

Minutes of Council
December, 7, 2021

Time: 7:00 PM

Location: Electronic Participation



Meeting # 38

Council Present in Council Chambers: Mayor Ron Vandewal, Ray Leonard, John McDougall, Doug Morey, Alan Revill, Norm Roberts, Randy Ruttan, Ron Sleeth, Ross Sutherland

Staff Present in Council Chambers: Neil Carbone - Chief Administrative Officer, Angela Maddocks - Clerk, Claire Dodds - Director of Development Services, Louise Fragnito - Director of Corporate Services and Treasurer, Christine Woods - Senior Planner

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

a) Resolution

Resolution No. 2021-38-01

Moved by Councillor McDougall

Seconded by Councillor Sleeth

That the Council meeting of December 7, 2021 be called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Carried

b) The Clerk conducted the roll call as outlined in the attendance noted above.

2. Declaration of pecuniary interest and the general nature thereof

a) Councillor Roberts declared a pecuniary interest with respect to Agenda Item 12 a) the Accounts Payable and Payroll Listing.

b) Councillor Leonard declared a pecuniary interest with respect to Agenda Item 12 a) the Accounts Payable and Payroll Listing.

3. Approval of Agenda

a) Resolution

Resolution No. 2021-38-02

Moved by Councillor Roberts

Seconded by Councillor Leonard

That the agenda for the December 7, 2021 Council meeting be approved as presented.

Carried

4. Scheduled Closed Session - not applicable

5. Delegations - none

6. Public Meeting

a) **Resolution and Public Meeting Statement**

Resolution No. 2021-38-03

Moved by Councillor McDougall
Seconded by Councillor Sutherland

That a public meeting be held to allow for input on planning matters related to:

- Road Closing Application - RC-21-06
- Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z-21-20
- Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z-21-21
- Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z-21-22

Carried

b) **Z-21-20 - Zoning By-law Amendment - 4376 Sydenham Mill St,
(Smith/Osicka)**

Christine Woods, Senior Planner, reviewed the proposal and delivered the report with respect to this application. The subject property is 550 square metres (0.14 acres) in area and has approximately 20 metres of road frontage and it is developed with a single detached dwelling. Anecdotally, commercial businesses historically operated out of a portion of the dwelling. Most recently the dwelling contained two residential units that were not legally established. The proposal is to change the zone on the subject property from Urban Commercial (UC) to Urban Residential – Second Density (UR2) to legally recognize the existing dwelling on the property and to permit a secondary dwelling unit. The proposed by-law would also specify zoning standards such as the required number of parking spaces.

Public Services reviewed the entrance and proposed parking layout and indicated that a four car-wide driveway is not practical in an urban area (particularly for snow removal), and the Township would not permit a curb cut wider than existing or 6 metres, whichever is greater. They are supportive of a reduction to the required number of on-site parking spaces. The applicant is working to provide a scaled drawing to show how a maximum number of parking spaces (e.g. three spaces instead of the required four) could fit and functionally work on the property with the existing entrance width.

Building Services reviewed the performance of the existing sewage system. They determined that the existing sewage system cannot support the new proposed design of the building as both the tank and bed are too small. The applicant is working to determine what floor plan changes would be required to make use of the existing sewage system, and whether the property can accommodate a larger replacement system.

Adequate water and sewage disposal systems are a consideration in rural settlement areas however it was confirmed that the existing building is connected to the municipal water system. The applicant will be engaging qualified professionals to determine the best way to proceed regarding the sewage system review.

Staff further noted that the Zoning By-law requires a minimum of two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit on a property. Where it is not possible to provide the required number of parking spaces on a property, the spaces may be permitted on a lot within 60 metres of the property. Four parking spaces are required for the two proposed dwelling units. Presently the property cannot accommodate four parking spaces that meet the zoning standards. It has also been demonstrated that there are no lots within 60 metres of the property that could accommodate parking for the dwelling units.

Staff indicated that they are of the opinion that it would be justifiable to reduce the required number of on-site parking spaces for this proposal as the subject property is within walking distance of many urban amenities including two schools, a public library, a park and a grocery store.

This application was assessed against existing policy framework based on the Provincial Policy Statement, the Frontenac County Official plan and the Townships Zoning By-law and Official Plan. All policies indicated that the rural settlement areas should be the focus of development and that their vitality and regeneration must be promoted by why of allowing a mixed range of housing. Adequate water and sewage servicing is a requirement in the Township's Official Plan, in this case the building is connected with the Sydenham Water System and the applicant is working towards a solution for the septic system. The Zoning Bylaw requires a minimum of two parking on site spaces per unit however this property cannot accommodate this. There is not capacity in this area for on-street parking so it needs to be determined whether or not it is justifiable to reduce the number of parking space for this development given the number of amenities that are within walking distance.

Councillor Sutherland felt it made sense to keep these as two apartments. With respect to the parking spaces, he felt it was justifiable to reduce the required parking spaces as he felt four parking spaces for two apartments neither of which are very large. He asked for clarity on the intention is to keep it as one building and Christine Woods confirmed that the intention is that it would be renovated to include two units in the building.

Alan Revill was generally supportive of allowing the second dwelling unit in the hamlet. He inquired about receiving an update on the septic system being adequate for two units in a subsequent report.

Christine Woods indicated that the applicant will have to determine what next steps are with respect to the sewage system and possible changes to the floor plan in order to accommodate the system workable.

Mayor Vandewal stated that if a new septic system can be situated that makes sense, this would be the best solution given the structure of the hamlet. He felt it was very important to get the septic system right. He noted that its easy to say a bedroom will be taken out of the plan to accommodate the sewage system requirements, however this would be difficult to ensure in the future. He supports multi-residential housing in South Frontenac.

There were no comments from the public on this application.

c) **Z-21-21 - Zoning By-law Amendment - 4153 and 4155 Road 38 (2311215 and 2311217 Ontario Limited)**

Christine Woods, Senior Planner provided an overview of the application that proposes to change the zones on the subject properties from Rural Industrial – Special Provision (RI-1 and RI-1-H) to a new Rural Industrial – Special Provision (RI-XX) to legally recognize the existing uses on the properties and to expand the list of permitted industrial and commercial uses. Examples of the proposed uses are manufacturing, processing or warehousing, workshop, business or professional office, contractor's yard, research and development facility, self-storage facility, and automotive repair garage. The effect of the by-law would also be to specify zoning standards such as setbacks from property lines and the required number of parking spaces.

Changing the zone on the properties would facilitate the construction of two new five-unit industrial buildings at 4155 Road 38. 4153 Road 38 is developed with a building that is occupied by a construction company and automotive repair garage. 4155 Road 38 is developed two buildings used for self-storage. The two properties share an entrance and function as one site. Ms. Woods noted that the subject lands are also subject to Site Plan Control Application SP-08-21-P under the Planning Act and that this application is currently under review.

Jason Sands, Boulevard Group, who is the Planning Consultant for the applicant, provided the contextual background analysis of the application. The subject properties are two separate conveyable properties sharing one single access. The northern parcel is 3.95 acres in size and the southern parcel is 2.93 acres. He noted that these properties are primarily surrounded by residential and agricultural land uses. He referenced the areas of the Provincial Policy Statement that have been considered for this proposal as well as the County of Frontenac, and the Township's Official Plan and the vision statement and what ought to be considered when reviewing these proposals, including natural heritage goals, regard for provincially significant wetlands, storm water management and cultural heritage resources. He specified the permitted uses as per Section 5.7.6 (i) of the Official Plan that are deemed appropriate. With respect to the MECP D-6 guidelines of industrial land uses that seek to minimize incompatibility with residential uses are they are considered to be sensitive 24 hours per day consideration is given to the potential to produce point source and/or fugitive air emissions such as noise, vibration, odour and dust. Mr. Sands reviewed the guidelines and differences between Classes I, II and III. All the uses considered on the subject property are within the Class I as the potential influence area is 70 metres and includes a 20 metre recommended as prescribed by the province. Therefore with regard to this proposal, the provincial recommendation of the 20 metre setback from sensitive land uses nearly satisfies the setback criteria for Class II, as the subject properties not accommodating manufacturing with the potential of emitting fugitive emission, the proposal is small scale when compared to St. Lawrence Business Park, the noise dust and vibration would only occur during the daytime with relatively infrequent movement of heavy trucks and product delivery. The outdoor storage will be limited to heavy equipment. There is buffering and screening proposed on site to mitigate the on-site activities from the sensitive land uses to the immediate north. He noted that the existing northern building setback is 10.5 metres whereas future development will be in excess of 20 metre. He was of the opinion that the existing on-site uses and proposes uses and the mitigation measures comply with the provincial D-6 series guidelines. ,

Mr. Sands discussed the existing zoning and permitted uses on both parcels and noted that the southern parcel is subject to a holding provision. The historic and current uses exceed the permitted uses but the proposal is to establish appropriate performance standards and regular on-site activity that will introduce uses consistent with the Official Plan. He reviewed a new site specific zone for Rural Industrial and permitted proposed uses. He specifically noted that accessory buildings or uses, including a bank, a cafeteria and a retail outlet for the purpose of selling goods manufactured, store and/or assembled on the premises, includes the provision that such outlet is part of the principle building and occupies not more than 25% of the gross or area. Mr. Sands noted that the proposal seeks to include the construction of two five unit buildings on the 4155 Road 38 parcel with each of those buildings proposing to be 929 square metres. There is no change proposed for the building on the southern parcel parcel and the impervious 377 square metre concrete area is to be removed and will become on-site parking. Mr. Sands reviewed the definitions to be included to avoid interpretation in the future.

Further to the zoning discussion, the proposal seeks to permit 25% of the floor area to be utilized as complementary business and profession office uses that would be consistent with the existing Wemp and Smith building. Mr. Sands summarized the proposal noting that it is consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement and complies with the intent and vision of the Official Plan. He confirmed that there has not been a comprehensive technical review and that this is the very first stage of the development approval process.

Ms. Woods reiterated that staff expect to have refinement to this proposal as public comments and questions on behalf of a number of landowners and a

petition from 60+ and owners who have concerns to be addressed including the impact on groundwater and their drinking water and wells.

Councillor Sutherland commented on the technical reports and that there is a bit of contradiction as they reports seem to refer to specialty trade construction with very low water use but he felt that at least 50 % of the permitted uses i.e. banks, doctors offices, hair salons appear to be high water use and high traffic. He also noted that the retail ancillaries are better suited in hamlets and accessible by walking. He also commented on whether new wells will be drill and if there are draw down assurances to be done. He also asked about having more time to review the reports as he felt three days were not enough.

Councillor Mcdougall asked about the brownfield on the property due to a fire that occurred there several years ago, and is there a clean up requirement. Ms. Woods indicated that it was her understanding that there is not a need for brownfield remediation and that this would only be required if the applicant was proposing to change the use to something more sensitive such as a residential use.

Councillor Ruttan agreed with Councillor Sutherland 's comments and would like to have a better understanding of the proposed uses due to concerns expressed about water quantity in the area. He felt the list was far too extensive.

Deputy Mayor Revill indicated that the site specific zoning could narrows the scope of the proposed activities based on water usage and availability. He questioned the new development appears to be within the 4155 Road 38 property and would they remain separate based on the parking requirements and water supply.

Councillor Morey shared the concern about water quantity available in this area. He wondered about a requirement for a slip lane noting that the topography is slightly more level when comparing it to the slip lane required by the township for the commercial development just south of Harrowsmith that is now a rental centre. He wondered about the impact of large trucks turning in and out of this yard during high traffic volumes on Road 38..

Councillor Leonard questioned the shared driveway and if there will be a separated entrance for each parcel. Ms. Woods indicated that it is the intent to keep the shared driveway and spoke to the history of the properties.

Mayor Vandewal asked about the increased in water usage and if activity grows there would need toe consideration for the egress of traffic with 10 units. He supported the growth of employment opportunities and this type of development. He questioned the hazardous material storage and the significant fire from a few years ago, although he's not received any complaints about the aquifer due to that fire. He did feel that the list is very broad at this point and that it needs to be narrowed down.

Alex Benn was concerned about the retention pond and noted that there is minimal soil before you hit bedrock: wells are not very deep and this could cause serious issues if there is a hazardous waste spill. He supported the need for traffic calming or slowing measures and suggested a slip lane be required in both directions as he has personally witnessed near accidents related to speeding.

Ellen Mulville questioned the filtration pond and the environmental risk; there is the natural fed pond that feeds livestock in the area. She asked for full disclosure in regard to the attempts to drill wells on the subject parcel. She expressed concern about the impacts on the water table if fracturing occurs.

With regard to storm drainage she asked where it drained and to what extent does it no longer become an environmental concern.

Tom Teal who lives next door was concerned about the possibility of tile bed failure on the subject property and if it effects his well - what if this development effects the water quantity on neighboring wells. He asked if there would be any testing for contamination done on the concrete when it is removed from the old structure that burned. He asked if there will be any testing of surrounding wells before any additional wells are drilled to determine impact on quantity. He was concerned that previous and exiting businesses are using hazardous materials and he was concerned about the long range effects of this if proper disposal is not carried out. Mr. Teal asked if the existing structure that had burned has been inspected for hazardous materials and has it been approved to be used again and whether there was ay structural damage done. He felt the storage units should have been built further back that where they currently exist. He expressed concerns about increased traffic volumes including large trucks. Without certainty of what permitted uses will be he had concerns about how his property value may be effected. He asked if there had been any studies conducted on the effects on farm land surrounding the properties. If blasting for water is to be a consideration he felt this will impact the existing water quantity concerns in the area.

Sherry Gowdy spoke on behalf of various residents sharing her connection. The group (including Walter Dunn, Donald Gowdy and Marilyn Gowdy) did question the circulation of the notification as it was not clear. Ms. Woods explained that the Planning Act requires that the municipality provide notice to landowners that are within 120 metres of the subject property are circulated the notice of rezoning. She confirmed that all the proposed uses would be Class I under the MECP D-6 Assessment.

Sherry Gowdy also asked about the depth of the filtration pond and the requirements for it to be fenced similar to the requirements to a pool. She reiterated the overall concern with respect to the impact on an already sensitive water table.

Susan Wipfli, landowner of property to the south, west and part of the north of the subject property, felt there was no appropriate use listed other than what exists now. The intensity of the proposed buildings is out of sync with what exists. There have been numerous wells drilled there before, the density of what is planned is going to totally destroy the environment around there. There will be families with kids living there in the future and she felt further development is going to effect the residential and agricultural uses. She felt this was not the appropriate location for this type of development.

Martin Burger, consultant for the applicant indicated that they appreciated the comments provided and will take each one into consideration and will prepare an appropriate response

Claire Dodds, Director of Development Services noted that this application is very much at its early stages in terms of undertaking a staff review, however it was recognized that public input was valuable in addressing the proposal. It appears there is significant matter to be consideration by the applicant before this comes back to Council. She anticipated that based on the questions and issues raised she believes it will be sometime before these are addressed.

d) **Z-21-22 - Zoning By-law Amendment - 66 Oak Shores Crescent (Beverley Mahon)**

Christine Woods presented the details of this application which proposes to change the zone on the subject property from Limited Service Residential (RLS) to Limited Service Residential – Special Provision (RLS-XX) to permit a

private garage as a principle building in the absence of a dwelling on the property. The applicant owns two properties (65 and 66 Oak Shores Crescent). The two properties are separately conveyable lots. The applicant's home is located at 65 Oak Shores Crescent. There is insufficient area and unsuitable topography at 65 Oak Shores Crescent for a garage. In addition, their home is on a portion of Oak Shores Crescent that is not maintained year-round. This limitation prevents the applicant from being able to access their home year-round. As such, the applicant would like to construct a garage on the vacant property they own at 66 Oak Shores Crescent to be able to park and access their vehicle from a year-round maintained portion of the lane. The applicant proposes to construct a one storey, 80 square metre (864 square foot) garage at 66 Oak Shores Crescent. The garage would house their vehicle and boat in the winter. The garage would meet all required setbacks from the property lines. The garage would not be connected to a sewage system. The driveway to access the garage is on the portion of Oak Shores Crescent that is maintained year-round. The subject property is located on Oak Shores Crescent, which is off of Bob's Lake Road. Oak Shores Crescent is a private lane that primarily services waterfront residential properties. The subject property is one of six interior (non-waterfront) properties on the lane. The majority of the lane is maintained year-round. The exception is a 200 metre strip of road on a steep hill immediately north of the subject property. The property is 0.8 hectares (2 acres) in area and has approximately 165 metres of road frontage. The lands consist of rocky, forested hills. The garage would be located at the bottom of the hill on the west end of the property, across from 53 Oak Shores Crescent. The application did not meet the criteria for circulation to Public Services, Building Services and Rideau Valley Conservation Authority. Ms. Woods explained that with respect to the policy framework, The Provincial Policy Statement and the County of Frontenac's Official Plan do not speak specifically to this particular development in that they do not differentiate between residential and non-residential uses in rural areas. Many of the properties on Oak Shores Cres are undersized as they were created in 1971 and many are physically constrained. Permitting a garage on the vacant lot could be considered sensitive to the limitations of the applicants property. The Township's Official Plan does allow residential development on private lanes and permitting a stand alone garage on this property would not restrict the property from being developed with dwelling in the future. A detailed policy analysis will be provided in a subsequent report to Council following the public meeting and there is no draft by-law at this time.

Councillor Morey recalled a similar situation with the construction of a garage before a principal building as not being permitted. He questioned why this was being entertained now as an option. Ms. Woods explained that typically that is the same answer however they do have the opportunity to apply for a zone change to allow for different uses, especially in the rural zones and applications are considered on a case by case basis. Councillor Morey agreed that the township does deal with lots of unique situations and he cautioned this creates an opportunity for other applications to come forward.

Deputy Mayor Revill was supportive of this and noted that the Zoning Bylaw does not permit an accessory use prior to the creation of a primary use. He noted that there are no other seasonal residences on the same side of the road. He felt this will allow the applicant to park vehicles.

Councillor Sleeth asked about the size of the parcel that is being developed with a garage and if there is room to include a dwelling in the future. Christine Woods confirmed that the topography of this lot is challenging and where the garage is being built is the most level however there are challenges without the lane being maintained.

Mayor Vandewal asked for clarity on the process of applications when staff do not support an application and if staff include in their reports the rationale not

to support any particular application. Christine Woods explained that the preliminary discussions with applicants provide clear direction on whether or not it is supported by staff, however, the applicant always has the right to apply and seek approval from the committee level and the staff's analysis would be reflected in the information submitted either to the committee or to Council.

There were no comments from the public.

e) **RC-21-06 - Road Closing Application - Unopened Road Allowance between Concessions 10 & 11, District of Portland**

Claire Dodds, Director of Development Services addressed this application which came before Council for initial consideration on October 5, 2021. Council directed staff to move forward with the process to stop up, close and transfer this portion of unopened road allowance. The road allowance is aligned from east to west across a large peninsula surrounded by Hambly Lake on the east side and Hardwood Creek on the west side. The properties to the north and south will be the benefitting lands. The property to the north is accessed by Silver Rock Lane and is currently vacant and is also subject to planning applications S-31-21-P (lot addition), S-32-21-P (lot addition), S-51-21-P (new lot creation) and S-67-21-P (lot addition). The property to the south is accessed by Cedarwoods Lane and pending approval of the road closing, there will be a lot addition application that will be received from each property owner to facilitate a property swap, a draft reference plan has been prepared by Hopkins Chitty.

The benefitting property is currently approximately 76 acres in size. Following the decisions on the proposed consent applications the benefitting property will be approximately 40 acres in size with waterfrontage along Hardwood Creek and Little Mud Lake. As discussed at the October 5th meeting, the road allowance has already been stopped up, closed and conveyed in portions to the east of the current subject road allowance through prior applications.

Planning staff and Public Services staff visited the site on September 15, 2021. Public Services staff advised the road allowance offers very little practical use due to topography, lack of connectivity and the low quality of waterfront for recreational access. Planning staff have reviewed the property assembly in this location and view this application as an opportunity to clean up a small, stranded parcel of unopened road allowance.

Ms. Dodds noted that Quinte Conservation had no concerns with the application however they noted that portions of the road allowance would be regulated by Quinte Conservation.

Planning staff have received two separate emails from a property owner on Silver Rock Lane, Jennifer Eastman, asking for further information. There have been no concerns or requests from the public to purchase a portion of the road allowance to date. There have been no requests to purchase other portions of the road allowance.

Councillor Ruttan asked for clarity on the benefitting lands and the number of consents that have been approved - new lots and lot additions and which lots would have water frontage. Ms. Dodds explained that the consent applications are subject to the road closing and reviewed the parts that are subject to lot additions. Councillor Ruttan felt that the cost of the road allowance should be the "waterfront" rate of \$2.71 square foot. Ms. Dodds did confirm that the value of this road allowance is calculated at approximately \$55,000.

Deputy Mayor Revill referred to the email circulated to Council members earlier in the day from Ms. Eastman regarding tree removal activities. He asked if the parcels that are being reconfigured would be subject to site plan control. Ms.

Dodds indicated that a development agreement would be part of the consent process rather than being attached to the road closing process.

Councillor McDougall supported the concerns from Ms. Eastman in that Hambly Lake was developed with small lots and cautioned the continued development of waterfront. He referenced a study from the Rideau Canal about viewing these types of developments from the middle of the lake.

Councillor Roberts noted that it is not uncommon for property owners to conduct landscaping prior to applying for severances and currently there is no way the municipality has control over that. Ms. Dodds noted that the only way to protect shorelines is through a by-law which she indicated would be forthcoming in 2022.

Mayor Vandewal felt that all of these lots would meet today's standards to the best of their ability and Ms. Dodds confirmed there are benefits and gains in lots additions and consent.

Councillor Sutherland was supportive of the upcoming shoreline protection by-law. He did not have a sense that Council was not supportive of this and suggested this could be deferred or to get a commitment from the applicant that they will not clear the shoreline. Ms. Dodds reminded Council that the conditions suggested can't be added to a road closing application. In this particular case, most of the property is beyond the 30 metres setback and vegetative buffers which is what a shoreline protection by-law would address. These types of concerns would be addressed through the consent process.

Claire Dodds acknowledged that the applicant and property owners could go ahead and remove vegetation from the shoreline, irregardless of the road closing, however Council is being asked to make a decision solely on the road closing.

Mayor Vandewal asked if the road closing could be a condition on the consent applications being approved. Ms. Dodds did confirm that this could be done but applicants have a level of uncertainty involved in this type of situation. A standard development agreement would be included in the consent approval conditions.

Councillor Ruttan wanted to know how much waterfront is associated with Part 4. Ms. Dodds explained that because an existing lot is being enlarged the water frontage requirement does not come into effect, only if it was a brand new waterfront lot.

Jennifer Eastman spoke to her historical knowledge of the property, and her understanding of lot additions and severances filed by Mr. Allan. Mayor Vandewal acknowledged her comments in the email that are on record with the Planning Department She expressed her concerned about roads being constructed prior to any site plan control. Ms. Dodds confirmed that the township does not have the authority to regulate work completed on private lanes. She noted that Mr. Allan has constructed roadways and cutting trees but not within the setback from the high water mark.

Don Allan, the applicant thanked Council and Ms. Eastman of the comments and spoke to the process and severances he has filed for. He felt these lot additions will improve lot sizes for other adjoining properties.

f) **Resolution - Close Public Meeting**

Resolution No. 2021-38-04

Moved by Councillor Morey
Seconded by Deputy Mayor Reville
That having provided an opportunity for input, the public meeting be closed.

Carried

7. Approval of Minutes

a) **November 16, 2021 - Council Meeting**

Resolution No. 2021-38-05
Moved by Councillor Morey
Seconded by Deputy Mayor Reville
That the November 16, 2021 Council meeting minutes be approved.

Carried

b) **November 18, 2021 - Special Committee of the Whole Meeting**

Resolution No. 2021-38-06
Moved by Councillor Ruttan
Seconded by Councillor Sutherland
That the minutes of the November 18, 2021 Special Committee of the Whole meeting be approved.

Carried

8. Business Arising from the Minutes

a) **Notice of Motion - Joint & Several Liability**

Councillor Sutherland asked for a friendly amendment to have the motion circulated to AMO. Councillor Ruttan had no issue with this addition to the motion.

Resolution No. 2021-38-07
Moved by Councillor Sutherland
Seconded by Councillor McDougall
That the Council of the Corporation of the Township of South Frontenac reaffirm its concern from October 2019 regarding joint and several liability and again request a review of the law to ensure a fair and reasonable way to ensure those who suffer losses are made whole while preventing the further scaling back of public services owing to the excessive insurance costs that result from joint and several liability.

And that this motion be circulated to AMO and other Ontario Municipalities.

Carried

9. Reports Requiring Action

a) **Licence Agreement Application LA-04-21S - Pine Point Lane (Windle)**

Resolution No. 2021-38-08
Moved by Councillor Sleeth
Seconded by Councillor Ruttan
That Council direct staff to prepare a by-law to allow the Mayor and Clerk to enter into a Licence Agreement with the applicants for the purposes of permitting a driveway to be located over a portion of an unopened road allowance between Concession 8, District of Storrington to provide access to the parcel described as Part Lot 19, Concession 8, Parts 4-6 on Plan 13R20958.

Carried

b) **Naming of a new lane (from 1569 Devil Lake Road)**

Council was unanimous in their decision to deny this request as they are not supportive of using first or last names to name private or public roads other than those that Council has already approved in By-law 2015-60.

Resolution No. 2021-38-09

Moved by Deputy Mayor Revill

Seconded by Councillor Ruttan

That Council direct staff to proceed with the advertising and notice requirements to name a new lane currently accessed from 1569 Devil Lake Road as outlined in the Notice By-law 2016-73.

Defeated

c) **Committee Appointments due to Vacancy (including RVCA)**

Deputy Mayor Revill nominated Councillor McDougall for all three vacancies. Councillor Leonard seconded the nominations.

Councillor McDougall accepted the nominations to the Heritage Committee, Rideau Valley Conservation Authority and the Recreation and Leisure Facilities Committee.

Resolution No. 2021-38-10

Moved by Councillor Leonard

Seconded by Councillor Roberts

That Council appoint a Council member to fill the vacant seat on the Heritage Committee, the Recreation & Leisure Facilities Committee and the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority and that Schedule A to By-law 2019-49 and By-law 2018-81 be amended accordingly.

Carried

d) **COVID-19 Community Grant Request**

Resolution No. 2021-38-11

Moved by Councillor Roberts

Seconded by Councillor Leonard

That Council approve a COVID-19 Community Grant to Frontenac Minor Hockey in the amount of \$10,000; and,

That the request be funded from the Township's Working Funds Reserve being the designated reserve from which the original COVID-19 Community Grant program was allocated.

Carried

e) **Non-union Sick Leave Policy Change**

Resolution No. 2021-38-12

Moved by Councillor Ruttan

Seconded by Councillor Morey

That Council approve the elimination of the annual 50% payout of unused sick leave for all non-union personnel as stipulated in the Township's non-union personnel policies, subject to a corresponding increase to the non-union salary grid, equivalent to the maximum payout under the current unused sick leave policy, calculated at each band of the grid; and,

That the above policy changes take effect on January 1st, 2022.

Carried

10. Committee Meeting Minutes
 - a) **Community Programming and Events Committee meeting held September 22, 2021**
 - b) **Community Programming and Events Committee meeting held October 25, 2021**
 - c) **Bellrock Hall Committee meeting held October 27, 2021**

Resolution No. 2021-38-13

Moved by Councillor Sutherland

Seconded by Councillor Roberts

That Council receives for information the minutes of the following Committee meetings:

- Community Programming and Events Committee meeting held September 22, 2021
- Community Programming and Events Committee meeting held October 25, 2021
- Bellrock Community Hall Committee meeting held October 27, 2021

Carried

11. By-laws - none
12. Reports for Information
 - a) **Accounts Payable and Payroll Listing**
13. Information Items - not applicable
14. Notice of Motions - none
15. Announcements/Statements by Councillors
 - a) Councillor McDougall commended Council on the Community Grants program offered during the pandemic and how well it was appreciated in the community.
 - b) Councillor Sleeth thanked the Mayor for attending the second annual Battersea Santa Claus parade held on December 4 and specifically the organizers, including Kyle Gordon for the success of the event.
 - c) Mayor Vandewal mentioned the drive through parade at Centennial Park on December 11.
16. Question of Clarity (from the public on outcome of agenda items)
 - a) There were no members of the public connected to the meeting virtually.
17. Closed Session (not applicable)
18. Confirmatory By-law
 - a) **By-law 2021-72**

Resolution No. 2021-38-14

Moved by Councillor Roberts

Seconded by Councillor Leonard

That By-law 2021-72, being a by-law to confirm generally all actions and proceedings of the Council of the Corporation of the Township of South Frontenac be given first and second reading this 7 day of December 2021.

Carried

Resolution No. 2021-38-15

Moved by Councillor Sutherland

Seconded by Councillor McDougall

That By-law 2021-72, being the confirmatory by-law, be given third reading,
signed and sealed this 7 day of December 2021.

Carried

19. Adjournment

a) **Resolution**

Resolution No. 2021-38-16

Moved by Deputy Mayor Revill

Seconded by Councillor Ruttan

That the Council meeting of December 7, 2021 be adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Carried

Ron Vandewal, Mayor

Angela Maddocks, Clerk