THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF SEVERN
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Thursday, October 20, 2016
Council Chambers - Municipal Office
7:00 P.M.
AGENDA

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST & THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

C. PUBLIC MEETINGS
   "NIL"

D. DELEGATIONS
   "NIL"

E. REPORTS FROM OFFICIALS (for information) Page #
   1 Building Report for the Month of September 2016 1-2
   2 By-law Enforcement Report for the Month of September 2016 3-4
   3 Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals – Statement of Pound Services for the Month of September 2016 5-6
   4 Director of Planning & Development re Wrecking Yard - 1505 Silk Line 7-8

F. REPORTS FROM OFFICIALS (for direction) Page #
   1 Planning Report No. P16-046 re Consent Proposal - 2700 Baguley Road 9-14
   3 Planning Report No. P16-048 re Request for Waiving of Fees for Rezoning Applications - 4033 Boyd Road, 3607 Fairgrounds Road & 3185 Riverdale Road 21-26

G. CORRESPONDENCE (for information) Page #
   1 Sustainable Severn Sound re Steering Committee Minutes - August 4, 2016 & September 8, 2016 27-36
H. CORRESPONDENCE (for direction)                  Page #
  1  Association of Municipalities of Ontario re AMO Resolution - 37-38
     What's Next Ontario?
  2  Severn Sound Environmental Association re 2016 SSEA 19th 39-40
     Annual Partnership Awards
  3  Coldwater Royal Canadian Legion re Veterans' Dinner - November 41-42
     5, 2016
  4  Land Solutions re Borehole Investigation at Severn River - 43-44
     4142
     Canal Road

I. CONFIDENTIAL AGENDA
  1  Reports from Officials

     "NIL"
  2  Correspondence

     "NIL"

J. ADJOURNMENT

Dates for Future Planning & Development Committee Meetings

Thursday, November 17, 2016 - 7:00 p.m.
Thursday, December 15, 2016 - 7:00 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Permits Issued</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Date</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permits Issued For:</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Commercial/Institutional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic Systems</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dwellings</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Apartment or Garden Suites</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential &amp; Septic</td>
<td>$4,387,832.00</td>
<td>$38,562,133.00</td>
<td>$1,398,067.00</td>
<td>$20,629,479.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$95,200.00</td>
<td>$68,400.00</td>
<td>$832,268.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential &amp; Agricultural Total:</td>
<td>$4,387,832.00</td>
<td>$38,657,333.00</td>
<td>$1,466,467.00</td>
<td>$21,461,747.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$270,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$860,854.00</td>
<td>$1,273,062.00</td>
<td>$155,170.00</td>
<td>$855,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$941,585.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$9,059,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indust/Comm/Instit Total:</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$2,484,647.00</td>
<td>$155,170.00</td>
<td>$9,914,230.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Fees Collected</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit</td>
<td>$45,741.78</td>
<td>$378,777.86</td>
<td>$19,207.71</td>
<td>$290,018.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic Permits</td>
<td>$6,056.85</td>
<td>$48,309.20</td>
<td>$2,863.35</td>
<td>$29,517.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fees</td>
<td>$2,546.55</td>
<td>$11,733.47</td>
<td>$1,950.00</td>
<td>$11,475.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$54,305.18</td>
<td>$438,820.53</td>
<td>$24,021.06</td>
<td>$331,011.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: __________________________ Date: 3.0.16

* TIM HORTONS
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## BY-LAW ENFORCEMENT REPORT TO PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

for the month of September

**2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCURRENCES</th>
<th>2015 September</th>
<th>2015 Total Year</th>
<th>2016 September</th>
<th>2016 To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEAN &amp; CLEAR</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY STANDARDS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSTOMER SERVICES, GENERAL</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INITIATIVES/ISSUES, SPECIFIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P.O.A. Part 1 (fines)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.A. Part 3 (fines)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING FINES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BY-LAW NOTES/INFORMATION:

Stats do not include incoming or outgoing telephone calls, reports and paperwork.

General issues and services include sump pump inspections, signs, limited animal control, limited zoning meetings, etc.

Special projects include errands, pictures and drop offs.

### NOTEWORTHY ISSUES:

[Signature]

**DATE**: 11 Oct 16
# SPCA Report to Planning and Development Committee

for the month of September 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCURRENCES</th>
<th>2015 September</th>
<th>2015 Total Year</th>
<th>2016 September</th>
<th>2016 To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dog Tags Issued</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs Impounded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs Taken to Shelter by Rate Payer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs Claimed by Owners</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints Investigated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tickets Issued</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs Euthanized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Patrols</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felines Sheltered</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature [Signature]

Date Oct 6/16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO:</th>
<th># DOG TAGS ISSUED</th>
<th># DOGS IMPounded</th>
<th># DOGS TAKEN TO SHELTER BY RATERPAYER</th>
<th># DOGS CLAIMED BY OWNERS</th>
<th># COMPLAINTS INVESTIGATED</th>
<th># TICKETS ISSUED</th>
<th># DOGS EUTHANIZED</th>
<th># ADDITIONAL PATROLS</th>
<th># FELINES SHELTERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1/2016</td>
<td>Sept 30/2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Branch Manager: Tom Molloy  
Date: Oct 6/16
------Original Message------
From: Andrew Fyfe
Sent: October 12, 2016 9:35 AM
To: Mark Taylor; Sharon Goerke
Cc: Mike Burkett; Henry Sander
Subject: RE: Agenda Item

Mark - the property is a former wrecking yard and is zoned as such. It has been bought by a company which intends to reactivate it in accordance with the zoning. They have agreed to enter into a site plan agreement which will cover screening, environmental protections, enclosure of equipment, etc. No other approvals except for building permits are required from the Township. The first step will be the construction of a berm across the front of the property to provide visual screening and noise attenuation.

They are subject to MOE regulations and they have also stated their operations are certified as meeting the Canadian Auto Recyclers' Environmental Code (CAREC) which is an audited industry code of operations.

Andrew

------Original Message------
From: Mark Taylor
Sent: October 12, 2016 9:18 AM
To: Sharon Goerke
Cc: Andrew Fyfe
Subject: Agenda Item

Hi Sharon,

Can you add this to the agenda for planning on Oct 20, 2016?

What is the status of the proposed wrecking yard on Silk Line?

Thanks

Mark
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REPORT

P16-046

TO: Chair & Members
Planning & Development Committee

FROM: Katie Mandeville
Planner

DATE: October 4, 2016

RE: Consent Proposal – Applications B-10/11-16
2700 Baguley Road

Recommendation

THAT Planning Report No. P16-046 dated October 4, 2016 be received;

AND FURTHER THAT the request from Andrea Matthew Williams to allow for consent applications to facilitate the creation of two residential building lots at 2700 Baguley Road be endorsed by Planning & Development Committee for the consideration of the Committee of Adjustment.

Background

Andrea Matthew Williams has submitted two applications for consent (B-10/11-16) and one retained parcel, containing the existing dwelling to the Township. Appendix 1 is a key map showing the location of the subject property. The following approximate dimensions were proposed as seen on the plan submitted as Appendix 2:

Severed Lot #1: Approximately 60.49 metres (198.5 feet) of frontage on Baguley Road and 5,139.7 metres squared (1.27 acres) of area.

Severed Lot #2: Approximately 60.12 metres (197.2 feet) of frontage on Baguley Road and 12,424 metres squared (3.07 acres) of area.

Retained: Approximately 75.13 metres (246.5 feet) of frontage on Baguley Road and 6,111 metres squared (1.51 acres) of area.

The subject property at 2700 Baguley Road is approximately 2.4 hectares (5.85 acres) in area with 195.7 metres (642.2 feet) of frontage on Baguley Road. The property currently contains a newly constructed dwelling and associated septic system.
The applicant is proposing to create two new residential lots located within the Settlement Area of Port Severn. According to Section B8.2.7 of the Township Official Plan:

"Application(s) which would result in the creation of multiple lots within the lands designated SETTLEMENT LIVING AREA, SETTLEMENT EMPLOYMENT AREA, SHORELINE RESIDENTIAL AREA, and HIGHWAY EMPLOYMENT AREA, shall be subject to review and approval by both the Planning Committee and Council prior to being considered by the Committee of Adjustment. The Planning Committee and Council shall have regard for Sections B1.4, B1.5 and B8 in considering a multiple lot severance.

Assessment of the effect of permitting the creation of lots by consent shall take into consideration the past, present and potential future applications in both the immediate and surrounding area."

Section B1.4 of the Township Official Plan lists numerous considerations that should be satisfied prior to any land subdivision or consent for a land severance. These considerations include: soil conditions, water/sewage services, traffic effects, frontage on a public road, potential impacts on adjacent uses, Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) requirements for livestock barns and cultural/natural heritage resources.

Soil and drainage should not be a concern as there are no apparent issues and any application for a new dwelling will be required to submit a lot grading plan as part of the standard building permit process. Appropriate building envelopes for new dwellings can be provided on all of the lots.

Due to the total number of lots proposed and their creation through the Consent process, a hydro-geological assessment is not required under MOE guidelines. The proposed lots will not create any traffic hazards and the Public Works Department will ensure appropriate driveway locations through the standard entrance permit process and severance application review. Due to the absence of any neighbouring agricultural activities, an MDS study is not required.

In terms of natural and cultural heritage, the property next to the subject lands, directly adjacent to the retained lands containing the existing dwelling, does contain an area identified as Environmental Protection (EP) under both the Township’s Official Plan and Zoning By-law as seen on Appendix 3. However, there is no identified feature, such as a wetland, which would lead to further direction in the OP. The property located to the rear and other side of the subject lands contains an unevaluated wetland, again visible in Appendix 3. The OP policies would classify this feature as being on adjacent lands, if the wetland were within 50 metres of the subject property; this would then prompt staff to request an environmental study. Based on the 2013 air imagery from the County of Simcoe, the closest point of the unevaluated wetland appears to be over 60 metres from the subject property.

Section B1.5 of the Township Official Plan states that Council may direct studies to be undertaken in the course of considering development proposals. Due to the proximity of
the subject lands to an unevaluated wetland and the potential presence of species at risk associated with wetland features and rock barrens common within this area of the Township, a requirement for a species at risk assessment is recommended. This will determine if a viable development envelope is present and what mitigative measures, if any, should be taken. Depending on the findings of this assessment, further investigation through the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) may be appropriate.

Section B8 Subdivision of Land of the Township Official Plan must all be satisfied when considering land division. It is within this section that the previously stated B8.2.7 policy regarding the creation of multiple lots through consent within the Settlement Living Area is included. Council must be satisfied that a plan of subdivision is not required for the proposed multiple lot creations. Typically a plan of subdivision is needed for multiple lots within a Settlement Living Area as municipal services such as water, sewer, roads and sidewalks need to be addressed within the area. As this development will be on private services, an existing municipal road without a sidewalk, planning staff feel a plan of subdivision is not necessary as the municipal services and infrastructure available within the area already exist.

Financial Impact

There is no financial impact to the Municipality. All costs have been paid by the applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

Katie Mandeville, BA, BURPI Planner

With the concurrence of,

Andrew Fyfe, M.A.
Director of Planning & Development

Appendix 1 – Key Map
Appendix 2 – Proposed Development
Appendix 3 – Proximity of the Subject Lands
REPORT P16-047

TO: Chairman & Members
Planning & Development Committee

FROM: Andrew Fyfe
Director of Planning & Development

DATE: October 11th, 2016

RE: Provincial Planning Initiatives

Recommendation

THAT Planning Report No. P16-047 dated October 11th, 2016, with regard to Provincial Planning Policy Initiatives be received;

AND FURTHER THAT a letter summarizing the Township's concerns be prepared for the Mayor's signature on behalf of the Municipality and forwarded to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing for his consideration.

Background

Co-ordinated Land Use Planning Review

This review is looking at four policy documents: The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, The Niagara Escarpment Plan, The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and The Greenbelt Plan. The Province has extended the commenting period to the end of October.

The Province has proposed a number of amendments to those Plans and has conducted workshops for municipal staff and public open houses. Staff attended the open house held in Barrie on June 6th and the workshop in Newmarket on June 7th, as well as a briefing session by Ministry Staff put on by the County on August 19th. As it appears that only the proposed revisions for the Growth Plan will have a potential impact on Severn, the summary below is focused on that document; however, it should be noted that it is proposed to bring the natural heritage policies in the Niagara Escarpment Plan forward to apply to the Growth Plan Area. Additional provincial planning initiatives are also briefly addressed in this report.

Many of the changes are intended to bring the policies and terminology in the Growth Plan into congruence with the new Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). In terms of more
The Province, in collaboration with municipalities, is to identify an agricultural system for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH).

In the absence of any detail, it is not possible to identify what the potential impact is. However, the Canada Land Inventory (CLI) mapping which is typically relied on to assess agricultural potential is seriously out-dated and often inaccurate, especially in areas where the landscape is an area of transition between major landform types (e.g. The great lakes lowlands and the Canadian Shield) or have been subject to significant glacial/fluviat activity where soil characteristics are highly variable, often over very short distances, both conditions which apply in much of Severn, can make implementation of planning policies based on CLI classifications problematic. Insufficient recognition of the quality of information available or insufficient flexibility in policy will significantly impair the ability of the Township to implement new policies in a reasonable and appropriate manner.

The Province is to identify a natural heritage system across the GGH.

As above, in the absence of any detail, it is not possible to identify what the potential impact may be. As the environmental mapping relied on by the Minister of Natural Resources is generated at such a high level (i.e. limited detail), it is often inaccurate or misleading (e.g. An area identified as part of an ANSI or other environmental feature is depicted as being associated with fields under active cultivation or lands already developed, where topographic mapping or aerial imagery indicates it does not apply or relates to other nearby lands). Any direction intended to implement policies derived from the identification of a natural heritage system should be cognizant of these limitations and differed to local or site specific analyses which are more detailed and better reflect existing conditions.

Require watershed planning

In the absence of a Conservation Authority with jurisdiction, the mechanism for undertaking this in Severn is unknown. The Township shares a watershed with the Towns of Gravenhurst, Midland and Penetanguishene and the Townships of Georgian Bay, Tay and Tiny, with the upper tier jurisdiction divided between Simcoe Country and Muskoka District.

Encourage soil re-use strategies and manage excess soil through planning approvals.

The Township has implemented fill control through its by-laws. It is unclear how municipalities are to manage excess soil through planning approvals. Given the scale and nature of development in Severn, the larger problem is controlling the importation of fill from our urban neighbours and jurisdictions to the south.
Require municipalities to undertake Stormwater Master Plans for settlement areas and examine municipal infrastructure for weaknesses associated with climate change. Comprehensive water and wastewater master plans informed by watershed planning are to be prepared.

The Township is currently undertaking some of the background work that would constitute part of this kind of exercise, but this type of master planning exercise would likely involve a more intensive program. In the absence of a Conservation Authority with jurisdiction, the Township would be required to rely on outside engineering consultants to undertake this work. The costs for the preparation of such plans are potentially significant.

Encourage use of green infrastructure and require low impact development techniques.

Green infrastructure would include programs like the Township’s LED streetlight replacement project, trail development and other active transportation projects. Low impact development techniques include greater use of stormwater infiltration measures and improved retention and enhancement of vegetation during development projects. While the Township endeavours to do this, resource limitations will constrain our ability to do so. A review and update of the Township’s new development standards would assist with this area. The proposed direction to increase development densities will also inhibit the ability to utilize low impact development techniques, while at the same time increasing run-off by creating more hard surfaces.

Planning authorities to take an integrated approach to land use and infrastructure planning.

The Township is already engaged in a process to implement this, in the development of its Growth Management Strategy for its OP update. One area of concern relates to the proposed requirements for an EA review regarding an extension of services related to a settlement area expansion, when the MOE is generally not supportive of EA’s in advance of planning designation.

Standardize methodologies for assessing land needs.

More clarity would be useful, but sufficient flexibility should be provided so that local circumstances, including staff resources can be respected.

Identification of “excess lands” in the outer ring and the potential for “down designation” in Official Plans.

It appears that where the amount of lands designated for development within a settlement area are found more than what is required to accommodate the population and employment targets for that municipality, land can be deemed as “excess”. If the upper-tier (i.e. determines that an expansion of a settlement area boundary in another
community is desirable, it has to balance the expansion with a reduction in the amount of “excess lands” somewhere else through a modification to the local Official Plan to suspend their development potential. If an increase in development densities and/or intensification levels is mandated, then this will result in an increased potential for lands being deemed as “excess”. If implemented, this approach to growth management would significantly increase uncertainty for municipalities and dramatically increase the potential for conflict in the next road of updates to the County Official Plan.

Increase minimum intensification levels from 40% to 60% and increase density targets from 50 to 80 people/jobs per hectare for new development. Municipalities in the “outer ring” (like Severn) would still be eligible for alternative targets, but the existing targets must be re-evaluated and an alternative target must be publically requested by Council.

Depending on the process and parameters for the establishment of new alternative targets, this proposal has the potential to have a very significant impact on how the Township undertakes planning and the character of development in the Township. The justification for the previous levels was centred around transit supportive densities, more efficient use of land and infrastructure, and better quality living environments. The existing density levels and intensification levels where already difficult to achieve in small urban centres, which did not have the same kinds of problems, needs, constraints and resources as larger communities in the Golden Horseshoe. The existing requirements reflect circumstances which relate to relatively mature (in planning terms) communities with sufficiently large enough population and employment bases where markets can respond to the effects of this type of policy direction.

The basis for the proposed increase in density and intensification is not clearly established and it appears the implications on markets and community character have not been thoroughly considered. The increase would shift communities from an average density level similar to townhouse type development to an average density which represents a concentration of low and mid-rise apartment dwellings.

Outside of metropolitan cores, the type of employment density contemplated does not seem to have a basis in current employment patterns and trends. Coupled with a very limited ability of municipalities to affect employment density through land use controls; this level of employment density appears to be completely unrealistic. As municipality have no control over staffing levels, the addition or deletion of shifts, etc. the only real mechanism available to them for increasing implement densities is to restrict through zoning uses such as warehousing which typically have low employment densities. Actively discouraging economic activity to achieve an arbitrary, externally imposed target seems counter-intuitive to the development of “complete communities” which is a supposed main objective of the new policies.

To the extent that employment density targets cannot be achieved, residential densities would have to be increased in order to achieve the mandated target as it is relates to
the average density of development – residential (people/hectare) and employment (jobs/hectare). This, to achieve an average density of 80/hectare, an even higher proportion of apartment buildings and taller buildings (more units/ha) will be required. In small urban settlements, the construction sector, market conditions and difficulty in obtaining financing for multi-unit projects in smaller markets would significantly constrain the ability to create new housing stock which is financially viable. This could have a significant impact on building permit revenues and the collection of development charges.

In sum, this proposal appears to be an example of well-intentioned but wishful thinking. Real-world constraints on implementation are likely to lead to significant distortions in the land market and development patterns with significant potential for unintended negative consequences. Employment densities should be excluded from mandated targets and residential targets should be reasonable and achievable for small urban communities, like those found in Severn if they are to have the desired effect without creating significant undesirable impacts.

Application of the new environmental policies in the Niagara Escarpment Plan to shoreline areas in the Growth Plan.

This may require site plan control agreements for any application which triggers a Planning Act application in shoreline areas. As a significant proportion of the minor variances processed by the Township relate to the development or redevelopment of shoreline properties, this would significantly increase the workload related to these projects. Additionally, the proposed policies related to the retention and enhancement of shoreline vegetation run counter to the proposed Wildland Fire Guidebook direction towards removing vegetation within 30 metres of residences in identified hazard areas. Much of the area along the Severn River falls into this category.

Direction of shoreline development to areas “zoned or designated for concentrated development” and description of “resource-based recreational dwellings for seasonal accommodation”.

Notwithstanding the seasonal nature of many dwellings in the Township (a more accurate term would be “non-primary dwellings”), it should be noted that municipalities do not have the ability to control the seasonality of residential uses. The reference to areas “zoned or designated for concentrated development” would appear to exclude traditional “cottage country” development characterized by detached dwellings on generally larger lots. Although the potential for addition areas of this type of development is quite limited, it represents a significant component of the local economy. In areas where the preservation of agricultural land, and “growth management” are not a real concern (e.g. the traditional “cottaging” areas in Severn, Ramara, Tiny and Tay) the utility of this type of policy is felt to be questionable.

Lands within a settlement area that are in excess of what is required to accommodate forecasted growth to the horizon of this Plan.
Other Provincial Planning Initiatives

- Review of the OMB
- Wildland Fire Guide Book
- Conservation Authorities Act review
- Proposed new Wetlands guidelines
- Proposed revisions to the Minimum Distance Separation Guidelines for livestock Facilities
- New Guidelines for Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas

Financial Impact

The changes do not appear to impose any direct costs on the Municipality at this time, but depending on what is finally adopted and how it is to be implemented, the Township could incur significant additional consulting costs to address these initiatives. When combined with recent and pending changes in provincial planning policies and legislation, the cumulative impacts of the various changes has the potential to negatively affect the level of service provided by the current staff complement. If the required development densities and intensification levels are significantly increased, the character of our communities will be significantly affected. Given the economic factors governing development in the Township, if it becomes impossible to meet the required thresholds with viable development, construction activity will significantly decease, communities will stagnate and the availability of affordable housing will be even more constrained. This will affect revenues, particularly the collection of building permit fees and Development Charges.

Combined with changes in the legislation, the pace and volume of the above initiatives severely constrain the ability of municipalities without large planning staffs from reviewing the initiatives, properly advising Council and provide meaningful comments to the various public agencies involved. Given the very short timelines provided to municipalities to implement the changes in the Regulations to the Planning Act (without the benefit of being able to review and comment on draft regulations in advance), staff is very concerned that the cumulative effect of the above initiatives will overwhelm the institutional capacity of local municipalities, upper-tiers and provincial agencies to implement planning policies which have the desired effect with generating an unacceptable level of undesirable, unintended consequences. At the very least they will necessitate a very significant overhaul of the County’s recently approved new Official Plan and substantially complicate how planning is undertake at the local level.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Fyfe, M.A.
Director of Planning & Development
| TO: | Chair & Members  
Planning & Development Committee |
| FROM: | Andrew Fyfe  
Director of Planning & Development |
| DATE: | October 12, 2016 |
| RE: | Request for waiving of Fees for Rezoning Applications  
Municipal Addresses: 4033 Boyd Road, 3607 Fairgrounds Road, 3185 Riverdale Road |

**Recommendation**

THAT Planning Report No. P16-048 dated October 12, 2016, with respect to request for waiving of fees, be received;

AND THAT the application fees be waived for requested zoning by-law amendments for properties known 4033 Boyd Road and 3607 Fairgrounds Road.

AND THAT application fees be waived for future zoning applications intended to correct mapping errors and/or restore a previously existing zoning where it appears to have been inadvertently replaced by a less appropriate zoning category.

AND FURTHER THAT staff be provided with direction regarding the requested waiving of fees for the zoning application submitted for the Riverdale Subdivision site, known municipally as 3185 Riverdale Road.

**Background**

In August of 2010, Council passed By-law No. 2010-65, the Township’s new Comprehensive Zoning By-law. This replaced the zoning by-laws of the former Townships of Orillia, Medonte, Matchedash, Tay and the Village of Coldwater. As with any new zoning by-law, when applying the new by-law, various minor discrepancies and interpretation issues come to light with respect to some of the text provisions as well as the zoning map schedules. As authorized by Planning Committee at their September 19th, 2013 meeting, as staff become aware of any site-specific mapping corrections, they could bring them forth to a public meeting as a municipally-initiated zoning amendment on an as-needed basis. This approach was intended to give the Township the ability to deal with mapping errors in a more timely fashion and minimize the potential hardship on affected property owners. Due to recent events, the Township has modified this approach to require that the process be initiated by the submission of an application by the affected property owner. It is proposed that the applicable fees would be waived for these types of
applications, as the application is intended to address a situation created inadvertently by the Township which has the potential to create a hardship for the affected property owner.

Fee Requests

1. 4033 Boyd Road: This property was created by severance a number of years ago and was zoned Rural under the previous Township of Orillia zoning by-law. The effect of By-law 2010-65 placed it in a new zoning category "County Forest (CF)". Although there is a County Forest to the west of the subject lands, the property was never owned by the County or used for forestry; clearly the existing zoning was created in error. It appears that the appropriate zoning symbol to reflect the ownership and the intended use (as approved by the creation of a building lot by severance) is Rural Residential (RR).

2. 3607 Fairgrounds Road: Under the former Township of Orillia Zoning By-law, the subject property was zoned Agricultural (AG). The former Orillia Township Zoning By-law established a minimum lot size for a residential use in a Rural or Agricultural zone of 2,000 square metres (21,528 sq. ft.). The subject lands have a lot area of 1.2 hectares (3.0 acres) which reflects the intended purpose of residential use when the lot was created by severance. As the property is not viable as an agricultural holding, the restricted of residential uses in the Agricultural zone to ones which are accessory to a permitted use, removes the historical permission for the intended use of the property, effectively sterilizing it.

3. 3185 Riverdale Road: The 21 lot Plan of Subdivision located at the intersection of Riverdale Drive and Black River Road was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on December 22, 2005. Concurrent zoning by-law and Official Plan Amendments were also approved, resulting in a redesignation and rezoning of the subjects lands to Shoreline Residential with the creation of a buffer of "Environmental Protection (EP)" zoning to protect the turtle habitat identified along the shoreline of the the Black River. The conditions of approval for the subdivision reflected the incorporation of the EP zoning as follows:

   That the lands within this draft plan of subdivision shall be appropriately zoned in a zoning by-law that has come into effect in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Owner agrees that the rear 30 metres in depth throughout Lots 5 to 15 inclusive on the Draft Plan of Subdivision shall be zoned to an Environmental Protection (EP) Zone.

Although the amendment approved by the Board satisfies this requirement, the County of Simcoe has advised Township staff that an extension of the limits of the EP zone in one area by 10 metres is required in order to protect potential habitat for a snake species identified as being at risk. Although Township staff is satisfied that the interpretation provisions of the Township's zoning by-law regarding the
establishment of the limits of EP zoning, coupled with controls enacted through the required development agreement, the County continues to insist on the passage of an additional zoning amendment. As the required amendment represents a minor adjustment to a zone line for a previously approved by-law, the applicant’s consultant has requested that the applicable fees be waived.

Financial Impact

Beyond a minimal amount for mailing, there are no external costs associated with processing proposed zoning by-law amendments. Therefore a waiving or reduction of fees would only affect application revenue. However, if the application is approved and subsequently appealed, there would be a cost associated with retaining the Township’s solicitor. Therefore, it is suggested that any relief be conditional upon the applicants’ acknowledgement that they will be responsible for any external costs the Municipality incurs as the result of a third-party appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew R. Fyfe, MA
Director of Planning & Development

Appendix 1 – Morgan Planning Request
Background

The Riverdale Estates Subdivision was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on December 22, 2005. Since that time extensions to the Riverdale Estates Subdivision were granted in December 2008, December 2011, December 2013, March 2014, and June 2016. The current approval is set to expire on September on 22nd, 2017.

Purpose of Zoning By-law Amendment Application

Enclosed herein is a Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) application. The purpose of the ZBA application is to rezone a portion of the subject property from the Shoreline Residential Two (SR2) Zone to the Environmental Protection (EP) Zone.

The area which is proposed to be rezoned was identified by the applicant’s environmental consultant as potential habitat for the Eastern Hog Nosed Snake, which is an identified species at risk. To ensure adequate protection of the species, the area that is proposed to be rezoned will include both the potential habitat and a 20 metre buffer around the potential habitat.

The 20 metre wide area which is proposed to be rezoned + a 10 metre EP Zone buffer as per Zoning By-law Section 3.33.2(b) is illustrated in green on the attached Species at Risk (SAR) Map. We note that the proposed rezoning impacts a small portion of Lots 14, 15 and 16 and the vast majority of those lands are also protected by a previously agreed upon Tree Preservation Area. For ease of reference the Tree Preservation Areas are also illustrated on the SAR Map.

It is important to note that the proposed ZBA will expand upon the 30 metre wide band extending across the entire shoreline frontage which was zoned and designated Environmental Protection by OMB Decision 3353 (2005).
Why Is It Necessary To Rezone?

Draft Plan of Subdivision Condition No. 8 requires that the land within the subdivision be "appropriately zoned". Notwithstanding the fact that the property was rezoned and redesignated by OMB Decision 3353 (2005) and the ability of the Township to protect the potential habitat via site plan control, the County of Simcoe, which is the approval authority for this subdivision, is of the opinion that this condition cannot be satisfied until the potential habitat and a 30 metre buffer from the potential habitat has been protected thru a combination of the 20 metre Environmental Protection Zone and a 10 metre EP Zone buffer.

The undersigned respectfully disagrees that a zoning by-law amendment is necessary as the buffers can be suitably protected during the site plan control process but has agreed to submit this application to avoid any further delay in the registration of the subdivision.

Request for Application Fee Exemption

As stated above it is the opinion of the undersigned that the potential habitat of the Eastern Hog Nosed Snake is suitably protected by a Tree Preservation Area which will be enforced by the Township’s Site Plan Control By-law. We respectfully disagree with planning officials from the County of Simcoe who are of the opinion that these lands must be further protected by an Environmental Protection Zone.

Due to the superfluous nature of the County’s request, the applicant hereby requests that the Township waive the $3,000 application fee.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN Planning & Development Inc.

Joshua Morgan, MCIP, RPP
(Principal)

c.c. Greg Marek, Planner III
Vince Gagliardi
# Sustainability Plan Steering Committee (SPSC) Meeting -- Draft Minutes

**Date**: Thursday, August 4, 2016  
**Time**: 10am-12pm  
**Location**: Sustainable Severn Sound’s Office (c/o North Simcoe Community Futures Development Corporation), 105 Fourth Street, Midland

## Attendees
- Chris McLaughlin, Director/General Manager, NSCFDC (Alternate Chair)  
- Councillor Barbara Coutanche, Township of Oro-Medonte  
- Councillor Ron Stevens, Ward 4, Township of Severn  
- Gail Marchildon, Office Manager, Severn Sound Environmental Association  
- Ian Feigel, Intern, NSCFDC  
- Jonathan Main, Councillor, Ward 1, Town of Midland  
- Jonathan Pauk, Planning Intern, Township of Tay  
- Karen Alexander, Community Engagement Leader, Township of Tiny  
- Marina Whelan, Program Manager, Environmental Health Program Manager, Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit  
- Nick Popovich, Director of Development Services, Township of Georgian Bay  
- Steffen Walma, Deputy Mayor, Township of Tiny, County of Simcoe representative  
- Tracy Roxborough, Sustainability Coordinator, Sustainable Severn Sound

## Regrets
- Andrea Betty, Director of Planning and Community Development, Town of Penetanguishene  
- Councillor Mike Lauder, Ward 2, Town of Penetanguishene  
- Jennifer Schnier, Communications and Economic Development Officer, Township of Georgian Bay  
- Doug Luker, CAO/Clerk, Township of Tiny  
- Keith Sherman, Executive Director, Severn Sound Environmental Association  
- Morgan Levison, Public Health Promotor, Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit  
- Steve Farquharson, Director of Planning and Development, Township of Tay  
- Patricia File, Councillor, Ward 1, Town of Midland

## 1.0 Welcome, Introductions and Approval of Agenda

**Discussion**: Chair began with introductions, and then requested any additions or changes to the agenda, with SSS indicating no changes requested. Chair then requested motion to approve the agenda. Moved by J. Main, seconded by R. Stevens. Carried. Agenda approved.

## 2.0 Approval of Minutes from the 6-Jul-16 SPSC Meeting

*SPSC DRAFT MINUTES – 4-Aug-16*

Sustainable Severn Sound (SSS) | 105 Fourth Street, P.O. Box 8, Midland, ON | L4R 4K6 | 705.526.1371 x.112
Discussion: Coordinator advised that the DRAFT minutes were provided to the SPSC on 28-Jul-16, with no corrections requested. Chair requested motion to approve the 6-Jul-16 meeting minutes. Moved by J. Main, seconded by M. Whelan. Carried. Minutes of the 6-Jul-16 SPSC meeting approved 4-Aug-16.

Action Item(s): (1) Coordinator to send the approved minutes to the Clerk of each partner municipality for submission to Council. (2) Coordinator to send full files to each representative in response to technical issues regarding downloading from the SSS website.

3.0 2016 SSS Work Plan Items

3.1 Sustainability Speaker Series
Discussion: Coordinator provided an overview of the next Sustainability Speaker Series event proposed for November, 2016. The event will feature 4 key components:
1. Launch of the new SSS website,
2. Presentations of 3-5 partner practices which are featured as case studies on the new site,
3. Release of the 2016 Sustainability Report Card, and
4. Recognition of Municipal Sustainability Leadership Nominations through the presentation of a small award (plaque).
Coordinator noted the update of the SSS work plan in regards to both Item 3.1 and 3.2 which is included below for SPSC representative.

3.2 Website Redesign Project
Discussion: Coordinator provided an update on the status of the website redesign, noting that the timeline had been pushed back slightly due to the addition of the Sustainability Report Card in November.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Sustainability BB</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Not Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Simcoe</td>
<td>Waste and Recycling Manual</td>
<td>Waste and Recycling</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Simcoe</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Charter</td>
<td>Greener, Food Secure Communities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPSC DRAFT MINUTES – 4-Aug-16
### 3.3 Sustainability Report Card

**Discussion:** Coordinator provided an update on the criteria for the Sustainability Report Card that was approved at the 6-Jul-16 meeting and the addition of the Sustainability Leadership Award ('Sustainability Champion') awards to the project overview. Discussion included that the best practice case studies will be linked to the Report Card, and used as examples of
sustainability progress in each of the municipalities. Motion to approve the changes to the Project Overview as presented by S. Walma, seconded by J. Main. Carried.

- Project Overview (Approved 6-Jul-16)
  ![ProjectOverview_SustainabilityReport](image)

- 2nd Review of Draft Checklist
  ![ReportCardCriteria_ReportCardCriteria_Comments_Aug4](image)

Action Item(s): (1) Coordinator to prepare a nomination form and background for the Sustainability Leadership Award and provide to each SPSC member at the 8-Sep-16 meeting. (2) Recommendation received to ensure the inclusion of the ‘provincial research’ (i.e., ‘What is Happening in Other Municipalities in Ontario’ as part of the narrative of the report card). (3) Coordinator to prepare an updated version of the Report Card Criteria for SPSC review at the 8-Sep-16 meeting based upon the review activity completed by the SPSC.

4.0 Budget

- Financial Statement as of 31-Jul-16
  ![FinancialStatement](image)

Discussion: Chair requested a motion to approve the statement as presented, moved by R. Stevens, seconded by S. Walma. Carried.

5.0 September 2016 – October 2016 Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Thursday, September 8, 2016 | 10am-12pm | SSS Office, 105 Fourth Street, Midland | • Review of Draft Report Card  
• Present Sustainability Champion Package/Documents  
• Discuss Sustainability Speaker Event and Municipal Presentations |

*SPSC DRAFT MINUTES – 4-Aug-16*
Sustainable Severn Sound
Sustainable Severn Sound (SSS) champions the integration of sustainability principles within our partner municipalities and their communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, October 6, 2016</td>
<td>10am-12pm</td>
<td>SSS Office, 105 Fourth Street, Midland</td>
<td>Regular Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, November 3, 2016</td>
<td>10am-12pm</td>
<td>SSS Office, 105 Fourth Street, Midland</td>
<td>Regular Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.0 Information Sharing

**Discussion:**

SSSE: Keith Sherman has retired as ED for the SSEA, with a new ED to start in September. Mr. Sherman will take on the role of Special Projects Manager and Risk Management Official with the SSEA.

Tiny: Utilizing social media to engage the community in wayfinding and physical activity – will share further information as available.

7.0 Adjournment: 12:10pm
Welcome, Introductions and Approval of Agenda

Discussion: Chair began with introductions, and then requested any additions or changes to the agenda, with SSS indicating no changes requested. Chair then requested motion to approve the agenda. Moved by P. File, seconded by R. Stevens. Carried. Agenda approved.

Approval of Minutes from the 4-Aug-16 SPSC Meeting
Discussion: Coordinator advised that the DRAFT minutes were provided to the SPSC on 1-Sep-16, with no corrections requested. Chair requested motion to approve the 4-Aug-16 meeting minutes. Moved by S. Walma, seconded by R. Stevens. Carried. Minutes of the 4-Aug-16 SPSC meeting approved 8-Sep-16.

Action Item(s): (1) Coordinator to send the approved minutes to the Clerk of each partner municipality for submission to Council. (2) Coordinator to send full files to each representative in response to technical issues regarding downloading from the SSS website.

3.0 2016 SSS Work Plan Items

3.1 Sustainability Speaker Series
Discussion: Coordinator provided an overview of the next Sustainability Speaker Series event proposed for November, 2016. The event will feature 4 key components:
1. Launch of the new SSS website,
2. Release of the 2016 Sustainability Report Card,
3. Recognition of Municipal Sustainability Leadership Nominations through the presentation of (7) small awards (plaques), and
4. (1) Keynote Speaker.

The Coordinator provided bios and details for the potential keynote and then requested a vote to select the keynote speaker, with the options being (1) Dr. Wayne Caldwell, or (2) Dr. Karen Farbridge. The committee voted with a majority to select Dr. Farbridge as the keynote speaker. Further discussion was held regarding event details and possible venues, with the committee suggesting several options.

Action Item(s): (1) Coordinator to research and select venue based upon (a) speaker availability, (2) technical options, and (3) choice to select local food options for catering and provide update at the 8-Oct-16 SPSC meeting.

3.2 Website Redesign Project
Discussion: Coordinator provided an update on the status of the website redesign, noting that the timeline had been pushed back slightly due to the addition of the Sustainability Report Card in November.

Action Item(s): (1) Coordinator to provide written update to the Website Redesign Subcommittee by the next meeting on 8-Oct-16.

3.3 Sustainability Report Card
Discussion: Coordinator provided an update on the criteria for the Sustainability Report Card that was approved at the 6-Jul-16 meeting and the addition of the Sustainability Leadership Award ('Sustainability Champion') awards to the project overview. Discussion included that the best practice case studies will be linked to the Report Card, and used as examples of sustainability progress in each of the municipalities. Motion to approve the changes to the Project Overview as presented by S. Walma, seconded by P. File. Carried. The Coordinator detailed the process for completing the assessment list which will form the bulk of the report card, and informed the committee that interviews will be arranged with each member and the CAO of their municipality to complete the checklist and discuss the actions/practices per municipality.

Action Item(s): (1) Coordinator to arrange meetings and inform each SPSC member of the date/time to ensure their attendance. (2) Coordinator to prepare DRAFT #1 of the report card for review by the committee at the next SPSC meeting on 8-Oct-16.

- Project Overview (Approved 6-Jul-16)

3.3.1. Municipal Sustainability Leadership Awards

Discussion: Coordinator overviewed the process for the Sustainability Leadership Awards and provided each SPSC member with the nomination form and asked for the return of the form by SPSC members by 4-Oct-16.

Action Item(s): (1) Coordinator to send a reminder on 2-Oct-16 for the 4-Oct-16 deadline. (2) Coordinator to review budget (add plaques) and reduce food/beverage budget for committee information at the meeting 8-Oct-16.

4.0 Project Budget

- Financial Statement as of 31-Aug-16
Discussion: Chair requested a motion to receive the statement as presented, moved by R. Stevens, seconded by S. Walma. Carried.

5.0 October 2016 – December 2016 Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Thursday, October 6, 2016| 10am-12pm   | SSS Office, 105 Fourth Street, Midland | • Review of Draft Report Card  
  • Review and Approve Leadership Nominations  
  • Discuss Sustainability Speaker Event Details |
| Thursday, November 3, 2016| 10am-12pm   | SSS Office, 105 Fourth Street, Midland | • Review and Final Comment on Report Card  
  • Review New Website |
| Tuesday, November 29, 2016| 2pm-5pm     | NSSRC, 527 Len Self Blvd., Midland | "Sustainability Speaker Series event" |
| Thursday, December 1, 2016| 10am-12pm   | SSS Office, 105 Fourth Street, Midland | • Review and Discussion of 2017 SSS Work Plan |

6.0 Information Sharing

Discussion: Due to the discussion of other agenda items, time was not available to address this item besides the mention regarding the Coordinated Land Use Review. Item is to be included in the September newsletter and to be added as an agenda item for discussion at the 6-Oct-16 meeting.

http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page10882.aspx#HowParticipate

7.0 Adjournment:

Time: 12:05pm

Next Meeting
When: Thursday, October 6, 2016
Time: 10am-12pm
Where: SSS Office

SPSC DRAFT MINUTES – 8-Sep-16

Sustainable Severn Sound (SSS) | 105 Fourth Street, P.O. Box 8, Midland, ON | L4R 4K6 | 705.526.1371 x.112
THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY
October 6, 2016

Dear Clerks:

**AMO Seeks Council Resolution**

On behalf of the AMO Board, I would ask you to place the attached resolution on council’s next agenda along with this letter.

AMO wants every council to be involved in the *What’s Next Ontario?* project. There is a looming fiscal gap facing Ontario’s municipalities. *What’s Next Ontario?* is about recognizing the gap and seeking sector support for closing it. The response has been impressive, but there’s more to be done! We’ve boiled down the essence of the challenge we face in the next ten years to a one-page resolution. *We urge every council in Ontario to adopt the resolution, and reply to AMO by December 1, 2016.*

What does it say? We know Ontarians see infrastructure as the number one challenge facing their community. We know that even if we raise property taxes and user fees by inflation (1.8%), we will still be $3.6 billion short to fix the infrastructure gap, every year for ten years. This is what we need to address. As elected officials, how do we deal with this challenge? What is the best approach? Ontarians already pay the highest property taxes in the country. How high is too high?

We could finance this gap by increasing property taxes. It would require property tax revenue increases of 4.6% annually for 10 years, sector-wide. And, what happens if the federal or provincial governments pull back on future commitments? We know that could mean property tax revenue increases of up to 8.35% annually for 10 years, sector-wide. How might these numbers translate locally as an annual rate increase?

The attached resolution is a starting point. Thank you for bringing this to your council’s attention. My e-mail address is on the resolution and I look forward to receiving council’s support.

If you have questions, please contact Matthew Wilson, Senior Advisor, mwilson@amo.on.ca, 416-971-9856 Ext. 323.

Yours sincerely,

Lynn Dollin
AMO President
WHAT'S NEXT ONTARIO? RESOLUTION

WHEREAS recent polling, conducted on behalf of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario indicates 76% of Ontarians are concerned or somewhat concerned property taxes will not cover the cost of infrastructure while maintaining municipal services, and 90% agree maintaining safe infrastructure is an important priority for their communities;

AND WHEREAS infrastructure and transit are identified by Ontarians as the biggest problems facing their municipal government;

AND WHEREAS a ten-year projection (2016-2025) of municipal expenditures against inflationary property tax and user fee increases, shows there to be an unfunded average annual need of $3.6 billion to fix local infrastructure and provide for municipal operating needs;

AND WHEREAS the $3.6 billion average annual need would equate to annual increases of 4.6% (including inflation) to province-wide property tax revenue for the next ten years;

AND WHEREAS this gap calculation also presumes all existing and multi-year planned federal and provincial transfers to municipal governments are fulfilled;

AND WHEREAS if future federal and provincial transfers are unfulfilled beyond 2015 levels, it would require annual province-wide property tax revenue increases of up to 8.35% for ten years;

AND WHEREAS Ontarians already pay the highest property taxes in the country;

AND WHEREAS each municipal government in Ontario faces unique issues, the fiscal health and needs are a challenge which unites all municipal governments, regardless of size;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Council supports the Association of Municipalities of Ontario in its work to close the fiscal gap; so that all municipalities can benefit from predictable and sustainable revenue, to finance the pressing infrastructure and municipal service needs faced by all municipal governments.

Please forward your resolution by December 1, 2016 to:
AMO President Lynn Dollin amopresident@amo.on.ca.
Date: October 3, 2016

Re: 2016 SSEA 19th Annual Partnership Awards

Dear Severn Sound Area Mayors and Council Members,

Nominations are now being accepted for the 2016 Severn Sound Environmental awards. The following awards will be presented at the SSEA 19th Annual Partners Reception on November 10, 2017. We would greatly appreciate if you please spread the word. There are so many individuals, groups and organization that should be recognized for their outstanding contributions for the betterment of our watershed.

Severn Sound Bob Whittam Environmental Award
Bob Whittam is a biologist and an avid naturalist who is well known in the Severn Sound area. He has been instrumental in ensuring the continued success and presence in our community of the Wye Marsh Wildlife Centre. One of Bob’s many accomplishments was his work in facilitating the public involvement program of the Severn Sound Remedial Action Plan (RAP). He was Public Advisory Committee Chair for many years through the development of the RAP.
In 2000 the Severn Sound Bob Whittam Environmental Award was started in order to honour Bob by recognizing those individuals or groups who are dedicated and truly interested in improving the Severn Sound ecosystem.

Severn Sound Sustainability Award
This award is given to an individual or group that has demonstrated a commitment to environmental sustainability in the Severn Sound area.

SSEA Source Water Protection Award
The award is presented to an individual landowner or group who has assisted in the promotion of source water protection or, who have developed and are implementing exemplary source water protection programs in the Severn Sound Source Protection Area

Severn Sound Environmental Stewardship Award
This award recognizes an individual or group for their meaningful achievements in the restoration and protection of the Severn Sound area.

Severn Sound Student Environmental Awards
SSEA Student Environmental Award recognizes outstanding students in the Severn Sound area that have displayed a passion for the natural world demonstrating a keen interest in nature, the environment, conservation, stewardship and sustainability. These awards are received by students who have aligned their environmental beliefs with their actions at school and at home.

Nominations found on our website and must be received no later than October 28th, 2016.
Sharon, I am sending this invitation along to you in the hope that you are able to forward it to the appropriate office. I didn't want to delay sending it until after Thanksgiving weekend.

Hope you have a delightful Thanksgiving.

Regards,
Betty-Jean Murray
RCL Branch 270, Coldwater

October 7, 2016

Mayor Mike and Mrs. Melodie Burkett

RE: Royal Canadian Legion Veterans’ Dinner, November 5, 2016

The pleasure of your company is requested at the above function.

We would be very happy to have you join us, if you are available.
Cocktails at 6 pm and dinner at 7 pm.

Please RSVP directly to

Betty-Jean Murray, Poppy Chair at 705-528-9292
Hi Sharon,

TransCanada Pipelines is planning to do boreholes on the TransCanada right-of-way, (existing pipeline easement) over the next couple of weeks.
This will take place at 4142 Canal Road, accessing off Canal Road.

TransCanada will supply a Memorandum of Insurance naming Severn Township directly.

A WSIB clearance will be provided if requested.

If there are any further questions required, please contact me to discuss.

Thank you in advance,

Bob

Sent from my iPad