

**THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF BROCK**

**MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION BUILDING**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**SESSION TWELVE**

**MONDAY, JUNE 19, 2006**

The Twelfth Meeting of the Planning Committee of the Corporation of the Township of Brock, in the Regional Municipality of Durham, was held on Monday, June 19, 2006, in the Municipal Administration Building Council Chamber.

Members present:	Mayor:	Keith Shier
	Regional Councillor:	Larry O'Connor
	Councillors:	Karen Windatt
		John Grant
		Reg Starr
		Debbie Bath
		Allan Simpson

Staff Members present:	Clerk-Administrator George S. Graham (recording the minutes)
	Deputy Clerk-Administrator Thomas G. Gettinby
	Clerk-Stenographer Susan Creighton
	Planning Consultant Valerie Cranmer, of Valerie Cranmer & Associates

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Larry O'Connor called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

**II. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

- (1) 10th meeting – May 15/06
- (2) 11th meeting – June 5/06

Resolution No. 1-12

MOVED BY Keith Shier that the minutes of the 10th and 11th meetings of the Planning Committee as held on May 15 and June 5, 2006, respectively, be adopted as typed and circulated.

MOTION CARRIED

**III. HEARING OF DEPUTATIONS**

**10:00 a.m.** – Don Shearer – comments re: Township of Brock Draft Official Plan/Durham Region Official Plan Review

Mr. Don Shearer, owner of the north part of lot 24, concession 11, (Cameron Street), Cannington, was present to discuss with the committee, the extension of the Cannington Urban Area easterly to Simcoe Street, inclusive of all or a part of the north part lot 24, concession 11. Mr. Shearer provided each member of the committee with a copy of correspondence number 1287 which contained his presentation as follows:

“It is important to follow centuries old planning principles or your town will be ineffective and social and economic hardships will occur. Please consider the following when planning the future of Brock Township and particularly the Village of Cannington:

- Reports state that employment/developmental lands should be located along major arteries. This is done in the south of Durham and throughout North America.
- Development lands in Cannington appear to be located in inappropriate places. Well heads, high water tables, large buffer zones for sewage ponds and access through/proximity to residential areas create unnecessary difficulties.
- With new Provincial legislation, it is likely that hundreds of small lot dwellings would need to be developed (infilling) before Cannington could extend to its nearest major artery, Simcoe Street. This could take several decades, leaving Cannington with limited visibility at its eastern gateway.
- Gateways to municipalities should be developed with signage and community facilities (Brock Official Plan Review – October 2005). A double pad arena,

- soccer fields, allotment gardens, or seniors' bungalows have already been suggested for this area.
- The donation of some land for community usage or economic development is time-sensitive, due to long-term, previously existing estate plans. These arrangements, and the infill requirements would prohibit development at the eastern gateway of Cannington for many decades if it is not approved shortly.
- Pursuant to Councillor Grant's question about severances, obtaining a severance is not a problem, since the remaining land can be attached to other farm operations in order to create a viable farm unit.

It is important that Brock Township moves forward in a unified, coordinated fashion when approaching Durham Region for approval of additional urban area land. I would be pleased to provide any further information if required."

Councillor Allan Simpson enquired of the Planning Consultant how severances can be obtained and was advised that a severance for a community facility would be in accordance with the Durham Official Plan and the Greenbelt Legislation. A lot line adjustment would be feasible as there is policy in this regard in the Durham Official Plan. Mrs. Cranmer advised that the Provincial Growth Plan became legislation on June 16 and will address severances, however retirement lots will not be permitted.

Councillor Allan Simpson enquired whether the Provincial Growth Plan supersedes the Greenbelt Legislation and was advised by Mrs. Cranmer that the Greenbelt Legislation "hasn't gone away" and that the Provincial Growth Plan will only increase restraints in urban areas with respect to infilling, intensification and boundary expansion.

#### IV. PETITIONS – N I L

#### V. COMMUNICATIONS REFERRED OR SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEE

- 1188 Durham Clerk's Department – Notice of Adoption of Amendment #112 to the Durham Regional Official Plan (Sunpark Developments Inc.)
- 1191 Durham Clerk's Department – Monitoring of Growth Trends
- 1240 Donald and Margaret Shearer – written submission regarding the inclusion of lands in the Cannington Urban Area
- 1234 Town of Georgina – Notice of Passing of Zoning By-law 500-2006-0006
- 1236 LSRCA – 2005 Environmental Monitoring Report
- 1287 Don Shearer re: Extending the Urban Area of Cannington to Simcoe Street, including all or part of the north part of lot 24, concession 11, Brock Township (Eastern Gateway to Cannington)

#### Resolution No. 2-12

MOVED BY John Grant that the Planning Committee receive communications 1188, 1191, 1240, 1234, 1236 and 1287 for information and filed.

#### MOTION CARRIED

- 1213 Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. – Simcoe Landing Golf Academy – Kaneff Capital Properties Inc. – Part of Lot 16 & 17, Concession 4, Township of Brock (Former Township of Thorah)

#### Resolution No. 3-12

MOVED BY Karen Windatt that the Township of Brock Planning Committee ask staff to proceed with implementation of the zoning by-law with the appropriate conditions which include the "H" provision, reference communication # 1213.

#### MOTION CARRIED

Councillor Karen Windatt advised that the intent of this motion is to give the applicant some assurance insofar as proceeding with the proposal.

Mayor Keith Shier advised that he and the Deputy Clerk-Administrator recently met with the proponents, at which time they advised that considerable funds will need to be expended to meet the requirements of the LSRCA, and they do not want to expend these funds and not have the zoning issue for the golf course resolved.

Councillor John Grant enquired when council can expect to see the required by-law and was advised on June 26, 2006.

1240 Donald and Margaret Shearer – written submission regarding the inclusion of lands in the Cannington Urban Area /offer of 20 acres for Township or Regional use

1258 Valerie Cranmer & Associates – memorandum re: Resolution 5, Brock Council Session – June 12, 2006

1287 Don Shearer re: Extending the Urban Area of Cannington to Simcoe Street, including all or part of the north part of lot 24, concession 11, Brock Township (Eastern Gateway to Cannington)

#### Resolution No. 4-12

MOVED BY Reg Starr that Brock Township Planning Committee refer the proposal to extend the easterly boundary of Cannington to include the north part of lot 24, concession 11, Brock Township to the next Brock Township Official Plan Review, reference communications # 1240, 1258 and 1287.

Mayor Keith Shier enquired what would happen should the committee consider extending Cannington's urban boundary easterly to Simcoe Street and was advised by Ms. Cranmer that the request would require Regional and Provincial approval in accordance with the Greenbelt Legislation and Places to Grow Legislation which both indicate no urban boundary extensions for 10 years.

The Deputy Clerk-Administrator advised that Brock's Official Plan must conform with the Durham Official Plan and the Greenbelt Legislation and that Durham Region will consider approval of the Brock Official Plan with the exception of the boundary extension.

Municipal Planning Consultant Valerie Cranmer clarified that boundary extension involving Beaver Avenue will be a consideration due to the action taken by council prior to the Greenbelt Legislation.

Mayor Keith Shier reiterated that approval of boundary extension requests, hinge on the Durham Official Plan and the Greenbelt Legislation and was advised in the affirmative.

Councillor John Grant enquired whether lands requested to be included within the urban boundaries, including those of Mr. Shearer, if approved, will remain on current mapping and was advised by Ms. Cranmer in the affirmative, however, she has noted other municipal areas in the Durham Official Plan mapping as special study areas and that if need be, she could speak to Durham Region in this regard insofar as properties in Brock Twp.

Councillor Karen Windatt commented that Provincial legislation prohibits urban boundary expansion for 10 years and yet resolution number 4-12 requests consideration to include Mr. Shearer's lands during the next 5 year Brock Official Plan Review, which even if included, would mean that the lands would still sit for another 5 years.

Councillor Reg Starr clarified that no time has been identified in that within the next 9 years, legislation could change to permit urban boundary expansion.

Councillor Debbie Bath commented on the need to identify areas of future growth and the need to have these lands documented in order to form the basis for support for future consideration.

Chair Larry O'Connor commented that although the Brock Official Plan Review has been completed, would a rezoning application on the subject lands be precluded and was advised by Ms. Cranmer that a zoning amendment would not be precluded. She advised further that the Steering Committee also wanted record to show that the municipality is looking ahead in terms of boundary expansion and that this information as well as motions passed by the Planning Committee in this regard will form part of the public record.

Mayor Keith Shier suggested a friendly amendment to resolution number 4-12, this being that the lands in question be included as a special future study area in order to indicate that Brock recognizes the need for growth and to possibly stimulate Durham Region to increase water and sewer capacity.

Resolution No. 4-12

MOVED BY Reg Starr that Brock Township Planning Committee refer the proposal to extend the easterly boundary of Cannington to include the north part of lot 24, concession 11, Brock Township to the next Brock Township Official Plan Review as a special future study area, reference communications # 1240, 1258 and 1287.

MOTION CARRIED

1231 Valerie Cranmer & Associates – Report 2006-PL-10 – Brock Township Official Plan – June 26, 2006

Ms. Cranmer outlined briefly the changes directed by Planning Committee on June 5, 2006, her report to the committee being as follows:

SUBJECT

BROCK TOWNSHIP OFFICIAL PLAN  
JUNE 26, 2006

---

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Brock Township Official Plan dated June 26, 2006 be adopted and forwarded to the Region of Durham for approval; and,
2. That the Region of Durham be requested to amend the Durham Region Official Plan to implement Brock Township Official Plan dated June 26, 2006 as adopted by Council.

---

ATTACHMENTS

- No. 1: Summary of Written Submissions Received
- 2: Revised Urban Area Maps

---

REPORT

**1. Background**

On June 5, 2006, Planning Committee considered the proposed Brock Township Official Plan.

This report will address the comments received from the public and the relevant agencies since May 8, 2006, incorporate revisions to the Official Plan as directed by Planning Committee on June 5, and identify additional revisions as a result of comments received from the public and agencies. In addition, in order to approve the Brock Township

Official Plan it will be necessary to request that the Region make a number of amendments to the Durham Region Official Plan. These will be identified.

## **2. Written Submissions and Delegations to Committee**

A number of submissions have been received from the public and agencies prior to the June 5, 2006 meeting of Planning Committee. These new submissions, numbered 48 to 55, have been summarized in the attached Summary of Written Submissions (Attachment No. 1).

In addition to the written submissions, there were five delegations made to Planning Committee on June 5<sup>th</sup>. The following are the issues raised:

- Herb Goldie – requested that the former eastern boundary of the Village of Cannington be reinstated (prior to 1974) and there needs to be some consideration of development in Cannington on private and/or partial services rather than on full municipal services only.
- Alan Noor – requested that the Open Space designation for lands within the Beaverton Urban Area between Mara Road and the eastern urban area boundary north of existing residential development and east of the Mixed Use Corridor be designated Residential.
- Alan Noor – requested on behalf of Cameron Ross that lands in Lot 12, Concession VI, adjacent to Beaverton be designated Future Employment Area and Future Residential Area as shown in the Draft Official Plan prepared by the Steering Committee.
- Don Shearer – requested that the Cannington Urban Area be extended easterly to include the lands at Simcoe and Cameron Streets.
- Ed Barkey – requests that there be opportunity to develop in Cannington on private/partial services and that the lands north of the Beaver River and west of Laidlaw Street be redesignated to Residential

## **3. Planning Committee Direction – June 5, 2006**

In accordance with direction received from Planning Committee on June 5, 2006, there are a number of revisions to the Urban Area Maps and the Policies of the Brock Official Plan. The requested map changes are detailed below and contained in Attachment No. 2.

### **A. Maps**

#### **Map 1 – A Beaverton Urban Area**

Within the Urban Area

1. Lands on south side of Victoria Avenue between Cedar Street and Mara Road to be designated Residential from Open Space. The Open Space designation had been requested by LSRCA as they are in the flood plain and are vacant. The lands are designated Residential and Hazard Land in the existing Brock Official Plan and are presently zoned R1 and EP.
2. Lands between Mara Road and the eastern Urban Area boundary in Part Lot 13, Concession 6, north of existing residential development and east of the Mixed Use Corridor from Open Space to Residential. The Open Space designation had been requested by LSRCA as they are in the flood plain and are vacant. The lands are designated Residential in the existing Brock Official Plan and are presently zoned Development.

Outside the Urban Area

1. Add the Future Residential and Employment Development Areas that were identified in the draft Official Plan prepared by the Steering Committee

**Map 2 - A Cannington Urban Area**

## Within the Urban Area

1. Lands west of Laidlaw, on the north side of the Beaver River within part Lot 20, Concession 12 be redesignated to Residential Area from Open Space. The Open Space designation had been requested by LSRCA as they are in the flood plain and are vacant. These lands are designated Residential in the existing Brock Official Plan.

## Outside the Urban Area

1. Extend the Urban Area boundary in the vicinity of the community of Saginaw, Part Lot 18, Concessions 11 and 12 and Part Lot 19, Concession 12 as Residential Area and Open Space Area as identified in the Draft Official Plan prepared by the Steering Committee.

2. Extend the Urban Area boundary to include the lands adjacent to the south urban boundary in Part Lot 20, Concession 11, between the land being developed for the school and the Beaver River as Residential Area and Open Space Area.

3. Extend the Urban Area boundary to the east to incorporate Part of Lots 22 and 23, concessions 11 and 12 and east of the former railway corridor as Open Space Area and Residential Area to reflect the boundary of the former Village of Cannington prior to 1974.

**Map 3 – A Sunderland Urban Area**

## Outside the Urban Area

1. Include the existing employment lands located in the south east quadrant of River Street and Highway 12 in the Urban Area as Employment Lands.

2. Include the existing employment lands located in the southwest corner of Highway 12 and Albert Street South.

**B. Policies**

As directed by Planning Committee

1. The inclusion of policies to address the Future Development Areas.
2. 5.2.3.7 Replace the last sentence in this section with the following:

“Until such time that the sewage system is expanded in Cannington, residential development will be permitted in the urban area on partial/private services in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Durham Region Official Plan.”

As requested by LSRCA

1. 4.11.3 Add to the last sentence of this section “and would be located in accordance with the General Policies and the Natural Heritage Policies of the Greenbelt Plan such that the last sentence would read as follows:

“This facility would be located in accordance with the General Policies and the Natural Heritage Policies of the Greenbelt Plan.”

2. 4.5.4 Replace the third sentence with the following:

“Existing development subject to riverine or lake flood or erosion hazards may be considered for redevelopment, replacements or additions provided that the effects to public safety and property damage can be managed or mitigated.”

3. 5.6.3.9 Insert “and hydrogeologic study” after Assessment in both sentences in the first paragraph so that it reads as follows:

“The lands north east of the Beaver Avenue Employment Area are designated Open Space. Prior to the approval of new development, a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment and Hydrogeological Study will be required to be conducted to the satisfaction of the Township and the Lake Simcoe Conservation Authority to determine the limits of the Open Space area and the required setbacks from development. The Environmental Impact Assessment and Hydrogeological Study shall determine.”

4. 5.6.3.9 add the following subsection e):

“e) the identification of appropriate buffers to mitigate the impacts of development.”

5. 7.3.2.1 Insert the following sentence after the first sentence in this section:

“The scope of the required Environmental Impact Assessment should be determined through discussions with the appropriate Conservation Authority prior to its commencement.”

6. 7.3.4.5 Revise the sentence to change “fenced” to “may require fencing” so that the policy reads as follows:

“ Stormwater management facilities shall be appropriately landscaped and may require fencing to create a facility that is safe and visually pleasing and that enhances the natural environment.”

#### Additional Revision Suggested by Staff

1. Section 5.6.3.1 should be revised to clarify that limited development in the Beaver Avenue Employment Area can proceed on the basis of private services. The last sentence in this section should be replaced with the following:

“ Limited development within the Beaver Avenue employment Area may be permitted on the basis of private septic systems and private drilled wells.”

#### **4. Amendments to the Durham Region Official Plan**

Prior to granting final approval to the Brock Township Official Plan, the following amendments to the Durham Region Official Plan will be required:

- Beaverton Urban Area to be expanded to include the Beaver Avenue Employment Area;
- Beaverton Urban Area to be expanded to include the future Residential and Future Employment Areas;
- Cannington Urban Area to be expanded to include:
  - a) the Saginaw Area;
  - b) the area to the south, north of the Beaver River;
  - c) the area to the east to reinstate the former limits of the Village of Cannington;
- and,
- Extend the Sunderland Urban Area to include the two existing Employment Areas.

#### Resolution No. 5-12

MOVED BY Reg Starr that Brock Township Planning Committee adopt the recommendations contained within Report 2006-PL-10, reference communication # 1231/06.

Councillor John Grant enquired why the Cannington urban boundary was adjusted in 1974 and was advised by the Deputy Clerk-Administrator that the original boundary was dissolved as the result of the Region of Durham Act and that he is not aware of why the original corporate boundaries were not retained, it possibly having something to do with servicing. The Deputy Clerk-Administrator pointed out that Cannington is only one of two areas in Durham Region with a partial service designation.

Councillor Grant enquired if we cannot expand our urban boundaries, would correction of the original corporate boundaries be a valid argument to which the Deputy Clerk-Administrator advised that a motion will be forthcoming incorporating what the

committee has requested and that this will form part of the rationale, however we do not know how it will stand up against the Greenbelt Legislation.

Councillor Grant enquired when Durham Region will consider Brock's Official Plan and was advised this fall.

Resolution No. 5-12

MOVED BY Reg Starr that Brock Township Planning Committee adopt the recommendations contained within Report 2006-PL-10, reference communication # 1231/06.

MOTION CARRIED

1275 Valerie Cranmer & Associates – Report 2006-PL-11 – Durham Official Plan Review – Population, Employment and Urban Land

Ms. Cranmer's report is as follows:

SUBJECT

DURHAM REGION OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS FOR THE POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT AND URBAN LAND COMPONENTS

---

RECOMMENDATIONS

3. That Council endorse the recommendations contained in this report on the Proposed Amendments for the Population, Employment and Urban Land Components of the Durham Region Official Plan;
  4. That Report 2006-PL-11, be forwarded to the Planning Commissioner of the Region of Durham for consideration in the Review of the Durham Region Official Plan; and,
  5. That Report 2006-PL-11, be forwarded to the area municipalities in Durham Region.
- 

ATTACHMENTS

No. 1: Durham Region Report 2006-P-39 (Extracts)

---

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 five opportunities to provide formal comments to the Region. The most recent report was considered on April 25, 2006, when Planning Committee considered the proposed policy directions for the Population, Employment and Urban Land components of the Durham Region Official Plan.

The purpose of this report is to address the proposed amendments for the three remaining components of the Official Plan Review – Population, Employment and Urban Land. The Region's report regarding the Proposed Amendments for Population, Employment and Urban Land issued by the Regional Planning Department on April 25, 2006 is appended to this report as Attachment No. 1.

## **2. Specific Comments**

Overall, the proposed amendments to the Durham Region Official Plan with respect to the Population, Employment and Urban Land component can be supported with a few notable exceptions. There are serious concerns with the small amount of consideration in addressing the issues being faced by the northern municipalities. Prior to the preparation of this report, staff met with staff of the Township of Uxbridge to discuss shared concerns. In addition, staff, together with the Uxbridge staff, are in the process of establishing a meeting with the Regional Planning Department.

The specific comments in this report are based on those issues identified in the March 20, 2006 report previously considered by Planning Committee. This report will focus on those identified areas of concern, the corresponding recommended amendment and its implications to Brock Township.

### **2.A Population Forecasts**

The Region was requested to re-examine the population forecasts for the Township of Brock to more appropriately address the anticipated rate of growth in Brock's urban areas over the next 25 years. The Region responded that it will continue to allocate growth to the area municipalities based on a historical share of growth approach. This translates into approximately 30 new residential units annually in the Township.

The historical share of growth approach does not take into account the growth pressures presently being felt by the Township. The Township of Brock should closely monitor the rate of growth experienced in the settlement areas in the next five years to provide a basis for a re-evaluation of the anticipated rate of growth for the municipality in the next 25 years and to raise the priority for the Region to address the servicing constraints in Sunderland and Cannington.

### **2.B Jobs to Population Ratio Target and Employment Forecasts**

The Township suggested that the Regional Official Plan should recognize the importance of achieving complete communities in each area municipality with an appropriate balance of population and employment. This would provide a strong foundation for the Region being a "complete community". The revised Section 7.3.2 provides the population and employment forecasts by area municipality.

The Region has responded to Brock's position by stating that "as a general goal, it is desirable for each community to strive towards an improved balance of population and employment. However, some communities are better located than others in terms of attracting employment opportunities, but still may be located close enough to those communities with fewer employment opportunities to generally serve their needs and the needs of Durham Region as a whole."

It is noted that additional Employment Lands are proposed to be designated in the southern municipalities along the Highway 401 and 407 transportation corridors. The Region does not acknowledge the difficulties experienced by the northern municipalities in attracting employment uses that are required to ensure that they become "complete communities".

### **2.C Services**

Section 5.3.11 requires the Region to prepare a servicing plan for water supply and sanitary sewerage facilities, at least every five years, to establish servicing requirements of the designated urban areas. This policy is in the existing official plan and ties the servicing plan to the population and employment forecasts and future intensification. This policy has been used in the past by the Region to avoid addressing the servicing constraints in the Township and specifically Cannington, due to the lack of demand for residential growth. There has been little acknowledgment that growth cannot occur until such time as the servicing constraints are addressed.

Section 5.3.19 is a policy that addresses the investigation into the provision of servicing capacity for the urban areas located in the Townships of Brock, Scugog and Uxbridge. Discussions with the Region have indicated that such investigations for Brock Township

may not occur until some time after 2025. Twenty years is too long to permit a designated urban area to stagnate, especially since there has been extremely limited development in Cannington during the last twenty years, mainly due to the servicing constraints. No expansions to the urban areas are to be permitted until a servicing strategy is in place.

It is recommended that the Region commit, through the inclusion of a policy in the Official Plan, to pursuing the investigation for providing additional servicing capacity in Cannington and Sunderland by 2010. Such an investigation could be completed prior to a review of Brock Official Plan that would be conducted prior to 2015 that would address, among other items, any expansions of the urban areas in accordance with the provisions of the Greenbelt Plan.

It is also recommended that an exemption be granted to the inclusion of the Beaver Avenue Employment Area into the Beaverton Urban Area prior to the completion of a strategy to provide full municipal services to the area. This would allow for the approval of this critical component of the Brock Official Plan.

## **2.D Designated Urban Areas**

The Official Plan provides for the expansion of the southern Urban Areas to take full advantage of the economic potential of exposure to major transportation corridors, specifically Highways 401 and 407. The Region has acknowledged that there is an over designation of Employment Lands in the south and that this over designation is justified by the location. The same treatment is not provided to the north. There is no identification of the need to provide expansion areas that can take advantage of highway locations such as Highway 12, 48/404. In fact the policy that applies to the northern municipalities automatically defers the consideration of any expansions, such as the Beaver Avenue area. The purpose of the inclusion of the Beaver Avenue area in the Beaverton Urban Area is to allow the Township to take advantage of the exposure to Highway 12.

Policies in a Regional Official Plan should apply to all areas. The need for Employment Lands with highway exposure is a main basis for the designation of such lands in the south, and it should be accepted as a main basis for the designation of Employment Lands in the northern municipalities. A more proactive policy regarding the three northern municipalities should be included in the Official Plan. Any policies regarding expansions should be applied across the region – especially in regard to expansion areas adjacent to major transportation corridors. It is also recommended that a specific policy be included in the Official Plan regarding Highway 404.

## **2.E Future Urban Area Boundary Expansions**

Section 7.3.12 addresses the requirement for a comprehensive Official Plan review in order to expand the urban boundaries. Although it is not explicit in the policy, a comprehensive review of an area municipal official plan that results in an amendment initiated by the area municipality would qualify under this policy. The clarification is provided in the definition of “Comprehensive Review”. It is recommended that the definition be clarified by deleting “that is intended to bring the area municipal official plan into conformity with this Plan” from the last sentence of the definition. It should be clarified, either in the policy or in the definition, that a comprehensive review does not necessarily mean the required 5-year review of the Official Plan.

## **2.F Employment Areas**

There is no recognition that the Employment Lands in the Township, are for the most part, inappropriately located and designated. In order for Brock Township to become a “complete community” and be on the same basis as the other area municipalities in Durham, the Region must recognize the locational difficulties inherent in the presently designated vacant Employment Lands and permit the designation of more appropriately located Employment Lands and the redesignation of existing Employment Lands.

Section 1.3.1 o) provides the following direction for the Region of “protecting designated employment lands from conversion to other uses”. The policies in the Brock Official Plan are in direct contradiction with this direction as the owners of the poorly located and

difficult to service designated Employment Lands in the Township are encouraged to discuss the redesignation of such lands with the Township. In addition, some of the Township's Employment Lands are constrained by the wellhead protection policies of the Region and uses permitted in such areas.

The Region is proposing a policy that addresses the redesignation of Employment Areas to other uses. One section of this policy (8C.2.16 c) would not permit the conversion of the Employment Areas if it results in an expansion of the Urban Area Boundary. There is a concern that this policy will have a negative impact on the approval of the Beaver Avenue Employment Area.

It is recommended that a second notwithstanding clause similar to the policy for Brownfield sites, be added to this section that would exempt the consideration of an urban area expansion to replace employment lands that have been negatively impacted by the well head protection requirements and environmentally sensitive lands.

## **2.G Schedule 'A' – Map 'A1'**

The schedule for the Township of Brock has a number of significant additions and revisions that should be noted:

- the 1991 built area boundary has been added for each of the three urban centres.
- The Greenbelt Boundary has been added and includes the complete township

The recognition of the built area boundary is required by the Provincial Growth Plan. It will be used as a basis for determining whether the municipality has fulfilled the 40% infilling requirement prior to additional lands being considered for future growth. It is recommended that the 1991 built boundary not be used by the Region and that the appropriate built area boundary include the lands that have received draft approval.

### Resolution No. 6-12

MOVED BY John Grant that the Planning Committee receive Report 2006-PL-11 and approve the recommendations, reference communication 1275.

Councillor John Grant thanked Ms. Cranmer for the report advising that it includes our concerns which will prevent the municipality from becoming a sustainable community. He advised that his concern respecting intensification policies is that the small town life that everyone wants, could be destroyed and the character of our downtown cores changed.

Councillor Debbie Bath commented on the Region's lack of recognizing the importance of Hwy. 404 to Brock Township and the need to be prepared for its arrival. She commented on the fact that historically the municipality has been unable to meet population targets and that the planners are not realistically looking ahead in this regard when it comes to Brock Township. She advised that development is slowly moving north for which Brock must be prepared, and Durham Region must consider, especially in the field of service capacity.

Councillor Bath enquired whether Brock will be an initial commenting agency prior to the results of the water and waste water study currently being undertaken by Durham Region, going to Regional Planning. She advised that the municipality needs some assurance that capacity issues will be addressed in the immediate future.

Councillor Allan Simpson enquired of Ms. Cranmer what the surface area of Brownfield lands is and was advised by Ms. Cranmer that there is a notwithstanding clause within the Durham Official Plan with respect to Brownfield's and that a similar clause pertaining to employment lands has been included in the Brock Official Plan due to the fact that Durham Region feels Brock has too many employment lands and that some need to be surrendered to justify Beaver Avenue.

Chair Larry O'Connor enquired of Ms. Cranmer whether other municipalities in Durham are facing restrictions, i.e. wellhead protection, similar to those being faced in Brock and was advised that Uxbridge Township is facing similar well head protection issues.

Resolution No. 6-12

MOVED BY John Grant that the Planning Committee receive Report 2006-PL-11 and approve the recommendations, reference communication 1275.

MOTION CARRIED

VI. REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES – N I L

VII. GENERAL ITEMS & ENQUIRIES

- (1) Chair Larry O’Connor – Public Meeting in July

Chair Larry O’Connor advised that staff have received an application for rezoning and need to arrange the required public meeting. He enquired whether a quorum would be available for a public meeting to be arranged on a Monday evening near the end of July. Staff were directed to proceed accordingly in this regard.

- (2) Public Questions and Clarification

There were no public questions for clarification.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Resolution No. 7-12

MOVED BY John Grant that we do now adjourn at 11:12 a.m.

MOTION CARRIED

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHAIR

\_\_\_\_\_  
SECRETARY