



MINUTES

GREENHOUSE POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE

NOVEMBER 05, 2019 @ 7:00 P.M.

Kingsville Council Chambers, 2021 Division Road North, Kingsville

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor N. Santos called the Meeting to order at 7:00 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
George Dekker
Dave Hunt
Henry Denotter

MEMBERS OF ADMINISTRATION:

Manager of Planning Services – Robert Brown
Administration – Stephanie Coussens

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, AUGUST 27TH, 2019.

Moved by Fred Driedger seconded by Kimberly DeYoung that the Greenhouse Policy Review Committee Meeting Minutes dated August 27th, 2019 be adopted.

CARRIED

D. NEW AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Discussion of any outstanding items from last meeting.

No comments or concerns.

2. Review of feedback and comments from October 15, 2019 presentation.

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

Under 3.1 Agriculture - under proposed policy ii)

Question: Can we have someone from the committee explain why you feel the greenhouses should be concentrated within the area of south of Road 5 East and east of Division Road North?

M. Pare - centerlaized location, the greenhouses are already there.

K. Deyong – bike lanes, connectivity to greenhouse properties.

F. Driedger, Kingsville should have a vision of what they want the future to look like. We are encouraging the Road 5 Division Rd N because of services. Sanitary can be serviced with large groups of greenhouses together.

Land up to the 4th and 5th have good soil, for good crops, why would you take away

Solid type and climatic conditions. Agricultural zoned land there is no restriction to what can be grown.

Why would you not move them away from sensitive areas such as schools.

N. Santos explained that the land has been agriculture, regardless of a green house or cash crop.

K. DeYong, cannabis is a whole different topic.

J. Taylor, majority of greenhouse growth projection (Independent Electricity System Operator - IESO) is vegetable.

3. Receive any further comment from the public.

Official Plan Changes

2.8 Site Suitability

Prior to the approval of any development or amendments to this Plan and/or the Towns' Zoning By-law, Council shall be satisfied that:

- ✓ a given development has demonstrated that all necessary services are available to adequately accommodate the proposal.
- ✓ 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 encourage 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.

Definitions

Sensitive Land Use (for the purpose of greenhouse development and supplementary to Section 3.10.28) is considered any non-accessory or off-site residential use, natural heritage feature, as defined in Provincial Policy Statement, institutional use, park land or active recreational facilities.

K. Deyong - increases the setbacks,

R. Brown - keep in mind locating a greenhouse next to a cash crop farm, do you think the cash crop owner thinks his land is sensitive land use?

R. Brown - This will be going to the County and then the province.

The Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) definition, covers every aspect of interaction.

H. Denotter - best practice management. Farmers talk to farmers when they need to. It is volunteer of each farmers that want to

J. Rivard - Why would we not want to follow the MECP definitions?

R. Brown - we are dealing with greenhouses only. MECP is referring to everything.

N. Santos - general terms

R. Brown - 2015 board hearing, about a definition that was very detailed. It caused nothing but grief. Examples "including but not limited to"

Supplementary to our existing

This is about greenhouses,

G. Dekker - is the sensitive Land use ONLY for greenhouse. Anything other than a greenhouse would go back to the original.

Narrowing to greenhouse by not having examples, or is it widening?

Zoning By-law, amendment are specific to greenhouses

K. DeYong - Official Plan is our defense.

Water line size, Hydro amp size, road conditions.

Agricultural members on the committee are not opposed to leaving the sensitive Land Use as R. Brown has provided.

Adverse effect if very personal,

3.10.28 Sensitive Land Use

4. Discussion of any proposed changes.

The goal of establishing the greenhouse policy review committee was not to development policy to prohibit greenhouse development. Its purpose was to review and update current policy recognizing that the industry has changed and grown since the original policy was put in place. This version will not be the last revision.

Greenhouses are considered and supported by the Ministry of Agriculture at both the provincial and federal level as an agricultural use. Regardless of whether there is agreement on this fact policies developed by the Town have to be consistent with this direction. Classification of greenhouses as industrial is unlikely to be supported.

Establishing a greenhouse (industrial park) is equally unlikely as it would require a coordinated effort on behalf of several different groups.

One of the key items that I believe has led us to the point we are at today is a lack of education, understanding, misinformation and speculation and everyone is to blame for this. One of the suggestion that came up during the discussion was development of a 'Did you know' about greenhouses.

- 1) There is and continues to be explosive growth in the greenhouse industry. In this area as a whole I would agree. In Kingsville I would not agree with that statement. In Kingsville greenhouse development has grown by approx. 5% each year in the last 5 years or more. Much of the growth has been expansion on existing sites that were approved several years or more ago. There is one about one new, green field development each year.
- 2) Greenhouse development is pushing on the Town limits. Not true. There has been no new greenhouse development within 500 m or more of the Town limit in the last 15 years or more. Residential development on the other hand has pushed closer to the agricultural area (greenhouses) significantly in the last 15 years. (Lake front)
- 3) Greenhouse development is owned and controlled by big faceless corporations that don't care about the Town and its residents. Not true. The majority of greenhouses in Kingsville are and continue to be family owned operations. They may be large corporations, not unlike many cash crop operations, but they are family owned. Most of these people live in Kingsville.
- 4) Fear of expansion – While it may be understood this is really unfounded as Kingsville does have limitation on expansion because of limits to service delivery. I have about one to two inquires a month about greenhouse development on property in Kingsville.

Many of these are outside the concentration area suggested by the Committee. Most of these sites cannot support development as there is a lack of water.

- 5) Cannabis Concern – cannabis production is a separate issue and even it has two different sources of concern. Part 1 versus Part 2.

5. Adoption of suggested changes; if any

Moved by Henry Denotter seconded by Justine Taylor.

CARRIED

6. Conclusion of the Committee.

October 15th meeting – Mr. Driedger, residents concerned about greenhouse development. Are we doing enough to make the residents feel like we have their backs? The rural character wants to be saved. There should be some general statement stating the Rural is to be maintained.

R. Brown, “Did you know...”

We had several meetings and open houses yet no one came to voice their opinion before it went to council.

Email committee agenda's.

E. NEXT MEETING DATE

Manager of Planning Services, Mr. Robert Brown will send an email.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Dave, seconded by Justine there being no other items scheduled, the meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

CARRIED

CHAIRPERSON, N. SANTOS

SECRETARY-TREASURER, R. BROWN