



**Session ordinaire du 6 avril 2021
PÉRIODE DE QUESTIONS /
Ordinary sitting of April 6, 2021
QUESTION PERIOD**

Début : 19 : 10 Fin : 19 : 33

1	Q	<p>1. At the March 9, Council meeting with reference to access to Gatineau River, you said there would be a moratorium on all dock construction on the River this year.</p> <p>When and how will this moratorium decision be promulgated?</p> <p>2. Kingsmere Lake: there are 10 vacant NCC lots and even one Municipal lot on the Lake.</p> <p>Would the Council agree to examine this option with regard to its policy to provide public access to water?</p>
	R	<p>1. That is not accurate, I said that a moratorium would only apply to applications for a private dock on municipal land. Owners of waterfront properties will still have the right to apply for a dock building permit if their private dock is to be installed on their own property.</p> <p>In fact, the current zoning by-law already prohibits private docks from being built on municipal land or land that is not owned by the permit applicant.</p> <p>2. Building a public dock on Kingsmere lake has never been proposed or discussed with Chelsea residents or within the Council.</p> <p>The NCC has stated that it will not offer public access to Kingsmere Lake. As stated previously this council is looking at access to the Gatineau River from La Voie Verte Chelsea only.</p>
2	Q	<p>Minor variance for 11 chemin Notch road.</p> <p>1. How many buildings will have water added by this proposed doubling of the snack bar, and how will the sewage and water be provided?</p> <p>2. Is it part of the Chelsea municipal system or rather drawing from ground water and emptying into Dunnderosa's septic system and how will this affect the environment for the surrounding properties with the addition of loudspeakers and noise which has long been a general problem with the mini golf?</p>
	R	<p>1. It is the same building and water source. Before the water use was limited to toilets, sinks and a water fountain. Now it is to allow the use of water to exploit a snack bar and dairy bar in what is defined as a secondary building.</p> <p>2. This will not be part of the Chelsea municipal system. It is part of Dunnderosa's water and septic system. It will not affect the environment of the surrounding properties. As for the noise, there is a by-law regulating nuisance issues through the MRC police services.</p>
3	Q	<p>Minor variance for 11 chemin Notch road.</p> <p>1. With the cutting of mature trees without permit, it is already showing a pattern of disrespect for the rule of law. What are the steps that the Municipality is taking to get its own rules respected by this owner?</p> <p>2. Where will the water and septic be coming from? Who will pay for it? Where is the water coming from in the existing buildings? Why not use the same source? I am concerned that bringing water there be the beginning of uncontrolled development in this sensitive area.</p>
	R	<p>1. Fines have been issued when the by-laws were not respected.</p> <p>2. There is already water in that building. Council granted permission on June 1, 2009 by Resolution 128-09 to install toilets, sinks and a water fountain in the mini-golf's secondary buildings. It will not be municipal water; and they are responsible for the costs of water and septic.</p> <p>This new application, however, is to service secondary buildings with water for a snack bar and dairy bar, thus two activities that were not included or authorized by the 2009 resolution. Therefore, the owner was asked to apply for a whole new minor variance.</p>



**Session ordinaire du 6 avril 2021
PÉRIODE DE QUESTIONS /
Ordinary sitting of April 6, 2021
QUESTION PERIOD**

4	Q	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On the morning of Friday March 26th, I called the municipality for emergency help on behalf of the residents of Carnochan Rd. The culvert that crosses our road was completely blocked with ice, and the rainwater was pooling in the creed and starting to overflow onto our road. I asked the municipality if they could send someone to unblock our culvert with a steamer as er were concerned about our road washing out. 2. I asked if we could borrow their equipment to do the work ourselves if they were not using it. I even offered to pay for the services if we had to. The municipality called us back after lunch to say they were sending someone right away. 3. By Saturday morning, the entrance to our driveway and parts of the road had washed out, causing an estimated \$ 1 500 in damage. <p>On Sunday, the rain started up again, and fearing that we would lose the whole road (and our only access to our homes), one of my neighbours called the municipality again, as an emergency. After much deliberation, the municipality agreed to send workers up to our road with the steamer. Because it was Sunday, we were charge \$400.</p> <p>As a Chelsea taxpayer, I would like to know what is the Municipality policy regarding offering assistance to private roads during emergency situations where roads and infrastructure are threatened?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. As a follow-up question, I'd like to know what the Municipality is doing to protect our infrastructure from water displacement caused by new developments in our backyards? Our creek has never overflowed in the 25 years we've lived here, but since several new homes went up right in behind (and above) us on Winnisic last summer, we've noticed a significant change in waterflow as well as much more particulate (mud/clay) in the creek.
	R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is the responsibility of the owner or association of the private road to see to its maintenance. 2. On Friday, all our teams and equipment were on the job to respond to the many problems of flooding. The municipality does not lend any equipment or tools. 3. The municipality is not authorized to proceed with any work on private property. However, if municipal infrastructure (public) is at risk of being damaged by negligence, private misbehavior or may become a safety issue for public infrastructure, the municipality will intervene to eliminate the risk. 4. With the upcoming climate change, many infrastructures are now affected by this phenomenon of heavy rainfall in a short period of time. Moreover, with the rainfall received (25 to 30 mm) last March 26, it was intensified by the fact that the ground was still frozen. Therefore, there was no percolation into the soil. This increases the speed and quantity of runoff water.
5	Q	<p>In June and July 2020, Chelsea residents participated in an on-line 'visioning' survey. At the same time, several consultation meetings with community groups took place.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residents were clear that they do not want more businesses and services, or more houses. Residents want Chelsea's rural character to be preserved. 2. Last month, residents were asked to comment on another survey about updating the Master Plan. Two maps were included in the survey: one expanding the urban perimeter in the southern part of the Municipality. 3. Another for an urban perimeter to be established in Farm Point, where intensive development would be allowed. 4. Additional questions in the survey were related to changes to zoning throughout the Municipality, including the establishment of 'rural consolidated' zones, where 2 acre residential lots would no longer be required. 5. How do they reflect the fact that respondents to the visioning survey indicated that the quality of the natural environment, community lifestyle and peaceful, rural way of life are Chelsea's key strengths? 6. How are the changes proposed in the Master Plan update survey aligned with the results from the Visioning exercise undertaken last summer?
	R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That is accurate, the revised Master Plan and by-laws will severely limit sprawl development outside of the urban perimeters in order to maintain Chelsea's rural and agricultural land and character in almost all of its territory.



Session ordinaire du 6 avril 2021
PÉRIODE DE QUESTIONS /
Ordinary sitting of April 6, 2021
QUESTION PERIOD

5	R	<p>The high majority of new applications to build houses, business and services will be directed and concentrated in the urban perimeters, identified by the MRC as the Centre-Village and Farm Point, in a way to prevent further sprawl and destruction of rural and agricultural land. This is a policy direction supported by the MRC and the provincial government.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. That is not accurate. The size of the urban perimeter in the Centre-Village is almost identical to the previous urban perimeter adopted in 2005. 3. That is not accurate. While the MRC did identify Farm Point as an urban perimeter, the Municipality has no intention of raising the density allowed in Farm Point as part of this Master plan review. If the Council, along with the residents of Farm Point wish to change the zoning in the future, it can adopt a Special Planning Program for Farm point. 4. That is not accurate. Lots created in the land use designation “rural consolidated” will remain very low density and will have to respect a minimum lot size of either 1 acre or 2 acres if the lot is located in the aquifer protected zones. 5. The draft Master Plan review is based (as much as possible) on the results of the visioning exercise, and many policy directions and objectives correspond to those proposed by Chelsea residents. 6. The Municipality must first and foremost respect the MRC Regional Land Use and Development plan and the provincial government’s policy directions. In a situation where a wish expressed by Chelsea residents contradicts the provisions of the MRC and provincial government, the Municipality is required to comply with the MRC and provincial government.
6	Q	<p>I would like to know if the municipality will exercise its right to specify to the developer which 10% of the land that the municipality deems suitable for natural areas, in particular, in the case of connecting one trail to another? It appears that when this decision is left to the developers that they will select a piece of land that is most beneficial to them rather than to the municipality and its residents.</p> <p>https://www.chelsea.ca/application/files/9215/5689/1039/1042-17_modifiant_637-05_anglais.pdf sec 4.</p>
	R	<p>That is inaccurate. The Municipality asks developers whether they would prefer to transfer a piece of land or a 10% monetary compensation as part of their subdivision application, but regardless of their offer, ultimately it is the Council that decides whether to take land or 10% in monetary compensation. If a land transfer is chosen, it is also the Council’s right to choose what part of the property to acquire.</p>
	Q	<p>We have asked to see the environmental and hydrological studies that have been done along ch de la Riviere in advance of the road re-construction. We are very concerned about possible damage to fragile small wetlands along ch de la Riviere that are home to turtles, frogs and birds, some which are considered endangered. A further concern is that some of these wetlands do not appear on any maps of the area that we have.</p> <p>Have the studies concerning chemin de la Riviere been done already or not? If they have not been done, when will they be done? When will residents be allowed to see the studies?</p>
7	R	<p>As part of their mandate, the consultants produced drafts of the following environmental deliverables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Characterization of the natural environment • Environmental Site Assessment Phase I • Environmental Site Assessment Phase II <p>We have not yet received the final versions, so no study has been submitted to the Council.</p> <p>The natural environment characterization report confirms the presence of nine (9) wetlands, seven (7) of which are part of the thirteen (13) watercourses identified, a special intervention zone, fish habitat protected under the Fisheries Act and migratory bird habitat protected under the Migratory Birds Act. In addition, there are two (2) confirmed plant species at risk and five (5) potential wildlife species at risk within the study site. Note that MH 3 and MH4 represent the wetlands, respectively, at the intersection of chemin de la Carrière and south of chemin Carnochan.</p> <p>In addition, the consultant has advised us that the project will involve applications for certificates of authorization to MELCC, which also involves the MFFP if necessary, as well as an application for review to DFO. We have not yet determined if a DFO authorization is required, the outcome of the review application will confirm this, as well as an application for a SARA permit.</p> <p>Stakeholders at various levels of government will confirm if further environmental studies are required, but at this time we have undertaken the studies required for this type of project.</p>



**Session ordinaire du 6 avril 2021
PÉRIODE DE QUESTIONS /
Ordinary sitting of April 6, 2021
QUESTION PERIOD**

7	R	<p>The environment is a priority in this and all municipal projects. Therefore, all measures will be put in place to ensure compliance with the standards and laws in force to protect the environment. It is our duty and responsibility.</p>
8	Q	<p>The brochure accompanying the recent Master Plan survey states that the Municipality can regulate development but cannot completely prohibit it. It cannot prevent a developer from building a project that complies with the Master Plan and the bylaws.</p> <p>The brochure creates the impression that the only way that the municipalities can prohibit development on private land is through conservation designation zoning IF the owner agrees, Regulation is allegedly limited to «ensuring that projects are carried out according to sustainable development best practice».</p> <p>Yet over the last few years, different municipalities in Quebec have successfully designated areas of private land for conservation via zoning to ensure the integrity of the forest canopy of the integrity of wetlands IN SPITE OF the owner/developer's objections, often in court, alleging the regulation was ultra vires, imprecise, un règlement discriminatoire, and/or une expropriation illegal deguise.</p> <p>Chelsea must use the "approche regulatoire mixte" outlined by the courts to protect /conserve anywhere near 50% of its remaining undeveloped private land. Conditions for limiting the use of private land to conservation via regulation include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completion of a study providing the "characterisation environnementale de l'ensemble des parcelles non bâties" 2. L'élaboration d'un plan de conservation des milieux naturels 3. L'adoption des mesures réglementaires appropriées (zonage, lotissement, PAE, PIIA, etc), restreignant la gamme des usages anthropiques autorisés. 4. Has Chelsea done steps 1 and 2 outlined above aimed at identifying the nature and ecological functions of the land that has not yet been developed on the municipality, prerequisite for protecting remaining forests on private land?
	R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Municipality mandated environmental specialists to prepare an ecological study of the two urban perimeters, the Centre-Village and Farm Point. Their findings will help the Municipality establish new provisions to protect high value ecological areas that will be included in the revised by-laws. <p>The new by-laws will require any new developers to submit an ecological study as part of their preliminary subdivision application. In this way, any future land to be developed will be subject to an ecological study paid for by the developers, instead of Chelsea's taxpayers.</p> <p>Those new provisions on environmental protection will be presented to Chelsea residents at the next public consultations planned this summer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The provincial government mandated MRCs across Québec to prepare a conservation plan of all wetlands located within their territory. The municipality of Chelsea will collaborate with the MRC des Collines-de-l'Outaouais to get this plan completed and adopted as quickly as possible.