

**SUDBURY EAST PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
Thursday, September 14, 2023 at 5:30 p.m.
Virtual Meeting/ Municipal Office of French River**

MEMEBERS PRESENT

VIRTUALLY: Dave Froats, Rachelle Poirier, Carol Lemmon, Mary Bradbury, Renee Germain

MEMBERS PRESENT: Josh Lachance, Bob Prevost, Paul Branconnier, Dave Viau, Steve Olsen

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OFFICIALS PRESENT: Matthew Dumont, Director of Planning/Secretary-Treasurer
Nancy Roy, Administrative Assistant

PUBLIC PRESENT

VIRTUALLY: James Dorland

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Chairperson Prevost called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Resolution: 23-066

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda for the Sudbury East Planning Board regular meeting of September 14, 2023 be adopted as distributed.

MOVED BY: Josh Lachance

SECONDED BY: Dave Viau

Carried.

3. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

No disclosures of Pecuniary Interest.

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

a) Sudbury East Planning Board – Regular meeting of July 13th, 2023 be adopted as distributed.

Resolution: 23-067

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the minutes of the Sudbury East Planning Board's regular meeting of July 13, 2023 be adopted as distributed.

MOVED BY: Rachelle Poirier
SECONDED BY: Paul Branconnier

Carried

5. **PRESENTATION/DELEGATION**
6. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

- **Caisse Alliance- Banking Update**

Resolution: 23-069

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Sudbury East Planning Board members have received the Caisse Alliance confirmation email regarding the redeemable transferred funds.

MOVED BY: Dave Froats
SECONDED BY: Steve Olsen
Carried.

7. **CONSENT APPLICATIONS**

The chair advised that a Public Hearing will be held before the Planning Board makes a decision on a Consent Application. Also that the analysis and discussion serves two purposes: first, to present to the Planning Board and the public the details and background to a proposed Consent Application; and second, to receive comments from the public and agencies before a Planning Board decision is made.

The Director of Planning Advised that Notice of the Public Hearing was posted in the Planning Board office and sent by First Class Mail to assessed owners within 60.0 metres of the property subject to the Consent Applications and to those persons and agencies likely to have an interest in the applications. The Notice was sent on August 28, 2023 and August 30, 2023, being over fourteen (14) days prior to this evenings meeting (B/36-39/23/MW – Donald Tarini, Shelly Tarini and Simon Dyon, B/40-41/23/MW- Michel and Nancy Asselin, B/42/23/SC – Daren Woito). Included with the Notice was an explanation of the purpose and effect of the proposed Consent and a key map showing the location of the property. The circulation was provided in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, R.S.O., Chapter P.13.

- a) **B/36-39/23/MW – Donald and Shelly Tarini, and Simon Dyon**

The Director of Planning summarized the application.

The lands are located south of Nepewassi Lake Road and west of Long Road. The Village of Markstay is approximately three kilometers north of the subject property. Adjacent, to the west of the subject property, is an existing licensed aggregate site, license number 20477, which is a Class B license for a pit. Also, the existing licensed aggregate site consists of primary aggregate and mineral

aggregate resources. The license was approved through the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry (MNDMNR).

The Sudbury East Planning Board has received applications to create Four Rural lots in the Township of Hagar. Each of the proposed lots will have an approximate area ranging between 5.63 to 10.70 hectares, and frontages ranging from 114.90 to 128.30 metres on Long Road. The proposed severed Lot 1 through to Lot 4 are presently vacant. The proposed retained lot is to have an approximate area of 36.34 hectares with a lot frontage of approximately 456.60 metres on Nepewassi Lake Road and contains a single storey dwelling and an existing pit (License #20477).

With respect to the OP

In this case, proposed severed lots and retained parcel meet the requirements of the 'Rural (RU)' Zoning. Adequate access for the proposed lots (Lot 1 through to Lot 4) to be severed is to be from Long Road which is maintained year-round by the Municipality of Markstay-Warren and the Director of Operations confirmed that there would be no issue with having a driveway along the proposed severance, however, before a driveway can be installed, the owners need to have a driveway permit filled in before the driveway is installed and the owners may have to install a culvert as well. With respect to servicing, the agent has provided the required documentation to demonstrate reasonable expectation of potable water and capacity for hauled sewage. With respect to Sudbury District Health Unit (site suitability for a septic system), comments were received (May 4th, 2022) stating that it appears that the proposed severed and retained lots are capable of development for installation of a septic tank and leaching bed system. A pit was identified adjacent to the northeast corner of the property as a development constraint. Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) is not applicable in this instance, as there are no farming-related activities in the area. The application, as proposed, generally conforms to the intent and the policies of the Official Plan.

One potential development constraint was identified on Schedule D of the Official Plan. A licensed pit is adjacent to the subject property to the immediate northwest. Section 3.8.2 of the Official Plan echoes the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement pertaining to the protection of aggregate resources for continued extraction or future use.

To address the policies of the PPS and Official Plan, it is the professional opinion of staff that the proposed severances will not impact the development of new, or expansion of existing aggregate resources in the area or have adverse effects within the proposed area because technical comments were received from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry stating that "For the four proposed lots on the east side of the existing property (Proposed Lots 3-6), there are no aggregate concerns and the severances would be supported. Based site observations of the property and the potential influence areas which are deemed under three different classifications, it is anticipated that the proposed severance, specifically the location of the proposed single family home, will not have a negative impact on the potential future development of the aggregate resource.

As per Section 3.3.2.19, Private Roads are roads that are not owned or maintained by the province or a municipality or maintained by a local roads board that service two or more properties in separate ownership. Development, i.e. lot creation on private roads is discouraged. However, there are many instances in the Planning Area where there are existing lots of record on private roads or that are accessed over crown land or via easement over private land.

In this case, retained parcel of land has legal road frontage on Long Road which is a public road that is assumed and maintained year-round by the Municipality of Markstay-Warren. The transfer of Long Road will result in a small piece of land (the remainder) on the east of Long Road where an existing driveway provides access to PIN 73484-0086. Therefore, legal access to that portion of the retained lands requires an access easement and will form part of a condition of consent for the above noted file, and is to be registered on title, and the reference plan of survey submitted to the Planning Board.

With respect to zoning

Current Zoning: **Rural (RU)**

Proposed Zoning: Same as above.

The 'Rural (RU)' Zone requires a minimum lot area of 5.0 hectares and a minimum lot frontage of 100.0 metres. Proposed severed Lot 1 through to Lot 4 and the retained parcel of land will continue to meet those requirements.

The proposal involves no new land use or change in land use.

Agency Comments:

Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk/Treasurer: No concerns at this time.

Chief Building Official: No concerns at this time.

Public Works Superintendent: No concerns at this time.

Fire Department: No issues with application.

Ministry of Natural resources and Forestry:

Aggregates (Part of proposal not supported)

- For the four proposed lots on the east side of the existing property (Proposed Lots 3-6), there are no aggregate concerns and the severances would be supported.
- For the two proposed lots in the North West corner of the existing property (Proposed Lots 1 & 2), they fall within approximately 170 metres of the adjacent aggregate pit (Lic. #20477). According to the D-6 Guidelines for Compatibility between Industrial Facilities, this places the two lots within the 300 metre potential influence area for industrial land uses of the existing pit, which would be deemed a Class II Industrial Facility. As Lot 1 is directly adjacent to the existing pit, it also falls within the 70 metre recommended minimum separation distance from the Class II Industrial Facility.
- The D-6 Guidelines indicate that "no sensitive land uses shall be permitted within the actual or potential influence areas of Class I, II, or III industrial land uses, without evidence to substantiate the absence of a problem".

- When studies are needed to identify problems and mitigative measures, see Section 4.6 of the D-6 Guidelines. It is recommended that any pertinent parts of Section 4 of the D-6 Guidelines be followed if the minimum separation distances are not adhered to.

Bio

- A creek is mapped within the subject land. MNRF does not have specific fish information for this creek, but it is likely that fish are present.
- MNRF does not have significant wildlife habitat mapped at the site. However, creation of more than three lots is a trigger for identification and evaluation of significant wildlife habitat. The process in the *Natural Heritage Reference Manual* should be followed to identify and evaluate significant wildlife habitat.
- NHIC records show an observation of Canada Warbler, a special concern species. I note this because habitat for species of special concern is considered significant. Although we do not have habitat mapped, the species' presence should be a consideration in the identification and evaluation of significant wildlife habitat.
- Because Endangered and Threatened Species are no longer within MNRF's mandate, our office cannot comment on their presence. Please contact SAROntario@ontario.ca for advice pertaining to Endangered or Threatened Species.

Member of the Public: concerns with accessibility and the road.

No other comments were received of the date this report was written.

The application for consent is consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement, conforms with the intent of the Official Plan for the Sudbury East Planning Area and the Zoning By-law for the Municipality of Markstay-Warren, therefore can be supported from planning perspective.

Agent Dorland raised the question regarding the easement which is part of the conditions. The Director of Planning advised that it was his job to look out of the best interest of the municipality which is why the condition was put in place.

Member Viau asked if the new lots would have the proper set backs for the adjacent pit and the Planning assured him yes.

Member Lemmon questioned why there was nothing in the comments regarding building and the Canada Warbler. The Direct of Planning explained things have changed in MECP and that it is no longer required.

Resolution: 23-069

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Consent Application B/36-39/23/MW submitted by Donald and Shelly Tarini and Simon Dyon be recommended for approval as per the report prepared by the Director of Planning.

MOVED BY: Dave Viau

SECONDED BY: Paul Branconnier

Carried

The Chair advised that there is a 20 day appeal period during which time any person or public body may appeal the decision or any condition imposed by the Planning Board by filing an appeal with the Secretary-Treasurer as prescribed by the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act.

The applicants have two years to fulfill the conditions of this provisional consent or the approval will lapse.

b) B/40-41/23/MW – Michel and Nancy Asselin

The Director of Planning summarized the application.

The lands are located south of Nepewassi Lake Road and Cardinal Road, north of Snowden Road and west of Long Road. The Village of Markstay is approximately Three kilometers north from the subject property. Adjacent to the northwest corner of the subject property is an existing licensed aggregate site, license number 20477, which is a Class B license for a pit. Also, the existing licensed aggregate site consists of primary aggregate and mineral aggregate resources. The license was approved through the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Naturel resources and Forestry (MNDMNRF).

The Sudbury East Planning Board has received an application for consent which proposes to create two rural lots on Snodden Road in the Municipality of Markstay-Warren. Lot A is to be approximately 10.3 hectares in area with a road frontage of 128.01 metres and is presently vacant. Lot B is to be approximately 10.3 hectares in area with a road frontage of 128.01 metres and is presently vacant. The proposed lot to be retained is to be approximately 35.78 hectares in area with a road frontage of 652.27 metres on Long Road and 658.65 metres on Snodden Road and contains a single-family home and detached garage (as per MPAC records).

History:

On February 9th, 2023, the Planning Board conditionally approved file B/01/23/MW. The intent of the consent application was to create one rural lot on Long Road in the Municipality of Markstay-Warren. The proposed lot to be severed was to be approximately 8.36 hectares in area with a road frontage of 152.40 metres and was presently vacant. The proposed lot to be retained was to be approximately 56.39 hectares in area with a road frontage of 652.27 metres on Long Road and 804.67 metres on Snodden Road and contains a single-family home and detached garage (as per MPAC records).

With respect to the OP:

In this case, proposed severed lot and retained parcel meet the requirements of the 'Rural (RU)' Zoning. Adequate access for the proposed lot to be severed is to be from Long Road which is maintained year-round by the Municipality of Markstay-Warren and the Director of Operations confirmed that there would be no issue with having a driveway along the proposed severance. A driveway and culvert permits will have to follow – May 16th, 2023. With respect to servicing, the agent has provided the required documentation to demonstrate reasonable expectation of potable water and capacity for hauled sewage. With respect to Sudbury District Health Unit (site suitability

for a septic system), comments were received (May 16th, 2023 – site inspection on the Site) stating that it appears that the proposed severed and retained lots are capable of development for installation of a septic tank and leaching bed system. A pit was identified adjacent to the northeast corner of the subject property as a development constraint. Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) is not applicable in this instance, as there are no farming related activities in the area. The application, as proposed, generally conforms to the intent and the policies of the Official Plan.

This proposed severance will not impact the development of new, or expansion of existing aggregate resources in the area or have adverse effects within the proposed area because the location of the proposed single-family home is approximately 819 metres from the potential influence area for industrial land uses. The Ministries D-6 Guideline, section 4.1.1 and 4.1.3 identify potential influence areas and the above noted proposal would be deemed a Class III (within 1000 metres) which is the furthest setback between a Class I (70 metres), Class II (300 metres) and a Class III (1000 metres). Based on site observations of the property and the potential influence areas which are deemed under three different classifications, it is anticipated that the proposed severance, specifically the location of the proposed single-family home, will not have a negative impact on the potential future development of the aggregate resource.

With respect to zoning:

Current Zoning: **Rural (RU)**

Proposed Zoning: Same as above.

The 'Rural (RU)' Zone requires a minimum lot area of 5.0 hectares and a minimum lot frontage of 100.0 metres. Proposed severed Lot A and Lot B and the retained parcel of land will continue to meet those requirements.

The proposal involves no new land use or change in land use.

Agency Comments:

Hydro One: no comments or concerns.

Bell Canada: no comments or concerns for this application.

Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk/Treasurer: no concerns at this time.

Chief Building Official: no concerns at this time.

Public Works Superintendent: email from May 16th, 2023 – no concerns at this time.

Fire Department: Fire service has no issues with application.

Ministry of Environment, Conservation, and Parks: no requirements under ESA to undergo a species at risk site assessment for lot severance.

MECP's D-Series Guidelines appear to provide relevant technical advice on potential influence areas for aggregate sites, please contact MECP directly about the D-Series Guidelines. The D-6 Guideline, section 1.2.4 mentions pits and quarries: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/d-6-compatibility-between-industrial-facilities>

No other comments were received of the date this report was written.

The application for consent is consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement, conforms with the intent of the Official Plan for the Sudbury East Planning Area and the Zoning By-law for the Municipality of Markstay-Warren, therefore can be supported from planning perspective.

Member Poirier questions if the first lot created (B/01/23/MW) was able to commence building. The Director of Planning stated that the first lot has not completed the severance process so no building permit should be issued at this point. The Director of Planning also stated that the CBO for the Municipality of Markstay-Warren did contact the office regarding the same question and is now aware that the severance is not complete.

Member Bradbury questioned if the owners were in the wrong by doing land scaping work. The Director of Planning stated he is not fully aware of what exactly is being done on the property so he can not comment.

Resolution: 23-070

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Consent Application B/40-41/23/MW submitted by Michel and Nancy Asselin be recommended for approval as per the report prepared by the Director of Planning.

MOVED BY: Rachelle Poirier

SECONDED BY: Josh Lachance

Carried

c) B/42/23/SC – Yvette Woito

The Director of Planning summarized the application.

The Sudbury East Planning Board has received application for consent which proposes to create one rural lot from the subject lands having road frontage on Pothier Road in the Municipality of St. Charles; the proposed lot will have a lot area of 5.58 hectares and a lot frontage of 122.0 metres on Pothier Road while the proposed retained lot will have a lot area of 26.39 hectares and a lot frontage of 280.3 metres on Pothier Road.

With respect to the OP:

In this case, proposed severed lot and retained parcel meet the requirements of the 'Rural (RU)' Zoning. Adequate access for the proposed lot to be severed is to be from Pothier Road which is maintained year-round by the Municipality of St. Charles. In addition, the Public Works Lead Hand conducted a pre-liminary inspection of the Site and determined that a driveway will be permissible on the proposed severed lot with the restriction of providing adequate sight lines due to the hill. With respect to servicing, the agent has provided the required documentation to demonstrate

reasonable expectation of potable water and capacity for hauled sewage. With respect to Sudbury District Health Unit (site suitability for a septic system), comments were received (May 12th, 2023 – site inspection on the Site) stating that it appears that the proposed severed and retained lots are capable of development for installation of a septic tank and leaching bed system. The application, as proposed, generally conforms to the intent and the policies of the Official Plan.

With respect to zoning.

Current Zoning: **Rural (RU)**

Proposed Zoning: Same as above.

The Rural (RU) Zone requires a minimum lot area of 5.0 hectares and a minimum lot frontage of 100.0 metres. The proposed Lot 1 conforms to the minimum requirements of the RU Zone and is intended to be used for residential uses as permitted by the zone.

The proposal involves no new land use or change in land use.

Agency Comments:

Clerk/Treasurer for Municipality of St. Charles: property subject to municipal drains and may require reapportionment. Please advise applicants to contact the Clerks to request Section 65 reapportionment as there are fees associated to this process. Road portion to be transferred to the municipality at applicants cost.

Chief Building Official: no concerns.

Public Works Superintendent: Any driveway for severed lot will be subject to specific placement requirements due to visibility.

Fire Department: no concerns.

Sudbury District Health Unit: the proposed severed and retained lots are capable of development for installation of a septic tank and leaching bed system.

Hydro One: no comments or concerns at this time.

Bell Canada: no concerns.

No other comments were received as of the date this report was written.

The application for consent is consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement, conforms with the intent of the Official Plan for the Sudbury East Planning Area and the Zoning By-law for the Municipality of Markstay-Warren, therefore can be supported from planning perspective.

There were no comments from the board.

Resolution: 23-071

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Consent Application B/42/23/SC submitted by Daren Woito be recommended for approval as per the report prepared by the Director of Planning.

MOVED BY: Josh Lachance

SECONDED BY: Steve Olsen

Carried

8. NEW BUSINESS**a) Staff and Board Members Traveling Expenses**

It has been eleven years since the mileage rate had been adjusted accordingly to reflect accurately CRA's reasonable allowance rates which is based on 90% of the current CRA limits per the province of Ontario. The Director of Planning recommends adjusting a reasonable per kilometer allowance, as per Canadian Revenue Agency (CRA) regulations, every fiscal year (start of January) to Board members and staff. For 2023, staff recommends 62 cents per km.

Chair Prevost asked the question, why do we calculate the amount on %90 rather than %100. The Director of Planning state that when you go on the CRA website the categorize it by the amount of kilometers traveled.

Resolution: 23-072

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the mileage rate for Board Members and Staff be adjusted accordingly to reflect accurately CRA's reasonable allowance rates which is based on %90 of the current CRA limits per the province of Ontario.

MOVED BY: Dave Viau

SECONDED BY: Rachelle Poirier

Carried

9. NOTICES OF MOTION RECEIVED BY THE SECRETARY-TREASURER PRIOR TO THE CLOSING OF THE MEETING**a) Motion #1**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT WHEREAS the ability to make sound financial decisions mandates that those making these decisions need the opportunity to undertake their own study of the matter at hand, AND WHEREAS this study can take some time to properly be undertaken, NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT,

All matters pertaining to financial issues, other than regular disbursements made during regular operations of the SEPB, need to be clearly explained in written form and have any supporting material sent to members of the board at least 25 days in advance of the vote.

MOVED BY: Paul Branconnier

SECONDED BY: Josh Lachance

Chair Prevost states that he thinks the 25 days time frame is unreasonable.

Member Olsen questions if this is particularly for specific items. Member Branconnier states yes just for any of major change or major expenses that are not in the regular budget, example rental changes.

Chair Prevost explains that board members have ample time with 7-10 days to ask any questions needed.

Member Bradbury states that if need be an item can always be deferred. Member Lachance agrees with that process.

The Director of Planning explains how the process went with the previously signed rental agreement and stated that that was an unplanned situation that was out of our control.

Administrative assistant states that the procedural by-law indicates that the agendas be sent out 7-10.

The Director of Planning suggests that any changes in the by law should legally result in a Procedural By Law over view and update.

Member Olsen apologizes on behalf of the Municipality of Markstay-Warren, Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the lack of response from the CAO during the Rental agreement negotiations.

Member Lemmon questions why can it not be sent separate. Chair Prevost states that all the information is part of the agenda and it is not part of the process to send things in different parts.

Member Olsen requested a recorded vote. Member Bradbury asks for clarification on what the Motion is requesting. Chair Prevost rereads the motion.

A recorded vote was taken.

Defeated

b) Motion #2

WHEREAS sound financial planning is important for the continuation of a stable SEPB,
AND WHEREAS SEPB needs to maintain a functional cash flow,
AND WHEREAS about 77% to 90% of expenses are fixed costs and can easily be predicted,
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOVED THAT,

- the operating reserve is set at \$60, 000.00 to be adjusted every January, payments will be made (by or to) supporting municipalities to correct any surplus or shortfalls in the operating reserve, and
- also in January, an initial payment equaling 50% of last year's budget will be made by supporting municipalities, and

- a second payment will be made in August, after audit, to complete payment as per the current year's budget to be calculated as (Current year budgeted municipal contribution - 50% of previous years contribution already made in January)

MOVED BY: Dave Froats

SECONDED BY: Mary Bradbury

Chair Prevost reads section 12(4) of the Planning Act - the Planning Board shall notify each municipality within the planning area, for which the Board was established, that the estimates have been approved as provided for in Section 12(3), and that the total approved estimates and the amount thereof chargeable to it, are now due. Prevost also explains that payment can not be received before budget is approved.

Member Branconnier states that the pre payment in January is not the full payment. Also stated that he would like to take the planning act section 12 to the municipality of St. Charles lawyer for review.

Administrative Assistant, Nancy Roy stated section of 12(3) of the Planning Act - the municipal apportionment is not binding until approved by the councils of municipalities representing more than one half (½) of the population of the planning area for which the Board was established. She also stated that the Planning Board can request any funds until this process is completed.

Member Branconnier states he would still like to verify the Planning act section 12 and asks that this motion #2 be deferred.

Resolution 23-073

DEFERRRED

C) Motion #3

WHEREAS applicants approaching the board have a variety of knowledge regarding matters of severances and variances,

AND WHEREAS any severance is a positive event in a municipality as it may lead to the construction of a new home or building resulting in municipal revenue,

AND WHEREAS it is to every municipalities advantage to assure that applicant have the information needed to undertake any application on their own and feel supported,

AND WHEREAS both the federal and provincial governments clearly encourage the use of "Plain language"

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT

The SEPB will prepare an information package that will include:

- An information sheet clearly explaining terms that might seem difficult to the public (Similar to Manitoulin planning board),
- Sample application document that can be used as a template to clearly show the expected result for multiple scenarios (RR, R1, R2, RU)
- A list itemizing the steps to follow when applying for a severance and potential or estimated cost of each step,
- Always keeping in mind that all documentation is to use plain language that can be easily understood by applicants not versed in these activities.

MOVED BY: Paul Branconnier

SECONDED BY: Mary Bradbury

Chair Prevost states he spoke to the Director of planning and requested he provide the board with a step by step report of what is being done at the moment to help with the Consent Process. The board deems that acceptable.

Member Viau asked that Motion #3 be deferred.

Deferred

c) Motion #4

WHEREAS complaints are part of dealing with the public,
 AND WHEREAS if a member of the public with a complaint needs to be able to have his complaint heard and responded to,
 AND WHEREAS each municipality has procedures in dealing with complaints,
 AND WHEREAS only by dealing with each complaint can SEPB improve in their dealing with the public,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT,

- A log of all complaints will be maintained and submitted to the board on a quarterly basis to improve service delivery,
- If a plaintiff wishes to have his complaint heard he will be provided a guide itemizing the steps he is to follow to have his complaint heard,
- A guide will be prepared and made available to anybody with a complaint towards SEPB and will include steps to follow to help resolve said complaints:
 - o The first approach will be a discussion between the plaintiff and the person with which the complaint is directed to, in the presence of a witness, to arrive at an amicable solution,
 - o If unsatisfied, the plaintiff must prepare and submit his complaint in written form to the Chair of SEPB who will then act as mediator and try to resolve the issue with the plaintiff,
 - o If the plaintiff is still unsatisfied, the complaint is to be discussed at the Board in a closed session and all documentation will be reviewed before making any recommendation,
 - o A letter explaining the Board decision will be prepared and sent to the plaintiff within 2 months of the decision of the board.

Chair Prevost recommends that Complaint Policy be put in place.

Resolution: 23-076

BE IT RESOLVED THAT A complaint By-Law policy be worked on by staff.

MOVED BY: Dave Froats

SECONDED BY: Josh Lachance

Carried.

10. PAYMENT OF VOUCHERS

a) June 2023 and July 2023

Resolution 23-077

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the statement of disbursements for the month June 2023 in the amount of \$25,022.17 and disbursements for the month of July 2023 in the amount of \$16,091.75 to be distributed and is hereby approved for payment.

MOVED BY: Paul Branconnier

SECONDED BY: Steve Olsen

Carried

11. CLOSED SESSION

Resolution: 23-078

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Sudbury East Planning Board proceed to a closed session as per Sections 239(2)(b) of the Municipal Act for the purpose of discussing personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees.

MOVED BY: Rachelle Proirier

SECONDED BY: Mary Bradbury

Carried.

Resolution: 23-081

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Sudbury East Planning Board return to public forum.

MOVED BY: Steve Olsen

SECONDED BY: Joch Lachance

Carried.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Resolution: 23-078

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Meeting be adjourned at 7.23 P.M.


AND THAT the next regular meeting be held on October 12th, 2023 at 5:30 p.m. at the Municipality

of French River Municipal Office Virtually and in person.


MOVED BY: Carol Lemmon

SECONDED BY: Dave Froats

Carried.



CHAIR



SECRETARY-TREASURER

