak Ridges Moraine.
- In order for the Region to properly protect the wellhead protection areas, due to the high degree of restriction on land use in the area, consideration should be given to the purchase of the subject lands by the Region.
- Section 2.3.20 should be deleted in its entirety. Site management and contingency plans should be required only for new development within the wellhead protection area.
- Section 2.3.25 should be amended to clarify that the mapping of high aquifer vulnerability areas is required for the rural area and not within settlement areas.
- Section 2.3.35 should be amended by deleting the last paragraph that allows for the application of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan requirements for environmental impact studies to all area municipalities.
- Section 14.7.14 should be amended to indicate that severances may be permitted provided a maximum of two new lots are created.

**4. *Greenbelt Conformity***

**a) *Proposed Amendment***

- Includes additional policies for the intensification and redevelopment in residential areas;
- Deletes the opportunity to establish any new Country Residential subdivisions, Rural Employment areas, Regional Nodes, Hamlets, and Residential Clusters. No

new farm retirement lots will be permitted and the policies regarding 4 hectare lots are to be deleted.

**b) *Implications to Brock Township***

- Section 4.2.8 has been revised to ensure development within Settlement Areas for next 10 years while maintaining lands with a servicing capacity sufficient for a 3-year supply of residential development. This policy has failed in Cannington. Additional emphasis should be included in the policy so that all settlement areas are clearly subject to the policy.
- Schedule A – Map A1 has been revised to add additional lands to the Shoreline Residential Area north of Port Bolster. This additional area will be included in the mapping for the Brock Official Plan.

**c) *Greenbelt Conformity Recommendations***

- Section 4.2.8 should be further amended to add the reference to all Urban Areas

In summary, the majority of the proposed amendments to the Durham Region Official Plan can be supported. However, it is strongly recommended that the Major Open Space System and the General Agricultural Areas be reinstated in the Official Plan. The Greenbelt Policies are necessarily applied to the Township, however, it is not appropriate to extend the requirements of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan beyond the limits of the Oak Ridges Moraine.

Councillor Reg Starr commented that the Planning Consultant listened well, having included all of Brock's concerns within this report. He commented that Brock is different from other parts of Durham Region. He enquired when the final O/P can be expected, and was advised by Ms. Cranmer that there is still one more component to the O/P review, this being that of population and employment which is to be dealt with over a shorter time frame with the final O/P document to be presented to regional council in August, so that it is finalized before the election. She advised that other Durham municipalities also have concerns. Councillor Starr enquired whether there is need to arrange a deputation between the committee and the regional planning commissioner and was advised it is a consideration, however to wait and see when an appropriate time might be.

Councillor Starr enquired of the Deputy Clerk-Administrator whether a motion is required authorizing a report concerning the population/employment phase of the O/P review and was advised by the Deputy Clerk-Administrator that although there was no committee direction in this regard, that he has asked the planning consultant to prepare a report as part of the O/P review process. The Deputy Clerk-Administrator advised that it has been made clear to the Region, as part of Brock's O/P review the Beaver Avenue issue and thus far staff are encouraged as to the recognition regional staff have shown in this regard, however that it will likely be a struggle with the Province to have Beaver Avenue placed in the Beaverton urban area as employment lands.

Councillor Debbie Bath advised of the need to retain the general agricultural designation and not color all areas with one brush. She noted further that the varied agricultural designations have been acceptable to date. She commented on the abolishment of farm retirement lots which could result in farms on which two houses are located. Furthermore, there are not a lot of residential properties available for sale should a farmer sell his farm. She acknowledged the pros and cons of retirement lots, the need to fight to keep the general agriculture designation and Brock's uniqueness.

Councillor Karen Windatt advised that she has two areas of concern, and that it is sad to lose farm retirement lots which will especially impact that generation of farmers who have had the hardest go at farming and cannot afford a home in town. She added that many farmers do not realize they are not entitled to a retirement lot.

Councillor Windatt advised she was of the impression that the designation of Beaver Avenue as employment lands was a trade off for designated employment lands that are unsuitable for development in Cannington and in Beaverton.

Planning Consultant Valerie Cranmer clarified firstly that the abolishment of farm retirement lots is part of the provincial policy statement.

She advised that as part of the Brock O/P they do not want to take any of the employment lands out of the urban areas nor as part of the employment area study, which was based on the municipality as a whole. As part of the study the designation of Beaver Avenue as employment lands was determined and can be supported due to the issues in Cannington (well head) and in Sunderland.

Councillor Allan Simpson enquired as to the position taken by the Townships of Uxbridge and Scugog insofar as farm retirement lots and was advised that it is not a big issue because they are impacted by the Oak Ridges Moraine legislation. It was noted that Brock Township is the only municipality not impacted by the Oak Ridges Moraine legislation. The City of Pickering has a major issue involving the extension of the Oak Ridges Moraine into their area. At the time of this report, no input was available from the Municipality of Clarington.

Councillor Simpson enquired whether the retirement lot issue could be revisited after ten years and was advised it would take a change in provincial government willing to change the issue. He was further advised that large municipalities in Ontario already have restrictions on severances of this nature.

Councillor John Grant advised of the importance of distinct agricultural lands and the possibility of using them to comply with the recreation and tourism aspect of the Greenbelt legislation.

He commented on the requirement for a noise study in conjunction with severances within 750 metres of a railway corridor which would impact all of Beaverton and feels that these reports are a waste of time and money when each report will be the same.

Councillor Grant requested further information with respect to the requirement for a 10 year land supply for development within settlement areas and a servicing capacity sufficient for a 3 year supply of residential development. Ms. Cranmer explained the intent of this policy is as is stated however that the Region has failed in this regard in the Cannington area as they have not provided the 3 year servicing capacity for the area. There needs to be more emphasis on this policy and an assurance that all urban areas are treated equally.

Councillor John Grant enquired whether in the case of border hamlets i.e. Sonya, whether development on the Brock side would be able to tie into infrastructure on the Kawartha Lakes side, to which Ms. Cranmer advised that this is highly unlikely because Durham Region does not look favourably upon communal systems, although one has been permitted in Coppins Corners. She further advised that if any problems, i.e. soil for septic systems, were discovered with respect to a proposed development for example in Sonya, that development would be limited to 4 houses which is not acceptable to Brock and totally unacceptable from the developer's standpoint.

In closing, Councillor Grant commented that Brock is a large geographic area with no room to retire or be buried, and with provincial and regional policy having far reaching negative implications on Brock.

Chair/Regional Councillor Larry O'Connor enquired with respect to the zoning of the H.W. Knight Public School property for possible use as a health centre and which would permit this use, to which Ms. Cranmer advised that although regional policy deals with health centres being located in urban areas, she is recommending that this policy be expanded to permit this use in a rural area zoned to permit said use.

Chair/Regional Councillor Larry O'Connor commented that the O/P Review report is well done and that he has raised the issue of the purchase of the well head lands in Cannington at regional council, however does not know if it will be a consideration by them.

#### Resolution No. 6-4

MOVED BY Reg Starr that Brock Township Planning committee adopt the recommendations contained within Report #2005-PL-03, reference communication # 308/06.

MOTION CARRIED

VI. REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES - N I L

VII. GENERAL ITEMS & ENQUIRIES

(1) Councillor John Grant – Bill 51

Resolution No. 7-4

MOVED BY John Grant that the Planning Committee request staff to prepare a report with regard to Bill 51 proposals on renewable and non-renewable energy projects, especially the implications of Section 23, reference communications 271 and 272.

MOTION CARRIED

(2) T.G. Gettinby – AIM PowerGen Tour

The Deputy Clerk-Administrator advised he has been contacted by AIM PowerGen and that they are prepared to arrange a tour of their Erie Shores facility. In discussing the tour, the Deputy Clerk-Administrator was instructed to arrange the tour this spring.

(3) Public Questions and Clarification

There were no public questions for clarification.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Resolution No. 8-4

MOVED BY Reg Starr that we do now adjourn at 11:45 a.m.

MOTION CARRIED

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

\_\_\_\_\_  
SECRETARY