AGENDA

REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
Council Chambers
Thursday, May 4, 2023 – 6:00 p.m.
May 1, 2023 version

---

1. Call the Meeting to Order

2. Approval of Agenda

Recommendation
That the agenda for the May 4, 2023, be approved as printed.

2. Disclosure of Interest
[At this time, Members of Council shall declare pecuniary interest, if any, with items on the agenda.]

4. Presentations - Nil

5. Delegations
a. Zabe MacEachren re variance application
Recommendation: Council receives Ms. MacEachern's information and requests staff prepare a report outlining Planning invoices

6. Public Meetings Pursuant to the Planning Act - nil

7. Public Meetings Pursuant to the Municipal Act - nil

8. Consent List
[Items from the Consent List may be moved to item 9, Items Referred from the Consent List, by members for debate/discussion]

a. Adoption of Council Minutes
i. Report – Closed Meeting – April 20, 2023
ii. Regular Council Meeting – April 20, 2023
iii. Public Council Meeting – April 20, 2023 (Pateman)
iv. Public Council Meeting – April 20, 2023 (Cicchillo)
v. Special Council Meeting – April 25, 2023

b. Receive Committee, Agency & Other Reports
i. Eastholme Financial Report March 2023

c. Staff Reports
i. SR-2023-020 – Boat Ramp Repairs
ii. SR-2023-021 - Office Space
iii. Fire Chiefs Information Reports – Training April 25, First Response Boundary ; housekeeping member addition
iv. Transfer Station Reports – April 11 to April 25, 2023

d. By-laws

i. **By-law No. 2023-24** Being a Bylaw to stop up, sell Shore Road Allowance (Boverhof)

ii. **By-law No. 2023-25 Deeming By-law** (Boverhof)

e. Receive Resolution Report - Nil

Recommendation
That the Consent List for April 20, 2023, and the Recommendations contained therein be adopted as Resolutions of Council, except for Items , which shall be moved out of the consent list for discussion and debate.

9. Items Referred from the Consent List

10. Other Business

11. Payment Register

Recommendation
That Council receives the List of Accounts for Cheques # 32676 to # 32718 in the total amount of $ 303,671.30

12. Correspondence for Information

a. **Information Release from SPR –** Assessment of Ontario Public Opinion re Bill 23

b. **Township of Perry –** Resolution re commitment of $50,000 towards the "Local Share" of the Muskoka Algonquin Healthcare Hospital Build

c. FONOM resolution re Bail Reform

Recommendation
That Correspondence Items 12 a) through 12 b) be received as information.

13. Correspondence for Action

a. Almaguin Highlands Secondary School 2023 Prom Committee

Recommendation
Whereas the Town of Kearney has received a request for support for $200 to assist students in holding a Prom for the 2023 graduating class; now
BE IT RESOLVED that the Council determines _____

b. Women's Own Resource Centre Request for Funding

Recommendation
Whereas the Town of Kearney has received a request to financially support the Women's Own Resource Centre; and
Whereas the Women's Own Resource Centre depends on both donations and federal and provincial funding; and
Whereas one of the programs offered by WORC in 2023 is a Travelling Rural Community Kitchen which may travel to Kearney; now
Therefore be it resolved that the Council requests the WORC attend a Council meeting to provide Council with further information on this and other programs to allow Council to fully understand the need for support and how Kearney can best help.

c. Larocque Elder Architects re Size of Generator

Recommendation

Whereas Larocque Elder Architects have indicated that the electrical consultants cannot confirm what the future electrical needs of the Kearney Community Centre could be; and
Whereas Larocque Elder Architects recommends a 200 kW generator; and
Whereas our Contractor, Bradanick Construction, has indicated a substantial cost savings by utilizing a 150 kW generator, both at installation and in fuel costs; now
Therefore be it resolved that Council determines the desire to

- □ move forward with the purchase and installation of the 150 kW generator
- □ move forward with the electrical consultants recommendation of a 200 kW generator

. **14. Notice of Motion**
[Members of Council may introduce motions for discussion at the next regular meeting.]

15. Council Announcements
Councillor Sharer
Councillor Pateman
Councillor Beaucage
Deputy Mayor Rickward
Mayor Philip

16. Talk to the Mayor
[This open forum provides members of the public a two-minute opportunity to address the Mayor on matters of public interest. Item discussed during this time will not be included in the Council minutes.]

17. Closed Session
If necessary, a Closed Session may be added.

18. Business Arising from Closed Session
[Resolutions, if any, arising from the closed meeting will be presented here. A closed meeting report will be provided at the next Regular meeting of council]

19. Confirming By-Law No. 2023-XX

Recommendation
That By-law No. 2023- XX, being a By-law to confirm the proceedings of Council at its Regular Meeting held on May 4, 2023, be approved.

20. Adjournment

Recommendation
That Council adjourn at _____p.m.

Entry Details #19

< Previous Next > ← Back to Entries

Form Entry Data

☆ Show empty fields

Terms and Conditions

Accepted

Name

Zabe MacEachren

Email

zabemaceachren@gmail.com

Telephone Number

16133283759

Address

218 Helen St

Date of Meeting for Designation

Thursday May 4th

Please describe the general nature of your delegation:

I would like to draw the council attention to the invoice amount I received on a variance application. [I will send attentional information soon]

[P.S. If possible I would like to present earlier as I must drive to Toronto after the meeting].

Submission Notes

Add Note

No Notes found

Submission Logs

General API Calls

No Logs found

Resend Email Notification | Entry Actions

Submission Info

Entity ID: #56

User IP : 45.72.213.147

Source URL : https://townofkearney.ca/15653-2/

Browser : Chrome

Device : Windows

User : Guest

Status : Read

Submitted On : 2023-04-21 06:16:35

Edit | Change status to

Thanks for using Fluent Forms

Version 4.3.25

Relevant Dates Pertaining to Zabe MacEachren variance application. She will address the council in person with her request listed at the end of this document.

2022

March Apply for variance re height on new cottage build / variance passes

June 14- Survey on lot completed but there is some confusion over if I must apply for another variance even though I plan to build a new cottage on old cottage footprint (with extensions only on sides and back not on lake side).

June -July I begin to ask questions re garage as my builder strongly suggested I get it marked on my site plan although it will be built later, after cottage is rebuilt.

Garage issues: I cannot alter my driveway entrance due to the location of a shed, septic field and hydro pole on one side and a recently installed culvert under the road on the other side (which causes flooding on my land as it was not set low enough). As I am trying to build green and want a garden, I aimed to place the garage as much as possible on the present driveway location to reduce the need to eliminate green space by building on my present yard/naturalized area. In order to accomplished this and retain as much garden space as possible I was informed that I needed to include the garage location in a variance application as it does not conform to the new side set-back distance.

July 15 All my questions re culvert cause a 'notice of cancelation' by the planner. I am informed the town will not alter the culvert they put in. Note in July they partially improved but did not completely repair the flooding the culvert creates and causes trees to die.

August 21 I submit another variance application with garage location clearly marked on it.

Trying to be a good citizen I talked to both my neighbors regarding my surveyor's boundary marks and my building plans so they are aware before they receive the variance notification letter. One neighbor had no concerns. The conversation with the other neighbor was left incomplete as they had to leave in a rush and only said they were told the boundary between our property was a wire on the ground not along the rope I had placed between two surveyor's marks. It is this neighbor that wrote a letter in response to my variance application. Trying to keep on good terms with this neighbor I did not clarify how their dock showed up on my survey. They also have a sauna and shed very close to the boundary markers.

Sept-Oct Numerous times I called the town and emailed inquiring about the date my variance will pass as my builder wanted to make plans.

Nov 2 - Council Meeting to pass variance. The planners mention one neighbors submitted a letter concerned about the boundary leading to the planner's recommendation that I submit a survey. I attended the council meeting to explain that the site plan submitted as part of variance application was based upon the survey I had already had completed; all my planner did was placed the proposed buildings on the drawing and remove where my neighbors dock had crossed onto my property. At the council meeting I also explain how I tried to talk to my neighbors. Council passes the variance on the condition I submit the original survey drawing which I did the next day.

Nov 10- Confusion over what is a survey holds up variance finalized approval. Kearney worker tells the planner in an email that council wants them to determine boundary (NOTE: This is not part of a planner's responsibility or part of a variance application.)

Nov 30 – My surveyor confirms the document I sent is accurate, calls it a **boundary survey** even though it is marked sketch and outlines that the onus is on a surveyor to clearly mark setbacks to make sure they are followed and this can only be done when building is constructed hence it is not marked a legal document.

Dec- I'm told the variance must wait until new council is sworn in and they will pass it again.

2023

January – Variance is brought forward to new council. Planners suggests again that it be passed. I am surprised that the recommendation this time has the full attached letter from the neighbour, but no rationale from my variance application. I am unable to attend this council meeting to address any concerns.

February- I called in order to receive assurance my variance has passed as well as the allotted amount of days without any further response.

April- I receive an invoice for $5,159.92. (This amount is well over the price I had to pay to get the property survey completed. My surveyor also sent the Kearney office a letter validating his work—at no additional charge.)

My Concern

When I paid the deposit for the variance, I was informed that what was not spent by the planner would be returned to me after the process was completed. When I had to pay the deposit a second time, which I acknowledge was due to all details not on the 2nd application due to garage and driveway issue, I thought for sure two deposits would cover the entire expense. Hence, my surprised to discover that I still owe a considerable amount of money for this variance application.

Trying to understand where the high cost came from and thinking it came from trying to validate the survey, I asked for a copy of what the planner charged. This information was sent to me but the dated invoices are vague, coded and leave me with many questions as to what actually occurred [e.g. 1) What work was completed in August the day before my application was submitted?; 2) On 07/10/2022 who is Sadiker, the technician who created the notices or another person meaning an error in billing?; 3) On 02/11/2022 was I charged for 1 hr and 30 mins of council meeting when my variance was passed within 10 minutes?; 4) Where others also charged for the planner's time at the council meeting?; 5)Why do my receipts state $200.00 pre-consultation, $400.00 planning application, $1,200 planning deposit Fee and $2,050.00 zoning By-Law Amendment Fees totaling paid ($3850.00) yet the invoice also states I owe for the PreConsultation, Planning Application Fee and ZBA Application Fees along with the Consulting Fees? = Owing $5,159.92 . . . . .]

I recognized I will never be able to sort out all these expenses as I don't have all the information to do so nor is this a good use of my own time. I also am not interested in requesting that another person spend/waste their time trying to clarify what all went on here re expenses. I am interested that councilors make the process for variance expenses clearer and question if it there is another way to

Nov 10- Confusion over what is a survey holds up variance finalized approval. Kearney worker tells the planner in an email that council wants them to determine boundary (NOTE: This is not part of a planner's responsibility or part of a variance application.)

Nov 30 – My surveyor confirms the document I sent is accurate, calls it a **boundary survey** even though it is marked sketch and outlines that the onus is on a surveyor to clearly mark setbacks to make sure they are followed and this can only be done when building is constructed hence it is not marked a legal document.

Dec- I'm told the variance must wait until new council is sworn in and they will pass it again.

2023

January – Variance is brought forward to new council. Planners suggests again that it be passed. I am surprised that the recommendation this time has the full attached letter from the neighbour, but no rationale from my variance application. I am unable to attend this council meeting to address any concerns.

February- I called in order to receive assurance my variance has passed as well as the allotted amount of days without any further response.

April- I receive an invoice for $5,159.92. (This amount is well over the price I had to pay to get the property survey completed. My surveyor also sent the Kearney office a letter validating his work—at no additional charge.)

My Concern

When I paid the deposit for the variance, I was informed that what was not spent by the planner would be returned to me after the process was completed. When I had to pay the deposit a second time, which I acknowledge was due to all details not on the 2nd application due to garage and driveway issue, I thought for sure two deposits would cover the entire expense. Hence, my surprised to discover that I still owe a considerable amount of money for this variance application.

Trying to understand where the high cost came from and thinking it came from trying to validate the survey, I asked for a copy of what the planner charged. This information was sent to me but the dated invoices are vague, coded and leave me with many questions as to what actually occurred [e.g. 1) What work was completed in August the day before my application was submitted?; 2) On 07/10/2022 who is Sadiker, the technician who created the notices or another person meaning an error in billing?; 3) On 02/11/2022 was I charged for 1 hr and 30 mins of council meeting when my variance was passed within 10 minutes?; 4) Where others also charged for the planner's time at the council meeting?; 5)Why do my receipts state $200.00 pre-consultation, $400.00 planning application, $1,200 planning deposit Fee and $2,050.00 zoning By-Law Amendment Fees totaling paid ($3850.00) yet the invoice also states I owe for the PreConsultation, Planning Application Fee and ZBA Application Fees along with the Consulting Fees? = Owing $5,159.92 . . . . .]

I recognized I will never be able to sort out all these expenses as I don't have all the information to do so nor is this a good use of my own time. I also am not interested in requesting that another person spend/waste their time trying to clarify what all went on here re expenses. I am interested that councilors make the process for variance expenses clearer and question if it there is another way to

make the process easier to track and more economical to complete, especially for people who are trying to doing the right/green thing. I wish I would have been told the range of fees that might be incurred by applying for a variance at the start of the process instead of being told it will be deducted from a deposit and then I will receive any money not spent afterwards. If I had known how much the whole process might have costed at the beginning, I could have chosen to spend my money on something else –as all I wanted to do was simply try to situate a garage on top of my present driveway and preserve some more green space.

Overall, I am left feeling financially penalized for trying to build with sustainable practices in mind. The process took over half a year and delayed my building plans. Now, in order to have a garage build on my present driveway to maintain and maximize greenspace on my lot I am having to pay a considerable fee. I understand the reason for bylaws and I strongly support bylaws designed to protect the environment. But in my case, I feel I am being charged well over what is a reasonable amount in order to save a few meters of green space. Who benefitted from this process except for the planner. It would be nice if the council considered a way to reduce my invoice. And going forward found a way to make the variance application process clearer for all Kearney residents aiming to create a sustainable home environment that protects wild spaces.

Sincerely,

Zabe MacEachren

All information listed can be supported with further documentation if requested.

The Corporation of the Town of Kearney

REPORT

CLOSED COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, April 20, 2023

Council Members Present: Deputy Mayor: Mike Rickward (Meeting Chair)
Councilors: Keven Beaucage, Heather Pateman and Jill Sharer

Regrets: Mayor: Cheryl Philip

Staff Present: Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk
Karen Fraser, Interim Chief Administrative Officer

Guests Present: Tom Agnew, Hicks Morley (Attended Remotely)

The Closed meeting commenced at 6:46 p.m.

[Agenda items were discussed in the following order: 2 a., 2 b., 1 a., 1 b.]

[Council Recessed at 8:22 p.m. until 8:25 p.m., following Item 2 b.]

1. *Advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose*

   a. Outstanding Claim

   Mr. Agnew attended remotely to provide an update to Council and to receive direction.

   ***b.* Clerk/Administrator Vacancy**

   Staff provided information to Council and received further direction in this matter.

2. *Labour Relations or employee negotiations*

   a. Recruitment – Part Time Treasurer

   Staff provided information for Council's Review.

   [Cindy Filmore left the meeting at 8:35 p.m.]

   b. Recruitment - Clerk Administrator

   Staff provided information for Council's Review.

   [Cindy Filmore returned to the meeting at 8:45 p.m.]

The Closed Meeting adjourned at 8:49 p.m.

THE CORPORATION OF THE
TOWN OF KEARNEY

_____
Mike Rickward, Deputy Mayor

_____
Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk

DRAFT

Minutes

REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
Council Chambers
Thursday, April 20, 2023 – 6:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Deputy Mayor Mike Rickward
Councillors: Keven Beaucage, Heather Pateman and Jill Sharer

Staff Present: Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk
Karen Fraser, Interim Acting Clerk
Brian Horsman, CBO
Matt Clouthier, DCBO
Caitlin Deevey, BLEO

1. **Call the Meeting to Order** – the meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm

2. **Approval of Agenda**

Res. No. 60 – 23 **Keven Beaucage, Jill Sharer**
BE IT RESOLVED that the Agenda of the Regular Council Meeting of the Corporation of the Town of Kearney of April 6, 2023 agenda, be adopted as amended:

- Remove SR-2023-016 from the consent list to item 9 for discussion
- Defer items 8.d.ii and 8.d.iii regarding the Boverhof Shore Road Allowance until May 4th Regular Council Meeting
- Defer item 8.d.iv regarding the Zoning By-law Amendment RZ-08-22
- Defer item 8.d.v regarding the Zoning By-law Amendment RZ-01-23
- Add 10.a. SR-2023-18 – Staff Report regarding the KCC Sound System Tender
- Add 10.b. SR-2023-19 – Staff Report regarding the KCC Generator
- Add 17.b.i Recruitment Part-Time Treasurer
- Add17.b.ii.RecruitmentClerkAdministrator

CARRIED

3. **Disclosure of Interest**
Councillor Pateman declared a pecuniary interest with regard to List of Accounts Cheque #32652, the reason being: cheque to my business, Fetterley's
Councilor Pateman declared a pecuniary interest with regard to Public Meeting Agenda Item 6.a. regarding Zoning By-law Amendment RZ-08-22 rezoning of own property

4. **Presentations - Nil**

5. **Delegations - Nil**

6. **Public Meetings Pursuant to the Planning Act**
a. Amendment to Zoning By-law 2022-20 – RZ-08-22 (Pateman)
[a Public Meeting took place, beginning at 6:04 pm
Councillor Patemen recused from the meeting
The meeting ended at 6:06 pm
Councillor Pateman rejoined the meeting]
b. Amendment to Zoning By-law 2022-20 – RZ-01-23 (Cicchillo)
[a Public Meeting took place, beginning at 6:07 pm and closed at 6:11pm]

DRAFT

7. Public Meetings Pursuant to the Municipal Act – nil

8. Consent List

a. Adoption of Council Minutes

i. Special Council Meeting – April 5, 2023
ii. Report – Closed Meeting – April 6, 2023
iii. Regular Council Meeting – April 6, 2023

b. Receive Committee, Agency & Other Reports

i. Almaguin Highlands Health Centre – April 6, 2023 Minutes

c. Staff Reports

i. SR-2023-016 – Scope of work re: accessibility window – Building and Fire Dept.
ii. SR-2023-017 - Hazardous Waste Day Event
iii. Fire Chiefs Report – April 20, 2023
iv. By-law Enforcement First Quarter Report - Jan. to Mar. 2023.
v. Transfer Station Reports – April 4 to April 11, 2023
vi. SR-2023-018 - KCC Sound Equipment Tender

d. By-laws

i. **Amendment to Notice By-law** [*due to unforeseen changes caused by scheduling issues, a motion to accept these changes is necessary- Boverhof*]

Res. No. 61-23 Keven Beaucage, Heather Pateman

With respect to the road closing and sale application of Rudolf Alex Boverhof and Deborah Ann Boverhof for part of the original shore road allowance in front of Lot 9, Concession 6, Geographic Township of Bethune now in the Town of Kearney, District of Parry Sound, designated as Part 1 Plan 42R-21983, Council deems the following:

1. In addition to the required advertising and posting which took place prior to the March 16, 2023 meeting of Council, posting of notice on the Town's website of the new date and time for consideration of the By-law by Council will be adequate in this circumstance.
2. Circulation of the new date and time for consideration of the By-law by Council to the Applicant and all parties who submitted comments to the Clerk, in advance of the March 16, 2023 meeting will be adequate in this circumstance.
3. The notice requirements pursuance to By-law No 2007-61 which would otherwise apply to the matter shall be amended as approved by this motion and no further notice shall be required.

CARRIED

ii. **By-law No. 2023-24** Being a Bylaw to stop up, sell Shore Road Allowance (Boverhof)) [deferred until the May 4th Council meeting]
iii. **By-law No. 2023-25 Deeming By-law** (Boverhof) [deferred until the May 4th Council meeting]
iv. **By-law No. 2023-28 Zoning By-law Amendment (Cicchillo)**
v. **By-law No. 2023-29 Zoning By-law Amendment (Pateman)**

e. Receive Resolution Report

Res. No. 62 -23 Keven Beaucage, Heather Pateman

BE IT RESOLVED that the Consent List for April 20, 2023, and the Recommendations contained therein be adopted as Resolutions of Council, except for items 8.c.i, which shall be moved out of the consent list for discussion and debate.

CARRIED

9. Items Referred from the Consent List

SR-2023-016 – Scope of work re: accessibility window – Building and Fire Dept

Res. No. 63-23 Keven Beaucage, Jill Sharer

WHEREAS there appears to be funding within the cash allowance (contingency) portion of the contract for the renovations to the Kearney Community Centre to address failures, shortcomings and concerns regarding possible issues which may arise while completing the renovations; and

WHEREAS the Report issued jointly by the Building and Fire Departments identifies shortcomings in the fire separations of the lobby area and the Municipal Office Service Window; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That Council hereby directs staff to request a Notice of Change for the remedial repair to the existing fire separation outlined by the Building and Fire Departments in their joint recommendations to Council.

CARRIED

Res. No. 64-23 Keven Beaucage, Jill Sharer

BE IT RESOLVED that Council considers the points presented to Staff by the Contractor and Consultants as identified in Staff Report SR-2023-019 and accepts the recommendations to require a review of the generator by the consultants Electrical Engineer to determine the necessary size of generator, and to have Larocque Elder Architects issue a Change Notice to allow for this review and to allow for a diesel generator in place of the propane unit.

CARRIED

10. Other Business

a. SR-2023-18 – Staff Report regarding the KCC Sound System Tender

Res. No. 65-23 Keven Beaucage, Jill Sharer

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Kearney hereby awards the tender to QVS at the amount of $17480.00 plus HST for the KCC Sound System

CARRIED

b. SR-2023-19 – Staff Report regarding the KCC Generator

Res. No. 64 – 23 Keven Beaucage, Jill Sharer

BE IT RESOLVED that Council considers the points presented to Staff by the Contractor and Consultants as identified in Staff Report SR-2023-019 and accepts the recommendations to require a review of the generator by the consultants Electrical Engineer to determine the necessary size of generator, and to have Larocque Elder Architects issue a Change Notice to allow for this review and to allow for a diesel generator in place of the propane unit.

CARRIED

11. Payment Register

Res. No. 66– 23 Jill Sharer, Keven Beaucage

BE IT RESOLVED That Council receives the List of Accounts for Cheques # 32633 to # 32675 in the total amount of $621,392.08

CARRIED

12. Correspondence for Information

a. Village of Sundridge Council Resolution re: Muskoka Algonquin Healthcare Local Share

Res. No. 67 – 23 Keven Beaucage, Jill Sharer

BE IT RESOLVED that Correspondence Item 12 a) be received as information.

CARRIED

13. Correspondence for Action

a. Regional Fire Training Service Agreement

Res. No. 68 – 23 Keven Beaucage, Heather Pateman

Whereas Kearney has been part of the Regional Fire Training Service with neighbouring municipalities since 2014, and

Whereas James Gary Courtice is willing to carry on this service to the five area fire departments at the same rate ($90,400 plus expenses up to $2,500) for the 2024-2027 time period; and

Whereas a new 2024 – 2027 agreement for the Joint Regional Fire Training Services has been provided, and is agreeable;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council hereby agrees to enter into this agreement, known as the Joint Municipal Agreement 2024-2027

CARRIED

b. Almaguin Highlands Health Council re: Long Term Plan (hospital)

Res. No. 69-23 Keven Beaucage, Jill Sharer

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Kearney hereby defers the resolution regarding 13.b. of the April 20th agenda to allow staff to prepare financial information in this regard prior to the May 4th agenda.

CARRIED

c. Almaguin Highlands Health Centre re: Long Term Plan (Burks Falls)

Res. No. 70 – 23 Keven Beaucage, Heather Pateman

Whereas the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Kearney agrees that the Village of Burk's Falls would continue to manage the Almaguin Highlands Health Centre with the assistance of the AHHC Board (governance option #4); and

Whereas all member municipalities are recommended to enter into contribution agreements to cover approved budgeted costs at a fixed percentage with 5 year review intervals; and

Whereas these contribution agreements need to address the average annual operating and capital deficit of $60,069; with the annual average contribution per member municipality for 2023 to be $6,007.00 (option #3)

Now therefore be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Kearney hereby agrees with Options #3 and #4 as recommended.

CARRIED

d. Memo re: 14 Rain Lake Road Zoning By-law Amendment application

Res. 71- 23 Keven Beaucage Jill Sharer

Whereas Council has received correspondence from Leanne Ziraldo dated February 2, 2023, requesting a Zoning Amendment for property at 14 Rain Lake Road with waiving of fees associated with same;
And whereas the current use for the property is non-conforming which requires a Zoning Amendment, at minimum, to rectify the situation;
And whereas associated costs for undertaking this process are not known and have potential to be substantial;
Now therefore be it resolved that Council, in keeping with the Town of Kearney's established fee schedule and by-laws, requires the applicant to provide all prescribed fees and costs associated with the process;
And further that the applicant be required to commence the process in a timely manner to address the non-conforming use.

CARRIED

14. Notice of Motion

[Members of Council may introduce motions for discussion at the next regular meeting.]

15. Council Announcements

Councillor Sharer

- Working on Swimming Lessons

Councillor Pateman

- Nothing at this time.

Councillor Beaucage

- Nothing at this time.

Deputy Mayor Rickward

- Nothing at this time.

16. Talk to the Mayor

17. Closed Session

Res. No. 72 – 23 Keven Beaucage, Michael Rickward

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council will enter into a Closed Session for discussion regarding:

a. Advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose;
   i. Outstanding Claim
   ii. Clerk/Administrator/Treasurer Vacancy
b. Labour relations or Employee negotiations
   i. Recruitment Part-Time Treasurer
   ii. Recruitment Clerk Administrator

CARRIED

DRAFT

18. Business Arising from Closed Session

Res. No. 73 – 23 Keven Beaucage, Jill Sharer

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Kearney hereby reconvenes in Open Session at 8:49 pm

CARRIED

19. Confirming By-Law No. 2023-30

Res. No. 74 – 23 Jill Sharer, Michael Rickward

BE IT RESOLVED that By-law No. 2023-30, being a By-law to confirm the proceedings of Council at its Regular Meeting held on April 20, 2023, be approved.

CARRIED

20. Adjournment

Res. No. 75 – 23 Keven Beaucage, Jill Sharer

BE IT RESOLVED that the Regular Council Meeting of the Corporation of the Town of Kearney adjourn at 8:54 pm to meet again at 6:00 pm on Thursday, May 4th, 2023 in the Council Chambers, Kearney, Ontario.

CARRIED

THE CORPORATION OF THE

TOWN OF KEARNEY

_____

Michael Rickward, Deputy Mayor

_____

Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk

DRAFT

Minutes

PUBLIC MEETING
(Pursuant to the Planning Act)
DURING
REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
Council Chambers
Thursday, April 20, 2023 – 6:04 p.m.

Council Members Present:	Deputy Mayor Mike Rickward Councillors: Keven Beaucage, and Jill Sharer [Councillor Pateman recused from the meeting]
Staff Present:	Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk Karen Fraser, Interim Acting Clerk Brian Horsman, CBO Matt Clouthier, DCBO Caitlin Deevey, BLEO

6. Public Hearings (Pursuant to the *Planning Act*)

(a) Zoning By-law Amendment Application re: RZ-08-22 (Pateman)

Deputy Mayor Rickward stated that this portion of the Meeting is to hear submissions from the public pursuant to Sections 34 (12), (13) and (14) of the *Planning Act* and declared the Public Meeting open to consider an amendment to our Comprehensive Zoning By-law No. 2022-20.

Deputy Mayor Rickward noted that if a person or public body did not make oral submissions at the public meeting or make written submissions to the Town of Kearney before the By-law was passed, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of Council to the Ontario Land Tribunal and may not be added as a party to a hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Land Tribunal unless, in the opinion of the Tribunal, there are reasonable grounds to do so. Also, Deputy Mayor Rickward stated that if anyone wished to be notified of the decision of Council on the proposed amendments, that they must make a written request to the Town of Kearney.

Deputy Mayor Rickward then turned the meeting over to our Planner to explain the purpose and effect of the proposed By-law amendment.

Town Planner Jessica Reid stated that application RZ-08-22 to amend Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2022-20 is to rezone the subject lands from the Rural (RU) Zone to the Rural Residential (RR) Zone, as a condition of Consent Applications B-027/22, B-028/22 and B-029/22. An Environmental Impact Study (EIS), completed by River Stone Environmental Solutions Inc., dated March 2022, was completed in support of the Consent Applications and identified a wetland on the subject lands and recommended vegetative buffers in order to protect the feature. In order to implement the recommendations of the EIS, this wetland area will be rezoned from the Rural (RU) Zone to Environmental Protection (EP) Zone.

Deputy Mayor Rickward asked if any member of the public had any comments. None were noted.

Deputy Mayor Rickward asked if Council had any questions. There were none.

Deputy Mayor Rickward asked if there were any further comments or questions from the public. There were none.

Deputy Mayor Rickward asked if our Planner had anything further to add, to which Ms. Reid replied, 'no, she did not'.

As there was nothing further, Deputy Mayor Rickward noted that this completes the public input portion of the meeting.

Time: 6:06 p.m.

THE CORPORATION OF THE
TOWN OF KEARNEY

_____
Michael Rickward, Deputy Mayor

_____
Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk

Minutes

PUBLIC MEETING
(Pursuant to the Planning Act)
DURING
REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
Council Chambers
Thursday, April 20, 2023 – 6:07 p.m.

Council Members Present:	Deputy Mayor Mike Rickward Councillors: Keven Beaucage, Heather Pateman and Jill Sharer
Staff Present:	Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk Karen Fraser, Interim Acting CAO Brian Horsman, CBO Matt Clouthier, DCBO Caitlin Deevey, BLEO

6. Public Hearings (Pursuant to the *Planning Act*)

(b) Zoning By-law Amendment Application re: RZ-01-23 (Cicchillo)

Deputy Mayor Rickward stated that this portion of the Meeting is to hear submissions from the public pursuant to Sections 34 (12), (13) and (14) of the *Planning Act* and declared the Public Meeting open to consider an amendment to our Comprehensive Zoning By-law No. 2022-20.

Deputy Mayor Rickward noted that if a person or public body did not make oral submissions at the public meeting or make written submissions to the Town of Kearney before the By-law was passed, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of Council to the Ontario Land Tribunal and may not be added as a party to a hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Land Tribunal unless, in the opinion of the Tribunal, there are reasonable grounds to do so. Also, Deputy Mayor Rickward stated that if anyone wished to be notified of the decision of Council on the proposed amendments, that they must make a written request to the Town of Kearney.

Deputy Mayor Rickward then turned the meeting over to our Planner to explain the purpose and effect of the proposed By-law amendment.

Town Planner Jessica Reid stated that application RZ-01-23 to amend Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2022-20 is required to rezone the subject lands from the Rural Exception Seven (RU-7) Zone to Rural Residential (RR) Zone, as a condition of Consent Applications B073-22. The Rural Exception Seven (RU-7) Zone is a site-specific zone in the Town of Kearney Zoning By-law that provides for a minimum lot area of 5.8 hectares and a minimum lot frontage of 115 metres, as per Section 4.4.5.7. The severed parcels will each have an area of 3.45 hectares and a frontage on Lawson Road of 60 metres, which does not meet the minimum requirement of the RU-7 Zone. Therefore, an amendment to the Town of Kearney Zoning By-law is required to permit the proposed area and frontage of the severed lots..

Deputy Mayor Rickward asked if any member of the public had any comments. Lanny Dennis, of Lanny Dennis Planning, spoke on behalf of the appellant. Mr. Dennis noted that North Bay Mattawa Conservation Authority had confirmed their approval of possible septic permits on both lots created.

Deputy Mayor Rickward asked if Council had any questions. Interim Acting CAO Karen Fraser asked if the discrepancy regarding the civic addresses would be an issue resulting in a delay to the process. Town Planner Jessica Reid advised that, as the correct legal description and roll number were used and abutting landowners were notified, there should not be any issue with moving forward.

Deputy Mayor Rickward asked if there were any further comments or questions from the public. There were none.

Deputy Mayor Rickward asked if our Planner had anything further to add, to which Ms. Reid replied, 'no, she did not'.

As there was nothing further, Deputy Mayor Rickward noted that this completes the public input portion of the meeting.

Time: 6:11 p.m.

THE CORPORATION OF THE
TOWN OF KEARNEY

_____
Michael Rickward, Deputy Mayor

_____
Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk

Minutes

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING
Council Chambers
Tuesday, April 25, 2023 – 6:00 p.m.

Council Members Present: Mayor Cheryl Philip, Deputy Mayor Michael Rickward
Councillors: Keven Beaucage; Heather Pateman and Jill Sharer

Staff Present: Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk
Scott McKay, Public Works Working Foreman

A Moment of Silence was observed in memory of Elizabeth Demain, in the memory of Shirley Reeds and in the memory of Elizabeth Turner

1. **Call the Meeting to Order** – 6 pm

2. **Approval of Agenda**
Res. No 76-23 **Keven Beaucage, Heather Pateman**
BE IT RESOLVED that the agenda of the Special Council Meeting of the Corporation of the Town of Kearney of April 28, 2023 be adopted as circulated.
CARRIED

3. **Disclosure of Interest - nil**
[At this time, Members of Council shall declare pecuniary interest, if any, with items on the agenda.]

4. **Discussion regarding the formation of the Roads Committee**
Res. No. 77-23 **Keven Beaucage, Heather Pateman**
BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Kearney hereby determines to form an Advisory Committee for Roads consisting of all members of Council as well as members of the public appointed by Council, namely Paul Shermet, Ron Patton, Bill Verhoog, Dave Bones, Moe Neves and Brent Kirkby
CARRIED

5. **Adjournment**
Res. No. 78-23 **Heather Pateman, Jill Sharer**
BE IT RESOLVED that the Special Council Meeting of the Corporation of the Town of Kearney adjourn at 7:03 pm to meet again at 6:00 pm on Thursday, May 4th, 2023 in the Council Chambers, Kearney, ON.
CARRIED

THE CORPORATION OF THE
TOWN OF KEARNEY

_____
Cheryl Philip, Mayor

_____
Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk

RESIDENT STATISTICS

RESIDENT REPORT for the month of March 2023

As at February 28, 2023 — Residents: Long Stay 128

New Admissions: Irene Tardif, Catherine MacDonald

Deaths: Fern Carmicheal, Marcia Kinrade

Discharges:

As at March 31, 2023 — Residents: Long Stay 128

Occupancy Statistics 128 Beds

	Long Stay	
YTD Actual Days	11,442	99.32%
YTD Max. Allowable Days	11,520	

Year to Date Long Stay Admissions & Discharges

Admissions = 07 Discharges = 05

Waiting List — As at April 21, 2023

	Long Stay		
Male	81		
Female	139		
Private Dwelling	112	Hospital	47
Other LTC Home	07	Retirement Home/Assisted Living	54

Shelley Reichstein, Secretary Board of Management

F:\WORD\ADMIN\FORMS\Resident Statistics.wpd

Eastholme General Operating Expenditures for March 2023
Bank Account 45-10

6-Mar-23	MSCOL-032301	IAN PARKER	6,369.82
6-Mar-23	MSCOL-032302	WSIB	25,464.12
6-Mar-23	MSCOL-032303	MINISTER OF FINANCE EHT	14,434.61
6-Mar-23	MSCOL-032304	OMERS	119,417.10
6-Mar-23	MSCOL-032305	DR. NG	3,246.40
6-Mar-23	MSCOL-032306	DR. KING	1,686.60
6-Mar-23	MSCOL-032307	MITCHELL JENSEN ARCHITECTS	10,542.90
7-Mar-23	MSCOL-032308	SUTHERLAND HR CONSULTING INC.	4,521.94
7-Mar-23	MSCOL-032309	MARTEL & MITCHELL PHYSIOTHERAPY	7,948.00
7-Mar-23	MSCOL-032310	WSIB	41.99
7-Mar-23	MSCOL-032311	GORDON FOOD SERVICE	13,254.34
20-Mar-23	MSCOL-032312	VENASSE BUILDING GROUP INC.	101,140.65
21-Mar-23	MSCOL-032313	VOID	0.00
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032314	2170640 ONTARIO LIMITED-EVAN HUGHES	5,100.00
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032315	DISTRICT OF PARRY SOUND SOCIAL SERVI	5,600.00
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032316	RECEIVER GENERAL FULL TIME	67,791.72
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032317	RECEIVER GENERAL PART TIME	45,808.77
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032318	RECEIVER GENERAL FULL TIME	62,839.13
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032319	RECEIVER GENERAL PART TIME	39,641.28
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032320	ADT SECURITY SERVICES CANADA INC.	64.79
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032321	BELL INTERNET	128.15
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032322	BELL TV	1,779.97
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032323	BELL CONFERENCING	56.50
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032324	DIVERSEY CANADA	2,348.11
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032325	COMVIDA CORPORATION	932.25
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032326	HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.	18,513.99
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032327	MILLER WASTE SYSTEMS INC.	6,874.56
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032328	ROBSON COMMUNICATIONS INC.	165.90
22-Mar-23	MSCOL-032329	TELIZON	482.97
23-Mar-23	MSCOL-032330	PLAN A NIPISSING/SIMCOE	11,249.24
23-Mar-23	MSCOL-032331	SYSCO	24,653.07
23-Mar-23	MSCOL-032332	MEDLINE CANADA, CORPORATION	16,016.63
24-Mar-23	MSCOL-032333	ADVANCED TELECOMMUNICATIONS & CABLIN	10,042.48
24-Mar-23	MSCOL-032334	ADVANCED TELECOMMUNICATIONS & CABLIN	6,716.53
24-Mar-23	MSCOL-032335	HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.	158.89
24-Mar-23	MSCOL-032336	HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.	197.92
24-Mar-23	MSCOL-032337	HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.	148.70
24-Mar-23	MSCOL-032338	HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.	52.23
24-Mar-23	MSCOL-032339	ENBRIDGE UNION GAS	15,410.60
27-Mar-23	MSCOL-032340	MINISTER OF FINANCE EHT	14,748.97
27-Mar-23	MSCOL-032341	WSIB	26,018.70
27-Mar-23	MSCOL-032342	OMERS	119,796.88
29-Mar-23	MSCOL-032343	TK ELEVATOR (CANADA) LIMITED	1,549.37
29-Mar-23	MSCOL-032344	DR. KING	1,738.00
29-Mar-23	MSCOL-032345	DR. NG	3,734.50
29-Mar-23	MSCOL-032346	MIP INC.	619.21
30-Mar-23	MSCOL-032347	DESJARDINS INSURANCE	27,841.03
30-Mar-23	MSCOL-032348	RBC VISA	13,578.95
31-Mar-23	MSCOL-032349	CLAIM SECURE	2,337.81
31-Mar-23	MSCOL-032350	CLAIM SECURE	838.42
31-Mar-23	MSCOL-032351	CLAIM SECURE	985.86
31-Mar-23	MSCOL-032352	LIFEWORKS (CANADA) LTD.	6,152.85
31-Mar-23	MSCOL-032353	LIFEWORKS (CANADA) LTD.	559.35

7-Mar-23	382	SSC622590	ABELL PEST CONTROL INC.	257.53
7-Mar-23	383	SSC622591	CANADIAN SPRINGS	525.95
7-Mar-23	384	SSC622592	CARDINAL HEALTH CANADA INC.	483.25
7-Mar-23	385	SSC622593	CUPE LOCAL 1339	9,498.89
7-Mar-23	386	SSC622594	DUDLEY INSTALLATIONS LTD.	1,052.76
7-Mar-23	387	SSC622595	GFL ENVIRONMENTAL INC.	265.55
7-Mar-23	388	SSC622596	MEDE-CARE HEALTH CARE SOLUTIONS INC.	14,782.21
7-Mar-23	389	SSC622597	MOTION	540.00
7-Mar-23	390	SSC622598	OFFICE CENTRAL	3,460.96
7-Mar-23	391	SSC622599	SOMETHING ORANGE TRAINING INC.	1,239.61
7-Mar-23	392	SSC622600	THE ENGRAVING SHOPPE	472.91
7-Mar-23	393	SSC622601	VAUGHAN PAPER	141.74
7-Mar-23	394	SSC622602	WOOD WYANT	1,888.07
7-Mar-23	395	SSC622603	MINISTER OF FINANCE EHT	90.21
21-Mar-23	396	SSC622604	BOARD MEMBERS RENUMERATION-PETTYCASI	1,521.00
21-Mar-23	397	SSC622605	CHRIS FORESHEW & SONS	14,125.00
21-Mar-23	398	SSC622606	EXPRESS PARCEL	35.64
21-Mar-23	399	SSC622607	LIFELABS	485.00
21-Mar-23	400	SSC622608	MOTION	184.00
21-Mar-23	401	SSC622609	MUNICIPALITY OF POWASSAN	27,014.73
21-Mar-23	402	SSC622610	STAFFSTAT INC.	2,005.33
21-Mar-23	403	SSC622611	TECHNICAL STANDARDS AND SAFETY AUTHOR	250.00
21-Mar-23	404	SSC622612	BILAN ROBIN	230.00
24-Mar-23	405	SSC622613	ACTIVITY CONNECTION	219.95
24-Mar-23	406	SSC622614	ADVANTAGE ONTARIO	540.00
24-Mar-23	407	SSC622615	AGILIS NETWORKS	368.23
24-Mar-23	408	SSC622616	CANADA BREAD-ONTARIO T6249	1,140.34
24-Mar-23	409	SSC622617	GRAHAM ELAINE	61.00
24-Mar-23	410	SSC622618	MCCARTHY SEPTIC AND VAC	387.60
24-Mar-23	411	SSC622619	ONTERA	37.23
24-Mar-23	412	SSC622620	POINTCLICKCARE	1,787.36
24-Mar-23	413	SSC622621	RIP & STITCH	1,539.69
24-Mar-23	414	SSC622622	STERICYCLE ULC	565.42
24-Mar-23	415	SSC622623	TRANSCANADA SAFETY	168.37
24-Mar-23	416	SSC622624	VAILLANCOURT, RICK	452.00
24-Mar-23	417	SSC622625	VALIN PARTNERS, LLP	502.51
27-Mar-23	418	SSC622626	CUPE LOCAL 1339	9,842.96
27-Mar-23	419	SSC622627	DR. NICHOLAS ROSCOE	40.00
27-Mar-23	420	SSC622628	GNXCOR	186.97
27-Mar-23	421	SSC622629	HEATHER BRUNET	90.00
27-Mar-23	422	SSC622630	NORTHERN COMMUNICATIONS	66.19
27-Mar-23	423	SSC622631	WOOD WYANT	3,580.09
29-Mar-23	424	SSC622632	BOARD MEMBERS RENUMERATION-PETTYCASI	1,017.00
29-Mar-23	425	SSC622633	DR. CHRISTOPHER CATHERS	35.00
29-Mar-23	426	SSC622634	EASTHOLME PETTY CASH	66.95
29-Mar-23	427	SSC622635	HAINSWORTH, GWEN	471.00
29-Mar-23	428	SSC622636	JEY'S BUSINESS RECORD STORAGE & MOBILE	288.62
29-Mar-23	429	SSC622637	NEDCO	605.76
29-Mar-23	430	SSC622638	NORTHERN BUSINESS SOLUTIONS	2,094.90
29-Mar-23	431	SSC622639	THE ENGRAVING SHOPPE	10.17
29-Mar-23	432	SSC622640	VAUGHAN PAPER	255.18
29-Mar-23	433	SSC622641	WOLSELEY CANADA INC.	412.63
31-Mar-23			Scotia Gov't Tax Fee	35.00
31-Mar-23			Cheques March 2023	978,761.21

Payroll March 2023

10-Mar-23	Pay #5		267,083.31
24-Mar-23	Pay #6		248,022.35
			515,105.66

Building Maintenance and Capital Work

Building Maintenance & Capital Work

- New floor installation (main entrance).

Construction Project (ICIP)

- Network project- continuing migration activities underway.
- BAS – Siemens – adding runs for the rooftop equipment controllers.
- In receipt of progress draw # 10 in the amount of $73,742.92.
- Building Committee minutes for April 14th (March 30th was cancelled). Next meeting April 27th.
- Scheduling work for HVAC installation work.

Contracts, Compliance and Policy Updates

Ministry of Long-Term Care Inspections

- Telephone Inquiry –April 13th and April 21st, 2023.

Fixing Long-Term Care Act 2021 –Updates

Program Evaluations and other changes

- Medication Review, Quarterly – April 25th.
- Complaints Review – 1st Quarter of 2023.
- Continuous Quality Improvement Meeting held April 6th.
- IPAC Quarterly Meeting held April 18th.

Emergency Preparedness Plans -Policy Updates & Testing

- Code Brown, Extreme Weather, Code Black – under review.

Critical Incidents (CIS)

- CIS report – M517-0000013-23 to M517-0000019-23.

Occupational Health & Safety updates

- WSIB Excellence Program – assessment underway.

Contracts and Agreements

- Banking Agreement – Scotiabank – on hold.
- StaffStat agreement – on hold.
- Occupational Therapy contract renewed
- Physiotherapy under review

MEET Lade

Odelia Callery, CPA, CA
Administrator

Maguille

Administrator's Report – April 26, 2023

Operational Items

Funding announcements/updates 2023

- Effective April 1st – new comprehensive minor capital fund $161,647 annually
- Effective April 1st – Clinical Decision Support Tools, IPAC personnel, training and education leads funding
- Effective April 1st – Level of Care funding 2.4% increase. Summary by funding envelope as follows:
    - NPC $105.96 ($103.88 -2022)
    - PSS $12.48 ($12.24 - 2022)
    - NS/RF $12.07 ($11.00 - 2022)
    - OA $57.65 ($56.52 - 2022)
    - Global $7.53 ($7.38 -2022)
- Case Mix Index (CMI) for 2023/24 is 1.2054 for home level, and 1.0909 funded based on assessments completed between April 1, 2021 and March 31, 2022. The 2021/22 funded CMI was 0.9636. CMI for 2022/23 was not published by the ministry, and the CMI for 2021/22 was applied.

Systems and program changes/Network

- Scheduling – Comvida software –time bank accrual and communication tools.
- General Ledger (Goldcare) – Resident AR (not started), AP Sub work starting.
- Cameras sourced – on site, policy development and installation in coming months.

Staffing, Recruitment & Retention, Temporary Foreign Workers

- Recruitment strategies continue. Hours of Care target: 3: 42 minutes by March 2024.
- 2 TFWs estimated arrival date for May, 1 unknown.
- NP recruitment continues.

Community Support Services Program

- Ontario Health (OH) developing Standard Operating Guidelines for all CSSP programs; work being facilitated by Red Cross and Innovation Centre.
- Participating in Aging With Confidence Symposium at YMCA on Thursday June 8th.
- MOW freezers in Sundridge moved to CSSP office Powassan – MOW coordinator delivers meals (weekly) to those registered.
- MOW freezers in Burks Falls moving from pharmacy building to AHHC by May 31st.
- Seniors luncheon was added to Kearney Royal Canadian Legion on April 24th and Sprucedale Community Centre on May 9th – bringing total locations to 11.
- Stay on Your Feet Classes - New class in Sprucedale on May 9th - total locations 9.

Town of Kearney

Staff Report

Staff Report No. SR-2023-021
Date: May 4, 2023
To: Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Members of Council
From: Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk
Subject: Office Space

Recommendation:

That Council permits staff to seek a change order from LEA to request a quotation from Bradanick for the construction of an office with sound proofing within the administrative office space.

Background:

Staff has determined the need for an additional office/meeting space within the current administrative office area. While current staff are each situated within acceptable areas, an additional office or meeting space would provide security for situations requiring discretion.

Analysis:

The current office arrangement has an open area where the Building Department had formerly been seated. This area could be used to provide an office/meeting space for the Interim Acting CAO, the Mayor or other users requiring soundproof capabilities.

The General Maintenance staff are currently ramping up for a busy season of outdoor work in the community, and adding the additional work of a construction project may be overwhelming.

Financial Consideration:

Bradanick are currently working within our building, have access to qualified personnel, may be able to source better pricing on materials and supplies needed on this project. A portion of this project would require changing light fixtures, heat/ac ducts, switches and receptacles. We could realize savings by utilizing Bradanick's expertise.

Conclusion:

Should Council wish to allow the building of an office/meeting room within the current administrative area, choosing to allow our current contractor to provide a quotation and possibly the construction would allow staff to complete their own daily tasks and may provide for a more economical solution.

Prepared by: Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk

Paul Schaefer
Fire Chief - Town of Kearney
paul.schaefer@townofkearney.ca

705-636-7402
705-571-3761 (Cell)
705-636-9743 (Fax)

Kearney Fire & Emergency Services
Postal Box 38
Kearney, ON P0A 1M0

Staff Report

Date: April 28th,2023.

To: Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Members of Council

From: Paul Schaefer Fire Chief

Re: Call boundaries

Recommendation:

That council support this staff report dated April 28th,2023 for the recommendation of realigning Township boundaries for First Response medical calls.

Background

Boundaries close to the Town of Kearney and farthest from the Township of Perry Firehall have always been an area of some confusion. Confusion for dispatch, boundary residents and responders. Such an incident happened the morning of April 25th, 2023 when the caller's confusion, address location and dispatch protocol allowed for loss of a timely potential lifesaving.

Analysis:

In discussions with the Chief of Perry Township and myself we would like to recommend that the new First Response medical call boundaries are as follows:

Highway 518 East 1102 and higher (Miron Pit)

- Old Monteith Road
- Crocus Lane
- Sunflower Lane
- Pine Aire Lane

Bevans Road 61 and higher (Deer Lake Road intersection)

Kearney Road 23 and higher (Rochestor Lake Road)

- Bill Groome Road
- Ironwood Lane
- Pine Grove Road
- Kelmac Lane
- Perry Winkle Road
- Emsdale Lake Road
- Fisher Lake Road

Conclusion:

Staff requires council approval to extend the boundaries for medical calls outside the Town of Kearney as this is separate from Fire Automatic aid calls or mutual aid calls.

Paul Schaefer
Fire Chief - Town of Kearney
paul.schaefer@townofkearney.ca

705-636-7402
705-571-3761 (Cell)
705-636-9743 (Fax)

Kearney Fire & Emergency Services
Postal Box 38
Kearney, ON P0A 1M0

April 26th, 2023.

To; Cindy Filmore

Acting Clerk

Council Town of Kearney

RE; Workplace Harassment and Violence Training

From; Paul Schaefer

Fire Chief

For Information

Kearney Fire and Emergency Services staff attended a workplace harassment and violence training hosted by Burks Falls and District Fire Department on April 25th, 2023. This training was facilitated by Laura Gibbons of BDO Canada.

Members that Attended were;

Chief Paul Schaefer

Captain David McKean

Captain Shawn Hayes

Firefighter Mike Ballantine

Firefighter Joey Hunt

Firefighter Jake Lee

Firefighter Amanda Mashinter

Firefighter Jason Hebblethwaite

Firefighter Jason Grenier

Attendees also wrote a training quiz which I have put in there training file.

If there are any questions or concerns, please contact me via email or my cell at 705 571 3761

Respectfully submitted

Paul Schaefer
Fire Chief - Town of Kearney
paul.schaefer@townofkearney.ca

705-636-7402
705-571-3761 (Cell)
705-636-9743 (Fax)

Kearney Fire & Emergency Services
Postal Box 38
Kearney, ON P0A 1M0

REPORT TO COUNCIL

May 1st,2023.

To: Members of Council

From: Paul Schaefer Fire Chief

Re: Housekeeping member addition

Overview: As a housekeeping issue The Town of Kearney should add Gary Courtice Chief Training Officer to the Kearney roster. As our training officer Gary is involved in many aspects of the Fire Department, as well as possibly attending calls when in the area. During his course of duty Gary may need to move vehicles, help at an emergency call etc. In order to not have any issues moving forward it would be prudent to add Gary Courtice to our roster of Firefighters.

Recommendation: That council accept this recommendation and add Gary Courtice to the roster of Kearney Fire and Emergency Services and pass the appropriate resolution accepting him as a member.

Submitted for consideration

TRANSFER STATION REPORT

Date	Bin Pick-up	Kearney	$	Sand Lake	$	Notes
APR 18				12	35	
APR 21		29		14	40	
APR 22		37		16	85	
APR 23		35	8	12	55	
APR 24		25		14	95	
APR 25		23				
Totals		149	8	68	310	Grand Total Cash 318

Comments 2 construction
1 Furniture
1 Plastics

_____ Transfer Station Attendant Date: _____

TRANSFER STATION REPORT

Date	Bin Pick-up	Kearney	$	Sand Lake	$	Notes
APR 11				17	80	
APR 14		34		24	33	
APR 15		25		21	135	
APR 16		29	2	17	115	
APR 17		24	7	8	140	
APR 18		32				
Totals		147	9	87	503	Grand Total Cash $512

Comments

2 Garbage
1 cardboard
1 Plastic

JOSH Transfer Station Attendant Date: APR 18/2023

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF KEARNEY

BY-LAW NO. 2023- 24

A BY-LAW TO CLOSE AND SELL PART OF THE ORIGINAL SHORE ROAD ALLOWANCE IN FRONT OF LOT 9, CONCESSION 6, TOWN OF KEARNEY (BOVERHOF)

WHEREAS pursuant to *The Municipal Act, R.S.O. 2001*, Chapter 25, Council is empowered to close highways;

AND WHEREAS pursuant to the said *Municipal Act*, Council is empowered to sell any highway which has been closed and declared surplus;

AND WHEREAS The Corporation of the Town of Kearney (the "Corporation") has complied with the requirements of its By-law respecting the Sale of Land and its Notice By-law with respect to the lands more particularly described in Schedule "A" attached hereto;

AND WHEREAS the Corporation received a request from the abutting landowner for a conveyance of the said lands;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of The Corporation of the Town of Kearney hereby enacts as follows:

1. Close – This Council does hereby close the highway on the lands more particularly described in Schedule "A" attached hereto.

2. Lands Are Surplus – This Council does hereby declare this said land to be surplus.

3. Authorization of Sale – This Council does hereby authorize the sale of the said lands by way of direct sale to Rudolf Alex Boverhof and Deborah Ann Boverhof for the consideration of $8,388.00 plus HST of $1,090.44.

4. Execution of Documents – This Council does hereby authorize the Mayor and Clerk or Deputy Clerk to sign all documents and to take all action necessary to carry out the intent of this By-law.

READ a First and Second Time this 4th day May, 2023.

_____
Cheryl Philip, Mayor

_____
Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk

READ a Third and Final Time and Enacted in Open Council this 4th day of May, 2023.

_____
Cheryl Philip, Mayor

_____
Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk

SCHEDULE “A” TO BY-LAW NO. 2023-

OF THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF KEARNEY

Part of the original shore road allowance in front of Lot 9, Concession 6, Geographic Township of Bethune now in the Town of Kearney; District of Parry Sound; designated as Part 1, Plan 42R-21983.

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF KEARNEY

By-Law No. 2023 - 25

Being a By-law to deem part of a Registered Plan M-454
not to be a Registered Plan of Subdivision (Lot 26)

WHEREAS The Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13, Section 50(4) as amended, authorizes a municipality to designate any plan of subdivision, or part thereof, that has been registered for eight years or more, which shall be deemed not to be a registered plan of subdivision for the purposes of subsection (3);

AND WHEREAS it is deemed expedient in order to adequately control the development of land in the municipality that a By-law be passed pursuant to Section 50(4);

NOW THEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF KEARNEY HEREBY ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. **THAT** the part of the plan of subdivision described as Registered Plan M-454, Lot 26, Town of Kearney, District of Parry Sound, is hereby designated to be part of a plan of subdivision which shall be deemed not to be a registered part thereof for the purposes of Subsection (3) of Section 50 of the said Planning Act.

2. **THAT** this By-law shall take effect upon registration of a certified copy or duplicate thereof in the proper Land Registry Office.

READ a first and second time this _4th_ day of __May___, 2023.

_____
Cheryl Philip, Mayor

_____
Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk

READ a third and final time and enacted in open Council this _4th_ day of _May__, 2023.

_____
Cheryl Philip, Mayor

_____
Cindy Filmore, Acting Clerk

Date Printed
2023-04-26 12:11 PM

Town of Kearney
List of Accounts . Report For April 19
Batch: 2023-00026 to 2023-00028

Bank Code: AP - GENERAL AP

COMPUTER CHEQUE

Payment #	Date	Vendor Name		Payment Amount
32676	2023-04-19	ACI-Accelerated Connections	Monthly Internet	466.46
32677	2023-04-19	Aird & Berlis LLP	B/D legal Re: Building Code	4,672.00
32678	2023-04-19	APC Auto Parts Centres	F/D Fire Department	108.48
32679	2023-04-19	Bell Canada	Monthly Phone Bill	758.31
32680	2023-04-19	Bell Canada (Internet)	Admin Monthly Internet	180.68
32681	2023-04-19	Bowman Fuels Ltd.	P/W Vehicle Diesal	882.66
32682	2023-04-19	Brandt	P/W John Deere Repair	6,201.58
32683	2023-04-19	Bradanick Construction Services	KCC Kitchen Renos Pymnt 6.	190,941.07
32684	2023-04-19	Burk's Falls Building Ctr Ltd	Town Flags	122.01
32685	2023-04-19	CRA - Receiver General	Payroll Deductions Apr. 1-15	12,058.69
32686	2023-04-19	Currie Truck Centre	P/W Shop Supplies & Hydraulic Oil	648.40
32687	2023-04-19	Josh Dresser	Trans Stn. Kms Feb 21 - Apr 11	269.28
32688	2023-04-19	FCM-Fed.of Can. Municipalities	FCM Annual Membership Renewal	390.65
32689	2023-04-19	Fetterley's Gas & Convenience	Parks, PW & FD Vehicle Fuel (Mar 23-31)	651.51
32690	2023-04-19	Fowler Construction	P/W Cold Patch	1,228.57
32691	2023-04-19	G.F. Preston Sales & Service	P/W Sweeper Repair	771.82
32692	2023-04-19	Gilroy's Tire	P/W Grader Tires	384.20
32693	2023-04-19	Glen Martin Ltd.	KCC Maintenance Supplies	401.36
32694	2023-04-19	Hydro One Networks Inc.	Monthly Hydro	5,211.01
32695	2023-04-19	Lake Country Office Solutions	P/W Laptop	1,812.52
32696	2023-04-19	LAS-Local Authority Services	Admin Office Supplies	146.29
32697	2023-04-19	LEA-Larocque Elder Architects	KCC Kitchen Renovations Pymnt 18	17,547.24
32698	2023-04-19	Mac Lang Sundridge Ltd	P/W 21 Ram Oil & Lube	94.87
32699	2023-04-19	Barb McQuillin	Refund Unused Oversized Load Permit	200.00
32700	2023-04-19	Min Of Fin-Ontario	OPP February LSR	24,747.96
32701	2023-04-19	Moore Propane Ltd.	KCC & P/W Propane Deliveries	1,662.12
32702	2023-04-19	MPAC-Municipal Property Assmt	2nd Qtr Billing	14,012.25
32703	2023-04-19	North Bay/Parry Sound District	April & may hevy Payments	4,645.98
32704	2023-04-19	Olympic Printing	F/D 2023-2024 Season Fire Permits	598.90
32705	2023-04-19	Purolator Inc.	P/W Return Merchandise to Vendor	6.29
32706	2023-04-19	Royal Bank Visa	KCC SGS Lakefield Water Testing	145.84
32707	2023-04-19	Sharer, Jill	Refund 2022 Council Nomination Fee	100.00
32708	2023-04-19	Spectrum Telecom Group Ltd.	F/D Pevensey Monthly Rental/Internet	325.95
32709	2023-04-19	Telequip Systems Limited	P/W Monthly Radio Usage	257.07
32710	2023-04-19	Telizon Inc	Monthly Long Distance	6.16
32711	2023-04-19	Lance Thrale	Refund 2022 Cuncil Nomination Fee.	200.00
32712	2023-04-19	Three Mile Truck	P/W Sterling Repair	917.05
32713	2023-04-19	Town Of Parry Sound	2023 Forum Delegation J Sharer	400.00
32714	2023-04-19	United Rotary Brush Of Canada	P/W Trackless Repair Parts	906.30
32715	2023-04-19	Waste Connections of Canada	P/W Bluebox Recycling	6,342.24
32716	2023-04-19	Bell Mobility Inc.	P/W Monthly Cell & B/D Monthly Data Use	211.07
32717	2023-04-19	Brandt	P/W Repairs on Backhoe	1,963.55
32718	2023-04-19	Hydro One Networks Inc.	Part Owing on Cheque 32694	72.91
			Total Computer Cheque:	303,671.30

Total AP: 303,671.30

Information Release, SPR, April 2023, www.spr.ca
For more information e-mail policy2023@bell.net

An Assessment of Ontario Public Opinion Regarding Bill 23 (the *More Homes Built Faster Act*) and Related Measures Affecting the Greenbelt and Affordable Housing

Toronto, April 2023

Highlights: On-line survey research was conducted in the period December 2022 to March 2023, to assess Ontario public opinion regarding the recent measures by the Government of Ontario related to Bill 23 and its potential impact on housing and the Greenbelt.

The on-line survey research was carried out independently by an expert survey research group and not funded by government or other sources. Dozens of NGOs and community organizations from across Ontario participated in the stakeholder portion of the survey.

The results show widespread opposition in Ontario to the Government's Bill 23 and measures affecting the Greenbelt and affordable housing. Based on over 6,400 responses, the survey showed, in summary:

- **In a random sample survey, four out of five Ontarians surveyed (81%) called for the repeal of Bill 23 and for an ethics review on the Government's handling of these measures.** People are calling for Government action to reconsider these measures.

- **As to housing, the government rationale for Bill 23 and the related measures, 79% of those surveyed believe the government's measures will have no impact on the affordable housing which is desperately needed in Ontario today.**

- **At 80%, opposition is much higher than a Mainstreet survey published in December 2022, and another published by Abacus Surveys in March 2023 which both reported that people were opposed to the Bill 23 measures 2 to 1.** In both of those surveys, Ontarians were vehemently opposed to the Bill 23-related measures adopted.

- **In additional targeted surveys: Opposition was shown to be widespread across many specific groups examined (such as farmers, planners, housing providers, ratepayers (homeowners), and others), not only among environmental groups.** Further, 80-90% of Ontarians pointed to numerous serious, negative impacts expected from these measures in areas as diverse as municipal finance, housing, farming, and environment.

In short, a strong majority of Ontarians urge the Government to reverse the Bill 23 measures.

More details are provided within.

Acknowledgements

The on-line survey reported on within, aimed at improving our understanding of public opinion as regards Bill 23 and the Greenbelt, was aided by the efforts of many NGOs and others to reach out to persons concerned about the Greenbelt. The Survey results show the seriousness of this issue to the people of Ontario.

Thanks are due to many types of organizations who invited participants to the stakeholder component of the survey, including: NGOs, such as: social planning organizations, environmental groups, citizens groups, student organizations and many others including: homeowners/residents associations; labour organizations; farming organizations; housing organizations & tenant associations; business associations; faith organizations; university faculties in planning, natural resources and tourism; cottage associations; and hiking & trails associations.

A. Introduction

This report provides information from on-line surveys of some 6,400 Ontarians, casting light on public opinion, in relation to debates on Bill 23, and its controversial removal of lands from the Ontario Greenbelt in 2022. This information could aid legislators and others, including those working to have these measures repealed.

To add new information to the debate on Bill 23 and the Greenbelt, this research on Ontario Public opinion was undertaken by *Research on the Greenbelt*.[1] The research included a large survey of views of key stakeholder groups such as planners, environmental groups, farmers, non-profit housing groups and residents' associations.

The researchers asked for Ontarians' views on three key issues: 1) whether an ethics investigation was required, 2) whether Bill 23 and related measures would be likely to increase the supply of affordable housing, and 3) whether Bill 23 should be repealed. To our knowledge, these questions had not been directly examined in previous studies of Ontario public opinion.

Results showed that most Ontarians want an ethics review of the Bill 23 process. Very few Ontarians expect affordable housing to result from Bill 23, and the vast majority of Ontarians favour repeal of Bill 23. Comparison to other surveys by Abacus Surveys and Mainstreet Surveys suggest that our survey results show Ontarians are increasingly opposed to Bill 23 and related measures and are calling for changes in these measures.

B. Background

In Fall, 2022, the Government of Ontario introduced Bill 23, Bill 39 and related measures removing 7,400 acres of land from the Ontario Greenbelt including the Duffins Rouge Agricultural Preserve and changing processes for housing development. This was a shock to many in Ontario, as previously the government had promised that the Greenbelt lands would be protected "forever" from development.

During a very-short consultation period, hundreds of presentations were submitted to the Provincial Government opposing these measures. Despite this opposition, Bill 23 and related measures passed into law on November 28, 2022, vastly changing Ontario's environmental situation and modifying housing development processes.

Bill 23 made these lands available for development, ostensibly to help address Ontario's shortage of housing. Because media reports indicated that the lands to be developed, potentially with very substantial profits, are in great part owned by individuals or companies linked to the Progressive Conservative Party numerous complaints were raised about the ethics of these moves, and Ontario's Integrity Commissioner, the Auditor General, and Ontario Provincial Police were asked to investigate.

---

1. In Winter, 2023, *Research on the Greenbelt and Ontario*, a project of SPR Associates of Toronto, conducted surveys to provide new information on public opinion to inform discussions of the Bill 23-greenbelt issues. Over 6,400 Ontarians completed these surveys. The on-line surveys were undertaken by SPR as a public interest effort. The research drew on a decades long track record in surveys SPR has conducted for the governments of Canada, Ontario, and NGOs. Key accomplishments of SPR include its $1million research contributing to the Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1990 and resulting certification training for over 400,000 Ontario workers and managers; and contributions through $2million in research for Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, to aid the establishment of Canada's system of family violence shelters.

During protests following the passage of these measures, critics of the changes predicted many harmful impacts to be expected. The Bill 23-related changes were widely criticized as destructive to the environment generally, harmful to farming, harmful to flood control, and harmful to municipalities from a financial perspective.

The changes were also criticized as being of uncertain value to housing and reflecting poor planning. Initial impacts would be to develop new housing in poorly serviced lands in Pickering and Markham, with the likely result, based on recent track records of developers, being the development of large and costly homes (likely with many 4–6-bedroom homes resulting, based on the performance of key developers in the past few years). No positive impacts were seen for areas where housing was deemed most needed -- in Ontario's cities.

Since the winter, Ontario has been in turmoil with widespread and ongoing opposition to these government actions. Demonstrations have been widespread, with hundreds of NGOs and community organizations mobilizing against Bill 23 and the related measures. Umbrella groups such as *Liveable Ontario* have grown rapidly, attracting hundreds of organizations and thousands of supporters. As well, recent research by Dr. Kevin Eby, former Waterloo Director of Community Planning has shown there is enough land now available in the Golden Horseshoe for building 2 million new homes, without touching the Greenbelt.

The current situation: Bill 23 is now law, but some obstacles may impede its full implementation. First, ongoing ethics investigations may present obstacles to the government. Second, a Federal Environmental Assessment related to the *Rouge National Urban Park* may impede parts of these measures. But overall, the "battle" against Bill 23 and related measures remains ongoing.

Considering a Role for Public Opinion. Although widespread opposition has been seen, little effort has been made to examine public opinion in developing these discussions. Some surveys have measured general Ontario opinion regarding these changes (see for example: *Toronto Star*, March 7, 2023, which reported on a study by Abacus Surveys indicating widespread opposition to Bill 23 (Ontarians were shown to be opposed two-to-one to the Bill 23 changes). These results were similar to those of an earlier report by Mainstreet Research. As well, no surveys have directly examined the need for an ethics review, or repeal of Bill 23.

Starting to Fill this Gap: This report starts to fill this gap. The research has two parts: a survey of a small random sample of the Ontario population, and a larger survey of specific stakeholders in these measures, such as environmentalists, farmers, housing providers, planners, and others. In the research, a focus is given to Ontarians' views on three main topics: 1) whether an ethics investigation was required, 2) whether Bill 23 and related measures would be likely to increase the supply of affordable housing, and 3) whether Bill 23 should be repealed.

To our knowledge, these questions have not before been directly examined in studies of Ontario public opinion. Altogether some 6,400+ Ontarians were surveyed in this effort to fill this gap.

It is hoped that this information will help those who wish to modify or reverse the Bill 23 measures.

C. Results of the Random Sample Population Survey

The research had two main components: a) a survey of a small random sample of the Ontario population (400 persons), and b) a larger survey of 6,000+ stakeholders in these issues -- including environment groups, planning bodies, housing organizations, farming bodies, residents' associations, and other areas. The research focused on Ontarians' views on three key issues: 1) whether an ethics investigation was required, 2) whether Bill 23 and related measures would be likely to increase the supply of affordable housing, and 3) whether Bill 23 should be repealed. Developers, financial bodies, and others who might benefit from the Bill 23 actions were not invited to the survey.

The population survey revealed that not all Ontarians are aware of the Bill 23-Greenbelt issue. Less than half of those invited to the survey were informed enough that they felt they could provide assessments of Bill23. Those with assessments, however, provided very clear views.

On the Three Key Issues:

- 80% indicated that an ethics review was needed.
- Only 21% thought the Bill 23 measures would aid affordable housing.
- 81% indicated that Bill 23 and related measures should be repealed.

Negative Impacts of Bill 23 and related measures: Of those providing assessments, a range of concerns were noted, with the percentages having specific concerns noted below:

- 95% expressed concerns with impacts on the environment.
- 92% expect loss of green space, recreational areas.
- 88% see negative impacts on farming and protection of agricultural lands.
- 80% cite negative impacts on climate change.
- 59% cite negative impacts on planning.
- 58% expect negative impacts on housing, including the provision of affordable housing.
- 54% foresee negative impacts on funding for municipalities.

Overall, the survey indicated that severe problems existed in the Ontario Bill 23 measures, that an ethics review was greatly needed, and that the legislation should be repealed. These results, which were similar for all regions of Ontario, should caution the government and aid opponents of the Bill 23 measures.

Conclusions: A wide range of concerns were expressed regarding negative impacts of Bill 23 and related measures, with greatest concerns for impacts on the environment, loss of green space and recreational area, impacts on farming, and impacts on climate change. *These results show a clear consensus in public opinion – that Bill 23 and its related measures are unacceptable to Ontarians. These results are further explored below for key stakeholder groups.*

---

2 *Sampling:* The population random sample (400 persons) was drawn from SPR databases. Stakeholder survey participants were recruited through invitations distributed to: *public agencies* such as municipalities and conservation authorities; *NGOs*, including environmental groups; *Farmers groups*, such as the National Union of Farmers, county branches of the Ontario Federation of agriculture; *University faculties* (e.g., in forestry, environment and planning), *Neighborhood associations*, including over 200 residents associations from cities across Ontario; *Housing bodies*, including non-profit housing agencies, and umbrella groups such as the Ontario YWCA Housing Network; *Business groups* such as local business improvement associations; *Faith Groups*, such as the Anglican diocese of Toronto; and *others* such unions and social action groups. Many of the survey participants were persons whose main interests in the greenbelt were as users of green spaces (hikers, naturalists, birders). See below regarding sampling of stakeholder groups.

D. Results for Key Stakeholder Groups

Overview: The survey results for key stakeholder groups generally mirrored those for the overall Ontario population, but in most cases with a stronger negative reaction to the legislation. Key groups examined were mainly persons invited to the survey by NGOs, and included environmental groups, non-profit housing groups, municipal officials, planners, farmers, users of green spaces, (hikers, campers etc.), residents' associations, and provincial civil servants. All these groups showed strongly negative assessments of Bill 23 and its related measures.#

Basic Results: of those providing detailed assessments key stakeholder groups shared common concerns with Bill 23 and need for an ethics review, little confidence in the Bill 23 measures aiding affordable housing, and strong support for repeal of Bill 23. See details below.

Stakeholder views on an ethics review: *As to the need for an ethic review*, respondents in all stakeholder groups were strident in their views that this was needed. These views were most strongly held by residents' associations, non-profit housing groups, users of green spaces and environmental groups, all of which favoured an ethics review by 90% or more. Also favouring a review, but less strongly, were planners, municipal officials, and farmers, all favouring a review by 80% or more. (See Table 1). *Specific comments*: Hundreds of respondents provided comments, often with very strong language condemning the Ford government and raising questions about corruption. (See comments, next pages).

Table 1
Percentage of Key Stakeholder Groups
Favouring an Ethics Review

% favouring an ethics review	Stakeholder Group
94%	environmental groups
96%	non-profit housing groups
83%	municipal officials
84%	planners
80%	farmers
95%	users of green spaces
96%	residents' associations
91%	provincial civil servants

Comments: Typical of the hundreds of comments provided regarding the needs for an ethics review are those shown on the next page, most focused on the widely held view that the Bill 23 measures were introduced as a reward for developer supporters of the Ford government. Respondents' comments reflect both the desire for more information (since no results are available so far on the ethics review) and a widely held sense of betrayal. Comments also show the ethics issue to be closely interwoven with issues of negative impacts (on environment, farming etc.) in the minds of stakeholders. (Some extremely negative comments are redacted with ***** symbols).

---

3. These groups varied in size and included: 100+ respondents from key groups such as farmers, members of non-profit housing bodies, municipal officials, and provincial civil servants; over 200 planners; 600+ members of environmental organizations; 700+ business persons; 1,400+ members of neighborhood residents associations; and 1,500+ users of greenspaces (hikers and other recreationists).

In Their Own Words
About the Need for an Ethics Review

"Bill 23 should be completely revoked. It is c*******,* led by Doug Ford & his development buddies. If this was a private venture it would never pass. Doug Ford … Doug Ford should resign immediately. He is not representing the people of Ontario but rather his … buddies … . He is increasing land sprawl. He is taking away the ability for farmers to feed the people of Ontario and putting farmers' jobs at risk. He is also adding to Climate Change that effects all wildlife, trees & fauna, rivers, & lakes. Bill 23 is a disaster. There is nothing good about it at all."

Member of a Toronto residents' Association.

"Bill 23 smells to high heaven of c*******. A handful of very wealthy people contributors to the PC party in Ontario stand to make many millions after buying up land in the Green Belt that Doug Ford swore would never be developed, and then suddenly declared open for development, on the false premise that it would alleviate the affordable housing crisis in Ontario, when it obviously won't. More suburban sprawl won't solve the housing crisis".

Member of a Northern Ontario Environmental Group.

"Bill 23 was tabled October 25th, 2022. Developers close to Doug Ford bought lands, for cheap, just before …, in what were then protected areas. It is significant that the only people to benefit from this bill are those developers. Homeowners will see vast increases in taxes, to the point some may lose their home. The homes built by D********* and R*** et al., will be sprawling and into the 1.5-to-2-million-dollar range with nothing to help those struggling to find affordable housing. It is a degenerate bill and shows moral c*********."

Member of a Residents Association in Eastern Ontario

"This bill was written for developers as a charter to increase developer wealth at the cost of taxpayers; the poor and near poor; the environment, specifically flood protection, floral and fauna; efforts to reduce climate change. Mr. Ford should be brought to answer … ."

A farmer in Central Ontario

"I feel like Bill 23 and removing portions of the Greenbelt is a disastrous plan that will only benefit developers and those who can afford million-dollar homes. I'm extremely worried about the loss of farmland and green spaces for our citizens. This plan in no way will help provide more affordable housing or address climate change. Something is rotten about how the bill came about and with how lands were purchased. Doug Ford said the people have spoken and we will not touch the Greenbelt, then does a 180 and makes these changes… I have lost all trust in him, and he does not seem to remember that he works for us. We must fill in our blank urban spaces before we impact the environment."

An environmentalist in South West Ontario

It is a profound obscenity. The Greenbelt should be increased, not diminished. This government is way off base with its priorities which are transparently to line the pockets of developers and to build more unneeded highways … . So offensive!

Member of a Faith organization in Central Ontario

Stakeholder Views on Expected Impacts on AffordableHousing: Respondents in all stakeholder groups indicated they felt that Bill 23 and related measures would not aid affordable housing in Ontario. These views were strongest among members of residents' associations and users of green spaces, who might be seen as "typical voters".

They were closely followed by environmental groups, non-profit housing groups, provincial civil servants, municipal officials, farmers, and planners. No stakeholder groups indicated a view that the Bill-23 changes were likely to aid the goal of affordable housing. (See Table 2, below). These views were underlined by typical and strongly held comments as shown on the next page).

Table 2:
Percentage of Key Stakeholder Groups Indicating Affordable Housing Could Result from Bill 23.

% in saying affordable housing could result	Stakeholder Group
3%	non-profit housing groups
6%	users of green spaces
6%	residents' associations
8%	environmental groups
10%	provincial civil servants
16%	municipal officials
17%	planners
16%	farmers

Comments: Typical comments provided regarding poor impacts of the Bill 23 related measures on housing were provided by respondents. Respondent comments suggested great scepticism that Bill 23 and related measures would aid Ontario's housing crisis. Hundreds of survey respondents commented in the ways shown on the next page, with many emphasizing the likely use of greenbelt lands for expensive homes, and the overall lack of affordable housing. (See next page).

In Their Own Words

Impacts of the Bill 23 measures on Ontario's Housing Crisis & Affordable Housing

"Bill 23 will not increase affordable housing in Ontario in the municipalities and locations that require it. Building on the Greenbelt will result in environmental issues (homeowners will need to commute), increased taxes for the infrastructure to support the build including hospitals, schools, roads, sewers, etc. The best strategy for affordable housing is to build "up", not "out"" in existing communities. We need … checks and balances in place to ensure developers actually build affordable housing not large and expensive homes for the elite."

A Municipal Planner, Eastern Ontario

"This is perhaps the worst piece of legislation to address housing I have ever seen. It is not about affordable housing where it is needed but meeting the housing desires of the wealthiest. It violates basic principles of planning, environmental protection, and what we know about affordable housing. There is clearly a conflict of interest between developers and this government."

A Member of a GTA Environmental Group

The Government has no intention of addressing Affordable Housing. The Gov't would repeal the legislation that introduced the removal of rent control. The theory was this would lead to fair competition of houses being build and affordable rent. Neither is true. Housing costs are virtually out of reach now for average Canadians and the rental market is less than 1% vacancies in most cities and unaffordable to many in the community. The decision of rent or food should not be an issue."

A Member of a Residents' Association in Southwest Ontario

Bill 23, along with Bills 3 and 39, will not result in affordable housing and are a transfer of wealth to developers and the construction industry. The bills will starve municipalities of funding and transfer the cost of growth to taxpayers, harm the environment, result in urban sprawl, and erode local democracy. All three bills should be repealed.

Manager of a Non-profit Housing Agency in Eastern Ontario

As it stands now, it seems that houses to be built in the Greenbelt would most probably be estate homes. Repeal the bill and replace it with affordable housing for people at risk, the evicted, the homeless. The Greenbelt must be protected against developing anything that would endanger already endangered species. Whatever is decided, it must meet Canada's GHG targets or better.

A GTA Business Person

I am incredibly disappointed that Bill 23 has been passed, especially for the profit of developers. Everything I've read – suggests that this has nothing to do with building affordable housing, nor do the plans for building even include affordable housing. We need to address the housing situation in Toronto, where no one can afford to buy a house or rent. This is disgusting.

A Member of a GTA Environmental Group.

Building subdivisions on farm and or wet land will not solve any housing problems, more multi million-dollar homes are not needed, what is needed is more affordable housing; this does not mean single family stand alone houses

A Businessperson, Eastern Ontario

"This move is completely unnecessary. We have so many empty residential spaces being used as investments. This isn't a lack of land; this is a matter of c********* policy issue. Politicians and the money made from development are the issue. They're not helping at all with affordable housing initiatives."

Member of a Non-profit Housing Group in Central Ontario

Stakeholder Views on the Desirability of Repealing of Bill 23 and Related Measures: As to repeal of Bill 23 and its related measures, all the stakeholder groups examined indicated that there is a need to repeal this legislation. This was particularly true for residents' associations, environmental groups, users of green spaces, non-profit housing groups and provincial civil servants (all 90% or more in favour of repeal). Less stringent, but still strongly in favour of repeal were municipal officials, farmers, and planners (79-83% in favour of repeal).

Table 3:
Percentage of Key Stakeholder Groups Favouring Repeal of Bill 23

% favouring repeal of Bill 23	Stakeholder Group
96%	residents' associations
94%	users of green spaces
93%	environmental groups
92%	non-profit housing groups
91%	provincial civil servants
83%	municipal officials
82%	farmers
79%	planners

Overall, these results showed a strong consensus among Ontarians regarding the repeal of Bill 23 and its related measures.

Comments: Typical of the hundreds of comments provided regarding the need for repeal of the Bill 23 measures are those shown on the next page, most clearly indicating the desirability of repeal, focused on the widely held views that the Bill 23 measures were introduced as a reward for developers, who are supporters of the Ford government, along with the related concerns mentioned above regarding negative impacts on the environment, farming, and municipalities.

In Their Own Words
the Need for Repeal of the Bill 23 Measures

"This Bill was Bulldozed through the Ontario Legislature with little thought other than lining certain developers' pockets. It was also passed on a Friday afternoon after Municipal Elections. None of the elected officials were officially sworn in to office at that time. No one could offer opposition at the time it was passed. There was a lack of democracy in this action. It should be repealed, and legislation created which deals with Homelessness and Geared to income housing for those in need."

A Greenspace User in Northern Ontario

The climate crisis is the most pressing and urgent issue of our time. All government decisions need to be made using a climate lens. Repealing land and green space from the green belt weakens the resilience of our environment and further fractures already fragile ecosystems. Development on these lands will only exacerbate climate change with more emissions, resource extraction, waste, and so forth. It is critical that the government repeal Bill 23. Repeal this legislation.

An Eastern Ontario Planner

Bill 23 should be completely revoked. It is c******** led by Doug Ford & his development buddies. If this was a private venture it would never pass. Doug Ford should be held accountable along with his developer friends. Doug Ford should resign immediately. He is not representing in a positive manner the people of Ontario He is increasing land sprawl in the Greenbelt rather than decreasing it. He also is taking away the ability for farmers to feed the people in Ontario and putting farmers jobs in jeopardy. He is also adding to Climate Change that effects all aspects of the Greenbelt such as wildlife, trees & fauna, rivers, lakes, etc. Bill 23 is a disaster. There is nothing good about it at all.

Member of a Toronto Residents 'association.

Repeal Bill 23. Impeach Ford for c******** and d********* Ontarians. Legislation needs to protect the greenbelt in perpetuity. An agreement of many is the only way that the greenbelt can be affected, not just by a one-party decision. Governance of Ontario mustn't include a right to sell off Ontario's assets. No single party should ever have that authority to destroy our natural greenspaces.

An Indigenous Planner in Southwest Ontario

Repeal the Act for MULTIPLE inherent harms including: environmental/climate damage to Greenbelt; sprawl causing public health harms through climate change & air pollution; unsustainable economically by cutting municipal revenue streams & lack of supporting infrastructure planning/funding for new builds; false representation as a "housing" Act as will produce a lesser number of more expensive/unaffordable housing than properly conceived plans already drawn by professional urban planners/municipalities which are being suppressed; destroys prime dwindling farmland; destroys the valuable Conservation Authorities removing public protections against flooding/poor land management; exposes Ontarians to uncontrolled tax high taxes. NO land should be removed from the Greenbelt. In fact, the Greenbelt should be expanded.

A Member of an Environmental Group in Central Ontario

Bill 23, the Greenbelt takeouts, and very troubling changes to Regional Planning are decreasing the supply of housing and new housing starts – not increasing it – while destroying the natural heritage and water sources our province needs for the future. The provincial government needs to repeal these Bills and restore Regional Planning.

A member of an Environmental Group in Eastern Ontario

The Ford Government Needs to Repeal Bill 23 and Restore the Greenbelt or Resign.

A member of a non-profit Housing Group in the GTA

C. Conclusions and Implications for the Greenbelt Debate

Conclusions: Overall, there can be little doubt that Ontarians widely reject the Bill 23 measures. This is clearly indicated by the broad demands for an ethics review, widespread skepticism as to the impacts on affordable housing, and a consensus that the Bill 23 measures should be repealed. These findings are particularly striking as seen in the widespread calls for repeal not just by specific interest groups (such as farmers and environmentalists), but rather groups as broad as Ontario's residents' associations (mostly homeowners), and Doug Ford's own employees – his own civil servants.

The results suggest that support for the Bill 23 measures is generally very limited, probably only to the Ford Government and selected developers who benefit from these controversial land deals.

Implications: There is a need to consider how these results can best inform the Bill 23 discussions. One way is to share these results more widely with Ontarians. As well, there is a need to continue to monitor movement in public opinion on these issues, especially if, as the above results suggest, Ontarians are becoming more opposed to the Bill 23 measures.

As compared to other recent surveys, our results suggest a shift in public opinion – towards increasing rejection of the Ford government measures. This should be monitored by additional surveys, to provide better information for the government to use in considering repeal of the measures, and to aid those advocating repeal. As well these results may caution further efforts to reduce the Greenbelt or urban planning in Ontario.

The Corporation of the
Township of Perry
Box 70 1695 Emsdale Road Emsdale, Ontario P0A 1J0

Date: April 19, 2023

Resolution No.: **2023-** 137

Moved By: Jim Cushman **Seconded By:** Margaret Ann MacPhail

Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Perry hereby supports a commitment of $50,000 for 2023 towards the Almaguin Highlands Municipal 'Local Share' of the Muskoka Algonquin Healthcare Hospital Build;

And further that Council will review their commitment amount annually during budget discussions to assess allocations towards the hospital build for that specific year.

Carried: ✓ **Defeated:** _____

Norm Hofstetter, Mayor

RECORDED VOTE			
Council		**For**	**Against**
Councillors	Jim Cushman		
	Joe Lumley		
	Margaret Ann MacPhail		
	Paul Sowrey		
Mayor	Norm Hofstetter		

Bail Reform Resolution

WHEREAS the cost of Policing and Emergency Services in Northern Communities is harming a community's ability to support local Social and Health issues

WHEREAS a small percentage of those affected by an Addiction in the communities of Northern Ontario are committing crimes

WHEREAS many of those committing crimes are not housed in the correctional system, therefore, remain in our communities, often those that do require treatment for their Addiction issue receive none.

WHEREAS some committing crimes become violent, but are released back into the community, due to the negative impacts Federal Bill C75

WHEREAS the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities (FONOM) believes that more must be done by the Federal Government on Bail Reform

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities (FONOM) requests the Federal Government make these Legislative changes

1. Create a Designation of a chronic persistent offender.
2. Allow community impact statements at bail and at bail hearings.
3. Creating reverse onus in bail for all firearms offences.
4. All bail-related gun charges go to the superior court for bail release.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a copy of this resolution be sent to the Prime Minister, Federal Justice Minister, Premier of Ontario, The Attorney General, the Solicitor General, Minister of Infrastructure, Minister of Municipal Affairs, Northeastern MPs and MPPs, Leaders of the Opposition, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, and the Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities.

APR 24 2023

04/21/23

Town of Kearney
8 Main Street
Kearney, ON
P0A1M0

RE: Almaguin Highlands Secondary School 2023 Prom

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

It is that time of year again when spring is in the air and graduating students of Almaguin Highlands Secondary School are planning for their future. As we look towards the horizon, making decisions on where and how to begin our journey, we also look to celebrate our many accomplishments and our time spent together.

Unfortunately, the challenges experienced by our community during the COVID-19 pandemic have also impacted students. Learning to navigate online learning, connecting with teachers and classmates virtually, losing out on opportunities for in person co-op placements and most of all, losing the chance to develop the all-important building blocks that will set us up for success as we exit high school.

It is for all these reasons and more, students are excited to join together at the 2023 Prom celebration. We hope to share in the experience of Prom like so many students have before us. To this extent we respectfully ask for a monetary contribution to the 2023 Prom. Without the financial support of our community, prom would not be possible, thus, we kindly ask for a donation in the amount of $200.00. We are reaching out to our Almaguin Highlands Municipalities, in hopes of receiving financial support, that when combined with additional student fundraising efforts, we will successfully host a memorable send off for our 2023 graduating class.

The 2023 Prom Committee has established a dedicated bank account to receive funds and we hope that Council will support the graduating class of 2023.

On behalf of the graduating students and Prom Committee,
Adelle Brooker

Women's Own Resource Centre

In 2023, WORC is excited to be launching a Travelling Rural Community Kitchen program with support from the Resilient Communities Fund delivered through the Ontario Trillium Foundation. This program is being organized in response to the increasing struggle we are seeing across the region with food insecurity due to the drastic increase in the price of living – grocery prices have climbed by 11% in the past year with another expected increase of 6% over the course of 2023. WORC has secured $70,000 to deliver a two-year program that will reach out to North Almaguin, South Almaguin and Central Almaguin in order to increase accessibility and reach those most in need.

WORC's services continue to be needed in our region, as indicated by engagement numbers, to foster growth and ensure that the most vulnerable are not left without the supports they need to build sustainable livelihoods. As always, we will continue to be there for the residents of the Almaguin Highlands and are continually striving to address needs and create programming that helps to build the resiliency of women and their families in the Almaguin Highlands. We have been able to increase our reach dramatically this year through our Resource & Business Network Meetings seeing 341 women participating throughout the year with 225 of these being individual women. These programs are helping to ease some of the social isolation we have all experienced these last couple of years and which are most felt in rural regions such as the Almaguin Highlands.

In order to continue to offer these free programs and supports, the Women's Own Resource Centre is dependent upon funding from several sources. Donations help to ensure that we can continue to make important services and supports available to the women and families of the Almaguin Highlands. Donations also help us to provide outreach to those clients who are made increasingly vulnerable by their severe isolation due to the sheer size of our region.

We are asking for support from each municipality in the amount of .50 cents per capita to support new and continuing initiatives in 2023/24. We thank those who have supported us in the past and look forward to new working relationships and opportunities. Should you wish WORC to make a presentation to your council to discuss upcoming projects, or if you have any questions, please call 705-386-9672 or email jessica@womensownresource.org

We thank you for your time and consideration in this matter and we look forward to continuing our efforts to help women in the Almaguin Highlands thrive.

J. Busch

Jessica Busch
Program Manager

105 Ottawa Ave., Box 155, South River, ON P0A 1X0
Phone: (705) 386-9672 Toll Free: 1-888-640-8668
Fax: (705) 386-7111 Email: info@womensownresource.org
www.womensownresource.org

Cindy Filmore

From: Jeff DeDecker <jdedecker@leaainc.com>
Sent: April 27, 2023 8:39 AM
To: Cindy Filmore
Cc: Brian Horsman
Subject: RE: 21044 - Kearney - Resolutions of Council

Importance: High

Categories: Red Category

Cindy,

With respect to the generator, the electrical Consultant cannot, with any certainty, confirm what the building's 'future load' requirements for a generator would be. As designed, the 200kW generator is capable of accepting the same maximum loading that your hydro service to the building can accommodate. This, in the electrical consultant's opinion, is the best method for sizing your generator to best accommodate any future loading and we would recommend proceeding with the 200kW size.

Please review and confirm the Town is in agreement with the Electrical Consultant's recommendation.

Regards,

Jeff De Decker
Senior Project Manager
Lic.Tech.OAA, BCIN, B.A, Dip.Arch.Tech.

L E A
LAROCQUE ELDER ARCHITECTS, ARCHITECTES INC.

188 Fifth Avenue East
North Bay, ON P1B 1N6
T (705) 497-9191 ext. 229
W: www.leaainc.com
E: jdedecker@leaainc.com

This email is intended for the use of the addressee(s) only and may contain privileged, confidential, or proprietary information that is exempt from disclosure under law. If you have received this message in error, please inform us promptly by reply email, then delete the email and destroy any printed copy. Larocque Elder Architects, Architectes Inc. makes no warranty that by electronic media this email is free of viruses, and shall have no liability for any corruption to data that may occur as a result of such transmission.

-----Original Message-----
From: Cindy Filmore <cindy.filmore@townofkearney.ca>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 10:04 AM
To: Jeff DeDecker <jdedecker@leaainc.com>