Council
April 12, 2018 – 9:30 AM
Council Chambers, Grey County Administration Building

1. Call to Order
2. O Canada
3. Roll Call
4. Declaration of Pecuniary Interest
5. Adoption of Minutes
   a. County Council and Committee of the Whole minutes dated March 22, 2018
      That the minutes of the County Council meeting and Committee of the Whole meeting dated March 22, 2018 and the resolutions contained therein, be adopted as presented.
   b. Recolour Grey Public Meeting minutes dated March 16 and 27, 2018
      That the minutes of the Committee of the Whole meeting dated March 16, 2018 being a Recolour Grey workshop and the County Council meeting dated March 27, 2018 being a statutory Official Plan Review public meeting under the Planning Act, be adopted as presented.
   c. Committee of Management minutes dated March 22, 2018
      That the Committee of Management minutes dated March 22, 2018 be adopted as presented to County Council; and
      That the Committee of Management closed meeting minutes dated March 22, 2018 be adopted as provided to County Council.
6. Reports
   a. Board of Health Report dated March 2018 and the Board of Health minutes dated February 23, 2018
      That the Board of Health Report dated March 2018 and the Board of Health minutes dated February 23, 2018 be received for information.
7. By-laws (None)
8. Good News and Celebrations
9. Adjournment
March 22, 2018

Grey County Council met at the call of the Warden on the above date at 9:30 AM at the County Administration Building. The Clerk called Council to order and Warden Stewart Halliday assumed the Chair.

The Warden invited members of Council to join him in O Canada.

Heather Morrison, Clerk, swore in Councillors Brian O’Leary, Pater Hambly and Terry Mokriy, alternate members for the City of Owen Sound, Town of Hanover and the Municipality of Grey Highlands respectively.

The Roll was called by the Clerk with all members present except Councillors McQueen, Jack and Bell.

Councillors Terry Mokriy and John Woodbury were in attendance on behalf of Councillors Paul McQueen and Norm Jack respectively.

Kim Wingrove, Chief Administrative Officer; Heather Morrison, Clerk and Tara Warder, Deputy Clerk/Legislative Coordinator were also in attendance.

The following staff members were in attendance:

Kevin Weppler, Director of Finance; Anne Marie Shaw, Director of Housing; Lynne Johnson, Director of Long Term Care; Pat Hoy, Director of Transportation Services; Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning and Development; Kevin McNab, Director of Paramedic Services; Grant McLevy, Director of Human Resources; and Wendy Henderson, Ontario Works Manager.

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

Adoption of Minutes

CC34-18 Moved by: Councillor Fosbrooke Seconded by: Councillor Greenfield

That the minutes of the County Council meeting and Committee of the Whole meeting dated March 8, 2018 and the resolutions contained therein be adopted as presented.

Carried
Moved by: Councillor Paterson    Seconded by: Councillor Hicks

That the Committee of the Whole closed meeting minutes dated March 8, 2018 and the Committee of Management closed meeting minutes dated March 13, 2018 be adopted as provided to County Council.

Carried

Moved by: Councillor Burley    Seconded by: Councillor Wright

That the minutes of the Committee of Management meeting dated March 13, 2018 be adopted as presented; and

That the following resolutions contained therein be endorsed:

1. That report LTCR-CM-07-18 regarding a Behavioural Support Transitional Unit at Lee Manor be received; and

   That staff be directed to proceed with the proposal submission, within the allocated funding from the South West Local Health Integration Network for the creation and operation of a Behavioural Support Transitional Unit.

2. That the multi municipal long-term care working group discussion paper be received for information.

3. That a letter be sent in response to the Grey Gables Family Council’s letter regarding a safe crossing zone for Grey Gables residents which states that the Municipality of Grey Highlands is investigating the possibility of a crossover at the subject location.

Carried

Councillors Barfoot and Boddy then entered the meeting.

By-Laws

Moved by: Councillor Woodbury    Seconded by: Councillor Mackey

That By-Laws 5009-18 and 5010-18 be introduced and that they be taken as read a first, second and third time, finally passed, signed by the Warden and the Clerk, sealed with the seal of the Corporation and engrossed in the By-law book.

5009-18  A By-law to Adopt Amendment No. 135 to the County of Grey Official Plan affecting lands described as Part Lot 6,
Concession 4 (geographic Township of Collingwood), Town of the Blue Mountains

5010-18  A By-law to appoint a Clerk for the Corporation of the County of Grey

Carried

Good News and Celebrations

Councillor Barfoot noted that the Foodland on the Sunset Strip had its grand opening today.

Councillor Fosbrooke shared that Southgate’s Maple Fest is occurring the weekend of April 14th and 15th in Holstein. Southgate also amended its procedural by-law to permit electronic meetings.

Councillor Ardiel noted that World Autistic Awareness Day is on April 2, 2018.

Councillor Boddy noted that the Owen Sound Attack are playing the London Knights in Round 1 of the playoffs.

Councillor McKean noted that James Hindle from Hindle Hardware in Clarksburg is featured in the Ontario Farmer magazine.

Councillor Mokriy noted that there is a celebration being held to commemorate Agnes Macphail’s appearance on the ten dollar bill.

Councillor Clumpus stated that the attainable housing forum is happening on April 6th at the Meaford Hall.

Councillor Woodbury congratulated one of Southgate’s staff members, John Watson, for receiving the Michael Woodcroft Memorial Award at the Ontario Good Roads Association Conference for the highest average mark in Ontario at the TJ Mahoney Construction and Maintenance Road School.

Adjournment

On motion of Councillors Barfoot and Paterson, Council adjourned at 10:01 AM to the call of the Warden.

Stewart Halliday, Warden  Heather Morrison, Clerk
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Grey County Council met on the above date at 10:02 AM at the County Administration Building. Warden Stewart Halliday assumed the Chair and called the meeting to order with all members present except Councillors Jack, McQueen and Bell.

Councillors Woodbury and Mokriy were in attendance on behalf of Councillors Jack and McQueen respectively.

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest
There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

Business Arising from the Minutes

*CW85-18* Moved by: Councillor Mackey Seconded by: Councillor Greenfield

*That staff be directed to investigate the current status and future requirements necessary to enable the extension of Grey Road 40 between Highway 6 and Highway 10 and bring a report back for Council’s consideration.*

Carried

*CW86-18* Moved by: Councillor Clumpus Seconded by: Councillor Wright

*That Report HDR-CW-03-18 regarding a proposed transfer of Golden Town Residential Company assets to Grey County be deferred in order for Golden Town Residential Community auditors to attend Committee of the Whole to provide an overview of its financial information on April 12, 2018.*

Carried

Sue Paterson provided an update on the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) discussed at the March 8, 2018 meeting. After further discussion with the Conservation Authority, the Authority said it is their mandate to provide comments on natural hazard matters but not natural heritage matters. Natural Heritage comments are over and above the mandate and the Authority would like each municipality to pass a resolution stating its wishes regarding comment provision and it
will be reviewed by the Authority. Staff noted the report and the MOU will be put on the Committee of the Whole agenda for April 12th.

Determination of Items Requiring Separate Discussion

There were no items removed from the Consent Agenda.

Consent Agenda

Moved by: Councillor Barfoot        Seconded by:  Councillor Hicks

That the following Consent Agenda items be received; and

That staff be authorized to take the actions necessary to give effect to the recommendations in the staff reports; and

That the correspondence be supported or received for information as recommended in the consent agenda.

1. That the letter from the Grey Bruce Christian Farmers Association regarding agricultural taxation in rural municipalities be received for information.

2. That the letter from the City of Owen Sound regarding support for federal action on the conservation of heritage properties be received for information.

3. That the correspondence from MP Larry Miller regarding Grey County receiving the Best New Special Event for Communities with populations of 50,000 to 250,000 for the Ag 4.0 event be received for information.

4. That the correspondence from MPP Bill Walker regarding Grey County receiving the Best New Special Event for Communities with populations of 50,000 to 250,000 for the Ag 4.0 event be received for information.

Carried

Items for Direction and Discussion

HDR-CW-05-18 Owen Sound Housing Company Additional Funds

Moved by: Councillor Eccles        Seconded by:  Councillor Fosbrooke

That Report HDR-CW-05-18 regarding additional funds for Owen Sound Housing Company be received and that Grey County Council approves the additional funding from the Province in the amount of $880,000 to build affordable housing; and

The Grey County enters into a Transfer Payment Agreement with the
Province; and
That Grey County enters into a Contribution Agreement with the Owen Sound Housing Company; and
That staff be authorized to proceed with the project prior to County Council approval as per Section 25.6 (b) of Procedural By-law 5003-18.

Carried

FR-CW-10-18 2017 Treasurer’s Statement – Council Remuneration and Expenses

CW89-18 Moved by: Councillor Burley Seconded by: Councillor McKean

That Report FR-CW-10-18 and the attached 2017 Treasurer’s Statement – Council Remuneration and Expenses be received for information.

Carried

FR-CW-11-18 2018 Tax Policy

CW90-18 Moved by: Councillor Clumpus Seconded by: Councillor McKean

That Report FR-CW-11-18 regarding 2018 property tax policies be received; and

That the 2017 tax policies remain the same for 2018 for:

- Tax Ratios
- Tax Reductions for Mandated Subclasses of Vacant Lands
- Tax Reductions for Farmland Awaiting Development Subclasses
- Optional Classes of Property; and

That the County utilize all of the optional capping tools available in order to move as many commercial properties towards full current value assessment (CVA) based taxation; and

That the necessary By-laws be drafted for Council’s consideration and approval; and

That future reports be provided to Council on any recommended changes and/or updates to the current Tax Relief and Rebate Programs, and any recommended changes to the current vacant unit rebate program for Council consideration.

Carried

Committee recessed briefly, then reconvened.
PDR-CW-13-18 Recolour Grey – Overview of Comments Received to Date on Draft Official Plan

CW91-18 Moved by: Councillor Burley Seconded by: Councillor Clumpus

That Report PDR-CW-13-18 which provides highlights of the comments received to date on the new draft Official Plan be received.

Carried

SSR-CW-07-18 Coordinated Rural Transportation Pilot Project Extension

CW92-18 Moved by: Councillor Barfoot Seconded by: Councillor Greenfield

That SSR-CW-07-18 regarding an extension of the Owen Sound to Shelburne transportation pilot project, pending notification of the outcome of the grant application made to the Ministry of Transportation Community Transportation Grant Program - Municipal Stream, be received and;

That the $10,000 cost to extend this service from April 1, 2018 to May 31, 2018, be funded from the Social Services Caseload Reserve.

Carried

Other Business

Councillor Ardiel inquired as to whether the Board of Health has held any workshops on the roll out of the legalization of non-medical marijuana and the potential effects on the community. It was noted there is a plan to hold such sessions across Bruce and Grey Counties.

Councillor Eccles requested that a response letter be forwarded to the Christian Farmer’s Association in response to the letter they sent on agricultural taxation in rural municipalities.

There are upcoming workshops and information sessions regarding the municipal election and information related to these will be shared via the County website and social media.

Notice of Motion

There were no notices of motion.

Adjournment

On motion of Councillors Pringle and Eccles, Committee of the Whole adjourned at 12:50 PM to the call of the Chair.

Stewart Halliday, Warden
Heather Morrison, Clerk
Grey County Council met on the above date at 9:30 AM at the County Administration Building. Warden Stewart Halliday assumed the Chair and called the meeting to order with all members present except Councillors Jack, Greenfield, Boddy, McKean, Ardiel and Bell.

Councillor John Woodbury was also in attendance on behalf of Councillor Norm Jack.

The following staff were also in attendance: Kim Wingrove, Chief Administrative Officer; Heather Morrison, Clerk; Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning; Pat Hoy, Director of Transportation; Scott Taylor, Senior Planner; Stephanie Lacey-Avon, Intermediate Planner; Philly Markowitz, Economic Development Officer; Carolyn Bailey, Planning Technician; Brad Noble, Planning Data Analysis Coordinator; and Tara Warder, Deputy Clerk/Legislative Coordinator.

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

Recolour Grey Key Policies, Mapping Changes and Comments

Randy Scherzer outlined the agenda and welcomed those in attendance which included council members and staff from the local municipalities in Grey County.

Scott Taylor spoke to the meetings which have taken place recently with regard to the new Official Plan, including information sessions, stakeholder meetings, open houses, and meetings with the Province and Saugeen Ojibway Nation. The draft Plan has also been circulated to individuals who have requested information on the Plan.

It was noted that the Plan has been divided into 5 sections: Cultivate Grey, Develop Grey, Natural Grey, Live Grey, and Move Grey.

Mr. Taylor then outlined the policy changes surrounding Cultivate Grey which include consideration of such things as smaller lots, clarification of policies around lot additions and split designation properties, consideration of recreational uses and alternative dwelling types and consideration of the entire food system, among others.

Stephanie Lacey-Avon spoke to the policy changes surrounding Develop Grey, noting the combining of tertiary settlement areas with secondary settlement areas and space extensive industrial together with commercial land uses. There are also policies to support healthy
Committee of the Whole  
March 16, 2018

Communities and economic development. Further, some policies also support rural employment opportunities and home business opportunities.

It was noted that the Live Grey policies support consultation with First Nations and Metis for all Grey County Official Plan Amendments, Local Official Plan amendments, and secondary plan amendments as well as plans of subdivision or condominiums. Further, policies permit age-friendly options and implement the Healthy Communities Checklist and advance cultural, eco and agri-tourism opportunities in the County.

Scott Taylor spoke to the Natural Grey section, noting that natural heritage setbacks are changing based on the updates to the Province’s Natural Heritage Reference Manual 2010. Mr. Taylor spoke to the update of significant woodlands mapping and parks, recreation and tourism policies. There are also updates proposed to parkland dedication policies stemming from updates to the Planning Act.

Randy Scherzer then addressed Council on Move Grey policies. The development of a complete transportation system which supports different modes of travel was noted. There are proposed policies which support active transportation and paved shoulders, connecting links and a required number of vehicle accesses for new developments.

Mr. Scherzer spoke to the mapping changes and the development of an interactive GIS site to compare the current official plan mapping with the proposed.

Planning staff then outlined a summary of the comments received to date.

Councillor McQueen entered the meeting.

Next steps were then outlined. There is a Council meeting which will serve as the statutory public meeting under the Planning Act on March 27th at 6:30 PM in the Council Chambers.

Staff noted that not all comments from the review will be recommended to be incorporated. Some are a large deviation from what is in existence today and could be different than what will be recommended by staff or adopted by Council.

Staff addressed questions from Council regarding significant woodlands, definitions, timelines and process, and historic landfills.

It was noted that it is important to summarize all the comments received even though some may not be able to be addressed in the Official Plan.

Randy Scherzer noted that once the Province makes the decision on the Official Plan, it will not be appealable based on recent changes to the Planning Act. Staff hopes that there will be an opportunity to review any proposed modifications to the adopted Plan prior to the Province making the final decision. The County can still amend the policies in the future if they are not working.

Councillor Wright then left the meeting.

Council and attendees then divided into groups to participate in the breakout sessions on each
of the five areas of the plan. Staff recorded the comments from the groups, which are appended to the minutes.

Other Business

There was no other business.

Adjournment

On motion of Councillors Pringle and Paterson, Committee of the Whole adjourned at 12:05 PM to the call of the Chair.

__________________________________  ______________________________
Stewart Halliday, Warden                  Heather Morrison, Clerk
Cultivate Grey

- Rural manufacturing (on-farm diversification) is vital regardless of community, Mennonite, horse & buggy or otherwise
- Both value-add agriculture and manufacturing must be maintained
- Some concerns re: on-farm manufacturing with respect to larger manufacturers clustered along stretch of road, hope that municipal bylaws would create checks and balances
- Allow exceptions for co-operative models (this would exempt much of the horse and buggy community and respect the unique challenges they have)
- Are employee limits a disincentive or a blessing? Some manufacturers are exceeding employee limit recommendations due to lack of enforcement
- Cumulative impacts on infrastructure should always be considered with respect to permitting on-farm manufacturing
- Consider a mechanism to gather development fees for specific on-farm diversification projects (non-agriculture) if there will be known municipal infrastructure impacts
- Consider MDS concerns when siting on-farm manufacturing, especially if it could restrict and “sterilize” common agricultural practices; permitted uses are not clear enough and could lead to problems (check PPS and OMAFRA process diagram for clarification)
- Make sure to re-route rural linkages (Green in Grey) to allay fears that farmland will be taken out of production; fears of “new NEC” in the agricultural community
- Clarify policy around agricultural forestry (ie: Christmas trees, nut trees, other functional forests not intended for timber or tree farms)
- Consider creating a sub-class for agricultural forests - could add “LT” for long-term after the general zone classifications, i.e.: “R1LT”
- Have clarification about short, medium, and long-term plantations with respect to clear-cutting
- Limit creation of more / smaller rural lots especially where there would be MDS problems; pits & quarries etc.
- Support smaller rural plots if it incentivizes on-farm value adds
- Some concern that smaller lots in Rural would easily transition out of specialized / small-scale / value add farming to estate residential
- Some rural 100 / 100+ acre lots might be ideal for severing with small farms in mind, especially if there are clear zones across the property, ie: 20 acres of fields in good condition that could be a small farm, the rest in bush / wetland / hazard etc.
- Considerations of tax balance if more small lots are created – could we stand to gain with higher residential to agriculture / rural taxation?
- Can Specialty Agriculture lots be even smaller?
- Zoning amendment process should be made easier for agricultural land at edges of settlement areas
Consider municipal drains as part of asset management
What is the reasoning behind mapping deer yards? Not recommended
Support and incentivize the creation of windbreak tree plantations along roads
Curtail the removal of treed fencelines / hedgerows / field barriers to mitigate erosion and retain moisture and wildlife habitat – consider a policy to examine and restrict fenceline removal
Incentivize erosion control through water and soil retaining plants in rural, ag and settlement areas – “low impact development” re: storm water
Create incentives for protection and preservation of wetlands; consider impacts of tile drainage and consider restricting in some areas
Consider the pending ag impact study with respect to pits and quarries – note and review the fill bylaw for alignment
Realtors and other “welcome wagon” or first contacts should have an understanding of and be much more clear / transparent with respect to aggregate lands
Why is the onus for setbacks/demonstration of impacts on the new homebuilder next to an existing pit or quarry rather than the other way around? Why can a pit locate anywhere?
What triggers a development agreement? Process should be outlined clearly (i.e.: something that would create a haul route / necessitate infrastructure change)
Is there any consideration at the county level about small flocks (i.e.: chickens) in urban / settlement areas? Could the county make recommendations to harmonize municipal bylaws?
We need the ability for people to more easily re-designate Agricultural lands to Rural or another land use designation.
Are we going to have an over production of cannabis? Divided opinions on whether it should be produced in a settlement area versus a rural area.

Develop Grey

Through the Official Plan, have the settlement boundaries changed and can settlement boundaries change in the future?
Why are natural heritage studies needed when development is proposed within primary and secondary settlement areas?
Can we introduce specific policies that address campgrounds
Can we introduce specific policies that address short term accommodation (Airbnb)? Countywide what do we do?
If policies at the lower tier are more restrictive, how is this dealt with?
What are the policies that deal with tiny homes and what are provincial policies on tiny homes?
Need more affordable housing throughout the County, need policies within Develop Grey
Affordability issues around Chapmans
Need initiatives that deal with affordability
With rising land costs and development costs how can Grey County encourage developers to offer affordable housing and still recover costs?
• Can intensification targets in the OP be amended to increase affordability? The idea here would be to intensify certain areas in order to create smaller units at a more affordable price.
• There is a big difference between the development and managing the development.
• It should be noted that market demand is what is driving development in Grey County.
• Although the province pushes development to settlements, perhaps Grey County is well suited to support “rural strips” in between communities and condo development in certain areas that are not primary settlements?
• Can Agriminiums occur inside settlement areas?
• We need friendly boundary expansions for communities and an easier way to expand settlement/municipal boundaries.
• Campgrounds in Grey need to be properly designed for long term sustainability.
• Remove natural heritage requirements from within primary settlement areas.
• Need to tighten up definition and policies on campgrounds in the OP including dealing with servicing issues.
• Need policies that deal with Community Hubs (social service, health, education, community services).
• Need county-wide policies to address Community Improvement Plans (CIP).
• Concern on exponential growth in the south and the east of the County. Is there enough available lands and how can we foster expansion with lands. Growth will impact the entire spectrum of services.
• Concern that growth management study has not adequately forecasted growth in Dundalk.
• Question regarding the use of the term “Countryside” in 4.2.5. This is a term introduced by the greenbelt plan. This term should be defined and explained in the OP.
• Comment that applications to develop lands adjacent to hamlets and communities should be easier.
• Smaller farm lots should be permitted and more flexible for families and succession.
• Settlement expansion should be easier.
• The growth study does not reflect what is actually happening in Dundalk.
• Growth management study needs further review.
• There should be an allowance to short circuit the comprehensive review process to relocate industrial lands.
• It should be easier to re-designate industrial lands to commercial lands.
• Need to review development charges process because this is a major impact on growth and growth forecasts.
• Question regarding the difference between secondary dwelling units and tiny homes.
• Need policies to deal with tiny homes because MPAC is unable to provide a proper tax assessment (no category) and the county tax base does not increase.
• Need to add more text regarding secondary homes and tiny homes in OP.
• Comment that there is not enough affordable housing in rural areas of the County. Need to encourage.
• Need to permit development like condos in rural areas in order to keep communities viable such as keeping schools open etc.
• Losing the residential tax base is a big concern in Grey County
• Why is there a limit of 20 years on garden suites?
• There is enormous demand for estate lots. Where can we create more of them? We need a policy that allows for the type of development that people actually want (estate lots).
• Hanover needs a boundary change to accommodate 40 years of growth not just 20 years. Staff should help justify this expansion and provide strong wording in the Official Plan for a boundary expansion. Hanover is currently being forced to develop in areas where it does not make sense to develop (e.g. it doesn’t make sense to have multiple industrial parks). We need to pay attention to what the market is demanding. See Hanover’s comments on the revised Growth Management Strategy. Some of these issues are unique to Hanover, which provides 15% of the County’s jobs on 0.2% of the County’s lands.

Live Grey

• Need higher density housing styles in rural areas to offer affordable housing solutions – 4-6 units sharing services.
• Encourage secondary suite development.
• There are currently larger farming operations with fewer residents to support rural roads/bridges/infrastructure.
• Agricultural communities are asking for reduced % tax ratio but are more frequent users of the roads/bridges.
• Consider smaller lot severances along major roadways – (eg. 100 acre lot could have 10, 10 acre lots).
• Do we need to have secondary unit development go through the zoning by-law amendment process, or permit as of right?
• Reconsider hobby farm sized operations, would like to see more of these in Special Ag.
• For lands immediately surrounding designated settlement lands, look to make these special policy lands, where smaller lots could be created than otherwise permitted in Rural/Ag lands.
• Urban affordable housing is directly impacted through the availability of developable land.
• Promote more County owned social housing.
• Hanover is currently doing an age-friendly sidewalk assessment, to assess where new benches may need to go, shaded areas, etc.
• Reallocating settlement lands if there are natural constraints on the subject property – eg. Excessive flooding.
• Pg. 109 – establish a right to a healthy environment. Ensure lower tier municipalities are circulating comments to Grey Bruce Public Health, and there are consistencies in developing healthy community initiatives throughout County and lower tier processes.
• Community hubs can serve the needs of local communities.
• With reference to public engagement, how will the Local Planning Tribunal process change the ability for a member of the public to provide input? How can we ensure we are capturing everyone’s opinions?
• Shrinking minimum floor area, Bruce County has a minimum floor area of ~600-650 sq. ft.
• Encourage multiple tiny homes on one lot. For example, there could be 2 acres of land, with 4 tiny homes, utilizing 1 septic system.
• Encourage apartments over commercial units.
• Include policy to recognize AirBNB as a type of rental housing in policy, although allow lower tier municipalities to incorporate their own regulations.
• Promote more public private partnerships to enhance affordable housing supply.
• Share healthy developer’s checklist online, make accessible to the public and lower tier municipalities.

**Natural Grey**

• Concerns with the impact of cores and linkages on agriculture. Can you build on a vacant lot within a core or linkage?
• We need to adjust the linkage boundaries now, and not wait for it to be done at the municipal level. Are the boundaries of the cores certain, or can these be changed?
• The Beaver River needs to be a linkage.
• Landowners are concerned that linkages are the ‘thin end of the wedge’ and could one day become trails, or be expropriated.
• We should be working with stewardship groups and NGO’s to establish and protect the linkages.
• Does Natural Grey further inhibit severances?
• Will conservation authorities be reviewing linkages when making their comments on development applications? If so, they should not be. While conservation authorities have jurisdiction over water, they do not have jurisdiction over land, which falls under the County jurisdiction. Agriculture is already over-regulated and does not need conservation authority input on this topic. We need to ‘push back’ when negotiating conservation authority memorandum of understandings on this issue.
• Other agencies, beyond just conservation authorities, should be able to waive the need for an environmental impact study (EIS).
• The Plan needs clear qualifications on who can complete or peer review an EIS. An EIS checklist is needed for simpler applications. When do we recommend or require peer reviews?
• Coyotes are a problem for agriculture.
• What will the wildfire appendix mapping mean? Should we ‘push back’ to the province on the need for this mapping in Grey County?
• Wind turbines cause fires to spread across fields.
• The County needs to take a position on Air B N B’s and short term accommodations.
• Deer wintering yards should not be added to the Plan. Deer move around and are adaptable. Controlled hunts should also be considered on this topic.
• Who determines what is ‘natural’? We need to clarify the significant features policies to distinguish between natural versus planted woodlots. People should not be restricted from developing on, or cutting plantation woodlots. There needs to be flexibility on ‘man-made’ woodlands. At the very least removing a man-made woodlot should be a simplified application process when compared to removing a natural woodlot.

• Hazard land boundaries keep changing. We need to make sure we always have the most recent boundaries to ensure we are providing the best information to landowners. Who has the final say on hazard land boundaries?

• Are we being proactive to prevent against future Niagara Escarpment Plan or Greenbelt expansions?

• What are the changes to the natural heritage setbacks? There should be some exemptions from these setbacks, especially to woodlands.

• Will there be new karst mapping? Where does this information come from?

• When does a drain become a watercourse? Municipal drains should be included under asset management.

• Who is managing drainage? Drainage and wetlands are key to climate change mitigation.

• Upper tiers need to take the lead on watershed planning – see new guidance document released February 2, 2018.

• Should we be concerned with the Provincial comments? We have to serve our Grey County public, not the Province.

• What are the implications of Natural Grey on Primary Settlement Areas? Why apply Natural Grey mapping in Primary Settlement Areas? These designated growth areas should be free from restrictions of valleylands, woodlands, endangered species, etc. The current Plan has a conflict between growth and the preservation of natural features in Primary Settlement Areas (e.g. Kraemer subdivision in Hanover). Maybe consider a no net loss or compensation approach where lands outside of settlement areas can be reforested, or streams rehabilitated, in compensation for features lost within settlements.

Move Grey

• Support for complete streets concept in order to support all modes of transportation. Main streets may be difficult to adapt as complete streets based on buildings being close to road, parking, etc.

• Support for connecting links (i.e. transferring County roads that go through settlement areas). The agreement between the County and the local municipalities will need to be fair.

• County needs a strong position on private and seasonally maintained roads which is consistent across the County.

• Need to clarify what is meant by ‘all modes of transportation’ – does this include e-bikes, motorized scooters, etc.

• Need to make sure that stormwater management/drainage matters are being dealt with properly (e.g. tile draining fields – what permits are required?, do the ditches have capacity? etc.). It was noted that MTO as well as the County has an interest
when it comes to stormwater management/drainage matters adjacent to Provincial Highways/County Roads/CP Rail Trail and that in some cases a permit is required.

- Need to further investigate the ability to put in fibre/conduit as well as installing other utilities (i.e. natural gas, hydro) when we are doing road construction. Need SWIFT to develop a consistent model and fibre/conduit specification that municipalities can use.
- Explore using Uber as a transit solution to support the regional transit initiative. Need to address any liability issues. Learn from the Innisfil model – what agreements are required, how did they address liability issues, insurance, etc.?
- Paved shoulders on bridges – how are we going to address this when the bridge platform is too narrow to install paved shoulders? There was mention that Ontario Traffic Manual Book 18 may have some signage examples for these situations.
- Need to further clarify the road widening policies when it comes to obtaining road widening on both the severed and retained parcels
- Too much emphasis being placed on cyclists for the reason to construct paved shoulders. There are other reasons for having paved shoulders including extending the longevity of the paved surface, supporting large farm equipment, supporting horse and buggy community, etc.
- Consider doing weekend traffic counts on County roads
- Need to do further education on sharing the road – not just active transportation but that all road users need to share and be respectful of the other users.
- Concerned about the impact of proposed policy 8.8.3 on new development where the CP Rail Trail goes through settlement areas. Proposed policy 8.8.3 indicates that new developments proposed adjacent to the County CP Rail Trail corridor will be reviewed to ensure that the permitted uses are compatible with the existing use of the rail corridor as a trail as well as the compatibility of the potential re-introduction of rail service assuming it will occur. The concern is that this may impact new development adjacent to the CP Rail Trail even though rail may never return to the area.
- Need to be prepared for autonomous cars/vehicles. Do we have the infrastructure to support autonomous vehicles? What kind of road maintenance will be required to support autonomous vehicles? Need to think beyond cars/vehicles – e.g. autonomous wheelchairs – should these be permitted on roads or sidewalks?
- Need to support electric vehicles – permitting/encouraging charging stations, etc.
- Need to do further research on maintenance of paved shoulders. Has this been studied yet?
- There was mention that the Province may be interested in uploading County roads?
- Is there an opportunity for heated roads (using solar power) or road surfaces that have lighting installed within the surface?
- Support the Grey Road 40 extension between Highway 6 and 10.
- Support the Grey Road 14 potential County Road Corridor to directly connect to Highway 89.
• Support the Dundalk Industrial Park by-pass and the proposal that this could be a potential County road. Can there be a roundabout/turning circle at Grey Road 9 and the proposed Dundalk Industrial Park by-pass?

• Recommended that Concession 5 between Grey Road 18 and Grey Road 40 be identified as a potential County Road Corridor on Appendix D

• Should look for a potential by-pass around Markdale to alleviate truck traffic in the downtown area. Could the CP Rail Trail be used as the location of a by-pass or West Back Line?

• Look for opportunities for live snow fencing (e.g. west side of Grey Road 124).

• Should there be a roundabout/turning circle at Grey Road 9 and Grey Road 14?

• Should Grey Road 9 be identified as an Arterial Road in the functional classification?
Grey County Council met at the call of the Warden on the above date at 6:30 PM at the County Administration Building. The Clerk called Council to order and Warden Stewart Halliday assumed the Chair.

All members were present except Councillors Burley and McKean.

Kim Wingrove, Chief Administrative Officer and Heather Morrison, Clerk were also in attendance.

The following staff members were in attendance:

Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning and Development, Scott Taylor, Senior Planner Stephanie Lacey-Avon, Intermediate Planner, and Monica Scribner, Planning Administrative Assistant.

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

Public Meeting

Warden Stewart Halliday noted the purpose of this evening’s meeting, being a public meeting for the Recolour Grey Official Plan review. This meeting is a statutory meeting held under Section 17 (15) d of the Planning Act.

Randy Scherzer outlined the process for the public meeting.

Planning staff provided an overview via a PowerPoint presentation of Recolour Grey, what is an Official Plan, how it affects properties in Grey County.

Councillors Eccles and Bell entered the meeting.

Planning staff then outlined the review of the five themes that have developed through the Recolour Grey process including Cultivate Grey, Natural Grey, Develop Grey, Live Grey and Move Grey and a highlight of the comments received for each theme.

Staff then provided an overview of mapping changes that are included in the draft Official Plan. A list of agencies, developers, public, businesses who have provided comments on the draft Plan was shared. Planning staff also provided a list of those
with who staff has met personally to provide comments and feedback on the draft Plan as well as some of those who attended the recent open houses throughout the county.

The next steps of the Official Plan process were then reviewed. It is anticipated that the revised draft Official Plan will be presented to Council in late May 2018. A further 30 day window for public input will be provided once the revised Plan is available. The goal is to have a final version of the Plan before County Council in July 2018. Should County Council adopt the Plan, it will then be sent onto the Province for their review and approval. Once the Province issues their decision, that decision is not appealable, based on recent changes made to the Planning Act.

Warden Halliday then invited members of the public to provide comments. The following individuals spoke to Council:

- Lynn Silverton-Grey Highlands
- Roberta Dockerty-Meaford
- Bob Weirmer-West Grey
- Charles McGillvary-Grey Highlands
- Harry Kooney-West Grey
- Rick Butler-Grey Highlands
- Gerald Carefoot-Grey Highlands
- David Ellingwood-Cuesta Planning
- Hugh Simpson-Feversham
- Kory Chisholm-MHBC Planning
- Vaughan Johnstone-Milton (property in Grey County)
- Beth Hamilton-West Grey

The following comments/concerns were received:

- Tiny houses should continue to be looked into.
- There should be exemptions for tree farms.
- The Minimum size of agricultural farms should allow for smaller farm sizes, which take into account specialty farming operations that require less acreage.
- An understanding that the Mennonite community relies on trucks bringing and taking products in and out of area, and the wording should not be exclusively ‘horse and buggy community’.
- Source protection area-what does this mean? Further definition is required.
- Fear about Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) taking over further lands in Grey, and we should be proactive in preventing this in the Plan.
• Clarification on how to register land where items are found below the surface. Who does one speak to about artifacts, if they are found and who has the rights to those artifacts? How are First Nations rights considered here as well?

• What does a landowner do if mapping is wrong? Does the property owner have to prove they are right at their own expense? What is the process for correction? Can something be included to protect landowners from costs associated with errors? Staff noted that linkage mapping will be revised based on comments received.

• Can the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) ‘override’ the Official Plan? If you need work done, who do you contact Grey County or SVCA? The mapping in the County Plan and SVCA’s mapping should be the same, otherwise it will cause confusion. SVCA is hard to get along with and get permissions for work done on site. Too much land is being consumed by hazard lands; landowners are paying increasing taxes but property rights keep going down. Staff noted that the most recent conservation authority mapping will be included in the County Official Plan maps in order to provide consistency between agencies. Any development within the conservation authority’s regulated areas will still require a permit from the authority.

• Concerns over restrictions on private property, some landowners have Crown Patents and nowhere does it allow for such restrictions on private lands. Staff commented on Crown Patents, noting that the province has shared case law on Crown Patents. Staff noted that the province has indicated that Crown Patents do not prevent municipalities from including such lands in official plans and zoning by-laws. Municipalities still have ability to regulate land use, which the case law supports. Huron County also shared case law that draws a similar conclusion.

• Core areas and encumbrances that designate environmental areas and are restricting development on these properties. If you want to get a building permit you have to go to the conservation authority and then there are fees and approvals required before approval from municipality. Sometimes you cannot get an approval without an Environmental Impact Study (EIS), which can be costly. Encumbrances are for the benefit of all within the province, but the EIS has to be paid for by property owner, which is not fair and unaffordable. If these restrictions and requirements are put on private property, then everyone should pay for it, through the municipality or county, not the property owner. Benefit is to all and therefore all should pay.

• Is the requirement 200 metres total, or 200 metres on each side of the river for linkages where they follow rivers and streams? How was this distance determined? Can you hunt in these areas? Could consume an entire 50 acres if its 200 metres on each side of the river. Staff clarified that it would be 100
metres on each side of the river, and hunting would still be permitted in these areas with a landowner’s permission.

- Reiterate the comments submitted to date. Rural and Agricultural areas have permitted use guidelines from the Province, and we should rely on these guidelines over the draft section 3.2.1(c).
- Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) only applies to surplus farm dwellings if the dwelling is to be separate from livestock facility.
- MDS should apply to vacant non-farm lots. Minor variances could be used where a lot would otherwise be undevelopable.
- Rural industrial should use Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change D-6 Guidelines, but the distance should be measured to neighbouring structures versus the lot line.
- Lot additions, section 3.2.3, should clarify that non-farm lot additions to a farm lot are allowed in all situations. However, farm to non-farm lot additions should only be used cautiously.
- Surplus farm dwelling policies should be exempt in aggregate resource areas. Under Aggregate Resource Act the dwelling is still potentially a sensitive receptor whether on separate property or not. This would allow for greater retirement opportunities for farmers.
- There are lots of vacant parcels of land in Grey County’s rural areas countryside, even though we try to direct development to settlement areas. We believe that Tertiary Settlement Areas should be reinstated (Jackson, Massie, etc.) as Secondary Settlement Areas to allow for further growth. As a balance then reduce the number of rural severances to 1 plus the retained on a 40 hectare crown lot. You also need to look at the quality of the lots being considered and servicing. Direct more development to settlement areas, by restoring some of these former settlement areas.
- Grey County Federation of Agriculture noted there is a long history of farming in Grey County with the economy heavily tied to agriculture. Within the vision of Grey County a strategic statement needs to be made regarding the importance of agriculture in Grey County. If no strategic statement is made about the value of agriculture, the rights, economics and presence of farmers will wane.

Councillor Hicks entered the meeting

- Noted that the policy on redefining hazard land boundaries should remove word “minor” as a qualifier. Through the EIS and zoning amendment processes, it can refine the hazard boundaries and no official plan amendment (OPA) is necessary. Noted that significant woodlands should not apply within settlement areas, which are designated for growth. These woodlands should be treated
similarly to how agriculture is treated i.e. it’s preserved in the countryside, but not within settlement areas.

- The reintroduction of rail use on CP Trail, as policy currently states, would mean planning for development in proximity to the rail land would have huge encumbrances, to guard against future land use conflict. Requiring this protection now may not be appropriate, given the uncertainty of future rail use.
- Compliments to planning staff on patience to assist public in understanding the Official Plan. Noted that Lynch versus St. Johns related to Crown Patents is contrary to the province’s referenced case law. Council should ask province to indemnify them against any court cases, based on their inaccurate advice. For hazard lands on river properties, if studies have not been done adequately to define the boundaries now, then why are designations placed on these lands, why not wait until the studies have been done?
- County Council in 2016 objected to NEC expansion, based on property value concerns. However, there is no policy in the draft Official Plan to protect land values and tax base.
- Noted that Section 6.12 of the draft Official Plan speaks to the County’s coming Recreational Trails Master Plan. Consideration was requested for this Master Plan document to be a binding document, rather than a guiding document.

The following Councillors spoke:

- Councillor Pringle
- Councillor McQueen
- Warden Halliday
- Councillor Barfoot
- Councillor Fosbrooke
- Councillor Eccles

The following comments/concerns were raised:

- The mapping on Appendix D and the development of a County road from Grey Road 40 to Mennonite Corners is not shown. Staff noted that no revisions to the maps have been made to date, but revisions will now be made in the coming months based on comments received.
- The Green Energy Act was passed in 2009, if this Act changes and the County is silent on alternative energy in the Official Plan in this regard what would happen? If the County wanted to change our policies, is there a freeze once this Plan is passed by the Province. Staff noted that there is a two-year freeze on amendments to the Official Plan, but this is voluntary and council can still consider amendments through the
passage of a motion. Should the *Green Energy Act* change, a future amendment to the County Plan could be considered, which could take into account some of the policies and mapping municipalities had completed prior to the *Green Energy Act*.

- What were the requirements for Natural Heritage Study? It came from the province but was council obligated to adopt it? Staff noted that the requirement for natural heritage systems planning comes from the Provincial Policy Statement, and the province will be looking for this when our Plan goes to them for approval.
- A review of the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) happens approximately every 10 years. However, there is currently a review the Greenbelt Plan area to the south of Grey County, which may include possible expansion in Dufferin County and other areas. Areas within Grey County are not being looked at currently.
- Staff was congratulated on the new approach to the development of Recolour Grey and the high level of public engagement which does not always happen with planning matters.
- The term ‘public participation’ only appears once in the document, this needs to be improved upon. All written comments from all agencies, public, etc. should be made available to the public. Individuals within settlement areas may feel this does not impact them as much as rural landowners, but Council needs to prioritize the health and safety of land, water and air for all residents.
- Concerns regarding the accountability under the Plan, where there may be overlapping jurisdiction between multiple Acts, e.g. gravel pits are covered by the *Planning Act* and the *Aggregate Resource Act*. Where does this accountability fall to?
- When mapping bedrock is Grey County using the same mapping as others across the province? Staff noted that the current sand and gravel resource mapping comes from the County’s Aggregate Resource Inventory Master Plan (ARIMP). However the ARIMP did not include bedrock resources, therefore we would need to get this mapping from the province, which would likely be a similar source to what other municipalities are using.
- Concern that once the Official Plan is passed by the province it is ‘set in stone’. If there are errors, what is the amendment process? Staff noted that housekeeping amendments are a standard process, and smaller errors or changes can be identified and completed through one housekeeping amendment. Typographical errors can be corrected without a formal amendment process.
- When monitoring the Plan, has staff revisited comments received from previous OPAs? How will ongoing monitoring happen? Staff noted that we have been keeping a list of comments and concerns over the past number of years
working with the current Plan. These comments have helped form the basis for Recolour Grey. Staff will work with municipalities, agencies and the planning data analysis coordinator to monitor the efficacy of the policies in the Plan going forward.

- Section 9 “Our Tools”, has not been discussed too much just yet, but am looking forward to revisions coming to this section, for example development charges.

Adjournment

On motion of Councillors Eccles and Bell, Council adjourned at 8:28 PM to the call of the Warden.

________________________________________  ________________________________
Stewart Halliday, Warden  Heather Morrison, Clerk
The Committee of Management met on the above date at the County Administration Building with the following members in attendance:

Present: Chair Dwight Burley; Councillors Arlene Wright, Alan Barfoot, Sue Paterson; and Warden Stewart Halliday

Staff Present: Kim Wingrove, Chief Administrative Officer; Lynne Johnson, Director of Long-Term Care; Heather Morrison, Clerk; Mary Lou Spicer, Deputy Director of Finance and Tara Warder, Deputy Clerk/Legislative Coordinator

Call to Order

Chair Burley called the meeting to order at 1:34 PM.

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest.

Closed Meeting Matters

CC31-18 Moved by: Councillor Wright Seconded by: Councillor Barfoot

That the Committee of Management does now go into closed session to discuss:

i. A position, plan, procedure, criteria or instruction to be applied to any negotiations carried on or to be carried on by or on behalf of the municipality or local board pursuant to Section 239 (2) of the Municipal Act, 2001 (Long-Term Care redevelopment application)

ii. Labour relations or employee negotiations pursuant to Section 239 (2) of the Municipal Act, 2001 (Union negotiations)
The Committee proceeded into closed session at: 1:35 PM.

The Committee returned to open session at: 2:44 PM.

The Chair confirmed that only the items stated in the resolution to move in camera were discussed.

**Other Business**

There was no other business.

**Next Meeting Dates**

At the Call of the Chair.

On motion by Councillor Barfoot, the meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM.

Dwight Burley, Chair
Board Report
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Second-hand Smoke in Multi-Unit Dwellings
What Could We Expect with Cannabis Legalization?
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The data and the statements presented are from the Smoke Free Housing Ontario survey conducted by Ipsos Reid examining second hand smoke exposure in Multi-Unit Dwellings (MUDs)
Specific areas explored in the research include:

• General information on the problem (those exposed to second-hand smoke in multi-unit dwellings)
• Assessing current attitudes and perceptions on the issue among key targets
• Determining knowledge and/or resource gaps for those who want to / are willing to take action
• Cannabis Smoke in Multi-Unit Dwelling
Sample Make-up

Respondents for this study were drawn from similar buildings in similar proportions as the November 2006 study. The sample distribution based on the TCANs was unique to this wave of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2006 Nov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High rise apartment</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triplex</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community housing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number and % of Total Interviews

- North/Thunder Bay, 8%
- Toronto, 22%
- East, 19%
- SouthWest, 6%
- CentralEast, 27%
- CentralWest, 19%

TOTAL N=1,533

Presence of Second Hand Smoke in Unit

• Just under half of all respondents (42%) have encountered the smell of second hand tobacco smoke in their unit within the past 6 months (unchanged trend).

• Open windows are now the most frequently cited access point for second hand smoke (53%). This is followed by hallways (42%).
How Second Hand Smoke Enters Living Space

- Open windows, as opposed to hallways (42%), are now the most frequently cited access point for second hand smoke (53%). Shared ventilation (22%) and air leaks from other units (20%) are reported next most often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Point</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2006 Nov</th>
<th>2006 Mar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through windows when they’re open</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the hallways</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through shared ventilation</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through air leaks from other units</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through bathroom or kitchen fans</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another way</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know how it got in</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. What was the most common way that tobacco smoke odours got into your living space from somewhere else? Base: Tobacco smoke odours get into living space 2010 n=645; 2006 Nov n=840; 2006 Mar n=739.
Impact of Second Hand Smoke Entering Living

• Over eight in ten (82%) of those who report tobacco smoke entering their unit indicate that the smoke bothered them (increasing trend)

• Ontarians are more likely to believe second hand smoke is an issue of some type than they did four years ago (increasing trend)

• Many different types of conditions are impacted based on exposure to second hand smoke
Impact of Second Hand Smoke Entering Living Space

Portion Bothered by Second Hand Smoke

- Over eight in ten (82%) of those who report second hand smoke in their unit indicate that the smoke bothered them. These figures are up 12 points since November 2006. Two in ten (22%) say they either considered moving or moved in order to get away from the smoke.

- Smoke seepage bothered those with no smokers in the household to a much stronger degree (90%) than those who don’t (64%).

- Smoke seepage least bothered those with lower education, lower income, and cheaper rents.

Qs: When tobacco smoke odours get into your living space from somewhere else, how much did it bother you?

Base: Tobacco smoke odours get into living space 2010 n=845; 2006 Mar n=739

© 2010 Ipsos Smoke Free Housing Ontario Multi-Unit Dwelling Second Hand Smoke Survey
Impact of Second Hand Smoke Entering Living Space

Characterization of Second Hand Smoke

Residents are more likely to believe second hand smoke is an issue of some type than they did four years ago. At present, 55% say it is a health hazard (up 14 points), 48% say it is a nuisance (up 9 points) and 39% say it is an infringement upon life/privacy (up 7 points). Results also show a reduction in the portion people who believe that second hand smoke is not something to worry about (down 12 points from 35% to 23%). Central East respondents are more likely to report health hazard (64%), those in the North are more likely to say they don’t worry about it (35%).

Q5. And when you think about the tobacco smoke that has drifted into your unit, would you say you consider this to be...? Base: Tobacco smoke odours get into living space 2010 n=645, 2006 Nov n=840.

© 2010 Ipsos Smoke Free Housing Ontario: Multi-Unit Dwelling Second Hand Smoke Survey
## Impact of Second Hand Smoke Entering Living Space

### Specific Condition Caused by Second Hand Smoke

Many different types of conditions are cited as having occurred due to exposure to second hand smoke. Asthma attacks (30%) are mentioned most often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2006 Nov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caused asthma attacks</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allergic to cigarette/ smoke</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caused coughing attacks</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty breathing/shortness of breath</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects sinuses</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caused sickness</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes headaches/migraines</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to cigarette/ smoke</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caused death</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caused discomfort/ annoyance</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed medical assistance/ hospitalizing</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caused upset stomach/ nausea</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their child has asthma</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive smell</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sore throats/colds</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Example Verbatim

- **2010:**
  - “My spouse has severe chronic asthma and allergies and tobacco smoke exacerbated the problem to such a degree that we had to move at great financial cost.”
  - “On an ongoing basis, I have headaches and feel stuffy as a result of the unwanted second hand smoke.”
  - “Why can the law not protect me from waking up, choking, due to high quantities of smoke entering my bedroom from my one source of fresh air: the window?”
  - “I have asthma and other residents didn’t refrain from smoking in the apartment hallway or parking garage. The cigarette smoke and pet odour were the reasons I had to vacate my unit 6 months ahead of time.”

---

Q.7. Tell us a little bit about that experience. For example, what type of condition was incurred? Did it happen to you? Did it happen to someone that is elderly or young? Did the condition or illness persist for a long-term? Please write anything else that is relevant. Base: All respondents who suffered illness due to second hand smoke 2010 n=127; 2006 Nov n=134.
Suggestion/Complaint and Impact

Suggestion or Complaint Raised Regarding Second Hand Smoke

• **Increases are noted** in the portion of people who have approached landlords / management / government in an effort to address the presence of second hand smoke.

Impact of Suggestion or Complaint Regarding Second Hand Smoke

• While residents are more inclined to make a suggestion or raise a complaint regarding second hand smoke, results show that little continues to be done.
Suggestion or Complaint Raised Regarding Second Hand Smoke

Suggestions / Complaints Made Re. Second Hand Smoke

- Increases are noted in the portion of Ontarians who have approached landlords/management/government in an effort to address the presence of second hand smoke. At present, over a third of respondents (35%) who have encountered second hand smoke have made a suggestion or voiced a complaint. This portion is up eight points since November 2006 (27%).

© 2010 Ipsos. Smoke Free Housing Ontario: Multi-Unit Dwelling Second Hand St. Survey.
Impact of Suggestion or Complaint Regarding Second Hand Smoke

While residents are more inclined to raise a complaint/make a suggestion regarding second hand smoke, results show that little continues to be done about their concern. At present 61% say nothing was done about their complaint/suggestion. This portion is essentially unchanged in four years. Just over one in ten (13%) say the problem was fixed, while one quarter (25%) say steps were taken but the problem was not fixed. Residents in the Southwest were the most successful at getting problems addressed successfully (33%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2006 Nov</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing was done</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps were taken to fix the problem successfully</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps were taken to fix the problem, but they were unsuccessful</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2A. And, what happened after your suggestion? Base: Asked to have something done about smoke in unit 2010 n=227, 2006 Nov n=227
Attitudes Towards Tobacco Use and Prohibition in MUDs

• Despite the Smoke-free Ontario Act, only marginal changes are noted in increased tobacco prohibition within multi-unit dwellings. At present, the majority of hallways (54%) and lobby/common areas (53%) and about half of laundry rooms (48%) are smoke-free (unchanged).

• There continues to be a strong level of belief that common areas in multi-unit dwellings are legally required to be smoke-free. (increasing trend)

• There is strong support for the banning of smoking in multi-unit dwellings. At present, two thirds (66%) support a ban (increasing trend), 31% are opposed (decreasing trend).
Attitudes Towards Tobacco Use and Prohibition in MUDs

Restrictions on Tobacco Use in MUDs

Despite the Smoke-free Ontario Act, only marginal changes are noted in increased tobacco prohibition within multi-unit dwellings. At present, the majority of hallways (54%) and lobby/common areas (53%) and about half of laundry rooms (48%) are smoke free. Party rooms (39%) and all apartments (25%) are more likely to be smoke free than four years ago. Those in Toronto are most likely to live in buildings where tobacco usage is controlled. Those living in other areas are more likely to have no tobacco usage controls present.

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2006 Nov</th>
<th>2006 Mar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hallways</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby/common areas</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry rooms</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party rooms</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All apartments/units</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some apt/units</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patios/balconies</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O8. Is (or was) smoking prohibited in any of the following areas in the multi-unit dwelling? Base: All respondents 2010 n=1,533; 2006 Nov n=1,835; 2006 Mar n=1,583.
Belief that Common Areas Are Required to be Smoke Free

- There continues to be a strong level of belief that common areas in multi-unit dwellings are required to be smoke free. As was the case four years ago, a significant majority of people (64%) believe that common areas of MUDs are required by law to be smoke free.

- **Total YES**
  - 84%
  - 85%

- **Total NO**
  - 16%
  - 15%

Q9. As far as you know, are common areas of multi unit dwellings, such as lobbies, social areas, and elevators, required by law to be smoke free?
Base: All respondents 2010 n=1,533; 2008 Nov n=1,835.

© 2010 Ipsos
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Attitudes Towards Tobacco Use and Prohibition in MUDs

Support for Smoking Ban in Multi-Unit Dwelling

There is strong support for the banning of smoking in multi-unit dwellings. At present, two thirds (66%) support a ban, 31% are opposed. Support has increased nine points across four years while opposition has decreased by 11 points. Those in the Central East TCAN are the most supportive (73%).

2010: 50% Strongly support, 16% Somewhat support, 12% Somewhat oppose, 18% Strongly oppose
2006 Nov: 40% Strongly support, 17% Somewhat support, 13% Somewhat oppose, 29% Strongly oppose

Total YES: 66%
Total NO: 31%

Smoking is already banned in my building: 3% (Not asked in Mar 2006)

2010: Q11. To what extent would you support or oppose a decision by your landlord to prohibit smoking in your building, including all private units? 2010 n=1,535 // 2006: Q11. As you may know, a large property management company in the City of Winnipeg has made the decision to ban smoking for all new tenants moving into their multi dwelling units. Do you (or would you have) strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose a similar smoking ban for your multi unit dwelling? 2006 Nov n=1,835.
Impact of Tobacco Usage on Dwelling Choice

• Respondents show a strong desire to live in a smoke free building. When provided with a number of options, 71% of respondents would either prefer to live in a smoke free building (48%) or insist that they did (23%) (increasing trend)

• Given the choice between two identical buildings, a sizeable majority (80%) would select the building which prohibited smoking everywhere (increasing trend)
Impact of Tobacco Usage on Dwelling Choice

Choice Between Two Identical Buildings – Smoking & Non

- Asked to choose between two identical buildings, a sizeable majority (80%) would select the building which prohibited smoking. The portion selecting the smoke free building increased from 64% (March 2006) to 71% (November 2006) to the present level of 80%. Those in the Central East TCAN are the most likely to select the smoke free building (88%).

Q. 13. And, if two buildings were the same in every way, including cost, except that one did not allow smoking anywhere, while the other building allowed smoking, to what extent would you be likely or unlikely to choose the "no-smoking" building over the building where smoking was permitted? Base: All respondents 2010 n=1,533; 2006 Nov n=1,835; 2006 Mar n=1,583.
Health Effect Cannabis Second-hand Smoke

- Cannabis smoke and tobacco smoke have similar health effects

- Cannabis smoke contains many of the same carcinogens as tobacco smoke

- While there is some evidence that cannabis smoking can be a risk factor for lung, head, neck and throat cancers, the association is unclear because of dual use of cannabis and tobacco smoking, and because research is lacking on cannabis use

- Second-hand cannabis smoke in an unventilated room can cause effects, including minor problems with memory and coordination

- Regular Cannabis smoking has been associated with chronic bronchitis and reduced lung function
Cannabis Smoke in Multi-Unit Dwelling

• Cannabis smoking is a common complaint and growing concern that the Health Units across Ontario receive from tenants and landlords

• The harmful health effects from exposure to second-hand cannabis smoke warrants health protective regulations

• Due to the similarities in composition between tobacco and cannabis smoke, second-hand cannabis smoke is likely to be a similar public health concern (research is lacking)

• With the coming legalization and regulation of cannabis this issue may become even more prominent across the province
Local community leaders are in a powerful position to signal to the housing community (landlords, property management groups and condo corporations, and tenants within multi-unit dwelling) and the public that smoke free multi-unit dwelling:

• Is a preferred option

• Offers tremendous health and property benefits
Recommendations - Examples of Policy/By-law

Smoke free multi-unit dwelling is a critical policy issue

Local governments are in a powerful position to enact by-laws to protect the public, and allow tenants to live without involuntary exposure to any form of second-hand smoking, whether from tobacco, or cannabis

• Smoke-free clause option in the standard “tenancy agreement form”

• If no-smoking clause option, the tenancy agreement could indicate second-hand smoke exposure countermeasures such as:
  - Setbacks from entrances
  - No smoking on balconies or patios
  - If the property has a designated outdoor smoking area, it must be at adequate distance from units and balconies
References

- Smoke-free Housing Ontario, https://api-d45f8310c91bf3.eweb.publichealthgreybruce.on.ca/EmployeeWebApps/Pages/hr/AbsenceApprovals.aspx
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Youth Engagement Project Partnership - Tobacco Free Art Contest
The Tobacco Free Art Contest was a partnership of the Nawash Youth Group and Public Health. The contest was to create original artwork to describe the use of sacred tobacco versus commercial tobacco.

Open to all ages, the contest was promoted through Nawash Youth Group classroom presentations at the Kikendaasogamig Elementary School. Approximately 95 students from kindergarten to Grade 8 took part in interactive presentations examining the use of sacred tobacco and why commercial tobacco is not suitable. To promote the art contest, colouring sheets were handed out to the younger students and a poster explaining the contest for older students. Teachers incorporated lessons on tobacco to support the topic of sacred versus commercial tobacco and included class time to work on artwork. Fifty-five entries were submitted from all age categories. Entries were judged by eight youth with guidance from Chippewas of Nawash Youth Worker. On February 18, the works were displayed and the winners of each category awarded their prizes. All of the artwork will be on display at the upcoming Healthy Communities Conference in May.
Grey Bruce Prevention of Falls in Older Adults
Falls represent a significant public health issue for Grey Bruce residents at all stages across the lifespan. In 2012-2013, fall related injury hospitalization rates were 42% higher than the provincial rate, with local age-specific falls-related emergency department visit rates 32% higher among seniors aged 65 and over compared to the provincial rate (GBHU Epi Fast Facts No.7). With funding from the South West LHIN, the Grey Bruce Health Unit works with local, regional and provincial partners to implement evidence-based initiatives targeting prevention of falls in older adults.

During the past year:
- 122 Georgian College students (46 Personal Support Workers and 76 Registered Practical Nurses) were trained in *A Step Ahead to Fall Prevention*, a program to incorporate fall prevention strategies into their normal routines when working with older adults. Participants report an increased comfort in promoting fall prevention material and implementing fall prevention strategies with older adults; 95% of students will use the information in their work with older adults; 97% of students agreed that fall prevention is a priority in their role as a health care provider.
- 159 health care providers attended Fall Prevention training workshops at the Owen Sound Family Health Team, Care Partners and Behavioural Supports Ontario.
- Over 1,400 older adults were reached through presentations or one-on-one counselling on prevention of falls.
- **Fall Prevention resources** were updated and made available throughout the community and via the website.
- In partnership with Grey County Emergency Medical Services (EMS) CHAPS program, fall risk assessments were conducted for 61 residents living in Grey County housing. Other residents participated in fall prevention education programs and were linked to an in-house medication review.
- A community engagement model was created with members of the Grey Bruce Council on Aging to support program development and evaluation. This model assisted older adults to engage with the Grey County Official Plan review.
- In partnership with the Chippewas of Nawash Health Care Centre and Saugeen First Nations, 39 Personal Support Workers received *A Step Ahead to Fall Prevention* training and the Canadian Centre for Activity and Aging’s tiered home exercise program. Clients will be screened for nutrition, cognition, home safety, medication review, timed up and go, sit to stand and functional fitness confidence. A research project is currently underway with the results to be presented at the National Falls Prevention Conference in Newfoundland in June 2018.

This **Collective Impact** project provides co-ordination for both the South West regional and provincial Falls Prevention strategies. Collective impact brings together organizations to address complex problems through a five part process: agreeing to a common goal; tracking progress in the same way; do what each does best by building on mutually reinforcing activities; have consistent communications and committing dedicated resources to move the work forward. As a result, Grey Bruce and the South West region are providing leadership in the area of falls prevention for older adults.
Board of Health Minutes

Date: Friday, February 23, 2018
Location: Grey Bruce Health Unit
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Members Present: Alan Barfoot (Chair), Paul Eagleson, Stewart Halliday, David Inglis, Laurie Laporte, Sue Paterson, David Shearman, Arlene Wright, Will Rogers
Regrets: Dr. Ian Arra, Mitch Twolan
Also Present: Dr. Hazel Lynn, Drew Ferguson, Kim Rutherford, Kristy Hansford
Special Guests: Erin Meneray

1.0 Call to Order
Chair, Alan Barfoot, declared quorum present and called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2.0 Amendments to Agenda
Roof/Building Update – Darren Lynk

3.0 Approval of Agenda
Moved by: Sue Paterson Seconded by: David Shearman
“THAT, the agenda for Friday, February 23, 2018 be approved as amended.”
Carried

4.0 Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest
There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest declared at this time.

5.0 Roof/Building Update – Darren Lynk
The Facilities and Maintenance Manager notified the board that contractors are on site and work has begun on the replacement of the roof. Project is on schedule.

6.0 Adoption of Minutes
Friday, January 26, 2018
Moved by: Stewart Halliday Seconded by: David Inglis
“THAT, the minutes of Friday, January 26, 2018 be approved as presented.”
Carried

7.0 Presentation: Budget – Kim Rutherford
Moved by: David Inglis  Seconded by: Stewart Halliday
“That the Board of Health adopt the budget as presented and one time funding requests as amended.”

Carried

8.0 Correspondence

8.1 Northwestern Health Unit Resolution Re. Income Security; Roadmap for Change

8.2 Middlesex London Health Unit Re. Nutritious Food Basket
Moved by: David Shearman  Seconded by: Sue Paterson
“That, the Board of Health receives the January correspondence as presented.”

Carried

9.0 Reports

9.1 February Reports

9.1.1 MOH Report – Accreditation – Dr. Hazel Lynn
Moved by: David Shearman  Seconded by: Arlene Wright
“That, the Board of Health receive the MOH report regarding Accreditation and will revisit the subject in January 2019.”

Carried

9.1.2 Program Report – February

9.2 News Releases

9.2.1 Naloxone available at the Health Unit
9.2.2 Southeast Grey Skate Exchange needs your skates
9.2.3 2017-2018 Healthcare Influenza Immunization Rates
Moved by: Laurie Laporte  Seconded by: Arlene Wright
“That, the Board of Health receives the February reports as presented.”

Carried

10.0 Financial Report

10.2 Financial Controls Checklist
10.3 Audit Planning Report to Board
Moved by: David Shearman  Seconded by: Laurie Laporte
“That, the Board of Health receives the financial report for December 2017 as well as the Financial Controls Checklist and Annual Audit Planning Report as presented.”

Carried

11.0 Other Business

11.1 alPHa AGM and Annual Conference
The Association of Local Public Health Agencies Annual General Meeting and Annual Conference is being held June 10-12 in Toronto. Any interested Board Members should contact Erin Meneray.

12.0 In-Camera

Moved by: Sue Paterson                     Seconded by: David Inglis

“THAT, the Board of Health does now go into closed session at 11:45 a.m. to discuss labour relations or employee negotiations, and personal matters about identifiable individuals and that Erin Meneray, will remain present as recording secretary and Dr. Hazel Lynn, Drew Ferguson, Kim Rutherford, Kristy Hansford and Melissa Clancy will remain present.”

Carried

The Board returned to open session at 11:56 a.m. with Chair Barfoot presiding.

Moved by: Laurie Laporte                     Seconded by: David Shearman

“THAT, the Board of Health for the Grey Bruce Health Unit appoint Dr. Hazel Lynn as Acting Medical Officer of Health as per Part VI, Section 69(1); and further that the Board of Health request that the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care approve the appointment.”

Carried

Moved by: Stewart Halliday                   Seconded by: Arlene Wright

“THAT, the Board of Health for the Grey Bruce Health Unit approve the Medical Officer of Health contract dated March 17, 2018 to September 28, 2018.”

Carried

Moved by: Sue Paterson                      Seconded by: Paul Eagleson

“THAT, the Board of Health approve the Physician Consultant contract for Dr. Ian Arra dated, May 1, 2018 to December 31, 2018.”

Carried

13.0 Adjournment

By motion of Arlene Wright, the Board of Health meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Next Meeting:

Friday, March 23, 2018 at 10:00 a.m.
Grey Bruce Health Unit, Owen Sound

X
Alan Barfoot
Chairperson

X
Dr. Hazel Lynn
Acting Medical Officer of Health
X

Erin Meneray
Recording Secretary