

Local Planning Appeal Tribunal
Tribunal d'appel de l'aménagement
local



ISSUE DATE: June 08, 2020

CASE NO(S): PL171215

The Ontario Municipal Board (the “OMB”) is continued under the name Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (the “Tribunal”), and any reference to the Ontario Municipal Board or Board in any publication of the Tribunal is deemed to be a reference to the Tribunal.

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 34(11) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Applicant and Appellant:	Losani Homes (1998) Ltd.
Subject:	Application to amend Zoning By-law No. 61-16 - Neglect of the County of Brant to make a decision
Existing Zoning:	(A) Zone, Agricultural Zone with one Special Provision (A-13), Agricultural Holding Zone and Residential Singles and Semis (HA-R2) Zone, Natural Heritage (NH) Zone and Employment Zone with a Special Provision (Mi-i)
Proposed Zoning:	Residential Singles Zone (Ri), with special exception (RI-_) to accommodate the single detached dwellings and larger street fronting rowhouses; Residential Multiple Medium Density Zone (RM2), with special exception (RM2-_) to Residential Multiple High Density (RM3), with special exception (RM3-_) to accommodate mixed use developments; Recreational Facilities (OS2) Zone to accommodate the parks and the stormwater management facilities; Natural Heritage Zone (NH) to accommodate the natural heritage features.
Purpose:	To permit the proposed draft plan of subdivision
Property Address/Description:	Part of Lot 7 and 8, Concession 2
Municipality:	County of Brant
Municipality File No.:	ZBA20-17-RA
OMB Case No.:	PL171215
OMB File No.:	PL171215
OMB Case Name:	Losani Homes (1998) Ltd. v. Brant (County)

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 51(34) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Applicant and Appellant:	Losani Homes (1998) Ltd.
Subject:	Proposed Plan of Subdivision - Failure of the County of Brant to make a decision
Purpose:	To permit 1292-1700 residential units consisting of single detached, townhouses, medium density residential, mixed use along with parks and SWM ponds
Property Address/Description:	Part of Lot 7 and 8, Concession 2
Municipality:	County of Brant
Municipality File No.:	PS2-17-RA
OMB Case No.:	PL171215
OMB File No.:	PL180025

Heard: June 2, 2020 by telephone conference call ("TCC")

APPEARANCES:

Parties

Counsel

Losani Homes (1998) Ltd.	Denise Baker
County of Brant	Jyoti Zuidema and Peter Tice
Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.	Jay Hitchon
Empire Communities (St. George) Ltd.	Paul DeMelo
Parkland Fuel Corporation	Marc Kemerer
John Newton	Alex Ciccone

MEMORANDUM OF ORAL DECISION DELIVERED BY MARGOT BALLAGH ON JUNE 2, 2020 AND ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL

BACKGROUND

[1] This Decision and Order results from this third hearing event, a status hearing

(“TCC”), on the appeals by Losani Homes (1998) Ltd. (the “Appellant”) of the failure of the County of Brant (the “County”) to make decisions within the prescribed timelines required by the *Planning Act* (the “Act”) on their applications to amend Zoning By-law No. 61-16 (“ZBA”) and for approval of a draft Plan of Subdivision (“POS”) in relation to the proposed development of the Appellant’s lands in the community of St. George, described as Part of Lot 7 and 8, Concession 2, in the Township of South Dumfries (the “subject lands”).

[2] The Memorandum of Oral Decision and Order from the first Prehearing Conference (“PHC”) was issued by the Tribunal on July 18, 2018 and served to: identify the Parties as noted above; grant Participant status to 15 individuals; and schedule a second PHC to get an update on the Parties’ efforts to resolve, define and scope the issues.

[3] The Decision and Order from the second PHC was issued by the Tribunal on November 29, 2019 and served to: schedule a hearing for 15 days beginning at 10 a.m., Monday August 17, 2020 in Paris, Ontario; finalize a Procedural Order (“PO”), which was attached as Attachment 1; and schedule this TCC, originally set for March 13, 2020 but adjourned to June 2, 2020, to receive an update on matters associated with the appeals and preparations for the hearing including any efforts to resolve or scope issues.

[4] In the meantime, on March 17, 2020, in response to the COVID-19 Pandemic, an emergency was declared pursuant to the *Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act Ontario* resulting in Regulation 73/20 which provides in part that “any provision of...any order of the Government of Ontario establishing any period of time within which any step must be taken in any proceeding in Ontario...shall, subject to the discretion of the...tribunal...be suspended for the duration of the emergency, and the suspension shall be retroactive to Monday March 16, 2020” (“State of Emergency Order”). The State of Emergency Order has been recently extended to June 30, 2020.

THE STATUS HEARING

[5] Counsel for the Parties participated in the TCC as noted. No Participants called in.

[6] The Tribunal canvassed the positions of each of the Parties related to the possible implications of the State of Emergency Order on their ability to comply with the timelines required by the PO that was issued on November 29, 2019. The Tribunal also invited the Parties' views on whether the form of hearing for this case could reasonably be converted from in-person to some other form such as videoconference if the pandemic situation required such an adaptation for the hearing currently scheduled for 15 days starting on August 17, 2020.

[7] Ms. Zuidema, counsel for the County, requested that the hearing days scheduled in August 2020 be adjourned for several reasons. She said that, at the end of March 2020, the County received a revised Plan of Subdivision from the Appellant. However, Ms. Zuidema told the Tribunal that the County had received some, but not all, of the corresponding updates for the following reports:

1. Environmental Impact Study
2. Functional Servicing Report
3. Archaeological Assessment
4. Hydrogeologic Assessment
5. Geotechnical Investigation
6. Erosion Threshold Analysis
7. Traffic Impact Analysis

8. Review and analysis of D-6 Guidelines

9. Zoning By-Law and schedules

Ms. Zuidema said that the County needed all the updated technical reports to consider approving the revised Plan. She felt an adjournment would allow time for the Appellant to provide all the updated reports and for the County to consider them.

[8] Further, Ms. Zuidema expressed concern that if a hearing in August was not able to proceed in-person, the hearing should be adjourned until it could. In her view, a videoconference hearing was not acceptable for this case in this remote area with “sketchy” internet access as compared to more urban centres and would be prejudicial to the County. She noted that there were 15 Participants who may not have internet access to observe the hearing. Ms. Zuidema estimated that 35-45 individuals would potentially attend the hearing and that there might also be media interest. She said there would be no suitable venue in the County for an in-person hearing to allow for social distancing with so many people.

[9] Lastly, Ms. Zuidema told the Tribunal that the County did not have the resources to prepare for a contested hearing at the same time as settlement negotiations (she referred to this as “the parallel track system”). She said it is a smaller county with only one senior planner assigned to the file and that progress is slower during the pandemic with people working remotely from home.

[10] Ms. Baker, counsel for the Appellant, requested that the hearing proceed as scheduled in August, regardless of whether the form of hearing needed to be creatively adapted to address the state of the pandemic at that time. She suggested the option of a hybrid form of hearing with some combination of in-person and videoconference or teleconference. In Ms. Baker’s view, the recently revised draft Plan of Subdivision satisfies the issues of the other parties, aside from the County, such that they would play only a minor or no active role in the proceeding. The Participants were legislated to participate by written statement only. She suggested that it was an option to have only

the Appellant and the County attend in person before the Tribunal while everyone else could participate remotely if the number of people able to attend an in-person hearing was still restricted pursuant to an extended State of Emergency Order. Ms. Baker said it is the testing of the evidence that is really the key. If an in-person hearing is impossible come August, she suggested an option was to have evidence-in-chief proceed in writing with only cross-examination proceeding by videoconference to reduce the amount of time needed. Another suggestion was that cross-examination could take place before a court reporter and filed in written form with the Tribunal.

[11] Ms. Baker said that the Appellant's applications had been deemed complete and that all required information had already been provided. In her view, no adjournment was needed to provide updated reports, as the County suggested. She said that the conditions for approval, the experts' meeting and witness statements would address any of the County's outstanding issues related to the revised Plan.

[12] Finally, Ms. Baker told the Tribunal that the parallel track system was embedded in the process and it was intended that the parties would prepare for a contested hearing while concurrently working toward settlement.

[13] Counsel for the other parties generally agreed with Ms. Baker that their parties' issues appeared to be addressed by the proposed revised Plan. They expressed willingness to consider participation in the hearing by remote technology, if needed, provided they receive the documentation in advance, including the updated technical reports, and be included in the experts' meeting.

[14] All the Parties agreed that the PO should be varied to allow additional time to provide the expert witness statements and to provide written responses to any written evidence, as is set out in the Order to follow. The Tribunal asked Counsel if any other changes were needed and none were requested, aside from the County's request to adjourn the hearing date, which was opposed as indicated above.

[15] After considering the submissions of the Parties, the Tribunal decided it was

premature to adjourn the in-person hearing scheduled for 15 days starting on August 17, 2020. Instead, the Tribunal scheduled another status hearing by TCC as set out in the order below.

[16] Ms. Baker offered to provide a draft revised PO reflecting those changes ordered at the TCC on June 2, 2020. The following day, the Tribunal received a draft revised PO, attached to an email from Ms. Baker indicating that she had not only incorporated the changes to the PO ordered at the TCC, but had taken the liberty to further revise the PO to change the date for non-expert witnesses statements and participant statements, as well as the date for visual evidence. Further Ms. Baker indicated that she had substituted a different Issues List than that which was attached to the PO issued on November 29, 2019.

[17] In response, Ms. Zuidema, emailed the Tribunal indicating that the County did not consent to varying the Issues List attached to the PO issued on November 29, 2019.

[18] The Tribunal is not prepared to revise the PO issued on November 29, 2019 except to the extent discussed with all the Parties and decided upon by the Tribunal at the TCC. The Parties had the opportunity to raise any additional issues during the TCC but did not.

[19] In comparing the Revised PO as provided by Ms. Baker with the PO issued November 29, 2019, the Tribunal noted further discrepancies including a significant change in the wording of paragraph 11 which appears to have been updated in the PO issued November 29, 2019 to address the legislated change to participant participation.

[20] In light of the apparent confusion, the Tribunal has looked to the wording of the PO as issued on November 29, 2019 and has varied the dates in paragraphs 13 and 14 as was consented to by the Parties and ordered by the Tribunal at the TCC. No other variations have been made.

[21] The Issues List, and any proposed changes to it, may be addressed at the

request of the Parties at the next TCC on July 24, 2020.

ORDER

[22] The Tribunal orders that the fourth hearing event, a status hearing, is scheduled for **Friday, July 24, 2020 beginning at 9 a.m. by TCC.**

Individual(s) are directed to call **416-212-8012 or Toll Free 1-866-633-0848** on the assigned date at the correct time. When prompted, enter the **code 4779874#** to be connected to the call. If assistance is required at any time, press '0' for the operator. It is the responsibility of the person(s) participating in the call to ensure that they are properly connected to the call and at the correct time. Questions prior to the call may be directed to the Tribunal's Case Coordinator having carriage of this case.

[23] The purpose of the TCC on July 24, 2020, as identified at this time, is to:

- Receive an update from the Parties following the same field experts' meeting on matters associated with the appeals and preparations for the hearing including scoping of the issues
- Discuss the logistics of the August hearing depending on updated implications of the COVID-19 pandemic.

[24] The Tribunal further orders that the PO issued on November 29, 2019 is hereby varied on consent as follows:

Paragraph 13 is deleted and the following is substituted: "The parties shall provide copies of any expert witness statements to the Tribunal, the other parties and to the Clerk on or before July 17, 2020 or the witness may not give oral evidence at the hearing."

Paragraph 14 is deleted and the following is substituted: "Parties may provide to the Tribunal, the other parties and file with the Clerk a written response to any written

evidence received on or before July 31, 2020.”

In all other respects, the PO issued November 29, 2019 remains the same. The revised PO is attached to this Decision and Order as Attachment 1.

[25] Should the Tribunal receive the consensus of all the Parties to change paragraph 15 to extend the time for providing copies of their visual evidence from July 28, 2020 to August 7, 2020, the Tribunal will consider such further variation of the PO. Otherwise, the July 28, 2020 date remains.

[26] Ms. Baker undertook to provide electronic access before June 18, 2020 to all the Parties to all the updated technical reports addressing the recently Revised Plan.

[27] The Parties consented, and the Tribunal directs, that same field experts from all the Parties shall be invited to attend the experts’ meeting to take place on or before June 18, 2020 as per the PO.

[28] The Parties and the Participants are to receive a copy of this Decision and Order.

[29] No further notice will be provided.

[30] This Member intends to continue to case manage this matter at the TCC on July 24, 2020, subject to availability.

“Margot Ballagh”

MARGOT BALLAGH
MEMBER

If there is an attachment referred to in this document,
please visit www.elto.gov.on.ca to view the attachment in PDF format.

Local Planning Appeal Tribunal

A constituent tribunal of Tribunals Ontario - Environment and Land Division
Website: www.elto.gov.on.ca Telephone: 416-212-6349 Toll Free: 1-866-448-2248

Local Planning Appeal Tribunal
Procedural Order

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 34(11) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Applicant and Appellant:	Losani Homes (1998) Ltd.
Subject:	Application to amend Zoning By-law No. 61-16 - Neglect of the County of Brant to make a decision
Existing Zoning:	(A) Zone, Agricultural Zone with one Special Provision (A-13), Agricultural Holding Zone and Residential Singles and Semis (HA-R2) Zone, Natural Heritage (NH) Zone and Employment Zone with a Special Provision (Mi-i)
Proposed Zoning:	Residential Singles Zone (Ri), with special exception (RI-_) to accommodate the single detached dwellings and larger street fronting rowhouses; Residential Multiple Medium Density Zone (RM2), with special exception (RM2-_) to Residential Multiple High Density (RM3), with special exception (RM3-_) to accommodate mixed use developments; Recreational Facilities (0S2) Zone to accommodate the parks and the stormwater management facilities; Natural Heritage Zone (NH) to accommodate the natural heritage features.
Purpose:	To permit the proposed draft plan of subdivision
Property Address/Description:	Part of Lot 7 and 8, Concession 2
Municipality:	County of Brant

Municipality File No.: ZBA20-17-RA
OMB Case No.: PL171215
OMB File No.: PL171215
OMB Case Name: Losani Homes (1998) Ltd. v. Brant (County)

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 51(34) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Applicant and Appellant: Losani Homes (1998) Ltd.
Subject: Proposed Plan of Subdivision - Failure of the County of Brant to make a decision
Purpose: To permit 1292-1700 residential units consisting of single detached, townhouses, medium density residential, mixed use along with parks and SWM ponds
Property Address/Description: Part of Lot 7 and 8, Concession 2
Municipality: County of Brant
Municipality File No.: PS2-17-RA
OMB Case No.: PL171215
OMB File No.: PL180025

1. The Tribunal may vary or add to these rules at any time, either on request or as it sees fit. It may alter this Order by an oral ruling, or by another written Order.

Organization of the Hearing

2. The hearing will begin on August 17, 2020 at 10:00a.m. at Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 7 Broadway Street West, Paris, in the County of Brant. The length of the hearing will be 15 days.
3. The parties and participants identified at the prehearing conference are set out in **Attachment 1**.
4. The Order of Evidence to be called at the Hearing is set out in **Attachment 2**.

5. The Issues are set out in **Attachment 3**. There will be no changes to this list unless the Tribunal permits, and a party who asks for changes may have costs awarded against it.
6. The Meaning of terms used in this Procedural Order are set out in **Attachment 4**.

Requirements Before the Hearing

7. A party who intends to call witnesses, whether by summons or not, shall provide to the Tribunal, the other parties and to the Clerk a list of the witnesses and the order in which they will be called. This list must be delivered on or before **May 15, 2020**.
8. Expert witnesses in the same field shall have a meeting on or before **June 18, 2020** to try to resolve or reduce the issues for the hearing. The experts must prepare a list of agreed facts and the remaining issues to be addressed at the hearing, and provide this list to the Tribunal, the parties and the Clerk on or before **June 29, 2020**.
9. An expert witness shall prepare an expert witness statement, which shall list any reports prepared by the expert, or any other reports or documents to be relied on at the hearing. The witness statement shall reasonably outline the evidence and opinions to be given at the hearing. Copies of this must be provided as in section 13. Instead of a witness statement, the expert may file his or her entire report if it contains the required information.
10. Parties must provide any non-expert witness statement to the Tribunal, the other parties and the Clerk, on or before **July 8, 2020** or the witness may not give oral evidence at the hearing.
11. A participant must provide to the Tribunal and the parties a participant statement on or before **July 8, 2020**. A participant is only permitted to make or file a written statement – called a participant statement- to the Tribunal. Participants cannot provide oral evidence.
12. Expert witnesses who are under summons but not paid to produce a report do not have to file an expert witness statement; but the party calling them must file a brief outline of the expert's evidence, as in section 13.
13. The parties shall provide copies of any expert witness statements to the Tribunal, the other parties and to the Clerk on or before **July 17, 2020** or the witness may not give oral evidence at the hearing.

14. Parties may provide to the Tribunal, the other parties and file with the Clerk a written response to any written evidence received on or before **July 31, 2020**.
15. Parties shall provide copies of their visual evidence to all of the other parties on or before **July 28, 2020**. If a model will be used, all parties must have a reasonable opportunity to view it before the hearing.
16. A person wishing to change written evidence, including witness statements, must make a written motion to the Tribunal.
17. A party who provides a witness' written evidence to the other parties must have the witness attend the hearing to give oral evidence, unless the party notifies the Tribunal and the other parties on or before **August 10, 2020** that the written evidence is not part of their record.
18. Losani Homes (1998) Ltd. shall prepare a work plan and circulate it to the parties by August 4, 2020 for comment. The finalized workplan shall be submitted to the Tribunal on or before **August 10, 2020**.
19. Any draft zoning by-law or draft plan conditions to be provided to the Tribunal at the hearing shall be circulated at least on or before **August 10, 2020** to the parties and the Tribunal.
20. Documents may be delivered by personal delivery, email, facsimile or registered or certified mail, or otherwise as the Tribunal may direct. The delivery of documents by fax shall be governed by the Tribunal's Rules (Rule 7) on this subject. Material delivered by mail shall be deemed to have been received five business days after the date of registration or certification.
21. No adjournments or delays will be granted before or during the hearing except for serious hardship or illness. The Tribunal's Rule 17 applies to such requests.

This Member is not seized.

So orders the Tribunal.

ATTACHMENT 1
LIST OF PARTIES/PARTICIPANTS

PARTIES

1. Losani Homes (1998) Ltd.

Denise Baker
WeirFoulds LLP
4100-66 Wellington Street West
Toronto, ON M5K 1B7

dbaker@weirfoulds.com
416-947-5090

2. County of Brant

Jyoti Zuidema
County of Brant
66 Grand River St. N.,
Paris, ON N3L 2M2

Jyoti.Zuidema@brant.ca
519.449.2451 x 2297

3. Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.

Jay Hitchon
Waterous Holden Amey Hitchon LLP
20 Wellington St. P.O. Box 1510,
Brantford, ON N3T 5V6

jhitchon@waterousholden.com
519.759.6220 ext. 343

4. Empire Communities (St. George) Ltd.

Paul DeMelo
Kagan Shastri LLP
188 Avenue Road
Toronto ON M5R 2J1

pdemelo@ksllp.ca
(416) 368-2100 x228

5. Parkland Fuel Corporation

Devry Smith Frank LLP
Marc Kemerer
95 Barber Greene Road, Suite 100,
Toronto, Ontario, M3C 3E9

marc.kemerer@devrylaw.ca
416-446-3329

6. John Newton

Peter Pickfield
Garrod Pickfield LLP
9 Norwich Street West
Guelph ON N1H 2G8

pickfield@garrodpickfield.ca
(519) 837-0500 x223

PARTICIPANTS

1. David Foy
2. Pauline Foy
3. Faisal Firoz
4. Sadaf Faisal
5. Wade Stevenson
6. Paula Stevenson
7. Daryle Delafosse
8. Jeff Wharton
9. Jeannette Wharton
10. Lionel Teed
11. Wendy Teed
12. James Randall
13. Alicia Randall
14. David Hanley
15. Sonya Gasparitsch

ATTACHMENT 2
ORDER OF EVIDENCE

1. Losani Homes (1998) Ltd.
2. County of Brant
3. Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.
4. Parkland Fuel Corporation
5. John Newton
6. Empire Communities (St. George) Ltd.
7. Reply, if any, by Losani Homes (1998) Ltd.

ATTACHMENT 3

ISSUES LIST

Note: The identification of an issue on this list doesn't mean that all Parties agree that the issue, or the manner in which it is expressed, is appropriate for or relevant to the proper determination of the appeals. The extent of the appropriateness and/or relevance of the issue may be a matter of evidence and/or argument at the Hearing.

Where other parties have indicated an interest in a particular issue of another party, it has been so noted following the specific issue.

Any Party may call or not call evidence on any issue of another Party; however, no Party is obligated to call evidence on any particular issue or every issue of another Party.

COUNTY OF BRANT PLANNING

Planning

1. OPA-8: Are the applications premature given the upcoming LPAT hearing of the St. George Official Plan Amendment (OPA-8) (LPAT Case PL180470)? Has the Applicant demonstrated that the proposed densities conform to and maintain the intent of the recently amended St. George Area Study and OPA-8?
2. Does the proposed development represent an appropriate level of density (persons/jobs per hectare)? Has the Applicant demonstrated that the requested density (units per hectare) in the proposed draft plan and the site-specific zoning is appropriate and will not adversely impact the character of the rural community of St. George?
3. Is the Six Nations Elected Council satisfied with the proposed development and archaeological issues? If not, why not?
4. Subdivision design: Are the final development constraint limits, top of slope and corresponding setbacks correct and appropriate? Are the internal design of the draft plan and the road connections to adjacent developments appropriate and do they allow for coordinated planning to ensure that the draft plan and the St. George Area develops into a functional, connected and complete community, in term of amenity and community uses, transportation, walkability, trails , cycling

etc.?(**Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.**) Does the proposed plan allow for the appropriate and efficient extension of services to the adjacent subdivisions? (**Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.**) Are the parks, including Park Block 78, appropriately located and sized to accommodate the required amenities? Is the school site appropriately sized and located? Should a public library be provided for in the plan?

5. Does the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment include the necessary regulations and provisions to ensure an appropriate lot and block structure and built form? Do the proposed provisions and regulations have appropriate regard for the site and the character of the surrounding lands and do they minimize the impact on surrounding lands? Are the proposed parking regulations appropriate? (**Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.**) Should the school site be zoned to permit a community center, gymnasium and sports field?
6. Does the proposed development meet the D-6 Guidelines and is the proposal compatible with the industrial area to the west of the subject lands?
7. Does the proposed development represent appropriate urban design and should the Applicant be required to submit Urban Design Guidelines for the proposed draft plan?
8. Should the proposed development be phased? If so, has the applicant provided a phasing plan? (**Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.**)
9. Are there conditions which should be imposed by the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal under subsection 51(25) of the Planning Act, if development is approved for the subject lands?
10. Are the Grand Erie District School Board and Brant Haldimand Norfolk District Catholic School Boards satisfied? If not, why not?
11. Is the Grand River Conservation Authority (“GRCA”) satisfied with the proposed development including in respect to: groundwater contour information; floodplain mapping; the proposed road connection to German School Road; and safe access to Park Block 78 given the GRCA’s comments on a creek crossing for this purpose?

12. Are the following studies from the Applicant required, have they been submitted and are the results appropriate?: preliminary designs and hydraulic calculations for the proposed creek crossings; erosion analysis; water balance analysis and mitigation plan for the natural heritage features and overall site infiltration; environmental impact study assessing any impacts to natural heritage features on the subject property and in the vicinity; an analysis demonstrating no adverse impacts to groundwater quality and quantity.

Engineering

13. Is the proposed development premature given that the Municipal Class Environment Assessment for Water and Wastewater has not been completed? **(Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.)**

14. Has the Applicant demonstrated that there is sufficient infrastructure, including sufficient water service capacity and water distribution and sanitary sewer capacity, current and/or planned, for the development taking into account other planned developments, and if there is not, is the proposed rezoning and plan of subdivision premature? **(Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.)**

15. What contribution, if any, should the Applicant make towards the cost of upgrading existing municipal infrastructure to accommodate the proposed development? These services include roads, sewer and water main upgrades. **(Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.)**

16. Has the Applicant adequately addressed and demonstrated: Any required road widenings on Beverly Street West, Highway #5 and Main Street South to accommodate the proposed long term road improvements? Any appropriate traffic calming measures in terms of roundabouts and a schematic of the roundabouts demonstrating that the ROW limits at those intersections are sufficient? No adverse traffic impacts caused by the proposed development when considering all relevant factors including the impact of all proposed residential subdivisions in the area? That the streets in the draft plan align with existing intersections and the proposed developments within the area? Any required improvements to existing intersections? That the proposed parking will not have an adverse impact on on-street parking.

16. Does the Stormwater Management Plan adequately address the issue of storm drainage and demonstrate that the proposed development will not negatively impact storm drainage in the area or result in future maintenance concerns for the County of Brant? **(Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.)**
17. Does the Functional Servicing Report address all matters in accordance with County's standards and determine that there are no adverse impacts caused by the proposed development?
18. Has a staging (phasing) plan been prepared for the upgrading of both the water distribution system and existing sanitary sewers required as a result of the proposed development?
19. Has the applicant demonstrated that the erosion constraints identified in the Environmental Impact Assessment from the existing natural features will not impact the Stormwater Management infrastructure?

Archaeology

20. Has the Applicant for the development submitted a further Stage 3 archeological assessment as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, in accordance with current guidelines and standards? Is there a requirement to do so?

JOHN NEWTON

1. Does the proposed Plan of Subdivision have regard for matters of Provincial Interest as set out in Section 2 e) f) h) j) l) n) p) q) r) and appropriately consider the criteria under Section 51(24) of the Planning Act?
2. Is the proposed Plan of Subdivision consistent with the policies in Section 1.0 of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 that guide development, the efficient use of resources and the coordination of planning matters?
3. Does the proposed Plan of Subdivision conform to policies in Sections 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, and 5.2 of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019 that

guide development, the efficient use of resources and the coordination of planning matters?

4. Does the proposed Plan of Subdivision comply with or maintain the intent of the County of Brant's Official Plan (2012 Cons.), in Sections 1.1, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 2.2, 2.4, 2.7, 3.2, 3.4, 5.2, 6.6 and 6.7? (see also County Issues)
5. Does the proposed Plan of Subdivision meet the proposed Official Plan Amendment (OPA 8) for St. George in Sections 5, 7, 8, and 2.8 as it relates to the long-term intent and vision, the efficient use and coordination of development for these lands? (see also County Issues)
6. Should the proposed Plan of Subdivision be designed to ensure that it does not preclude or hinder the future development of the adjacent lands at Part Lot 7, Concession 2, County of Brant, in the former Township of South Dumfries, located at 183 Main Street South (St. George ON), which are designated Urban Residential in the County of Brant Official Plan and located within the Primary Urban Settlement Area Boundary?

PARKLAND FUEL CORPORATION

1. Should any changes to the applications locate any sensitive uses within the hazard distances applicable to the Parkland propane facilities (the "Facilities") at 150 and 183 Industrial Boulevard, would the applications:
 - a. be consistent with the PPS 2014, including but not limited to, Policies 1.1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 3.0;
 - b. conform to the County OP, including but not limited to, Sections 1.11.2, 2.7, 3.11.3 and 3.12.3;
 - c. meet the TSSA Regulations and Guidelines for the implementation of Level 2 Risk and Safety Management Plans;
 - d. be compatible with the industrial areas to the west of the subject lands;
and
 - e. have appropriate regard for the continued operation of the Facilities and to the associated matters of public health and safety.

Empire Communities (St. George) Ltd.

1. Should the application be approved, is it appropriate to include the following as a draft plan condition: **(Riverview Highlands (St. George) Holdings Ltd.)**

Prior to final approval of the Draft Plan of Subdivision or any phase thereof, the Developer/Owner shall enter into one or more cost sharing or land owners group agreements to ensure the provisions of or funding for the Community and Common Facilities (such as municipal services and public roads) or make alternative arrangements to satisfy its cost share or developers group responsibilities. The owner acknowledges and agrees that the County shall not be obligated, required or demanded to release the Draft Plan of Subdivision or any phase thereof until the owner has obtained and provided a certificate confirming that it has entered into such agreements or made alternative arrangements and satisfied any obligations outlined in the agreement to the satisfaction of the escrow agent or Trustee of the land owners group.

ATTACHMENT 4

Meaning of terms used in the Procedural Order

Party is an individual or corporation permitted by the Tribunal to participate fully in the hearing by receiving copies of written evidence, presenting witnesses, cross-examining the witnesses of the other parties, and making submissions on all of the evidence.

Participant is an individual or corporation, who is not a party to a proceeding and is only permitted to make or file a written statement to the Tribunal, upon such terms as the Tribunal may determine in respect to the proceeding. **NOTE** that such persons will likely not receive notice of a mediation or conference calls on procedural issues. They also cannot ask for costs, or review of a decision as parties can.

Written and Visual Evidence: **Written evidence** includes all written material, reports, studies, documents, letters and witness statements which a party intends to present as evidence at the hearing or a participant intends to include in its written participant's statement. These must have pages numbered consecutively throughout the entire document, even if there are tabs or dividers in the material. **Visual evidence** includes photographs, maps, videos, models, and overlays which a party intends to present as evidence at the hearing or a participant intends to include in its written participant's statement.

Witness Statements: A **witness statement** is a short written outline of the person's background, experience and interest in the matter; a list of the issues which he or she will discuss and the witness' opinions on those issues; and a list of reports that the witness will rely on at the hearing. An **expert witness statement** should include his or her (1) name and address, (2) qualifications, (3) a list of the issues he or she will address, (4) the witness' opinions on those issues and the complete reasons for the opinions and (5) a list of reports that the witness will rely on at the hearing. A **participant statement** is a written document that sets out the Participant's position on the matter and issues of the proceeding together with an explanation of their reasons in support of their position. The participant statement should clearly indicate the OMB Case No. and the participant's name, current address and current contact information.

Additional Information

Summons: A party must ask a Tribunal Member or the senior staff of the Tribunal to issue a summons. This request must be made before the time that the list of witnesses is provided to the Tribunal and the parties. (See Rule 13 on the summons procedure.) If the Tribunal requests it, an affidavit must be provided indicating how the witness' evidence is relevant to the hearing. If the Tribunal is not satisfied from the affidavit, it will require that a motion be heard to decide whether the witness should be summoned.

The order of examination of witnesses: is usually direct examination, cross-examination and re-examination in the following way: direct examination by the party presenting the witness; direct examination by any party of similar interest, in the manner determined by the Tribunal; cross-examination by parties of opposite interest; re-examination by the party presenting the witness; or another order of examination mutually agreed among the parties or directed by the Tribunal.