



MINUTES

GREENHOUSE POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE

AUGUST 27, 2019 @ 6:30 P.M.

Kingsville Council Chambers, 2021 Division Road North, Kingsville

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor N. Santos called the Meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with the following persons in attendance:

MEMBERS OF GREENHOUSE POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Mayor Nelson Santos
Councillor Kimberly DeYong
Mike Burns
Fred Driedger
Margaret Pare
Dr. Justine Taylor

MEMBERS OF ADMINISTRATION:

Manager of Planning Services – Robert Brown
Administration – Stephanie Coussens

Absent: George Dekker; Dave Hunt; Henry Denotter

B. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

Chairperson, Nelson Santos, reminded Committee members to disclose any interest they may have prior to each agenda item being discussed.

C. ADOPTION OF GREENHOUSE POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES DATED MONDAY, JULY 15TH, 2019.

Moved by Kimberly DeYoung seconded by Mike Burns that the Greenhouse Policy Review Committee Meeting Minutes dated July 15th, 2019 be adopted.

CARRIED

D. DISCUSSION / QUESTION & ANSWER FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS (OUTSTANDING ITEMS)

1. Discussion of any outstanding items from last meeting.

No comments or concerns.

2. Review of feedback and comments from August 21 open house.

Manager of Planning Services, Robert Brown discussed the presentation and feedback from the Public Open House.

Amenity space for the greenhouse, a split opinion before and against.

Side yard setback in relation to smaller farms, long narrow parcels.

Not a lot of negative feedback from the public.

Cannabis questions came up but Robert noted that this was not part of this review.

3. Discussion of any final policy changes prior to Committee approval.

Official Plan Changes

Section 1.5.4 – Forecasted Agricultural Demand (*deleted and replace with*)

'Agriculture and related development will remain the primary economic activity of the Town. The main agricultural uses in Kingsville are field crops and greenhouse farming

(primarily vegetable production and limited flower and plant greenhouses). Secondary agricultural uses include mushroom production, raising of livestock and the recent introduction of commercial cannabis for medical and recreational use.'

Growth in the greenhouse sector has remained consistent from year to year. Availability and cost of services will continue to be the key factors in future growth.

Section 2.8 – Site Suitability

- ✓ Development shall be required to locate in areas of the Town with existing service capacity for hydro, natural gas and municipal water.
- ✓ Development with access to sanitary sewer service shall be required to connect and demonstrate adequate unreserved capacity in the service area. Development in close proximity to sanitary sewer service shall be encouraged to connect, where feasible, and where unreserved capacity is available.
- ✓ Development shall demonstrate appropriate, safe access to the local and County road network capable of supporting traffic generated by the proposed development.
- ✓ Development shall provide on-site storm water quantity and quality management and demonstrate no negative impact to approved drainage outlet(s).
- ✓ Development shall be encouraged to utilize low impact storm water management systems.
- ✓ Development with limited frontage shall be required to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Town how the subject site can be accessed without impact to abutting sensitive land uses. Minimum lot frontage requirements are more specifically outlined in the implementing Zoning By-law.
- ✓ Development located to the rear of existing sensitive land uses shall be required to demonstrate a higher standard of separation and buffering through the site plan approval process.
- ✓ Development shall be oriented as to maximize buffering between it and sensitive land uses to minimize or mitigate adverse impacts

Mr. R. Brown spoke more about what Adverse Impact means. Adverse impact can be very subjective, are we going to require that if there is a perceived adverse impact that the objection be qualified? For example a land owner could do everything reasonable to minimize or mitigate and still have a neighbor claim adverse impact. This point still requires further discussion.

Mr. Fred Driedger spoke regarding JC Fresh as being a good example, move the bunkhouse to an area that was a fair distance from the neighbouring homes. Dates of March on the JC Fresh site plan, the neighbours had one week to respond, how can the public put forth comment in that short of time?

Mr. R. Brown, explained that he sees several site plans before there is a public draft set. Also site plan is not a public process, we are following a delegation process that we need to follow, we have a "hick-up" in the process of allowing the public to speak at a Council Meeting.

Councillor DeYong can see the benefit of giving developers a guideline to help impact or not. Dr. Justine Taylor, agrees minimize or mitigate, not eliminate.

3.1 Agriculture

Goals

Item d) *be deleted or clarified by replacing with the County wording:*

'to ensure the conservation, preservation and enhancement of the rural character of the Town as a cultural resource'

OPA #3 – Medical Marijuana Regulations are updated by:

Replacing any reference to MMAR, MMPR, or ACMPR with Cannabis Act

Revising the policy on replacing, retrofit or use of existing agriculture structures with:

- i) New purpose built facilities will be encouraged as the first option, any retrofit or use of existing agricultural buildings or structures must demonstrate suitability.

Any reference to “medical marihuana grow and production facilities’ is replaced with “cannabis production and processing facilities.”

Policies

Item b) *is revised as follows:*

Greenhouse farming and associated support facilities such as packing, shipping, co-generation and on-site labour housing are permitted in the ‘Agriculture’ designation subject to the following:

- i. Greenhouse development shall be subject to the Site Suitability criteria of Section 2.8 of the Plan;
- ii. Greenhouse development will be encouraged to locate in close proximity to existing greenhouse development more specifically south of Road 5 E and east of Division Rd. N. Greenhouse development not located with this area shall be required to provide justification of compliance with Section 2.8;
- iii. Greenhouse development shall be subject to site plan control;
- iv. Greenhouse development shall demonstrate that it is providing sufficient on-site labour housing for the crop(s) being grown. Labour for a given greenhouse development should be provided wholly on the same property. Notwithstanding labour may be housed off-site subject to demonstration of safe and appropriate private transportation between locations;
- v. On-site farm housing shall be required to maintain a rural residential character within the agricultural area. Consideration shall be given to the design, placement, landscaping, separation from the main permitted uses(s) and the provision of *and shall encourage* outdoor amenity space as defined in the Zoning By-law;

Added a definition – eliminated in the zoning by-law. More to encourage. On a case by case.

Regarding *On Site Amenity Space* Mr. Driedger asked where the 40sq meter amenity space came from. Mr. R. Brown, explained that he looked at soccer pitch sizes, town houses, park spaces, etc. He found that 50 acres 80% coverage, what makes sense on that lot, without impacting the site driveway, parking, etc.

Dr. Taylor noted that other municipalities may pick up this policy, and this is not the philosophy, an orchard would not be able to satisfy this condition. Other stake holders would be affected indirectly by this. Unintended consequences.

Mr. Driedger, feels that migrant workers would be better to be introduced to the public; better integrated. Kingsville isn’t very well represented as a place for the immigrant workers to go. Mr. Driedger feels that a number isn’t what is needed, best practice is for the number of workers on the farm. Compare it to a residency at a University.

Dr. Taylor, pointed out that private or on farm green space doesn’t help to integrate the workers into the community.

Councillor DeYong spoke about feeling the comfort of home, going to socialize in the town through restaurants, shopping, etc. Migrant workers don’t really have a place to go, similar to teenagers. This is a Kingsville solution to a Kingsville problem. If other municipalities take our policy that is up to them to make sure it works for them.

Dr. Taylor cultural practice needs to be considered. We can’t segregate, Latin culture likes to go downtown and mix and mingle with the public.

Mr. Driedger, made reference to Drew Kringle, author of an AMAFRA document. Mr. Driedger asked what ‘Rural Character’ meant to Mr. Kringle. He didn’t have a definite answer. Kingsville and Leamington have a unique situation. Progressive. We need to encourage Greenspace amenity. Orientation of the greenhouse, to provide a better place for greenspace.

- vi. The use of existing single detached dwellings for housing of on-site labour is discouraged. Only legally converted dwellings, subject to Building, Fire and Health Unit inspection will be considered subject to item b) iii) and iv);
- vii. Greenhouse development shall be encouraged to provide linkages to existing and future active transportation corridors including CWATS and the ERCA Greenway.

Zoning Standards

Section 4.16

- a) **Landscaped Buffer/Separation – minimum 5 m wide abutting the lot line(s) of a sensitive land use**
Establishes minimum on-site buffer that does not currently exist... 33 feet, resident lot line, not the residential house. The buffer area is on the property of the greenhouse.
- b) **Bicycle Racks shall be provided for all housed on-site workers and located to the rear of housing facility or appropriately screened from view.....orientation could help to screen the bicycle racks.**
- c) **Main Driveway Access – 10 m from an abutting sensitive land use, secondary access locations shall be as determined in consultation with the Town and County.**
- d) **Loading Area – 100 m from the nearest residential dwelling, subject to screening, noise and light abatement during site plan approval**
- e) **Housed on-site worker outdoor amenity space – 40 sq. m per housed worker to a maximum of 0.4 ha per 20 ha or lot area. – ELIMINATED from the Zoning**

Definitions

- ✓ **Outdoor Amenity Space – is considered any green space capable of accommodating recreational space for items such as sports fields, walking paths or picnic areas.**

Zoning Standards

- ✓ **Lot Frontage Notwithstanding Section 7.1 c) ii) – 60 m or as shown on an approved site plan demonstrating adequate setbacks and buffering from abutting sensitive land uses but at no time less than 30 m (minimum)**
Mr. Brown - this was added because of smaller farm concern.
- ✓ **Front Yard setback – Notwithstanding Section 7.1 c) iv) the minimum setback requirement shall be 20 m, minimum**
Mr. Brown - Original wording seemed to be unclear so this just increases the setback by 5 m from the front property line only.
- ✓ **Interior Side Yard – 3 m or equal to the height of the side wall of the greenhouse, whichever is greater; when abutting a sensitive land use 15 m minimum on all sides that abut sensitive land and and 3 m on the other side**
Mr. Brown - re-word to include situation where sensitive land use is on both side of the property.

Mr. R. Brown noted that this should help to address the concern raised related to smaller farms or cases where no abutting sensitive land use is of concern

Dr. Taylor asked what happens with expansions and the side lot lines. R. Brown explained you can continue with your existing set back, it is in the by-law to allow for addition / expansion, within reason. Current regulations must be met (MOE).

Going forward:

All proposed regulations would not be applicable to a greenhouse development with existing site plan approval and may not necessarily apply in whole to expansions on some smaller lots.

33 feet, resident lot line, not the residential house. The buffer area is on the property of the greenhouse.

4. Determine final approval meeting date for Committee.

Final Approval, recommendation to council. R. Brown to draft the amendment to the Official Plan. A final draft to be sent / circulated to the committee via email. OP to the county.

Motion to forward to Council for consideration, Dr. Taylor and seconded by Kim DeYong.

Site plans over 2 million dollars are presented to council. Any amendments to previously registered site plans are done in the administrative level.

Manager of Planning Services, R. Brown to update the wording in the notices of Public Meetings to encourage public input sooner than later. Delegations must be submitted to the Town Clerk by noon on the Wednesday prior to the meeting of Council.

5. Posting of Committee adopted policy.

Posted to the website.

6. Council presentation

Zoning Amendment and Official Plan Amendment to implement policy changes.
• October 15, 2019

E. NEXT MEETING DATE

Manager of Planning Services, Mr. Robert Brown suggested a tentative date of Tuesday, September 10th, 2019 at 6:30PM

Margaret Pare thanked administration for allowing her to be a part of this review. Ms. Pare felt that she was able to contribute and attain very important and progressive information.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Margaret Pare, seconded by Fred Driedger there being no other items scheduled, the meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

CARRIED



CHAIRPERSON, N. SANTOS



SECRETARY-TREASURER, R. BROWN