

# Council Agenda Item 10(b) – Consent Agenda

For the Regular Meeting of Council April 17, 2025

If you wish to separate an Item from the Consent Agenda, please contact the Municipal Clerk prior to the meeting so a resolution can be prepared for any item requiring debate.

1. Annual Repayment Limit
2. Renfrew County Senior Summer Games
3. Monitoring Food Affordability In Renfrew County
4. Community Emergency Preparedness Grant
5. Private Property Rights and Municipal Official Plans/Zoning Bylaws
6. Yellow Ribbon Campaign

**Ministry of  
Municipal Affairs  
and Housing**

Municipal Finance Policy Branch

777 Bay Street, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto ON M7A 2J3  
Email: MFPB@ontario.ca

**Ministère des Affaires  
municipales et du Logement**

Direction des politiques relatives  
aux finances municipales

777, rue Bay, 13<sup>e</sup> étage  
Toronto ON M7A 2J3  
Courriel: MFPB@ontario.ca



April 4, 2025

Dear Municipal Treasurer,

I am pleased to enclose a report showing your municipality's 2025 Annual Repayment Limit (ARL) respecting long-term debt and financial obligations. Your 2025 ARL was calculated based on 25 percent of your net own source revenues as reported in your 2023 Financial Information Return (FIR).

Municipalities in Ontario are responsible for ensuring that they do not exceed their ARL without the approval of the Ontario Land Tribunal. When a municipality proposes works that would require long-term borrowing (or other long-term financial obligations), the municipal treasurer is responsible for updating the limit provided by the Ministry. The treasurer must determine if there is capacity within the municipality's ARL to undertake the planned borrowing. Schedule 81 of the FIR may be among the schedules of interest to the treasurer when updating the municipality's ARL.

If you require any further information, please contact the appropriate Municipal Services Office of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (list enclosed).

Yours truly,

Ruchi Parkash  
Director

Enclosures

**Ministry of  
Municipal Affairs  
and Housing**

Municipal Finance Policy Branch

777 Bay Street, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto ON M7A 2J3  
Email: MFPB@ontario.ca

**Ministère des Affaires  
municipales et du Logement**

Direction des politiques relatives  
aux finances municipales

777, rue Bay, 13<sup>e</sup> étage  
Toronto ON M7A 2J3  
Courriel : MFPB@ontario.ca



Le \_\_ février 2025

Bonjour,

J'ai le plaisir de vous faire parvenir un rapport indiquant la limite de remboursement annuelle (LRA) de votre municipalité pour 2025 en ce qui concerne la dette et les obligations financières à long terme. Le calcul de votre LRA pour 2025 est fondé sur un montant représentant 25 % des revenus autonomes que vous avez indiqués dans votre Rapport d'information financière (RIF) de 2023.

Les municipalités de l'Ontario doivent s'assurer de ne pas dépasser leur LRA sans l'approbation du Tribunal ontarien de l'aménagement du territoire. Lorsqu'une municipalité propose des travaux qui nécessiteraient un emprunt à long terme (ou d'autres obligations financières à long terme), il revient à la trésorière ou au trésorier de la municipalité de mettre à jour la limite indiquée par le ministère. La trésorière ou le trésorier doit déterminer si la LRA de la municipalité est suffisante pour aller de l'avant avec l'emprunt prévu. Elle ou il pourrait notamment prendre en considération l'annexe 81 du Rapport d'information financière lorsqu'il met à jour la LRA de la municipalité.

Si vous avez besoin de renseignements supplémentaires, veuillez communiquer avec le bureau des services aux municipalités concerné (voir la liste ci-jointe) du ministère des Affaires municipales et du Logement.

Veuillez agréer l'expression de mes meilleurs sentiments.

La directrice,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Ruchi Parkash".

Ruchi Parkash  
p. j.

# Annual Repayment Limit

---

## What is the Annual Repayment Limit?

The Annual Repayment Limit (ARL) may be generally summarized as the maximum amount that a municipality in Ontario can pay each year (without first obtaining approval from the Ontario Land Tribunal) in new principal and interest payments for its long-term debt and other long-term financial commitments.

For most municipalities (not including Toronto) the ARL is set at 25 percent of their annual own-source revenues (such as property taxes, user fees and investment income), less their annual existing long-term debt service costs and payments for other long-term financial obligations. Municipalities may only exceed their ARL with the prior approval of the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT).

For more information about the ARL, please see O. Reg. 403/02 (Debt and Financial Obligation Limits) on <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/020403>.

## Role of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing issues an updated ARL statement to municipalities once a year. The ARL statement is typically sent to each municipal treasurer and posted to the Financial Information Return (FIR) website near the beginning of the calendar year and is based on the most recent financial information submitted by the municipality in its FIR. Both the FIR and ARL are available on the Financial Information Return: Reports and Dashboards website at <https://efis.fma.csc.gov.on.ca/fir/index.php/en/reports-and-dashboards/>.

## How Does the Ministry Calculate the ARL?\*

The calculation of the ARL involves a number of steps, set out in the Debt and Financial Obligation Limits regulation. The steps can be generally summarized as follows: The Ministry first determines the municipality's annual own-source revenue from sources such as property taxes, user fees and investment income. The Ministry then calculates the amount that is 25 percent of the municipality's annual own-source revenue. Finally, the Ministry subtracts the municipality's annual existing debt service costs and payments for other long-term financial obligations to arrive at the ARL.

The Ministry calculates 25 percent of the municipality's annual own-source revenue:

$$\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{Municipal} \\ \text{Own-Source Revenue} \\ \text{(e.g., Property Tax, User Fees)} \\ \hline \end{array} \times 25\% = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 25\% \text{ of} \\ \text{Own-Source Revenue} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

The Ministry subtracts municipal debt and other financial obligations to determine the ARL:

$$\begin{array}{|c|} \hline 25\% \text{ of} \\ \text{Own-Source} \\ \text{Revenue} \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{Annual Payments for} \\ \text{Existing Debt and} \\ \text{Other Financial} \\ \text{Obligations} \\ \text{(Principal + Interest)} \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{Annual Repayment Limit} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

For details on specific municipalities, please see the Financial Information Return: Annual Repayment Limits at <https://efis.fma.csc.gov.on.ca/fir/index.php/en/reports-and-dashboards/annual-repayment-limits/>.

*\*For illustrative purposes only*

## Role of Municipalities

Municipalities in Ontario are responsible for ensuring that they do not exceed their ARL without approval from the OLT. When a municipality proposes long-term borrowing (or other long-term financial obligation), the municipal treasurer is responsible for updating the limit provided by the Ministry in accordance with the steps set out in the Debt and Financial Obligation Limits regulation. The treasurer must determine if there is capacity within the municipality's updated limit to undertake the planned borrowing or whether council must obtain approval of the OLT.

## Role of the Ontario Land Tribunal

Applications and appeals in relation to a range of matters are brought before the OLT. In cases where municipalities intend to authorize works that require borrowing or other long-term commitments that involve annual payments that would cause the municipality to exceed its updated ARL, they must first seek the approval of the OLT. Learn more about the Ontario Land Tribunal at <https://olt.gov.on.ca/>.

# Limite de remboursement annuelle

---

## Qu'est-ce que la limite de remboursement annuelle?

On définit généralement la limite de remboursement annuelle (LRA) comme étant le montant maximal de nouveaux paiements de capital et d'intérêts qu'une municipalité de l'Ontario peut effectuer (sans obtenir d'abord l'autorisation du Tribunal ontarien de l'aménagement du territoire) pour sa dette à long terme et ses autres obligations financières à long terme.

Pour la plupart des municipalités (mis à part Toronto), la LRA correspond à 25 % de leurs revenus autonomes annuels (comme l'impôt foncier, les frais d'utilisation et les revenus de placement), moins leurs frais annuels de service de la dette à long terme et leurs paiements actuels pour leurs autres obligations financières à long terme. Les municipalités peuvent dépasser la LRA uniquement avec l'autorisation du Tribunal ontarien de l'aménagement du territoire (TOAT).

Pour obtenir des précisions sur la LRA, veuillez consulter le Règlement de l'Ontario 403/02 sur les plafonds des dettes et des obligations financières à <https://www.ontario.ca/lois/reglement/020403>.

## Rôle du ministère des Affaires municipales et du Logement

Le ministère des Affaires municipales et du Logement transmet chaque année aux municipalités un état mis à jour de la LRA. Habituellement, le ministère le communique au début de l'année civile à chaque trésorier municipal et le met à disposition dans le site Web du Rapport d'information financière (RIF). Ce document reflète l'information financière la plus récente ayant été soumise par la municipalité dans son RIF. Le RIF et la LRA sont accessibles sur la page Rapport d'information financière – Rapports et tableaux de bord à <https://efis.fma.csc.gov.on.ca/fir/index.php/fr/rapports-et-tableaux-de-bord/>.

## Comment le ministère calcule-t-il la LRA?\*

Le calcul de la LRA comporte différentes étapes qui sont énoncées dans le règlement sur les plafonds des dettes et des obligations financières. En général, le ministère détermine d'abord les revenus autonomes annuels de la municipalité provenant de l'impôt foncier, des frais d'utilisation et des revenus de placement. Il calcule ensuite le montant correspondant à 25 % des revenus autonomes annuels de la municipalité. Enfin, le ministère soustrait de ce montant les frais de service annuels de la dette à long terme et les paiements pour les autres obligations financières à long terme de la municipalité afin d'obtenir la LRA.

**Le ministère calcule le montant correspondant à 25 % des revenus autonomes annuels de la municipalité :**

$$\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{Revenus municipaux} \\ \text{autonomes} \\ \text{(p. ex., impôt foncier, frais} \\ \text{d'utilisation)} \\ \hline \end{array} \times 25 \% = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 25 \% \text{ des} \\ \text{revenus autonomes} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

**Le ministère soustrait le montant correspondant à la dette municipale et aux autres obligations financières afin de déterminer la LRA :**

$$\begin{array}{|c|} \hline 25 \% \text{ des} \\ \text{revenus} \\ \text{autonomes} \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{Paielements annuels} \\ \text{pour la dette et les} \\ \text{autres obligations} \\ \text{financières} \\ \text{(capital + intérêts)} \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \text{Limite de remboursement} \\ \text{annuelle} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Pour des précisions sur des municipalités particulières, visitez le site Rapport d'information financière – Limites de remboursement annuelles à <https://efis.fma.csc.gov.on.ca/fir/index.php/fr/rapports-et-tableaux-de-bord/2021-limite-de-remboursement-annuelle/>.

*\*À titre indicatif seulement.*

## **Rôle des municipalités**

Les municipalités de l'Ontario doivent s'assurer de ne pas dépasser la LRA sans l'autorisation du TOAT. Lorsqu'une municipalité propose un emprunt à long terme (ou toute autre obligation financière à long terme), le trésorier municipal doit mettre à jour la limite établie par le ministère en suivant les étapes établies dans le règlement sur les plafonds des dettes et des obligations financières. Le trésorier municipal doit déterminer si la LRA mise à jour de la municipalité permet d'aller de l'avant avec l'emprunt prévu ou si le conseil doit obtenir l'autorisation du TOAT.

## **Rôle du Tribunal ontarien de l'aménagement du territoire**

Des demandes et des appels concernant différentes affaires sont portés devant le TOAT. Les municipalités qui souhaitent autoriser des travaux qui nécessiteront des emprunts ou d'autres engagements à long terme comportant des paiements annuels qui pourraient dépasser leur LRA doivent demander d'abord l'autorisation du TOAT. Pour en savoir davantage sur le Tribunal ontarien de l'aménagement du territoire, consultez <https://olt.gov.on.ca/fr/>.

## 2025 ANNUAL REPAYMENT LIMIT

(UNDER ONTARIO REGULATION 403 / 02)

**MMAH CODE:** 69612  
**MUNID:** 47098  
**MUNICIPALITY:** Head, Clara and Maria Tp  
**UPPER TIER:** Renfrew Co  
**REPAYMENT LIMIT:** \$ 201,729

### FOR ILLUSTRATION PURPOSES ONLY,

The additional long-term borrowing which a municipality could undertake over a 5-year, a 10-year, a 15-year and a 20-year period is shown.

If the municipalities could borrow at 5% or 7% annually, the annual repayment limits shown above would allow it to undertake additional long-term borrowing as follows:

5% Interest Rate			
(a)	20 years @ 5% p.a.	\$	2,513,989
(a)	15 years @ 5% p.a.	\$	2,093,878
(a)	10 years @ 5% p.a.	\$	1,557,698
(a)	05 years @ 5% p.a.	\$	873,381
7% Interest Rate			
(a)	20 years @ 7% p.a.	\$	2,137,120
(a)	15 years @ 7% p.a.	\$	1,837,330
(a)	10 years @ 7% p.a.	\$	1,416,860
(a)	05 years @ 7% p.a.	\$	827,129



# DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL DEBT REPAYMENT LIMIT

(UNDER ONTARIO REGULATION 403/02)

MUNICIPALITY:

Head, Clara and Maria Tp

MMAH CODE:

69612

## Debt Charges for the Current Year

		1
		\$
0210	Principal (SLC 74 3099 01)	0
0220	Interest (SLC 74 3099 02)	0
0299	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>
0610	Payments for Long Term Commitments and Liabilities financed from the consolidated statement of operations (SLC 42 6010 01)	0
9910	<b>Total Debt Charges</b>	<b>0</b>

## Amounts Recovered from Unconsolidated Entities

		1
		\$
1010	Electricity - Principal (SLC 74 3030 01)	0
1020	Electricity - Interest (SLC 74 3030 02)	0
1030	Gas - Principal (SLC 74 3040 01)	0
1040	Gas - Interest (SLC 74 3040 02)	0
1050	Telephone - Principal (SLC 74 3050 01)	0
1060	Telephone - Interest (SLC 74 3050 02)	0
1099	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>
1410	Debt Charges for Tile Drainage/Shoreline Assistance (SLC 74 3015 01 + SLC 74 3015 02)	0
1411	Provincial Grant funding for repayment of long term debt (SLC 74 3120 01 + SLC 74 3120 02)	0
1412	Lump sum (balloon) repayments of long term debt (SLC 74 3110 01 + SLC 74 3110 02)	0
1420	<b>Total Debt Charges to be Excluded</b>	<b>0</b>
9920	<b>Net Debt Charges</b>	<b>0</b>

		1
		\$
1610	Total Revenue (SLC 10 9910 01)	1,040,855
<b>Excluded Revenue Amounts</b>		
2010	Fees for Tile Drainage / Shoreline Assistance (SLC 12 1850 04)	0
2210	Ontario Grants, including Grants for Tangible Capital Assets (SLC 10 0699 01 + SLC 10 0810 01 + SLC10 0815 01)	196,819
2220	Canada Grants, including Grants for Tangible Capital Assets (SLC 10 0820 01 + SLC 10 0825 01)	13,824
2225	Deferred revenue earned (Provincial Gas Tax) (SLC 10 830 01)	0
2226	Deferred revenue earned (Canada Gas Tax) (SLC 10 831 01)	23,296
2230	Revenue from other municipalities including revenue for Tangible Capital Assets ( SLC 10 1098 01 + SLC 10 1099 01)	0
2240	Gain/Loss on sale of land & capital assets (SLC 10 1811 01)	0
2250	Deferred revenue earned (Development Charges) (SLC 10 1812 01)	0
2251	Deferred revenue earned (Recreation Land (The Planning Act)) (SLC 10 1813 01)	0
2256	Deferred revenue earned (Community Benefits) (SLC 10 1815 01)	0
2252	Donated Tangible Capital Assets (SLC 53 0610 01)	0
2253	Other Deferred revenue earned (SLC 10 1814 01)	0
2254	Increase / Decrease in Government Business Enterprise equity (SLC 10 1905 01)	0
2255	Other Revenue (SLC 10 1890 01 + SLC 10 1891 01 + SLC 10 1892 01 + SLC 10 1893 01 + SLC 10 1894 01 + SLC 10 1895 01 + SLC 10 1896 01 + SLC 10 1897 01 + SLC 10 1898 01)	0
2299	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>233,939</b>
2410	Fees and Revenue for Joint Local Boards for Homes for the Aged	0
2610	<b>Net Revenues</b>	<b>806,916</b>
2620	<b>25% of Net Revenues</b>	<b>201,729</b>
9930	<b>ESTIMATED ANNUAL REPAYMENT LIMIT</b>	<b>201,729</b>
	(25% of Net Revenues less Net Debt Charges)	

\* SLC denotes Schedule, Line Column.

**Ministry of  
Municipal Affairs  
and Housing**

Municipal Finance Policy Branch

777 Bay Street, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto ON M7A 2J3  
Email: MFPB@ontario.ca

**Ministère des  
Affaires municipales  
et du Logement**

Direction des politiques relatives aux  
finances municipales

777, rue Bay, 13<sup>e</sup> étage  
Toronto ON M7A 2J3  
Courriel: MFPB@ontario.ca



If you require any further assistance regarding your Annual Repayment Limit calculation, please contact your Senior Municipal Financial Advisor at your designated Municipal Service Office:

MSO Office	Telephone	Fax	Address
Central	1-800-668-0230 (416) 585-6226	(416) 585-6882	777 Bay Street, 16th Floor Toronto, Ontario M7A 2J3
Eastern	1-800-267-9438 (613) 545-2100	(613) 548-6822	8 Estate Lane, Rockwood House Kingston, Ontario K7M 9A8
Western	1-800-265-4736 (519) 873-4020		659 Exeter Road, Exeter Road Complex 2nd Floor London, Ontario N6E 1L3
North (Sudbury)	1-800-461-1193 (705) 564-0120		159 Cedar Street, Suite 401 Sudbury, Ontario P3E 6A5
North (Thunder Bay)	1-800-465-5027 (807) 475-1651		435 James Street South, Suite 223 Thunder Bay, Ontario P7E 6S7



# Renfrew County 55+ Summer Games

**REGISTRATION DEADLINE**

**2 WEEKS PRIOR TO EVENT**

Late registration will be accepted up to 10 days prior to the event if schedule permits.

First Name:			Last Name:		
Female ____	Male ____	Year of birth:	Email:		
Address:			City/Town:		
Postal Code:			Phone Number:		

Check all events you wish to enter and indicate the division you wish to participate when there is more than one option. For games that require partner, list your partner's name(s).

✓	Date	Events	Town	Time	Division
	May 5 <sup>th</sup>	Cribbage	Cobden	1:00 PM	Open Doubles Partner:
	May 8 <sup>th</sup>	8-Ball Pool	Cobden	1:00 PM	
	May 14 <sup>th</sup>	Darts – Men's Doubles	Deep River	10:00 AM	Partner:
	May 14 <sup>th</sup>	Darts – Women's Doubles	Deep River	10:00 AM	Partner:
	May 15 <sup>th</sup>	5 Pin Bowling	Renfrew	9:30 AM	<input type="checkbox"/> Singles <input type="checkbox"/> Teams Captain: Average:
	May 15 <sup>th</sup>	Cornhole	Chalk River	10:00 AM	Open Doubles Partner:
	May 21 <sup>st</sup>	Euchre	Chalk River	1:00 PM	Open Doubles Partner:
	May 21 <sup>st</sup>	Darts – Mixed Doubles	Deep River	10:00 AM	Partner
	May 21 <sup>st</sup>	Womens Pickleball (Skill 3.0-3.5) 55+ ____ 65+ ____ (Skill 3.5+) 55+ ____ 65+ ____	Deep River	9:00 AM	Partner:
	May 21 <sup>st</sup>	Mens Pickleball (Skill 3.0-3.5) 55+ ____ 65+ ____ (Skill 3.5+) 55+ ____ 65+ ____	Deep River	9:00 AM	Partner:
	May 22 <sup>nd</sup>	Mixed Pickleball (Skill 3.0-3.5) 55+ ____ 65+ ____ (Skill 3.5+) 55+ ____ 65+ ____	Deep River	9:00 AM	Partner:
	May 23 <sup>rd</sup>	Prediction Walking	Calabogie	10:00 AM	<input type="checkbox"/> 55+ (3K) <input type="checkbox"/> Men <input type="checkbox"/> 75+ (1.6K) <input type="checkbox"/> Women
	May 23 <sup>rd</sup>	Nordic Walk	Calabogie	1:00 PM	<input type="checkbox"/> 55+ (3K) <input type="checkbox"/> Men <input type="checkbox"/> 75+ (1.6K) <input type="checkbox"/> Women
	May 26 <sup>th</sup>	Prediction Cycling	Westmeath	10:00 AM	

	May 28 <sup>th</sup>	Bocce Ball	Deep River	9:00 AM	Open Doubles Partner:	
	May 28 <sup>th</sup>	Golf	Eganville	9:00 AM	<input type="checkbox"/> 55+ <input type="checkbox"/> 65+ <input type="checkbox"/> 75+	<input type="checkbox"/> Men <input type="checkbox"/> Women
	May 29 <sup>th</sup>	Lawn Bowling	Deep River	10:00 AM	Open Doubles Partner:	
	May 29 <sup>th</sup>	Bid Euchre	Pembroke	1:00 PM	Open Doubles Partner:	
	May 30 <sup>th</sup>	Contract Bridge	Pembroke	1:00 PM	Open Doubles Partner:	

Do you have difficulty climbing stairs? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Do you require wheelchair assistance? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
---	---

Emergency Contact	
First Name:	Last Name:
Relationship:	Phone Number:

The Ontario Senior Games Association (OSGA) has requested that participants register, sign the waiver form, and pay their membership fees online this year using the OSGA data base at <https://osga55plus.ca/>

This will enter you into the database.

If you are NOT registering on-line, please fill out this form, including the waiver form and submit the forms to the address below along your OSGA Fee plus event/game fees.

Fees		
OSGA Participant	\$15.00	
Event/Game	\$3.00 (each) x _____	
Golf <u>Extra</u> (includes cart)	\$50.00	
Bowling <u>Extra</u>	\$15.00	
Total:		

You must read and submit the registration and waiver forms. If you registered online then you would have completed the waiver forms and would not have to submit the waiver forms with the games form.

**Mail** Completed registration form with Cheques payable to Renfrew County 55+ Games to:

Val Hinsperger  
Box 449  
Eganville, ON K0J 1T0

Etransfer to:  
[Renfrewcounty55@gmail.com](mailto:Renfrewcounty55@gmail.com)

For more information contact Val Hinsperger  
[valhinsperger@gmail.com](mailto:valhinsperger@gmail.com)  
(613)402-3408 or (613)628-5577

**NO REFUNDS WILL BE ISSUED**

If you are driving to an event and are willing to provide a ride to someone, please check this box

☐



# **RENFREW COUNTY 55+ SUMMER GAMES 2025**

**MAY 5**

**CRIBBAGE - 1:00 P.M.**  
Cobden Legion - 43A Main Street

**MAY 8**

**8-BALL POOL - 1:00 P.M.**  
Cobden Legion - 43A Main Street

**MAY 14**

**DARTS-MENS/WOMENS DOUBLES - 10:00 A.M.**  
Deep River Legion - 50 Mcelligott Dr.

**MAY 15**

**BOWLING - 9:30 A.M.**  
Renfrew - 233 Raglan St. South

**MAY 15**

**CORNHOLE - 10:00 A.M.**  
Chalk River Lions Hall - 11 Kellett St.

**MAY 21**

**EUCHRE 1:00 P.M.**  
Chalk River Lions Hall - 11 Kellett St.

**MAY 21**

**DARTS - MIXED DOUBLES - 10:00 A.M.**  
Deep River Legion - 50 Mcelligott Dr.

**MAY 21**

**PICKLEBALL- MENS/WOMENS - 9:00 A.M.**  
Deep River Arena - 2 Club House Road

**MAY 22**

**PICKLEBALL - MIXED DOUBLES - 9:00 A.M.**  
Deep River Arena - 2 Club House Road

**MAY 23**

**PREDICTION WALKING - 10:00 A.M.**  
**NORDIC WALKING - 1:00 P.M.**  
Calabogie Community Hall

**MAY 26**

**PREDICTION CYCLING- 10:00 A.M.**  
Westmeath Recreation Centre - 119 Synton St.

**MAY 28**

**GOLF - 9:00 A.M.**  
Eganville - White Tail Golf Course

**MAY 28**

**BOCCEE BALL - 9:00 A.M.**  
Deep River, 17 Double Dip Rd  
Pat McAnulty Park

**MAY 29**

**BID EUCHRE - 1:00 P.M.**  
Pembroke Seniors Centre - 42 Renfrew St.

**MAY 29**

**LAWN BOWLING - 10:00 A.M.**  
Deep River - 14 Club House Road

**MAY 30**

**CONTRACT BRIDGE - 1:00 P.M.**  
Pembroke Seniors Centre - 42 Renfrew St.

## **FOR INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Georges Martin - [gsamartin@sympatico.ca](mailto:gsamartin@sympatico.ca)  
Val Hinsperger - [valhinsperger@gmail.com](mailto:valhinsperger@gmail.com)

## **COST PER PERSON:**

**OSGA PARTICIPANT = \$15.00**  
**EVENT FEE = \$3.00 EACH**  
**ADDITIONAL FEES:**  
**\$50 FOR GOLF**  
**\$15 FOR BOWLING**

## **REGISTRATION DEADLINE:**

**2 WEEKS PRIOR TO EACH EVENT**

## **FORMS AVAILABLE AT:**

→ <https://osga55plus.ca>  
→ Your Community Recreation Dept  
→ Your Senior Active Living Centre

**From:** [Melissa Ziebarth](#)  
**Subject:** Monitoring Food Affordability in Renfrew County and District, 2024  
**Date:** April 9, 2025 4:01:52 PM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[Food-Afford-RCDHU-2024 FINAL.png](#)

---

Good afternoon,

We would like to share with you information about food affordability monitoring in Renfrew County which may be relevant to your work or the work of your staff/organization.

Public Health units in Ontario are directed by the Ministry of Health to monitor food affordability, annually. This is achieved by conducting a survey of the average retail price of 61 grocery store food items using a tool called the [Nutritious Food Basket](#). Food costing was conducted in 9 grocery stores throughout Renfrew County in May 2024. Food costs were then combined with housing rental rates and compared to various income situations to determine the local affordability of food.

Attached, you will find the complimentary infographic and you can access the report posted on the Renfrew County and District Health Unit website in the Eating and Nutrition section under the Food Insecurity header:

<https://www.rcdhu.com/healthy-living/eating-and-nutrition/>

Please note the French translations of the report and infographic are underway. As appropriate, feel free to share this information with other individuals, staff and/or groups with whom you work.

Kind regards,  
Melissa

---



Melissa Ziebarth  
Executive Assistant, Corporate Services

Renfrew County and District Health Unit  
141 Lake Street  
Suite 100  
Pembroke, ON K8A 5L8  
Phone: 613-732-3629 ext. 796  
Fax: 613-735-3067

[www.rcdhu.com](http://www.rcdhu.com)

*"Optimal Health for All in Renfrew County and District"*



*The information in this e-mail is intended solely for the addressee(s) named and is confidential. Any other distribution, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please reply by e-mail to the sender and delete or destroy all copies of this message.*





# FOOD AFFORDABILITY

*in Renfrew County and District (RCD), 2024*



**1 IN 4 HOUSEHOLDS**

are experiencing food insecurity in RCD

**1 IN 3 CHILDREN**

live in a food-insecure household in Ontario



How Much is **Left Over** for Necessities After Paying for Monthly **Rent** and **Food**?

One Person,  
Ontario Works:

**- \$355**



One person,  
Ontario Disability  
Support Program:

**\$164**

Family of Four,  
Ontario Works:

**\$356**



**Food insecurity** means **inadequate access to food** due to a lack of money. Food insecurity is **caused by poverty**.



## SIGNIFICANT **HEALTH IMPACTS**



- mental illness
- asthma
- high blood pressure
- diabetes
- depression

## THE **SOLUTION?**

**Policies that target poverty**, which guarantee adequate income to pay for the basic necessities of living.





**From:** [EMO Community Grants \(TBS\)](#)  
**To:** [EMO Community Grants \(TBS\)](#)  
**Subject:** Community Emergency Preparedness Grant / Subvention pour les projets communautaires de protection civile  
**Date:** March 28, 2025 1:54:43 PM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Dear Community Emergency Preparedness Grant applicant:

Thank you for applying to the 2024-25 Community Emergency Preparedness Grant (CEPG). We sincerely appreciate the effort you put into submitting your application.

This was an extremely competitive year, with a large number of applicants. Unfortunately, we regret to inform you that your application was not selected to receive funding.

As the one window for provincial emergency management, EMO remains available to support your community to be better prepared for any emergency.

To support communities, EMO offers a variety of resources such as training, exercise opportunities and public education materials that are available at no cost. Should this be of interest to your community please let us know and we will connect you with your local EMO Field officer to provide further information.

Thank you once again for your application and your ongoing leadership to ensure that people and communities across Ontario are safe, practiced and prepared before, during and after emergencies.

Nina Diaz

Director, Emergency Management Preparedness, Programs and Planning

Emergency Management Ontario | Treasury Board Secretariat

[nina.diaz@ontario.ca](mailto:nina.diaz@ontario.ca)

To learn more about how emergencies are managed in Ontario, visit Emergency Management Ontario's [webpage](#).



---

Madame, Monsieur, candidat(e) à la Subvention pour les projets communautaires de protection civile :

Nous vous remercions d'avoir fait une demande dans le cadre du Programme de subventions pour les projets communautaires de protection civile (Programme de SPCPC) de 2024-2025. Nous vous remercions sincèrement pour les efforts que vous avez déployés pour soumettre votre candidature.

Cette année a été extrêmement compétitive, avec un grand nombre de candidats. Nous avons le regret de vous informer que votre demande n'a pas été retenue pour bénéficier d'un financement.

En tant que guichet unique pour la gestion des situations d'urgence de la province, Gestion des situations d'urgence Ontario (GSUO) reste disponible pour aider votre collectivité à mieux se préparer à toute situation d'urgence.

Afin de soutenir les collectivités, GUSO offre tout à fait gratuitement une variété de ressources telles comme des formations, des possibilités d'exercice et du matériel de sensibilisation du public. Si ces ressources peuvent intéresser votre collectivité, n'hésitez pas à nous en faire part et nous vous mettrons en contact avec votre agent régional de GSUO qui vous fournira de plus amples informations.

Nous vous remercions une fois de plus d'avoir soumis votre candidature et pour le leadership dont vous faites preuve afin de garantir que les personnes et les collectivités de tout l'Ontario sont en sécurité, entraînées et préparées avant, pendant et après les situations d'urgence.

**Nina Diaz**

Directrice, Protection civile, programmes et planification relatifs à la gestion des situations d'urgence

Gestion des situations d'urgence Ontario | Secrétariat du Conseil du Trésor

[nina.diaz@ontario.ca](mailto:nina.diaz@ontario.ca)

Pour en savoir plus sur la façon dont les situations d'urgence sont gérées en Ontario, visitez la [page Web](#) de Gestion des situations d'urgence Ontario.

**Ontario** 

**From:** [Bruce Howarth](#)  
**To:** [Renfrew County Municipalities](#)  
**Cc:** [Jason Davis](#)  
**Subject:** Private property rights and municipal official plans / zoning by-laws  
**Date:** March 26, 2025 2:05:05 PM  
**Attachments:** [OLT-24-000926-FEB-20-2025.pdf](#)

---

Good afternoon:

At today's County Development and Property committee meeting the following was presented as information. We are sharing with you as the issue of private property rights has been a common discussion topic throughout many local municipalities. Attached is a decision from the Ontario Land Tribunal case (OLT-24-000926) involving an appeal against the County of Renfrew's refusal to grant consent to sever a 0.3355-hectare residential lot from an 8.055-hectare property in McNab/Braeside. The key issue was the County's requirement for hydrogeological and noise impact assessments to ensure compliance with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2024 and the County's Official Plan (OP).

The Applicant argued that the County's demand for studies infringed on his private property rights, suggesting that Official Plans only apply to public lands owned by municipalities. It was asserted that municipalities should not impose requirements on privately owned lands unless the municipality owns the property. Additionally, it was claimed that the County failed to provide legal justification for requiring these assessments.

The Tribunal rejected this argument, emphasizing that the Planning Act mandates municipalities to ensure conformity with Official Plans when evaluating applications, regardless of land ownership. The Tribunal dismissed the appeal, concluding that the Applicant's refusal to provide the necessary studies demonstrated non-compliance with the PPS 2024 and the County's OP. This decision reaffirms that municipalities have the authority to apply Official Plan policies to private lands when considering development proposals.

This decision provides a strong validation for Renfrew County and local municipalities that studies like hydrogeological, archaeological, stormwater management, and noise assessments are required as part of development applications. By affirming that OPs apply to private lands, the Ontario Land Tribunal established that municipalities have the legal authority and responsibility to enforce policies aimed at protecting public health, safety, and the environment. Paragraph 28 of the decision the tribunal states "it is well understood through legislation and case law that municipalities have the ability to regulate lands within their jurisdiction through the application of their OPs"

Moving forward, municipalities can reference this decision when dealing with applicants and property owners who argue that OP or Zoning requirements do not apply to private property. It reinforces that the Planning Act requires municipalities to ensure compliance with Official Plans and Zoning By-laws regardless of land ownership status. This ruling effectively counters arguments claiming municipalities overstep their authority by passing Official Plans or Zoning By-laws (or amendments thereto), requesting studies, or imposing conditions on private property.

Additionally, the decision highlights the importance of providing adequate justification and studies to support development proposals. It emphasizes that refusal to comply with requirements is a valid

ground for denying applications. Ultimately, the decision reinforces the ability of Renfrew County and local municipalities to uphold their Official Plans' policies and maintain orderly, responsible growth aligned with provincial and municipal standards.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely

Bruce Howarth, MCIP, RPP  
County of Renfrew, Manager of Planning Services  
613-735-7288 x467

The information in this email and any accompanying document(s) are intended solely for the addressee(s) named, and is confidential. Any other distribution, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please reply by email to the sender and delete or destroy all copies of this message with all attached document(s).

Ce courriel peut faire état d'information privilégiée ou confidentielle destinée à une personne ou à une entité nommée dans ce message. Dans l'éventualité où le lecteur de ce message n'est pas le récipiendaire visé ou l'agent responsable de le faire suivre au récipiendaire visé, vous êtes par la présente avisé que toute revue, diffusion, distribution ou reproduction de cette communication est interdite. Si cette communication a été reçue par erreur, veuillez nous en aviser par réponse de courriel et supprimer le message original et tous documents ci-joints.

**Ontario Land Tribunal**  
Tribunal ontarien de l'aménagement  
du territoire



**ISSUE DATE:** February 20, 2025

**CASE NO(S).:**

OLT-24-000926

**PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER** subsection 53(19) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended

Applicant and Appellant:

Lou Laventure

Subject:

Consent

Description:

To permit a consent for conveyance of a residential lot

Reference Number:

B34/24

Property Address:

42 Milton Stewart Ave, Pt Lot 18, Con 8

Municipality/UT:

Township of McNab/Braeside/County of Renfrew

OLT Case No.:

OLT-24-000926

OLT Lead Case No.:

OLT-24-000926

OLT Case Name:

Laventure v. Renfrew (County)

**Heard:**

November 28, 2024 by Video Hearing  
Closing Submissions December 13, 2024

**Parties**

Lou Laventure

County of Renfrew

**Counsel/Representative\***

Self-Represented\*

Emma Blanchard

## **DECISION DELIVERED BY YASNA FAGHANI AND ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL**

---

[Link to Final Order](#)

### **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

[1] The matter before the Tribunal is an Appeal pursuant to s.53(19) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13 (“Act”) by Lou Laventure, (“Applicant”) against the decision by the County of Renfrew (“County”) refusing the application for provisional consent (“Application”).

[2] The property, municipally known as 42 Milton Stewart Avenue, Lot 18 Concession 8, Township of McNabb/ Braeside (“Subject Property”), is an 8.055 hectares (“ha”) parcel of land on a rural property. The Applicant seeks to sever and convey a vacant residential building lot from the large rural property.

[3] The proposal includes the severance of 0.3355 ha for the residential lot, and the remainder would result in an area of 7.75 ha containing a shed. The proposed residential lot is zoned Residential One – Exception 48 [R1-E48]. There is no issue regarding minimum area and frontage requirements under the Zoning By-law.

[4] The Application was filed with the County, and according to the Consent Planning Report dated July 29, 2024 (“Consent Planning Report”), the Application was denied because the proposal was not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (“PPS”) and did not conform to the County’s Official Plan (“OP”) since satisfactory noise impact and hydrogeological assessments had not been submitted. The County denied the Application.

[5] On August 28, 2024, the Applicant filed an Appeal to this Tribunal. No issues were raised regarding the Administrative Notice of this Hearing dated October 15, 2024, and marked as **Exhibit 1**.

[6] The Tribunal did not receive any Party or Participant status requests in advance of the hearing, and no one appeared at the hearing requesting Party or Participant status.

[7] For the reasons that follow, the Tribunal finds that the Appeal should be dismissed, and the Application refused.

## HEARING

[8] The Document Book of the County was marked as **Exhibit 2**.

[9] The Supplementary Book of Documents provided by the County was marked as **Exhibit 3**. Of note, this Supplementary Book of Documents consolidated all of the single documents that the Applicant had previously filed. The Applicant agreed to mark the Supplementary Book of Documents as an exhibit and referenced the tabs within when presenting his case.

[10] The Witness Statement of Bruce Howarth, dated November 22, 2024, was marked as **Exhibit 4**.

[11] The Tribunal heard uncontroverted *viva voce* evidence from Mr. Howarth, who was qualified as an expert in the area of land use planning. His *Curriculum Vitae* and Acknowledgement of Expert Duty are part of **Exhibit 4**.

## LEGISLATIVE TEST

[12] The Tribunal is a creature of statute. This means it is bound to follow the rules under its specific Legislation, which in this case is the *Planning Act*. The Tribunal observes two purposes of the Act under s. 1.1, which are to provide for a land use

planning system led by provincial policy (b) and to recognize the decision-making authority and accountability of municipal councils and planning (f).

[13] Next, the Tribunal must have regard to the matters of provincial interests as set out in s. 2 of the Act and to the decision, if any, of the County and the information considered in making the decision, as required by s. 2.1(1) of the Act.

[14] In addition, the Tribunal is mandated by s. 3(5) of the Act to render decisions that are consistent with the PPS and conform or not conflict with the provincial plans that are in effect on the date of the decision.

[15] As of October 20, 2024, the PPS, 2020 ("PPS 2020") and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe are no longer in effect, and the PPS, 2024 ("PPS 2024") is in effect. In this respect, the Tribunal must be satisfied that the Application is consistent with the PPS 2024.

[16] Of significance for this hearing is the provision of the Act relating to consent applications. Where a Plan of Subdivision is not required, s. 53(12) of the Act directs the reader to s. 51(24), which sets out a number of criteria to be considered but not limited to the following:

- a. The effect of development on the matters of provincial interest;
- b. Whether the proposed plan is premature or in the public interest;
- c. Whether the plan conforms to the Official Plan and adjacent plans of subdivision;
- d. The suitability of the land for the purposes for which it is to be subdivided;
- e. The number, width, location and proposed grades and elevations of highways;
- f. The dimensions and shapes of the proposed lots;
- i. The adequacy of utilities and municipal services; and
- j. The adequacy of school sites;



## ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

### *Matters of Provincial Interest under s. 2 of the Act*

[17] Mr. Howarth opined that the matters of provincial interest which are most relevant to this case are s. 2(f) the adequate provisions and efficient use of communication, transportation, sewage and water services and waste management systems; s. 2(h) the orderly development of safe and healthy communities; and s. 2(o) the protection of public health and safety. Mr. Howarth testified that in rural communities, a big component of the orderly development of safe and healthy communities is to ensure safe drinking water where municipal sewage is not available and the use of wells and septic systems are required. Further, the protection of public health and safety means there needs to be consideration for the need for housing while providing it in a way that has regard for proper sewage, water, and noise.

[18] According to Mr. Howarth, the County requires a hydrogeological study and noise impact study, which will be discussed in detail further below. He stated that the absence of these studies will result in an inability to assess whether the proposed residential development will permit the provision of adequate sewage and water systems on the proposed residential lot and whether potential risks to public health will be created. Mr. Howarth found that the Applicant's refusal to provide said studies does not support the orderly development of healthy and safe communities.

[19] The Applicant provided no evidence to demonstrate how the refusal to submit a hydrogeological assessment and noise impact study will have regard to matters of provincial interest. In fact, in his Reply Submissions, the Applicant cites s. 1.1 of the Act and its purpose, which has been paraphrased as:

The promotion of economic development within the policy, to provide land use planning led by provincial policy and to integrate matters of provincial interest in the provincial and municipal planning decisions.

[20] The Applicant then proceeds to define “economic development services” under the *Municipal Act*. The Tribunal did not find the reference to the *Municipal Act* helpful nor is satisfied that the Applicant has demonstrated his refusal to provide the hydrogeological and noise impact study with regard to matters of provincial interest as required by s. 2 of the *Act*.

***Provincial Policy Statement, 2024***

[21] Mr. Howarth testified that s. 3.6.4 of the PPS 2024 requires those who intend to develop land, including “creation of new lot,” which rely on wells and septic systems, to undertake a study to identify relevant site conditions and to demonstrate that these systems can be installed and operated over the long term with no “negative impacts”. Negative impacts are explicitly defined as:

Risks to human health and safety and degradation to the quality and quantity of water, sensitive surface water features and sensitive ground water features, and their related hydrologic functions, due to single, multiple or successive development.

[22] Furthermore, the definition clearly states that:

Negative impacts should be assessed through environmental studies, including hydrogeological or water quality impact assessments, in accordance with provincial standards” [emphasis added].

[23] Mr. Howarth explained that each successive development requires a new assessment to determine how adding new development will impact the quality and quantity of water, both for the new development itself as well as for existing development in the area. Of note, Mr. Howarth explained that the PPS 2020 underwent significant updates, which included updates to the criteria to review when considering new development when it relates to the source of potable water, the long-term impacts, and ensuring no “negative impacts”. According to Mr. Howarth, new residential development is supported and encouraged so long as it is done in a manner that is safe for current residents and future residents. Mr. Howarth testified that these significant

updates in the PPS 2020 have been carried forward in the PPS 2024, as discussed above.

[24] Regarding the noise impact study, s. 3.5 of the PPS 2024 requires land used for residential purposes be planned to avoid, minimize, or mitigate “adverse impacts” from noise while ensuring long-term operation and economic viability of “major facilities,” including transportation corridors, such as Highway 417. According to Mr. Howarth, given the proximity of the proposed development to Highway 417 (within 250 metres (“m”), the PPS 2024 requires a noise study in accordance with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks’ Environmental Noise Guidelines (“Environmental Noise Guideline”) in order to identify, minimize, and/or mitigate potential adverse impacts arising out of noise.

[25] The Applicant argued that he has a long-standing history of development in the area without the requirement of a hydrogeological assessment or a noise impact study. He referenced two development projects he was involved with, one in 2002 and one in 2010, where there was no need for hydrogeological assessment or noise impact study. He directed the Tribunal’s attention to letters of approval granted by the County for said development projects. Additionally, he submitted that the County has failed, despite his repeated requests, to: “provide [him] with legal legislation compelling a private landowner to provide third-party studies” while contending that municipalities lack the legal authority to “regulate property that does not belong to them or property that has not been dedicated to them.”

[26] The Tribunal is satisfied that the requirement for a hydrogeological assessment and noise impact study is consistent with the PPS 2024. The Act is the legislation that compels owners to provide third-party studies to produce said reports because the Act requires consistency with the PPS 2024. The PPS 2024 is clear and unambiguous in its requirement for the hydrogeological assessment and noise impact study.

[27] The Applicant confirmed that he is not a qualified hydrogeologist or acoustic engineer. The Tribunal agrees with counsel for the County that personal experience alone cannot confirm that the proposed severance will have no “negative impacts” as defined in the PPS 2024. This includes impacts from successive development, quantifying noise impacts, or recommending noise mitigation measures. The Tribunal is satisfied that these are matters that the Province and the County now require qualified professionals to review and address for the protection of public health and safety in order to provide for orderly development.

[28] With respect to municipalities lacking authority to regulate lands that don’t belong to it, the Applicant referenced several sections in the Act and the *Municipal Act* that are not helpful nor useful for the Tribunal. It is well understood through legislation and case law that municipalities have the ability to regulate lands within their jurisdiction through the application of their OPs.

[29] Furthermore, the legislation governing the 2002 and 2010 developments are not before this Tribunal, nor do they apply to this Application. However, the Tribunal notes that legislation, as well as provincial policies, are not etched in stone and are updated from time to time to address the needs of communities as they evolve. Understanding this makes it imperative for Parties to ensure they are applying the most up-to-date legislation and policies to their Applications in order for their proposals to meet the consistency criteria.

### ***Official Plan***

[30] Section 51(24) of the Act mandates that an approval authority have regard for whether a proposed consent conforms to the applicable OP. Mr. Howarth testified that in 2021, the County adopted significant amendments to the OP in order to achieve consistency with the PPS 2020, including the introduction of express requirements for hydrogeological assessments and noise studies.

[31] According to Mr. Howarth, while the OP permits the severance of rural lands and the creation of new lots served by wells and septic systems, this is only permitted in accordance with s. 2.2(12) of the OP. Section 2.2(12)(f)(i) states that a hydrogeological evaluation “should be undertaken when the proposed severed lot size is less than 1 ha (2.5 acres).” Mr. Howarth opined that since the proposed residential lot is 3355 square metres (0.3355 ha), a hydrogeological assessment prepared by a qualified professional is required to demonstrate a potable source of water and the suitability of the site to accommodate an additional septic system.

[32] In addition, s. 2.2(15) of the OP states, “a noise impact study is required if sensitive development located within 250 m of Highway 17” to ensure the impact of noise levels is acceptable as prescribed by the Environmental Noise Guideline. Mr. Howarth found that since the proposed Residential Lot is approximately 60 m from Highway 17, a noise study prepared in accordance with the Environmental Noise Guideline is required. In sum, Mr. Howarth opined that conformity with the OP requires the Applicant to submit the required studies.

[33] The Applicant argued that “OPs are not statutes and should not be construed as such.” He disagreed that the OP, including the requirement for the development of new residential lots in rural areas, applies to the proposed severance. He stated that the OP is “inconsistent and does not compel [him] to do the studies.” Moreover, he argued that:

“These studies come at significant cost and do not demonstrate any better suitability of subject property for proposal than the historical facts and experience I relied upon when I put forth this proposal. This interferes with progress in building more homes faster at a time when there is a housing crisis in this Province.”

[34] The Tribunal finds that ss.53(12) and 51(24) of the Act explicitly mandates that the County “shall have regard” to whether the proposed application “conforms to the Official Plan.” This means that the application of the OP to lands within a municipality’s jurisdiction, whether the lands are owned by it or not, is essential. In this case, there is no dispute that the Subject Property is within the County, is less than 1 ha or is within

250 metres from Highway 17. As such, the OP is clear in its requirement for a hydrogeological assessment and noise impact study under these conditions.

[35] In addition, the Tribunal finds that the Applicant's history of developing in the area (64 Milton Stewart Avenue in 2002), where consent was granted under a different OP coupled with the well records for the said property, are not helpful in advancing his position. Similar to legislation, OPs are not etched in stone and evolve with time. As Mr. Howarth testified, the current OP underwent significant updates so that consistency with the PPS 2020 would be achieved, including the addition of s. 2.2(12)(f), which was not in the previous OP. Undoubtedly, in 2002 and 2010, the County considered relevant policies under the OP at that time when rendering its decision. With that said, the 2002 and 2010 OPs are not before this Tribunal and are not relevant to this Application.

[36] Of note, debates with respect to proposed amendments and/or requirements under an OP, for example, the cost of studies and interfering with the progress of building more homes faster, do have a specific route. Those arguments can be advanced at an OP Amendment ("OPA") Appeal. An OPA application is not before this Tribunal. The current OP before the Tribunal mandates the need for the studies mentioned above. The Applicant has failed to prove that refusing to provide a hydrogeological assessment and noise impact study conforms to the OP.

### ***New Argument Advanced in Closing Submissions***

[37] In the Applicant's closing submissions, for the first time and at no point during the Hearing, he stated, "*Even if severance proposal does somehow contravene current official plan in force, would then be fair to grandfather this proposal as legal non-conforming.*" The County responded that there is no evidence to this effect, and it is simply inaccurate.

[38] The Tribunal states that closing submissions are intended to summarize each Party's position once the evidence is complete. It is not a place to advance new

arguments, especially those that require elaboration or evidence. As such, absent evidence in support of this position, the Tribunal will not consider this question.

## **FINDINGS**

[27] The Tribunal finds that based on the filed materials and submission of the Parties, the Application does not represent good land use planning and does not meet the legislative tests. The Application is not consistent with policy directives of the PPS 2024 and does not conform to the policy intent of the County OP. The Tribunal is not satisfied that the criteria listed in s. 51(24) are met, and the proposed development has regard for matters of provincial interest as listed in s. 2 of the Act. As such, the Application is denied.

## **COSTS**

[28] Both Parties sought costs in their closing submissions. Adequate materials were not provided to consider whether costs should be granted or how the requested cost amount was derived. The Tribunal acknowledges that there is a high threshold to meet in order for costs to be awarded. However, based upon a review of Rule 23 of the Tribunal's *Rules of Practice and Procedure* and the conduct observed at the hearing, the Tribunal is not immediately persuaded that the conduct rises to the exceptionally high threshold. Nevertheless, the Parties remain free to seek relief in the form of costs by way of a formal motion in accordance with the Rules as directed at the hearing.

**ORDER**

[29] **THE TRIBUNAL ORDERS THAT** the Appeal is dismissed, and the provisional consent is not to be given.

*“Yasna Faghani”*

YASNA FAGHANI  
MEMBER

**Ontario Land Tribunal**

Website: [www.olt.gov.on.ca](http://www.olt.gov.on.ca) Telephone: 416-212-6349 Toll Free: 1-866-448-2248

The Conservation Review Board, the Environmental Review Tribunal, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal and the Mining and Lands Tribunal are amalgamated and continued as the Ontario Land Tribunal (“Tribunal”). Any reference to the preceding tribunals or the former Ontario Municipal Board is deemed to be a reference to the Tribunal.



**From:** [Tracy Saar](#)  
**To:** [HCM Clerk-Treasurer](#)  
**Subject:** Yellow Ribbon Campaign  
**Date:** April 4, 2025 9:55:28 AM  
**Attachments:** [image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[oledata.mso](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[Yellow Ribbon Campaign Postcard.pdf](#)



## Renfrew County and District Health Unit

*"Optimal Health for All in Renfrew County and District"*

April 4, 2025

Dear Community Partner:

The Renfrew County and District Health Unit would like to take this opportunity to partner with you on our 3<sup>rd</sup> annual **Yellow Ribbon** campaign. It is scheduled to take place in the spring. It is a public awareness campaign to lower the incidence of animal bites, hospital visits, and the unnecessary use of costly rabies post-exposure treatment.

I have attached the campaign material for you to review. It is a postcard with key messages along with the inclusion of a yellow ribbon. They are meant to be displayed on a counter accessible to the public. Initially I can offer you 25 postcards with ribbons and an additional 50 postcards. You can request more postcards and yellow ribbons while supplies last. Please respond to this letter and make any additional resource requests through [environmentalhealth@rcdhu.com](mailto:environmentalhealth@rcdhu.com).

This campaign cannot be successful without your business partnership whose prime motivation is animal population health and safety, care for animals and support for their owners to make their pets' lives more comfortable and fulfilling.

Please respond to this correspondence by **April 11** if you are interested in supporting this campaign.

Sincerely,

David Tantalo

Tracy Saar  
Senior Administrative Assistant, Health Protection

Renfrew County and District Health Unit  
141 Lake Street  
Suite 100  
Pembroke, ON  
K8A 5L8




Telephone: 613-732-3629 ext. 367  
Fax: 613-735-3067  
[www.rcdhu.com](http://www.rcdhu.com)

*"Optimal Health for All in Renfrew County and District"*



The information in this e-mail is intended solely for the addressee(s) named, and is confidential. Any other distribution, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please reply by e-mail to the sender and delete or destroy all copies of this message.

## Yellow Ribbon Campaign

-  Some animals need space (while in training, post-op, aggressive, nervous, old, or unwell).
-  If your pet needs space, **tie yellow ribbon to its collar or leash.**
-  If you see yellow, give the animal space. Do not pet without asking.

**CAUTION...  
I MIGHT BITE!**






Renfrew County and District Health Unit  
"Optimal Health for All in Renfrew County and District"

#GiveMeSpace  
www.rcdhu.com

Adapted with the permission of Haliburton, Kawartha, Pine Ridge District Health Unit

## Yellow Ribbon Campaign

-  Some animals need space (while in training, post-op, aggressive, nervous, old, or unwell).
-  If your pet needs space, **tie yellow ribbon to its collar or leash.**
-  If you see yellow, give the animal space. Do not pet without asking.

**CAUTION...  
I MIGHT BITE!**






Renfrew County and District Health Unit  
"Optimal Health for All in Renfrew County and District"

#GiveMeSpace  
www.rcdhu.com

Adapted with the permission of Haliburton, Kawartha, Pine Ridge District Health Unit

## Yellow Ribbon Campaign

-  Some animals need space (while in training, post-op, aggressive, nervous, old, or unwell).
-  If your pet needs space, **tie yellow ribbon to its collar or leash.**
-  If you see yellow, give the animal space. Do not pet without asking.

**CAUTION...  
I MIGHT BITE!**






Renfrew County and District Health Unit  
"Optimal Health for All in Renfrew County and District"

#GiveMeSpace  
www.rcdhu.com

Adapted with the permission of Haliburton, Kawartha, Pine Ridge District Health Unit

## Yellow Ribbon Campaign

-  Some animals need space (while in training, post-op, aggressive, nervous, old, or unwell).
-  If your pet needs space, **tie yellow ribbon to its collar or leash.**
-  If you see yellow, give the animal space. Do not pet without asking.

**CAUTION...  
I MIGHT BITE!**



Renfrew County and District Health Unit  
"Optimal Health for All in Renfrew County and District"

#GiveMeSpace  
www.rcdhu.com

Adapted with the permission of Haliburton, Kawartha, Pine Ridge District Health Unit