

**MINUTES**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, August 3, 2021, 6:30 PM**  
**Council Chambers and by Zoom**  
**18 Centre Street, Spencerville ON**  
**Contact the Township Office to Register**  
**(613)658-3055**

PRESENT: Deputy Mayor Tory Deschamps  
Mayor Pat Sayeau  
Councillor Hugh Cameron  
Councillor Stephen Dillabough  
Councillor John Hunter  
Conor Cleary  
Greg Modler  
Chris Ward

REGRETS: Cody Oatway

STAFF: Rebecca Williams, Clerk  
Wendy VanKeulen, Community Development Coordinator  
Candise Newcombe, Deputy Clerk

**1. Call to Order – Chair, Tory Deschamps**

Deputy Mayor Deschamps called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**2. Approval of Agenda**

**Moved by:** G. Modler

**Seconded by:** Councillor Hunter

That the agenda be approved as presented.

Carried

**3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest & the General Nature Thereof**

None.

**4. Business Arising from Previous Committee Meeting Minutes (if any)**

Members noted concern with the accuracy of the transcription of Committee member comments in the previous CDC - July 5, 2021 meeting minutes. The noted discretion was in regard to the insinuation that Council speculated the type of tree on the property in question to be butternut where in fact it was black walnut.

## 5. Delegations and Presentations

### a. Nabi-Alexandre Dabé Champagne, Terpene Farms

Mr. Champagne was joined by the CEO of Terpene Farms, Hussein Baydoun, to outline their proposal for a future cannabis micro-cultivation facility. A 5000 ft<sup>2</sup> building was purchased in 2020 at 3209 County Rd 2, with the intention of dedicating 2000 ft<sup>2</sup> for cultivation. The other 3000 ft<sup>2</sup> will be devoted to office space and remaining processing procedures such as drying and trimming.

Mr. Champagne noted that the proposed facility would not emit any odours due to their multi-process filtration system. It was noted that Terpene Farms intends to use a multi-layer system of charcoal, UV, and a HEPA filters to ensure there are no odours released from the facility. It was noted that the intention was to arrange the landscape of the facility to ensure environmentally friendly practices. An extensive storm water management plan will be implemented to ensure water is contained to the property, and avoid negatively affecting current Township or County infrastructure.

Mr. Champagne outlined their expectations of producing approximately 18 harvests per year, totaling roughly \$1-2 million dollars in revenue in the first year. There would be 1 full-time and up to 5 part-time positions created with the startup with the intent of hiring locally.

Mr. Champagne noted that they intend to apply for a processing licence which would allow the processing of edibles, extracts, and packaged products and potentially expand and hire more employees. The future processing licence may lead to the launching of a retail operation, requiring additional hires. It was noted that the owners plan to expand within the community and then nationally, subsequently lending the Township exposure on a national stage. If future processing expansion is needed, they intend to expand to a second location within the Township.

Mr. Champagne noted that their goal is to open by the end of 2021 with their Health Canada application in an advanced stage. It was noted the process of applying for a Zoning bylaw amendment and Site Plan Control has been started, with the planning rationale and the surveying report planned to be submitted by next week.

Members inquired about the employment opportunities specifically about what educational background and experience would be required for these positions and if the same number of positions would be available without a storefront location. Due to the modernity of the industry, there is no specific educational background required and much of the training will be on the job, although an agricultural background is an asset. The estimated number for hires only took into consideration the initial startup of the facility and did not include employment for a future storefront.

Members noted the existence of a Terpene Farms cannabis cultivation facility in California, Los Angeles inquiring if there was any affiliation between the two and if the business was considered an incorporated entity or limited partnership. It was noted that there was no affiliation with the California based business. Members confirmed that Terpene Farms is registered as a corporation.

Members inquired about the intended start date for planned renovations to the facility. Mr. Champagne noted that the engineering plans are complete, funding in place and contractors on stand-by. When given the green light by the Township, work will begin right away. The intent is to have the outside of the facility, including a security fence, completed within the first month. The remainder of the facility is anticipated to be completed in the following 3-4 months.

Members inquired if Mr. Champagne was aware of the length of time the application process could take, noting his proposed timeline of opening by the end of this year. Mr. Champagne noted that due to many delays the application process was postponed, however, he has been corresponding with the CBO, who has tentatively agreed to cohesively work with them by possibly providing future partial permits to get things underway. It was noted that once the application is complete, SNC, the United Counties and Novatech will need to review the application. Staff will work with Novatech to submit a report to the Community Development Committee meeting for members to review. It was noted that both the SPCA and the proposed Zoning bylaw amendment could be reviewed collectively. Meanwhile, a public meeting will have to be held in accordance with the Planning Act, for the Zoning bylaw amendment.

Members inquired about the placement of the septic system as there was some concern with the proximity to County Rd 2. It was noted that the septic installation plans were reviewed by the Health Unit.

Committee inquired if there had been an assessment done by Hydro One technicians to ensure there is appropriate power supply available to sustain an operation of this size as the current transformers had very low capacity remaining. Mr. Champagne noted that this building previously housed an industrial printing operation, which required high amounts of power. The owners electrical engineers anticipate a small electrical upgrade required for the facility, but Hydro One technicians see no issue with connecting to required utilities.

Committee thanked Mr. Champagne and Mr. Hussein for their presentation.

## **6. Action/Information/Discussion Items**

- a. Live: Land Use Planning

1. Information Item: Considerations for Additional Residential Units (UCLG Staff Report)

Members reviewed the UCLG Housing Affordability Task Force report, which reviewed and shared best language for official plan policies and zoning bylaw provisions to allow additional residential units (secondary dwelling units). The additional residential unit (ARU) changes in the Planning Act require municipalities to authorize ARUs through the official plan, and to give effect to these policies through the specific regulations of a zoning bylaw. UCLG reported that all Official Plans be reviewed and, if needed, the policies be updated to implement the changes in the Planning Act, to permit one ARU in the main dwelling and one additional dwelling unit in an accessory structure for a total of three potential units on a property. The UCLG report noted four suggested zoning bylaw amendment provisions for municipalities to consider.

Members had a general discussion to determine which of the UCLG report considerations were already included in the Township's new draft zoning bylaw. It was noted that in the current official plan, the Township permits detached garden suites as an ARU in rural areas only. These garden suites require a temporary use bylaw that implements a time limit on the use of the ARU of approximately 10 years with the possibility of an extension.

Members discussed the implementation of such ARUs in the hamlets of the Township, noting concerns of the suggested amendments, and commenting that these seem like "big city solutions".

There was a general discussion on the details of the ARUs, including placement on the property, dimensions, and utility uses. It was noted that the secondary dwellings would be tied into the same water and septic system as the primary dwelling. Members inquired how ownership in such a situation would work and if such guidelines would fall under the Landlord/Tenant Act. There was a general discussion of the restrictive nature of the Landlord - Tenant Board, with members noting that affordable housing is not likely attainable until that particular piece of legislature is reviewed and amended appropriately. Members noted that it may result in certain landlords creating undesirable dwelling units, which are not any more affordable than what is currently on the market.

Members had a general discussion on the effect of implementing the suggested ARUs including a possible influx in traffic, the risk of over-burdening the urban sectors and inadvertently promoting a blighted area in the community. Committee discussed parking requirements for the main residential building and the ARU's. Members noted current parking concerns where there are too many

vehicles per dwelling, which has resulted in residents illegally parking on municipal streets. Members suggested that two parking spaces should be required for the main dwelling unit, with 1-2 additional parking spaces per ARU. It was noted that the parking requirements would not be a concern in a large city, where accessible public transit is available.

Members discussed options of promoting uncomplicated development opportunities in the area with the condition that contractors include affordable housing units to the proposed developments. It was noted that members were partial to the concept of allowing secondary dwellings to be added as income units to new builds rather than the option of adding an accessory secondary dwelling to the property.

Members inquired about the possibility of residents requesting future land severances. It was noted that the reason the ARU is required to be tied into the same utilities as the primary residence is to deter such severances. It was further noted the requirements for lot size, frontage and set-backs would still apply when considering an application for severance. Staff noted they would request further clarification from MMAH on the amended section 16.3 of the Planning Act that allows 2 additional residential units per existing dwelling.

Members noted there were many variables to be considered before making a decision on this subject. It was suggested that due to the complexity of the topic, discussions be continued at the next Committee meeting scheduled for September 7. There was consensus from the Committee to defer further discussion until September.

2. Discussion Item: Short Term Accommodations

Due to the expectation of a thorough discussion, there was consensus from Committee to defer the item until the September meeting.

3. Information Item: Aggregate Resources Master Plan (UCLG Study)

Committee reviewed the report outlining an ongoing study led by the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville (UCLG) to prepare an Aggregate Resources Master Plan (ARMP). The results of the plan will likely lead to a Counties Official Plan Amendment. It was noted that Committee should anticipate an amendment to the Township's Official Plan following the completion of the ARMP.

Members discussed their concerns with Provincial over burden standards being set at 10 meters. It was noted that the current metrics are viewed as unrealistic, as it is a very difficult task to

remove 10 meters of over burden. Members discussed their concern with respect to the restrictions and its effects on local businesses viability. Members suggested that a motion be prepared outlining the concerns of the 10 meters over burden, and that the requirement be reassessed and potentially reduced to 5 meters. Members noted that these were only preliminary numbers, however, circulating a motion for re-assessment of the suggested standard to surrounding municipalities might aid in a quicker response to the issue at hand.

Members discussed the possibility of a misprint on the unit of measurement, noting perhaps it was meant to be in feet rather than meters. Members requested staff seek clarification from The Ontario Aggregate Resources Corporation (TOARC). Committee further requested staff to draft a motion requesting the re-assessment of the Provincial Standards for overburden and circulate to surrounding municipalities requesting support.

b. Work: Economic Development

1. Information Item: South Grenville Digital Service Squad

Members reviewed the report on the Digital Main Street program and discussed previous successes within the program.

Committee discussed how businesses could apply, what pre-requisites are required for the application, and if businesses were welcome to re-apply if they have received aid previously. It was noted that the previous guidelines for the Digital Transformation Grant have been broadened, for example, it was previously stated that businesses required a storefront location. Under the new guidelines, a seasonal stand could be considered a storefront, expanding the grant to a variety of other businesses that otherwise previously would not have access.

Businesses that do not qualify for the Digital Transformation Grant can still access support from the Digital Service Squad and Digital Main street programs. It was noted that the program launch date is planned for August and a job posting has been advertised for a squad member. It was noted that Edwardsburgh Cardinal has received \$29,000 from the overall \$100,000 in funding for the South Grenville Digital Service Squad.

c. Play: Recreation

None.

**7. Inquiries/Notices of Motion**

Mr. Cleary brought to the attention of the Committee a letter he had received from a local resident, and inquired if other members had received one as well.

Committee requested staff add a copy of the letting to the upcoming Council Correspondence package.

**8. Question Period**

None.

**9. Closed Session**

None.

**10. Adjournment**

**Moved by:** C.Ward

**Seconded by:** G. Modler

That Committee does now adjourn at 9:07 p.m.

Carried

---

Chair

---

Deputy Clerk