

Meeting No. 5

Date: February 9th, 2010

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Sydenham

**Present: Mayor, Gary Davison
Councillors, Larry York
Bill Robinson
Jim Hicks
Allan McPhail
Del Stowe
Ron Vandewal**

**Regrets: John Fillion
David Hahn**

**Staff: Wayne Orr, Clerk-Administrator, Alan Revill, Mark Segsworth
Lindsay Mills, Deb Bracken, Rick Chesebrough**

1. Call to Order

The Mayor called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest.

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

3. Delegations

(i) Presentation to Dale Reynolds

The presentation to Dale Reynolds has been deferred until he is able to attend.

(ii) Shoalts & Zaback –Library Project

Ray Zaback on behalf of Gerry Shoalts presented an update to Council on the library project budget. There is a revised construction budget of \$1,810,000.00. The pretender costing has been completed and based on the recommendation of the Committee the radiant in floor heating has been added and the decision to remove the certification but still follow LEED principles have been incorporated into the costing. At this time, the costing estimate now indicates a minimal surplus of approximately \$200.00 on the project. Ray was asked with regard to the merit of LEED and suggested that the benefits from the certification are more a matter of prestige than practicality. In fact by addressing our budget concerns the project will end up with a better heating system which is more efficient although there will not be the LEED certification.

(iii) SFRC Master Plan

Mike Howe from South Frontenac Recreation Committee presented Council the 5 Year Plan that has been prepared by the committee with the assistance of Wes Garrod. He thanked Council for attending the January meeting and indicated that the report has been fine tuned based on those comments. The process has been a consultative process with numerous meetings and the draft has been reviewed by all the committees and based on the needs of the local groups. The focus has been on summer programs, facilities, communication and volunteerism. A key part of the plan is the hiring of a part time Recreational Coordinator. Clearly without someone in this role, nothing will happen. He acknowledged that costs are involved with this recommendation but believes the role will provide a key linkage between the various committees and the implementation of the plan. He indicated that the plan can be

adjusted and while the 5 year capital plan has been developed it has been structured so that it can be phased in differently if that is the direction of Council. The thrust from South Frontenac Recreation Committee will be participant based, that is to say that the number of participants in the various programs as well as using the various facilities will have a strong influence on where our future monies are being spent. In discussion with Council it was identified that the Committee had considered other communities that are of similar size. The Committee had a part time Recreation Coordinator come in to address how they operate within their municipality. It was clarified that this was a three day a week, year round position with flexibility in hours to address when the greatest need exists. This would be a single recreation coordinator who would work within all four districts.

(iv) FoTenn Consultants- Ouellette Subdivision

Mike Keene from FoTenn Consultants spoke to the Ouellette Subdivision proposed in Battersea. He indicated that what was before Council is the conceptual plan and the lots would meet standards for both road frontage and lot size. On behalf of his client, Mr. Keene was asking Council for consideration for reduced frontages. It was highlighted to Council that some of the proposed lots are as big as six acres. Mr. Keene pointed out that the potential to add additional lots to the subdivision thereby sharing the costs associated with the development over a variety of properties. The process clearly requires the application to be filed for Council's review, comment and decision. Mr. Keene indicated that he will follow the standard process and that standard studies will be completed and he acknowledged that discussions at this point do not constitute a formal response from the township. When asked, Mr. Keene responded that the advantage to the six additional lots would be increased assessment to the Township and when asked whether the water table would support these additional lots, he indicated that the science has not yet been completed. With regard to roads and fire comments, the initial comment included a request for pavement and a potential dry hydrant.

Direction from Council was that staff works with the developer and formulate a recommendation with the rationale for support.

(v) FoTenn Consultants – Zanet Subdivision

Mr. Keene then presented on behalf of the Zanet Subdivision. This is a proposed development approximately three kilometres east of the village of Sydenham with an entrance from Georgia Lane. Three waterfront lots were previously created and this proposal is the development of half of the remaining property. The remaining half will be left as rural and will potentially have a home built on it in the future. Georgia lane will be brought up to township standards and the plan would also include a turning bulb although it is not shown at this stage. In this subdivision the studies are currently underway. They acknowledge that there is a very steep bank and they may need to adjust the lot lines. They are investigating endangered species at the waterfront where the new lots would be created. The water frontage lots will have greater than 300 feet frontage and the road frontage of 250 feet will be maintained as well. A Two acre size minimum lot is also included. The developer asked about parkland and street lighting requirements. It was clarified that parkland or dollars in lieu are an acceptable alternative. The preference for the turning bulb is to have the road continue to the end of the three existing lots. Comments from fire and road will be forthcoming through the development stage.

4. Business Items

(i) Matias Commercial Subdivision – Hamlet of Inverary

Lindsay Mills addressed this report. He reminded Council of the October 20th public meeting where the proposed layout was outlined to Council. The outstanding item is the dedication of a specific block of property for a fire hall. At a meeting with the developer, the developer indicated that he may be willing to look at not restricting the use of the property for a fire hall but that it would have to be for

municipal purposes not simply for resale. The frontages associated with that component of property were raised and given the nature of fire, this may be an appropriate lot for other uses. The lot has 160 feet of frontage at a corner which would not be an ideal spot for a high traffic use. Three questions were proposed to Council, specifically do they want a dedicated fire lot, should they accept the block for municipal use or should they accept the block at all.

Discussion amongst Council was whether to accept a lot with undersized frontage without conditions for municipal use. Clearly given this is a commercial development, one lot regardless does not equal the value of the parkland requirement. No plan has been put forward at this time with regard to the need for a fire hall at this location and that has an influence on the current decision. It was commented that we should keep the lot with no conditions on the townships use of that property however Councillor Vandewal was clear that if we were doing any rationalization of fire halls and if one was not located at this site then there was no value in keeping this lot. Lindsay Mills was asked to prepare a staff report for discussion at the next council meeting.

(ii) Requirement for Road Improvements on former County/Provincial Roads

Lindsay Mills addressed his report to Council. This was a follow up item from previous discussions in the fall. It is an attempt to set the rationale and conditions for requiring turning lands on provincial and county roads. There was concern that the suggestion was vague and that there needed to be a defined rationale or definition of when a turning lane is required rather than making it simply subject to the satisfaction of the manager of Public Works. Recognizing that traffic studies are often completed, it was clarified by Mark Segsworth that studies still sometimes do not give the answer that would be apparent.

General discussion from Council was concern with the vagueness of the report. Staff were asked to revisit this recommendation to set a criteria for turning lanes.

(iii) Solid Waste Collection Request for Proposals

Mark Segsworth addressed his report with regard to the Solid Waste Collection RFP. The timeline for the RFP process has been adjusted to allow for the complete documentation of the facts needed for the RFP before bringing it to the Committee of the Whole. Specifically data with regard to seasonal and permanent residents as well as central line kilometre information is still being compiled. A student has been hired who has been able to work with our databases to facilitate pulling that information from our electronic records. The question with regard to disposal costs taxed on assessment was raised and there is still some debate with regard to the appropriate method for this issue. This will be part of budget discussions. Mark Segsworth reminded Council that a recommendation from the Sustainability Committee and supported by Council was that collection would be a household charge and that disposal would be on the tax bill and that the seasonal rates on a moving forward basis would be discontinued. All properties would receive 50 tags.

Del Stowe reiterated previous discussions that alternatively the situation would be for a full user fee system but this had not been supported by council. Questions with regard to bins and how those would be managed were raised. This will be addressed through the implementation process recognizing that there will be an evolution of these services over time. It was important for Council to realize that should we not be able to implement this new system during a low season, it may need to be deferred for one year.

(iv) 2010 Budget

A budget review timeline process was distributed to Council. It was agreed that the February 16th meeting would begin at 5:30 p.m. with a light supper and the meeting convening at 6:00 p.m. Similarly if necessary this will also happen on March 2nd. In general comments, Wayne Orr advised Council that while the budget meets their

initial objectives for a tax increase, there are long term implications with regard to the sustainability of projects given the significant amount of reserves being drawn to support this budget.

Council walked through and asked questions and or gave comments on the general government, administrative, protective services, health services, recreation, culture and planning budgets. Key comments that were addressed include staff identifying a clear rationale for the Facilities Coordinator position noting that this was the first time that this has been brought up to council with the exception of the preliminary budget overview.

In Treasury, it was commented that the audit fees will likely place the 2009 costs over budget because of the PSAB audit requirements. As it applies to all budget lines with departments salary lines, the payroll numbers for 2009 are not complete as there are year end adjustments associated with final pay. Another general comment, as a source of revenue generation, all fees collected within the municipality are being compiled and will be reviewed as part of the 2011 budget process.

With regard to emergency services, the item for special charges has increased from \$250,000.00 to \$350,000.00 in the operating budget this is a net zero impact. It will be discussed as part of the capital budget. At this point in time while salaries under the Fire Budget are over for 2009, the total to be raised by taxation is within the target. Draw downs from wage stabilization will occur as necessary to bring this item in line for the total raised by taxation.

General discussion with regard to the conservation authority budgets resulted in the understanding that there is little that Council can do to influence the levies of the three conservation authorities. The exception being that work on the boat ramp and dam are special charges under the CRCA that Council could choose to not pursue.

From a Building Department point of view, there was discussion with regard to the transfer from reserves for wage stabilization. Alan Revill spoke to Council and stated that he believes based on the information he has heard from builders and suppliers etc that the \$30,000 additional increases in revenue is reasonable.

With regard to Recreation Committees budgets, it was identified that major changes in this area were the addition of a three day a week position, the volunteer recognition on a large scale and the introduction of a program brochure. It was commented that the total recreation budget of \$282,000.00 for 2009 is predominantly managed and administered by volunteers without a dedicated staff member to manage those costs.

The Environmental committee budget has been revised and submitted by Del Stowe and will need to be updated in the final package. It will have a reduced draw on taxation from the Treasurers' estimated version of \$2300.00.

In Planning there are significant shifts with regard to professional services noting in particular that in 2009 legal fees were extremely high as a result of 7 OMB hearings.

5. Other Business

Allan McPhail served a notice of motion with regard to a request for staff to prepare alternatives for council's consideration on how to address growth pressures within the Sydenham area. This item will be brought forward to the February 16th meeting and if moved and seconded, it will be debated at that time.

6. Adjournment

The Committee of the Whole meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.