

Special Joint Meeting
Planning Committee and Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee
Extract of Draft Minutes 4
Monday, January 25, 2021; Tuesday, January 26, 2021

New Official Plan: Growth Management Report II - Lands Proposed for Residential and Industrial Urban Expansion

ACS2021-PIE-EDP-0001

City Wide

Report recommendations

That the Joint Planning Committee and Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Direct staff to include mapping and policies to establish a Gold Belt in the new Official Plan, as described in this report, such that the Gold Belt be primarily composed of Agricultural Resource lands, aggregate resource areas and natural areas and with the intent that this Belt be established to contain future urban expansion in the City of Ottawa until the end of the century;**
- 2. Direct staff to submit to Council amending by-laws to the Tree Protection and Site Alteration By-laws to apply the relevant provisions of each by-law to protect trees and natural features on any land areas evaluated in Documents 2 or 3 until such time as the new Official Plan is approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and the appropriate limits of each by-law's protections are finalised in accordance with that decision;**
- 3. Approve the Category 1 lands identified in Appendix A and described in Document 2, representing land clusters of 1,011 hectares that best meet the evaluation criteria and the Five Big Moves, as candidate areas to be added to the urban boundary in the new Official Plan, and direct staff to insert this Appendix into the draft Official Plan for technical circulation purposes;**
- 4. Direct staff to include gating policies for mobility and infrastructure**

upgrades that are required before development can take place as part of the recommended urban expansion of Category 1 lands in Appendices A and B that will be recommended to Council in the draft Official Plan;

5. Direct staff to identify an additional 270 hectares to be added to the urban boundary for future neighbourhoods under the approved Growth Management Strategy, and to report back to Council with informed recommendations, no later than Q4 2026, on one of these options:

i) Distributed option: An analysis of Category 2 lands identified in Appendix B and described in Document 2 which represent parcels distributed around and contiguous to the existing urban boundary and/or to lands recommended for inclusion under Recommendation 2, and prepare necessary gating policies for mobility and infrastructure upgrades that are required before development can take place;

OR

ii) An analysis of three possible concentrated options: An analysis of all Category 3 lands identified in Appendix C and described in Document 3, and outline the financial, planning, infrastructure, transit, transportation, geotechnical and environmental considerations necessary to be analyzed as listed in Appendix D, following Council approval of the Transportation Master Plan;

OR

iii) A focused analysis of a single concentrated option: An analysis of Category 3 lands identified in Appendix C and described in Document 3 only for a single concentrated option at a location that has the largest amount of available land, and outline the financial, planning, infrastructure, transit, transportation, geotechnical, hydrological, environmental and ecological considerations and proponent-financed studies necessary to be analyzed as listed in Appendix D, following Council approval of the Transportation Master Plan;

6. Direct staff to monitor the uptake of identified growth lands, and the

- number of units created through intensification against the growth management strategy adopted by Council in May 2020, and report back to Council on the City's compliance with the Provincial Policy Statement's requirement for a 15-year land supply no later than Q4 2026;
7. Receive and adopt the Industrial and Logistics Land Strategy, attached as Document 5;
 8. Approve the lands identified in Appendix D, representing land clusters of 140 net hectares, for inclusion in the urban boundary as new Traditional Industrial, Freight and Storage lands and direct staff to insert this Appendix into the draft Official Plan for technical circulation purposes;
 9. Approve the lands identified in Appendix E, representing land clusters of 20 net hectares, as new Rural Industrial, Freight and Storage lands and direct staff to insert this Appendix into the draft Official Plan for technical circulation purposes;
 10. Direct staff, through the new Official Plan, to convert the lands shown as Industrial Area 1 in the Richmond Secondary Plan to a non-industrial land use; and include an area-specific policy for the area southeast of McBean Street and the railway with the intention of requiring a secondary planning process to provide the requirements in Section 12 of the new Official Plan that amends the Richmond Secondary Plan prior to any approvals for plans of subdivision or site plans within this area;
 11. That the Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee and Planning Committee be delegated the authority:
 - i) To hold the public meetings pursuant to the *Planning Act* for the consideration of the comprehensive Official Plan; and
 - ii) To receive a report and provide recommendations to Council with respect to any draft decision by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing with respect to the comprehensive Official Plan.

The following staff provided a presentation and/or responded to questions:

- Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department:

- ❖ Steve Willis, General Manager
- ❖ Don Herweyer, Director, Economic Development and Long Range Planning
- ❖ Alain Miguelez, Manager, Policy Planning
- ❖ Royce Fu, Planner III
- Innovative Client Services Department:
 - ❖ Tim Marc, Senior Legal Counsel-Planning, Development & Real Estate
- Transportation Services Department
 - ❖ Jennifer Armstrong, Program Manager, Transportation Policy & Networks

The committee heard from the following 40 delegations:

1. Lynn Clouthier, Algonquin Negotiation Representative of Ottawa on behalf of the Algonquins of Ontario, and Janet Stavinga, Executive Director, Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office. The following members of their consultant team were also available to answer questions: Cyndi Rottenberg-Walker, Urban Strategies Inc.; Craig Lametti, Urban Strategies Inc. ; David Gilbert, Paterson Group; Steve Pichette, David Schaeffer Engineering Ltd.; Chris Gordon, CGH Transportation. They requested that the lands encompassing Tewin (the Algonquins of Ontario's vision for a new sustainable, connected and inclusive community), described as 'Leitrim East/Carlsbad West Potential New Community' in the Category 3 lands that require further study to determine viability for urban development, be included in the urban boundary now, to allow the planning process to begin.
2. Gib Patterson, Patterson Group, landowners of Findlay Creek, introduced Francois Juneau and Jaime Posen, to speak to their properties in Findlay Creek, and was available for questions.
3. Francois Juneau, Multivesco, landowners of Findlay Creek, spoke to the master plan for the Findlay creek parcels (north of the future Earl Armstrong Transit priority corridor) and argued they would score high enough to be given priority for inclusion in the additional 270 hectares to be added to the urban boundary for future neighbourhoods.

4. Jaime Posen, Fotenn, landowners of Findlay Creek (Hawthorne lands), provided site context and expanded on the master plan details for the parcels, including transit access and possible housing density, suggesting the lands meet the Official Plan goals and criteria for inclusion in the urban boundary.
5. Andrew Glass, O'Keefe Court Properties Limited, requested 6.7 ha of land known as O'Keefe Court Properties (4497 O'Keefe Court) be added to the urban boundary and suggested the lands may have been omitted from inclusion as a result of methodology that inadvertently conflated servicing transit and community integration issues.
6. Jason McDonald, speaking as Chair, Barrhaven Business Improvement Area, and Realtor, MacDonald Property Group, spoke in support of the majority of the proposed expansion lands to enhance communities outside the Green Belt and spoke to a lack of affordable housing and housing stock in general in Ottawa.
7. Wayne French, Board Member, Carp Road Corridor BIA and Roddy Bolivar, Executive Director and Board Member, Carp Road Corridor BIA, included their comments on this report when speaking to Agenda items 1 and 2 for this meeting (1. Inventory of Vacant Industrial and Business Park Land, 2018-2019 Update; 2. Ottawa Employment Survey, 2016). They spoke to the role of the Carp Road Corridor Rural Employment Area in the economic development in Ottawa and asked the City to consider preparing a sector specific strategic plan to grow Ottawa's light industry sector.
8. Paul Hicks, RPP and Principal at Re:Public Urbanism, spoke to the proposed Industrial and Logistics Land Strategy and suggested a lack of land has been identified in the city to supply large industrial and logistics operational needs; he requested that 34 ha of land located on Highway 416 and Fallowfield Road be given industrial, Freight and Storage designation. Michel Pilon, CEO from Avenue 31 Inc., was also available for questions on this matter.
9. Danny Page, Valecraft Homes Ltd., spoke about his vacant and underutilized property at 255 Wall Road in the Notre Dame des Champs village that abuts the urban boundary on two sides and asked that the City explore the feasibility for Notre Dame des Champs to be considered a serviced village.
10. Shawn Hamilton, Building Owners and Managers' Association of Ottawa

(BOMA), was concerned that the recommendations being brought forward will erase possible industrial distribution hubs. He suggested the size and location of current available lands and proposed land will not alleviate industrial lands shortage and will not draw new industrial users, and recommended the City create industrial redevelopment corridors (if/when needed) along Highways 416/417.

11. Murray Chown, representing Len Payne, raised concerns that the description of the gold belt in the report does not reflect what was intended, does not recognize rural employment areas or rural lot subdivisions within the proposed gold belt, does not allow for opportunities to designate employment opportunities where there is an identified need and inhibits such developments that would be allowed in draft Official Plan.
12. Stephanie Morris, Senior Land Use Planner, Portfolio Planning, Infrastructure and Environment Group, Department of National Defence (DND), spoke in support of the proposal to exclude the lands at 1225 March Valley Road from the urban boundary, as they should not be considered compatible with residential land uses given proximity to the Connaught Range, which will continue to be used by the DND for its needs, including the use of explosive ordnance.
13. Alex Cullen, President, Federation of Citizens Associations (FCA), re-affirmed the FCA's previously stated opposition to urban sprawl, spoke in support of supports the proposed Gold Belt to protect Agricultural Resource lands, aggregate resource lands, and natural areas from future urban development, and raised concerns about the implications of establishing a new urban centre in the Leitrim East/Carlsbad West area (option 3), with no infrastructure to accommodate it and the high cost and impacts to provide servicing, roads and rapid transit.
14. Murray Chown, Carp Road Landowners (south of 417 and east of Carp Road), supported the inclusion of lands south of Highway 417 and east of Carp Road in the urban area but suggested that designating all of the lands east of Carp Road and north of the current urban boundary as Traditional Industrial Freight and Storage results in a significant oversupply of industrial lands, and that it would be appropriate to designate lands that are more than 500m from the existing quarry and land fill north of Highway 417 for residential purposes.

15. Dr. Judy Makin supported the Gold Belt proposal but opposed the proposal for the potential South March new community. She suggested the combined Category 1 and Category 3 lands that have been identified in this area for inclusion in the boundary would create a massive urban community that is not needed and would take away land that is being actively farmed.
16. Paul Johanis, Chair, Greenspace Alliance of Canada's Capital, called for the establishment of strong measures to guarantee the long term effectiveness of the proposed Gold Belt to contain future urban expansion and for measures to forestall urban expansion in gap lands between the urban boundary and the Gold Belt until at least 2046, while dealing with the climate emergency. GACC also recommends that the report to be provided by 2026 include the cost benefit analysis of achieving the remaining projected growth through increased intensification targets.
17. Murray Chown, Riverside South Landowners (Riverside South Development Corporation (Urbandale); Richcraft; the Mion family, Tomlinson/Cardel), advocated for the lands west of River Road, north of Rideau Road and to the east of the Bowesville lands (being 673 Rideau Road, 805 Rideau Road, 4975 Spratt Road, 1420 Earl Armstrong Road, and 1379 Rideau Road) to be considered for urban expansion, as these lands, if evaluated by staff, would have scored as high as many "Pass 1" lands, higher than many "Pass 2" lands and higher than many "Category 2" and "Category 3" lands, are located well within 1,900 metres of existing or planned transit stations, round out an existing neighbourhood, and Rideau Road provides a rational urban boundary to reinforce the separation between the suburban and rural Transect areas and a rationale separation between the urban area and Agricultural Resource Area lands, should Council direct staff to establish a Gold Belt in the Official Plan.
18. Kevin Murphy, Vice President, Land Development, Mattamy Homes Canada, raised concerns the current proposal will not introduce a sufficient quantity of land to support future growth and meet the City's approved intensification objectives and suggested that increased development charges would help pay for infrastructure in the fastest-growing employment development areas. Mattamy feels that staff should have been more generous in assessing their lands at 800 Cedarview Road and should have determined the property serviceable with

respect to storm, sanitary and water servicing.

19. Ursula Melinz, Soloway Wright LLP, for Cavanagh Developments, indicated the Gold Belt proposition was not made known to her client or the industry at large before this agenda was published; she questioned the need for a Gold Belt, sought clarification of what would be included/excluded, and recommended further study and consultation with the industry on the policies that would encompass it. She suggested certain parcels of land would not meet the criteria for inclusion and should be excluded.
20. Matt Nesrallah, Cavanagh Developments, indicated the Gold belt proposal, as written, fails to make concessions for lands that have existing status, such as various parcels within the Cavanagh lands (being 6700 Hazeldean Rd., 251 Jinkinson Rd., 6631 Fernbank Rd. 329 Jinkinson Rd, 2596 Carp Rd., 2727 Carp Rd., 1001 Spruce Ridge Rd., 255 Spruce Ridge Rd.). He asked that the proposal be removed for further consultation, and barring that, the report be amended to indicate specific exclusions from the Gold Belt for land parcels with existing planning or legal status.
21. Miguel Tremblay, Fotenn, spoke in support of staff's recommendation to include the lands at 4740 High Road, the Falcon Ridge Golf Course, as Category 1 lands to be included in the urban boundary. Peter Moroz, Stantec, was available for questions.
22. James Gallivan suggested that the Official Plan needs to include Covid-19/ public health considerations as a real world key pillar by which to define scopes of work and development, track key indicators and comparators.
23. Michal Michalski, representing owners of two land parcels along Hawthorne Road (close to the Findlay Creek subdivision), close to the urban boundary, designated as Vacant Residential, asked if those lands could be brought into the urban boundary.
24. Neil Malhotra and John Riddell, Claridge Homes Group of Companies, asked that staff be directed to address their concerns regarding missing information about servicing that resulted in underscoring 6435 Fernbank Road. They suggested that, properly evaluated, both parcels north and south of Fernbank, west of Stittsville, would score at the 14 threshold or higher, and would meet

criteria for inclusion as Category 1 lands.

25. Marcel Denomme, Vice President, Land Development, Urbandale Corporation, suggested that by not evaluating any agricultural lands for inclusion, there will be inadvertent leap frogging of the urban boundary; he advocated for Riverside South Development Corporation (RSDC) land holdings adjacent to the urban boundary in Riverside South to be considered for urban expansion, as a rational expansion of the Riverside South community to Rideau Road.
26. Kevin Cinq-Mars, Executive Vice President, Cavanagh Group of Companies, asked that the Cavanagh lands (being 6700 Hazeldean Rd., 251 Jinkinson Rd., 6631 Fernbank Rd. 329 Jinkinson Rd, 2596 Carp Rd., 2727 Carp Rd., 1001 Spruce Ridge Rd., 255 Spruce Ridge Rd.) be exempted from the proposed Gold Belt as they are already designated for development and would have been identified as Category 2 lands if they had been properly evaluated by staff.
27. Neal Deruyter, Ontario Stone, Sand & Gravel Association (OSSGA), indicated OSSGA had been unaware of a Gold Belt proposal until this report was published and, in absence of policies and information upon which to weigh the effect and potential implications as it relates to the management of aggregate resources, they could not take a formal position of the proposal; they asked that the City meaningfully consult with the aggregate industry.
28. Michel Tremblay, President/CEO, Landit Development Inc., suggested there were both technical and scoring discrepancies in the lands evaluated for expansion and that his property at 6591 and 6579 Fernbank Road was scored too low and should be brought into the urban boundary.
29. Salma Al-Shehabi and Professor Ian Lee spoke in opposition to the gold belt proposal and the suggested urban expansion; they intimated the proposal will drive up housing prices in the core, lead to greater housing affordability and community integration issues for younger people and immigrants, and that intensification targets could be reached and environmental concerns mitigated by leaving the boundary as is.
30. John B. Cooper contended that his lands at 1245 Old Second Line Road should be redesignated from Category 3 to Category 1 as part of the South March Cluster to reduce servicing costs through holistic development planning, to

establish a coherent urban boundary along the Gold Belt, and to follow through with long-standing urban development plans.

31. Daniel Buckles, The People's Official Plan for Ottawa's Climate Emergency, worried that the inner edge of the Gold Belt leaves a lot of rural and forested land available as potential greenfields for development, and the ambiguity of their status may lead to land speculation and pressure on a future Council to bring them into the urban boundary. He suggested the City use a natural linkage areas designation policy to proactively create corridors and connections between the new urban boundary and the Gold Belt, especially where they connect to existing greenspace such as the Green Belt, which could help protect such areas, near urban greenspace, from future urban expansion.
32. Bronwyn Anderson, Vice President, Land Development, Minto Communities – Canada, supported many of the recommendations in the report but wanted clarification on what changes would occur if the Gold Belt is implemented, in order to better understand potential implications.
33. Jim Burghout, Claridge Homes Group of Companies, cited concerns about insufficient consultation with affected landowners and subjective and inconsistent scoring methodologies, and contended that a Gold Belt is unnecessary because those plans already have protection under various current and proposed policies. He suggested that only Pass 1 lands (shown in yellow on the map) should be approved at this point, and then direct staff to use the overall wholistic score, using all of the criteria, and rank the remaining lands and recommend them in order, based on overall merit.
34. Kevin Yemm, Vice President, Land Development, Richcraft, contended there was insufficient time for the industry to review the proposal prior to this meeting, insufficient research to support the proposal for a Gold Belt, and that the Gold Belt will actually target development of natural areas rather than direct it away from them. He called for more information on the Gold Belt proposal in order to understand its implications. He asked staff to consider how to use infrastructure wisely before implementing a Countryside/Gold Belt and specifically assess properties at 2244 Frank Kenny Road and 1379 Rideau Road for inclusion in the urban boundary.
35. Martin J. Hauschild stressed the importance of having a separation between rural

roads and urban development when implementing a Gold Belt, so that farmers do not incur unintended impacts on their ability to effectively use their agricultural lands because of conflict between urban and rural transportation corridors.

36. Gail White spoke in opposition to the proposal for a potential South March new community, noting over 50% of the land mass there has already been developed as rural estate lots and efforts were undertaken in the Kanata North expansion to have transition zones between the urban boundary and rural estate lots. There are also covenants on Title saying those lots can't be developed.
37. Sam Hersh, Horizon Ottawa, voiced concerns about inadequate and disingenuous consultation, developer influence, and a proposal that is not balanced or measured but rather affects environment and the needs of future residents.
38. Ursula Melinz, Soloway Wright LLP, on behalf of Metcalfe Realty Company Limited and Minto Communities Inc., advocated for the inclusion of 936 March Road in the Category 1 lands group; suggesting it was excluded based on dated, incorrect information about associated noise impacts from the Connaught Range and Primary Training Facility.
39. Noel Perera spoke about his lands (Cedarhill Golf lands and Onassa Springs lands) on Cedarview Road, identified by staff as Category 2. He asked that Category 2 lands be added to the urban boundary now to ensure that long-term visioning and planning know exactly where the City will grow, or, failing that, Staff be directed to continue to work with him and his consultants to assess the appropriateness of his lands as part of the Option 1 review of the category 2 lands.
40. Michael Wolfson suggested that because Covid-19 will have major impacts on resident activity and planning, including the possible conversion of office spaces to residential, the demographic projections underlying the basic need for new space for greenfield residential construction outside the current urban boundary could be significantly over-estimated. He recommended the City not make any irreversible decisions on new residential dwelling construction outside the current urban boundary at this time and instead have staff undertake better demographic projections and report to Committee and Council annually on findings.

The following correspondence was provided to the committee coordinator between January 15 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and the time the matter was considered on January 25 and 26, 2021, a copy of which is held on file:

- Email dated January 16 from email sender 'Jason Baldwin' (unsigned)
- Email dated January 17 from Becky Gillam
- Email dated January 17 from Emily Gray
- Email dated January 19 from Luc Landry
- Email dated January 21 from Norman Cheesman, Executive Director, Ontario Stone, Sand & Gravel Association
- Email dated January 21 from Stephanie Morris for Martin Tomkin, Executive Director, Real Property Planning and Programming, Department of National Defence
- Email dated January 21 from Jara Hughes for Robert D. Aburto, RDA:kd, Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP, on behalf of William Davidson
- Email dated January 21 from Vijaya Garapati
- Email dated January 21 from email sender 'Sandy Singh' (unsigned)
- Emails dated January 22 and 24 from Christian Leclair, President – Les Habitations Leclair Inc.
- Email dated January 22 from Ursula K. Melinz, Partner, Soloway Wright LLP, on behalf of Cavanagh Developments, representing 1332741 Ontario Inc., 1384341 Ontario Ltd., Jeffrey Cavanagh in Trust and Thomas Cavanagh Construction Limited
- Emails dated January 22 and 26 from Murray Chown, Director, Planning and Development, Novatech on behalf of their clients, the owners of 673 Rideau Road, 805 Rideau Road, 4975 Spratt Road, 1420 Earl Armstrong Road and 1379 Rideau Road

- Email dated January 22 from Nadia De Santi, Senior Project Manager, WSP Canada Inc., on behalf of Newcastle Developments Inc.
- Email dated January 22 from James Gallivan
- Email dated January 22 from Phil Sweetnam for Allan Ryan, President, Stittsville Business Association
- Email dated January 22 from Grace Thrasher, President, Manotick Village and Community Association
- Email dated January 22 from Dennis Gratton, Catena Consulting Services, on behalf of Dilawri Property Holdings Ltd
- Email dated January 22 from Murray Chown, Director, Planning and Development, Novatech, on behalf of their clients, owners of lands south of Highway 417 and east of Carp Road
- Email dated January 22 from Daniel Paquette, President, Paquette Planning Associates Ltd., on behalf of their clients, owners of 1530 March Road
- Email dated January 22 from Daniel Paquette, President, Paquette Planning Associates Ltd., on behalf of their clients, owners of 2375 Richardson Side Road
- Email dated January 22 from Antonio Catizzone, re his property at Hazeldean Road at West Ridge Drive
- Email dated January 22 from John B. Cooper
- Email dated January 22 from Neal DeRuyter, MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture, on behalf of R.W. Tomlinson Ltd
- Email dated January 22 from Andrew Glass, Director, Development & Leasing, The Properties Group Management Limited
- Email dated January 22 from Paul Hicks, Avenue 31 Inc.
- Email dated January 22 from Robert Karam, President, 2108939 Ontario Inc. and S. Chiarello
- Email dated January 22 from Nick Ricciuto, for 2500611 Ontario Inc. and

2500603 Ontario Inc.

- Email dated January 22 from Roddy Bolivar, Executive Director and Board Member, Carp Road Corridor BIA
- Email dated January 22 from Mr. Kim Hume & Mrs. Melody Jamieson, Hume Trading Company Limited
- Email dated January 22 from Cathy O'Connor, 110430 Canada Limited
- Email dated January 22 from Janet Mason, Chair, Friends of the Carp Hills
- Email dated January 22 from Bronwyn Anderson, Vice President, Land Development, Minto Communities – Canada
- Email dated January 22 from Kevin Murphy, Vice President, Land Development, Mattamy Homes Canada
- Emails dated January 22 from Grant Mason, Urban Strategies Inc., on behalf of the Algonquins of Ontario and their partner, Taggart Group, and from Janet Stavinga, Janet Stavinga, Executive Director, Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office
- Email dated January 22 from Neil Malhotra, Chief Financial Advisor, Claridge Homes Group of Companies
- Email dated January 22 from Kevin Yemm, Vice President, Land Development, Richcraft
- Email dated January 22 from John Horwitz, March Rural Community Association
- Email dated January 22 from Neil Malhotra, Chief Financial Advisor, Claridge Homes Group of Companies, on behalf of 2714796 Ontario Limited
- Emails dated January 22 and 24 from Dr. Judy Makin
- Email dated January 22 from Gail White
- Email dated January 22 from Isla Jordan
- Email dated January 22 from Tom Hauschild

- Email dated January 22 from Rod Price, RorTar Land Development Consultants
- Email dated January 22 from Martin J. Hauschild
- Email dated January 22 from Ursula K. Melinz and Douglas B. Kelly, Soloway Wright LLP, on behalf of Metcalfe Realty Company Limited and Minto Communities Inc.
- Email dated January 22 from Guy Whissel, President, Longwood Building Corporation
- Email dated January 22 from Honourable Lisa MacLeod Minister of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries Member of Provincial Parliament, Nepean
- Email dated January 23 from Phil Sweetnam
- Email dated January 24 from Michael Wolfson
- Email dated January 24 from Michel Tremblay, President/CEO, Landit Development Inc.
- Email dated January from Greg Winters, Novatech, on behalf of the Van Gaal Family
- Email dated January 24 from Noel Perera
- Email dated January 24 from Milan Fait
- Email dated January 24 from Marcelle Carvalho
- Email dated January 24 from Brian Holmes
- Emails dated January 24 from Doug Thompson, President, Greely Community Association
- Email dated January 24 from Alex Cullen, President, Federation of Citizens Associations
- Email dated January 24 from Paul Johanis, Chair, Greenspace Alliance of Canada's Capital

- Email dated January 25 from Dr. Sarah Sloan
- Email dated January 25 from Angie Todesco
- Email dated January 25 from Phil Mount, Associate Director, Just Food
- Email dated January 25 from John Bernard
- Email dated January 25 from John Riddell, Sam Bahia and Greg Winters, Novatech on behalf of Claridge Homes
- Email dated January 25 from Jim Maxwell
- Email dated January 25 from Denis Lacroix, Lacroix Group of Companies

Motion N° PLC-ARAC 2021-4/1

Moved by Councillor E. El-Chantiry:

WHEREAS the report for the New Official Plan: Growth Management Report II - Lands Proposed for Residential and Industrial Urban Expansion (ACS2021-PIE-EDP-0001) details specific lands for urban, commercial and industrial growth, framed by the establishment of a Gold Belt in the new OP to direct future urban development away from Ottawa's agricultural and natural areas; and

WHEREAS there have been several administrative errors found in the report since it was published on January 15, 2021

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Joint Planning Committee and Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee recommend to Council that the following corrections and additions be made to the main report and documents:

1) In the main report:

- On page 2 in recommendation 4, replace reference to "Appendices A and B" with "Appendix A";**
- On page 3 in recommendation 5 i), replace reference to "inclusion in recommendation 2" with "inclusion in recommendation 3" and**
- On page 3 in recommendation 5ii), replace reference to "Appendix D" with "Appendix F"**

- d. On page 3 in recommendation 5iii) replace reference to “Appendix D” with “Appendix F”
- 2) In Document 2, staff noticed a number of corrections and omissions
- a. Replace “O-train” in all map legends with “O-Train”;
 - b. Page 5 – correct the South March Cluster servicing totals (in **brackets**) with scores as shown below:

Planning Committee and
Agriculture and Rural Affairs
Committee
Joint Report 4
January 25 and 26, 2021

199

Comité de l'urbanisme et Comité de
l'agriculture et des affaires rurales
Rapport conjoint 4
le 25 et 26 janvier 2021

SCA	OPID	1. Water	2. Wastewater (sanitary)	outlets	3. Stormwater - separate grade raise requirement relative to restrictions and other topographic constraints on drainage.	4. Servicing infrastructure	5. Servicing Risk Factor	Total Servicing	Transit Priority - Isolated	Corridor - Isolated Measures or Park and Ride feeding Rapid Transit System	Transit Total	Retail	Facilities	Facilities - Fire	Upgrades	14. Community and Agricultural Land Use	15. Active Agricultural Operation	16. Natural Heritage Linkage	Total Score	Category		
SM-6-a	2143	6	8	0	6	6	-2	24 (18)	10	8	18	8	1	1	3	0	6	0	-1	0	60	1
SM-6-a	2140	6	8	0	6	6	-2	24 (18)	10	8	18	8	1	2	3	0	2	0	-1	0	57	1

c. Page 12 – correct the Stittsville South Cluster scores (in brackets) with scores as shown below:

SCA	OPID	1. Water	2. Wastewater (sanitary) and availability of surface water outlets	raise requirement relative to restrictions and other topographic constraints on drainage.	4. Servicing Integration Factor	5. Servicing Risk Factor	Total Servicing	Transit Priority - Isolated	Corridor - Isolated Measures or Park and Ride feeding Rapid Transit System	Transit Total	8. Proximity to Jobs	Retail	Facilities	11. Distance to Emergency Facilities - Fire	13. Connectivity	Use	16. Natural Heritage Linkage	Total Score	Category			
S-5	608	2	4	0	3	² (3)	-1	10	6	4	10	6	1	3	3	2	6	0	2	0	35	2
S-6	423	2	4	0	3	2	-1	10	0	0	0	6	1	2	3	2	6	0	1	0	25 (15)	2
S-6	238	2	4	0	3	2	-1	10	6	4	10	6	1	2	3	2	6	0	1	0	35 (25)	2
S-8	1994	2	4	0	3	2	-4	7 (4)	6	4	10	6	0	3	3	2	6	0	0	0	30	2
S-8	1995	2	4	0	6 (3)	4 (2)	-4	12 (7)	6	4	10	6	0	2	3	2	4	0	1	0	34 (29)	2
S-8	2001	2	4	0	3	2	-4	7 (4)	6	4	10	6	0	3	3	2	4	0	1	0	27	2
S-9	2150	2	2	0	6	2	-2	10	6	4	10	6	0	2	3	2	4	0	1	0	32	2
S-9	1992	2	2	0	6	2	-2	10 (6)	6	4	10	6	0	2	3	2	8	0	0	0	37 (33)	2

S-9	1998	2	2	0	6	2	-2	10 (6)	6	4	10	6	0	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	35 (31)	2
-----	------	---	---	---	---	---	----	--------	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------	---

d. Pages 17 & 18 – correct the Barrhaven South Cluster scores in brackets with scores as shown below:

SCA	OPI D	and availability of surface water outlets	raise requirement relative to restrictions and other topographic constraints on drainage.	4. Servicing Integration Factor	5. Servicing Risk Factor	Total Servicing	6. Availability of Rapid Transit or Transit Priority - Isolated	Transit Corridor - Isolated Measures or Park and Ride feeding Rapid Transit System	Transit Total	Retail	Facilities	Facilities - Fire	Upgrades	Use	15. Active Agricultural Operation	16. Natural Heritage Linkage	Total Score	Category				
B-1	85	8	8	2	6	6	0	30	10	12 (8)	22 (18)	4	0	4	4	0	8	-4	0	0	68	1
B-2	461	8	8	2	6	6	-3	27	10	4	14	6	0	4	4	0	8	0	-1	0	62 (63)	1
B-2	1005	8	8	2	6	6	-3	27	10	4	14	6	0	4	4	0	8	0	-1	0	62 (63)	1
HWY416-1	2033	2	4	1	3	2 (4)	-4	8 (10)	0	0	0	8	0	3	4	-2	2	0	-1	0	22	2
HWY416-1	2034	2	4	1	3	2 (4)	-4	8 (10)	0	0	0	8	0	3	4	-2	2	0	-1	0	22	2
HWY416-1	2035	2	4	1	3	2 (4)	-4	8 (10)	0	0	0	8	0	1	4	-4	2	0	-1	0	18	2

- e. Page 19 – add the property at 3872 Rideau Valley Drive (less than 2ha in size) to Cluster B-3;
- f. Page 24 – correct the Riverside South Cluster scores in brackets with scores as shown below:

SCA	OPID	1. Water	2. Wastewater (sanitary) outlets	3. Wastewater - Sanitary - raise requirement relative to restrictions and other topographic constraints on drainage.	4. Servicing Integration Factor	5. Servicing Risk Factor	Total Servicing	6. Servicing - Isolated	Transit Station, Transit Priority Corridor - Isolated Measures or Park and Ride feeding Rapid Transit System	Transit Total	Retail	Facilities	Facilities - Fire	Upgrades	Use	15. Active Agricultural Operation	16. Natural Heritage Linkage	Total Score	Category			
R-5	202	8	2	0	6	4	-3	17	0*	0*	0*	6	0	2	0	-4	6	-4	-1	-4	18 (17)	1
R-5	394	8	2	0	6	4	-3	17	0*	0*	0*	6	0	2	0	-4	6	-4	-1	-4	18 (17)	1

g. Page 31 – correct the Leitrim Cluster scores in brackets with scores and add rows L-3_1 and L-4 as shown below:

SCA	OPID	1. water	2. Wwaswater (sanitary)	outlets	3. Wwaswater - expensive grade raise requirement relative to restrictions and other topographic constraints on drainage.	4. Servicing integration Factor	5. Servicing Risk Factor	Total Servicing	Transit Priority - Isolated	Transit Station, Transit Priority Corridor - Isolated Measures or Park and Ride feeding Rapid Transit System	Transit Total	Retail	Facilities	Facilities - Fire	Upgrades	Use	15. Active Agricultural Operation	16. Natural Heritage Linkage	Total Score	Category			
L-3_1	2012	8	0	1		6	0	-3	12	6	4	10	8	3	0	3	-2	6	0	-1	-4	35	2
L-3_1	2152	8	0	1		6	0	-3	12	6	4	10	8	3	0	3	-2	6	0	-1	-4	35	2
L-4	401	4	0	1		6	0	-3	8	6	12	18	6	1	0	0	-1	8	0	0	0	40	2
L-5	915	4	0	0		6	0	-3	7 (8)	6	12	18	6	1	0	0	-4	6	0	0	0	34	2
L-5	594	4	0	0		6	0	-3	7 (8)	6	12	18	6	1	0	0	-5	6	0	0	0	33	2
L-5	1132	4	0	0		6	0	-3	7 (8)	6	8	14	6	1	0	0	-4	6	0	0	0	30	2
L-6	596	4	0	1		6	0	-3	8 (-1)	0	0	0	8	1	0	3	-6	8	0	-1	0	21	2
L-6	403	4	0	1		6	0	-3	8	0	0	0	8	1	0	3	-4	8	0	-1	0	23	2

- h. Page 33 – in the “Orléans South Cluster” map, remove the Park and Ride symbol at Trim Road;
- i. Pages 36 and 37 – correct the Orléans South (EUC) Cluster identification code and scores in brackets with numbers and scores as shown below:

SCA	OPID	1. Water and availability of surface water outlets	2. Sewerage and availability of sewerage outlets	3. Solid Waste and availability of surface water outlets	4. Noise and availability of surface water outlets	5. Air Quality and availability of surface water outlets	6. Land Use and availability of surface water outlets	7. Services and availability of surface water outlets	8. Safety and availability of surface water outlets	9. Transit and availability of surface water outlets	10. Retail and availability of surface water outlets	11. Facilities and availability of surface water outlets	12. Facilities - Fire and availability of surface water outlets	13. Upgrades and availability of surface water outlets	14. Use and availability of surface water outlets	15. Use and availability of surface water outlets	16. Use and availability of surface water outlets	17. Use and availability of surface water outlets	18. Use and availability of surface water outlets	19. Use and availability of surface water outlets	20. Use and availability of surface water outlets	21. Use and availability of surface water outlets	22. Use and availability of surface water outlets	23. Use and availability of surface water outlets	24. Use and availability of surface water outlets	25. Use and availability of surface water outlets	26. Use and availability of surface water outlets	27. Use and availability of surface water outlets	28. Use and availability of surface water outlets	29. Use and availability of surface water outlets	30. Use and availability of surface water outlets	31. Use and availability of surface water outlets	32. Use and availability of surface water outlets	33. Use and availability of surface water outlets	34. Use and availability of surface water outlets	35. Use and availability of surface water outlets	36. Use and availability of surface water outlets	37. Use and availability of surface water outlets	38. Use and availability of surface water outlets	39. Use and availability of surface water outlets	40. Use and availability of surface water outlets	41. Use and availability of surface water outlets	42. Use and availability of surface water outlets	43. Use and availability of surface water outlets	44. Use and availability of surface water outlets	45. Use and availability of surface water outlets	46. Use and availability of surface water outlets	47. Use and availability of surface water outlets	48. Use and availability of surface water outlets	49. Use and availability of surface water outlets	50. Use and availability of surface water outlets	51. Use and availability of surface water outlets	52. Use and availability of surface water outlets	53. Use and availability of surface water outlets	54. Use and availability of surface water outlets	55. Use and availability of surface water outlets	56. Use and availability of surface water outlets	57. Use and availability of surface water outlets	58. Use and availability of surface water outlets	59. Use and availability of surface water outlets	60. Use and availability of surface water outlets	61. Use and availability of surface water outlets	62. Use and availability of surface water outlets	63. Use and availability of surface water outlets	64. Use and availability of surface water outlets	65. Use and availability of surface water outlets	66. Use and availability of surface water outlets	67. Use and availability of surface water outlets	68. Use and availability of surface water outlets	69. Use and availability of surface water outlets	70. Use and availability of surface water outlets	71. Use and availability of surface water outlets	72. Use and availability of surface water outlets	73. Use and availability of surface water outlets	74. Use and availability of surface water outlets	75. Use and availability of surface water outlets	76. Use and availability of surface water outlets	77. Use and availability of surface water outlets	78. Use and availability of surface water outlets	79. Use and availability of surface water outlets	80. Use and availability of surface water outlets	81. Use and availability of surface water outlets	82. Use and availability of surface water outlets	83. Use and availability of surface water outlets	84. Use and availability of surface water outlets	85. Use and availability of surface water outlets	86. Use and availability of surface water outlets	87. Use and availability of surface water outlets	88. Use and availability of surface water outlets	89. Use and availability of surface water outlets	90. Use and availability of surface water outlets	91. Use and availability of surface water outlets	92. Use and availability of surface water outlets	93. Use and availability of surface water outlets	94. Use and availability of surface water outlets	95. Use and availability of surface water outlets	96. Use and availability of surface water outlets	97. Use and availability of surface water outlets	98. Use and availability of surface water outlets	99. Use and availability of surface water outlets	100. Use and availability of surface water outlets	Total Score	Category
E-1	1287 (1387)	8	2	0	3	2	-2	13*	10	4	14	4	1	4	3	0	8	-4	-1	0	42	1																																																																																	
E-1	353 (593)	8	2	0	3	2	-2	13*	0**	0**	0*	4	1	5	0	-4	8	-4	-2	0	21	1																																																																																	
E-2	1445	4 (8)	0	0	3	0	-2	5 (13)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	6	-4	-1	0	14 (22)	2																																																																																	
E-2	1266	4 (8)	0	0	3	0	-2	5 (13)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	8	-4	-2	0	15 (23)	2																																																																																	
E-2	873	4 (8)	0	0	3	0	-2	5 (13)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	8	-4	-1	0	16 (24)	2																																																																																	
E-2	878	4 (8)	0	0	3	0	-2	5 (13)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	8	0	-2	0	19 (27)	2																																																																																	

**Planning Committee and
Agriculture and Rural Affairs
Committee
Joint Report 4
January 25 and 26, 2021**

205

**Comité de l'urbanisme et Comité de
l'agriculture et des affaires rurales
Rapport conjoint 4
le 25 et 26 janvier 2021**

E-2	520	⁴ (8)	0	0	3	0	-2	⁵ (13)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	8	-4	-1	0	16 (24)	2
E-2	1265	⁴ (8)	0	0	3	0	-2	⁵ (13)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	8	-4	-2	0	15 (23)	2
E-2	1082	⁴ (8)	0	0	3	0	-2	⁵ (13)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	8	-4	-1	0	16 (24)	2
E-3	702	⁴ (8)	0	0	3	0	-4	³ (11)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	8	0	-2	0	17 (25)	2
E-3	148	⁴ (8)	0	0	3	0	-4	³ (11)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	6	0	-2	0	15 (23)	2
E-3	331	⁴ (8)	0	0	3	0	-4	³ (11)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	8	0	-2	0	17 (25)	2
E-3	699	⁴ (8)	0	0	3	0	-4	³ (11)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	8	-4	-1	0	14 (22)	2
E-3	147	⁴ (8)	0	0	3	0	-4	³ (11)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	6	0	-2	0	15 (23)	2
E-3	705	⁴ (8)	0	0	3	0	-4	³ (11)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	6	0	-1	0	16 (24)	2
E-3	146	⁴ (8)	0	0	3	0	-4	³ (11)	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	-2	8	0	-2	0	17 (25)	2

CARRIED

Motion N° PLC-ARAC 2021-4/2

Moved by Councillor Hubley

WHEREAS the City of Ottawa is recognized as a strong location in the international marketplace as a growing hub for goods movement facilities; and

WHEREAS the prime location for these sites is adjacent Highway 400 series interchanges; and

WHEREAS the majority of lands adjacent Highway 400 series interchanges within the urban area are owned and controlled by the National Capital Commission (NCC); and

WHEREAS Staff have recommended the Approval of lands identified in Appendix E, representing land clusters of 20 net hectares, as new Rural Industrial, Freight and Storage lands and direct staff to insert this Appendix into the draft Official Plan for technical circulation purposes; and

WHEREAS the Owners of the subject lands have completed an Agricultural Impact Assessment which shows the lands have a LEAR score well below the 125 Threshold value;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Joint Planning Committee and Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee recommend to Council direct staff to evaluate the new LEAR information and consider the validity of the submission and report to Council by June on whether the City can add an additional 34 gross ha as new Rural Industrial Freight and Storage on lands at the south west quadrant of the Hwy 416 / Fallowfield interchange, as shown on attached Schedule A.

CARRIED

Motion N° PLC-ARAC 2021-4/3

Moved Councillor A. Hubley

WHEREAS staff recommendation 6 recommends that the City's intensification targets and 15-year land supply required by the Provincial Policy Statement should be reviewed no later than 2026; and

WHEREAS during the CoVid-19 pandemic, housing prices have had a year-over-year increase that are outside of typical norms for the Ottawa market which risks making housing unaffordable for many key workers in the local economy and residential demand and development patterns may have deviated from pre-COVID-19; and

WHEREAS the City has adopted an aggressive intensification target that is even higher than that adopted by municipalities in the area surrounding Toronto; and

WHEREAS intensification is sometimes difficult to accomplish since Council regularly hears stakeholder concerns about the intensity and compatibility of development, and that may mean that the adopted intensification target may be difficult to reach in the timeframe contemplated in the growth management strategy of the new Official Plan; and

WHEREAS in the last few years, there have been rapid changes to the system of distribution of goods in cities as a result of the surge in e-commerce businesses;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Joint Planning Committee and Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee recommend to Council approve that the review consider the following:

- **Residential development patterns through intensification and on greenfield lands from 2020 to 2026 and whether that has resulted in any observable change to market housing demand and affordability;**
- **A review of gross to net ratios on land utilization to ensure that the required number of units from gross hectares are being realized;**

- Industrial development patterns from 2020 to 2026, and an assessment of the uptake of lands for industrial freight and storage and the adequacy of the supply at that five-year review, particularly in the vicinity of the major highways (417, 416 and 7);
- The potential for these development patterns to continue over the long-term; and
- The adequacy of the residential and industrial land supply as required by the Provincial Policy Statement.

CARRIED

Motion N° PLC-ARAC 2021-4/4

Moved by Councillor C. A. Meehan

WHEREAS the Pass 2 lands south of Rideau Road in Riverside South, as shown in Appendix A, have servicing and infrastructure challenges and create an illogical southern boundary to Riverside South; and

WHEREAS City Council has adopted strong principles of intensification and transit-oriented development near Light Rail Transit (LRT) stations, and City Council has invested \$150 million in the Limebank to Bowesville LRT extension, including \$32 million for Bowesville Station and park and ride; and

WHEREAS the Bowesville Station will be complete and operational in 2022, and using the proposed lands north of Rideau Road provides Council with the opportunity to design and build a 15-minute demonstration neighbourhood within the next few years where high order transit is in place before the first new residents move in; and

WHEREAS staff indicates they are supportive of this amendment only in the context of Riverside South, because of the opportunities created for transit-oriented development and potential increased ridership at Bowesville Station given that:

1. Council has consistently promoted intensification development close to transit stations since the adoption of OPA 113 in 2012;

2. Section 1.1.3.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement directs planning authorities to identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for transit-supportive development;
3. Section 1.1.3.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement directs a preference for new growth adjacent to existing built-up areas to allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure and public service facilities; and
4. Section 1.1.3.8 of the Provincial Policy Statement does allow for the designation of prime agricultural lands provided the lands are not specialty crop areas and that alternative locations have been evaluated and there are no reasonable alternatives to avoid prime agricultural lands or which use lower agricultural lands;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Joint Planning Committee and Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee recommend Council approve that the Pass 2 cluster in Riverside South, representing 106.29 net hectares, be removed and an equivalent amount of land be added between the existing Riverside South Community and the Pass 1 lands proposed to be added so that Riverside South to form a logical boundary that is contained north of Rideau Road.

CARRIED, on a division of 10 yeas and 2 nays, as follows:

YEAS (10): Councillors L. Dudas, T. Tierney, R. Brockington, C. Kitts, G. Darouze, C.A. Meehan, A. Hubley, Vice-chair G. Gower, Chair E. El-Chantiry and Chair J. Harder

NAYS (2): Councillors J. Leiper and S. Moffatt

Motion N° PLC-ARAC 2021-4/5

Moved by Councillor E. El-Chantiry

WHEREAS Recommendation 3 of staff report ACS2021-PIE-EDP-001 identifies a cluster of land shown as South March (175.35 net hectares) as a potential area to be identified for urban expansion, depending on the results of further analysis and study; and

WHEREAS this is a challenging area to develop due to the exclusive reliance on March Road, the adjacent country residential subdivisions and the proximity to the South March Highlands, so much so that Council has previously rejected expansions into this area, only to have been overruled by the Ontario Municipal Board; and

WHEREAS the lands identified are difficult and expensive to service due to the bedrock conditions and the potential impact on the five adjacent country residential subdivisions; and

WHEREAS further expansion in this area towards Dunrobin and the South March Highlands may stir speculative land investment for future investment, which is also contrary to the City's intent to prevent encroachment on villages;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Joint Planning and Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee recommend that Council approve that the South March land cluster identified in Recommendation 3 be removed and that the land supply (175.35 net hectares) be added to the new community option in Recommendation 5 of the staff report, as amended.

CARRIED, on a division of 8 yeas and 3 nays, as follows:

YEAS (8): Councillors L. Dudas, T. Tierney, G. Darouze, C.A. Meehan, A. Hubley, Vice-chair G. Gower, Chair E. El-Chantry and Chair J. Harder

NAYS (3): Councillors J. Leiper, R. Brockington, C. Kitts

Motion N° PLC-ARAC 2021-4/6

Moved by Councillor T. Tierney

WHEREAS in 2017, at the start of the Official Plan process, City Council directed staff to develop this Official Plan with the intention of completing communities and planning for a new community to accommodate the City's growth in an environmentally and financially sustainable manner; and

WHEREAS, in May 2020, Council adopted a blended methodology for

determining new lands to come into the Urban Boundary in this OP, updating the scoring methodology currently used based on a set of criteria used to rate parcels or cohesive blocks of land, consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and validating the choice of new lands against the Five Big Moves; and

WHEREAS City Council is committed to reconciliation with local Indigenous communities and recognizes the importance of working with the Algonquins of Ontario as a meaningful opportunity towards achieving that goal; and

WHEREAS in February 2018, City Council approved a formal commitment to the Truth and Reconciliation action plan that includes supporting opportunities to weave Indigenous communities into the socioeconomic fabric of Ottawa in an environmentally sustainable way; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Joint Planning Committee and Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee recommend that Council approve that Recommendation 5 of the staff report be amended to read as follows:

'Direct staff that the remaining 445.35 ha be added into the Urban Boundary on the lands identified as Tewin, and that staff focus on the creation of a new community on the Tewin lands; and, that staff be directed to work with the Algonquins of Ontario between now and June to identify the specific lands in the land use schedule of the new Official Plan, and that it be understood that it is Council's intent, in the spirit of a positive and constructive working relationship with the Algonquins of Ontario and a respect for their objectives for Tewin, that the planning process for this new community will be an expeditious and collaborative planning process.'

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that staff be directed to work with the Algonquins of Ontario and their representatives to help secure funding from the federal and provincial governments to support the Tewin development; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in the draft Official Plan to be presented to Council in 2021, staff shall recommend necessary policies and technical requirements that are required before Council approves a secondary Plan for

the Tewin development.

CARRIED, on a division of 9 yeas and 3 nays, as follows:

YEAS (9): Councillors L. Dudas, T. Tierney, C. Kitts, G. Darouze, C.A. Meehan, A. Hubley, Vice-chair G. Gower, Chair E. El-Chantiry and Chair J. Harder

NAYS (3): Councillors J. Leiper, R. Brockington, S. Moffatt

The report recommendations as amended by Motions No PLC-ARAC 2021-4/1, 4/2, 4/3, 4/4, 4/5 and 4/6 CARRIED on a division of 11 yeas and 1 nay, as follows:

YEAS (11): Councillors L. Dudas, T. Tierney, J. Leiper, R. Brockington, C. Kitts, G. Darouze, C.A. Meehan, A. Hubley, G. Gower, E. El-Chantiry and J. Harder

NAYS (1): Councillor S. Moffatt

Councillors J. Leiper and R. Brockington dissented on Recommendation 5 as amended.

The joint committees also approved the following Directions to staff, raised by Councillor L. Dudas:

- That staff be directed to identify the specific “gating” roadways, public transitways, and active transportation facilities that would be applicable for the approval of the South Orléans Category 1, as well as the Category 2 Notre-Dames-des-Champs Lands, should they be recommended for inclusion within the urban boundary. This identification, which shall be consistent with the lands being designated and available within the meaning of the Provincial Policy Statement, should include the specific mobility and infrastructure upgrades that are required in order for the development of these lands under the new Official Plan, which will then be evaluated and specified in the update to the Transportation Master Plan.

That staff working on the Transportation Master Plan are to identify these infrastructure upgrades and expansions in the draft Transportation Master Plan and include them as part of the draft Affordable Network Plan.

- That staff be directed to include in the forthcoming Official Plan report on the “Gold Belt” specifics on the proposal that provide clarity to residents, planners, developers, investors, etc. with regard to the “Belt”:
 - that the Gold Belt does not affect land-use designations and policy in the Gold Belt for the underlying land uses;
 - not impeding the City’s flexibility to deploy necessary multi-modal transportation infrastructure if deemed necessary by future councils;
 - clarify that the reference to 2100 is a projection and not a policy timeframe or sunset clause and it is a matter that is reviewed regularly, as is the purpose and effect of the Gold Belt during the legislatively required 10-year reviews of the Official Plan; and,
 - clearly highlight and detail the policies of how agricultural lands both within and without the proposed Belt will be protected.