



Committee of the Whole Agenda

Tuesday, December 8, 2020

**Immediately Following Council
Virtual meeting via Zoom**

Pages

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Suggested Motion:

THAT the agenda be accepted as presented.

3. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY/CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

4. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED AND RECEIVED

a. Committee of the Whole Minutes

8

Suggested Motion:

THAT the Committee of the Whole Minutes dated November 24th and December 1st, be accepted as presented.

5. DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

**a. Mary Wilson Trider, Carleton Place and District Memorial Hospital,
Integrated President and CEO**

COVID-19 Readiness

b. 2021 Budget Presentation

Trisa McConkey, Treasurer

c. Building Permit Fees - Public Meeting

Lennox Smith, CBO

6. REPORTS

Planning and Protection

- a. **Updated Emergency Plan (Communication 132001)** 17
- Pascal Meunier, Director of Protective Services
- Suggested Motion:**
THAT Council hereby approves the updated Emergency Plan for 2020;
and
THAT this information be forwarded to the Office of the Fire Marshal and
Emergency Management Ontario.
- b. **Fire Report - October and November 2020 (Communication 132002)** 56
- Pascal Meunier, Director of Protective Services
- Suggested Motion:**
THAT the Director of Protective Services' Report on the activities of the
Ocean Wave Fire Company (OWFC) and By-law Enforcement services
for the months of October and November 2020 be accepted as
information.
- c. **Sign By-law Amendments (Communication 132003)** 60
- Lennox Smith, CBO
- Suggested Motion:**
THAT the awning and projecting sign provisions of Sign By-Law 65-2008
be amended as outlined in the Chief Building Official's report dated
December 8, 2020.
- d. **Development Permit By-law Housekeeping Amendment (Communication 132004)** 63
- Niki Dwyer, Director of Development Services
- Suggested Motion:**
THAT Council pass a comprehensive housekeeping by-law amending
the text and Schedule A of the Development Permit By-law 15-2015.

- e. **2021 Insurance and Risk Management Services (Communication 132005)** 88

Trisa McConkey, Treasurer

Suggested Motion:

THAT Council awards the Request for Proposal for insurance coverage and risk management services to Frank Cowan Company with McDougall Insurance & Financial as broker for the period January 1, 2021 to January 1, 2022 in the amount of \$334,039.76 including non-refundable PST; and

THAT the Treasurer be authorized to enter into agreements as required for the placement of insurance services; and

THAT Council authorizes an addition to the draft 2021 budget of \$28,839 to be funded from the Insurance and Water/Sewer reserves.

- f. **2021 Draft Childcare Budget (Communication 132006)** 90

Trisa McConkey, Treasurer

Suggested Motion:

THAT Council approve the Childcare 2021 Budget-Option #1 as presented by the Treasurer; and

THAT further changes to Health Unit restrictions and/or Ministry guidelines be reviewed by staff immediately and a report prepared for Council's consideration outlining the impact to the Childcare budget.

- g. **Carleton Place Childcare Services Parent Fee Proposal (Communication 132007)** 95

Tracy Freill, Manager of Carleton Place Childcare Services

Suggested Motion:

THAT the proposed Childcare fees as presented be approved based on a 2% increase effective February 1, 2021; and

THAT the necessary by-law to enact the fees be forwarded to Council for approval.

Community Issues

- h. **Additional Community Enrichment Grant Request (Communication 132008)** 98

Joanne Henderson, Manager of Recreation and Culture

Suggested Motion:

THAT Council approve the allocation of a Community Enrichment Grant to the Carleton Place Christmas Basket Program in the amount of \$1,500.00.

- i. **Sidewalk Art (Communication 132009)** 99

Joanne Henderson, Manager of Recreation and Culture

Suggested Motion:

THAT Council authorizes the CAO to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Interval House regarding winter maintenance of the sidewalk area in front of the As Good As New location due to the installation of the sidewalk art.

Physical Environment

- j. **Waste Collection - Additional Bag of Waste (Communication 132010)** 100

Guy Bourgon, Director of Public Works

Suggested Motion:

THAT Council direct staff to proceed with Option ____ as outlined in the report prepared by the Director of Public Works dated December 08, 2020, in regard to the collection of curbside waste.

7. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

- a. **Alternate Overnight Parking** 103

Suggested Motion:

THAT staff be directed to prepare a report regarding alternate overnight parking during the winter parking restrictions.

Suggested Motion:

THAT Council direct staff to amend Traffic and Parking By-Law 46-2003 to accommodate overnight winter parking in four (4) Town parking lots as outlined in the report prepared by the Director of Public Works dated December 08, 2020.

b. COVID-19 Childcare Impacts and Funding

Suggested Motion:

WHEREAS the COVID-19 pandemic has negatively impacted child care options for nearly every family in our community and has profoundly increased the cost to operate safe child care forcing child care spaces or centres to close; and

WHEREAS Ontario has among the highest average child care fees of any Canadian province and while costs vary regionally for licensed child care, families are paying between \$9,000 and \$20,000+ per year for each child and these costs continue to rise steadily which makes passing the associated COVID-19 costs to families not possible; and

WHEREAS a 2012 study identified that in Ontario, public investment in the early years and child care has a ripple effect in positive economic benefits resulting in an economic output of \$2.27 for every dollar invested in child care; and

WHEREAS the economic recovery of Carleton Place, Lanark County and Ontario is dependent on families having access to safe, reliable, and affordable child care that incorporates early learning principles; and

WHEREAS we are committed to working with the provincial government and child care service managers to deliver positive and affordable options for our families;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT

1. the Town of Carleton Place request the Government of Ontario:
 - a. prioritize children and child care as part of its overall post-pandemic recovery plan;
 - b. develop, adequately fund and release publicly a comprehensive plan that can support facilities through the provision of licensed child care and early learning education; and
 - c. provide increased funding to child care providers reflective of COVID-19 operating cost increases to ensure a safe reopening and long-term sustainability for the sector; and
1. this resolution be circulated to all municipalities in Ontario, Randy Hillier MPP, Scott Reid, MP, the Federal Minister of Families, Children and Social Development and the provincial Minister of Education.

8. COMMITTEE, BOARD AND EXTERNAL ORGANIZATION UPDATES

a. Parks and Recreation Committee Minutes

109

Suggested Motion:

THAT the Parks and Recreation Committee minutes dated November 30, 2020 be received.

b. Arena Advertising (Communication 131147)

Joanne Henderson, Manager of Recreation and Culture

Suggested Motion:

THAT the Carleton Place Canadians be exempt from paying for non-renewals of advertising spaces for the period of September 1, 2020 until August 31, 2021.

9. INFORMATION LISTING

113

- Farm 911 - The Emily Project, Municipality of Mississippi Mills
- OVRT Two Year Review, County of Lanark
- Letter Regarding Pesticides, Myrna Lee-De Cou
- Accessibility for Ontarians - Request for Website Support, Marmora Lake

Suggested Motion:

THAT the Information Listing dated December 8th, 2020, be received as information

10. NOTICE OF MOTIONS

11. CLOSED SESSION

a. Sidewalk Art (Communication 132009)

Joanne Henderson, Manager of Recreation and Culture

Suggested Motion:

THAT the Committee move into closed session at _____ p.m. to discuss matters subject to the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. Section 239 (2):

(B) personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees;

1. Sidewalk Art

AND THAT Diane Smithson, CAO and Stacey Blair, Clerk, Joanne Henderson, Manager of Recreation and Culture be permitted to participate in the Closed Session Zoom meeting.

12. RISE AND REPORT

13. ADJOURNMENT

Suggested Motion:

THAT the meeting be adjourned at _____p.m.

Committee of the Whole Minutes

Tuesday, November 24, 2020
Immediately Following the Council Meeting

COUNCIL PRESENT: Mayor Black, Deputy Mayor Redmond, Councillor Fritz,
Councillor Seccaspina, Councillor Randell, Councillor Tennant,
Councillor Atkinson

STAFF PRESENT: Diane Smithson, CAO, Stacey Blair, Clerk, Pascal Meunier,
Director of Protective Services, Trisa McConkey, Treasurer, Niki
Dwyer, Director of Development Services, Joanne Henderson,
Manager of Recreation and Culture

1. CALL TO ORDER

Deputy Mayor Redmond called the meeting to order at 7:55 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by: Councillor Tennant

Seconded by: Councillor Fritz

THAT the agenda be accepted as amended:

Addition:

- Notice of Motion from Councillor Tennant regarding Overnight Parking and Winter Parking Restrictions

CARRIED

3. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY/CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

1. Councillor Tennant - Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program - COVID-19 Resilience Infrastructure Stream - Local Government Intake (Communication 131142)

Councillor Tennant's company will likely bid on projects that would be funded by this grant program.

4. MINUTES TO BE APPROVED AND RECEIVED

1. Committee of the Whole Minutes

Moved by: Mayor Black

Seconded by: Councillor Fritz

THAT the Committee of the Whole Minutes dated November 10th, 2020 be accepted as presented.

CARRIED

5. DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

None.

6. REPORTS

Planning and Protection

1. Interim Control By-law Update (Communication 131135)

Moved by: Councillor Fritz

Seconded by: Councillor Tennant

THAT Council receive the [Neighbourhood Character Study](#) by JL Richards and Associates for information purposes; and

THAT Council direct staff to undertake the statutory public process to amend Section 4.6 of the Development Permit By-law.

CARRIED, CONSENT

2. Confirmation of Emergency Management Committee Membership (Communication 131136)

Moved by: Councillor Randell

Seconded by: Councillor Seccaspina

THAT Council hereby confirms the following appointments to the Carleton Place Emergency Management Committee for 2020:

- Chair: Pascal Meunier, Director of Protective Services/CEMC;
- Mayor Doug Black;
- Diane Smithson CAO;
- Rob Croth, OPP;

- Guy Bourgon, Director of Public Works;
- Graham Patterson, Public Works;
- Randy Shaw, Carleton Place & District Memorial Hospital;
- Travis Mellema, Lanark County Paramedics;
- Mark Dorman, Public Member;
- Carleton Place CERV representative;
- Stephanie Tuffin, Administrative Assistant/Alternate CEMC
- Dave Joy, Deputy Chief;
- Matt Anderson, Assistant Chief

AND THAT this information be forwarded to the Office of the Fire Marshal and Emergency Management Ontario.

CARRIED, CONSENT

3. Backyard Chickens (Communication 131137)

John and Kelly Nephin were registered to speak to this item. The Nephin's made a presentation encouraging Council Members to permit the keeping of backyard hens in the Town of Carleton Place.

Moved by: Councillor Randell

Seconded by: Councillor Tennant

THAT the Director of Protective Services' Report regarding backyard chickens dated November 24, 2020 be received as information; and

THAT staff be directed to prepare a by-law for the regulation and keeping of backyard hens in the Town of Carleton Place.

CARRIED, CONSENT

Corporate Services

4. Municipal Interest Penalties/Charges during COVID-19 Pandemic (Communication 131138)

Moved by: Councillor Atkinson

Seconded by: Councillor Fritz

THAT Council repeal By-law 32-2020 to reinstate penalty and interest charges on tax, water and other fees/charges owing to the Town effective January 1, 2021.

CARRIED, BY LAW PREPARED

5. 2021 Interim Tax Levy (Communication 131139)

Moved by: Mayor Black

Seconded by: Councillor Randell

THAT Council authorize the passing of an interim tax levy by-law for 2021 based on 50% of the prior year's annualized taxes.

CARRIED, BY LAW PREPARED

6. 2021 Fees and Charges (Communication 131140)

Moved by: Councillor Seccaspina

Seconded by: Councillor Randell

THAT Council adopt the proposed comprehensive Fees and Charges By-law incorporating both proposed new rates and rates which are not being recommended to change in 2021.

CARRIED, BY LAW PREPARED

7. Recreation and Pool User Fees (Communication 131141)

Moved by: Councillor Fritz

Seconded by: Councillor Seccaspina

THAT the proposed approximate 3% increase to Regular Season Ice Rental Rates and Pool User rates be approved for the period January 1, 2021 to September 5, 2021.

CARRIED, BY LAW PREPARED

8. Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program - COVID-19 Resilience Infrastructure Stream - Local Government Intake (Communication 131142)

Councillor Tennant declared a conflict on this item. (Councillor Tennant's company will likely bid on projects that would be funded by this grant)

program.)

Moved by: Councillor Randell

Seconded by: Councillor Seccaspina

THAT Council authorize staff applying for the exterior repointing repairs on the north and west side of the Town Hall as the Town's priority under the COVID-19 Resilience Infrastructure Stream – Local Government Intake of the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program.

CARRIED, MOTION PREPARED

9. CAO's Report - Delegated Authority (Communication 131143)

Moved by: Councillor Tennant

Seconded by: Councillor Atkinson

THAT Council accept the CAO's Delegated Authority Report dated November 24, 2020 as information.

CARRIED, CONSENT

7. NEW/OTHER BUSINESS

8. COMMITTEE, BOARD AND EXTERNAL ORGANIZATION UPDATES

1. Advisory Committee Minutes

Moved by: Councillor Atkinson

Seconded by: Councillor Randell

THAT the Carleton Place Environmental Advisory Committee minutes dated October 5th, 2020 be received.

CARRIED

9. NOTICE OF MOTIONS

THAT staff be directed to prepare a report regarding alternate overnight parking during the winter parking restrictions.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by: Councillor Fritz

Seconded by: Councillor Randell

THAT the meeting be adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

CARRIED

Deputy Mayor Sean Redmond

Stacey Blair, Clerk

Special Committee of the Whole Minutes

Tuesday, December 1, 2020

6:00 p.m.

COUNCIL PRESENT: Mayor Black, Deputy Mayor Redmond, Councillor Fritz,
Councillor Seccaspina, Councillor Randell, Councillor Tennant,
Councillor Atkinson

STAFF PRESENT: Diane Smithson, CAO, Stacey Blair, Clerk, Trisa McConkey,
Treasurer

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Seccaspina called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by: Councillor Tennant

Seconded by: Councillor Randell

THAT the agenda be accepted as presented.

CARRIED

3. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY/CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

None.

4. CLOSED SESSION - PART 1

Moved by: Deputy Mayor Redmond

Seconded by: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the Committee move into closed session at 6:03 p.m. to discuss a matter subject to the Municipal Act, 2001 S.O. Section 239 Section (3.1) Educational or Training Session for members of Council; and

THAT Diane Smithson, CAO, Stacey Blair, Clerk, Trisa McConkey, Treasurer, Andrew Grunda, Consultant and Emma Blanchard, Solicitor BLG, be permitted to participate in the meeting.

a. Development Charges Background Study - Educational Session

CARRIED

Moved by: Councillor Fritz

Seconded by: Deputy Mayor Redmond

THAT the Committee return to regular session at 6:51 p.m.

CARRIED

5. RISE AND REPORT - PART 1

During the Closed Session, an informational presentation regarding the Town's Development Charges Background Study was provided by Andrew Grunda of Watson & Associates, Economists Ltd. As well, the Town's solicitor, Emma Blanchard of BLG, was present to answer any legal questions regarding Mr. Grunda's presentation.

6. BUSINESS

1. Development Charges Background Study - Updated Findings

Moved by: Councillor Fritz

Seconded by: Deputy Mayor Redmond

THAT Council direct staff to post the Development Charges Background Study and draft By-law on the Town's website in accordance with the provisions of the Development Charges Act.

CARRIED, MOTION PREPARED

7. CLOSED SESSION - PART 2

Moved by: Councillor Fritz

Seconded by: Councillor Tennant

THAT the Committee move into closed session at 7:10 p.m. to discuss matters subject to the Municipal Act, 2001 S.O. Section 239 Section (2):

- (b) personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees;
- (f) advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose; and

THAT Diane Smithson, CAO, Stacey Blair, Clerk, be permitted to participate in the meeting.

- a. Staffing Matter
- b. Council/Employee Relations

CARRIED

8. RISE AND REPORT - PART 2

The CAO reported that with respect to Closed Session - Part 2, Item A, staff direction was provided. With respect to Item B, a general discussion took place and no direction was provided to staff.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by: Councillor Randell

Seconded by: Councillor Atkinson

THAT the meeting be adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

CARRIED

Councillor Linda Seccaspina

Stacey Blair, Clerk

COMMUNICATION 132001

Received from Pascal Meunier, Director of Protective Services
Addressed to Committee of the Whole
Date December 8th, 2020
Topic Updated Emergency Plan

SUMMARY:

On an annual basis, the Office of the Fire Marshal and Emergency Management Ontario requires that the municipal emergency management plan be reviewed, updated as required and any changes approved.

The only change required this year was to change the Community Control Group (CCG) to the new updated name of Municipal Emergency Control Group (MECG).

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council hereby approves the updated emergency plan for 2020; and

THAT this information be forwarded to the Office of the Fire Marshal and Emergency Management Ontario.

BY-LAW NO. 108-2020

A BY-LAW OF THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF CARLETON PLACE TO ADOPT AN EMERGENCY MEASURES PLAN

WHEREAS Section 3(1) of *The Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act, R.S.O. 1990*, Chapter E9 authorizes a municipality to formulate an emergency plan governing the provisions of necessary services during an emergency and procedures thereunder;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Carleton Place deems it necessary and desirable to adopt a new emergency measures plan for the said municipality;

NOW THEREFORE the Corporation of the Town of Carleton Place enacts as follows:

1. That the Emergency Measures Plan of the Town of Carleton Place attached hereto as Schedule "A" be hereby adopted.
2. That, in accordance with Section 4 of *The Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act*, the Mayor or his/her designate is hereby authorized to declare an emergency when deemed appropriate and direct the enactment of the Emergency Measures Plan of the Town of Carleton Place.
3. An emergency shall be defined in accordance with Section 1 of *The Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act*.
4. That By-law No. 78-2019 be hereby repealed in its entirety.

READ A FIRST TIME, SECOND TIME AND A THIRD TIME AND FINALLY PASSED THIS
8th DAY OF DECEMBER 2020

Doug Black, Mayor

Stacey Blair, Clerk

THIS IS SCHEDULE "A" TO BY-LAW NO. 108-2020

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLAN

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF CARLETON PLACE



November 2020

MAYOR'S ADDRESS

On behalf of the members of Council, it is my pleasure to authorize the use of this Emergency Management Plan. This Plan has been formulated to assign responsibilities and to guide the immediate actions of key municipal officials after the onset of an emergency declared by the Office of the Mayor.

This Plan is essential for the protection of the life and property in the event of a natural and/or man-made disaster within our municipality. In order for this Plan to be effective, it is essential that all concerned be made aware of its provisions and that every municipal department be ready to carry out their assigned functions and responsibilities.

The Carleton Place Emergency Management Committee of Council is encouraged to keep this Plan current and to conduct regular exercises to test and, where applicable, to improve the Plan.

Date

Doug Black, Mayor

Emergency Quick Reference Guide

- Upon the arrival of three or more members, the Municipal Emergency Control Group (MECG) may initiate its function.
- Ensure that all Community departments have been notified and either activated or placed on standby. Each MECG member is responsible for their own department.
- The Mayor must inform the Province of Ontario that the Town of Carleton Place has declared an emergency, and specify the nature of the emergency situation. The provision of a return contact number is required for communication purposes. The call is made to the Office of the Fire Marshal and Emergency Management.

The number to use for this purpose is **(416) 314-0472**.

- Turn to individual responsibilities within the plan. Provide input and assistance as required.
- Each member of the MECG will report and respond to immediate needs in accordance with the Operations Cycle format.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Part 1 - Administration

Mayor's Address	2
Quick Reference Guide	3
Table of Contents	4
Introduction.....	6
Aim	7
Authority	8
Plan Maintenance.....	9
Distribution List.....	10
Amendments	11

Part 2 - Emergency Operations

2.0	Municipal Emergency Control Group	12
2.1	Emergency Operation Centre Procedures	13
2.2	Operations Cycle	14
2.3	Municipal Emergency Control Group (MECG)	15
2.4	Mayor.....	17
2.5	CAO (Operations Officer).....	18
2.6	CEMC	19
2.7	Ontario Provincial Police	20
2.8	Fire Chief	21
2.9	EMS/Ambulance	22
2.10	Public Works	23
2.11	Medical Officer of Health.....	24
2.12	Director of Social Services.....	25
2.13	Public Information Officer.....	26
2.14	Health and Safety Advisor.....	27
2.15	Purchasing Officer.....	28

Part 3 - Emergency Support

3.0	Canadian Red Cross.....	29
3.1	Clergy	30
3.2	Boards of Education	31
3.3	Legal Advisor	32
3.4	CERV.....	33

Appendices

Appendix A	- Emergency Notification System
	- MCEG
	- Members of Council
	- Outside Emergency Assistance
Appendix B	- Vital Services Directory
Appendix C	- Local Resources Directory
Appendix D	- Emergency Management Act
Appendix E	- Local By-law
Appendix F	- HIRA
Appendix G	- Critical Infrastructure
Appendix H	- EOC Log's & Message Forms
Appendix I	- Emergency Declaration Checklist
Appendix J	- Declaration of Emergency Form
	- Termination of Emergency Form
Appendix K	- Guide to Emergency Media Relations
Appendix L	- EOC Layout & Set-up Guide
Appendix M	- Evacuation Plan
Appendix N	- Shelter Plan
Appendix O	- CERV Program
Appendix P	- Glossary of Terms

Introduction

The Emergency Plan for the Town of Carleton Place has been developed to reflect the public safety requirements of our community. The effective use and maintenance of this plan is reliant upon all concerned being aware of its provisions and prepared to fulfill their roles and responsibilities in the event of an emergency. Responsible individuals are expected to participate in emergency training and exercises which will assist them in the fulfillment of their roles accordingly.

The heads of departments and agencies are expected to develop their own internal notification lists, procedures and contingency plans to fulfill their departmental or agency responsibilities.

Together we work to ensure that our community is prepared to respond to an emergency in the most effective manner possible.

Date

Pascal Meunier, C.E.M.C.

Aim

The Aim of this plan is to protect the health, safety, welfare and property of our citizens from the effects of a natural, technological or human caused emergency.

Authority

This Plan has been developed and will be implemented in accordance with the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act, detailed in Appendix “D”, which is the Provincial statute under which all emergency management activities are conducted in the Province of Ontario.

The By-law adopting this Plan is attached hereto as Appendix “E”.

Plan Maintenance

This Plan was originally written in 2004 and it is essential that it be kept current and viable by adherence to a maintenance schedule. Responsibility for the plan being kept up to date rests with the Community Emergency Management Coordinator who may delegate tasks accordingly.

The emergency telephone numbers will be reviewed on an annual basis.

The notification system will be tested annually.

The plan will be exercised once every year as a minimum requirement.

The Control Group and Support Staff shall receive training and participate in exercises once every year as a minimum requirement.

The Vital Services and/or Local Services Directory should be updated annually.

The Community Emergency Management Coordinator will determine the schedule under which the maintenance activities will be performed.

Distribution List

Mayor	-	1
Council	-	6
CAO	-	1
CEMC	-	1 *
OPP	-	1
Fire Chief	-	1
EMS/Ambulance	-	1
Public Works Supervisor	-	1
Medical Officer of Health	-	1
Director of Social Services	-	1
Office of the Fire Marshal and Emergency Management	-	2
Emergency Operations Centre	-	14

Amendments to the Plan

REVISION NO.	DATE	PAGES
1	April 2004	Comprehensive Update
2	March 2005	Comprehensive Update
3	March 2006	Comprehensive Update
4	February 2007	Comprehensive Update
5	February 2008	Comprehensive Update
6	February 2009	Comprehensive Update
7	February 2010	Comprehensive Update
8	March 2011	Comprehensive Update
9	February 2012	Comprehensive Update
10	January 2013	Comprehensive Update
11	February 2014	Comprehensive Update
12	February 2015	Comprehensive Update
13	January 2016	Comprehensive Update
14	February 2017	Comprehensive Update
15	February 2018	Comprehensive Update
16	June 2019	Comprehensive Update
17	November 2020	Comprehensive Update

Part 2

EMERGENCY OPERATIONS AND PROCEDURES

2.0 MUNICIPAL EMERGENCY CONTROL GROUP

The Municipal Emergency Control Group is the group that is responsible for the direction and control of the overall emergency response within the community. The MECG ensures the provision of the essential services necessary to minimize the effects of an emergency on the community.

The MECG is made up of the following members:

Mayor (*or alternate*)
CAO (*or alternate*)
CEMC (*or alternate*)
OPP Representative
Fire Chief (*or alternate*)
EMS/Ambulance (*or alternate*)
Director of Public Works (*or alternate*)
Medical Officer of Health (*or alternate*) if required
Director of Social Services (*or alternate*) if required
Public Information Officer (*or alternate*)

IMPLEMENTATION

Any member of the Municipal Emergency Control Group may request, through the CEMC, that the Emergency Plan be implemented.

It is the responsibility of the agency that is first at the scene of an emergency to decide whether the emergency plan should be implemented. If the size or seriousness of the emergency is beyond the capability or responsibility of that agency, then the Emergency Plan will be activated. The Emergency Plan may be implemented in whole, or in part, based on conditions at the site of severity of the situation.

The CEMC will immediately notify the Mayor and other members of the MECG. Notification lists and procedures are located in Appendix A.

2.1 EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTRE PROCEDURES

The Emergency Operation Centre (EOC) has both a primary and a secondary or alternate location. During the notification process, direction as to which location members of the MECG will report to will be given. For example, members will be told that this is an emergency plan activation and that they should report to the primary EOC immediately. The primary and secondary locations are geographically separated so that if one or the other is endangered or rendered non-functional as a result of the emergency situation the other should be safe and operational.

Primary EOC Location: Fire Station (upstairs)
15 Coleman Street

Alternate EOC Location: Carleton Place Town Hall (Council Chambers)
175 Bridge Street

Upon receiving notification the CAO/Operations Officer will contact the administrative staff who have been assigned the task of setting up the EOC. The EOC will be set up and operational within one hour of activation. The Operations Officer will supervise the set up and ensure operational viability.

Upon arrival at the EOC, each MECG member/designate will:

- a) Sign in
- b) Check telephone/communication devices
- c) Open personal log
- d) Contact their own agency and obtain a status report
- e) Participate in the initial briefing
- f) Participate in planning initial response/decision making process
- g) Pass MECG decisions on to member agencies/areas of responsibility
- h) Continue participation in the EOC Operations Cycle

Upon leaving the EOC, each MECG member will:

- a) Conduct a hand over with the person relieving them
- b) Sign out on the location board indicating where they can be reached

Once the initial response is established, routines are put into place by the Operations Officer. The MECG functions most efficiently on a system known as an Operations Cycle.

2.2 OPERATIONS CYCLE

An operations cycle is how the MCEG manages overall emergency operations. MCEG members will come together usually around a planning board or map at which time they will in turn report their agencies' status to the Mayor and Operations Officer. It is essential that every member, covering each area of responsibility, be heard from during this process. The MCEG is a team and the actions taken by one, or the lack of action by one, may have a significant impact upon operations.

The round table discussion should include problems, questions, resources, requests and any other relevant information so that timely informed decisions can be made as a group. Once the meeting is completed, the members should contact their agencies' and pass on any relevant information or directives that come out of the MCEG meeting. The frequency of the meetings are determined by the Operations Officer in conjunction with the Mayor, but should reflect the pace of the emergency and occur on a scheduled basis which may be adjusted accordingly.

During the period after the meeting and dissemination of information, members will be in the process of gathering information and preparing for the next scheduled meeting. MCEG members use this time to follow up and ensure MCEG decisions are being implemented. Each member is responsible for informing their respective agency of the schedule for MCEG meetings. No calls are to interrupt the proceedings. All calls must occur prior to or after the formal meeting of the MCEG.

It is essential that the EOC is comfortable, has good communications and is secure from unnecessary distractions. Only MCEG members and the EOC support staff should have access to the EOC. No media are allowed into the EOC, nor is anyone who has not been authorized by the Operations Officer.

2.3 MUNICIPAL EMERGENCY CONTROL GROUP RESPONSIBILITIES

The MCEG is responsible for the following:

1. Implementing the Emergency Plan in whole or in part to respond to an impending, potential or existing emergency.
2. Coordination and direction of community resources used to mitigate the effects of an emergency.
3. Ensuring that the composition of the MCEG is appropriate to mitigate the effects of a given emergency situation by determining which, if any, ad-hoc members are required.
4. Advising the Mayor regarding requests for assistance from the Province and the Federal Government.
5. Ensuring the provisions of essential resources and services to support emergency response activities.
6. Coordination of services provided by outside agencies.
7. Appointing or confirming an Emergency Site Manager.
8. Ensuring that the Public Information Officer is kept informed and up to date to facilitate the information flow to the media and the public. The Public Information Officer will be the Communications Coordinator. His/her alternate will be the Treasurer.
9. Coordinating the evacuation of citizens who may be in danger.
10. The alternate CAO/Operations Officer will be the CEMC.
11. Discontinuing utilities or services provided by public or private concerns, i.e. hydro, water, gas, closing businesses.
12. Appeals for volunteers.
13. Establishment of advisory subcommittees to work on specific problem areas related to the emergency, as required.
14. Authorization of expenditures during the emergency; provision for cost accounting and facilitation of cost recovery.

2.3 MUNICIPAL EMERGENCY CONTROL GROUP RESPONSIBILITIES (contd)

15. Maintenance of an operations log detailing the Group's decisions and activities.
16. Deactivating the plan and notifying all of those who had been notified of its activations.
17. Conducting and participating in a debriefing, generating a post-emergency report and implementing recommendations for improvement of the Emergency Response Plan.

2.4 MAYOR

The Head of Council, or designate, is responsible for:

1. Declaration of an Emergency.
2. Termination of an Emergency.
3. Notifying the Province of Ontario of the declaration of emergency, and termination of the emergency. (*Contact made through OFMEM*).
4. Ensuring the members of Council are advised of the declaration and termination of an emergency, and are kept informed of the emergency operational situation.
5. Ensuring that the local MPP and MP, neighbouring municipalities and the County are advised of the declaration and termination, and kept informed of the emergency situation.
6. Approving all major announcements and media releases prepared by the Public Information Officer, in conjunction with the CAO and MECG.
7. Maintain a personal log.

2.5 CAO/OPERATIONS OFFICER

The CAO is referred to as the “Operations Officer” for emergency purposes. The responsibilities of the Operations Officer (*or alternate*) are:

1. As the Operations Officer, coordinating all operations within the Emergency Operations Centre.
2. In the absence of the Community Emergency Management Coordinator will act as the alternate.
3. Chairing meetings of the Municipal Emergency Control Group.
4. Advising the Head of Council on policies and procedures, as appropriate.
5. Approving, in conjunction with the Head of Council, major announcements and media releases prepared by the Public Information Officer, in conjunction with the MCEG.
6. Ensuring that a communication link is established between the MCEG and the ESM.
7. Calling out additional staff as required.
8. Maintaining a log.

2.6 COMMUNITY EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR

The Community Emergency Management Coordinator is responsible for:

1. Activating the emergency notification system, including set up of the EOC and secretary of regular meetings.
2. Providing information, advice and assistance to members of the MEEG on Emergency Management programs and principles. Also to provide administrative assistance to the CAO/Operations Officer.
3. Providing direction to EOC support staff as required in support of the Control Group, and ensures proper operation of the EOC.
4. Coordinating activities and deployment of CERV Team.
5. Maintaining the Emergency Response Plan in accordance with requirements of the Emergency Management Act.
6. In conjunction with the CAO, coordinating a post-emergency debriefing and assisting in the development of a final report to Mayor and Council.
7. Ensuring a master record of all events and actions taken is maintained (main events board).
8. Maintaining a personal log.

2.7 ONTARIO PROVINCIAL POLICE

The Ontario Provincial Police representative is responsible for:

1. Activating the emergency notification system.
2. Establishing and maintaining ongoing communications with the senior police at the emergency site.
3. The provision of traffic control to facilitate the movement of emergency vehicles.
4. Coordination of evacuation routes.
5. Liaison with Social Services regarding security of reception/evacuation centres.
6. The protection of life and property and the provision of law and order.
7. The provision of police services in evacuation centres, morgues and other facilities as required.
8. Coordinating or providing assistance with rescue, first aid, casualty collection, evacuation, etc.
9. Notifying the coroner of fatalities.
10. Liaison with external police agencies, as required.
11. Providing an Emergency Site Manager if requested to by the MCEG.
12. Maintaining a log.

2.8 FIRE CHIEF

The Fire Chief is responsible for:

1. Activating the emergency notification system.
2. Providing the MECG with the information and advice on fire fighting and rescue matters.
3. Establishing an ongoing communications link with the senior fire official at the scene of the emergency.
4. Initiating mutual aid as required.
5. Determining if additional or specialized equipment is required, i.e. protective suits, CBRN Team, etc.
6. Coordinating or providing assistance with rescue, first aid, casualty collection, evacuation, etc.
7. Providing an ESM as required.
8. Maintain a log.
9. Providing advice to MECG on building and structural integrity issues.

2.9 EMS/AMBULANCE

The EMS/Ambulance representative is responsible for:

1. Activating the emergency notification system.
2. Providing the MCEG with information and advice on treatment and transport of casualties.
3. Liaising with the Medical Officer of Health, area hospitals, police and fire officials during an emergency situation.
4. Alerting all staff using the Provincial Health Emergency Alert System.
5. Taking charge of casualties within the emergency area and be responsible for triage, lifesaving care, and the transport to area hospitals.
6. Maintaining a personal log.

2.10 PUBLIC WORKS

The Director of Public Works is responsible for the following:

1. Activating the emergency notification system.
2. Providing the MCEG with information and advice on engineering or public works matters.
3. Liaison with the senior public works officers from the neighbouring community(s) to ensure a coordinated response.
4. The provision of engineering assistance.
5. The construction, maintenance and repair of public roads.
6. Assistance with road closures and/or roadblocks.
7. Maintenance of sanitation and a safe supply of potable water, as required.
8. The provision of equipment for emergency pumping operations.
9. Discontinuing any public works service to any customer, as required, and restoring these services when appropriate.
10. Liaising with Utilities.
11. Providing public works vehicles and resources to any other emergency service, as required.
12. Maintaining liaison with flood control, conservation and environmental agencies and being prepared to take preventative action.
13. Providing an Emergency Site Manager, if required.
14. Maintaining a log.
15. The Chief Administrative Officer or the Director of Public Works and in their absence their designates, are authorized to exempt Municipal and Contractor commercial motor vehicle operators from the Hours of Service restrictions for an emergency under the following conditions:
 - a) When the Town of Carleton Place's Control Group is assembled to respond to a danger of major proportions
 - b) When road conditions, in a specific localized area threaten the safe movement of emergency services vehicles

As soon as possible after the emergency has been resolved the Chief Administrative Officer, Director of Public Works or their authorized designates shall direct Municipal and Contractor commercial motor vehicle operators to resume compliance with Regulation 555/06 Hours of Service, including completing the required rest time before resuming driving.

16. Maintenance of sanitation and a safe supply of potable water. Assessing the impact on the drinking water supply and implementing contingency plans as required.

2.11 MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH

The Medical Officer of Health, or designate, is responsible for:

1. Acting as a coordinating link for all emergency health services at the MEEG.
2. Liaison with the Ontario Ministry of Health, Public Health Branch.
3. Liaison with local and regional hospital representatives.
4. Liaison with ambulance service representatives.
5. Liaison with the Community Care Access representative.
6. Providing advice on any matters that may adversely affect public health.
7. Providing authoritative instruction on health and safety matters to the public through the Public Information Officer.
8. Coordinating the response to disease related emergencies or anticipated emergencies such as epidemics, according to Ministry of Health policies.
9. Ensuring liaison with voluntary and private agencies, as required, for augmenting and coordinating public health resources.
10. Ensuring coordination of all efforts to prevent and control the spread of disease during an emergency.
11. Ensuring the safety of drinking water in conjunction with the Public Works Representative.
12. Liaison with the senior Social Services Representative regarding health services in evacuee centres.
13. Maintaining a log.

2.12 DIRECTOR OF SOCIAL SERVICES FOR THE COUNTY OF LANARK

The Director of Social Services for the County of Lanark, or alternate, is responsible for:

1. Ensuring for the care, feeding and shelter of evacuees if requested by the municipality.
2. Assist with the operation of reception and evacuation centres if requested by the municipality.
3. Liaison with the police regarding the pre-designation of evacuee centres which can be opened on short notice.
4. Liaison with the MOH in areas regarding public health in evacuation centres.
5. Liaison with the public and separate school boards regarding the use of school facilities for reception and evacuation centres if requested by the municipality.
6. Liaison with the nursing homes and homes for the aged if requested by the municipality.
7. Maintain a log.

2.13 PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER

The Public Information Officer is responsible for:

1. Notifying information centre staff.
2. Ensuring that the Information Centre is set up and operational.
3. Initial and subsequent media releases, subject to approval by the Mayor and Operations Officer. The P.I.O. may use electronic communications as deemed appropriate. Examples include the Web, Facebook and/or Twitter.
4. Establish and maintain linkages with provincial, county, local or industry media officials as appropriate.
5. Coordinating interviews and media conferences.
6. Designating a site media spokesperson as appropriate.
7. Ensuring set up and staffing of public inquiry lines.
8. Coordinating of public inquiries.
9. Monitoring news coverage.
10. Maintaining copies of all media releases.
11. Maintaining a personal log.
12. In accordance with Section 13 of the Integrated Accessibility Standard, that emergency procedures, plans or public safety information in an accessible format or with appropriate communication supports be made available as soon as practicable, upon request.

2.14 HEALTH AND SAFETY ADVISOR

The Health and Safety Advisor is responsible for:

1. Ensuring that advice and directions from the EOCG conform to the municipality's Health and Safety Policies.
2. The provision of advice to the EOCG on Health and Safety related matter during a declared emergency.
3. Ensuring that any facility (and its employees and volunteers) used during an emergency conforms to all Health and Safety Policies and procedures.

2.15 PURCHASING OFFICER

The Purchasing Officer is responsible for:

1. The control and coordination of purchases required during an emergency.
2. The control and distribution of items purchased and required during an emergency.
3. The administrative procedures and reporting requirements of purchases to the EOCG.

Part 3

EMERGENCY SUPPORT

3.0 CANADIAN RED CROSS

1. Upon receiving notification, activate the local Red Cross Emergency Response Plan as per the executed agreement with the municipality.
2. Provide support to the emergency response.
3. Provide registration and inquiry services, if required.
4. Liaise with Regional Red Cross to access additional resources
5. Establish and maintain contact with the Director, Social Services in the EOC to coordinate activities.

3.1 CLERGY

1. Provide for multi-denominational religious observances.
2. Establish visitations to evacuees in evacuation centres on a scheduled basis.
3. Provide guidance to the MEEG regarding matters of a religious nature.
4. Provide advice regarding care of the deceased in areas which relate to religious observances.
5. Liaise with Director, Social Services regarding the use of churches and related facilities for reception and evacuation centres.

3.2 BOARDS OF EDUCATION

1. Provide schools for reception centres.
2. Provide schools for evacuation centres.
3. Provide liaison with Director, Social Services and the MEGC.

3.3 LEGAL ADVISOR

1. Provide legal opinions and advice to the MEEG, as required.
2. Provide legal representation, as required.

3.4 CERV

1. Upon receiving notification, activate organization.
2. Establish contact with the CEMC and support the operation, as required.
3. Assist at reception centres, as required.
4. Assist at evacuation centres on an as required basis.
5. Assist in the evacuation of casualties.
6. Assist in the evacuation of home care patients, as required.
7. Other duties as assigned.

Glossary of Terms

<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>
CBRN	Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear
Municipal Emergency Control Group (MECG)	The MECG is the group responsible for managing the emergency situation on a community wide basis. The membership, as detailed in the plan, consists of all key decision makers and Officials who have the authority to direct or coordinate human and material resources within the community.
Community Emergency Management Coordinator (CEMC)	The person responsible and accountable for the development and implementation of their communities emergency management program.
COMMUNITY	The critical management team that oversees the development, Implementation and maintenance of a community emergency management program
CERV	Community Emergency Response Volunteer
CISM	Critical Incident Stress Management
Critical Infrastructure	Interdependent, interactive, interconnected networks of institutions, services, systems and processes that meet vital human needs, sustain the economy, (protect public safety and security), and maintain continuity of, and confidence in, government.
Disaster	A widespread or severe emergency that seriously incapacitates a community.
Emergency	Emergency is defined as a situation caused by a natural, accidental or intentional act, or otherwise that constitutes an actual or impending danger.
Emergency Management	Organized and comprehensive program and activities taken to deal with actual or potential emergencies or disasters. These include mitigation against, preparedness for, response to and recovery from emergencies or disasters.
Office Of The Fire Marshal And Emergency Management	OFMEM is an organization within the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, a part of the government of the Province of Ontario. EMO is responsible for monitoring, coordinating and assisting in the development and implementation of Emergency Management Programs in Ontario.

<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>
Emergency Management Program	A comprehensive program that is based on a hazard identification and risk assessment process (HIRA) and includes the four core components of mitigation/prevention, preparedness, response and recovery.
Emergency Operations Centre (EOC)	An EOC is the structure/facility wherein the Control Group conducts its emergency management functions. There is a primary and secondary EOC identified to ensure operational viability.
Epidemic	A widespread occurrence of a disease in a community at a particular time.
ESM/IC	Emergency Site Manager/Incident Commander. Public sector official (usually fire, police, ambulance or public works) at the site, in charge of coordinating resources and developing actions to resolve the emergency situation.
Evacuation Centre	The Centre is a facility set up to provide emergency shelter, food, recreation and basic requirements to a group of people who have been evacuated from an area as a result of an emergency.
Exercise	A simulated drill or sequence of events to evaluate plans and procedures.
HIRA	Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment. Identification of hazards or risks to public safety, public health, the environment, property, critical infrastructure and economic stability from natural, human-caused and technological sources/activities, and evaluation of the importance of the activity to the continued operation of the community. The vulnerability of the community to each activity should also be evaluated.
Incident Management System	The combination of facilities, equipment, staff, operating procedures, and communications operating within a common organizational structure with responsibility for the management of assigned resources to effectively respond to an incident or emergency/disaster.
Information Centre	A facility set up to brief and inform the media.
Mitigation	Actions taken to reduce or eliminate the effects of an emergency or disaster.
Mutual Aid Agreements	An agreement developed between two or more emergency services to render aid to the parties of the agreement. These types of agreements can include the private sector emergency services when appropriate.

<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>
Mutual Assistance Agreement	An agreement developed between two or more jurisdictions to render assistance to the parties of the agreement. Jurisdictions covered with these types of agreements could include neighbouring cities, regions, provinces or nations.
Ontario Disaster Relief Assistance Program (ODRAP)	A provincial financial assistance program intended to alleviate the hardship suffered by private homeowners, farmers, small business enterprises and non-profit organizations whose essential property has been damaged in a sudden and unexpected natural disaster such as a severe windstorm, tornado, flood, forest fire or ice storm.
Preparedness	Actions taken prior to an emergency or disaster to ensure an effective response. These actions include the formulation of an emergency response plan, a business continuity plan, training, exercises and public awareness and education.
Provincial Emergency Team Response (PERT)	An emergency response team that is dispatched to a community to coordinate provincial emergency response.
Public Awareness Program	Provides generic information to the broader public to raise awareness about emergency management and suggests ways to reduce the risk of loss of life and property damage in the event of an emergency.
Public Education Program	Provides focused information to a target audience to educate about protective actions to reduce the risk of life and property damage in the event of an emergency. For example, for communities located in a high-risk flood area, the public should know what measures should be taken in the event of a flood.
Reception Centre	The centre is a facility which is set up for the purpose of receiving evacuees, providing refreshments and temporary shelter. Its primary purpose is to register evacuees and, if necessary, direct them to an evacuation centre as required.
Recovery	Actions taken to recover from an emergency or disaster.
Terrorism	It is the unlawful and intentional use of force against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, a civilian population or any segment thereof, in the furtherance of political or social objectives.

COMMUNICATION 132002

Received From: Pascal Meunier, Director of Protective Services
Addressed To: Committee of the Whole
Date: December 8, 2020
Topic: Ocean Wave Fire Company (OWFC) and By-law Enforcement
Monthly Activity Report for October-November 2020

SUMMARY

The October-November 2020 activity reports for Ocean Wave Fire Company and By-law Enforcement services are attached.

COMMENT

Items of note for the months of October and November include:

Ocean Wave Fire Company (OWFC)

- October and November were average months with a total of 15 and 16 calls for service respectively
- 1 weekend of NFPA 1001, Level 1 and 2 recruit refreshers
- Fire Prevention activities were a success
- Participated in the November 11, 2020 Remembrance Day memorial service
- 4 trucks conducted Halloween safety patrol

By-law

- October and November were busy months for by-law enforcement services
- Winter parking restrictions - 51 warnings were issued on the first snowfall
- Winter parking tickets - 32 tickets were issued on the second snowfall of the season
- 4 stolen cars were found during routine patrolling and OPP was notified

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Director of Protective Services' Report on the activities of the Ocean Wave Fire Company (OWFC) and By-law Enforcement services for the month of October and November 2020 be accepted as information.

NOVEMBER 2020

EMERGENCY CALLS	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	YTD	YOY
Fire related	4	5	1	13	3	2	10	7	2	2	5		54	-1
CO Alarms	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1		14	2
False Alarms	2	6	9	3	4	9	4	8	6	6	7		64	-2
MVC	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	1		7	2
Medical Assist	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0		5	3
Mutual Aid	0	1	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0		9	0
Other	3	2	3	3	2	7	8	6	1	2	2		39	3
Total	11	16	19	21	10	22	25	23	14	15	16	0	192	7
Automatic Aid to Miss. Mills (incl. in above calls)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2		7	1
NON-EMERGENCY CALLS														
Meetings	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1		11	NC
Training	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2		18	-1
Other	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1		6	2
Total	3	3	3	2	3	2	5	3	4	3	4	0	35	1
TOTAL CALLS	14	19	22	23	13	24	30	26	18	18	20	0	227	8
Avg. Response (%) All Calls	50%	46%	43%	67%	55%	53%	57%	66%	42%	55%	51%		53%	3%
Avg. Response (%) Mon-Fri 6am-6pm	49%	41%	41%	59%	58%	61%	52%	61%	44%	50%	44%		51%	11%
Avg. Response Time (min/sec)	11:10	10:52	7:16	8:35	7:43	10:17	8:42	12:14	7:17	9:58	9:44		9:26	0:02
Fire Loss (\$)	0	10,000	0	102,000	0	0	400,000	1,000	0	0	0		513000	-2100
Rescues	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	NC
Injuries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	NC
Fatalities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	NC
FIRE PREVENTION														
Fire Safety Inspections	14	8	8	3	4	1	2	4	10	11	7		72	-48
Orders Issued	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	2		10	NC
Charges Laid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	NC
Public Education (Hrs.)	18	16	13	10	10	12	14	15	18	64	16		206	-2

Bylaw Activity Report November 2020

	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	YTD
PHONE CALLS/WALK IN'S/EMAILS													
# OF CALLS & INQUIRIES	174	60	141	155	140	206	148	99	168	178	171		1640
CALLS RESULTING IN COMPLAINTS	63	4	30	9	21	78	44	27	34	30	42		382
TRAFFIC AND PARKING													
WARNINGS ISSUED	167	79	117	55	66	124	80	47	69	112	133		1049
CHARGES LAID	120	48	91	0	9	24	32	13	18	20	52		427
PROPERTY STANDARDS													
INFORMAL NOTICES	11	5	12	0	24	21	18	7	12	13	21		144
FORMAL ORDERS TO COMPLY	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	3		11
ANIMAL CONTROL													
WARNINGS ISSUED	32	30	26	19	24	35	33	12	33	38	39		321
CHARGES LAID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0
WATER USAGE													
WARNINGS ISSUED	0	0	0	0	5	28	53	1	9	0	0		96
CHARGES LAID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
WASTE COLLECTION													
WARNINGS ISSUED	35	15	19	16	25	27	14	19	27	31	16		244
CHARGES LAID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1
PICK UPS ORDERED	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	1		9
YARD MAINTENANCE													
WARNINGS ISSUED	0	0	0	0	2	13	8	2	5	5	0		35
ORDERS ISSUED	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	0	3	0		10

Bylaw Activity Report

November 2020

SIGN BYLAW												
WARNINGS ISSUED	21	1	11	20	29	15	14	9	28	28	33	209
CHARGES LAID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
LICENSING												
WARNINGS ISSUED	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4
CHARGES LAID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PARKS												
WARNING ISSUED	6	0	3	3	5	7	2	3	2	9	3	43
CHARGES LAID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
POOL												
WARNINGS ISSUED	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
CHARGES LAID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SNOW REMOVAL												
WARNINGS ISSUED	29	33	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
CHARGES LAID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NOISE												
WARNINGS ISSUED	4	0	0	1	2	5	1	1	1	2	2	19
CHARGES LAID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
OTHER BYLAWS & DUTIES												
WARNINGS ISSUED	0	0	1	16	14	10	4	0	8	4	3	60
CHARGES LAID	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

COMMUNICATION 132003

Received From: Lennox Smith, Chief Building Official
Addressed To: Committee of the Whole
Date: December 8, 2020
Topic: Sign By-Law Amendments

SUMMARY

Staff received an application for a sign permit for Giardino Lifestyle Salon which has not been issued due to current non-conformity to the Sign By-law. The By-law is dated and due for review, however, in the interest of time, the following amendments are being proposed to address the most pressing matters in order to facilitate pending permits.

BACKGROUND

In several recent sign permit applications, issues have emerged regarding awning installations, projecting signs, encroachment agreements, and hold harmless requirements. The current By-law is quite restrictive in nature when it comes to these requirements and installation practices. After hearing these concerns from businesses and property owners, the Chief Building Official (CBO) and the Director of Development Services (Director) reviewed the document together and concluded that certain amendments were warranted.

DISCUSSION

Awnings

Definition

Awning signs are regulated in the current Sign By-law, are specifically defined and have specific installation details. The current definition is:

*“**Awning** means a roof or covering for protection from sun or rain as the season dictates, and that can be quickly and easily folded or removed from a building as climate and seasons dictate. Further, an awning shall be defined as being constructed, except for its supporting structure, of canvas or other cloth-like material having flexibility and being foldable and removable”*

This definition requires all erected awnings be temporary in nature and easily removable. Most modern awnings are constructed of lightweight yet strong designed aluminum frames and are anchored with significant fasteners to withstand the weather patterns of all four (4) seasons. The removable nature of the investment or wind-in and wind-out awnings is no longer the norm in the industry. It is proposed that the temporary or retractable nature be an option of installation and not mandatory and therefore staff recommends the following new definition:

*“**Awning** means a roof or covering, **or a group of roofs or coverings, erected** for protection from sun, rain **or snow as the season dictates**, and that **may** be quickly and easily folded or removed from a building as climate and seasons dictate. Further, an awning shall be defined as being constructed **except for its supporting structure, in a manner to***

support the required seasonal rain, snow and wind loads and has a covering that is of canvas or other cloth-like material having flexibility and the ability to be foldable and removable”

Limit on number of “signs”

Awnings are limited by the current wording to only one (1) awning installed per commercial frontage. Staff feel this restriction is inappropriate and contrary to the heritage feel of the downtown. Traditionally, awnings would be located over all windows and doors on a façade to promote a consistent aesthetic appearance. Additionally, the current by-law considers an awning as a “sign” however, if there is no advertising on the covering, the awning should not contribute to the number of signs permitted for commercial designations. It is recommended that Section 6.2.1 be amended to read as follows:

*“6.2.1. - For each place of business in a commercial designation, only one permanent type sign/structure of the following: awning **(having advertising other than a name on its face)**, fascia, ground, multiple faced type signs, standard/pylon sign, wall sign, mural, or projecting overhead sign may be erected for every 7.5 metres of continuous property, or fraction thereof”*

Height clearances (private lands)

The current By-law requires a minimum of 2.4m of clearance under an awning. The primary purpose of this clearance is facilitating clearances for Municipal maintenance equipment on public right of ways. While staff is not recommending the removal of the 2.4m clearance requirement over Town-owned sidewalks, it is proposed that there be no such clearance requirement on private sidewalks in commercial plazas. It is staff’s opinion that a private property owner should regulate signage clearances and rules and requirements on their own property. Staff therefore recommends the following statement be added:

7.1.6 All requirements for clearances below awnings referenced in Section 7.1 do not apply to private sidewalks not maintained by the Town.

Projecting Signs

Similar to the requirements for awnings, projecting signs require a minimum 2.4m clearance over sidewalks to provide clearances for municipal maintenance equipment. It is therefore recommended that for consistency with clearances on private property that a clarifying statement be inserted into Section 7.10 regulating Projecting Signs as follows:

7.10.9 All requirements for clearances below projecting signs referenced in Section 7.10 do not apply to private sidewalks not maintained by the Town.

Staff believe the proposed Sign By-law amendments will create a more reasonable policy to manage and regulate awnings and projecting signs. However it should be acknowledged that this is an interim measure and does not negate the need to update the Sign By-law comprehensively.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the awning and projecting sign provisions of Sign By-Law 65-2008 be amended as outlined in the Chief Building Official's report dated December 8, 2020.

COMMUNICATION 132004

Received From: Niki Dwyer, RPP MCIP, Director of Development Services
Addressed To: Committee of the Whole
Date: December 8, 2020
Topic: Development Permit By-law - Housekeeping Amendment (DPA-01-2020)

BACKGROUND

Purpose and Effect:

Housekeeping Amendments are a recommended practice and in some cases are statutory requirements to ensure that planning policy is consistent and in conformity with the Official Plan, Provincial Policy Statement and Planning Act. As a result, it is strongly encouraged that Council proceed with the present Housekeeping Amendment to bring the Development Permit By-law (DP) in compliance with applicable law.

Generally, the amendments proposed as part of this application fall into the following categories:

1. Amendments to conform to provincial legislation;
2. Correct errors and omissions in the existing text;
3. Provide clarity to existing provisions;
4. Consolidate uses in land use designations which have been previously permitted by Permit applications;
5. Provide administrative clarity;
6. Consolidate previous amendments; and
7. Establish new provisions.

The existing [Development Permit By-law](#) was approved by Council in 2015 and has not been subject to substantial amendment since that time. The 2020 Amendment was proposed to: clarify existing policies that have been subject to misinterpretation, add additional definitions, and update the policy to be consistent with legislative changes enacted by the Province of Ontario.

Description of the Subject Lands

The proposed amendment to the by-law will apply to all lands designed under the By-law within the Town of Carleton Place.

COMMENT

Evaluation

Provincial Policy Statement (2020)

The PPS provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. As per Section 3(5)(a) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, all planning decisions must be consistent with the PPS.

The PPS encourages Municipalities to manage and direct land use activities in healthy, livable and safe communities by promoting efficient development patterns and accommodate an appropriate range and mix of land uses within the settlement area (Policy 1.1.3.2).

Healthy livable communities in Settlement Areas will be composed of a range of uses supportive to the long-term needs of the community and will be encouraged to take the form of intensified redevelopment where appropriate for the context of the community (Policy 1.1.1).

The new (2020) PPS also places heavy emphasis on form and function planning through the acknowledge of the benefits of sense of place and promotion of well-designed built form as a means of defining character and conserving communities (1.7.1e)) and promoting a built form design which optimizes energy efficiency and conservation (1.8.1f)). These principals can be best achieved through the use of a Development Permit By-law.

Official Plan (2015)

The Carleton Place Official Plan (OP) has been established to achieve a vision of maintain and celebrating the heritage of the community through balanced and sustainable growth and supporting a unique sense of place for residents. The OP's core guiding principals identify a proactive approach to preserve existing buildings, landscapes and natural features and ensuring that future growth supports the development of clear employment areas to complement residential expansion.

In order to support these goals, the OP includes a substantial policy framework respecting "Community Design" which is further bolstered through the use of a Development Permit By-law, rather than traditional Zoning regulations. As the OP and DP By-law were created and adopted at approximately the same time, the policies appropriately reinforce reciprocal policies and regulatory requirements.

It is however noted that the OP has not been subject to thorough review within the last 15 years and as a result there are several structural and administrative provisions which require updating to conform to current provincial policy. The Town is presently undertaking a Comprehensive Review of the plan which will assist in analyzing the need for amendments to the text of the policy.

The present Housekeeping Amendment continues to be consistent and in conformity with the Official Plan, and while it brings the municipality closer to conforming with Provincial legislation, it will not be fully compliant until the next comprehensive DP update in 2022 following the adoption of the Official Plan Amendment.

Comments Received

The application for the Housekeeping Amendment has been circulated in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.

An Open House was conducted on October 29th, 2020 during which two (2) participants sought general information regarding the amendment. No objections or material comments were provided pertaining to the amendment.

The statutory Public Meeting was conducted on November 10th, 2020 with comments provided by one (1) participant, Mr. Ben Clare of McIntosh Parry. Mr. Clare provided a verbal summary of comments he had previously provided in writing.

Staff has received eight (8) comment submissions respecting the proposed amendment. Appendix A of the staff report includes a summary of the comments received, staff's response and a note respecting the need to make further amendment to the By-law as a result of the submissions.

Summary

In response to comments received, staff recommends making the following additional notable revisions to the By-law:

1. Inclusion of "Automotive Body Shop" as an additional permitted use in the Business Campus (S Pentz)
2. Lower the calliper for tree removal from 200mm to 150mm (Urban Forest Committee)
3. Increase the maximum frontage of driveways for semi-detached dwellings from 45% to 50% in order to increase on-site parking (Cavanagh Development)
4. Introduction of further provisions respecting the erection of boathouses and docks on the Mississippi River (MVCA)
5. Provide flexibility to analyze the requirement for "Parking Studies" as a component of reduced parking requests (B Clare)
6. Further clarity for Secondary Suite/Additional Residential Unit provisions (B Clare)
7. Introduction of additional use, "Veterinarian Establishment"; "Church" etc. (B Clare)
 - a. *Definitions of the undefined uses will be sourced from existing policies in adjacent municipalities (i.e. City of Ottawa).*

Staff also acknowledges that the circulated draft of the amendment included modifications to the provisions of the "Mississippi Residential Sector". Since the circulation of the amendment, Council has provided staff direction to proceed with DPA-03-2020 respecting the Mississippi Residential Sector specifically. As a result, staff will withdraw all of the present proposed amendments to Section 4.3 in order to deal with the amendment through a separate application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council pass a comprehensive housekeeping by-law amending the text and Schedule A of the Development Permit By-law 15-2015.

APPENDIX A – PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

Commenter	Policy Reference	Comment	Municipal Response	Revision Recommended
Steve Pentz	5.2.1	I see that “automotive repair garage” is proposed as a new use to be added to the Business Campus. Would you consider also adding “automotive body shop” to the Business Park designation? (Relates to 119 Roe Street)	“Automotive Body Shop” is a defined use within the Development Permit By-law and is not inconsistent with other discretionary uses in the Business Campus.	Yes
Urban Forest Committee	1.1	Requested wording: DPS “shall” include regulations for Tree Cutting and Site Alteration	The Policy refers to the legislated requirements of a DPS – the Planning Act permits that DPS <i>may</i> including Site Alteration policies. No change recommended	No
	2.10	<p>This section is extremely weak and must be strengthened, as it is an issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be a fine for those who do not apply for a permit on a sliding scale and this should go into the regulations. • Must have a security deposit to ensure the Environmental Impact Statement is followed. The contractor must show that all the requirements such as fencing around identified trees and waterways have been completed before contractors begin. If not, security deposit is forfeited to the town. This is also on a sliding scale. This would also apply to subdivisions, which come under the county. 	<p>The Planning Act does not provide opportunities for establishing set fines for violations of Zoning By-laws or DP By-laws. Violations are managed through prosecution under Section 67 of the Planning Act.</p> <p>Security Deposits can be taken for all on-site and off-site works. The requirement for a security can be detailed in the Development Permit agreement rather than the By-law.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Include in Agreement instead of By-law</p>
	2.13	<p>d) The removal of vegetation within 30 metres of the Mississippi River and/or existing watercourses.</p> <p>e) The removal of trees having a calliper of 150 mm or more, for the purpose of facilitation of new development.</p>	<p>The requested language is consistent with that used in other Planning Policy.</p> <p>Request reduces the threshold by 50mm and does not change the intent of the policy.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>

	2.16	1) Development is setback a minimum of 30.0 metres from the Mississippi River and a minimum of 10 metres from existing waterways	The requested language is inconsistent with that used by the Conservation Authority – recommend changing to 15m for consistency.	Yes
	2.17	Class 1 5) The removal of trees having a calliper of 150 mm or more, for the purpose of facilitating new development Class 1A v)- Must include Green Infrastructure	Request reduces the threshold by 50mm and does not change the intent of the policy. This is a significant change to the policy and will require some additional policy respecting which “green infrastructure” will be acceptable. Suggest postponing to a more specific amendment.	Yes No
	2.22	Commencing a development prior to pre consultation could result in a fine of \$5,000 ?? Supporting Studies and Reports- Low Impact Development Studies Record of Site Condition The committee would like to know what is “Source Water Protection Study” as we had problems when we requested such.	The Planning Act does not provide opportunities for establishing set fines for violations of Zoning By-laws or DP By-laws. Violations are managed through prosecution under Section 67 of the Planning Act. It’s wise to recommend additional technical requirements. Source Water Protection Studies are completed in accordance with the Mississippi-Rideau Source Water Protection Plan and are reviewed by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority in accordance with the Clean Water Act.	No Yes No
	2.26	viii “Grading or alteration with consideration of LID and Green Infrastructure	Noted consideration for additional clarity – not anticipated to result in new intent of the policy.	Yes

		Cash in lieu of parkland – Usually not acceptable- ask council what do they want	Comments are noted – the intent of the policy is to provide scope to general powers.	No
	2.27	Financial guarantees are essential and should be of such value to ensure the work is completed to the satisfaction of the town	Comment noted.	No
	3.28	No development should be located in the floodplain with climate change at our doorstep. The 100-year flood line must be looked at and be realistic. Council needs to be proactive and not reactive and not allowing development in flood plains.	Comment noted.	No
	3.23	When dealing with landscaping native species are to be used unless otherwise directed by the town	This is a significant change to the policy and will require some additional policy respecting which “green infrastructure” will be acceptable. Suggest postponing to a more specific amendment.	No
	3.23	It is recommended Parking areas use Permeable pavement as a Low Intensity Development mechanism to reduce Storm Water Runoff.	This is a significant change to the policy and will require some additional policy respecting which “green infrastructure” will be acceptable. Suggest postponing to a more specific amendment.	No
	3.39	Setbacks From Existing Watercourses. Needs to be reorganized Need a section for the Mississippi River Need a section for other existing watercourses.	Sections pertaining to Source Water Protection (3.39) have been adopted concurrent with other lower-tier municipalities in the Mississippi-Rideau Watershed. It is therefore not recommended that alterations are made without first consulting with the RVCA.	No
	3.40.2	Do Strom Water Management Ponds have the same classification as a sewage storage area?	Existing policy language is general enough to refer to the prevailing Class D Guidelines applicable to the day. No recommended changes.	No
	3.44	Vegetation Removal or Site Alteration	The requested language is inconsistent with that used by the	

		<p>As such, the Town, by means of this By-law, requires that all development be set back 30 metres from the Mississippi River, wetlands and other related waterways.</p> <p>Second paragraph Environmental Impact Statement undertake by a professional qualified to perform the evaluation, the standards outlined above may be varied as determined by the EIS and a Hydrological Study</p>	<p>Conservation Authority – recommend changing to 15m for consistency.</p> <p>Hydrological Studies may be requested as part of a complete application in accordance with Section 2. Including them as a requirement pre-vegetation removal along a shoreline is sensible, however blanket wording for any removal outside of a natural heritage feature may be excessive.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes – to paragraph 1.</p>
	3.45	Water Supply, Sewage Disposal and Storm Water Systems	<p>Comment is reasonable and appropriate for most sizes of Stormwater Management Systems. Will examine Class D Guidelines for consistency in wording and scale.</p>	Yes.
John Angelosante (Cavanagh Development)	2.19	Class 1 and 1A Development permits should be approved at a staff level	Comment noted.	No
	2.22	You have indicated that you would like to add reports as required thru the planning process I think that the required reports should be requested by the town at time of pre-consult stage or within 30 days	<p>Comment noted. It is the goal of the amendment to require pre-consultation sessions which will allow the opportunity to request studies/reports. In some cases, as a proposal evolves it may be appropriate to request further studies during the application review (i.e. initial consultation notes requirement for an EIS – EIS recommends a Species at Risk Assessment)</p>	No
	6.3.2	<p>Single family homes, we are still looking to have 35 ft lots with two car garage and a double driveway.</p> <p>On a 35 ft lot increasing the max. driveway lot frontage to 50% would allow for this.</p>	<p>At least 50% of the lot frontage is required to soft landscaping. This leaves the remaining 50% for hard surfacing which may be composed of drive aisles.</p>	No

		In Meadow Ridge we have done this using a DP1 – many builders have two storey units with two car garage. That would provide 4 parking spots 2 in garage and two in driveway eliminating the on street parking and still provide an affordable unit to a family.		
	6.3.2	This would not be required on 50 or 60 ft lots as two car garages will work fine in these sizes.	Comment noted.	No
	6.3.2	The balance of frontage should have soft landscaping as I see many units adding interlock and concrete or installing additional asphalt which takes away from the curb appeal of the unit.	Comment noted. We certainly hear from residents that they would like to maximize the 50% hard surface for driveway width. This is permitted by the By-law presently and no change is proposed at this time.	No
	6.3.4	Semi detached units should also have 50% max. driveway frontage. On a 7.5 meter lot width the 50% max width would allow for a 14 ft. driveway and oversize garage allowing for 2 cars in driveway and 2 cars in garage again helping in the and still providing a street curb appeal.	No change presently proposed however, the requested revision would allow for additional on-site parking and provide relief to on-street overflow. Recommend change will increase from 45% to 50%.	Yes.
	6.3.8	Townhomes you have already expressed that the main garage foundation should be 6m not 9m this will eliminate all the issues and the 70%. Garage width will allow for oversize driveways and garages allowing for more space in driveway and garage – on a 20ft lot builders can allow for a 14ft garage door and larger driveway allowing for a car and some storage and a car in garage.	Correct – original draft of By-law had a typo.	Yes
	6.0 (overall)	The setbacks that are in the development permit for towns and semi units plus singles are very achievable however an architect should be able to show that he	Comments noted for the record. This is certainly the intent of permitting variations via Class I	No.

		<p>has used the intent of the setback, but may vary them in order to achieve a streetscape.</p> <p>That allows him to provide a unit or block of towns that are architecturally appealing to all and maintain the high level that both homeowners.</p> <p>The town is requesting some of the units that have been built or are being built do not provide this look. Some builders do engage a licenced architect to provide elevations and layouts that are both practical and have a “wow “ factor</p> <p>Which leads to the point of having a design committee or review of plans at a stage prior to building permit application.</p>	permits to establish visual interest in the community.	
	6.0 (overall)	In an architectural point the closer that the units are to the lot line allows for an “old village look” which is why many people are attracted to the Town of Carleton Place , Arnprior and smaller towns, this should be maintained	Comments noted.	No
Frances Moore	General	This purpose of this email is to ensure I receive notification of any decision regarding the proposed Development Permit By-law Amendment (Section 34 and 70.2).	Participation noted.	No
Erica Buffam	3.36	Is there an amended building height proposed for the accessory suites/buildings? Or is it still restricted to a building height of 4.5 metres in section 3.2 part 8.	No – it is not the intent of the revisions to amend the building height for accessory structures (including Secondary Suites)	No.
MVCA	3.36	<i>On privately serviced lots, it shall be demonstrated that there is adequate water and sewer capacity to accommodate the secondary unit, as part of a scoped hydrogeological review.</i>	Private services are not permitted within the Town of Carleton Place without an Official Plan Amendment, which would include a Hydrogeological review.	No

		<i>Additional units shall not be permitted in the 1:100 year flood plain, as defined by the Conservation Authority.</i>	Comment is reasonable and reflective of other Planning Policy (i.e. PPS).	Yes
	3.38	<p><i>Where the shoreline has been hardened by means of a break wall...15.0 metres.: We are not clear on the rationale for a reduction from 30 m to 15 m if the shoreline is hardened. We would suggest that each application be assessed on a site-specific basis to assess a reduction from 30m, as part of a DPA. To that end, we recommend the exclusion of bullet 1.</i></p> <p>In general, we do not find that EIS's of a scoped nature are useful in assessing the impact of single lot development with reduced waterbody setback. A broader EIS review is required <i>that considers the overall intent of the minimum setback requirement, an assessment of the overall development capacity, conveyance, and function of the waterbody; the sensitivity of the waterbody; cumulative impacts; biophysical conditions such as soil depth, slope angle, and vegetation cover; and natural hazards.</i> Any reduction in waterbody setback should only be considered if all constraints have been addressed and better alternatives do not exist.</p> <p><i>Boathouse....</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the following bullets: 	<p>This section is not proposed to change in the amendment, however the recommendation by the MVCA is reasonable and appropriate without dramatically changing the impact of the existing policy. Review of application should be conducted through a Class II/III permit.</p> <p>Recommended wording is reasonable and considered to be an appropriate planning practice.</p> <p>Recommended revisions are appropriate and consistent with</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A maximum of one (1) boathouse is permitted on each lot; • The maximum gross area of a boathouse shall not exceed 47 square metres; • <i>A boathouse shall not exceed 4.5 metres in total height and is limited to a single storey;</i> • <i>The Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority shall be contacted to determine if a permit is required; and</i> • <i>The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry shall be contacted for a boathouse below the high water mark of the waterbody, to determine if a permit is required.</i> • Add following definition of a boathouse: <i>Means a one-storey accessory building that does not contain habitable living space, has an opening to the waterbody of an appropriate size to accommodate a boat and is connected to the waterbody by a boat slip, boat lift, or marine railway.</i> <p>2. Boatport/Launch...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the following text: <i>...and to a maximum width of 3 m. A maximum of one (1) boatport is permitted on each lot; and</i> • <i>The Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry shall be contacted to determine if a permit is required.</i> <p>3. Dock...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the following text to the end of the bullet: <i>...and to a maximum width of 2 metres, unless otherwise permitted by the Mississippi Valley Conservation</i> 	<p>similar Zoning/Development provisions in adjacent municipalities within the watershed. The proposal is contextually appropriate to Carleton Place's policies and clarify the administrative requirements to comply with other general provisions of the existing DP By-law.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<p><i>Authority and any other authority having jurisdiction;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A maximum (1) dock is permitted on each lot; • <i>Docks shall be limited to floating, cantilevered or post dock construction unless otherwise permitted by the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority;</i> • <i>The surface area of a dock shall not exceed 15 square metres in area, unless otherwise permitted by the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority and any other authority having jurisdiction;</i> • <i>A dock shall not be constructed closer than 3 metres from the nearest adjacent side lot line where the lot abuts another property and shall not encroach on adjacent lot lines when the lot boundaries are extended into the water;</i> • <i>Despite the above, no dock shall be constructed which constitutes a navigation or safety hazard; and The Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority shall be contacted to determine if a permit is required.</i> <p><i>8. New Bullet: No new development shall result in a further reduction in the minimum waterbody setback requirement, compared to the existing structure.</i></p>		
	3.44	<p>With respect to the Mississippi River, we recommend that all proposed development within 30m of the high water mark of the river, be subject to a site specific review, as part of a DPA.</p>	<p>A DPA application is reserved for structural amendments to the Development Permit By-law. Staff would recommend that development within 30m of the high watermark of the Mississippi River be subject to a Class II/III permit.</p>	Yes

		<p>In general, we do not find that EIS's of a scoped nature are useful in assessing the impact of single lot development with reduced waterbody setback. A broader review is required, <i>that considers the overall intent of the minimum setback requirement, an assessment of the overall development capacity, conveyance, and function of the waterbody; the sensitivity of the waterbody; cumulative impacts; biophysical conditions such as soil depth, slope angle, and vegetation cover; and natural hazards</i>. Any reduction in waterbody setback should only be considered if all constraints have been addressed and alternatives do not exist.</p>	<p>The recommendation by the MVCA is reasonable and appropriate without dramatically changing the impact of the existing policy.</p>	
	12.4	<p>This bullet appears to deal with flood plain. Therefore, we recommend the reference to the <i>unstable slopes</i>, be removed. And, add a new bullet to deal with slopes as outlined in 6. below.</p> <p><i>Modification of the flood plain...Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority and the Ministry of Natural Resources.</i></p> <p>Remove reference to the Ministry of Natural Resources.</p> <p>Replace a. and b. with the following: <i>The reconstructed building or addition must be constructed in accordance with MVCA's Regulation Policies and relevant floodproofing requirements.</i></p>	<p>Comment noted and identified as technical in nature.</p>	Yes

		New bullet: <i>Any new building or structure or any expansion of; or addition to, any buildings or structure;, or any site alteration, within and adjacent to a steep slope (i.e. greater than 3 m in height and a 5:1 (horizontal:vertical)) may be subject to Ontario Regulation 153/06. The Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority shall be consulted to determine if a permit is required and to ensure that development proceeds in a safe manner.</i>		
	Schedule A	Rename <i>Flood Fringe</i> to <i>1:100 year Flood Plain</i>	Comment noted and identified as technical in nature.	Yes
Ben Clare, McIntosh Perry	1.3	Should be updated to indicate where the Development Permit By-law gets its authority under the Planning Act. Should also contain a section to talk about what the Planning Act requires in order for the Development Permit By-law to be updated.	Comments and noted and will be included in the final amended draft.	Yes
	2.3	Suggestion to replace with "Director of Development Services."	Previously amended.	No
	2.6	Suggestion to update section to ensure only "development" as defined in the Planning Act is subject to permitting under the By-law.	Comments are noted and will be included in the final amended draft.	Yes
	2.9	Suggestion to replace with "Director of Development Services."	Previously amended.	No
	2.11	The Municipality should not have authority to change the Development Permit By-law without public process. Though changes are minor, this could potentially impact development. What does the Planning Act require?	Wording in Section 2.11 is standard for Zoning By-laws across Ontario and is intended to only permit typographical, technical or reference amendments which do not impact the nature, scope, or intent of the policies.	No

	2.15 (2)	Should have mechanism/ability to be exempt from Pre-Consultation based on proposal.	Staff conduct Pre-consultations in a manner and scope relative to the type of proposal. Where there is little benefit to an in-depth pre-consultation session, the consultation is brief but is still of value to identify the project as an anticipated application.	No
	2.15 (3)	<p>Overly prescriptive.</p> <p>Requirements should be identified by way of pre-consultation.</p> <p>For example, elevations may not be applicable for all applications.</p> <p>"Planning Department" should become "Director of Development Services."</p>	Comments are noted and valuable. Section 2.22 provides authority for staff to identify any requirements that are necessary to review the application. Section 2.15(3) to be removed.	Yes
	2.15 (1-5)	<p>Definition should align with Planning Act.</p> <p>Does Town have authority to require Development Permits for other work (e.g. vegetation removal)?</p> <p>We also note that part of item 5 under the development definition section has been removed. Has anything else been removed from the By-law?</p>	The definition of "development" in the DPS includes such activities as site alteration and the removal of vegetation. This is a broader definition of development than what is established under section 41 (site plan) of the Planning Act.	No
	2.16	Last paragraph exempts compliant development from DPs, but seems to indicate "Planning approval" of a site plan is required. Is that the intent and what does this Planning approval entail?	The existing process in reviewing Building Permit applications includes the provision of a "plot plan" or "site plan" to validate that the proposal is consistent with the DP By-law. Wording in the provision to be clarified to differentiate	Yes
	2.17	Too difficult to determine what a particular proposal is classified as. Also too subjective providing "Municipal Planner" with too much authority.	Comment noted. The intent of the amendment is to try and further clarify what class of permit is required in each instance.	No

		Does the Planning Act give the Municipality the authority to require compliance with design criteria?	Reference to “Municipal Planner” has been removed. Yes, LPAT has supported that a Development Permit By-law may require prescriptive design criteria.	No
	2.17.1	Item 5 appears to include a separate item 6.	Comment noted but cannot find referenced point.	No
	2.17.2(2)	Should refer to Development <u>Agreement</u> ?	Comment noted	Yes
	2.17.2(3)	Is the intent of (a) to match the 'four tests' per Section 45 of the Planning Act and should this provision match Provision 1(1) for Class 1? (d) should match updates to Section 2.6.	Yes – the intent is for the analysis to be similar to the commonly applied “four tests” and Class I and Ia permits should be identical.	Yes
	2.17.3(6)	"or which would result in a variance to development standards" is redundant. Refer to 2.17.3(4).	Comment noted.	Yes
	2.17.3(9),(10) and (11)	Why do certain land uses fall under Class 2? Provided the proposal complies with the By-law, it should be Class 1.	In some cases there is a required to execute a Development Agreement in order to collect securities for the work and ensure servicing, grading and drainage on the development site is appropriate. In this case a Class II permit would be required even if the proposal was compliant with the By-law.	No
	2.17.3(12)	This does no constitute development.	Cannot find reference	No
	2.17.3(14)	Is the intent that a simple addition to a residential development would trigger a Class 2 Development Permit?	If the residential development was a prohibited use in the designated area, then yes the “expansion or extension” would require a Class II permit.	No
	2.17.4(2)(i)	Suggestion to remove the word "existing" from "plan of subdivision."	Comment noted.	Yes
	2.17.4(2)(ii)	Please confirm a DP3 is required for variations in cladding/colour.	Yes, but only within the Mississippi Residential District	No

	2.17.4(2)(i v)	Does this insinuate that Committee can make a determination on the completeness of an application? Perhaps this should be the responsibility of the Director of Development Services.	Yes, Council reserves the right to request additional studies, reports or information prior to making a decision. Alternatively, this can be required through a holding provision. Provision is redundant to general powers of decision making.	Yes
	2.17.4(4)	Isn't it possible that technical studies and reports might be required to ensure full and complete review of any class of Development Permit?	This is a true statement and in cases where technical studies are required a Development Agreement is required to ensure the recommendations of the studies are satisfied. If a Class I permit application was found to require supporting studies, it would be elevated to a Class II/III permit as appropriate.	No
	2.17.4(6)	Does this include access?	Comment unclear.	No
	2.17.4(9)	This item is already addressed by 2(i). There is no Section 6.5.	Comment noted.	Yes
	2.18	This section could address housekeeping amendments as well.	Comment noted.	No
	2.19	Authority for referral should sit with Director of Development Services.	Previously amended.	No
	2.19.1	Authority for referral should sit with Director of Development Services.	Previously amended.	No
	2.22	This makes 2.15.3 redundant. It appears as though this section is trying to list all possible studies. Suggestion to rework to provide key examples.	The policy has been revised to include the phrase "...may be required to submit, but not limited to, the following..." in order to provide flexibility.	No
	2.22	Please add "under exceptional circumstances."	Comment unclear.	No
	2.23	Lots of redundancy within this section and with section 2.20.	Comment noted – recommend removing "Class II" and "Class III" specific provisions.	Yes

	2.24	Suggestion to change "Municipal Planner" to "Director of Development Services."	Previously amended.	No
	2.25	Please provide clarity on timelines/deadlines. Minor departures or deviations from approved plans should be accommodated within a development agreement.	Comment noted – timelines/deadlines are as prescribed in the Planning Act.	No
	2.26(2)	Suggestion to remove 2.26(2).	Comment noted.	No
	2.27(e)	Addressed in Section 2.24.	Comment not found.	No
	2.27	Please elaborate on "lain dormant." 2.27.2 is unnecessary given the nature of 2.27.1.	Comment not found.	No
	2.28	2.28 should be consolidated with 2.24.	Section does not exist.	No
	3.2(1)	The word "and" should be replaced with "or." This would apply to situations where the principal use is not associated with a principal building or structure (e.g. salvage yard, transport terminal).	Comment noted.	Yes
	3.2(5)	"no-encroachment zone" should be replaced with "No Encroachment Zone" to acknowledge the definition in the By-law.	Comment noted.	Yes
	3.6	Suggest that "or other permits as necessary" is replaced with "or other applicable approval authorities."	Comment noted.	Yes
	3.7	Can exceptions be made by way of a Development Permit Application? Provision should clarify this. Should 3.7, 3.13, and 3.26 be combined?	Comment noted. No – each of the sections deal with different scenarios of non-conformity and development.	Yes No
	3.12.1	It appears that 3.12.1 is intended to apply to secondary dwelling units or basement dwelling units in multiple dwellings. Does this impact density maximums?	No – O Reg 299/199 prevails over the authority of a Zoning/DP By-law to regulate the density of the residential uses unless servicing capacities exist or planning	No

			justification can demonstrate unmitigated adverse impacts.	
	3.13	Should 3.7, 3.13, and 3.26 be combined?	No – each of the sections deal with different scenarios of non-conformity and development.	No
	3.14	Is there a fence By-law?	No	No
	3.15	Coloured elevations may not be applicable to all proposals. Does the Planning Act give the Municipality the authority to require compliance with design criteria?	Yes, LPAT has supported that a Development Permit By-law may require prescriptive design criteria.	No
	3.26	Should 3.7, 3.13, and 3.26 be combined?	No – each of the sections deal with different scenarios of non-conformity and development.	No
	3.26.9	Development Permit should only apply to "development."	Agreed.	No
	3.29.1	Specifics would be useful on type, height, etc. of screening (fence, landscape?). Items 3 and 4 overlap.	Comment noted. Will clarify.	Yes
	3.29.2	"no-encroachment zone" should be replaced with "No Encroachment Zone" to acknowledge the definition in the By-law.	Comment noted.	Yes
	3.30(1)	With respect to the minimum length of a parking space, and provisions 4.4.6.2, 6.3.2.2, etc., note that six metres might not comply with Section 7 of the Town's By-law No 46-2003 re: on street parking.	Comment noted. Will advise By-law Services.	No
	3.30(2)	By-law should provide flexibility to waive requirement for a Parking Study in certain instances. Parking reductions should not necessarily trigger reviews of movements and access.	Comment noted. "Shall be accompanied" to be changed to "may be required"	Yes
	3.30(4)(iii)	Suggestion to increase maximum permitted width of combined access and egress driveways from 12 to 14 metres to accommodate flaring out of driveways at	Flaring typically occurs beyond the property line at the street-line. 12m egress at the property line would still	No

		property lines. Provision should also clarify that widths are measured at property lines.	accommodate flaring at connection to the street.	
		Is the intent to require 3.5 metre widths for single residential driveways (single, semi, town)?	No – provisions only apply to “parking area for more than four vehicles”.	No
	3.30(4)(iv) and (v)	Please confirm why 2 metre landscape buffer is required when fence is also proposed. Suggestion that typical landscape requirements should apply.	Additional setback of 2m with a fence supports mitigation of impacts on adjacent properties.	No
	3.30.1	Suggestion to rework provision numbering.	Comment noted.	Yes
		Suggestion to make Type B space widths equivalent to minimum required widths within 3.30.1.		
	3.30.2	Suggestion to list commercial/ other uses that are subject to this provision.	Provision refers to requirements of the OBC for accessibility compliance.	No
	3.30.5	Suggestion to restructure and rework to not require cash-in-lieu for every parking reduction.	Town to complete a “Parking Study/Strategy” to assess the value and appropriate considerations for acceptance of cash in lieu.	No
		Should cash-in-lieu apply to Downtown District only?	Additional amendments to come forward in 2022.	
	3.31.1 (2)	Appears to be redundant. Suggestion to revisit.	Comment noted.	Yes
	3.32	"no encroachment zone" should be replaced with "No Encroachment Zone" to acknowledge the definition in the By-law.	Comment noted.	Yes
		For accessible ramps and walkways, By-law should identify permitted projection, not trigger need for Development Permit.	Comment noted.	Yes
	3.32.1	Replace word "guidelines" with "provision."	Comment noted.	Yes
		Please clarify which provision applies to decks.	Provisions have been introduced to provide a sliding scale of setbacks varying based on height of structure.	No
		Suggestion to remove final paragraph.	Comment noted.	Yes

	3.32.2	Please clarify which provision applies to decks.	Comment noted	Yes
	3.32.3	Please clarify which provision applies to decks.	Comment noted	Yes
	3.32.4	Note: no requirements for rear yard setback.	Comment noted	Yes
	3.36	<p>Second paragraph in this section is repetitive. This information (i.e. type of dwelling unit where it's permitted), is also repeated in provision 3.36.4.</p> <p>Two secondary suites is mentioned a couple times: once in the paragraphs, another time in in provision 3.36.2. This appears repetitive to the reader.</p>	Comment noted – will clarify wording of provisions.	Yes
	3.36(8)	How is the floor area addressed for a second secondary suite?	Floor area is contemplated in 36.6(6) as a percentage of primary dwelling area. Minimum dwelling unit areas must comply with OBC.	No
	3.36(9)	<p>Is it reasonable to expect properties to accommodate 3+ parking spaces? We note that a Traffic Study is required to reduce parking requirements, per 3.30.2.</p> <p>Often, secondary suites are pursued to accommodate elderly family members.</p>	<p>The More Homes More Choice mandate was to encourage the construction of affordable rental accommodation – rather than to accommodate family members specifically as has been contemplated in previous Acts. As a result, each “household” should be provided with adequate access to parking for their individual needs.</p> <p>Section 3.30.2 has been amended to provide flexibility.</p>	No
	3.36(10)	Not clear if "accessory building" refers to a detached secondary suite.	Comment noted – this is the intent. Will clarify	Yes
	3.41	Confusion could come about due to the amount of time a temporary structure vs a temporary use could be permitted.	Comment noted.	Yes

		Suggestion to replace the word "tarpauline" with "tarpaulin."		
	3.43	Is this section referring to a Development Permit By-law Amendment? If so, should this section be consolidated with 2.18?	No – this section is referring to Class I/II/III permit applications – not a formal By-law amendment.	No
	3.44	Can the Development Permit By-law regulate vegetation removal? This section also appears to be overly prescriptive and lacking in flexibility. For example, not all trees in all instances are desirable, and compensation or replacement planting could be favourable. The section states that a TPP is required in support of development applications and later also states that a TPP may be required in certain instances. An Environmental Impact Statement should provide direction in some of the instances.	Yes, a DP By-law can include site alteration and tree preservation provisions in accordance with O Reg. 173/06 .	No
	4.1.1	Suggestion to change "School - Commercial private" to "School - Commercial" per the Definitions.	Comment noted	Yes
	4.1.3	The second sentence might not be warranted for every development and the requirement for an Urban Design Brief shall be established at pre-consultation.	Comment noted – agreed. Statement to be removed.	Yes
	4.2.8	"Planning Department" should become "Director of Development Services."	Previously amended.	No
	4.3.1	Was Townhouse Dwelling intended to be included as a Permitted Use?	Note – the Town is undertaking DPA-03-2020 respecting an amendment to Mississippi Residential Sector Provisions. The draft for adoption will not include any revisions to the Mississippi Residential Sector which will be dealt with separately.	Yes
	4.4.1	Because there is more than one definition, "School - Public" and "School - Private" should be listed as separate uses.	Comment noted	Yes
	4.4.6(4)	Consider updating to match 6.3.2.4.	Comment noted	Yes

	6.1	Because there is more than one definition, School -Public and School - Private should be listed as separate uses.	Comment noted	Yes
	6.3.1	Consider having no requirement for <u>maximum</u> exterior side yard build within area. DP1s have been required in this regard, especially for irregular lots. This also applies to 6.3.3, 6.3.5, and 6.3.7.	The Town wishes to ensure that dwellings are built within reasonable distance to the street, as a result there is a strong desire to continue with established maximum setbacks from front and exterior side yards in order to frame the street.	No
	6.3.8	Please provide reason for increase in minimum garage foundation set back of 9.0 metres from front or exterior lot line.	Note – this was a typo in the revised draft of the By-law circulated. No change is proposed to the front yard setback from the existing policy.	No
	6.3.10	Please provide reason for use of word "Style." Suggestion to consider adjusting Definitions to improve clarity on this. For instance, Apartment "Building" is defined.	Comment noted – will revise to reference built form per definition.	Yes
	6.3.10(3)	Please provide reason as to why the number of dwellings that are permitted within an apartment on an arterial or collector roadway was reduced from seven to four.	Note – this was a typo in the revised draft of the By-law circulated. No change is proposed.	No
	6.3.10(5)	Could be problematic.	Comment noted	Yes
	6.3.10(12)	This is already captured by 3.32.4.	Comment noted	Yes
	6.4.2(1)	This provision should not be necessary.	Comment noted	Yes
	6.4.2(3) and 6.4.2(4)	These provisions are generally problematic and need to be revisited. In our opinion, a Development Permit By-law should be specific and not general.	Comment noted but not specifically found	No
	6.4.3	Please provide an example as to how density within the neighbourhood would be calculated.	Comment noted but not specifically found	No
	7.4(3)	Suggestion to replace with "Director of Development Services."	Previously amended	No

	8.1	Suggestion to change "School - Private / Commercial" to "School - Commercial" and "School - Private" per Definitions.	Comment noted	Yes
	8.4(1)	Suggestion to replace with "Director of Development Services."	Previously amended	No
	10.4(1)	Suggestion to replace with "Director of Development Services."	Previously amended	No
	11.4	Suggestion to replace with "Director of Development Services."	Previously amended	No
	12.4(1)	Suggestion to replace with "Director of Development Services."	Previously amended	No
	Definitions	<p>Suggestion to ensure permitted uses in Development Permit By-law are all defined in Definitions. For example, "Veterinarian Establishment" and "Church" are permitted uses in the Mississippi Transitional Sector but are not defined in Definitions.</p> <p>As well, some definitions provided do not appear as a permitted uses in the By-law. An example of this is "Brewery/Winery/Distillery."</p>	Comment noted – will review and include new definitions per industry standards.	Yes
Louis Antonakos	General	General objection to provisions regulating and prohibiting the erection of sea-containers within the municipality	Housekeeping Amendment does not presently include sea-cans in the policy	No

COMMUNICATION 132005

Received from Trisa McConkey, CPA, CGA, Treasurer
Addressed to Committee of the Whole
Date December 8, 2020
Topic 2021 Insurance and Risk Management Services

SUMMARY:

Staff recommend the acceptance of Frank Cowan Company's proposal for insurance and risk management services beginning January 1, 2021.

BACKGROUND:

The Town partnered with the County of Lanark and Tay Valley Township to release an RFP for insurance coverage and risk management services. To assist with the process and evaluation of proposals, the group contracted with Cameron and Associates. The Town of Carleton Place last issued an RFP for Insurance services in 2015.

Three (3) proposals were received. After reviewing the proposals and confirming that the coverage and risk management services offered by each of the proponents were comparable, staff recommend acceptance of Frank Cowan's proposal which has the lowest cost of the three (3) proposals.

PROPONENT	PREMIUM INCLUDING NON-REFUNDABLE PST
Frank Cowan Company	\$334,039.76
Halpenny Insurance Brokers Ltd.	\$406,631.75
AON	\$493,826.24

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The draft 2021 budget included \$305,200, a 22% increase over the 2020 budget as renewal costs in June of 2020 were significantly higher than the approved 2020 budget. The lowest quoted premium is however 33% higher than the 2020 insurance budget and therefore \$28,839 in additional funds is required for 2021. Staff recommend funding this additional increase to the 2021 draft budget from the insurance and the water/sewer reserves.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council awards the Request for Proposal for insurance coverage and risk management services to Frank Cowan Company with McDougall Insurance & Financial as broker for the period January 1, 2021 to January 1, 2022 in the amount of \$334,039.76 including non-refundable PST; and

THAT the Treasurer be authorized to enter into agreements as required for the placement of insurance services; and

THAT Council authorizes an addition to the draft 2021 budget of \$28,839 to be funded from the Insurance and Water/Sewer reserves.

COMMUNICATION 132006

Received from Trisa McConkey, CPA, CGA, Treasurer
 Addressed to Committee of the Whole
 Date December 8, 2020
 Topic 2021 Draft Childcare Budget

SUMMARY:

Staff recommends the acceptance of the 2021 Childcare Budget – Option #1.

BACKGROUND:

Childcare Services operating results have not been positive throughout 2020. During the COVID closure (March to August), the Town's centers lost \$275,314 despite Council's decision to lay-off the majority of Departmental staff for the duration of the shut-down and implementing other cost cutting efforts by staff. During the shut-down, the Province regularly communicated there would be funding to cover costs during the shut-down period. Town staff submitted the required reports to Lanark County who acts as the Service Manager for Childcare in Lanark County on the Province's behalf. As of the date of this report, the Town has received no confirmation of the amount of these funding allocations. County staff indicate that no word will be received prior to year-end.

In September, the Province allowed for Childcare centers to re-open provided they followed Health Unit guidelines. These guidelines and the decreased demand for before and after school care have resulted in an estimated loss for September to December of \$400,510. Under the Province's Safe Restart Funding for Childcare, the Town received only \$164,510 in funding. Lanark County continues to collect information and advocate with the Province for additional funding.

As illustrated in the below chart, our losses for the year are entirely related to direct services to children and COVID expenses. Staff are forecasting a \$78,000 reduction in net expenditures in December due to the timing of revenue receipts.

Service	2019	2020 (YTD to Nov)
Direct Services to Children		
Dietary	253,386.32	149,465.61
B/A RYP	(180,916.07)	(20,929.27)
Infant	24,340.68	24,336.25
Kinder	(180,249.99)	(24,837.97)
Nursery	35,091.42	11,507.02
Pre-Kinder	10,650.29	
Pre-School	(46,186.20)	306,794.04
Regular B/A	(211,309.85)	(590.05)
Specialty Project	(1,447.90)	(83.20)
Toddler	48,261.16	123,986.87
Camp	153.87	2,245.62

Direct Services to Children Total	(248,226.27)	571,894.92
Overhead		
Administration	568,153.61	495,054.54
Department Revenue	(954,839.98)	(843,918.72)
Building Maintenance	398,917.54	361,436.98
COVID-19		13,324.35
Overhead Total	12,231.17	25,897.15
(Surplus)/Deficit	(235,995.10)	597,792.07

Estimated 2020 Year-End Deficit	519,792.07
--	-------------------

Staff are hopeful funding will be received for the closure period, and that County staff are successful in advocating for additional funds from the Province and/or are able to reallocate funding not used for other purposes in 2020. In the absence of additional funding, there is a Childcare Operating Reserve with a balance of \$1,051,748 that will fund the 2020 deficit, leaving approximately \$531,956 for 2021.

Draft 2021 Budget – Option #1

In November 2020, the local health unit increased cohort sizes from 10 to 24. This means that staff can now work in up to three (3) rooms of eight (8) children rather than being limited to one (1) room only. Any further changes to Health Unit restrictions and/or Ministry guidelines will be reviewed immediately and a report outlining the impact to the Childcare budget will be brought forward to Council.

FRANCIS STREET LOCATION

With the completion of the expansion at the Francis Street Centre and the above recent changes to cohort sizes, this budget contemplates opening two (2) new rooms with a capacity of twenty-four (24) pre-school aged children in each. It is possible to do this without increasing staffing levels for the Centre and therefore results in a significant reduction in the anticipated deficit for the Centre. In addition, the following cost saving measures will be taken:

- Staff have been reduced through not replacing those who leave, retire, or take maternity leave. To cover the duties of those staff, supervisors and/or administrative staff will perform COVID screening and running and cover some breaks.
- Food costs have been reduced by \$50,000 over the 2020 budget.
- Programming materials budgets were reduced.
- The annual mortgage payment ended in 2020 saving over \$126,962 for 2021.
- Transfers to capital reserves will not be made in 2021.
- All capital and minor maintenance projects have been deferred.
- Fees increase by 2% beginning February 1, 2021.

CARAMBECK LOCATION

Carambeck houses before and after school care. Health Unit requirements still state that programs must maintain school-age cohorts according to a) their school and b) their core day class. Currently, children are separated in five (5) rooms each dedicated to a particular school. To comply with the requirement to separate classrooms, children are separated into groups and kept apart from each other though within the same room. Due to these requirements, staff are recommending that services not be provided for snow days, PD days or any other full day program at this time.

Demand for the program is down by over 35% from pre-COVID numbers further impacting the profitability of the Centre. In normal times these programs earn a profit that offsets the cost of infant and toddler programs at Francis Street and contributes significantly to balancing the overall Childcare budget. That being said, the Centre is providing critical services to 94 families allowing them to work and contribute to the economy.

The following cost saving measures have been taken:

- Staff have been reduced through not replacing those who leave, retire, or take maternity leave.
- Food costs have been reduced by \$20,000.
- Programming materials budget was reduced by \$25,000.
- Transfers to capital reserves will not be made in 2021.
- All capital and minor maintenance projects have been deferred.
- Fees increase by 2% beginning February 1, 2021.

The following table summarizes the Draft 2021 Budget – Option #1:

2021 Budget-Option #1	Francis St	Carambeck	Total	FTE
Fees	(1,572,000)	(394,944)	(1,966,944)	
General Operating Grant	(740,214)		(740,214)	
Administration Staff	252,000		252,000	2.64
Cleaning Staff	85,000		85,000	1.71
Direct Care Staff	1,572,285	511,572	2,083,857	30.52
COVID Screening Staff	68,592	143,214	211,807	3.57
Dietary Staff	104,242	26,349	130,591	2.43
Administration	78,900	53,976	132,876	
Building Maintenance	110,800	77,600	188,400	
COVID Supplies	17,000	7,000	24,000	
Food	60,000	15,000	75,000	
Insurance	11,000	4,000	15,000	
Program Expenses	27,200	25,000	52,200	
Shift Premium	300	4,500	4,800	
Training	4,000		4,000	
Total Deficit	79,104	473,268	552,372	40.9
Available Operating Reserves	(79,104)	(452,852)	(531,956)	
Unfunded Deficit		20,416	20,416	

Any additional funding received from either the Province or Lanark County will be used to offset this deficit. If no further funding is received, the Town would be “lending” the amount of the deficit to the Childcare Centre. This amount could easily be repaid the following year provided that COVID is over.

Draft 2021 Budget – Option #2

FRANCIS STREET LOCATION

No change from Option #1

CARAMBECK LOCATION

Close the Centre until COVID has passed and Health Unit restrictions are lifted. This would require laying-off 12 staff currently working at the Centre and will affect 94 families counting on these services. If lay-offs last longer than thirteen (13) weeks, there would be further costs related to severance pay.

The following table summarizes the Draft 2021 Budget – Option #2:

<u>2021 Budget-Option #2</u>	Francis St	Carambeck	Total	FTE
Fees	(1,572,000)		(1,572,000)	
General Operating Grant	(740,214)		(740,214)	
Administration Staff	252,000		252,000	2.64
Cleaning Staff	85,000		85,000	1.71
Direct Care Staff	1,572,285		1,572,285	22.67
COVID Screening Staff	68,592		68,592	1.00
Dietary Staff	104,242		104,242	1.71
Administration	\$78,900	\$9,500	88,400	
Building	\$110,800	\$77,600	188,400	
COVID	\$17,000		17,000	
Food	\$60,000		60,000	
Insurance	\$11,000	\$4,000	15,000	
Program Expenses	\$27,200		27,200	
Shift Premium	\$300		300	
Training	\$4,000		4,000	
Total Deficit	79,104	91,100	170,204	29.7
Available Operating Reserves	(79,104)	(91,100)	(170,204)	
Unfunded Deficit	0	0	0	

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Option #1 will require all funds in reserve leaving nothing for unforeseen circumstances and/or the continuation of COVID restrictions beyond 2021. It will also require a loan from the Town's reserves to cover the \$20,416 deficit.

Option #2 will leave \$361,752 in the reserve however more of the reserve may be required if the General Operating Grant from the County of Lanark is reduced due to the closure and the reduction of children served. County staff are not able to quantify the reduction at this time.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council approve the Childcare 2021 Budget-Option #1 as presented by the Treasurer; and

THAT further changes to Health Unit restrictions and/or Ministry guidelines be reviewed by staff immediately and a report prepared for Council's consideration outlining the impact to the Childcare budget.

COMMUNICATION 132007

Received From: Tracey Freill, Manager of Carleton Place Childcare Services.
Addressed To: Committee of the Whole
Date: December 08, 2020
Topic: Carleton Place Childcare Services Parent Fee Proposal

SUMMARY:

Staff recommends an increase of 2% to childcare fees to help offset the loss of revenue due to the pandemic.

BACKGROUND:

Childcare staff are continually working to balance the Ministry of Education requirements and the Health Unit cohort guidelines to provide safe, educational, warm, and nurturing environments for children during these unprecedented times. Cohorts have impacted the overall flow and scheduling of staff and children which has also severely impacted the budget. Cost savings and fee increases will help to ease some of the financial burden.

COMMENT

Carleton Place Childcare Services offer a unique homelike atmosphere that provides small group settings allowing for more focused teaching moments that are essential to growth and development during the formative years of 0 to 4. Room capacity for preschoolers are set by the Ministry and based on square footage. The Francis Street location offers preschool rooms that have a maximum capacity of 8 children to 1 teacher. Scheduling pre-COVID allowed for movement between all 12 preschool rooms. As of November 2020, the maximum cohort set by the Health Unit is 24. This only allows for movement between three (3) groups thus greatly impacting and adding to the financial constraints.

Our School Age program is even more restricted in movement as children must be separated by schools and to the best of our ability, their individual classes. Many parents are choosing to work from home and some children are being home-schooled. This is impacting attendance within the program. Capacity numbers have also dropped due to the Health Unit's cohort size restrictions. Maintaining individual group bubbles has created a significant impact to overall attendance and revenue.

The fees at the Centre reflect the hours of operation which are longer than most centers to allow for parents commuting to their place of employment. The Centre is open from 6:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Friday. Staff absences due to sickness, vacation, COVID testing, etc. require coverage without mixing cohorts and to meet staff to child ratios and have contributed to higher costs. In addition, the Town hires qualified staff and pays salaries which promotes the exceptional care for the children in our community. Even during a pandemic, quality childcare is a factor which encourages new families to move to the area and supports the community's ongoing growth and development.

The last fee review for Carleton Place Childcare Services occurred in October 2019.

The proposed fees and charges are attached.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed fees for 2021 reflect increased costs for staffing and reduced attendance resulting in the need for a 2% increase to rates. Overall, it is estimated the new rates will provide an additional \$38,000 in revenue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the proposed Childcare fees as presented be approved based on a 2% increase effective February 1, 2021; and

THAT the necessary by-law to enact the fees be forwarded to Council for approval.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Summary of Proposed Changes to Carleton Place Childcare Fees

Carleton Place Childcare Services

Fee Schedule 2021

Age Group	1 Day	2 Day	3 Day	4 Day	5 Day
Infants (0-18 months)					
Full Day	\$80.80	\$161.60	\$242.40	\$323.20	\$404.00
Toddlers (18-30 months)					
Full Day	\$54.40	\$108.80	\$163.20	\$217.60	\$272.00
Preschoolers (2.5-5 yrs.)					
Full Day	\$52.30	\$104.60	\$156.90	\$209.20	\$261.50
Nursery School					
Preschool Morning Session (9:15 – 12:00)	\$21.60	\$43.20	\$64.80	\$86.40	\$108.00
JK/SK					
Full day (Carambeck or Francis)	\$45.30	\$90.60	\$135.90	\$181.20	\$226.50
JK/SK Before School (Carambeck)	\$14.60	\$29.20	\$43.80	\$58.40	\$73.00
JK/SK After School (Carambeck)	\$14.60	\$29.20	\$43.80	\$58.40	\$73.00
JK/SK Before & After School (Carambeck)	\$29.20	\$58.40	\$87.60	\$116.80	\$146.00
School Age (Grade 1 and up)					
Full Day	\$36.50	\$73.00	\$109.50	\$146.00	\$182.50
Before School	\$13.90	\$27.80	\$41.70	\$55.60	\$69.50
After School	\$13.90	\$27.80	\$41.70	\$55.60	\$69.50
Before & After School	\$27.80	\$55.60	\$83.40	\$111.20	\$139.00
Junior School Age Program					
Full Day	\$36.50	\$73.00	\$107.40	\$146.00	\$182.50
Before School	\$13.90	\$27.80	\$41.10	\$55.60	\$69.50
After School	\$13.90	\$27.80	\$41.10	\$55.60	\$69.50
Before and After School	\$27.80	\$55.60	\$82.20	\$111.20	\$139.00
Summer Camp					
JK/SK	\$45.30	\$90.60	\$135.90	\$181.20	\$226.50
School Age & Junior	\$36.50	\$73.00	\$109.50	\$146.00	\$182.50

COMMUNICATION 132008

Received from Joanne Henderson, Manager of Recreation and Culture
Addressed to Committee of the Whole
Date December 8, 2020
Topic Additional Community Enrichment Grant Request

SUMMARY

An additional request for a Community Enrichment Grant has been received from the Carleton Place Christmas Basket Program in the amount of \$5,000. Staff recommends that the maximum grant amount of \$1,500 per the program parameters be provided.

COMMENT

Each year, Council approves a budget to allocate funding to various community groups to assist them in their endeavours. Council approved a budget of \$30,000.00 for 2020. The funding program is known as the Community Enrichment Program.

Staff has received an additional application under the program following the 1st and 2nd intakes and has reviewed it against the program criteria. The request was received from the Carleton Place Christmas Basket Program in the amount of \$5,000. The Community Enrichment Program criteria outlines a maximum contribution for requests in the amount of \$1,500. Given the program's criteria, staff recommends that a \$1,500 grant be provided in response to the request received.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Below is a summary of Community Enrichment Grant Funding available:

2020 Budget	\$30,000.00
Total used from Intake 1	\$ 7,577.22
Total used from Intake 2	\$ 5,000.00
Staff Recommendation – Additional Application	<u>\$ 1,500.00</u>
Remaining Balance	\$15,922.78
	=====

Council approved at the November 24, 2020 Council meeting that any unused funds at year end be transferred to a reserve and used to fund 2021's Community Enrichment Program.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council approve the allocation of a Community Enrichment Grants to the Carleton Place Christmas Basket Program in the amount of \$1,500.00

COMMUNICATION 132009

Received from Joanne Henderson, Manager of Recreation and Culture
Addressed to Committee of the Whole
Date December 8, 2020
Topic Sidewalk Art

SUMMARY

It has been brought to Staff's attention that the sidewalk art installation in front of the As Good As New Store has created a slip hazard in wet and winter conditions.

COMMENT

Staff has spoken with Erin Lee from Interval House which is the organization that installed the sidewalk art in this location. She has agreed to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding for the maintenance of the sidewalk area for the winter months and will assume all responsibility for this piece of Town property. The Town of Carleton Place will continue to be responsible for snow removal.

Although, Interval House will assume responsibility for this area, due to the Joint and Several Liability system within the Province of Ontario, the Town as the property owner, could still be held liable and responsible to defend itself in the event of a claim depending on the nature, named defendants and amount of a claim made for an injury caused due to the Sidewalk Art.

Options to address this matter include:

1. Removed the sidewalk art
2. Enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Interval House to minimize as much of the risk to the Town as possible.

Staff wanted Council to be aware that there is still potential risk to the Town in the event of an accident in the area in front of the As Good as New location as the Town is the owner of the sidewalk.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council authorizes the CAO to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Interval House regarding winter maintenance of the sidewalk area in front of the As Good As New location due to the installation of the sidewalk art.

COMMUNICATION 132010

Received From: Guy Bourgon, Director of Public Works
Addressed To: Committee of the Whole
Date: December 08, 2020
Topic: Waste Collection – Additional Bag of Waste

BACKGROUND

At the September 22nd, 2020 meeting of Council, the following motion regarding waste collection during the COVID-19 pandemic was passed:

Motion No. 17-131-05

Moved by: Councillor Fritz

Seconded by: Councillor Randell

THAT Council directs staff to proceed with Option 2 - Extend the One (1) Additional Bag of waste until December 31, 2020, as outlined in the report prepared by the Director of Public Works dated September 08, 2020, in regard to the collection of curbside waste.

CARRIED

DISCUSSION:

As the current extension of the one (1) additional bag of waste expires on December 31, 2020, it is appropriate at this time to determine if Council wishes to consider a further extension.

The increased cost associated with the collection of an additional bag of waste per household each week is limited to the tipping fees at the disposal site and the quantity of material received. Tipping fees were \$94.07/tonne until the end of October and are now \$99.00/tonne based on the recently approved contract. Collection costs are not impacted. The quantity of waste and tipping fees for 2019 and 2020 from April to October are summarized in the table below:

Month	2019 (tonnes)	2020 (tonnes)	Increase (2020 over 2019)	Increase in Cost
April	236.11	322.45	86.34	\$8,122
May	279.28	260.87	-18.41	-\$1,732
June	235.44	272.73	37.29	\$3,508
July	218.50	278.60	60.10	\$5,654
August	248.68	290.97	42.29	\$3,978
September	232.01	281.76	49.75	\$4,803
October	268.37	303.34	34.97	\$3,462
Total	1718.39	2010.72	292.33	\$27,795

Due to the lack of headway made against the spread of COVID-19, while some of the workforce has returned to the workplace, many residents are still working remotely.

Additionally, many students will be continuing to learn remotely for at least a portion of each day. The waste that would otherwise be generated at the workplace or at school

by those individuals is consequently finding its way into the residential waste stream. While the amount of waste generated at home during the work or school day is not considered to be large, it still results in a small increase in weekly waste for those impacted households. While a small amount of the increase in curbside collection can be attributed to growth within the community over the past year, the majority of the increase is directly related to the additional permitted bag of waste.

A typical effect of allowing additional waste to be collected is a reduction in recycling rates, as can be seen in the table below. In general, allowing only one bag per week encourages residents to recycle more material, thereby diverting recyclable material from landfills. The Town had made good progress from 2018 to 2019, but the recycling rates have dropped significantly since the introduction of the additional bag of waste.

Month	2018 (tonnes)	2019 (tonnes)	2020 (tonnes)	Decrease (2020 from 2019)
April	80.39	110.97	91.94	19.03
May	88.68	130.81	76.99	53.82
June	79.10	111.37	79.09	32.28
July	76.41	107.72	82.85	24.87
August	88.14	102.64	57.80	44.84
September	82.47	99.76	77.77	21.99
October	98.79	110.95	108.04	2.91
Total	593.98	774.22	574.48	199.74

OPTIONS

Option 1 – Return to One (1) Bag Limit Effective January 1, 2021

The Town would return to collecting one (1) bag of waste per week from each household. There would be no further impact on the Town's waste budget after returning to the one (1) bag limit.

Option 2 – Extend the One (1) Additional Bag until April 30, 2021

The Town could extend the period of the collection of one (1) additional bag of waste per household per week until the end of April. There would be a return to the one (1) bag limit in May. Based on the trending observed for the quantity of material tipped at the disposal facility, it is estimated that \$16,000 in additional charges will result from continuing with an additional bag of waste per week for the first four months of 2021.

Option 3 – Extend the One (1) Additional Bag for an Alternate Timeframe

Council could determine to extend the period of collection of one (1) additional bag of waste per household for some alternate period of time, shorter or longer than April 30, 2021, at an additional cost of approximately \$4,000 per month.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council direct staff to proceed with Option ____ as outlined in the report prepared by the Director of Public Works dated December 08, 2020, in regard to the collection of curbside waste.

COMMUNICATION 132011

Received From: Guy Bourgon, Director of Public Works
Addressed To: Committee of the Whole
Date: December 08, 2020
Topic: Accommodations for Winter Visitor Parking

BACKGROUND

There has been recent interest amongst members of Council with regard to providing some form of winter overnight parking area to accommodate guests of property owners who may not have sufficient driveway/garage space for additional overnight vehicles.

DISCUSSION:

Under Traffic and Parking By-Law 46-2003, the Town of Carleton Place restricts parking in municipal parking lots through the following provisions:

9. Parking Regulations - Highway Clearing, Snow Removal, Highway Cleaning, Municipal Parking Lot Snow Removal and Cleaning

1. No person shall park a vehicle or permit a vehicle to remain parked on any highway or municipal parking lot:

- (a) while the work of removing snow or ice therefrom or clearing of snow therefrom is in progress, or;
- (b) in such manner as to interfere with highway or municipal parking lot cleaning operations.

2. Overnight Winter Parking

No person shall park a vehicle or permit a vehicle to remain parked on any highway between 12:00 a.m. midnight to 7:00a.m. from November 15 to April 1 of any year.

46. Municipal Parking Lots

- (1) No person shall park a vehicle or permit a vehicle to remain parked in a Municipal Parking Lot for a period of time longer than four hours between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. without first obtaining a parking permit.
- (2) Notwithstanding the above, the Municipal parking Lot on Allan St. will have no restrictions in regards to the length of time parked, nor shall a permit be required to park there.
- (3) Except where provided elsewhere in this By-law, there shall be no limitations for all Municipal Parking Lots between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

As our winter operations for municipal parking lots occur overnight, overnight parking in any municipal parking lot is currently not possible by virtue of Section 9(1). To provide additional clarity, staff is proposing to amend Section 9(2) to include municipal parking lots.

In consultation with Parks and Recreation and By-Law Services, locations were reviewed where overnight parking could potentially be accommodated without impacting the operation of the facility where applicable while allowing for winter operations to be completed during daytime hours.

Staff has identified four (4) areas at various locations in Town that would be appropriate to serve as overnight parking areas as follows which are shown in the attachment to this report:

1. The Riverside Park parking lot at the end of John Street is not heavily used during the winter months therefore staff would recommend that 10 spaces at the east end of this parking lot be designated for overnight winter parking. These spaces would need to be signed.
2. The gravel parking lot for Carleton Junction on Coleman Street could accommodate 8 overnight parking spaces.
3. The gravel area on Cavanagh Road next to the tower and stormwater pond can accommodate 10-12 overnight spaces.
4. Lastly, the temporary gravel area at the south end of McNeely Avenue by the trail can accommodate approximately 6 overnight parking spaces.

It should be noted that the Coleman St. and Cavanagh Road parking areas noted above are not priority one areas and generally are plowed on the second day of winter operations. The temporary McNeely Ave. gravel area is currently not maintained by the Town and would need to be added to the second day schedule.

The current by-law would require any vehicle parked overnight in the parking lot to be removed by 11:00 am based on Section 46(1). This would allow Public Works staff to return to the parking lot during the day to clear areas where overnight parking occurred.

A further amendment to Section 9(2) would be required to permit overnight winter parking to occur in the above-noted locations between November 15th of any given year to April 1st of the following year.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council direct staff to amend Traffic and Parking By-Law 46-2003 to accommodate overnight winter parking in four (4) Town parking lots as outlined in the report prepared by the Director of Public Works dated December 08, 2020.

ATTACHMENT

Map showing proposed overnight parking areas



BY-LAW NO. XX-2020

A BY-LAW OF THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF CARLETON PLACE TO AMEND TRAFFIC AND PARKING BY-LAW NO. 46-2003.

WHEREAS Section 11 (3) 1. of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c25 authorizes municipalities to pass by-laws relating to Highways, including parking and traffic on highways;

AND WHEREAS Section 11 (3) 8. of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c25 authorizes municipalities to pass by-laws relating to parking, except on highways;

AND WHEREAS Section 27 of the Municipal Act, 2001 S.O. 2001, c25 permits a municipality to regulate the Traffic and Parking on municipal streets that they have jurisdiction over;

AND WHEREAS Section 63(1) of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001. c25 permits a municipality to remove, impound, restrain or immobilize an object or vehicle placed, stopped, standing or parked on a highway in contravention of a by-law that a municipality has passed regarding placing, stopping, standing or parking an object or vehicle on a highway;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the Town of Carleton Place adopted By-law 46-2003, the Traffic and Parking By-law;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed expedient and necessary to amend By-law 46-2003;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Carleton Place hereby enacts as follows:

1. THAT Section 9(2) of the Traffic and Parking By-law No. 46-2003 "Overnight Winter Parking" be amended as follows:
 - (a) No person shall park a vehicle or permit a vehicle to remain parked on any highway or in any municipal parking lot between 12:00 a.m. midnight to 7:00 a.m. from November 15th of any given year to April 1st of the following year.
 - (b) Notwithstanding the above, parking will be permitted in the locations listed in Schedule 'XX' between 12:00 a.m. midnight to 7:00 a.m. at any time during the year.

SCHEDULE 'XX' TO BY-LAW NO. 46-2003

OVERNIGHT PARKING AREAS

Column 1 Parking Area	Column 2 Location	Column 3 Designated Spaces
Riverside Parking Lot	John Street	10 signed spaces at eastern limit
Carleton Junction	Coleman Street	Gravel parking area in its entirety
Cavanagh Rd Parking Lot (at communication tower)	Cavanagh Road	Gravel parking area in its entirety
Temporary parking area	McNeely Ave (southern limit)	Gravel parking area in its entirety

READ A FIRST TIME, SECOND TIME AND A THIRD TIME AND FINALLY PASSED THIS
8th DAY OF DECEMBER, 2020.

Doug Black, Mayor

Stacey Blair, Clerk



**Parks and Recreation Committee Minutes
for the November 30, 2020 meeting held at 7:00 p.m. in the
Arena Large Board Room**

Present: Councillor Linda Seccaspina, Reeve Richard Kidd, Paul Pillsworth, Tom Marshall, Bill Levesque, John Andrews, Todd Boyce, Facilities Clerk Steph Scollan, Manager of Recreation & Culture Joanne Henderson.

Absent: Jan Ferguson(regrets)

- 1) DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY/CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF – now or anytime during the meeting**
 - 2) PUBLIC MEETING – NONE**
 - 3) DELEGATIONS**
 - 4) PLEASE SILENCE ALL ELECTRONIC DEVICES**
-

Communication 131145

Received from: Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians
Addressed to: Parks & Recreation Committee
Date: November 30, 2020
Topic: Credit for ice

SUMMARY

Staff have received a request from Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians for a credit of \$4,000.00 for the games played without fans. The credit would be applied to practice ice.

COMMENT

Ice rental rates were not increased from September to December. This resulted in a loss of revenue of approximately \$9,000 as well as the loss in canteen revenue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Committee provide direction to staff regarding the request by Jason Clarke for a credit for ice time for games played without fans.

Moved by John Andrews

Seconded by Todd Boyce

That due to budget restrictions; the request for a credit of \$4,000.00 for practice ice be denied.

CARRIED

Communication 131146

Received from: Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians

Addressed to: Parks & Recreation Committee

Date: November 30, 2020

Topic: Room 5 Furnace

SUMMARY

Staff have received a request from Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians for the Town to help fund the relocation of the furnace in room number 5 or the removal of the furnace and the addition of wall heaters.

COMMENT

There are critical arena infrastructure projects required in the next few years. These projects will force our major maintenance reserve to go into a deficit position. Staff therefore recommends that unnecessary operational changes cannot be justified.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the request from Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians to help fund the relocation of the furnace in room number 5 or the removal of the furnace and the addition of wall heaters be denied.

Moved by John Andrews

Seconded by Linda Seccaspina

THAT the request from Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians to help fund the relocation of the furnace in room number 5 or the removal of the furnace and the addition of wall heaters be denied.

CARRIED

Communication 131147

Received from: Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians

Addressed to: Parks & Recreation Committee

Date: November 30, 2020

Topic: Arena advertising

SUMMARY

Staff have received a request from Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians to be exempt from paying for non-renewals of arena advertising. The Carleton Place Canadians will pay for those that have renewed but would like to retain the advertising

spaces that have not renewed for future advertising. The request is for a one-year exemption only.

COMMENT

The Carleton Place Canadians currently purchase advertising spaces from the Town and are permitted to sell these spaces for sponsorship dollars.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Carleton Place Canadians be exempt from paying for non-renewals of advertising spaces for the period September 1, 2020 until August 31, 2021.

Moved by Tom Marshall

Seconded by Bill Levesque

THAT the Carleton Place Canadians be exempt from paying for non-renewals of advertising spaces for the period September 1, 2020 until August 31, 2021.

CARRIED

Communication 131148

Received from: Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians
Addressed to: Parks & Recreation Committee
Date: November 30, 2020
Topic: Request for Back Bay in Arena Storage Area

SUMMARY

Staff have received a request from Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians to obtain the back bay of the arena storage area to open up a gym that could be used by all Carleton Place athletes. The Canadians would pay rent to the Town of Carleton Place and the renovations would be the responsibility of the Canadians.

COMMENT

This area is currently a non-heated storage garage for parks equipment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

THAT the request from Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians to use the back bay of the arena storage area for a gym be denied.

Moved by Todd Boyce

Seconded by Bill Levesque

THAT the request from Jason Clarke, Carleton Place Canadians to use the back bay of the arena storage area for a gym be denied.

CARRIED

NEW BUSINESS

1. Staff advised the Committee about an issue with an unsigned seasonal contract by a significant user of the facility for the 2020/2021 season. Following a discussion; the Committee instructed to staff to meet with the user at the beginning of each month to determine usage for the upcoming month. Once usage is determined; the user will be required to sign a monthly contract. Any ice time that is uncommitted by the user will be sold to other users. The user will be financially responsible for any committed ice time that is unused during the month.



CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MISSISSIPPI MILLS

3131 OLD PERTH ROAD • PO BOX 400 • RR 2 • ALMONTE ON • K0A 1A0

PHONE: 613-256-2064
FAX: 613-256-4887
WEBSITE: www.mississippimills.ca

December 2, 2020

Dear Lanark County Clerks:

RE: Farm 911 – The Emily Project

Please be advised the Council of the Municipality of Mississippi Mills at their regularly scheduled meeting on December 1, 2020, adopted the following resolution:

WHEREAS farm accidents can occur in remote locations, making it difficult for first responders to easily locate the situation;

AND WHEREAS not all rural property entrances have emergency signage;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT, Council requests the County of Lanark to support Ontario's Farm 911 – "The Emily Project", to enhance emergency addresses and signage for vacant rural land;

AND THAT, this resolution be sent to local Lanark County municipalities requesting their support for this project.

I encourage you to check out the Farm 911 website (www.farm911.ca) for additional background information regarding this important initiative.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Cynthia Moyle,
Acting Clerk
Mississippi Mills

c.c. Local Lanark County Municipalities

THE COUNTY OF LANARK

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

October 28, 2020

Report # CAO-19-2020 of the
Chief Administrative Officer

Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail - Two Year Review

1. STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

"THAT, Lanark County Council accept the report CAO-19-2020 Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail Two Year Review for Information."

2. PURPOSE

To provide council with an update on the status of the OVRT at the two-year anniversary of the trail opening, October 5, 2018.

3. BACKGROUND

County Council approved motion #ED-2018-18, March 14, 2018,

"That, County Council review the approved uses for the trail in 2021 (after two years of operation)."

For Lanark County motorized users require license, insurance and permit from OVATV or OFSC.

Trail uses are outlined in the Management Plan:

5.2 Authorized Trail Users Given the municipalities have distinct responsibility for managing their specific sections of the Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail, and while they come together through the Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail Advisory Committee, the Committee as a whole will review what is permitted if and when needed, and each may recommend specific uses for their specific section, both locally and to the OVRTAC.

5.2.1 Hiking/Walking The Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail will permit hiking along all sections. Hiking will be promoted and encouraged. Hikers will share the trail with other all-season users.

5.2.2 Cycling and Alternative Biking The Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail will permit cycling along all sections. Cycling will

be promoted and encouraged. It is recommended the trail surface be upgraded where appropriate and as resources are available with aggregate that accommodates hybrid bikes for three seasons and permits fat biking in the winter months. Other cycling determinations will be made in accordance with other Ontario Ministry of Transportation Guidelines for other products, such as E-Bikes.

5.2.3 Cross Country Skiing The Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail will permit cross country skiing, dog-sledding and snowshoeing along all sections during the winter months. Skiers will share the trail with snowmobiles and other users. These activities will be promoted and encouraged.

5.2.4 ATV/ORV/Side-by-Sides The Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail will permit licensed and insured off-road vehicles along all sections unless indicated by signage with a clearly marked by-pass in place. For the purposes of the definition of "off-road vehicle", the Ontario Ministry of Transportation definition is as follows: Off-road vehicles (sometimes called ORVs) are any two- or three-wheeled motorized vehicles, as well as specific vehicles with four or more wheels as prescribed by regulation, intended for recreational use. Examples of off-road vehicles include all-terrain vehicles (ATVs), two-up ATVs, side-by-side ATVs, utility terrain vehicles (UTVs), amphibious ATVs, off-road motorcycles and dune buggies. Note: Electric and motorized scooters (commonly known as go-peds) and pocket bikes (which are miniature motorcycles about two feet in height and with a speed of 70-80 kph) are not offroad vehicles and, as such, cannot be registered as off-road vehicles. These vehicles also do not comply with motorcycle standards and cannot be registered as motorcycles. The trail may be closed at certain times of the year to preserve the trail bed due to wet conditions (See Section 5.3). ATVing will be promoted and encouraged through organized ATV clubs and associations, such as Renfrew County All-Terrain Vehicle Club (RCATV) or Ottawa Valley ATV Club. A Memorandum of Understanding will be signed with ATV groups in the area for social events and club use of the trail.

5.2.5 Snowmobiling The Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail will permit snowmobiles on all sections of trail identified as OFSC prescribed trails, December 1st to March 1st. A Memorandum of Understanding will be signed with the Snowmobile District and the owners for use of the trail. All sections that allow snowmobile passage will have a corresponding Land Use Agreement between the

3
<http://www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/dandv/driver/handbook//section7.3.0.shtml> Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail Management Plan 7 Club/OFSC and Land Owner on file and shared with the OVRT owners. Snowmobiles, may have exclusive motorized use of the trail,

on sections that are OFSC prescribed trail. Snowmobile users will respect and share the trail with other winter users during this time. Snowmobiling will be promoted and encouraged in conjunction with the Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs. Snowmobiles and snowmobiling will not take place on non-groomed, non-OFSC signed areas.

5.2.6 Equestrians Equestrian riding is permitted on all sections of the trail. Equestrian riding will be promoted and encouraged in conjunction with the provincial equestrian federations. Riders are required to remove all manure from the trail surface.

5.2.7 Other Users, Emergency Response As new modes of travel are developed, the municipalities may review the new use based on its fit with existing uses. **Currently dirt bikes are not a permitted use on the trail.** The review would be based on request: a) access by new user groups; b) received conflict reports from other authorized users; or c) upon anticipated demand for a new potential market/experience. Emergency Services (Police, Fire and Ambulance) will be allowed to access the trail ROW as required.

Description

The Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail is approximately 296 km in length running from outside Sturgess Road in Montague to the outskirts of Mattawa. The former rail bed was part of a longer line from Ottawa to Sudbury. The corridor is 990.3 hectares, the width of the corridor varies from 27.4 m (90+/-feet) and has 37 bridges and underpasses. The Lanark County section is 61km in length with 6 bridges and the highway 7 underpass.

The natural features found along the trail vary from traversing through vast wetlands to following the beautiful Ottawa River.

Historical Setting

In 1853, caught up in the excitement and foreseeing the benefits of a railway, the municipalities in the United Counties of Lanark and Renfrew secured land and agreed to underwrite the Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company (B&O) to the tune of 200,000 pounds sterling. The first phase of the railway started at Brockville and ran to Smiths Falls. It was to be continued to Arnprior and Pembroke, with several branch lines to Westport, Newboro, and Merrickville. Only a line to Perth was realized. The inaugural run from Brockville to Smiths Falls began on a sub-zero February morning in 1859. Travelling at 15 mph, the wood-burning locomotive carrying two coaches filled with passengers took 2 ½ hours to reach Smiths Falls. The trip to Perth took another 7 hours because of a broken coupling and lack of water. Five years of construction took a heavy toll on the B&O and interest payments could not be met and refinancing had to

be arranged. The line was extended to Carleton Place in 1859 and reached the Ottawa River through Almonte, Arnprior, and Sand Point in 1864. B&O turned over the right to build from Arnprior to Pembroke to Canada Central Railway and the line was extended through Renfrew County in the 1870s. Both companies were united under Canadian Pacific Railway Company and linked with a transcontinental network in 1881.

Recent History

The Counties were notified about Canadian Pacific's intent to discontinue and sell the Ottawa Valley Railway between Smiths Falls and Sudbury in January 2010. After CP diverted traffic off the line, short-line operator Rail America terminated its lease with CP. This launched a process under the Canada Transportation Act that provides stipulated time periods for various stakeholders to express interest in purchasing it. The Counties then lobbied MP's to keep the rail line as an operational line for economic development in the future. When an active rail line wasn't feasible the Counties began conversations to keep the corridor intact and use as a full multi-use recreational trail. In 2011 the County of Renfrew, County of Lanark and the Township of Papineau-Cameron engaged in discussions to acquire the discontinued rail corridor. The goal of the three municipalities was to acquire the corridor in one contiguous piece and to maintain and operate as a contiguous whole.

Antec Appraisal Group appraised the discontinued rail corridor at \$77,692,039 using an 'across the fence' method. The Partners paid (will pay) \$500,000 cash plus a tax receipt to the appraised value to acquire the corridor. The Lanark County portion was appraised at \$14.6 million with a cash price of \$120,000 and the balance as a charitable tax receipt.

The corridor is being purchased in three parcels starting with the most southernly section with the remainder leased until transfers are completed. Each of the municipalities will acquire title to that part of the trail within their respective boundaries and be responsible for the construction, operation, use and management of that part acquired.

Lanark County purchased the majority of the property from CP Rail on February 8, 2017 and November 30, 2017. There remains to date one outstanding property in Lanark County to be transferred that CP is working on establishing clear title.

4. DISCUSSION

The Lanark County portion of the Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail was officially opened October 5, 2018 with a ribbon cutting ceremony

at the Highway 7 underpass. Politicians, staff and the public attended with bicycles, horses, dogs and ATVs all in attendance.

Well prior to the opening, County Council asked for a two-year review to assess the uses of the trail.

The Trail has been acquired and operated with the assistance of various key partners:

Renfrew County and the Township of Papineau-Cameron.

Lanark County has worked closely with these municipalities for the last 10 years. Renfrew County has been the lead on negotiations with CP, website, survey and legal. The municipalities work closely with a working group that meets a minimum of twice annually. The group developed a joint management plan, share best practices and keep everyone updated on trail development and all issues trail related.

Public Works Staff. The addition of the OVRT the build and maintenance has been managed by the Lanark County Public Works Department. Their expertise in bridge and road design has created a safe corridor that is lauded by all users.

OPP Lanark County Detachment and OPP S.A.V.E. Team; patrol the trail, responded to complaints, shared best practices. See Appendix A.

Local Snowmobile Clubs – B.E.A.S.T. and West Carleton have signed user agreements since 2016 and provide annual insurance certificates. Volunteers brushing, warden patrols, \$120,000 contribution to the Carleton Place bridge upgrades.

Local ATV Club – Ottawa Valley ATV signed a user agreement in 2018 and provides an annual insurance certificate. Volunteer wardens patrol the trail on a regular basis. Membership has grown from 136 members to 572 memberships since partnering with Lanark County Trails. They have contributed \$46,000 towards Lanark County Trails in the last year.

Local Municipalities – Cooperation with all four local municipalities. Mississippi Mills contributed to enhancements to the bridge railing in Almonte. They are tying in their Mill Workers Staircase to the OVRT. Carleton Place has leased the siding historically and now again known as Carleton Junction, developed a secondary paved section of the trail, paid for bridge enhancements including a viewing platform on the bridge. The CP total investment of \$1million dollars in the trail and park has made the OVRT an outdoor, downtown destination for everyone. Beckwith has added multi trail access points to their trails

feeding users for both recreation and commuting. Montague has been a strong supporter of the trail encouraging increased access to the trailhead and links to Smiths Falls.

Alameda Project – Grass roots community group has raised over \$45,000 to enhance the trail in Almonte including planting and maintaining one hundred plus sugar maples, benches, picnic tables and landscaping.

Federal & Provincial Funding – The Provincial Program Ontario Municipal Commuter Cycling Program provided \$548,000 from the Ontario Cap & Trade Program. Federal funding \$74,237 from the Provincial Transit Infrastructure Fund and \$75,000 from the Canada 150 Fund.

Voyageur Cycling Route – The OVRT is part of this Ottawa to North Bay cycling route.

Usage

Very difficult to get accurate numbers on usage when you have a 61km trail that can be accessed at unlimited locations. We have done some counts over the past year that provide a general idea of non-winter usage.

Periodic Counts at various locations from August 2019 to September 2020:

Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail						
Urban		Walk	Bike	ATV	Total Users	
	Users	2835	1073	316	4224	30 days
		67%	25%	7%		
Average per day		95	36	11	142 average	
Rural		Walk	Bike	ATV		
	Users	395	281	258	934	45 days
		42%	30%	28%		
Average per day		9	6	6	21 average	
Total		Walk	Bike	ATV		
	Users	3230	1354	574	5158	75 days
		63%	26%	11%		
Counts between August 2019 and September 2020						

The Town of Carleton Place supplied trail count information:

May 2019 – 56 users (9 hours)

May 2020 – 167 users (1 day) 75 walk or jog; 72 cyclists; 20 ATVs.

The usage of the trail appears to be steadily growing. This will present increased tourism and economic development spinoffs. It is providing an outdoor space for people to get outdoors and see the best Lanark County has to offer.

Complaints, Concerns & Observations

The development of the OVRT as a multi-use trail has not been without concerns and objections being raised by adjacent property owners and others.

The management philosophy of our trails is that we take at Lanark County is **We want to be good neighbours**. We endeavor to respond to all complaints and try to come with solutions.

As the OPP observes in Appendix A the amount of complaints has gone down over time. Lanark County has an email trails@lanarkcounty.ca and a phone number 613-267-1353

Calls and emails to Public Works at Lanark County re trail:

April 14, 2020 to August 27, 2020:

- 1 drainage issue
- 3 observations (e.g., missing signs)
- 2 complaints (i.e., dirt bikes / motor bikes on the trail)
- 3 concerns (e.g., poison ivy, fishing from the bridge)

Common concerns over the past two years and County response:

- Dirt Bikes - Not allowed and signage has been expanded.
- Speed of snowmobiles – Work with OPP and snowmobile clubs, expanded signage.
- After Hour Motorized Use – Not allowed and signage has been expanded.

Next Steps

Committees

Lanark County Council has two committees that deal with trails. The Trails committee is made up of representatives from council (2), local municipalities (2) the public (5), the Health Unit (1) and County staff (1). The OVRT Promotion Committee that is made up of one council representative from each municipality. The terms of reference for these committees are attached as Appendix B.

Capital Improvements

Capital improvements are still being made to improve parking, signage and safety. These will continue in the years ahead as we work with our existing partners and form new partnerships

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The conversion of the rail bed to a multi-use trail was approximately a \$3 million dollar project that included upgrading bridges and adding stone dust to the entire trail. Three different capital grants were received worth \$800,000 with the balance of the trail paid for by Lanark County taxpayers. The annual operating cost is budgeted at \$60,000 a year (~1,000km).

6. LOCAL MUNICIPAL IMPACT

The local municipalities have been valuable partners in the trail development.

7. CONCLUSIONS

The acquisition, development and operation of a multi-use rural/urban trail has been an eleven-year journey. Lanark County Council has built something that will continue to grow and serve the community for future generations. We will continue to work with all our partners, committees and public to improve the trails experience for all users.

9. ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A: OPP Update and February Snowmobile Report

Appendix B: Lanark County Trails Sub Committee - Terms of Reference & OVRT Promotion Working Group - Terms of Reference

Recommended By:

Kurt Greaves
Chief Administrative
Officer

Manager Approval By:

Kurt Greaves
Chief Administrative
Officer

Kurt Greaves

From: Nicholas, Lisa (OPP) <Lisa.Nicholas@opp.ca>
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2020 2:51 PM
To: Kurt Greaves
Cc: McConnell, Marty (OPP); Padiachi, Karuna (OPP); Dupuis, Joshua (OPP)
Subject: RE: Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail
Attachments: MSV Feb 2020 For Council.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello again Kurt,

I have spoken with our detachment Analysts. When the trail was first opened there was substantial amount of push back from the residents in Mississippi Mills who were living adjacent to the trail. As of recent, the amount of noise/speeding complaints has significantly decreased. I have attached a report we did in February that outlines our Motorized Snow Vehicle Project with our results. We continue to do Snowmobile, ATV, Bicycle and foot patrol on the trail. In the last year OPP have laid a total of 59 charges, 50 percent speeding with other 50 percent being equipment related. The major user groups from the Snowmobile and ATV clubs have been engaged in holding each other accountable on the trail.

Sincerely

Thanks

A/S/Sgt Lisa Nicholas

From: Kurt Greaves [<mailto:kgreaves@lanarkcounty.ca>]
Sent: 14-Aug-20 2:46 PM
To: Padiachi, Karuna (OPP) <Karuna.Padiachi@opp.ca>
Subject: Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments in unexpected emails.

Hi Karuna,

This October marks two years of having the OVRT open in Lanark County.

I am doing a review for councils consideration.

Part of that review I was hoping to include some comments, observations and suggestions from the OPP.

If you could pull something together for us that would be very helpful.

Enjoy your weekend.

Kurt

Lanark County OPP

Motorized Snow Vehicle Patrol



During the month of February 2020 the Lanark County OPP, and the OPP SAVE unit have dedicated a total of 171.5 officer hours to MSV Patrol in Beckwith Carleton Place and Mississippi Mills. All of these hours were dedicated to the OVRT*

60% of ALL MSV Patrol during the month of February was conducted in Mississippi Mills on the OVRT

Given that each patrol is two officers this equates to:

- Mississippi Mills 51 Hours of Dedicated Patrol *

During the month police received 8 "Traffic Complaints" regarding speeding Snow Machines on the OVRT. They also received 1 "Noise Complaint" regarding snow machines intentionally revving their engines near the complainants' residence. These were all in Almonte.

During this time Officers have conducted in excess of 30 R.I.D.Es. They have issued 32 Provincial Offence Notices, more than 20 Warnings under Provincial Acts and issued 1 three day warning for an operator registering a WARN on a roadside Breath test. They have conducted multiple radar enforcements

*Officers have completed their Daily Activity Reports (DARS) for the Month of February resulting in an additional 17.5 hours being reported in Mississippi Mills since the initial information was provided.



LANARK COUNTY TRAILS SUB-COMMITTEE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Approved: September 25, 2019
Amended: December 11, 2019**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
2. MANDATE	3
3. COMMITTEE STRUCTURE	3
4. MEETINGS & QUORUM	4
5. REPORTING PROCESS	4
6. STAFF AND SUPPORT SERVICES.....	4
7. BUDGET	5
8. TERM.....	5

2. MANDATE

Trails are a vital component of transportation and recreation within Lanark County, in addition to building a sense of community. Trails benefit residents and visitors alike by fostering economic development and local tourism; encouraging healthy lifestyles, appreciation of the natural features of the County and helping us connect with our environment, our heritage and each other.

The purpose of the Lanark County Trails Sub-Committee is to manage, plan, educate and partner in developing a well- coordinated, sustainable and environmentally responsive trail network within the County of Lanark that balances environmental protection and recreational activity, health and prosperity of a diverse range of users.

The Lanark County Trails Sub-Committee will undertake the following:

- i. To promote the development of ecologically, socially and economically sustainable trails within Lanark County;
- ii. To promote responsible, and accessible use;
- iii. To advocate and promote a healthy active transportation system on both land and water;
- iv. To advocate on behalf of an interconnecting trail system at local, provincial and national levels as appropriate;
- v. To promote and market the economic and tourism benefits of a recreational trail system in Lanark County;
- vi. To foster a policy that supports public consultation and communication between all land users and land owners;
- vii. To encourage and support an education plan on the benefits of a healthy, active and safe lifestyle;
- viii. To create a sustainable cooperative partnership between various trail organizations and users;
- ix. Provide a point of contact between citizens, County Staff and Council in soliciting and assessing community feedback with respect to the maintenance, issues and concerns pertaining to all trails within the County.

3. COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Comprised of the following:

- Two (2) members of County Council
- Warden
- Two representatives from local municipalities within the County of Lanark
- Five (5) public representatives from the County of Lanark (including one from a local Snowmobile Club and one from a local ATV Club)
- The Chief Administrative Officer or his or her designate (ex-officio)
- One representative from the Leeds, Grenville and Lanark District Health Unit.

The Chair shall be elected amongst the members. The Committee shall report, through the Economic Development Committee, to Lanark County Council.

4. MEETINGS & QUORUM

The Sub-Committee shall meet on a quarterly basis (minimum four times per year) or at the call of the Chair. A quorum shall be deemed as 50% plus one voting members of the Trails Sub-Committee. The Meetings will be held in a Meeting Room at the County of Lanark Administration Building, 99 Christie Lake Road Perth, unless otherwise determined. The Term of the Trails Sub-Committee shall be reviewed on an annual basis by Council.

5. REPORTING PROCESS

The Trails Sub-Committee will provide quarterly updates (at a minimum) to the Economic Development Committee, through a report from the Chair.

6. STAFF AND SUPPORT SERVICE

The Trails Sub-Committee will be coordinated by the Research Assistant and led by the Chair, who shall be selected by the Striking Committee and shall be limited to a member of Council only.

The County Clerk will provide additional staff resources that may be required as deemed necessary, by the Committee.

7. BUDGET

Council remuneration will be paid in accordance with the Elected Official – Meeting and Professional Development Remuneration Policy. Travel reimbursement shall be paid in accordance with Travel Management and General Expenses Policy. All amounts will be expended to the Governance Budget for salaries and wages and travel expense. This only applies to County Council representatives.

The annual budget allocation of the Trails Sub-Committee shall be requested on an annual basis during the budget process, based on the goals and objectives of the work plan and subject to budget adoption by Council.

8. TERM

The Term of the Trails Advisory Committee and its appointed Members shall be renewed every two years.

AUTHORIZATION

Recommended by the Striking Committee:

Dated:

Chair,

Adopted by Council:

Dated:

Warden, Brian Campbell



**OTTAWA VALLEY RECREATION
TRAIL (OVRT) PROMOTION
WORKING GROUP**

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Approved: September 25, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
2. MANDATE	3
3. WORKING GROUP STRUCTURE	3
4. MEETINGS	3
5. REPORTING PROCESS	3
6. STAFF AND SUPPORT SERVICES.....	4
7. BUDGET	4
8. TERM.....	4

2. MANDATE

The purpose of the OVRT Promotion Working Group is to identify and provide recommendations on opportunities to promote and enhance development of the Ottawa Valley Recreation Trail, and the future 'Ring Trail', by collaborating with local municipalities, community partners and recreation groups, etc.

3. WORKING GROUP STRUCTURE

Comprised of the following:

- One representative from each local municipality (being a member of County Council)
- Warden (ex-officio)

4. MEETINGS & QUORUM

The OVRT Promotion Working Group shall meet at the call of the Chair, to a maximum of four to six meetings per year.

Quorum shall be deemed as 50% plus one voting members of the Working Group.

The meetings will be held in a Meeting Room at the County of Lanark Administration Building, 99 Christie Lake Road Perth, unless otherwise determined.

5. REPORTING PROCESS

The OVRT Promotion Working Group will provide regular updates to the the Lanark County Trails Sub-Committee, through a report from the Chair, and will make final recommendations to the Economic Development Committee, through a Staff Report, which will reflect the direction of the working group.

6. STAFF AND SUPPORT SERVICE

The OVRT Promotion Working Group will be led by a Chair, elected amongst the working group.

The Tourism Manager and Chief Administrative Officer or his/her designate shall participate in the Working Group.

In addition, the County Clerk will provide additional staff resources that may be required as deemed necessary, by the Working Group.

7. BUDGET

Council remuneration will be paid in accordance with the Elected Official – Meeting and Professional Development Remuneration Policy. Travel reimbursement shall be paid in accordance with Travel Management and General Expenses Policy. All amounts will be expended to the Governance Budget for salaries and wages and travel expense. This only applies to County Council representatives.

The OVRT Promotion annual budget allocation shall be requested on an annual basis during the budget process, based on the goals and objectives of the working group and subject to the adoption of the budget by Council.

8. TERM

The term of the OVRT Promotion Working Group will continue for the term of this Council (2018 – 2022), to a maximum of four - six meetings per year.

AUTHORIZATION

Recommended by the Striking Committee:

Dated:

Original signed by B. Campbell
Chair, Brian Campbell

September 25, 2019

Adopted by Council:

Dated:

Original signed by R. Kidd
Warden, Richard Kidd

September 25, 2019

To All Township and Lanark County Councillors,

I read with interest the 2020 Vegetation Management Plan Update prepared by Michelle Vala, a student intern working on her MA in Biology. I question why a strategic document that holds so much importance for so many constituents in Lanark would be produced by a student who is a part-time employee of the department that implemented the plan. Given the seriousness of spraying pesticides year after year against the wishes of a majority of voters in Lanark County, it would behoove this council to ask that a review of the Plan be conducted by one of our many local scientists for a true, educated perspective on the situation.

We have to stop taking this report at the word of its implementers and start to question the strength of its claims:

- Awards notwithstanding, it is simply scientifically impossible for our County to spray hundreds of miles of roadsides with pesticide, plant a few pollinators and come up with a positive number for pollinators. Who is conducting the studies proving that pollinators are increasing despite widespread pesticide spraying? It's just not believable.
- I reviewed the North American Pollinator Protection Campaign (NAPPC) that bestowed the award to our County and have to question its agenda, as should you. It is an American-led organization, heavily managed by American agriculture businesses, many of them with a vested interest in having taxpayers pay for pesticide spraying.
- Why are we bragging about spraying walking trails? Surely that's the last place we should be contaminating nature. Those certainly aren't organic farmers making those poor decisions.
- Why are we "spot spraying"? If you're going to send a truck out to spot-spray, you can just as easily send a truck out with a few trained, properly dressed workers and shovels and remove the offending weeds once and for all, end of story.
- History shows that there is no end to "noxious weeds" and "invasive species". Every year, the province adds another species and threatens consequences if counties don't handle it. I have investigated the "consequences" and realistically, there are none. The Province of Ontario has never followed up in any instance of inaction on the part of any county. It's a myth.
- Allowing this plan to proceed is encouragement for these sloppy, expensive eradication methods that ruin the environment, increase cancer rates and don't get rid of the *supposed* problem.
- Be aware: there is no organization in Canada that claims that pesticides are not harmful to humans or animals; that includes the Pesticide Management Regulatory Agency, Health Canada and Public Health Ontario. All the studies (conducted by those with a vested interest in selling pesticides) can conclude is that there is no proof to the contrary. Anyone saying otherwise is extrapolating from the studies dangerously.

Let's make 2020 the last year Lanark County wastes taxpayer money on pesticide and spraying. The County needs to be made aware of the fact that roadside spraying (and indeed, all pesticide spraying) is not compliant with any climate change action plan. The County needs to direct the Planning Department to go back to the drawing board, hire an educated scientist experienced in nature-based solutions and come up with a cost-effective plan for the removal of noxious weeds that is supportive of Lanark County's Climate Action Plan.



City of Belleville
Corporate Services Department
169 Front Street, Belleville ON
K8N 2Y8

SENT BY EMAIL

November 25, 2020

Re: Council Resolution – Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act
– Website support

Further to the Meeting of Council on November 17, 2020 Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Marmora and Lake passed the following motion:

MOTION2020NOV17-260

Moved by Councillor Bernie Donaldson

Seconded by Councillor Ron Derry

WHEREAS Section 14(4) of O. Reg 191/11 under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act requires designated public sector organizations to conform to WCAG 2.0 Level AA by January 1, 2021; and

WHEREAS the City remains committed to the provision of accessible goods and services; and

WHEREAS the City provides accommodations to meet any stated accessibility need, where possible; and

WHEREAS the declared pandemic, COVID-19, has impacted the finances and other resources of the City; and

WHEREAS the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act contemplates the need to consider technical or economic considerations in the implementation of Accessibility Standards;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Corporation of the Municipality of Marmora and Lake requests that the Province of Ontario consider providing funding support and training resources to municipalities to meet these compliance standards; and



THAT this resolution is forwarded to the Premier of the Province of Ontario, Prince Edward-Hastings M.P.P., Todd Smith, Hastings -Lennox & Addington M.P.P., Daryl Kramp, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and all Municipalities within the Province of Ontario.

FURTHER THAT the Municipality of Marmora and Lake supports the resolution passed by the City of Belleville.

Carried

I trust this is the information you require, however, should additional information or clarification be required do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Bennett,
Deputy Clerk
613-472-2629 ext. 2232
jbennett@marmoraandlake.ca

cc: The Honourable Doug Ford
Todd Smith, MPP Prince Edward-Hastings
Daryl Kramp, MPP Hastings – Lennox & Addington
Association of Municipalities of Ontario
All Municipalities within the Province of Ontario