



Notes from the Planning Advisory Committee Meeting No. 3/09
Held on May 8, 2009

Members Present:

Walter Benotto (Chair)	Town of Shelburne
Percy Way (Vice Chair)	Township of Amaranth
Gerald Poisson	City of Barrie
Mel Coutanche	Township of Oro Medonte
Tom Elliott	Township of Springwater
Sonny Foley	Town of Collingwood
Garry Matthews	Township of Melancthon

Regrets:

Brian Mullin	Municipality of Grey Highlands
--------------	--------------------------------

Staff Present:

Wayne Wilson	Chief Administrative Officer
Chris Hibberd	Director of Planning
Patti Young	Senior Planner

1. Adoption of Agenda:

Members of the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) adopted the agenda for the May 8, 2009 meeting subject to inclusion of an agenda item regarding a letter from Essa Township on permit fees.

2. Review of Notes from April 17, 2009 PAC Meeting:

The PAC members reviewed the April 17th notes and found them acceptable. Moved by Tom Elliott and seconded by Percy Way

3. Discussion on reviewing older approved subdivisions and existing lots of record:

Section 3 of the *Planning Act* was distributed to the PAC members for background purposes. This section indicates that planning decisions and review comments on planning matters shall be consistent or conform to current Provincial policies and plans.

The challenges of applying new policies to older approvals were discussed with questions around applications approved by the Ontario Municipal Board. It was

noted that newer approved applications include sunset dates whereas older OMB approvals may not. To modify OMB conditions requires the matter to be taken back to the OMB for consideration. In some cases these prior approved development that have not been constructed require NVCA permit approval which must be reviewed under current policies setting up significant conflict potential. Staff advised that each matter is dealt with on a case by case basis in partnership with the municipality.

No action items were identified, other than close cooperation with the local municipalities, staff and members is essential in this area.

4. Discussion on potential service agreements with member municipalities:

A draft service agreement template prepared by staff was provided to the PAC members for discussion purposes. Currently, the NVCA has an agreement with the County and screening agreement with most of our member municipalities. There are also service agreements with a few of our member municipalities.

The PAC members saw benefit in developing service agreement(s) with all of the watershed municipalities. The agreement should clearly outline in the background section the mandatory services that the NVCA provides including natural hazard planning and regulations as well as watershed natural heritage/planning. The members advised that the optional services would form the actual service agreement component of the document. Staff were asked to include pre-consultation as part of the agreement.

Action Item: Staff were asked to revise the template to address the discussion items heard at this PAC meeting.

5. Discussion on April 15, 2009 letter from Essa Township regarding permit fees:

The Essa letter was handed out at the meeting to the PAC members for discussion. The letter requests that NVCA exercise flexibility in the application of permit review fees under three key areas:

- Exempt requirement for a permit for a minor work on new lots.
- Exempt the requirement for above ground pool or shed under 16 x 16 ft.
- Reduce fee for a minor works.

Staff noted that in general most new lots are created outside hazard areas and regulated areas and thus don't require permits for work. In regards to exempting works, staff noted that the *Conservation Authorities Act* and Ontario Regulation 172/06 do not currently afford NVCA the option to exempt works. However, the NVCA has defined works which are considered of such a minor nature as to not

Planning Advisory Committee Notes
Meeting 03/09, May 8, 2009

trigger permit approval or permission pursuant to the regulation. These works include decks and structure less than 107 square feet and other works as determined by the Chief Administrative Officer (see attached schedule). The PAC members raised concerns with using a size criteria to determine review fee and preferred basing it on the staff effort required and the location of the proposal (e.g. with floodplain versus within an allowance area). Staff identified to the PAC members opportunities in the current fee schedule and associated policies that allow for some flexibility in the applied review fee. In this regard, staff are recommending to apply the clearance or minor works fees (as applicable) as described in the current fee schedule. Examples would include non-habitable structures where the works are located outside of the hazards and all pools proposals where no site visit is required. Furthermore, matters that require revisions to the fee schedule could be addressed through the normal annual review of the fee schedule.

Action Item: Staff were asked to bring this matter to the next Executive Committee for further discussion.

6. Other Business: none

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m. Moved by Garry Matthews and Seconded by Tom Elliott.

Notes Prepared by: P. Young and C. Hibberd