



**Agenda
Council Meeting
Tuesday, March 19, 2024
Council Chambers 1:00 PM**

- 8.1. Adele Arbour, Planner
Re: Notice of Proposed Wireless Site: C8592 Allens Alley & Crystal Lake Rd (Rogers)

[C8592 Newspaper Ad](#)
[C8592 Public Notification Package](#)
[C8592 Site Selection - Justification](#)

PROPOSED ROGERS 60 METRE WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS SELF-SUPPORT TOWER INSTALLATION

Details: An equipment shelter will also be installed at the base of the proposed tower and the site will be surrounded by a security fence with a locked gated access point.

The public is invited to provide written comments by 5pm on March 31st, 2024 to the contact information shown below. Please include a return address. The Municipality of Trent Lakes will be hosting a Public Meeting on March 19th at 1:00pm where the proposed tower will be discussed. Members of the Public will be able to participate electronically in addition to attending in-person at Peterborough County Road 36, Trent Lakes Ontario. To participate electronically, please register for the webinar.

Dear sir or madam, 23 Feb. 2024 Rogers Communications Inc. ("Rogers") is expanding its wireless network and would like to share with you its current plan in the Municipality of Trent Lakes. We are consulting residents and businesses of this area regarding this proposed project. Details of this project are included in the present notification file. We invite you to take note of the proposed project and to provide us with any questions or comments in writing by 5pm March 24th 2024, after which we will answer your concerns. You will then have the opportunity to submit further comments if you require additional clarifications.

More information on agenda.

Public meeting is part of this process.

Armstrong – within the notice package which was sent out to Ratepayer's groups in advance there were 4 pictures that had nothing to do with the suggested site on White Lake. Answer

This is great news. Rogers is req'd to allow collocation for other companies to put up antennas on the existing location.

Franzen – Curious as to why Herald and Promoter. People in this area would not receive Herald and the Promoter is only online.

Adele – People in the tower areas received notification.

Cadigan – Knowledge that he has about Promoter a year ago there was a hard copy..

Attendee – there is no hard copy

Adele – has the rep from Rogers received any comments about either of the two sites?

Rep – No

Motion – Cadigan motion to receive the info. Armstrong seconds. Motion carried.

8.2. Staff report re: Notice of Proposed Wireless Site: White Lake Rd near FR 345 (Rogers)

8.2. Adele Arbour, Planner

Re: Notice of Proposed Wireless Site: C8593 White Lake Rd at White Lake (Rogers)

[C8593 Newspaper Ad](#)

[C8593 Public Notification Package](#)

[C8593 Site Selection - Justification](#)

PROPOSED ROGERS 95 METRE GUYED WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER INSTALLATION

Objective: To improve wireless coverage to the area southwest of Gooderham, and to meet rising demands for wireless services.

The public is invited to provide written comments by 5pm on March 31st, 2024 to the contact information shown below. Please include a return address.

The Municipality of Trent Lakes will be hosting a Public Meeting on March 19th at 1:00pm where the proposed tower will be discussed. Members of the Public will be able to participate electronically in addition to attending in-person at Peterborough County Road 36, Trent Lakes Ontario.

Dear sir or madam, 23 Feb. 2024 Rogers Communications Inc. ("Rogers") is expanding its wireless network and would like to share with you its current plan in the Municipality of Trent Lakes. We are consulting residents and businesses of this area regarding this proposed project. Details of this project are included in the present notification file. We invite you to take note of the proposed project and to provide us with any questions or comments in writing by 5pm March 24th 2024, after which we will answer your concerns. You will then have the opportunity to submit further comments if you require additional clarifications.

More information on agenda.

- 9.1. Delegation re: Kinmount and District Health Centre Appeal and Family Health Organization (FHO) Guidelines

9.1. Lori Richey, Healthcare Advancement Coordinator, Peterborough County
Re: Kinmount and District Health Centre Appeal and Family Health Organization (FHO) Guidelines (Items 13.1 and 16.1)

Re: Denial of the request to affiliate Dr. Lesslie Ponraja as a signatory physician with the City of Kawartha Lakes FHO (BAMJ). We are writing on behalf of the Council of the Municipality of Trent Lakes to appeal the Ministry of Health's decision that denied the request for Kinmount's physician, Dr. Lesslie Ponraja, to be affiliated with the City of Kawartha Lakes Family Health Organization (CKL FHO). Dr. Ponraja practices at the Kinmount and District Health Centre (KDHC) which is located within the Municipality of Trent Lakes and has a RIO Score of 50.

It is our understanding that the reason the approval was not granted is because the Kinmount District Medical Centre is located more than 5km from the site of the FHO Lead, however this would be the case for all medical clinics within Peterborough County and many of those within the City of Kawartha Lakes.

Cadigan asked as to whether there was any response back from letter that was sent.

Lori R. – letter has not been sent as of yet.

Franzen – Should get Laurie Scott involved who helped recruit the doctor.

Lori R. – understands that they have also sent a letter of support.

Armstrong – should also be sent to County Council.

Lori R. – Second letter is asking for support from not only county council and also seven other municipalities re new guidelines.

Notice of Motion by Councilor Cadigan -

New entry guidelines The following guidelines will apply to new FHO groups or new locations to existing groups: • Where all physicians in a group cannot be in the same location, there can be no less than 3 physicians in each location. • Where a group has more than 1 location, all locations must be within a 5km radius of one another, where a RIO score is 0. • In areas with a RIO score of 1 or more, consideration will be given to applications from groups who cannot locate within 5 km due to infrastructure limitations or any other relevant factors, having regard to the primary health care needs of the community. Any application not granted can be referred to the Physician Services Committee for resolution. And whereas all of the new entry guidelines have a direct negative impact upon the recruitment and retention of primary care physicians to our rural communities; And whereas a recent example of this was the denial of the request to affiliate Dr. Lesslie Ponraja

Cadigan asked as to whether there was any response back from letter that was sent.

Lori R. Doesn't believe that the 5 km is possible in this rural area. Would love if a motion was granted on the behalf of Trent lakes Council that this was discussed in other municipalities and the Eastern Warden Conference. (Unsure of name of the group)

Cadigan moves to receive. Armstrong seconds. Motion carried.

11.1.1. Evan Grieger, Director of Public Works
Re: New Dedicated Mechanics Facility Project - Sand Dome
Procurement

[New Dedicated Mechanics Facility Project - Sand Dome
Procurement](#)

Recommendation: That Council receives the New Dedicated Mechanics Facility Project Update – Sand Dome Procurement; and further That Council direct staff to proceed with a non-competitive bid process to award the Sand Dome Construction to Storage Systems Construction Corporation, subject to no responses to the Advanced Contract Award Notice. Financial Implications: Staff has included \$550,000.00 in the 2024 Capital Budget.

Armstrong is fine with this because there is protection for Trent Lakes and the process/

Braybrook – asked about other companies that build these types of buildings.

Grieger – these are companies that definitely build similar buildings but the present company is only one that does the conical building that we are interested in. Others are more expensive.

Braybrook – In my research \$440,000 is pretty cheap in comparison with other municipalities I have seen such as \$1.8 million or \$2.4 million

What was original quote and reason for update? Original was still in 4 range. That quote was received a year ago. It wasn't a major increase. It is part of understanding where the industry is right now.

Lambshead – what roofing material will be used for new Sand Dome.

Grieger – 30 year shingle

Motion – Franzen moves to support recommendation from staff. Cadigan seconds. Motion carried.

11.4.1. Adele Arbour, Planner

Re: Public Meeting Development Charges Background Study
Feedback

[Public Meeting Development Charges Background Study Feedback](#)

Recommendation: That Council receive the report from the Planner regarding Development Charges Background Study Feedback for information;

and further That Council support the single detached unit charge of \$7,584 as recommended in the Development Charge Study prepared by Watson & Associates;

and further That Council support the non-residential charge of \$42.96 per sq. m of gross floor area for aggregate development and \$28 per sq. m. of gross floor area for other non-residential developments;

and further That Council adopt the D.C. approach to calculate the charges on a uniform Municipal-wide basis for all services within this background study;

and That Council approve the capital project listing set out in Chapter 5 of the D.C. Background Study dated February 2, 2024, subject to further annual review during the capital budget process;

and further That Council approve the Development Charges Background Study dated February 2, 2024, and further That Council direct staff to bring the revised Development Charge By-Laws for adoption at the April 2, 2024 meeting in advance of the expiry of the current By-Law on April 16, 2024;

and further That Council has determined that no further Public Meeting is required.

Financial Implications: The purpose of Development Charges (D.C.s) are to recover the capital costs associated with residential and non-residential development within a municipality.

Armstrong – I believe that I was the one asking for two categories two categories for residential buildings. It was not based on ability to pay but the number of occupants and their projected usage. I thought that it would be useful for people that were building houses with fewer bedrooms. I am comfortable with what you have here.

Franzen – I was the one that brought forth the ability to pay. I did not support any increase in development charge.

Adele – there were sixteen communities that were used to make decisions.

Teggart - North Kawartha doesn't have development charges.

Armstrong moves to receive report, support the single detached unit charge of \$7,584, support the non-residential charge of \$42.96 per sq. m of gross floor area for aggregate development and \$28 per sq. m. of gross floor area for other non-residential developments and further that we approve the development charges background dated February 2, 2024, and further That Council direct staff to bring the revised Development Charge By-Laws for adoption at the April 2, 2024 meeting in advance of the expiry of the current By-Law on April 16, 2024;

Second by Cadigan

Franzen – request recorded vote.

Franzen – No Lamshead Yes, Armstrong yes Braybrook No Cadigan Yes

Motion carried.