

**SUPPLEMENT TO
RESPONSE DOCUMENT: STAFF ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS
RECEIVED ON PROPOSED REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN
AMENDMENT No. 38,
NOVEMBER 20, 2009 TO DECEMBER 10, 2009**

DECEMBER 10, 2009

**INDEX OF WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS
RECEIVED BETWEEN NOVEMBER 20, 2009 AND DECEMBER 9, 2009**

**Submissions added since December 2, 2009*

COMMENTER	DATE	PAGE
*Barnes, June	November 1, 2009	4
*Bell Canada	December 2, 2009	84
*Bentley, Tom	November 30, 2009	70
*Brackley, Kevin	December, 2009	126
*BurlingtonGreen Environmental Association	December 3, 2009	114
*Councillor Jan Mowbray	December 2, 2009	82
*Councillor Jane Fogal	December 5, 2009	117
*Clay Brick Association of Canada	December 1, 2009	75
*D.E. Landscaping Inc	November 12, 2009	7
Foster, Bob and Sherry	November 25, 2009	18
*Gevaert, Lieven	December 2, 2009	92
GLBP Nominee Company II	December 1, 2009	78
*Grimwood, Michael	December 2, 2009	103
Grossi, Marilyn and Jones, Greg	November 25, 2009	17
*Halsall, Barbara	December 2, 2009	105
*Halsall, Barbara	December 6, 2009	123
*Halton Agricultural Advisory Committee	December 2, 2009	94
*Halton Diversity Advisory Committee	December 2, 2009	111
Halton Healthcare Services Corporation	November 25, 2009	18
*Harmer, Isabelle	December 2, 2009	101
Harvest Bible Chapel of Oakville	November 30, 2009	65
*Harvest Bible Chapel of Oakville	December 7, 2009	125
*Hoyle, Peter	December 2, 2009	98
*Interfaith Council of Halton	December 2, 2009	99
Ironrose Investments Limited & Melrose Properties Inc.	November 30, 2009	69
Joshua Creek Community Developments	December 1, 2009	79
Kaule	November 24, 2009	17
Kim, Douglas	November 26, 2009	20
*Landscape Ontario	December 2, 2009	81
*Maple Lodge Farms	December 2009	126
Mattamy Group of Companies	November 30, 2009	53
Mattamy Group of Companies	December 1, 2009	72
Marshall, Dave	November 23, 2009	16
*McIlveen, W.D.	December 7, 2009	124
*Milton Heights Landowners Group	December 2, 2009	80
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	November 27, 2009	23
Newmark Developments Limited & Rosko Investment and Development Limited	November 27, 2009	21
*North Oakville Community Builders	December 1, 2009	73

COMMENTS	DATE	PAGE
Oakville Christian School	November 20, 2009	8
*OakvilleGreen Conservation Association	November 23, 2009	16
*OakvilleGreen Conservation Association	December 3, 2009	115
Oakville Independent Schools	November 23, 2009	13
*PERL	December 2, 2009	86
*Petrelli, Tony	December 5, 2009	120
*Region of Peel	December 3, 2009	113
*RRL Burloak Inc.	November 26, 2009	20
Silwell Development Limited	November 30, 2009	52
*Sheridan Nurseries	November 20, 2009	10
Stillich, John	November 30, 2009	50
South Georgetown Landowners Group	November 30, 2009	54
*Smitas et al	December 2, 2009	89
*Synod of the Diocese of Niagara and FRAM Building Group	December 2, 2009	92
The Remington Group Inc.	November 20, 2009	9
Viel, Laruent and Anesen, Jette	November 23, 2009	15
Walker, Colleen	November 23, 2009	15
Wierl, Marilyn	November 24, 2009	17
*Wilkes, Margaret	December 7, 2009	125

NOTE: The following individuals spoke at the December 2, 2009 Public Meeting of ROPA 38 but did not provide a written submission:

- James Fisher, Burlington Resident
- Leslie Adams, P.O.W.E.R (Protect Our Water and Environmental Resources)
- Peter Lambrick, Milton Resident

[Note: Responses that result in a modification to ROPA 38 are shown in italics.]

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
<p>June Barnes</p> <p>November 1, 2009 (received December 2, 2009)</p>	<p>Attention; Regional Chair Gary Carr</p> <p>Comments and suggestions; ROPA # 38.</p> <p>Dear Chair Carr,</p> <p>As a farmer and long time citizen of Nassagaweya I would like to express a few of the many concerns and suggestions I have over the Regional Official Plan Amendment # 38.</p> <p>I would first like to thank the planning staff for the cooperation they have shown to members of agricultural community through the conduit of the Halton Agricultural Advisory Committee - of which I am a member - in working with the committee to resolve some of the concerns that have been expressed. However I think that we have quite a way to go yet and in writing this communiqué I am outside of the HAAC.</p> <p>The first comment is regarding the influence of the "green groups" on decisions that are being made about the future of agricultural lands in the Region. I do understand their concerns about the natural environment. I too am concerned. Last year about two acres of trees were planted on my farm adjoining the existing bush. If I had known the consequences of this tree planting - as it brings the edge of the bush almost to the existing farm buildings - under proposed ROPA 38 I would not be allowed to locate a new farm building in this area without an EIA. It is a sad fact that tree planting on farm and rural properties will be seriously impacted by the proposed increase in the size and restrictions to farming in Halton. This is not helping the environment one iota.</p> <p>I attended the workshop the Region organized on October 27th at the Country Heritage Park. I was horrified to discover about sixty? Oakville Greens in attendance and only a handful of farmers- due to the sunny weather and work restrictions. The table I sat at had a large number of "greens" whose knowledge of farming practices was abysmal. They knew nothing about nutrient management regulations, pesticide courses and certification, minimum distance separation, best farm management practices and diesel tank safety measures. I have just named a few of their information shortfalls. They announced that they wanted to keep agriculture in Halton and that they are on the same page as the agricultural community. Do be very careful Chair Carr, because they are reading a different book. A book titled with unreasonable restrictions, restrictions that would seriously curb the ability of farmers to farm their land with autonomy. To listen to their requests could toll the death knell for agriculture in Halton. It takes years to understand the practice of farming and cannot be learned without responsible practice.</p> <p>Here are some of my direct concerns, comments and suggestions/recommendations for ROPA#38.</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>1. Use an overlay to show the ENHS. That is brought down when an official plan amendment is requested.</p> <p>2. Designate agricultural\rural lands.</p> <p>3. The development of two key areas. One is ENHS and the other is Prime agricultural lands which have been identified in Map 1E of the proposed ROPA 38.</p> <p>4. This second key would protect prime lands under the Provincial Policy Guidelines set down for prime agricultural land.</p> <p>27.3; A rural countryside where Agriculture is the preferred and predominate activity.</p> <p>Suggested; Changed to 27.2 a rural countryside where agriculture is the designated activity.</p> <p>31; Healthy Communities.</p> <p>Suggested; The production of local farm fresh foods from Halton farms,</p> <p>99.1; To recognize agriculture as the primary activity and land use in the agricultural rural area.</p> <p>Suggested; To recognize agriculture as the designated activity and land use in the agricultural and rural areas.</p> <p>99.2; To preserve prime agricultural soils.</p> <p>Suggested; designation of prime agricultural soils.</p> <p>99.3; To maintain as Much as possible lands for existing and FUTURE use.</p> <p>Suggested; To maintain and designate lands for existing and future farm use.</p> <p>99.4; To protect farms from incompatible activities and land uses which would limit agricultural productivity and efficiency.</p> <p>Comment; This statement says it all an ENHS that is for too restrictive will have the very effect the Region is trying to avoid.</p> <p>101.(1.6);Recognize and protect lands within the agricultural and rural areas an Important natural resource to the economic viability of agriculture.</p> <p>Suggested; Designate and protect lands.....</p> <p>101.2; Recognize, encourage and protect agriculture as</p> <p>Suggested; Designate encourage and protect.....</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>114.1(23); Outside the key features to recognize agriculture</p> <p>Suggested; To designate agriculture.....</p> <p>117.1(3); Existing uses including existing agricultural operations.</p> <p>Suggested; Existing uses including designated agricultural operations.</p> <p>118(3.1);no EIA required as long as there is no tree removal.</p> <p>Suggested; This one needs a lot of combined interests brainpower to sort out. It is very restrictive.</p> <p>146(1-10); Land.</p> <p>Suggested; Added designation and maintenance of agricultural lands.</p> <p>I could make many more suggestions. But you and I Chairman Carr have not got the time to read or write them. I do hope you will- along with the planners Involved in this process- take the time to look at some of my suggestions and give serious thought to them?</p> <p>Regards June Barnes</p> <p>I apologize as the previous document I submitted had the meat of the submission missing from it. At this point it is probably still very relevant.</p> <p>I had time to briefly read the final draft of ROPA # 38 and feel angry and discouraged. If I was out walking the dogs and tried to identify the scat from this animal- ropa38- I would not be able to identify it. What a dog's dinner. As farmers we asked for an overlay of the natural heritage system to be used across Halton Region we now have it above the brow and called Greenbelt Natural heritage system. What about the farmland below the brow, what about the farmland south of Georgetown and south of the town of Milton? An injustice is being perpetrated on the farming community of Halton. If you are really serious about protecting valuable farmland In Halton then designate it as such including the white areas outside of the NHS. If you are serious then make real policies that protect and support farmers and farmland for the long term. The cost of ROP amendments and other studies cost thousands of dollars. Please really listen to us. The time has come for you as councillors to step up to the plate and save agricultural lands in Halton.</p> <p>There are numerous inconsistencies throughout this document. In one section it states that farmers will be encouraged to plant woodlots for harvesting and in another the woodlots that have been planted for such a purpose will become significant woodlands. The key features- the expansion and blending of Greenlands A and B- pose the most encumbrance and restriction to farmers. If you read 114.1(19) it states.; outside of the key features to recognize and support</p>	<p>Comments noted. Agricultural Rural Area is a designation and therefore many of the suggested changes are already in effect. Staff maintains that ROPA 38 is supportive of agriculture and does not place any further restrictions on agricultural uses than the current Plan.</p> <p>A Forestry Management Plan will assist the landowner to harvest the resource on an on-going basis.</p> <p>The EIA requirement</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>agriculture. The key features cover most of Halton how are you going to protect us? If you were to look in a Regional cupboard do you think the bogey, man that jumps out of it will be a farmer? No it would probably be a developer. Farmers are stewards of the land.</p> <p>There is not time to get this right for the farming community as there is so much that needs to be changed before the deadline. I ask for an amendment to defer that section of ROPA 38 that pertains to lands outside of the developed urban area to an April deadline.</p> <p>I thank the Regional planners for working with the farming community and for the changes you have made that are positive.</p> <p>I still think that designation of farmland is the way to go.</p> <p>Respectfully Submitted June Barnes.</p>	<p>placed on new agricultural buildings has been reduced under ROPA 38.</p>
<p>D.E. Landscaping Inc.</p> <p>November 12, 2009 (received December 8, 2009)</p>	<p>Re: Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38 (ROPA 38)</p> <p>Dear Mr. Carr,</p> <p>Your NHS designation strives to somehow satisfy an ever-increasing sense of entitlement that city folk have, to romp and play on land they don't own. Aren't our Conservation areas, Provincial Parks, Agreement Forests and Crown Land enough?</p> <p>The natural features existing in the rural area are there because of generations of private ownership and good stewardship, not because of Government influence. Does the Aggregate Industry, Conservation Halton, or Municipal Works Department have as many successes?</p> <p>Why has our Government continued to spend money on consultants making mountains out of molehills? If it ain't broke, don't fix it! The two-tier agricultural policy framework from three and four decades ago works fine. The problem is encroaching development, both residential and industrial, that is allowed because of changes to the Official Plan which could perhaps, be attributed to politicians looking for bigger budgets, increased salaries, urbanite toys and more facilities.</p> <p>ROPA 38 I'm told, is a compliance document, but somehow, perhaps intentionally hidden amongst all its rhetoric, are some pretty important changes that will negatively affect Agriculture, Forestry, and Horticulture. These issues are too important to hide and deserve a more thorough review along with consultation with those whom it will affect the most.</p> <p>I urge you to reject ROPA 38 as it impacts negatively and unfairly on the rural portion of our county.</p>	<p>Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38 not only brings the Region's Official Plan into conformity with Provincial Plans like the Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan, but also incorporates changes to policy resulting from a comprehensive review of the Official Plan (the statutory five-year Official Plan Review process). Staff does not view that the new policies</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
		under ROPA 38 place additional restrictions on agriculture, forestry and horticulture.
<p>O'Connor MacLeod Hanna LLP on behalf of Oakville Christian School</p> <p>November 20, 2009</p>	<p>Dear Mayor and Members of Council:</p> <p>Re: Oakville Christian School, 112 Third Line, Oakville Comments on the proposed Oakville Official Plan Our File No.</p> <p>Please be advised that we act on behalf of the Oakville Christian School which is the owner of the property located at 112 Third Line, Oakville, and have the following submissions with respect to the proposed Official Plan, adopted by Council on June 22, 2009.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Under the current Official Plan, private schools are specifically identified in the Official Plan and are permitted in residential areas. The land use schedule for each of the communities acknowledges the location of the private schools.</p> <p>However, under the proposed Official Plan which was adopted on June 22, 2009, the status of private schools is less certain. There is no specific reference to private schools as being a "Community Use". Elementary and secondary schools are identified and these uses "may" be permitted in residential areas.</p> <p>The plan establishes locational criteria for educational facilities. The plan indicates that:</p> <p><i>"Educational facilities are to be located adjacent to a public park, where possible, to provide a neighbourhood focal point and encourage the provision of complementary facilities ...". (Section 7.1.2 d)</i></p> <p>Concerns</p> <p>These locational criteria are appropriate for educational facilities that are publicly funded. Both the public and separate school boards are circulated development applications and comment on these applications. They are mandated to participate in the planning process and can therefore influence the location of school facilities.</p> <p>Private schools on the other hand are not a commenting agency and not consulted in the same way as publicly funded school boards. Private schools are not able to influence the planned location of educational facilities. This locational criteria is therefore not relevant to their facilities and private schools should be exempt from this locational requirement.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is a concern that because the locational criteria are so clearly appropriate and oriented to publicly funded schools, there may be an interpretation that the intent of the plan is recognize</p>	<p>This is a submission to the Town of Oakville regarding the Livable Oakville Official Plan Amendment, but copied to the Region.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>publicly funded schools and to exclude private schools.</p> <p>Finally, unlike the current Official Plan, the proposed Official Plan does not permit educational facilities in residential areas in an unqualified way. The land use "may" be permitted, but it is not clear what determines whether the use is permitted. Implicitly, the use may not be permitted and this is a concern. Potentially, the continued long-term operation of the existing private school is significantly compromised by this change of policy in the Draft Official Plan.</p> <p>In the Case of the Oakville Christian School, the site abuts a local park. It would be helpful if the Town would confirm that the school complies with the locational criteria in the proposed Official Plan and that the use is indeed a "permitted" use under the proposed Official Plan.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Please be advised that the proposed Official Plan, as it relates to locational criteria for educational facilities, is of significant concern to Oakville Christian School.</p> <p>We respectfully request that the Official Plan be modified to include private schools as a community use that is permitted in residential areas.</p> <p>We appreciate your consideration of these submissions.</p>	
<p>The Remington Group Inc.</p> <p>November 20, 2009 (received December 1, 2009)</p>	<p>Region of Halton, Legislative & Planning Services 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, ON L6M 3L1</p> <p>Attention: Perry Vagnini, Senior Planner</p> <p>Dear Sir:</p> <p>Re: Comments on ROPA 38 North Oakville East</p> <p>We are landowners in North Oakville East and a member in good standing with the landowners group North Oakville Community Builders Inc. (NOCBI).</p> <p>The North Oakville East Secondary Plan (OPA 272) was approved at the Ontario Municipal Board in January 2008, and includes detailed Natural Heritage System (NHS) mapping and policies to guide development in North Oakville East. Furthermore, the North Oakville Creeks Subwatershed Study provides detailed fieldwork and analysis and recommends a Natural Heritage System that is specific to North Oakville East.</p> <p>It is in light of the above that we write this letter to request that the ROPA 38 policies acknowledge the North Oakville east approved</p>	<p>The entirety of the North Oakville Natural Heritage</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>NHS, and that any new direction from the Region's Official Plan review on natural heritage system planning not be connected to the approved NHS in North Oakville East.</p> <p>More specifically:</p> <p><u>Policy 115.1</u></p> <p>This policy – specifically dealing with the North Oakville East NHS – has been deleted. The policy states:</p> <p>“If the final approval of Local Official Plan amendments for Secondary Plan areas located entirely north of Dundas Street in the Town of Oakville includes alternative Greenlands A and B that meet the criteria set out in Subsections 115(1) to (5), then the alternative Greenlands A and B set out in the approved Local Official Plan amendments will thereafter be deemed to have the effect of Section 115(7), notwithstanding that the processes leading to those Local Official Plan amendment commenced prior to the final approval of this policy.”</p> <p>As this policy was addressed with the Region as part of the North Oakville East OMB hearing, we request that it not be deleted from ROPA 38 – it should remain in the Region's Official Plan to provide clarity and context with respect to the approval of the North Oakville East NHS through OPA 272.</p> <p><u>Policy 117.1</u></p> <p>The list of permitted uses in the NHS is not consistent with the uses permitted in the North Oakville East NHS. Specifically, infrastructure and stormwater management facilities are permitted in and through the North Oakville East NHS in certain areas. Given this, we wish to clarify and confirm that the list of uses currently permitted in the North Oakville East NHS will continue to be permitted.</p> <p>In closing, we wish to thank you for taking the time to consider our letter and we would be pleased to discuss further at your convenience. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jason Sheldon, MCIP, RPP Vice President Land Development</p>	<p>System was incorporated into the Region's Natural Heritage System as it was developed, recognizing the studies that had been undertaken and planning approvals in place.</p> <p>Section 116.1 recognizes the previous commitment under the old Section 115 and refinements to the NHS boundary can be made through the preparation of Area-Specific Plans, which would reflect the results of the Subwatershed Study.</p> <p>Through refinement of the NHS boundary as part of the Area-Specific Plan, under Section 116.1.</p>
<p>Sheridan Nurseries</p> <p>November 20, 2009 (Received December 2, 2009)</p>	<p>To: Regional Chair and Members of Council</p> <p>I appreciate an opportunity to work with you to help clarify Sheridan's needs to continue to be a success in the agricultural industry.</p> <p>This specific letter is to further clarify the background and needs as summarized in the November 12, 2009 letter sent to the Region by Sheridan's consultant Victor Lind.</p> <p>The objective of this communication is to encourage the Region of</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Halton and the Town of Halton Hills. to include in ROPA 38 a change to the restrictions on the size of the facilities for "retail" or "commercial" selling use on farmland, along with a clarification of which type of customer base should have restrictions. The current 500 sq. metre limit is a long time restriction that will limit a key part of our future facility needs for our customers. We have been advised by the Town of Halton Hills' pre consultation group that the size restriction applies to facilities for selling to both retail customers and our important landscaper customer base (which are deemed "commercial business").</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>Sheridan has been growing plants in Halton Region since 1913. The original farm was in Oakville. We have been growing plants in Glen Williams since 1955 and Norval since 1986. We remain dedicated to being in farming. This is evidenced by our large investment in infrastructure over the past few years. Our new irrigation holding pond was itself \$1M but it was necessary as a good environmental steward, and to help insure adequate irrigation water to our millions of plants on our Glen Williams farm.</p> <p>Our workforce for our farming operations peaks at over 300 employees, with approximately half of these permanent year round staff. We have also been very fortunate to have a lot of long term dedicated employees.</p> <p>We sell our produce to most of eastern Canada and to about 10 mid western states, and are the largest grower of our kind in Canada. Sheridan represents well over 10% of the agricultural dollar output of Halton Region. Sheridan uses 6% of all compost produced in Halton Region in its growing operations.</p> <p>Our type of agriculture is changing in many ways. Our growing methods have dramatically evolved. This especially includes the change from traditional in ground growing to growing plants in pots. This has advantages and disadvantages. Environmentally we are now using mostly recycled "media" to grow plants in. This eliminates the need to remove soils from growing land. It also allows more year round access to plants. The negative side is that plants cannot be held back from market for an extensive period like the older (in ground) method allowed. This requires we have a more reliable and flexible access to customers.</p> <p>The market place is also changing. Independent small garden centres are being steadily replaced by mass merchants. Remaining independent garden centres are now often much larger than they were years ago. The retail public often associates "large" with success and convenience. This applies to almost all products in our society With less independent garden centres, landscapers now buy direct from growers more than ever. Although we have been selling directly to landscapers since 1913, they are now a very large part of our direct customer base, as it is for virtually every horticultural grower in Canada.</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Being a farmer in Halton Region is becoming more difficult. We are being increasingly surrounded by urban areas and urban generated legislation and restrictions. These are negative factors as our flexibility and cost effectiveness, especially as compared to our competitors in other areas of Canada and the US. The high Canadian dollar has also changed the flow of horticultural produce. Exports are decreasing and imported competition is increasing. This is unlikely to change for the foreseeable future. As such, it is important that Sheridan, as with other growers, has competitive advantages to attract new customers and retain existing ones.</p> <p>The restriction on facilities to "500 sq. Metres" is from an era of simpler smaller farms that had a different requirement. It is important that Halton Hills and Halton Region continue to support agriculture in a real way and take the lead in allowing flexibility for modern large facilities to support all types of customers. For retail customers, we are suggesting that large scale "farm outlets" are both a producer outlet, and a type of agri-tourism. People will drive many miles for a sense of event, but will only travel locally to a small store.</p> <p>There is an ongoing misconception that restrictions on facilities on farmland is "protecting" farmers. The traditional 100 acre mixed farm in Halton Region is disappearing. For most farmland areas to remain economic for the next generation, an urbanized flexibility of facilities and activity must be allowed. Words on a power point that agriculture will be supported must be backed up by specific innovative Official Plans. We need a forward vision to protect agriculture, not a reflection back as to how much of the restrictions we can hang onto. There were also concerns raised regarding the increased traffic potential that would be caused by larger scale retail operations and facilities by Sheridan. The "rural" roads are already very busy by urban users. There is virtually no such thing as a quiet rural farm road in Halton Region.</p> <p>SPECIFIC REQUEST for ROPA 38 a) Sales to our non retail customer base, whether it is to governments, garden centres, utilities, or wholesale landscapers should not have any specific limitation in facility other than normal building bylaw and environmental restrictions.</p> <p>Horse farmers and fruit growers have no specific limitation as to the size and number of buildings on their property. Why should a grower of trees? The preconsultation meeting concluded that sales to landscapers are a "commercial" activity. All large farmers sell to commercial businesses so this definition is actually archaic. A dairy farm sells their milk to a commercial milk processor and their "barn" is likely more than 500 sq. metres. The milk processor picks up from the farm. We must not selectively restrict landscapers as not farm friendly. They are a key ingredient in our type of produce delivery chain.</p> <p>We are not talking about having landscape trade (construction) companies operate from the farm. We are simply talking about having large enough facilities to allow Sheridan to provide one stop shopping</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>for plants, most of which would be from our own farm, and to have some (limited) non plant ancillary products (soil, tree supports, fertilizer, irrigation supplies).</p> <p>b) Sales to the retail public should have generous guidelines to the scale and scope of the store and related facilities (main building, greenhouse, covered areas, parking, display and plant storage. As highlighted by the recent Halton Hills Agriculture support meeting, there is a lot of pride in the large scale public access buildings and facilities used by Chudleigh's and Andrew Scenic Acres. Given our much larger growing operation, and the large percentage of our own produce that would be sold in our intended large retail outlet, why would we not be allowed an even larger facility?</p> <p>c) Restrictions on facility size should be related to the scale and size of the operation. Industrial, Commercial, and Residential buildings are often limited in building size only by the percentage ratio to size of the property. Why is farming not provided the same flexibility?</p> <p>SUMMARY The key for support for agriculture is to understand the marketplace that Sheridan and other farmers operate in. We need a progressive vision for the allowed facilities and market access that will support our business and customer needs.</p>	<p>Staff has advised that Sheridan may use the floor area provisions for retail, agri-tourism, and horticultural trade use cumulatively to have up to 1,500 sq m of floor area, beyond which it is still staff's position that a site-specific amendment would be advisable.</p>
<p>Oakville Independent Schools</p> <p>November 23, 2009</p>	<p>Attention: Mr. Perry Vagnini, Senior Planner, Legislative and Planning Services Department</p> <p>Dear Sir:</p> <p>Re: Region of Halton Proposed ROPA 38 – An Amendment to Incorporate the Results of Sustainable Halton, Official Plan Review Directions and Other Matters</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The Oakville Independent Schools as an organization have become aware of ROPA 38. Individual private schools have participated in the planning process and have submitted letters of concern. Please be advised that the Oakville Independent Schools have significant concerns with the policies contained within ROPA 38 as they related to private schools and we believe modifications are required to clarify the interpretation of key policies.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The Oakville Independent Schools represent 12 different private school entities and provide educational services to the entire spectrum of elementary and secondary students. Oakville Independent Schools contribute significantly to local economy and provide major social benefits to the Oakville community.</p> <p>The following statistics provide an indication of how important independent schools are to the social and economic fabric of Oakville:</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private schools provide educational services to a large number of Oakville students. In 2007/2008, there were 4,615 enrolled in private schools. • The Oakville Independent Schools are one of Oakville's largest employers. In 2007, there were 777 staff employed at private schools and, in addition, more than 192 contract jobs were sustained at private schools. • Many charitable organizations and initiatives are supported by funds raised at private schools. In 2007, over \$215,000 was raised for these purposes and countless hours are devoted to community service and volunteerism. • The economic impact is significant. The overall revenue in 2007 was over \$76,000,000 and the payroll was over \$47,000,000. Property taxes paid amounted to over \$671,000. <p>Without question, the Oakville Independent Schools are a tremendous contributor to the overall quality of life in the Oakville community and the Region as a whole.</p> <p>Concerns</p> <p>Of specific concern is Section 77.4 (1) which states: Prohibit residential and other non-employment uses including major retail uses in the Employment Areas except to recognize uses permitted by specific policies of a Local Official Plan on the date of adoption by Council of this Plan.</p> <p>The Places to Grow Plan under the Employment Land policies (Section 2.26) Section 2 a) states that Municipalities will promote economic development and competitiveness by a) providing for an appropriate mix of employment uses including industrial, commercial and institutional uses to meet long-term needs.</p> <p>Under this policy institutional uses are considered an employment use. Very similar wording is included within Section 1.3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement.</p> <p>It is our understanding that the Region of Halton is taking the position that private schools, which are an institutional use, will not be permitted within Employment areas. This is set out in the proposed policy Section 77.4(1). This policy and interpretation is contrary to the Places to Grow Plan and the PPS.</p> <p>We are requesting that this policy be amended to be consistent with these two provincial planning documents and that a definition of employment uses be included in the plan that clearly states that industrial, commercial (except major retail) and institutional uses are employment uses.</p> <p>It is our opinion that permitting private schools within employment areas is appropriate from a land use planning perspective.</p>	<p>Our interpretation of this section of the Growth Plan is that it describes the manner in which a municipality should plan for those uses in order to promote economic development and competitiveness. The heading preceding that section is "Employment Lands", not "Employment Areas". It is not meant to specify the type of uses that should be permitted in the "Employment Areas", which is defined to exclude institutional uses.</p> <p>However, <i>we propose to provide for small-scale institutional uses in Employment Areas based on very strict conditions so that the use can be supported on the principle</i></p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>We look forward to speaking with you further about resolving these concerns prior to the adoption of the amendment by Regional Council.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>Oakville Independent Schools Appleby College Chisholm Academy High School Dearcroft-Westwind Montessori Fern Hill School Glenburnie School John Knox Christian School Kings Christian Collegiate MacLachlan College Oakville Christian School Rotherglen School St. Mildred's-Lightbourne School Wildwood Academy</p>	<p>of complete communities.</p>
<p>Laurent Viel and Jette Anesen</p> <p>Rockwood</p> <p>November 23, 2009</p>	<p>November 2009</p> <p>The Regional Municipality of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, Ontario 16M3L1</p> <p>Attention: Regional Chair Gary Carr</p> <p>Subject: Regional Official Plan Amendment # 38</p> <p>Dear Chair Carr: This letter is to express our concern about ROPA #38 and the Region's priority of Natural Heritage Systems over agriculture.</p> <p>We wish the Agricultural designations to remain and current permitted land uses to be maintained.</p> <p>Please consider the alternatives offered by the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture.</p>	<p>Please refer to our responses to the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture submission contained within Attachment #3 to Report LPS114-09.</p>
<p>Colleen Walker</p> <p>November 23, 2009</p>	<p>November 2009</p> <p>The Regional Municipality of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, Ontario 16M3L1</p> <p>Attention: Regional Chair Gary Carr</p> <p>Subject: Regional Official Plan Amendment # 38</p> <p>Dear Chair Carr: This letter is to express our concern about ROPA #38 and the Region's priority of Natural Heritage Systems over agriculture.</p>	<p>Please refer to our responses to the Halton</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>We wish the Agricultural designations to remain and current permitted land uses to be maintained.</p> <p>Please consider the alternatives offered by the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture.</p>	<p>Region Federation of Agriculture submission contained within Attachment #3 to Report LPS114-09.</p>
<p>Dave Marshall</p> <p>Milton</p> <p>November 23, 2009</p>	<p>November 2009</p> <p>The Regional Municipality of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, Ontario 16M3L1</p> <p>Attention: Regional Chair Gary Carr</p> <p>Subject: Regional Official Plan Amendment # 38</p> <p>Dear Chair Carr: This letter is to express our concern about ROPA #38 and the Region's priority of Natural Heritage Systems over agriculture.</p> <p>We wish the Agricultural designations to remain and current permitted land uses to be maintained.</p> <p>Please consider the alternatives offered by the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture.</p>	<p>Please refer to our responses to the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture submission contained within Attachment #3 to Report LPS114-09.</p>
<p>OakvilleGreen</p> <p>November 23, 2009</p>	<p>Chair Carr, Mayor Burton, Councillors and Regional Staff:</p> <p>As you know from our participation in the Sustainable Halton process, protection of the Natural Heritage System is one of our prime concerns so when the Milton Council voted to put an overlay on Map 1 showing what part of the Natural Heritage System above the brow was also agricultural land we were concerned. Twice in public forums we have asked about the implications of this and twice we have been assured by Regional staff that there were no implications and that what was allowed or not allowed on NHS land would not change.</p> <p>As you are all well aware, agricultural uses are permitted on NHS land, something Oakvillegreen fully supports, so we never understood why this overlay was needed, and in fact, when staff were asked during a public forum in Oakville what the "good planning reason" for doing it would be, they could not answer.</p> <p>Recently I had the opportunity to read a Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs report on the Burlington Quarry Extension and it certainly seems to me having land designated as "agricultural" has implications under the Provincial Policy Statement, in the case cited, allowing the expansion of a quarry as a permitted use on prime agricultural land.</p> <p>So, if we map the NHS AND show it as agricultural land, are there not implications? And given that agricultural activity is a permitted use in</p>	<p>The Prime Agricultural Areas overlay above the Brow is to implement policies of the Greenbelt Plan, which prohibits non-agricultural uses within those areas.</p> <p>The implication is that the overlay will impose</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>the NHS, why is an overlay in any way necessary?</p> <p>I would appreciate a definitive answer to these questions.</p>	<p>additional conditions or restrictions to development. ROPA 38 shows the Prime Agricultural Areas as an overlay on Map 1E but only has effect above the Brow, not below as all lands are Prime.</p>
<p>Marilyn Wierl</p> <p>November 24, 2009</p>	<p>November 2009</p> <p>The Regional Municipality of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, Ontario 16M3LI</p> <p>Attention: Regional Chair Gary Carr</p> <p>Subject: Regional Official Plan Amendment # 38</p> <p>Dear Chair Carr: This letter is to express our concern about ROPA #38 and the Region's priority of Natural Heritage Systems over agriculture.</p> <p>We wish the Agricultural designations to remain and current permitted land uses to be maintained.</p> <p>Please consider the alternatives offered by the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture.</p>	<p>Please refer to our responses to the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture submission contained within Attachment #3 to Report LPS114-09.</p>
<p>Kaule</p> <p>November 24, 2009</p>	<p>November 2009</p> <p>The Regional Municipality of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, Ontario 16M3LI</p> <p>Attention: Regional Chair Gary Carr</p> <p>Subject: Regional Official Plan Amendment # 38</p> <p>Dear Chair Carr: This letter is to express our concern about ROPA #38 and the Region's priority of Natural Heritage Systems over agriculture.</p> <p>We wish the Agricultural designations to remain and current permitted land uses to be maintained.</p> <p>Please consider the alternatives offered by the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture.</p>	<p>Please refer to our responses to the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture submission contained within Attachment #3 to Report LPS114-09.</p>
<p>Marilyn Grossi and Greg Jones</p>	<p>November 2009</p> <p>The Regional Municipality of Halton</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
<p>November 25, 2009</p>	<p>1151 Bronte Road Oakville, Ontario 16M3LI</p> <p>Attention: Regional Chair Gary Carr</p> <p>Subject: Regional Official Plan Amendment # 38</p> <p>Dear Chair Carr: This letter is to express our concern about ROPA #38 and the Region's priority of Natural Heritage Systems over agriculture.</p> <p>We wish the Agricultural designations to remain and current permitted land uses to be maintained.</p> <p>Please consider the alternatives offered by the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture.</p>	<p>Please refer to our responses to the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture submission contained within Attachment #3 to Report LPS114-09.</p>
<p>Bob and Sherry Foster Nassagaweya November 25, 2009</p>	<p>November 2009</p> <p>The Regional Municipality of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, Ontario 16M3LI</p> <p>Attention: Regional Chair Gary Carr</p> <p>Subject: Regional Official Plan Amendment # 38</p> <p>Dear Chair Carr: This letter is to express our concern about ROPA #38 and the Region's priority of Natural Heritage Systems over agriculture.</p> <p>We wish the Agricultural designations to remain and current permitted land uses to be maintained.</p> <p>Please consider the alternatives offered by the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture.</p>	<p>Please refer to our responses to the Halton Region Federation of Agriculture submission contained within Attachment #3 to Report LPS114-09.</p>
<p>O'Connor MacLeod Hanna LLP for Halton Healthcare Services Corporation November 25, 2009 (received November 27, 2009)</p>	<p>Mr. Perry Vagnini Senior Planner Legislative and Planning Services Region of Halton 1151 Bronte Road OAKVILLE, Ontario L6M 3LI</p> <p>Dear Mr. Vagnini:</p> <p>Re: Halton Healthcare Services Corporation - Milton Hospital Region of Halton Proposed ROPA 38 - An Amendment to Incorporate the Results of Sustainable Halton, Official Plan Review Directions and Other Matters Our File No. 83699</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Please be advised that we act for Halton Health Services Corporation, which operates the Milton Hospital. In our review of Map 1 and Map 1G of ROPA 38, the proposed Natural Heritage System is shown on easterly portion of the Milton Hospital lands as well as the lands further to the east.</p> <p>We are requesting the removal of the Natural Heritage System designation for the lands north of McLaughlin Avenue and the lands west of Fannstead Drive as these lands have been deleted from the Town of Milton Official Plan through the Subwatershed Impact Study process.</p> <p>As I am sure you are aware, although these lands are designated Greenlands A within the Town of Milton Official Plan, Section C.8.4.3 of the Milton Official Plan states:</p> <p>All new development in the Sherwood Survey will have regard for the recommendations of the applicable subwatershed plan and will be subject to the findings of the relevant Subwatershed impact Studies (SIS) as approved by the Town in consultation with the relevant public agencies. No amendments to the Secondary Plan shall be required to implement the recommendations of the subwatershed plans or for changes in the location of stormwater facilities in accordance with the policies of Section C.8.5.16 of this Plan.</p> <p>Further, prior to draft plan approval, Subwatershed Impact Studies (SIS) are required for each Sub-watershed Impact Area identified on Schedule C-8-E to this Plan.</p> <p>We have confirmed with the Town of Milton that a Subwatershed impact Study was completed for Subwatershed Area 10 and included these lands. The Subwatershed impact Study had recommended that the portion of the creek north of McLaughlin Road could be engineered to accommodate the subdivision. This portion of the creek was eliminated with its function replicated in a piped system that feeds to an open channel system further south.</p> <p>Based on this recommendation and the policies contained in Section C.8.4.3., the Greenlands A designation in the Town of Milton Official Plan no longer applies to these lands. Draft Plans of Subdivision, that reflect these changes to this feature, have been approved by the Town of Milton.</p> <p>Due to the process undertaken to date, in our view, it is not appropriate for ROPA 38 to show these lands within the Natural Heritage System and we request that the designation be removed and the lands designated as Urban Area.</p> <p>I look forward to speaking with you further about resolving these concerns prior to the adoption of the amendment by Regional Council.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, O'CONNOR MACLEOD HANNA LLP</p>	<p>Please refer to policy 116.1 of Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38 which speaks to refinements of the Regional Natural Heritage System boundary based on Area-Specific Plans, Subwatershed studies, or individual Environmental Impact Assessments.</p> <p>Regional staff have consulted with Town of Milton staff and determined that the approved subwatershed impact study has eliminated a portion of the creek. The ROPA 38 mapping will be updated to reflect this change.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
<p>Millington & Associates for Douglas Kim</p> <p>November 26, 2009</p>	<p>Perry Vagnini, Senior Planner Legislative & Planning Services 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, Ontario L6M 3L1</p> <p>Subject: ROPA38 Wedgewood Golf Centre 1535 Plains Road West Burlington, Ontario</p> <p>My client, Mr. Douglas Kim, is the owner of 6 ha of property at 1535 Plains Road West. Mr. Kim is concerned that his property is within the North Aldershot Policy Area but is not identified on the map as "Eligible for Urban Servicing". The ROPA 38 policies require new development and new lots to be on full municipal services yet the policies do not support full municipal services for his property.</p> <p>Within the North Aldershot Planning Area of the Burlington Official Plan this property is designated North Aldershot Commercial along the Highway 6 frontage and Infill Residential on the east side of the property. Redevelopment for these uses requires full municipal services.</p> <p>Mr. Kim requests that ROPA 38 be amended to include his property within the "Eligible for Urban Servicing" designation in the North Aldershot Policy Area.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Millington & Associates.</p>	<p>This issue is being investigated by City of Burlington staff. A response will be provided once this process is complete.</p>
<p>RRL Burloak Inc.</p> <p>November 26, 2009</p>	<p>Dear Mr. Vagnini: Re: Sustainable Halton ROPA38</p> <p>RRL Burloak Inc. is the owner of the Burloak Shopping Centre, the commercial centre at the south-east junction of the QEW and Burloak Drive, in the Town of Oakville. We have a specific interest in ROPA 38 as it affects the lands on the south side of Wyecroft Road, adjacent to our existing commercial centre, which also fall under our ownership. We are also reviewing the comments made by the Town of Oakville and the proposed Livable Oakville policies, as they relate to our holdings.</p> <p>The Burloak Shopping Centre is found within an Employment Area, within ROPA 38, while other commercial centres of similar size are found within the Urban Area. The Centre performs a vital role in the commercial hierarchy of the Town of Oakville. We trust that this role is recognized within the proposed Employment Area designation.</p> <p>We note that the Town has posed the question regarding policy 77.4(1) and the exclusions from employment uses. We would also like clarity regarding what is contemplated by major retail.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments and we look forward to</p>	<p>Being within an Employment Area under ROPA 38, the lands are subject to policies in Sections 77.1 through 77.4. In general, major retail is not a permitted use within Employment Areas as they are protected for the traditional industrial and office uses.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	your response.	
<p>Aird & Berlis LLP for Newmark Developments Limited and Rosko Investment and Development Limited</p> <p>November 27, 2009</p>	<p>Regional Council Regional Municipality of Halton c/o Halton Legislative and Planning Services 1151 Bronte Rd., Oakville, ON L6M 3L1</p> <p>Attention: Perry Vagnini, Senior Planner</p> <p>Dear Mr. Vagnini:</p> <p>Re: Written Submission regarding Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38 Newmark Developments Limited & Rosko Investment and Development Limited</p> <p>We are counsel to Newmark Developments Limited and Rosko Investment and Development Limited. We write to provide our clients' written submissions with respect to proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38 (ROPA 38).</p> <p>We note that ROPA 38 is coming before Regional Council for its statutory public meeting on December 2, 2009. We ask that this written submission be provided to Regional Council and form part of the public record in advance of any final decision being made with respect to the approval of ROPA 38. We also ask that you provide our office with notice of any future meetings, proceedings or decisions pertaining to ROPA 38.</p> <p>Our clients own 3069 Dundas Street West in the Town of Oakville. Their site comprises the majority of the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Regional Road 25 (Bronte Road) and Dundas Street West, extending up to (and beyond) Highway 407. As Regional Council is aware, this area is poised to be subject to the North Oakville West Secondary Plan, which was recently approved by Oakville Town Council. The North Oakville West Secondary Plan is currently before the Ontario Municipal Board on an appeal filed by our clients and others.</p> <p>Our clients are proposing to develop their site for a full range of employment, living, entertainment, recreation and other uses as part of a comprehensively planned and integrated mixed-use community. Accordingly, our clients' interest is ensuring that ROPA 38 does not unreasonably or unjustifiably constrain the development potential of their lands.</p> <p>ROPA 38 proposes to designate our clients' lands as <i>Employment Area</i>. Of primary concern to our clients is proposed policy 77.4(1), which reads as follows:</p> <p>77.4(1) Prohibit residential and other non-employment uses, including major retail uses in the <i>Employment Areas</i>, except to recognize uses permitted by specific policies of the Local Official Plan on <i>the</i> date of adoption of Council of this Plan;</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Our clients submit that the above-noted policy is overly restrictive. ROPA 38 does not define "non-employment" uses. Further, the permission to develop non-employment uses within designated employment areas, including major retail uses, should be left to the local municipalities. Local council is best able to determine whether such uses meet and enhance the objectives of the local official plan.</p> <p>Neither the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement nor the <i>Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe</i> prohibit the presence of mixed use development permissions within an employment area. Yet as currently drafted, ROPA 38 would prevent, on a go forward basis, local municipalities from including permissions for mixed uses within their designated employment areas.</p> <p>To address this concern, we propose that the words "<i>...on the date of adoption of Council of this Plan</i>" be deleted from proposed policy 77.4(1). This revision would ensure that a mixed-use development could occur on our client's lands if approved through the North Oakville West Secondary Planning process.</p> <p>In the alternative, a designation other than <i>Employment Area</i> should be considered for our clients' lands to better reflect its key locational attributes and its mixed use development potential.</p> <p>Our clients have additional concerns with proposed policy 77(21), which prescribes criteria for the approval of large-scale retail uses that may have primary trade areas extending beyond the boundary of the relevant local municipality. Similar to policy 77.4(1), policy 77(21) is overly restrictive and effectively does not permit local councils to address the location of "large-scale retail uses" (not defined) within their own municipalities. The Region should not become an independent approval authority wherever a large-scale major retail use is proposed to be developed in conformity with a local official plan.</p> <p>Our clients also seek clarification to the <i>Intensification Areas</i> policies of ROPA 38. In particular, proposed policy 80(3) indicates that <i>Intensification Areas</i> "...include <i>Intensification Corridors</i> as identified in local official plans, which consist of areas along Higher-order</p>	<p>Regions desire is to protect Employment Areas for long term employment uses for this purpose "Employment Areas" exclude "mixed use" that may include residential, retail, and recreational uses. Only "associated retail and ancillary facilities" are permitted.</p> <p>We disagree with this suggestion as it would defeat the purpose of protecting the Employment Areas for long term employment uses as defined through the definition in the PPS and the Growth Plan.</p> <p>The lands in question are designated employment in the North Oakville West Secondary Plan. The lands west of Regional Road 25 are intended for employment uses only in both the Regional and Local Official Plans.</p> <p>The policy is to "co-ordinate ...the approval process", not to approve. The co-ordination of such matters that cross municipal boundaries is an obligatory responsibility of the Region under the Growth Plan.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p><i>Transit Corridors and selected Arterial Roads."</i></p> <p>Pursuant to Oakville's approved Official Plan, our clients' lands are at the intersection of two arterial roads, being Bronte Road and Dundas Street West. The latter is recognized as a "High-Order Transit Corridor". The wording of proposed policy 80(3) does not clarify how "<i>selected Arterial Roads</i>" must be identified within a local official plan before adjacent lands are considered to be within an <i>Intensification Area</i> for purposes of ROPA 38. Given the location of our clients' lands at the intersection of two <i>Arterial Roads</i> comprising a gateway into the new North Oakville West Secondary Plan Area, we submit that it would be appropriate for our clients' lands to be considered an <i>Intensification Area</i> pursuant to ROPA 38.</p> <p>We ask that Region Council direct its staff to give further consideration to the above-noted policies. Our office is available for consultation with staff where needed. Should you have any questions or require clarification, please contact the undersigned directly.</p> <p>Yours truly, Steven A. Zakem AIRD & BERLIS LLP</p>	<p>As identified in the Local Official Plan.</p> <p>We generally agree but the details will be part of a future amendment to the Local Plan to conform to ROPA 38 when approved.</p>
<p>Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing</p> <p>November 27, 2009</p>	<p>Mr. Ron Glenn, M.C.I.P., R.P.P. Director of Planning and Chief Planning Official Halton Region Legislative and Planning services 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, ON, L6M 3L1</p> <p>Dear Mr. Glenn:</p> <p>Subject: Request for Comments on draft Regional Amendment No. 38 MMAH File No.: 24-DP-0D27-06038</p> <p>Thank you for providing the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MAH) with an opportunity to offer One-Window comments on Halton Region's draft Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38 (ROPA 38).</p> <p>ROPA 38 comprises the second part of the Region's Growth Plan conformity exercise and official plan review, which is also intended to update the Halton Region Official Plan to conform with the Greenbelt Plan and be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 (PPS). The draft was the subject to a multi-ministry review through the provincial One-Window Planning Service.</p> <p>The exercise, known as "Sustainable Halton, represents an important step in providing the Region and its area municipalities with a sustainable growth management strategy. Overall, the exercise positions the Region well for the future by establishing a framework of regional and local centres and corridors, an emphasis on intensification and provisions for more compact and complete communities. Simultaneously, the draft plan reflects and compliments</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>the Greenbelt Plan and implements the PPS by establishing a vision and policies for natural heritage, agricultural and water resource systems.</p> <p>While draft ROPA 38 (and part 1 ROPA 37) provide many of the important policy directions, there a number of matters that require further discussion and policy direction. From a Growth Plan/PPS perspective, the key matters relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the absence of any intensification targets and objectives prior to the year 2015; • the lack of specificity regarding achievement of the designated Greenfield density target of 50 residents and jobs per hectare; • the lack or generality of policy dealing with free standing office buildings and major retail uses; • the role the Region should play in relation to achieving appropriate urban form and densities in regards to the regional centres and corridors; and, • the role the Region should/plans to play in relation to planning, developing and sustaining transit service and use. <p>In addition to the above, the preferred growth option contemplates substantial residential growth in the community of Georgetown, to be facilitated by the extension of Lake Ontario based sewage and water. However, detailed financial analyses of the implications of this option have not yet been undertaken and it is understood the Region is only part way along the path of undertaking a more detailed financial analysis. Further discussion is needed in regards to this matter.</p> <p>In addition, the evaluative framework for the growth options was generalized as the Sustainable Halton process evolved leading to only high level conclusions regarding the merits of the various options, including the preferred one. To this end, further discussion is needed regarding the merits of the preferred growth option in relation to impacts on agricultural lands, natural heritage and water resources systems, and the establishment of complete communities, recognizing that only a residential expansion is being proposed for Georgetown.</p>	<p>It should be noted that, as the Minister is the approval authority of ROPA 38, these discussions can continue after Council adoption of ROPA 38. If as a result of such discussions, modifications to ROPA 38 are proposed, the Minister will consult Council on these modifications prior to his decision to approve ROPA 38.</p> <p>Some of the issues raised in this letter have already been addressed through modifications contained in Appendix 2 of Attachment #4 to Staff Report LPS114-09.</p> <p>Ministry staff has yet to review the Fiscal Affordability Analysis report (referred to as “part way along the path of undertaking a more detailed financial analysis”) released in late October. In addition, the Ministry has not been engaged on the staged but comprehensive approach taken by the Region in addressing the fiscal impact of growth, staff will engage the Ministry in further discussions on this matter.</p> <p>We believe that Ministry staff is not fully aware of the comprehensive evaluation process undertaken as part of Sustainable Halton work leading to Council’s selection of the preferred growth option in June 2009. They also fail to recognize that the Georgetown urban</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>From a Greenbelt Plan and Provincial Policy Statement perspective, two fundamental issues have been identified. First, ROPA 38 proposes a Natural Heritage System (NHS) designation which would involve the redesignation of substantial areas of land currently designated Agricultural Rural Area, particularly to the north and west of the Niagara Escarpment Plan area. While understanding the importance of recognizing the NHS, and acknowledging that it supports existing and new agriculture, it is equally important to provide appropriate recognition to the Region's agricultural system, as per the PPS and GB. This could be accomplished by specifically identifying prime agricultural areas as part of the remaining Natural Heritage System (i.e. linkages) identified on Map 1G and identifying this area on Map 1 Regional Structure as a dual Prime Agriculture/NHS designation; by designating prime agricultural areas with a Natural Heritage System overlay; or through other approaches which achieve the same goals. Further discussion is needed on this matter.</p> <p>Second, ROPA 38 contains an aggregate policy framework which appears to be incongruent with a variety of elements of both the PPS and Greenbelt Plan. In particular, elaboration is needed in relation to negative impacts and net environmental benefit; the "preclude and hinder" framework requires further direction with respect to the types of permitted uses in High Potential Mineral Aggregate Areas and on</p>	<p>area expansion includes a component of mixed use areas that provide employment. As well, there is an employment area introduced along Highway 401, within the context of the Town of Halton Hills. Also an Urban boundary expansion in Milton to accommodate a significant portion of growth to 2031. Staff is of the opinion that the land use concept adopted by Council in June 2009 creates a balance of growth across the Region and meets the Growth Plan objective of "complete" communities.</p> <p>The alternative treatment of the NHS north and west of the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area, as recommended in Staff Report LPS114-09, will address this concern. Map 1G will be used to assist the Local Municipalities in developing the detailed implementation policies for conformity to the Greenbelt Plan while being consistent with Regional Plan goals, objectives and policies. In Halton Hills outside the Greenbelt and the Niagara Escarpment Plan areas the key features have been designated and the linkages have been identified as an overlay to the Agricultural Rural designation.</p> <p>Regional staff is of the view that ROPA 38 treatment of aggregate resources complies and meets the minimum standards on this matter set forth by</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>lands adjacent thereto; clarification of the regulatory roles for enforcement of licenses under the Aggregate Resources Act is needed; and further work on identifying and mapping of significant woodlands with respect to posing constraints on potential aggregate uses is required.</p> <p>In addition to these more substantive mailers, we have identified a number of technical and/or mechanical issues which are identified in the attached table. It is important and beneficial to ensure official plans reflect provincial policies accurately in order to ensure proper implementation and the appropriate framework for the guidance and approval of area municipal official plans by the Region.</p> <p>Lastly, we have some suggested additions which would support the plan and the overall vision and approach, recognizing that some of these may be more appropriately dealt with through a subsequent exercise (eg. the role of regional transit and urban design in urban growth and/or regional centres and regional corridors).</p> <p>We have been pleased with the cooperation and dialogue that has occurred on the draft plan and, in keeping with this ongoing dialogue, we are committed to working closely with Regional staff to continue discussing these matters prior to a recommended version of the new official plan being finalized. To this end, attached please find three tables as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 1 identifies what are generally the policies with the most need for substantive revision. • Appendix 2 Identifies comments in relation to the maps. • Appendix 3 Identifies additional matters of a more technical nature. <p>We would also strongly encourage the region to continue its efforts to engage interested Aboriginal communities. MMAH staff would be pleased to attend any such meetings if this would be seen as beneficial to either the Region or the relevant Aboriginal communities.</p> <p>Larry Clay Regional Director</p>	<p>Provincial Plans and policies. Some of the matters advanced by ROPA 38 are to recognize the long history of Halton's involvement and previous Council positions in dealing with licence applications under the Aggregate Resource Act. Staff will be pleased to continue our dialogue with Ministry staff to provide a full background of Halton's approach to aggregate resource planning.</p> <p>As noted before, many of these technical or mechanical issues have been addressed through the proposed modifications through Staff Report LPS114-09.</p> <p>In conclusion, Staff feels that this is a positive letter from the Ministry with respect to ROPA 38. The outstanding issues can be addressed through continued dialogue with the Ministry during Ministers approval of ROPA 38, by explaining the policy background and history of planning in Halton. Should there be any modifications needed to satisfy the Ministry, Council will be consulted on these modifications as part of the approval process of ROPA 38 by the Ministry.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE										
	<p>Supporting Documents:</p> <p>1. Appendix A:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="402 695 1084 1873"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="407 701 548 804">OP Section Number</th> <th data-bbox="548 701 1079 804">Comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="407 804 548 972">26/27</td> <td data-bbox="548 804 1079 972">The Plan would benefit from a vision statement related to the region's urban structure eg. series of compact and complete communities with a vibrant series of regional and local centres connected by a multi-modal series of corridors.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="407 972 548 1140">51</td> <td data-bbox="548 972 1079 1140">While maintaining development is directed to Urban Areas, Hamlets should be included as a primary designation within the Regional Structure as the Region sets such boundaries, limits growth, and provides connections.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="407 1140 548 1556">52</td> <td data-bbox="548 1140 1079 1556"> <p>Refinements should not result in minor extensions of Urban Area.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the boundaries of the Niagara Escarpment Plan area (specific NEP designations also), Greenbelt Area, Greenbelt NHS, and Prime Agricultural Areas and Hamlet within the Greenbelt shall not be modified or amended.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="407 1556 548 1873">Table 2</td> <td data-bbox="548 1556 1079 1873"> <p>Subnote 1 excludes the Natural Heritage System from the Table 2, however the Natural Heritage System includes lands not identified in Section 2.2.7 (3) of the Growth Plan, and should be revised accordingly. It appears this was deleted in Section 77(2.4) of the OP.</p> <p>Intensification of Urban Growth Centres should also be added to Table 2, in accordance with Section 2.2.4 of the Growth Plan.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	OP Section Number	Comments	26/27	The Plan would benefit from a vision statement related to the region's urban structure eg. series of compact and complete communities with a vibrant series of regional and local centres connected by a multi-modal series of corridors.	51	While maintaining development is directed to Urban Areas, Hamlets should be included as a primary designation within the Regional Structure as the Region sets such boundaries, limits growth, and provides connections.	52	<p>Refinements should not result in minor extensions of Urban Area.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the boundaries of the Niagara Escarpment Plan area (specific NEP designations also), Greenbelt Area, Greenbelt NHS, and Prime Agricultural Areas and Hamlet within the Greenbelt shall not be modified or amended.</p>	Table 2	<p>Subnote 1 excludes the Natural Heritage System from the Table 2, however the Natural Heritage System includes lands not identified in Section 2.2.7 (3) of the Growth Plan, and should be revised accordingly. It appears this was deleted in Section 77(2.4) of the OP.</p> <p>Intensification of Urban Growth Centres should also be added to Table 2, in accordance with Section 2.2.4 of the Growth Plan.</p>	<p>This is covered at a higher level under Section 31, regarding "healthy communities", further detailed under the objectives of the Urban Area.</p> <p><i>This proposed change has been made.</i></p> <p>Section 52(4) is very site specific and only applies when the Urban Area boundary is not a readily identifiable line and when the extension is required for proper site or subdivision design.</p> <p><i>We have modified this section to exclude reference to Map 1A.</i></p> <p>The restrictiveness of permitted uses in our NHS designation effectively elevates it to the same "no development permitted" status as significant natural heritage features.</p> <p>See Section 81.3(2).</p> <p>They are listed under</p>
OP Section Number	Comments											
26/27	The Plan would benefit from a vision statement related to the region's urban structure eg. series of compact and complete communities with a vibrant series of regional and local centres connected by a multi-modal series of corridors.											
51	While maintaining development is directed to Urban Areas, Hamlets should be included as a primary designation within the Regional Structure as the Region sets such boundaries, limits growth, and provides connections.											
52	<p>Refinements should not result in minor extensions of Urban Area.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the boundaries of the Niagara Escarpment Plan area (specific NEP designations also), Greenbelt Area, Greenbelt NHS, and Prime Agricultural Areas and Hamlet within the Greenbelt shall not be modified or amended.</p>											
Table 2	<p>Subnote 1 excludes the Natural Heritage System from the Table 2, however the Natural Heritage System includes lands not identified in Section 2.2.7 (3) of the Growth Plan, and should be revised accordingly. It appears this was deleted in Section 77(2.4) of the OP.</p> <p>Intensification of Urban Growth Centres should also be added to Table 2, in accordance with Section 2.2.4 of the Growth Plan.</p>											

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
	61 (1)	All the Schedules should be noted.	Section 51.2.
	63	Should be augmented with a statement that the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System policies apply in the Parkway Belt West Plan.	<i>We will add a reference as suggested.</i>
	66	<p>Lot creation policies should include provisions for infrastructure and natural heritage conservation. In addition to facilitating conveyances to public bodies, the Region may also consider non-profit entities as per the policies of the GB Plan. Also, appears not to contemplate any form of development based severance.</p> <p>Subsection 66(2.1), regarding adjusting lot lines, should be revised to address Section 4.6 (2c) of the GB Plan which prohibits further fragmentation of environmental features.</p> <p>This section should also address lot creation as it pertains to agricultural uses, agricultural related uses, and surplus farm dwellings to conform to Section 4.6 (3) of the GB Plan, such as whether or not lot creation is permitted for agricultural related uses. It appears the policies in ROPA 38 are more restrictive than the Greenbelt Plan which states that municipal official plans cannot be more restrictive than the Greenbelt Plan with respect to agriculture and aggregates.</p>	<p>Such provisions are addressed under Sections 66(1) and 66(2.2).</p> <p>Halton's Plan is more restrictive in this respect.</p> <p>The "subject to" clause of Section 66's preamble covers this.</p> <p>This will be addressed by the Local OP's when they implement policies of the Greenbelt Plan within the Greenbelt Plan Policy Area.</p>
	73	Further discussion is needed in relation to including certain policies of the Greenbelt Plan not being fully incorporated into the amendment.	See comment above.
	77	<p>For subsection 77(1) further discussion is needed as to the timing of Region adopting more detailed population and employment forecasts for upcoming local municipal official plan updates.</p> <p>For subsection 77(2.3), further discussion is needed regarding the methods to ensuring minimum 40% intensification is achieved. As well, there does not appear to be any intensification forecast for the years up to 2015.</p> <p>This should also be applicable to lands within the built boundary.</p>	<p>This is planned for 2010 in the form of an update to the Best Planning Estimates.</p> <p>See Section 77(1)e). <i>We have also modified Section 77(2.2) by starting the monitoring now, instead of waiting until 2015.</i></p>
	77(5)	Subclause g) requires municipalities to maintain minimum DGA density target as listed in Table 2. 'Maintain' should be replaced with 'achieve or exceed' as these density targets are minimums.	<i>We have modified "maintaining" to "achieving". We view the direction "to exceed a minimum" to be meaningless because the exceedance could be minuscule. "To achieve a</i>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		<p>Lastly, there is currently no policy describing how the DGA density target for new community areas proposed via ROPA 38 is to be determined to achieve the overall DGA density target in the Growth Plan of 50 people/jobs/ha nor is there a description of how it will be applied/measured (eg. at the secondary plan level?). Wording should be added wording to address these matters.</p> <p>Further discussion is also required on the DGA targets in Table 2.</p>	<p>minimum” is a good, measurable performance target. The Growth Plan should have adopted a higher minimum instead of asking for exceedance.</p> <p>Section 77(4) provides the framework for conformity to the targets in Table 2, which were derived based on detailed work described in Sustainable Halton Phase 3 Report 3.07.</p>
	77.1	<p>As a new objective, the Region should add a policy that speaks to designating and preserving lands within settlement areas in the vicinity of existing major highway interchanges, ports, rail yards and airports as areas for manufacturing, warehousing, and associated retail, office and ancillary facilities, where appropriate.</p> <p>As well, the Region should add a policy to encourage the facilitation of the development of transit-supportive, compact built form and minimize surface parking as per Section 2.2.6.10 of the Growth Plan.</p> <p>A policy should be included promoting the intensification or redevelopment of existing built employment lands to employment uses which use land more intensely or efficiently – regardless of employee density.</p> <p>Policy should also be provided speaking to the role of free standing office uses in employment areas – as generally they should be directed to centres and corridors to leverage the synergies with other commercial businesses located there and to enhance their accessibility by transit.</p> <p>Added back into Appendix C see 81(10.1)</p>	<p><i>We will add a new objective as suggested.</i></p> <p><i>A new policy has been added, incorporating this and the next comment.</i></p> <p>See Section 81(10.1).</p>
	77.4(1)	<p>Further discussion is needed on deferring to existing permissions for major retail in employment areas. Further, how is major retail to be defined?</p>	<p>Major retail is defined through Section 77(21).</p>
	77.4(4)(e)	<p>Subsection 4e), ‘over the long term’ should be added in conformity with Section 2.2.6 of the Growth Plan.</p>	<p><i>This has been added.</i></p>
	81(10.1)	<p>A policy should be added that appropriate major</p>	<p>This is already provided for</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		institutional development should be located in urban growth centres, major transit station areas or areas with existing frequent transit service, or existing or planned higher order transit service. Should strengthen policy 77(11) to reflect this Growth Plan policy.	<p>in Section 81(10.1).</p> <p>Section 86(6) sets minimum Regional targets while Section 86(6.1) distributes them among the Local Municipalities. Performance is then monitored through Section 86(7) and responded to through Section 86(8). Individual targets for Local Municipalities are not shown in the OP because such targets vary by year throughout the planning period.</p> <p>See comment above and Section 77(1).</p> <p>This will be addressed through detailed implementation policies of the Local OP's within the Greenbelt Plan Policy Area.</p> <p>Such uses require a site-specific amendment to the Plan and will trigger all the necessary conformity exercises.</p> <p>This will be addressed through detailed implementation policies of</p>
86(4)	<p>The PPS provides for an appropriate range of housing "types" and "densities." These capture the appropriate range of housing. The OP can group these housing types and densities under the "low", "medium", and "high" categories. Further, targets should be "minimum".</p> <p>Should also clarify that Region will establish minimum housing targets for "each" local municipality, similar to <u>Table 2, Intensification and Density Targets</u>, in which targets can then be shown by "types" and "densities".</p>		
86(6.1)	The population projection in Table 1 is based on the Growth Plan. The allocation of units in Table 2 reflects how the population will group into households in dwellings. Both tables respond to 1.4.2 of the PPS. But further; 1.4.3 of the PPS asks specifically for the provision of the appropriate range of housing types and densities. As such, there should be a distribution of housing types to area municipalities rather than a region wide figure.		
100	Specific to the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt, a policy should be added that prohibits redesignation of the prime agricultural area to non-agricultural uses, unless specifically permitted, and prohibits amendments to the prime agricultural area boundary, in conformity with Section 3.1.3 of the GB Plan. For rural areas, the Region should address and include application policies in Section 3.14 and 4.1 of the GB Plan.		
101(1.5)	<p>Subsection (1.5) should be revised as follows: golf courses and driving ranges should be prohibited in prime agricultural areas throughout the Region and directed to settlement areas or rural areas. If such is being considered in a prime agricultural area outside the GB Protected Countryside Area, then such would be subject to Section 2.3.5 of the PPS.</p> <p>Further, policies in Section 4.1.2 of the GB Plan should be added to address major recreational uses within the Protected Countryside eg. a requirement</p>		

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		<p>for a vegetation enhancement plan or a conservation plan.</p> <p>Lastly, further discussion is needed regarding 'net gain' and 'net loss' concept, as set out in subsection (1.5 b) vii) with respect to overall natural features and golf course development.</p>	<p>the Local OP's within the Greenbelt Plan Policy Area.</p>
	104	<p>Further discussion is needed in regards to Rural Cluster being recognized as settlement areas and such not being identified on Map 1. This also applies to Section 99.1, 101(1.2), 101(1.6), 102(1), 105, and 106(4) including further lot creation being permitted in prime agricultural areas and not requiring Local Official Plans to designate Rural Clusters.</p>	<p><i>Rural Clusters have been deleted from the Plan.</i></p>
	107	<p>This section should address and include policies for extraction of mineral aggregate resources in <i>prime agricultural areas</i> in accordance with PPS 2.5.4, specifically the requirements for agricultural rehabilitation.</p> <p>Subsection (2) does not appropriately reflect the direction in the PPS which protects mineral aggregate operations from "... <i>development</i> and activities that would preclude or hinder their expansion or continued use or which would be incompatible for reasons of public health, public safety or environmental impact..." This also applies to Section 110(1).</p> <p>For subsection (3.1), the words 'to the extent possible' should be added, to be consistent with PPS.</p> <p>The intent of subsection (5) is unclear. Of particular note, phrases such as "appropriate after use" and "within the time frame of the license" would benefit from further explanation. It should be noted that the PPS and the ARA identify the requirement to undertake progressive and final rehabilitation. Further, the Aggregate Resources of Ontario" Provincial Standards Version 1.0, which forms part of O Reg. 244/07, outlines a number of technical requirements for the rehabilitation of licensed mineral aggregate operations. Also, the word 'after-use' in subsection (5) should be replaced with 'natural heritage system or agricultural uses', in accordance with the PPS and as noted in Section 110(6) of this OP.</p>	<p>Since licences for new or expanded quarries are by amendment to this Plan, such detailed issues would be addressed at that time.</p> <p>This section is only an objective. <i>We have modified Section 110(1) by adding the phrase "for reasons of public health,..."</i></p> <p>This is only an objective and we do not see the need for such a qualifier, nor do we find it in the PPS.</p> <p>As an objective, <i>we have deleted the words "within the time frame of the licence"</i> but keep the general reference of after-use based on what the application calls for.</p>
	109(4)	<p>Revision of the wording of this section is</p>	<p>We believe that this Section</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		<p>recommended in order to clarify its intent. Progressive and final rehabilitation objectives should be considered in determining the appropriate location for any associated facilities. In keeping with both the ARA and the PPS, the location of associated facilities should not, to the extent possible, unduly preclude or interfere with the timely progressive or final rehabilitation of an operation. In some circumstances, however, this may require that associated facilities be located in the later parts of the extractive operation to permit progressive rehabilitation in early extractive phases. Further the restriction on only dealing with materials from the site is not supported as there is a need/benefit in some instances for processing or blending of materials from off site.</p>	<p>is appropriately worded.</p>
	<p>109(5.1)</p>	<p>Golf courses and other non-agricultural uses are not permitted in prime agricultural areas, including post aggregate extraction. Consideration of a golf course in a prime agricultural area would need to be in accordance with PPS 2.3.5, noting such redesignations in prime agricultural areas within the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt is prohibited (Region may include additional areas). Even in rural areas, a golf course is a new principle use and needs to go through a fulsome planning process.</p> <p>This section should be deleted in its entirety.</p>	<p><i>We will delete this Section.</i></p>
	<p>110(7.2)</p>	<p>Further discussion is needed regarding “no negative impact” on the features and functions of Halton Region’s natural heritage system as it appears to be more restrictive than the GB Plan. Also, further discussion is needed regarding “net environmental gain” as the definition is unclear, subjective and open to interpretation, including consideration of compensation for the loss of the NHS. Removing and replacing elements of the natural heritage system rather than protecting, maintaining and enhancing would not be consistent with the provincial policies.</p> <p>Subclause a) should be revised to clarify the term ‘no negative impact’, such applying specifically to Section 2.1 of the PPS, versus applying such to the all features and functions of the Natural Heritage System, which is not set out in the PPS, GB Plan, or NEP.</p> <p>For subclause b), as noted earlier in these comments, portions of the natural heritage system extend through prime agricultural areas, as such, in prime agricultural areas, rehabilitation for agriculture purposes should be precedent.</p>	<p><i>We have clarified that prior to the net environmental gain approach, conformity test to Provincial Plans is a pre-requisite.</i></p> <p>“No negative impact” is being qualified as “in accordance with Provincial Plans and policies.</p> <p>Since this Section deals with impact on the NHS, we believe that the rehabilitated use should be</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>For subclause c), the words 'enhanced' should be replaced with the words 'maintained or restored, and to the extent possible, enhanced'. Also the words 'features and' should be added before the word 'function'.</p> <p>For subclause c) & d), restoration and enhancement planning appears to include additional works beyond the proposed licensed area. The following should be noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no requirement in the ARA for mineral aggregate operations to include rehabilitation plans outside the area licensed. ▪ Areas outside the licensed areas are not subject to the conditions of the ARA, licence or site plan. Areas outside the defined licensed boundary would subject to other applicable statutes (e.g., Planning Act, Municipal Act, Conservation Authorities Act, etc.). <p>Accordingly, the requirement to undertake rehabilitation outside the licensed boundary should not be a condition of the ARA licence or site plan.</p>	<p>NHS.</p> <p>Enhancement is the right approach because we are dealing with net gain.</p> <p>The net gain approach is a Planning Act application consideration and is designed to protect the NHS.</p>
110(8)	<p>For subclause a), as per section 2.5.2.1 of the PPS, the demonstration of availability of aggregate to meet demand is not required. This clause should be deleted.</p> <p>For subclause b), as per section 2.5.2 of the PPS, the need to demonstrate economic benefits to Halton is not required. This clause should be deleted.</p> <p>For subclause c) ii), the words "on site and in the area" should be added after the word "waters".</p> <p>For subclause c) iv), the term 'significant geologic formations' should be clarified, such as the Escarpment, the Escarpment Brow, karst formations....., and whether this applies "on the site and in the area".</p>	<p>This is not a request for demonstration, just a factor for our Council's consideration.</p> <p>Ditto.</p> <p>It is understood and applies to all items on the list.</p> <p><i>We have deleted this reference as it is covered under our NHS.</i></p>
111	<p>For subsection (1), the words 'mineral resource areas' should be added after the words 'To protect', and the word 'area' should be added after 'mineral resource'.</p> <p>For subsection (3), while Map 1F identified Mineral Resource Areas, the Region has not undertaken a fulsome constraint exercise in conjunction with the Province to more specifically identify those areas where other regional objectives would supersede</p>	<p><i>We have added the words "mineral resource areas" but do not think adding the word "area" is appropriate.</i></p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>the need to protect the resource. As such, until this exercise is undertaken, this policy should end after the words “as is realistically possible”. Further, any references to demand forecasts are not supported and should be deleted.</p> <p>118 For subsection (1), a sentence should be added stating ‘Local OPs shall specifically identify and map natural features, in both the official plan and zoning by-law and, within the Greenbelt, this should include minimum vegetation protection zones as well.</p> <p>For subsection (2), the words ‘physical and/or biological features’ should be replaced with “features and their ecological functions” to be more consistent with the terminology in provincial documents and elsewhere in the Halton Region OP.</p> <p>For subsection (3), the definition of development (which includes site alteration) should include change in land use and excavation, and exemption for agricultural practices that were carried out on December 16, 2004 and activities or works under the <i>Drainage Act</i>, in accordance with the GB Plan and PPS. Also, further discussion is need as per subclauses b) – d) as it appears these exemptions are not in conformity with the Section 3.2.2 of the GB Plan. Lastly, the purpose of the EIA should be revised to include connectivity and establishing an appropriate natural self-sustaining vegetation protection zone that is sufficient width to protect the feature and its functions from impacts, in conformity with the GB Plan.</p> <p>For the last paragraph in 18.3, the purpose of an EIA – words should be added that it is also to establish any required buffer or, within Greenbelt, the appropriate vegetation protection zone.</p> <p>For subsection (3.1 – 3.2), reducing the 120m EIA area within the Greenbelt portion of the OPs Natural Heritage System is not in conformity with the GB Plan. Scoped EIAs as noted in subsection (3.3) can be considered for minor development.</p> <p>For subsection (4), for clarification should add ‘minor variance’.</p> <p>For subsection (12), there should be a link to requirements of the Greenbelt Plan or an EIA as they will inform what is “appropriate”. Further, this policy appears to be hazard related – with 118(11) seeming to be the beginning of hazard policies. It is</p>	<p><i>We will delete the part as suggested.</i></p> <p>This will be addressed through detailed Local OP implementation policies related to the Greenbelt Plan.</p> <p><i>We accept this proposed change.</i></p> <p><i>We have adopted the PPS/Greenbelt Plan definition for “development”.</i></p> <p>This and following comments will be addressed in the Local OP’s.</p> <p>We disagree with this suggestion as it is onerous.</p> <p>This will be addressed in the Local OP’s.</p> <p>By definition, hazard lands</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		<p>recommended/requested that hazards be subject of a separate subsection from the NHS.</p> <p>For subsection (15), Conservation authorities lead shoreline work, therefore references to MNR in a) and b) should be removed.</p> <p>For subsection (17), Public lands on the floor of Lake Ontario are subject to the Public Lands Act. For lands where private waterlots exists, it may be advisable to include natural heritage and conservation activities as permitted uses.</p>	<p>are generally included in the NHS.</p> <p><i>We have removed these references.</i></p> <p>Being part of the NHS, such water lots are allowed such uses.</p>
	139.4 & 139.5	<p>Further discussion is needed on OP policies and land use schedules regarding the PBWP. This also applies to Section 176(1.1) of this OP. Pending a rationalization exercise between the PBWP and the Halton OP, Section 139.5 should require area municipal OP's to reflect all remaining land use designations within the PBWP as shown on Map 1A and not just the transportation and utility corridors as shown on Map 1B.</p>	<p>Halton intends to seek an amendment to remove all Complementary Uses except those included in the NHS or Urban Areas from the Parkway Belt West Plan.</p>
	141	<p>For subsection (6), the words 'renewable energy sources' should be replaced with 'alternative energy systems and renewable energy systems' to be consistent with the PPS, including a definition for alternative energy systems. Also, renewable energy systems should be permitted in those land use designations as set out in the <i>Green Energy Act</i>, and not subject to <i>Planning Act</i> approvals, including an EIA. This may also be addressed in Section 175 & 176 of this OP. Further, larger and more complex alternative energy systems, or other infrastructure projects such as waste management facilities in Section 149 of this OP, which require an Environmental Assessment should require an amendment to the Region's OP, while smaller and less complex projects requiring a Certificate of Approval should be reviewed at the local municipal level.</p>	<p>These are details that we would prefer to await the issuance of all Regulations related to the Green Energy Act and the experience of some case studies.</p>
	2. Appendix B:		
	Map 1	<p>Agriculture, Rural, Environmental are the primary regional land use categories outside of urban areas and hamlets. The approach the Region has taken is to create a new Natural Heritage System (NHS) designation. While acknowledging that the NHS designation allows for existing and new agriculture, there is a need to further discuss this approach and alternatives to approaching this matter (see covering letter). The outcome may have implications for the base mapping of several of the other maps.</p>	<p>See comment to the covering letter.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
3. Appendix C:		It is noted that Map 1 now shows detailed boundaries for hamlets while also showing Agricultural Rural Area and Natural Heritage System within them. It appears the agricultural/rural identifier should be removed from within the hamlets – acknowledging the Region’s intent to show the NHS within the hamlets.	<p><i>We have introduced a new “Hamlet” designation to replace the “Agricultural Rural Area” designation.</i></p> <p>We disagree. They are not needed to interpret Map 5. Map 1A is clear. Halton intends to make an application to modify the Parkway Belt West Plan for harmonization with its OP as amended by ROPA 38.</p> <p>Municipal official plans represent the key implementation instrument of the Provincial Growth Plan and we believe our approach to strategic employment lands does that while reflecting the need and aspiration of Halton.</p> <p>This will be addressed in Local OP’s through detailed implementation policies.</p> <p><i>We have done this.</i></p> <p>“High Potential” is not a well defined term.</p> <p>Key Features shown on Map 1G represent a consistent approach in implementing Provincial plans and policies.</p>
	Map 5	As noted above on Map 1, the built boundary and Urban Growth Centre should be identified on Map 5.	
	Map 1A	Where Provincial Plans overlap, such overlap should be more visible to identify the full extent of each boundary and/or a note on the map advising of this. Further discussion is also needed to consider how to move forward with rationalization of the Parkway Belt West Plan area and the Halton Official Plan.	
	Map 1C	While understanding the intent to protect “strategic employment lands” beyond the 2031 timeframe and having previously advised that the concept is one which could be discussed, there is a need to develop a consistent approach if such an approach is to be considered within an official plan, with a focus on policy rather than mapping. With respect to mapping, the advice provided to the region has been on conceptual mapping which should not form part of the official plan and thus the use of detailed mapping on a schedule of the official plan as with Map 1C is not supported.	
	Map 1D	As per Section 5.3 of the GB Plan, vulnerable areas should also be mapped, with associated policies as set out in the GB Plan, PPS, and other provincial policies and initiatives. Typically, these include more than just well-head protection areas and it may be that this exercise needs to await the source water protection plan(s) for lands within Halton.	
	Map 1E	Need further discussion on Prime Agricultural Areas.	
	Map 1F	Hamlet boundaries should be shown. This applies to Map 1G as well. As well, the title in the legend should be revised to read “High Potential Mineral Resource Areas”.	
	Map 1G	As polices regarding environmental features may vary within various Provincial Plans, as well as outside of such plans, the boundaries of the NEP, GB Plan, and PBWP should be identified. Further thought is needed as to how best identify each plan in areas of overlap.	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
	OP Section Number	Comments	
15 (3)	Should note that proposed amendments which implement are 5-year reviews of the official plan under Section 26 of the Planning Act, require a public open house.	Section 15 is intended to provide a “layman” version of a private amendment. The suggested details are not appropriate here.	
16	Could note that this Plan provides more detailed Regional policy direction to Provincial land use plans and policies. Could also note its applicability before the Ontario Municipal Board, including any applicable OMB Reform policies set out in Bill 51.	See Sections 36 through 38.	
33	Should add “and optimization” to the phrase “timely provision of infrastructure” to ensure the use of infrastructure is maximized and provides a broad range of benefits.	Section reference should be 32. “Optimization” is not a well-defined term within the land use planning context. The provision of a “broad range of benefits” is already well expressed throughout the “Vision” section of the Plan. Section 65 makes	
65	As lot creation may not be permitted in some designations, such as Provincially Significant Woodlands and environmental features and associated vegetation protection zones with the Protected Countryside area of the Greenbelt, the word ‘permitted’ should be replaced with ‘subject to’, or add ‘for the range of uses permitted by this Plan’, or list where lot creation is prohibited.	reference to “specific policies” of this Plan, which would be Section 66 and other Sections such as Sections 76, 139(4) and 139.2(3). Under Section 66, there is a “subject to” clause with respect to Provincial Plans.	
72	<p>For subsection 72(3) should add ‘complete and inter-connected’ after the word ‘identifiable’.</p> <p>For subsection 72(4), should add words similar to ‘and coordinates land use, finance, and infrastructure planning’. Should also reference Table 2 in the OP. Not clear what this policy is intending with the term “commensurate”?</p> <p>For subsection 72(9), should add the words ‘and increased densities’.</p> <p>For subsection 72(10), should add the words ‘direct where such uses should locate, and protect employment areas’.</p>	<p><i>We will make this change.</i></p> <p>The additions will dilute the focus of this objective. Reference to Table 2 is more appropriate for a policy, not for an objective.</p> <p><i>We have made this change as suggested.</i></p> <p><i>We have introduced a new objective to reflect this.</i></p>	
77	Subsection 77(5c) should be revised to provide more specific direction in relation to hazard lands.	Details are contained in Sections 118(11) through 118(18).	
77(6)	There should be some regional direction on what constitutes ‘substantial occupancy’.	As stated, it provides flexibility for structuring the	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
			financing plan under Section 77(15).
	77(7)	<p>More detailed policies in Section 3.4.2 of the GB Plan should be included.</p> <p>For subclause c), an additional subclause should be added that municipal or communal sewage and water services are preferred for hamlets and should not exceed the assimilative and water production capacities of the local environment.</p> <p>For subclause f), the words 'and in conformity' prior to the words "with the Growth Plan".</p>	<p>Greenbelt Plan conformity will be addressed in Local OP's.</p> <p>There is no expansion of Hamlets being permitted by the Plan.</p> <p>"Consistent with" provides intent; "conformity" is an exercise as part of the approval of this Plan.</p>
	77.3	See comments re Section 139.6 and 139.7.	
	77(7)	For subclause a.1), delete the words "that time horizon may be varied as a result of a Provincial planning exercise" as the Growth Plan is now the governing document.	We disagree. This PPS provision is not in conflict with, but complementary to, the Growth Plan and resolves the inherent conflict in the Growth Plan between "not exceeding 20 years" and the 22-year planning horizon of "2031".
	81(7)	Wording should be added which requires the local municipal exercises to establish densities which are commensurate with supporting existing or planned transit. In (c), any reduction should only be considered through a municipal comprehensive review as an area specific review does not have the overall municipal context to inform it.	<p><i>We will add such a policy.</i></p> <p>An Area-Specific Review has the ability to rebalance the overall density target within the area.</p>
	85	Objectives should be added which specifically address PPS 1.4.1 a) & b) Housing policies. This should include language which speaks to 10 year supply through residential intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, greenfield lands.	<p><i>We have modified Section 77(7)a.1) to address the 10-year supply. The 3-year supply is addressed under Section 86(1). Section 77(7)a) deals with the locational criterion of housing supply.</i></p>
	86(2)	In section 214, the definition of "Affordable" does not align with the definition in the PPS. The other dimension of affordability is the relative location of a household in the income distribution. This can be included into the ROP with the addition of "low and moderate income household," which is defined in the PPS.	Halton's definition for Affordable represents an improved version of the PPS definition as it reflects real non-housing costs. Otherwise, using the PPS definition will result in the upper limit for ownership affordable housing being some 20% higher because

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
			of the high income level in Halton.
	86(4)	Incorporating the Joint Municipal Housing Statement (JMHS) with the Regional Official Plan not only benefit the implementation of housing programs, but also joins the strategic directions of the JMHS with the goals and objectives of the ROP. In this light, a strategic ROP can provide a framework for specific outcomes the land use planning system could deliver. Particularly, in the mix of housing both market and affordable to support a wide variety of households.	Comment noted.
	86(7)	This policy for monitoring supply and demand for housing would be more effective if: a) the actual total is shown for the fractions stated in section 86(6); and, if section 86(6.1) states the minimum targets for each of the local municipalities. These are benchmarks from which housing gaps and shortfalls can be identified.	Section 86(6) sets Regional target while Section 86(6.1) distributes them among the Local Municipalities. Performance is then monitored through Section 86(7) and responded to through Section 86(8). Individual targets for Local Municipalities are set through Section 77(1). They are not shown in the OP because such targets vary by year throughout the planning period.
	99	<p>There should be a Prime Agricultural designation and Rural designation in order to identify the boundaries of Prime Agricultural Areas. Further, this provides policy direction on locating such things as consideration of non-agricultural uses outside of Prime Agricultural Areas.</p> <p>These uses should also be distinguished throughout the land use policies of this designation/s, such as Section 100(1) and 100(4).</p> <p>For subsection (16), the term 'rural uses' should be defined, and likely not permitted in prime agricultural areas if such includes non-agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Halton has traditionally taken a very restrictive approach to rural uses, to the extent that they reflect a high degree of protection of agricultural lands. Hence, we have only a single designation, Agricultural Rural Area, which is equivalent to an "Agricultural" designation under Provincial policies and plans. All non-agricultural uses within the Agricultural Rural Area will require an amendment to our Plan.</p> <p>The term, as defined, is used because it is commonly used and easily understood by the public. We don't see how having this contradicts Provincial policies.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
	100	<p>As noted above in Section 99, for subsection (1), should use the PPS term and definition for 'agricultural uses'. This applies throughout the OP. For the Agriculture Rural designation, could also generally permit 'agriculture-related uses' and 'secondary uses' with range of uses and development criteria set out in policy or definitions. Or if such uses are already specifically identified in this section, then each of these uses should be noted as being agriculture-related or secondary use.</p> <p>For subsection (2), the definition of 'existing use' should be revised for the Protected Countryside area of the GB Plan to reflect the December 16, 2004 date as per Section 4.5 of the GB Plan. This would also address Section 117.1(3) of the OP. The GB Plan definition of development and exemption of existing agricultural practices may also be added.</p> <p>For subsection (3), wording should be added to state that the existing lot had to have been zoned to permit the dwelling as of December 16, 2004. This also applies to Section 117.1(4) of the OP.</p> <p>For subsection (4), the terminology set out in the PPS definition of agricultural uses should be used for accessory dwellings. This also applies to Section 117.1(5) of the OP.</p> <p>For subsection (14), the definitions for 'home occupations' and 'cottage industries' should be revised from accessory use to secondary use. This</p>	<p><i>We propose to adopt the PPS definition but with a modified preamble of "AGRICULTURE of AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY or AGRICULTURAL OPERATION or AGRICULTURAL USE or FARMING means ..."</i> because each term has its place in certain context of the Plan. We do not generally permit agricultural related or secondary uses, only specific uses as listed in this Section because our Plan is more restrictive. Halton does not support a broad spectrum of secondary uses because its definition in the PPS does not limit scale and provides loophole for non-agricultural uses to claim to be agricultural-value added. Same comment applies to a lesser extent for agriculture related uses, and hence no definitions for both terms.</p> <p>The Preamble of Section 100 provides for a "subject-to" screening for conformity to the Greenbelt Plan.</p> <p>Ditto.</p> <p>Regarding this and following comments, our Plan is very clear on under what circumstances these uses are permitted and do not provide general permission for "secondary uses".</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		<p>would also address Sections 100(21) and 117.1(13) of the OP.</p> <p>For subsection (15), bed and breakfast establishment should be defined and noted as a secondary use. This would also address Section 117.1(14) of the OP.</p> <p>Subsection (16) and (17) should be revised to address the following, veterinary clinics and animal kennels should be directed to settlement areas, and may be considered in rural areas. Such uses may be considered as secondary uses in prime agricultural areas, recognizing challenges exist to ensure it is established and remains in the future as a secondary use. These are PPS and Growth Plan related matters, therefore reference to the GB Plan should be deleted. This also applies to Sections 117.1(14) of the OP.</p> <p>For subsection (21), the definition of 'commercial farm' should tie into a definition for 'agricultural use', therefore the words 'farm operation' in the beginning of this subsection and in the definitions should be replaced with 'agricultural use'. This would also address Section 117.1(16) of the OP.</p> <p>For subsection (21e), it appears "horticultural trade uses" are considered as secondary uses which applicable criteria, however the definition should be revised to the business aspect of horticulture as per the following: growing of nursery and horticultural crops (and the associated on-farm buildings and structures) is an <i>agricultural use</i> as defined in the PPS, and not a <i>secondary use</i>; and storage and distribution could be considered an <i>agriculture-related use</i>. Contractor-type and retail uses could be considered secondary uses if within associated criteria of secondary uses. This also applies to Sections 117.1(16 e) of the OP.</p> <p>Some policies refer to the Prime Agricultural Areas of the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside Area. <i>Prime agricultural areas</i> are not delineated in the GB. The GB states that <i>prime agricultural areas</i> are those lands designated as such within municipal official plans.</p> <p>This section does not permit agriculture related uses such as commercial and industrial uses in the Agricultural Rural or NHS designations.</p>	<p>See earlier comment regarding multiple and interchangeable terms on "agricultural operation".</p> <p>The term and accompanying policies are the result of an extensive study by the Region on landscape contractors; and should be maintained. To clarify, <i>we will keep the parenthetical note "(but not horticultural trade use)" in our definition for "agricultural use" above.</i></p> <p>Greenbelt Plan conformity will be dealt with through the Local OP's.</p> <p>See above comment on "agriculture related" uses.</p>
	101	A separate subsection needs to be added addressing the provincial policy requirement that in	See Section 101(2)d).

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		<i>prime agricultural areas and rural areas, new land uses, including the creation of lots, and new or expanding livestock facilities shall comply with the provincial <i>minimum distance separation formulae</i> (MDS), as amended from time to time.</i>	
	101(3)	Further discussion is needed to categorize the list of uses as agriculture-related uses, secondary uses, or other greater uses and which of these are to be directed to settlement areas.	
	101(4)	In regards to 'retiring farmer', subclause j) i) should be revised accordingly as the PPS definition of agriculture use permits 'accommodation for full-time farm help'.	The definition has been modified.
	102	As this OP review is part of the Region's Greenbelt conformity exercise, a policy should be added to prohibit expansions and minor rounding out of Hamlets (OP also recognizes Rural Clusters as settlement areas) within the Protected Countryside area of the Greenbelt.	<i>We have added a sentence to this effect under Section 103. There are no more Rural Clusters.</i>
	103	Should note Hamlets play a lesser role in accommodating growth.	Section 102(1) does this.
	109	Further discussion and policy revisions area needed to ensure GB Plan policies related to aggregates and wayside pits and quarries are incorporated into this OP, as well as the proposed policies for this OP should not be more restrictive than Section 4.3.2 of the GB Plan as they apply to mineral aggregate resources.	
	109(3)	Delete the words " <i>in compliance with</i> ".	This Section is based on a Cabinet decision.
	110(7.1)	For subclause d), the word 'Protected Countryside Area' should be replaced with 'Natural Heritage System' to be in conformity with the GB Plan. Also, extraction 'areas' should be replaced with extraction 'operations'. For consistency within this subsection, the words 'as determined by the Province' should added in reference to MNR's GB Technical Papers. Additional wording should be added to address the conditions set out in Section 4.3.2 (3a) iii) of the GB Plan. Municipal wellhead protection areas should be added to the constraints list for new or expanded Mineral Resource Extraction Areas (alternatively, they could be removed from areas identified as aggregate potential on Map 1F).	<i>We have made this change. We prefer the term "confirmed" to "determined" as another party may carry out the field work and it reflects the conditions set out in Section 4.3.2(3a)iii).</i> We will undertake this when Map 1D is updated based on the Source Protection Plan.
	110(7.3)	"completeness", pursuant to the ARA, is established through O. Reg. 244/97 vis a vis the	<i>This Section has been amended to restrict the</i>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Provincial Standards Version 1.0. Further, MNR is identified as the agency responsible for deeming an application complete pursuant to the ARA. The “completeness” reference should only be in relation to a Planning Act application.	<i>reference of “completeness” to the Planning Act application.</i>
	110(8.2)	The term ‘Adaptive Management Plans (AMP)’ should be defined in the OP, and further discussion on the applicability of such is needed.	<i>A new definition has been added.</i>
	110(9)	The NEC should be added.	<i>This has been done.</i>
	112(1)	Clarification is required on the “exclusion of certain areas considered to be unsuitable”. Are these areas explicitly defined in the OP and provincial policies/plans (such as provincially significant wetlands) or does this policy contemplate to include other, yet to be determined, considerations (such as Section 112(2) of this OP which reflects Section 2.5.2.5 of the PPS)? See comment on 111(3) above.	<i>We have made changes to this Section to clarify its intent.</i>
	112(4)	It appears this subsection is a ‘demonstrate need’ policy which is not consistent with Section 2.5.2.1 of the PPS. This section should be deleted.	<i>This Section has been deleted.</i>
	113	As commented on earlier, further discussion is needed regarding the designation of the Natural Heritage System (NHS) and how it applies to prime agricultural areas. Further it appears additional GB Plan policies, such as Section 3.2.2, 3.2.4, and 4.5, need to be incorporated into this OP.	
	114.1	For subsection (1), the word ‘natural’ should be replaced with ‘significant’. For subsections (10-13 and 19), the noted environmental features are specifically listed in the PPS and could be combined into one objective listing such features. For consistency among these subsections and with the PPS, same wording ‘preserve or, where possible, enhance the natural features and their ecological functions of the following:’ should be used. Further other PPS listed features, such as woodlands, valleylands, and ANSI should be included in this subsection, as well as additional features listed in the GB Plan. Also, definitions of features should consistent with the PPS and conform to the GB Plan and NEP. A subsection should also be added to address an objective for adjacent lands in the PPS, vegetation protection zones and area of influences in the GB	<i>We believe that “natural” is more appropriate in this context.</i> <i>We have made modifications as suggested.</i> <i>The concept of adjacent lands should be a policy</i>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		<p>Plan.</p> <p>For subsection (23), the term 'key features' should be clarified and defined, considering various OP terminologies and terminologies used in Section 2.1 and 2.2 of the PPS, Section 3.2.4 of the GB Plan, and policies of the NEP. Further, it should be noted that the NHS policies of the OP recognize, support, and complement agricultural uses, in which agricultural uses may be subject to scoped NHS policies, while not limiting the ability of existing agricultural uses to continue. Key provincial policies include Section 2.1.7 of the PPS and definition of development in the GB Plan (which includes the date of December 16, 2004 for identifying an existing agricultural use).</p>	<p>and is fully addressed under Sections 118(3), 118(3.1) and 118(3.2).</p> <p>Key Features are defined in the Plan through Map 1G.</p>
	115.2	<p>For clarification, this subsection should be revised to state that the Natural Heritage System identified in Section 114.1 is designated on Map 1, and Map 2 - Regional Waterfront Parks, and includes the GB Plan NHS and Escarpment Natural and Protection Areas identified on Map 1A. Key features and linkage areas of the NHS are specifically identified on Map 1G. Also, the NHS may include other natural features and areas, such as significant habitat of endangered species and threatened species, not designated on Map 1 and identified through a land use planning application or Local OP.</p>	<p>Section 114.1 contains objectives and does not identify the NHS; Map 2 is about the Waterfront Parks and is not part of the NHS; NHS as shown on Map 1 already includes those suggested components.</p>
	115.3	<p>For subsection (1), the words 'as identified in Section 114.1' should be added after the words 'Key features' since 115.3(1) only mentions 3 of many such features. Alternatively, deleting the words "generally consisting of woodlands, wetlands and watercourses" would address this.</p> <p>For subsection (2), enhancements to linkages and buffers also appears a goal of the NHS.</p>	<p><i>These words have been deleted.</i></p>
	115.4	<p>The elements here appear to be better located in 115.2 or 115.3. Further, the words "has been extended to" should be deleted as the elements in 115.4 are fundamental components of the NHS and include many of the features cited in 2 and 3.</p> <p>For 115.4(3), confirmation should be provided whether this is speaking to all lands covered by the CA generic regulation, or only those lands which form part of an regulated flood plain.</p>	<p><i>This Section has been re-worded.</i></p> <p>Only the latter.</p>
	116.1	<p>As this OP review is part of the Region's Greenbelt conformity exercise, a policy should be added to prohibit future amendments or refinements to the GB NHS boundary – either by the Region, or in</p>	<p>This is no longer needed as the NHS has been re-</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		area municipal official plans given they must conform with the Regional Official Plan . This also applies to Section 145(6) of this OP.	constituted as Regional NHS.
	139.1(1)	The phrase “407 transitway” should be revised to “Highway 407 transitway” in all instances.	<i>This change has been made.</i>
	139.2(1)a	The Region should be providing guidance for densities along regional corridors as part of a more comprehensive package of policies to address intensification and major transit station areas etc.	This guidance is provided in the Final Report of the Land Use Study for this Area under Section 139.2(1)d
	139.3	<p>As per previous comments, references to these Maps and corresponding policies, should be revised.</p> <p>The OP does not appear to deal with waste disposal sites. These can and do form constraints to development and policies should be provided in this regard. Active and closed waste disposal sites should be shown in either the regional or area municipal official plans. As well, an inventory of contaminated or brownfield sites should be compiled both for identifying opportunities and enhancing awareness so that appropriate policies are applied.</p>	These are dealt with through Sections 147(15) through 147(19) of the Plan.
	139.6	See comments regarding Map 1C.	
	139.11	Should note not all significant features are mapped on Schedule 1G, and addition significant features may be identified via further Regional studies, at the time of a land use planning application, or through local municipal OPs or Zoning By-laws, as amended.	<i>We will modify Section 116.1.</i>
	143	<p>For subsection (4), recognizing public transit as a priority,. This also applies to Section 172 and 173 of this OP.</p> <p>Subsections should be added to address Section 1.8 of the PPS.</p> <p>A subsection should also be added to consider use of pavement rehabilitation methods that recycle the existing asphalt significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions, air pollutants and the use of energy and aggregates.</p>	<p>This and the cited sections already address the importance of public transit.</p> <p>It is addressed throughout various sections of the Plan.</p> <p>This is an operational matter and will be investigated as part of the Region’s Corporate Sustainability Plan.</p>
	144	Should also consider support for green infrastructure, such as green roofs, rain gardens, and support with policies in the following	We don’t see these fitting into the “Water” section of the Plan. In any event, these are building design

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		subsection.	and site plan issues that belong more appropriately in the Local OP's
	145(3)	<p>For subsection (3), MOE requests to review any background reports regarding Table 2.1 and 2.2. Also, further discussion is needed regarding addressing agricultural and aggregate uses, and providing the flexibility to include additional uses identified at a later date.</p> <p>For subsection (4), identification of wellhead protection zones which originate in adjacent municipalities and include lands within the Region should be identified on Map 1D as part of this OP update.</p> <p>For subsection (6), should also include 'identify best management practices to minimize stormwater volumes and contaminant loads from settlement and countryside areas', to be consistent with Section 2.1 of the PPS.</p> <p>This section would benefit from a policy speaking to the Clean Water Act and that Source Water Protection Plan(s) will be prepared for relevant lands/areas in Halton which may necessitate further amendment to the OP.</p> <p>For subsection (16), should focus more on the effluent quality rather than the water quality of the receiving body. Reference should be made to wastewater best management practices.</p>	<p>It was based on research done by a former Regional Senior Hydrogeologist (Steve Holysh)..Agriculture is not considered a risk; quarries are screened through the ARA and Planning Act application process.</p> <p>We have yet to receive such information.</p> <p><i>We will introduce a new policy as suggested.</i></p> <p>See Section 145(3.1).</p> <p>We disagree. Effluent quality is controlled by MOE. Ultimately, the water quality of the receiving body is at stake.</p>
	146	<p>For subsection (6), should also include 'promote the enhancement of woodland cover in the region or portions thereof including a target percentage cover'.</p> <p>There should also be a policy committing the Region and area municipalities to use the results of watershed or subwatershed plans as the basis for achieving these objectives.</p>	<p><i>We will add this objective.</i></p> <p>The suggestion is too broad in scope and not applicable to all the objectives.</p>
	147	For subsection (15-17), further discussion is needed on contaminated or waste	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		<p>disposal sites regarding the detail of Regional mapping and policies versus Local mapping and policies.</p> <p>For subsection (18), 'surface water' and 'quantity' should be added to be consistent with PPS.</p>	<p>We do not believe those changes are relevant as the policy refers to the conditions of a development site</p>
	148	<p>For subsection (12), the following words, 'in accordance with provincial legislation and standards', should be added to be consistent with the PPS.</p>	<p>Section reference is in error.</p>
	149(13)	<p>For subsection (13), should add the wording, 'which may include <i>Ontario Regulation 101/07 Waste Management Projects Regulation</i>'.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to including policy regarding the Region's perspective on energy from waste facilities.</p>	<p>We disagree that such details are needed in an OP.</p>
	167(4)	<p>For subsection (2 & 2.1), further discussion is needed, including other aboriginal peoples and the Metis in addition to First Nations, as well as addressing known treaty or asserted aboriginal rights.</p> <p>As per direction from Culture, the term "Management" should be used in place of "Master", when referring to Archaeological Master Plans.</p>	<p><i>We have made this change.</i></p>
	172	<p>For subsection (3), while acknowledging the definition of the word "highway" includes all roads, common understanding is that highways are provincial. As such, the term "highway" should be replaced with "roadway" or similar reference to road types under the jurisdiction of the Region. The same is found in policy 173(5) b and 173(6).</p>	<p>The use and definition of the term "highway" (see Section 246) originated from the Highway Traffic Act and we consider that to be appropriate.</p>
	173(1)	<p>In Table 3 Function of Major Transportation Facilities, under "Provincial Highways", there is a reference to the ROW requirement being for provincial highway to be "up to 50 m". Provincial highway ROWs can be far greater as much as 100-120 m, depending on the type of highway and adjacent land use. No references to ROW's should be stated under provincial highway in all Official Plans as they are variable.</p>	<p><i>We have made this change.</i></p>
	173(5.1)	<p>For subsection (5.1), the words ', and in consultation with the Ministry of Transportation,' should be added after the words 'Master Plan'.</p>	<p>We don't think this reference is needed as the Master Plan is undergoing an EA process.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		<p>A subsection should be added to address, projects initiated by the Region or municipalities for the purposes of public and/or rapid transit may be subject to the requirements of Ontario Regulation 231/08, the <i>Transit Projects Regulation</i>.</p> <p>For subsection (22), should add the following words 'require transportation demand management planning' as a component of the assessment.</p>	<p>We don't agree with this level of detail in an OP.</p> <p>Such planning is not universally relevant for all development proposals.</p>
	185	<p>The following words should be added, 'including conformity with provincial plans and policies' to this section.</p> <p>Further discussion is need regarding policies to direct Regional collaboration and encouragement for zoning bylaw updates to follow shortly after local municipal official plan updates as the final stage to conformity and implementation of Provincial Plans. Discussion and consideration of policies should also address various planning tools and necessary establishment of planning application triggers to ensure implementation of provincial policies.</p>	<p>We disagree. Such conformity should be dealt with at the OP Amendment instead of Zoning By-law level.</p>
	215	<p>Agriculture, Agricultural Industry, Agricultural Operation or Farming. As noted in Section 99, should set out specific definitions for agriculture, agriculture-related uses, and secondary uses to be consistent with the PPS. Agricultural use should also permit accommodation for full time farm labour. Additional definitions should be provided for specialty crop areas, and minimum distance separation formulae.</p>	<p><i>We have adopted the PPS definition.</i></p> <p><i>These definitions have been added.</i></p>
	221	<p>Commercial Farm. Further discussion is needed in regards to this definition and Section 100(21) of this OP in regards to potential agricultural restrictions. This definition should be deleted as it is restrictive and contrary to the PPS.</p>	<p>The definition is needed to distinguish such from hobby farms because it is used to interpret permitted uses.</p>
	226	<p>Development. Should be revised as noted in Section 118(3) of this OP.</p>	<p><i>This has been modified.</i></p>
	235	<p>Farming. See comments regarding Section 215 of this OP.</p>	<p>This has been addressed.</p>
	246	<p>Highway. Includes every road type, but the term "Provincial Highways" has been used for roads that fall under the jurisdiction of the province. There will be a potential for misunderstanding by the general public. The same applies for the definition of "Major Highway". Should clarify that Provincial highways fall under the jurisdiction of the MTO.</p>	<p>We maintain that the term "highway" as used under the Highway Traffic Act should continue.</p>
	249.1	<p>Horticultural Trade Uses. Further discussion in</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		need in regards to this definition and Section 100(21e) of this OP in regards to potential agricultural restrictions.	<p>We disagree. It serves a specific purpose as state in the Plan.</p> <p>This definition expands slightly on the PPS definition.</p> <p><i>We have made this change.</i></p> <p>We keep this definition because it is commonly referred to and easily understood.</p> <p>Ditto.</p> <p>We have included a new Section 21 to guide the reader to the PPS definitions.</p> <p><i>This has been added.</i></p> <p>We would like to keep this reference general until there is a commonly accepted approach to such a definition.</p> <p>We will consider such specific policies in future as we have not undertaken proper research into their relevance and appropriateness within Halton's context.</p>
259.1	Municipal Comprehensive Review. This definition includes an exception for consideration of Future Strategic Employment Areas which should be deleted.		
261.1	Normal Farm Practice. Should be replaced with the PPS definition of <i>normal farm practices</i> .		
265.1	Prime Agricultural Area. In the second sentence, change the word "are" to "have been", and add the words and "are shown on Map 1E of this Plan"		
266	Prime Agricultural Soils. Should be revised to 'Prime Agricultural Land' and replaced with PPS definition of Prime Agricultural Land.		
275.1	Right to Farm. This definition should be deleted as it is outdated and the concept has been replaced by the <i>Farming and Food production Protection Act</i> .		
New Definition	Other environmental related definitions, such as Key Natural Heritage Features, Key Hydrologic Features, Vegetation Protection Zone (VPZ) in the GB Plan and Natural Heritage Features and Hydrological Functions of the PPS, should be included in this OP.		
New Definition	Major office, as described in 81(10.1) of this OP, should be defined.		
New Definition	'Transit-supportive', as described in Sections 173(20-21) and 77(5e) of this OP, should be defined. Please be advised that MTO/MMAH are working on an update of the provincial Transit Supportive Land Use Planning Guidelines address transit-supportive.		
General Comments	<p>Petroleum Resources</p> <p>The Region's Official Plan currently does not contain policies for petroleum resources. There are a number of petroleum resource wells throughout the Region of Halton that were drilled at various times in the last 200 years. These wells as well as existing pool areas need to be protected from inappropriate development. The PPS sets out policy direction that the Region should be including in their Official Plan.</p> <p>Section 2.4.2 deals with the protection of petroleum resource operations and known petroleum resources/significant areas of petroleum potential. Policy 3.2.1 of the PPS</p>		

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS		RESPONSE
		<p>states that development on, abutting or adjacent to lands affected by oil, gas and salt hazards, or former petroleum resource operations may be permitted only if rehabilitation measures have been carried out.</p> <p>The following are recommended policies that the Region should consider incorporating in the Official Plan.</p> <p>“Petroleum resources shall be protected for long term use. Exploration and production of petroleum resources should be a permitted activity in all land use designations except urban areas, provincially significant wetlands, and significant habitat of endangered and threatened species.</p> <p>Development on, abutting or adjacent to lands affected by oil, gas and salt hazards or petroleum resource operations, may be permitted only if rehabilitation measures to address and mitigate known or suspected hazards are under-way or have been completed. Buildings may not be constructed within 75 metres of an active or unplugged well. Rehabilitation must be conducted according to the <i>Oil, Gas and Salt Resources Act</i> and its regulations and standards and all activities in or on a petroleum well shall be conducted in accordance with a well licence from the Ministry of Natural Resources.”</p>	
	General Comments	<p>Transportation - General</p> <p>In support of the policy directions of the Growth Plan, MTO has initiated formal environmental assessment (EA) studies for the GTA West and Niagara—GTA corridors. The OP should acknowledge both studies. MTO advises the need for additional transportation improvements and solutions to address that need are subject to further review and approval by the Province where applicable.</p> <p>The Region should be encouraged to consider providing alternative routes to major corridors where possible and it is recommended that the infrastructure treatments employed to accommodate cyclists be appropriate for the specific context of the roadway, including average motor vehicle speed and/or volume.</p>	<p>These are on-going processes with no firm recommendations yet and hence should not be the basis for new policies in the Plan. It is premature.</p>
John Stillich November 30,	To: Regional Clerk Regional Municipality of Halton 1151 Bronte Road		

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
2009	<p data-bbox="500 239 756 268">Oakville, Ontario L6M 3L1</p> <p data-bbox="402 302 997 361">Re: <u>Proposed Halton Regional Plan Amendment No. 38 (ROPA38)</u></p> <p data-bbox="402 394 1062 541">I wish to advise the Region of Halton that I object to a number of the policies contained as part of Halton Regional Plan Amendment Number 38, and request that it not be adopted by Regional Council until it is further amended in support of the sustainability principles stated in the amendment.</p> <p data-bbox="402 575 1078 756">The Region's basic position as stated in section 25 of the amendment is contradicted by weak policies related to energy, a planned consumption of rural lands that is excessive, targeted intensification levels that are inadequate, and density levels for the development of designated greenfield areas, as shown on Table 2, that are wasteful and insufficient for achieving sustainability.</p> <p data-bbox="402 789 1078 1033">The result of implementation of ROPA 38 will be an increase in environmental and economic damage from travel in Halton, increases in greenhouse gas emissions from transportation and space heating as a result of unsustainable urban form, a loss of agricultural lands and natural habitat, unnecessarily high exposure to future global energy price shocks and high economic losses resulting from importation of fuels and motor vehicles and, as a result, economic difficulty for many residents of Halton region.</p> <p data-bbox="402 1365 1078 1575">The Region has not shown that higher targets for intensification and higher densities for greenfield development are not also beneficial for the environmental, economic and social well-being of Halton residents now and in the future, and that they are not more appropriate for achieving sustainability than the proposed amendments. The Region has also not shown that the targets it has set in table 2 will result in a more sustainable future in Halton.</p> <p data-bbox="402 1671 1078 1852">The shortcomings of policies identified in ROPA 38 to accommodate future growth will also affect me as a nearby resident of Mississauga, as a result of increased pollution from motor vehicles, increases in greenhouse gas emissions and toxins, increased travel by automobile into Mississauga, and the indirect economic consequences to the Greater Toronto Area of the importation of fuels and motor vehicles.</p>	<p data-bbox="1110 575 1386 1335">The entire Plan is premised on making Halton communities more healthy, complete, and sustainable and less reliant on fossil fuels. To this end, Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38 policies focus on influencing the form and function of communities – increasing the density of people and jobs in both intensification areas and greenfield areas, reducing sprawl and commuting distances, increasing public transit use, and increasing active transportation (walking, cycling). Healthy Communities Guidelines will be prepared to give guidance and clarity on Regional intent and expectation for all developments.</p> <p data-bbox="1110 1365 1386 1638">Halton is only achieving approximately 15%; so 40% intensification is a significant departure from business-as-usual. In addition, the targets in Table 2 are minimum targets and can be exceeded.</p> <p data-bbox="1110 1671 1386 1879">ROPA 38 policies call for an air quality monitoring program, policies directed at the implications of poor air quality as a result of growth, and emphasizing the impact of air quality on</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>I request that this letter be distributed to all members of Halton Regional Council. Thank you for your assistance.</p>	<p>health. These are aggressive polices not found in many municipal official plans.</p> <p>Furthermore, through ROPA 38, the link between land use planning and transportation planning has been strengthened to promote transit-supportive development in key intensification areas, including those areas supported by planned future transit infrastructure. It is the Region's objective to reduce dependency on automobile use and towards this aim, the Region is pursuing the implementation of 20 per cent transit usage by 2031, from the current 5 per cent.</p>
<p>Aird & Berlis LLP for Silwell Development Limited</p> <p>November 30, 2009</p>	<p>Mayor and Members of Council Regional Municipality of Halton 1151 Bronte Road, Administrative Building Oakville Ontario L6M 3L1</p> <p>Attention: Regional Clerk</p> <p>Dear Mayor and Members of Council</p> <p>Re: Regional Official Plan Amendment 38 Sustainable Halton Five Year Review Statutory Public Meeting pursuant to Section 17 (15) of the <i>Planning Act</i> December 2, 2009</p> <p>Aird & Berlis LLP acts for Silwell Development Limited ("Silwell") Metrontario Group who have a number of current and pending development applications pursuant to the <i>Planning Act</i> within the Uptown Core of the Town of Oakville.</p> <p>Notice of the Statutory Public Meeting on December 2, 2009 of the Planning and Public Works Committee of the Region of Halton has just been brought to our attention. Our client's consultants and advisors will review the proposed ROPA 38 when it is made available on-line later today. However, until such time as Silwell's consultants have had an opportunity to review the planning document(s) we are</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>not in a position to provide Council with detailed planning comments at this meeting.</p> <p>Our concern is that the ROPA 38 accommodate the current and pending Silwell planning applications before the Town of Oakville and not introduce new Regional Official Plan conformity issues that have heretofore not been presented to our clients.</p> <p>Please accept this letter as our written submission pursuant to Section 17(23) and 17(36) of the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p> <p>If you require any further information please contact the undersigned or Rob Dolan of this office.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p> <p>Yours Truly, Aird & Berlis LLP</p>	<p>ROPA 38 has complied with public notice requirements under the Planning Act.</p>
<p>Townsend and Associates for Mattamy Group of Companies</p> <p>November 30, 2009</p>	<p>Region of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville ON L6M 3L1</p> <p>Attention: Mr. Perry Vagnini, Senior Planner Legislative and Planning Services Department</p> <p>Dear Sir:</p> <p>Re: Region of Halton Proposed ROPA 38 An Amendment to Incorporate the Results of Sustainable Halton Official plan Review Directions and other Matters</p> <p>Further to our letter of November 12, 2009 where we set out our concerns on behalf of the Mattamy Group of Companies, we have one additional item for consideration.</p> <p>In our experience when developing greenfield lands, the issue of the application of the minimum distance separation formula (MDS1) has been raised. For example in the Town of Milton's approved official plan, MDS 1 is not be applied in the urban area and the current policies in the plan indicate that MDS is applied in Rural, Agricultural, Niagara Escarpment Plan and Parkway Belt Corridor Areas. This policy direction is further clarified within their new draft Official Plan that states:</p> <p>2.3.2.11 Agricultural Operations The following policies apply to agricultural operations and non-agricultural operations near such uses in the Town:</p> <p>a) In order to provide farmers with the ability to carry out normal farm practices, all new development, including development on existing lots of record, shall be set back from agricultural operations in accordance with the Minimum Distance Separation One formula, as amended. Development on lands within the <i>Urban Area, and the Hamlet Area</i> is</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>exempt from this policy.</p> <p>The implementation Guidelines for MDS 1 state in guideline 37 that "MDS I does not apply to proposed nonagricultural uses in approved settlement area designations. However, municipalities have the option to apply MDS I livestock facilities within a settlement area designation. The application of MDS I will take its direction from the applicable municipal planning documents."</p> <p>It is our request that Section 139(5) of the draft ROPA 38 be further amended by the addition of the wording "Development on lands within the Urban Area and the Hamlet Area is exempt from this policy" to ensure a consistent and clear policy framework regarding this matter.</p> <p>Should you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned directly.</p> <p>Yours Truly,</p> <p>Townsend and Associates Lynda J. Townsend</p>	<p><i>Staff agrees and would recommend a modification to this effect.</i></p>
<p>Davis LLP for South Georgetown Landowners Group</p> <p>November 30, 2009</p>	<p>Perry Vagnini, Legislative & Planning Services Senior Planner Halton Region 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, ON L4M 3L1</p> <p>Re: SOUTH GEORGETOWN LANDOWNERS GROUP PEER REVIEW - SUSTAINABLE HALTON FISCAL AFFORDABILITY ANALYSIS - CAPITAL COMPONENT</p> <p>On November 12, 2009, we submitted to the Region both an Executive Summary and detailed comments on ROPA 38. In that submission, we indicated that a peer review was being carried out of the Fiscal Affordability Analysis, and would be provided as soon as it was complete.</p> <p>Please find attached a copy of that peer review, for consideration by staff and Council in the examination of ROPA 38.</p> <p>Respectfully Submitted,</p> <p>Davis LLP</p> <p><u>Supporting Document:</u></p> <p>November 30, 2009</p> <p>South Georgetown Landowners Group (SGLG) c/o Mr. Mark Pavkovic Acquisition & Development Coordinator National Homes 291 Edgeley Blvd</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Concord, Ontario L4K 3Z4</p> <p>Dear Mark:</p> <p>Peer Review - Sustainable Halton Fiscal Affordability Analysis - Capital Component</p> <p>We have conducted a high level peer review of the <i>Sustainable Halton Fiscal Affordability Analysis</i> (FAA) focussed specifically on the capital component. Through our review we have identified a number of concerns/issues.</p> <p>FAA Fundamentals</p> <p>Before detailing our concerns, it is important to re-iterate some of the fundamentals of the FAA noted in the October 16, 2009 report; these are as follows [emphasis added]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report provides a high level analysis of the anticipated fiscal impact of the Preferred Growth Option (Option 2) for <i>Sustainable Halton</i> on the Region and the four local municipalities. (p. i, par 1) • The purpose of the report is to determine whether there are any significant fiscal issues with the Option. (p. i, par 1) • In terms of capital spending/development charge impacts, the analysis focuses on the growth increment over the 2021 to 2031 timeframe. (p. i, par 1) • The FAA notes that 'all municipal services will be impacted to some degree by the amount, type, timing and location of growth; however, those services which are most directly affected, beyond basic per capita growth requirements, are water / wastewater and transportation (roads, structures and transit).' (p. i, par 2) • The fiscal implications of intensification have not been addressed. (p. iii, par 5) • The enhanced transit capital (and operating) are assumed to be funded via non-municipal sources (ie., the Province, Metrolinx and/or GO Transit). (p. iii, par 6) • The financial measures considered include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Tax and user rates; ⇒ Capital funding requirements with respect to development charge outlook. (p. 1-1, par 1.2.2) • 'Available information is considered with respect to capital funding requirements and future development charges but was insufficient to enable an analysis of future debenture requirements to be made at this time.' (p. 1-1, par 1.2.5) • The primary focus of the analysis is on the cost of servicing the 2021-2031 growth increment. General considerations have been given to 2015-2021. (p.1-2, par 1.2.6) 	<p>What the paragraph states is that the fiscal implications of intensification have been addressed, but not in detail.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the information available to date the 2021-2031 analysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Provides an indication of the capital funding requirements to be faced as they relate to development charge and other capital funding needs. ⇒ Comments on any significant service level implications and emerging trends that are of relevance (e.g. transit) (p.1-3, par b and c) <p>Key Issues/Concerns</p> <p>The following outline our key concerns with the FAA capital cost analysis at the Regional level.</p> <p>1. Costs Are Very Preliminary and Unavailable for Review</p> <p>The report acknowledges, as noted above, that the services most affected by growth are the 'hard' services such as water, wastewater and roads. This is particularly true at the Regional level, where major hard infrastructure is funded. It is also important at the local municipal level, but is of a different scale compared to the Regional level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FAA analysis is based on preliminary costs. Master servicing costs are not yet available. In our view, in the absence of the master servicing costs, whether or not there are any fiscal concerns related to Concept 2 (the preferred option) cannot be determined. <p>Additionally, it is a concern that there has been a substantial change in the costs since earlier work was carried out. Footnote references or captions in Appendix C – Part 2 of the FAA provide the source for the data as GHD (Sept 9, 2009) for roads and Aecom (July 20, 2009) for water/wastewater. However, servicing cost information for <i>Sustainable Halton</i> available through the Region's website is from April 2009 for roads and water/wastewater. According to the April 2009 reports,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads component of the 'enhanced transit' approach for Concept 2 had an identified cost estimate of \$569 million; this compares to \$768.1 million identified in the FAA Appendix C. This represents a cost difference of some 35%. 	<p>The decision-making throughout the Sustainable Halton process was necessarily based on the level of cost information available at the time. That information will become increasingly detailed as the approval and implementation process continues. The Master Plan process currently underway, is based on the Preferred Growth Option and ROPA 38.</p> <p>IBI is not comparing "apples to apples". The two cost estimates compared in this letter are not costs of the same things. The \$569 million identified for roads infrastructure in Sustainable Halton Report 3.12: Transportation Servicing, is the order-of-magnitude cost estimate of the roads infrastructure required to accommodate growth per</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>the "Concept 2" land use scenario as identified in Phase 3 of the Sustainable Halton study.</p> <p>The \$768.1 million of roads infrastructure identified in Appendix C of the Sustainable Halton Fiscal Affordability Analysis is an all inclusive order-of-magnitude cost estimate of all roads needs required to support future demand (2031) in the Region such as road needs due to growth, Halton's share of projects identified by other jurisdictions, and regional studies such as: Traffic and Screen Line Counts, Pavement Management & Road Needs, Transportation Master Plan Study, Bridge Inspections / Evaluation, Retrofit Noise Attenuation Barriers, Road Resurfacing Program, and Street Lighting Replacement. In essence it is an estimate of a full capital program at 2031.</p> <p>Hence, these costs cannot be compared to each other.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For water/wastewater, the April 2009 report identified a program cost of \$686 million for Concept 2; the FAA includes a cost of \$789.3 million – a cost increase of 15%. <p>The reasons for the increase are unknown and the updated costs are not available for review. A formal request was submitted by Mr. Pavkovic on November 23, 2009 to both the Region and Consultant for this information and we have not received a reply with the information requested at this time.</p> <p>2. Masterplan versus Sustainable Halton Costs Substantially Different</p> <p>As well, Table C-8 on page C-18 provides a comparative cost profile of the existing Masterplan costs for water/wastewater against the <i>Sustainable Halton</i> costs. The Masterplan costs for 2009-2021 total \$1.2 billion; the <i>Sustainable Halton</i> costs for the same time period are \$254.5 million (i.e., \$80.3m + \$174.2m). If the costs to 2031 are included, the total <i>Sustainable Halton</i> water/wastewater costs are</p>	<p>the "Concept 2" land use scenario as identified in Phase 3 of the Sustainable Halton study.</p> <p>The \$768.1 million of roads infrastructure identified in Appendix C of the Sustainable Halton Fiscal Affordability Analysis is an all inclusive order-of-magnitude cost estimate of all roads needs required to support future demand (2031) in the Region such as road needs due to growth, Halton's share of projects identified by other jurisdictions, and regional studies such as: Traffic and Screen Line Counts, Pavement Management & Road Needs, Transportation Master Plan Study, Bridge Inspections / Evaluation, Retrofit Noise Attenuation Barriers, Road Resurfacing Program, and Street Lighting Replacement. In essence it is an estimate of a full capital program at 2031.</p> <p>Hence, these costs cannot be compared to each other.</p> <p>See previous response. The two cost estimates compared are not costs of the same things.</p> <p>The updated costs were provided on December 3, 2009.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>\$692.4 million. The comparative cost estimates on page C-8 suggest that water and waste water servicing costs under Sustainable Halton are approximately 50% of those included in the existing Masterplans to 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the absence of more detailed information, the magnitude of the difference is significant. Further, it calls into question whether the preliminary Sustainable Halton Costs are sufficiently developed to reflect anticipated growth. Alternatively, it calls into question the costs included in the existing Masterplans. Are the costs in the Masterplans overestimated? Builders/developers as well as taxpayers would be concerned if the Masterplans include inflated costs. <p>3. Water/Wastewater Costing In FAA – Further Details Required</p> <p>The water/wastewater ‘costing’ on page C-14 is difficult to follow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 1st line entry is noted as ‘Total Cost (incl. pre 2021 expenditures). What does this mean? If the costs are to reflect growth in the 2021 to 2031 timeframe, what pre 2021 costs are included? The 2nd line entry indicates ‘less benefit to existing development’; the associated footnote states ‘benefit to existing is applicable only to intensification projects...’. How is this possible? Intensification represents ‘new growth’, so why would this be a deduction? The 4th line entry is ‘plus 2008 MP [masterplan] oversizing for post 2021 benefit’; the associated footnote indicates ‘the 2008 masterplan provided for oversizing beyond 2021. The magnitude of the oversizing is identified in the 2008 DC Study’. Of note, the oversizing is consistent with the original 	<p>This is incorrect. The Sustainable Halton figures are additive with the Master Plan figures. So, the Sustainable Halton program 2009 – 2021 is \$1.2 billion + \$255 million for a total of \$1.46 billion.</p> <p>These comments are not valid since costs were interpreted incorrectly (see above comments).</p> <p>Refers to costs for intensification related projects added to the 2008 Master Plan program for the pre-2021 period. The pre-2021 costs are included in order to capture those additional Sustainable Halton costs involved, whether oversizing for post-2021 or additional intensification costs pre-2021, in order to provide a complete picture.</p> <p>There is a “benefit to existing” for some intensification projects. The “benefit to existing” deduction (re: intensification projects) relates to the portion of the capacity expansion projects that is benefiting existing development via early replacement and/or problem rectification.</p> <p>The oversizing cost is based on the infrastructure staging plan where the Region went from two small</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>2008 DC Study. However, the water/wastewater component was revised in an addendum report which altered the post 2021 benefit and deducted potential subsidies. Clearly the entries of post 2021 are incorrect and not reflective of what the Region has approved.</p> <p>4. Potential for Oversizing?</p> <p>The costing is predicated on meeting the hard infrastructure needs for the 2021 to 2031 timeframe only. The infrastructure costing does not appear to include consideration of a cost effective approach to road capacity or water/wastewater capacity. For example, the sizing of pipes can be considered to accommodate future growth rather than twinning pipes at a later date. While we do not have detailed costing available, intuitively the current approach (twinning) is less efficient and more costly.</p> <p>5. Impact of Roads</p> <p>There are 2 concerns related to roads:</p> <p>(1) The analysis presumes that the necessary transit investment is made. However, the capital required is assumed to be funded by non-municipal sources. Thus, the underlying assumption is that the Region does not play a role in addressing the transit requirements associated with growth or to achieve a 20% modal split.</p> <p>(2) The analysis has considered the impact of roads residential but has not identified the impact on non-residential. During the last development charge review, the non-residential sector, particularly the warehousing/logistics sector raised concerns about full recover DC rates and the impact such charges would have on economic development and the ability to attract companies. The result was that the DC related to warehousing was gradually phased in. Such phasing in will have an impact on the tax base of the Region and should potentially be flagged.</p> <p>6. Intensification Not Considered</p> <p>The FAA also notes that the costs do not take intensification into consideration. Given that Sustainable Halton is predicated to a large extent on intensification, lack of capital costing as it relates to intensification and the consideration of how this capital will be funded is a significant shortcoming of the analysis. For example, when considering higher density residential development, the timing of capital payments such as DCs by builders/developers has a significant impact on the ability of the builder/developer to actually finance the project as well as the affordability of the housing delivered. Given that there may need to be some change in the DC policy/approach, the FAA falls short of identifying potential capital cost impacts related to intensification.</p> <p>The Regional overview of ROPA 38 at a Public Open House on</p>	<p>treatment plants for both water and wastewater, to one large plant for each.</p> <p>Strategic oversizing will be considered as part of the Master Plan process. The program will consider the most cost-effective approach to water and wastewater capacity.</p> <p>[A] The November 18, 2009 presentation to the Inter-Municipal Liaison Committee made by Watson & Associates, addressed this transit capital funding concern.</p> <p>The phasing in of the non-residential roads development charge will be complete in the short term and the analysis is long term. Also, the forecast is for a decline in the roads DC, which will improve the situation.</p> <p>Please refer to the presentation by Watson & Associates made at the November 18, 2009 Inter-Municipal Liaison Committee as well as Appendix H of the Fiscal Affordability Analysis.</p> <p>The DC approach relating to housing affordability can be considered as part of the next DC update process.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>October 29, 2009 notes 'make all intensification sites development-ready – servicing and transportation capacities will be made available as a Regional priority – all sites will be pre-zoned within 1 year of approval of the Local Official Plan or its amendments'. This has not been taken into consideration in the FAA. As noted above, the ability to deliver the infrastructure and recoup the capital investment through DCs is more challenging for higher density development. Thus, the capital impact of delivering development ready intensification sites is potentially substantial and significant.</p> <p>Related to intensification is the need for transit service. The FAA simply assumes that the Province or provincial agencies will be responsible for funding. At a minimum, in our view, the analysis should have examined the potential capital impact of transit.</p> <p>7. Gross Population</p> <p>A minor point is that the servicing costs are examined against a gross population of 141,900; the calculation of the gross population is incorrect. The footnotes indicate a net population of 129,300 with 10% added to reflect a gross population. One can either multiply by 1.1 or divide by 0.9 to allow for a 10% gross up. If you use the former approach the gross population would be 142,250 and if you used the latter approach it would yield 143,667. This is not a significant concern, but it raises questions about the other calculations.</p> <p>8. Region Wide Water/Wastewater Assumed – Inconsistent with Current Policy Approach</p> <p>The analysis examines the capital funding / development charge impact of water/wastewater on a Region-wide basis. This is entirely inconsistent with the area specific development charge policy approach adopted by the Region since the inception of HUSP. Further, the absence of an area specific examination of the capital costs also serves to 'hide' the potentially significant impact associated with the preferred option. The following is an overview of the potential impact of the water/wastewater servicing costs (<i>Unit calculations assumed 3 persons per dwelling unit. Costs are estimates based on data compiled by SGLG consultants and are for discussion purposes</i>) associated with Balanced Growth Concept put forward by the SGLG.</p>	<p>We agree that the capital impact of delivering development ready intensification is important.</p> <p>Sustainable Halton Report 3.13: Water and Wastewater Servicing, does consider intensification as per the Best Planning Estimates for Growth Option 2C. However, the costs included for intensification will be refined through the Master Plan process and based on the outcome of DC policy decisions.</p> <p>Please see the above response [A]</p> <p>The difference between 141,190 (not IBI's 141,900) and 142,230 (not IBI's 141,250) is negligible and has no consequential impact on the result.</p> <p>This was the principle agreed to for the purposes of the Fiscal Affordability Analysis. See bullet point on page C-15. The intent was to indicate broadly, the anticipated DC performance.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS				RESPONSE																																																																																
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Balanced Growth Concept Total Servicing Cost (125,000 New Population)</th> <th>Balanced Growth Concept Milton Servicing Cost (75,000 New Population)</th> <th>Balanced Growth Concept Halton Hills Servicing Cost (50,000 New Population)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SERVICE</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>WATER</td> <td>185,000,000</td> <td>112,000,000</td> <td>73,000,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WASTEWATER</td> <td>226,000,000</td> <td>163,000,000</td> <td>63,000,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL (\$)</td> <td>411,000,000</td> <td>275,000,000</td> <td>136,000,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>SGLG Balanced Growth Concept</th> <th>Cost Per Unit Total</th> <th>Milton Cost Per Unit</th> <th>Halton Hills Cost Per Unit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)</td> <td>411,000,000</td> <td>275,000,000</td> <td>136,000,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NEW POPULATION</td> <td>125,000</td> <td>75,000</td> <td>50,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UNITS</td> <td>41,666</td> <td>25,000</td> <td>16,667</td> </tr> <tr> <td>COST PER UNIT (\$)</td> <td>9,864</td> <td>11,000</td> <td>8,160</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Concept # 2 - 20,000 pop. To Halton Hills</th> <th>Cost Per Unit Total</th> <th>Milton Cost Per Unit</th> <th>Halton Hills Cost Per Unit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)</td> <td>411,000,000</td> <td>302,200,000</td> <td>108,800,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NEW POPULATION</td> <td>125,000</td> <td>105,000</td> <td>20,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UNITS</td> <td>41,667</td> <td>35,000</td> <td>6,667</td> </tr> <tr> <td>COST PER UNIT (\$)</td> <td>9,864</td> <td>8,634</td> <td>16,320</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Concept # 3 - 40,000 pop. To Halton Hills</th> <th>Cost Per Unit Total</th> <th>Milton Cost Per Unit</th> <th>Halton Hills Cost Per Unit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)</td> <td>411,000,000</td> <td>288,600,000</td> <td>122,400,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NEW POPULATION</td> <td>125,000</td> <td>85,000</td> <td>40,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UNITS</td> <td>41,667</td> <td>28,333</td> <td>13,333</td> </tr> <tr> <td>COST PER UNIT (\$)</td> <td>9,864</td> <td>10,186</td> <td>9,180</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Balanced Growth Concept Total Servicing Cost (125,000 New Population)	Balanced Growth Concept Milton Servicing Cost (75,000 New Population)	Balanced Growth Concept Halton Hills Servicing Cost (50,000 New Population)	SERVICE				WATER	185,000,000	112,000,000	73,000,000	WASTEWATER	226,000,000	163,000,000	63,000,000	TOTAL (\$)	411,000,000	275,000,000	136,000,000	SGLG Balanced Growth Concept	Cost Per Unit Total	Milton Cost Per Unit	Halton Hills Cost Per Unit	SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)	411,000,000	275,000,000	136,000,000	NEW POPULATION	125,000	75,000	50,000	UNITS	41,666	25,000	16,667	COST PER UNIT (\$)	9,864	11,000	8,160	Concept # 2 - 20,000 pop. To Halton Hills	Cost Per Unit Total	Milton Cost Per Unit	Halton Hills Cost Per Unit	SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)	411,000,000	302,200,000	108,800,000	NEW POPULATION	125,000	105,000	20,000	UNITS	41,667	35,000	6,667	COST PER UNIT (\$)	9,864	8,634	16,320	Concept # 3 - 40,000 pop. To Halton Hills	Cost Per Unit Total	Milton Cost Per Unit	Halton Hills Cost Per Unit	SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)	411,000,000	288,600,000	122,400,000	NEW POPULATION	125,000	85,000	40,000	UNITS	41,667	28,333	13,333	COST PER UNIT (\$)	9,864	10,186	9,180	<p>These assumptions on population growth are significant higher than those in Sustainable Halton Phase 3 Report 3.07, which determined that, based on the Growth Plan Schedule 3 and intensification targets, the population to be accommodated in the new urban areas (new population?) is 83,000 , not 125,000. As a result, the conclusions of this analysis would be irrelevant.</p>
	Balanced Growth Concept Total Servicing Cost (125,000 New Population)	Balanced Growth Concept Milton Servicing Cost (75,000 New Population)	Balanced Growth Concept Halton Hills Servicing Cost (50,000 New Population)																																																																																		
SERVICE																																																																																					
WATER	185,000,000	112,000,000	73,000,000																																																																																		
WASTEWATER	226,000,000	163,000,000	63,000,000																																																																																		
TOTAL (\$)	411,000,000	275,000,000	136,000,000																																																																																		
SGLG Balanced Growth Concept	Cost Per Unit Total	Milton Cost Per Unit	Halton Hills Cost Per Unit																																																																																		
SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)	411,000,000	275,000,000	136,000,000																																																																																		
NEW POPULATION	125,000	75,000	50,000																																																																																		
UNITS	41,666	25,000	16,667																																																																																		
COST PER UNIT (\$)	9,864	11,000	8,160																																																																																		
Concept # 2 - 20,000 pop. To Halton Hills	Cost Per Unit Total	Milton Cost Per Unit	Halton Hills Cost Per Unit																																																																																		
SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)	411,000,000	302,200,000	108,800,000																																																																																		
NEW POPULATION	125,000	105,000	20,000																																																																																		
UNITS	41,667	35,000	6,667																																																																																		
COST PER UNIT (\$)	9,864	8,634	16,320																																																																																		
Concept # 3 - 40,000 pop. To Halton Hills	Cost Per Unit Total	Milton Cost Per Unit	Halton Hills Cost Per Unit																																																																																		
SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)	411,000,000	288,600,000	122,400,000																																																																																		
NEW POPULATION	125,000	85,000	40,000																																																																																		
UNITS	41,667	28,333	13,333																																																																																		
COST PER UNIT (\$)	9,864	10,186	9,180																																																																																		
	<p>On the basis of a 'region-wide' approach to water/wastewater the average cost does not change across any of the options and is estimated at \$9,864 per unit. However, if water/wastewater costs are done on an 'area specific' approach, consistent with current regional policy, there is a substantial cost differential between the options. For example, Concept 2 would result in a per unit cost of \$8,634 in Milton, compared to \$16,320 in Halton Hills. This is attributed to the fact that Concept 2 assigns only 20,000 population growth to Halton Hills and 105,000 to Milton.. Comparatively, Concept 3, which assigns 40,000 population growth to Halton Hills and 85,000 to Milton, results in a per unit cost of \$10,186 for Milton and \$9,180 for Halton Hills. Option 3 results in a 45% reduction in per unit costs to Halton Hills and an 18% increase to Milton. Moreover, compared to the average cost estimate of \$9,864 per unit, Concept 3 results in a relatively equitable distribution of costs.</p> <p>Using the costs identified in the FAA (see table below) and apportioning them in a similar fashion, results in a similar outcome. On an average or region wide approach, the per unit cost is \$14,675 for both Milton and Georgetown. However, if the area specific approach prevails, Concept 2 would result in a per unit cost of \$15,041 for Milton and \$16,614 for Halton Hills. Under Concept 3 the per unit cost decreases for Milton to \$14,804 – less than the average and less than Concept 2 – and also decreases for Halton Hills at \$10,707 per unit.</p> <p>Going forward, the Region may not be successful in implementing a Region wide DC related to water/wastewater given its historic policy approach which is area specific. Will areas not benefiting from the scale of development (i.e., largely built up areas such as Burlington, south Oakville or other non-HUSP areas) be supportive of a Region wide approach which requires them to bear</p>				<p>See comment above as to the validity of this conclusion.</p>																																																																																

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE																																								
	<p>a greater burden of the costs? Recent history suggests this is not the case.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="407 331 1081 520"> <thead> <tr> <th>FAA - 20,000 pop. to Halton Hills</th> <th>FAA Sustainable Halton Growth Concept</th> <th>Milton</th> <th>Georgetown</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)</td> <td>789,300,000</td> <td>434,115,000</td> <td>155,492,100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NEW POPULATION</td> <td>129,300</td> <td>71,700</td> <td>25,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UNITS</td> <td>53,785</td> <td>28,862</td> <td>9,359</td> </tr> <tr> <td>COST PER UNIT (\$)</td> <td>14,675</td> <td>15,041</td> <td>16,614</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="407 548 1081 758"> <thead> <tr> <th>FAA Revised - 40,000 pop. to Halton Hills</th> <th>FAA Sustainable Halton Growth Concept</th> <th>Milton</th> <th>Georgetown</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)</td> <td>789,300,000</td> <td>308,093,389</td> <td>178,815,915</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NEW POPULATION</td> <td>129,300</td> <td>51,700</td> <td>45,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UNITS</td> <td>53,785</td> <td>20,811</td> <td>16699.39216</td> </tr> <tr> <td>COST PER UNIT (\$)</td> <td>14,675</td> <td>14,804</td> <td>10,708</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The aforementioned demonstrates the significant impact of the approach assumed i.e., region wide (average cost) or area specific relative to the population assumptions under the various Concepts. By planning for more population in Halton Hills, the area specific per unit costs can be substantially reduced. This efficient and more cost effective approach demonstrates that there is merit in investigating the outcome, and speaks to the requirement in the Minutes of Settlement to carry out a ‘comprehensive evaluation of all infrastructure alternatives and financing options’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given that the Region’s policy to date has been to utilize an area specific approach, the evaluation of options should have examined the impact of continuing this policy. <u>The absence of the area specific evaluation against the various costs and options is contrary to the Group’s Minutes of Settlement.</u> 	FAA - 20,000 pop. to Halton Hills	FAA Sustainable Halton Growth Concept	Milton	Georgetown	SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)	789,300,000	434,115,000	155,492,100	NEW POPULATION	129,300	71,700	25,500	UNITS	53,785	28,862	9,359	COST PER UNIT (\$)	14,675	15,041	16,614	FAA Revised - 40,000 pop. to Halton Hills	FAA Sustainable Halton Growth Concept	Milton	Georgetown	SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)	789,300,000	308,093,389	178,815,915	NEW POPULATION	129,300	51,700	45,500	UNITS	53,785	20,811	16699.39216	COST PER UNIT (\$)	14,675	14,804	10,708	<p>We fail to understand the computations, especially the allocation of costs and population between Milton and Georgetown, in this table.</p> <p>This conclusion appears to be based on a manipulated allocation of new population between Milton and Halton Hills. It should be pointed out that within the evaluation framework that assessed the relative merits of the three proposed Concepts, cost is only one of many factors, including building complete communities, protecting natural resources, and water security. On the other hand, we have not received any technical input challenging the conclusions of Reports 3.12 and 3.13 on transportation and servicing cost comparison that the capital costs for the three Concepts are within a 7% range of each other.</p> <p>The structure of the DC by-law will be reviewed as part of the next DC update. There are a number of options that would be considered including area specific development charges in Halton Hills.</p>
FAA - 20,000 pop. to Halton Hills	FAA Sustainable Halton Growth Concept	Milton	Georgetown																																							
SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)	789,300,000	434,115,000	155,492,100																																							
NEW POPULATION	129,300	71,700	25,500																																							
UNITS	53,785	28,862	9,359																																							
COST PER UNIT (\$)	14,675	15,041	16,614																																							
FAA Revised - 40,000 pop. to Halton Hills	FAA Sustainable Halton Growth Concept	Milton	Georgetown																																							
SERVICE (WATER & WASTEWATER)	789,300,000	308,093,389	178,815,915																																							
NEW POPULATION	129,300	51,700	45,500																																							
UNITS	53,785	20,811	16699.39216																																							
COST PER UNIT (\$)	14,675	14,804	10,708																																							

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>9. Housing Affordability</p> <p>ROPA 38 seeks to achieve the delivery affordable housing at 30% or more of new units. Given that the potential costs associated with intensification have not been examined, the ability to deliver 30% of total units as affordable has not been sufficiently tested. Further, under Concept 2, assuming an area specific approach to water/wastewater, Halton Hills will be at a distinct disadvantage in its ability to deliver 30% affordable housing.</p> <p>10. Lake Based Servicing to Existing Georgetown Residents</p> <p>The earlier April 2009 references that Concepts 2 and 3 provide lake based servicing to existing Georgetown, but it is unclear if these costs have been included in the FAA costs. Concept 3 has the ability to potentially deliver lake based services in a much more cost effective way to existing Georgetown by allocating the costs across a broader Halton Hills base. Clarification on this matter is sought through this submission.</p> <p>11. User Rates</p> <p>Appendix C, Part 2 is entitled 'Water Rate and Development Charge Impact'. The analysis presented on pages C-16 through C-19 suggest that water rates are anticipated to decline over the timeframe to 2031. We re-iterate our earlier concerns about the comparative Master Plan and <i>Sustainable Halton</i> costing and the significant difference. Additionally, some municipalities finance a portion of water/wastewater capital through user rates. It does not appear that this has been considered in the evaluation of <i>Sustainable Halton</i>. If in fact the rates are anticipated to decline, there may be an opportunity to fund some of the capital requirements through the user rate.</p> <p>12. Debenture Requirements</p> <p>The FAA clearly indicates that the debenture requirements have not been analysed at this time. It would be appropriate to have a high level infrastructure staging plan which would allow at least a preliminary examination of the potential timing of projects and potential quantum to be financed / debentured in any given year to provide for the identification of potential fiscal challenges / hurdles to be faced by the Region. Evidence of this possibility is provided through recent financing concerns raised by the Region for near term infrastructure projects in the 2008/2009 Allocation Program.</p> <p>13. Servicing and Financial Evaluation Not Comprehensive</p> <p>Finally, in our view, the FAA does not represent a 'comprehensive evaluation of all infrastructure alternatives and financing options' as referenced in the Minutes of Settlement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The preliminary nature of the costs are a concern as is the comparative cost of the Master Servicing Plan relative to <i>Sustainable Halton</i>. Given that the master servicing plans 	<p>There are a number of factors contributing to the cost of housing, of which servicing cost is only one component. Therefore, this conclusion is without technical support.</p> <p>Sustainable Halton Report 3.13 assumed that lake based servicing provided for the new Greenfield area only. This will be evaluated further as part of the Water and Wastewater Master Plan.</p> <p>The impact on the user rate will be reviewed in more detail once the Water and Wastewater Master Plan is completed.</p> <p>An adequate high level staging plan, asset replacement plan and 2021 debt forecast were not available sufficient to provide meaningful 2021-31 debenture assumptions.</p> <p>As indicated on p. (i) of the Fiscal Affordability Analysis, "This report presents a high level analysis of the anticipated fiscal impact of the '<u>Preferred Growth Option</u>' for Sustainable</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>are to be updated in 2010, it would be appropriate to carry out the FAA with more detailed and updated costs prior to any growth concept being approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consideration of Region wide DCs for water/wastewater is entirely inconsistent with the current area specific water/wastewater DCs and is a significant policy departure for the Region. The method of calculating DCs should be approved by the Region prior to any Fiscal Work being completed so that it clearly defines, not assumes, how capital projects will be appropriated. • There is reference in the April 2009 Water/Wastewater costing to examining the opportunity to provide servicing through Peel. The potential for efficiency and economies of scale through the utilization of infrastructure capacity through Peel is intuitively significant and should be investigated before determining which option/concept should be pursued. • Transit costs are assumed to be the responsibility of non-municipal agencies or the Province. Regardless, there must be some understanding of the scale of these costs to ascertain their potential fiscal implications. • Arising from the concerns about the preliminary nature of the costs as well as the Region wide DC approach to water/wastewater and the lack of transit costing, the issue of affordability (i.e., achieving a minimum 30% affordable housing) has not been examined. • Clarification of the financial consideration of delivering lake based services to existing Georgetown is required to ensure it has been appropriately incorporated into the costing and benefit assessments. • The FAA relies entirely on DCs to fund capital. With the exception of noting that non-municipal sources will fund transit, the FAA has not identified alternative funding sources. As an example, water/sewer user rates have been used in other jurisdictions to assist in funding water/sewer capital projects. • The FAA does not address the debenture requirements at all. Given the Region's recent challenges in financing significant infrastructure, it would appear to be prudent to at least consider a possible timeline for the various infrastructure projects to ensure that there is a reasonable roll out of projects which will not heavily burden the Region. • Intensification, a key initiative of the Growth Plan and 	<p>Halton on the Regional Municipality and the four Local Municipalities". (underline added). It was not intended to address "all infrastructure alternatives".</p> <p>An update of the financial costs will be undertaken as part of the Master Plan process and next DC update in 2010/11.</p> <p>The Region-wide Water and Wastewater DC calculation was not a policy recommendation, but was a broad analysis.</p> <p>This option will be evaluated as part of the Master Plan process.</p> <p>Please see previous response [A]</p> <p>Fundamental affordability issues were not apparent from the analysis carried out, other than Milton's financing challenges.</p> <p>This will be considered as part of the Master Plan process.</p> <p>All non-DC capital must be funded by taxes or rates or subsidies or equivalent.</p> <p>Debenture analysis was addressed under Item 12 above.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p><i>Sustainable Halton</i>, has not been considered in a meaningful way. Given the commitment of ROPA 38 to have development ready sites for intensification with 'servicing and transportation capacities' being a Regional priority combined with the challenges associated with imposing the relevant capital costs on higher density new development due to the development financing of such projects, the lack of any analysis of the potential fiscal impact of intensification, in our view, is a significant short coming of the FAA.</p> <p>The aforementioned highlights key areas identified in our high level peer review of the FAA capital component at the Regional level. In our view, the FAA does not represent a comprehensive evaluation of all infrastructure and financing options in response to the Minutes of Settlement.</p> <p>Yours truly, IBI GROUP</p>	<p>It has been included in the water and wastewater analysis to the extent possible based on the information available. Further policy discussions are required to decide what size of pipes will be included in the DC By-law.</p> <p>Please refer to our responses to an earlier submission by SGLG on pg. 339-340 of the Response Document dated November 25, 2009</p>
<p>O'Connor MacLeod Hanna LLP for Harvest Bible Chapel of Oakville</p> <p>November 30, 2009</p>	<p>Ron Glenn Director of Planning Services and Chief Planning Official The Regional Municipality of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, Ontario L6M 3L1</p> <p>Dear Mr. Glenn:</p> <p>Re: Region of Halton Proposed Modifications to Livable Oakville Planning and Public Works Committee Public Meeting - ROPA No. 38</p> <p>I am writing as a follow up to my delegation at Oakville Planning and Development Council on Monday November 23, 2009, at which you were in attendance.</p> <p>As you know, we are retained by Harvest Bible Chapel or Oakville ("Harvest").</p> <p>Harvest has a firm offer on a new site and intends to move from its current location at 1215 Lakeshore Road West in Oakville (the "current site") to the proposed new site (the "new site") located somewhat north of Rebecca Street on a triangle piece of land bounded by Great Lakes Blvd.. Burloak Drive in west Oakville.</p> <p>Concern:</p> <p>The Region of Halton has expressed concerns about community uses in Employment Areas. As discussed in the Town of Oakville's Planning Staff Report PD 099-09, the Region is concerned about non-employment uses in Employment Areas and in particular places of worship and educational facilities.</p> <p>The Region is carrying this forward through ROPA No. 38 wherein the Region is proposing to prohibit non-employment uses in Employment</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Areas, unless specific policies are in place at the local level before ROPA 38 is adopted. We understand that with respect to Livable Oakville the Region is proposing not to make a decision on places of worship at this time. The Region does however intend to approve a modification restricting education facilities in Employment Areas.</p> <p>The Region's position on these non-employment uses could well prove to be fatal to Harvest's ability to use the new site as intended, unless the Region will modify Livable Oakville in the manner proposed by Town staff and adopted by Oakville Planning and Development Council on Monday November 23, 2009 Committee.</p> <p>Background:</p> <p>To put the concerns in context, you will recall that a firm offer on the new site was executed a number of months ago. This was the culmination of four years of searching and planning, which included numerous consultations, both formal and informal, over the years with Region of Halton and Town of Oakville staff, the Mayor and a number of councillors. Harvest's previous discussions with the Region and the Town included Harvest's plan to construct a new church on the new site as well as the possibility of using the same facility for a Christian private school and day care facility.</p> <p>In addition, those discussions covered Harvest's intention to complete its purchase of the new site, and then sell the current site in part to pay for the construction of the church at the new site. Harvest intended that the current site might be purchased by another church, which may well wish to undertake renovations and/or expansions, given the age of the current church building, or a developer that would demolish the Church and pursue another use.</p> <p>In conducting its due diligence, Harvest fully relied on the approved Region of Halton Official Plan, the Town of Oakville approved Official Plan and the Town of Oakville Zoning By-law. The site is designated Employment in the Town's current Official Plan and the zoning for the new site is T-1 (Transition Employment), which allows for a broad range of uses, including places of worship, private schools and daycares, as of right.</p> <p>Harvest proceeded to sign the contract, pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in deposits, and raised millions of dollars in pledges from its congregation.</p> <p>Finally, following meetings with Town Staff, Pauls Corporation proceeded by filing a Plan of Subdivision (rather than an application for severance) in May 2009 for the new site.</p> <p>Harvest intends to phase the construction on the new site over time as sufficient money can be raised.</p> <p>Understanding the Issue:</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Livable Oakville restricts places of worship to sites of 2 hectares or less. By way of amendment to the text in June and adopted by Council in June, Livable Oakville provides some relief to that size restriction as follows:</p> <p><i>"7.1.2 g): Notwithstanding section 7.1.2 a) ii), existing places of worship in Employment Areas on sites greater than 2 hectares may be permitted. Development applications for places of worship on sites greater than 2 hectares made prior to the adoption of this Plan may be permitted in Employment Areas. Policies relating to places of worship within all land use designations will be considered through further study."</i></p> <p>The 2 hectare restriction impacts both Harvest's new site and its current site, both of which exceed 2 hectares in size. Therefore, the addition of 71.2 (g) was helpful to our client and was a move in the right direction</p> <p>The concerns that Harvest did have about the wording of 7.1.2 (g) are minor in comparison to the possibility of places of worship and education facilities being removed as permitted uses in Employment Areas, through modification to Livable Oakville and through ROPA 38.</p> <p>Region's Position and Impact of ROPA 38:</p> <p>Upon becoming aware of the Region's intention to modify Livable Oakville to prohibit non-employment uses in Employment Areas, our client was able to secure a meeting with Regional Planning staff on Friday November 13, 2009.</p> <p>As you know, there was a lengthy discussion as to the impact of Regional modifications to 7.1.2 (Community Uses) of the Livable Oakville combined with the Region's own proposed ROPA 38 policy 77.4(1). ROPA 38 proposes to prohibit non-employment uses in the Employment Area, unless there is a specific local official plan policy in place at the time ROPA 38 is adopted by Regional Council. The impact of a modification to Livable Oakville and ROPA 38 on Harvest is very significant and disturbing in that their legal right as of today to develop a church, private school and daycare on their new site is actually being taken away.</p> <p>In order to recognize existing land use permissions and acknowledging the fact that Harvest has an agreement to purchase the new site, and a subdivision application is currently being processed, Regional staff agreed they would support a modification to recognize the new Harvest site as Institutional in the Liveable Oakville Plan and Urban Area in ROPA 38, provided the request was initiated by the Town of Oakville.</p> <p>We were subsequently in contact with the Town's Director of Planning and following extensive discussions we found a mutually acceptable planning solution which does not involve designating the site Institutional as was originally discussed with Regional staff.</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>The Solution:</p> <p>The solution was set out in the Director of Planning's memo of November 23,2009, presented to Planning and Development Council (attached for your reference) and subsequently adopted by Council. What is proposed is the addition of a new policy 7.1.2(i) which reads as follows:</p> <p><i>"On the lands designated Business Employment north of Rebecca Street, between Great Lakes Boulevard and Burloak Drive, a place of worship and associated educational facility may be permitted on a site greater than 2 hectares."</i></p> <p>The addition of policy 7.1,2 (i), by modification, would clarify that a place of worship and an associated educational facility would continue to be permitted uses on the new site, notwithstanding other policies in Livable Oakville and in the draft version of ROPA 38. The modification would preserve a land use entitlement that Harvest currently enjoys. This approach would also allow Harvest to proceed with certainty, whether or not the Region makes a decision on the other places of worship polices in the Community Use section of the Liveable Oakville Plan.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>We are writing to confirm our understanding, based on recent correspondence with Regional Planning staff, that Regional staff will support the above noted modification.</p> <p>We understand that the Region is intending to render its decision on Livable Oakville without the need for it to conform to ROPA 38, You are evaluating Livable Oakville within the context of the current Region Official Plan as amended by ROPA 37 (which was recently approved by MMAH and is now subject to the appeal period), the PPS and other relevant provincial plans, including <i>Places to Grow</i>. The Town of Oakville's site specific policy for our client's new site conforms to the current Regional Official Plan.</p> <p>With respect to the current wording of ROPA 38 which "prohibits non-employment uses in the Employment Areas, unless there is a specific local official plan policy in place at the time ROPA 38 is adopted by Regional Council", it is our understanding based on an e-mail exchange with Robert Walters that the proposed modification for Harvest's new site in Livable Oakville as recommended by Oakville Planning and Development Council on November 23, 2009 would still conform to it and allow a place of worship and an associated educational facility on our client's new site. The policy modification would satisfy the exception provision in ROPA 38. If there are any changes to the draft ROPA 38 policy, we have been advised by Robert Walters that the site specific policy in the Town's Plan will still conform through any change to the ROPA 38 policy. Finally we understand that any staff recommendations for policy changes to</p>	<p>We can confirm that we are in support of the above noted modification. We have approved such a modification in the recently approved Livable Oakville Official Plan (see the response to your December 7, 2009 submission for the precise wording of the policy).</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>ROPA 38 will be presented at the December 2, 2009 public meeting on ROPA 38.</p> <p>Our client is obviously very appreciative of the Town's and the Region's ongoing support for its new site.</p> <p>We look forward to the Region's approval of the Town's proposed modification. We are also confident that staff will take the steps necessary to ensure that the final draft of ROPA 38 does not inadvertently undermine the Town's site specific policy for our client's new site. As you know, the modification merely acknowledges the assurances given by the Town and Region to Harvest when it was conducting its due diligence and Harvest's reliance on the approved Regional and Town Official Plans and the Town's Zoning By-law. Those planning instruments currently permit a place of worship, private school and daycare on the new site. Furthermore the proposed modification to the Plan resolves the rather unfortunate land use problem in which Harvest was caught.</p> <p>Our client looks forward to getting on with its project and building a new church for the Harvest congregation.</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>O'CONNOR MACLEOD HANNA LLP</p> <p><u>Supporting Documents:</u></p> <p>1. Town of Oakville Memorandum, dated November 23, 2009</p>	
<p>David Faye & Associates Inc. for Ironrose Investments Limited and Melrose Properties Inc.</p> <p>November 30, 2009</p>	<p>Regional Chair Gary Carr and Members of Council Region of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, Ontario L6M 3L1</p> <p>Re: Proposed ROPA 38, September 23, 2009</p> <p>Dear Chair Carr and Members of Council:</p> <p>Dear Chair Carr and Members of Council:</p> <p>We represent Ironrose Investments Limited ("Ironrose") and Melrose Properties Inc. ("Melrose") which own land in Part Lots 1, 2, and 3, Concession 2, NOS in the Town of Milton. The Ironrose property fronts onto No.1 Side Road, Tremaine Road, and No.2 Side Road. The Melrose property fronts onto NO.2 Side Road.</p> <p>The southerly portion of these properties is designated <i>Protected Countryside</i> in the Greenbelt Plan. The northerly portion of these properties is designated <i>Agricultural Rural Area</i> in the existing Region of Halton Official Plan and <i>Agricultural Area</i> in the Town of Milton Official Plan, and is zoned <i>Agricultural (At)</i> by Town of Milton Zoning</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>By-law 144-2003.</p> <p>In Proposed ROPA 38, our clients' lands are designated Natural Heritage System, including the portion not in the Greenbelt Plan. This designation is apparently due to the Ministry of Natural Resources ("MNR") Candidate Trafalgar Moraine Earth Science ANSI on a part of these properties. We emphasize to Council the existing "Candidate" status of this ANSI. The MNR has not completed the steps in their protocol to move from "Candidate" status to a final decision on the ANSI. Only within the past 3 weeks were notices sent to landowners within the proposed ANSI area requesting their input. Our clients have retained Dr. John Menzies, a specialist in glacial geology at Brock University, to assist them in responding to the MNR notice.</p> <p>We believe that placing an NHS designation on our clients' lands is premature given the incomplete state of the MNR's ANSI process. We request that Regional Council respect that a "Candidate" status is not sufficient justification to include lands within an NHS designation. Landowners are entitled, at a minimum, to due process. Regional staff have pre-empted the MNR's ANSI process, which should be allowed to run its course with a decision being issued by MNR, before the Region designates lands Natural Heritage System.</p> <p>We request that the <i>Natural Heritage System</i> designation on our clients' lands be removed on Maps 1, 1C, and 5 in favour of the <i>Agricultural Rural Area</i> designation and that our clients' lands be shown as <i>Agricultural Rural Area</i> on Maps 1E, 1F, and 1G of ROPA 38 prior to adoption by Regional Council.</p> <p>Yours truly, David Faye & Associates Inc.</p>	<p>Given the status of these lands as Regionally significant and the impending confirmation by MNR of this ANSI, we believe that the public interest is better served by including it in the NHS. Should the conformation result in no designation or an altered boundary, Map 1 would be amended by the Region as stated under Section 116.1.</p>
<p>Tom Bentley November 30, 2009</p>	<p>Re: <u>Objection to Proposed Halton Regional Plan Amendment No. 38 (ROPA38)</u></p> <p>The Corporation of the Region of Halton has not incorporated sustainable planning in its Amendment. ROPA 38 is evidence of the strangling grip that farmland developers maintain on Halton councilors.</p> <p>The devastating results of the declining supply of oil within the planning period are denied. A sustainable plan is required because there will be no alternative energies capable of supporting our food supply.</p> <p>The region imports approximately 93% of fruit and 53% of vegetables. As oil supply declines over the mandated 25 year provincial planning period, distant agricultural supplies will be unaffordable. To feed Toronto and the GTA will require adjacent farmland. ROPA 38 requires that these populations shrink.</p>	<p>The entire Plan is premised on making Halton communities more healthy, complete, and sustainable and less reliant on fossil fuels. To this end, Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38 policies focus on influencing the form and function of communities – increasing the density of people and jobs in both</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>The excuses put forward by regional politicians and staff for farmland development are several:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While Amend. 38 is promoted to the public as Sustainable, Regional planners state that it is not intended to be a sustainable plan but is simply a response to growth demanded by the province. ▪ Director of Planning Ron Glen justifies ROPA 38's lack of sustainability by saying that he <i>"would be irresponsible if he recommended Intensification to regional council because he would be out of step with the other three regions"</i>. ▪ Regional planner Haiqing Xu justifies farmland development by musing that declining oil supply is a theory, while the history of oil is that the net supply has been declining for 40 years. ▪ Councillors deny their treasurers who concur that suburbias are economically unsupportable because suburban density cannot provide the public amenities required for a healthy lifestyle. ▪ Regional Chair Gary Carr, Halton Hills Mayor Rick Bonnette, and experienced regional councillors persist in publicly stating that their decision to support farmland development is based on the provincial Places to Grow Act requiring 60% 	<p>intensification areas and greenfield areas, reducing sprawl and commuting distances, increasing public transit use, and increasing active transportation (walking, cycling). Healthy Communities Guidelines will be prepared to give guidance and clarity on Regional intent and expectation for all developments.</p> <p>In one sense, ROPA 38 responds to the requirements of the Growth Plan, but in another sense, Council has embraced the principles of sustainability on a move-forward basis.</p> <p>Halton is currently only achieving approximately 15% intensification; so 40% intensification [as established through policy 77(2.1)] is a significant departure from business-as-usual. In addition, the targets in Table 2 are minimum targets and can be exceeded. Policy 77(2.1) does not preclude the evaluation of opportunities for further intensification in the future.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>farmland development. This is a gross application of public misinformation. The Act does NOT require, nor recommend farmland development. These public servants must therefore rescind that decision to be publicly accountable.</p> <p>Farmland development provides no sustainable economic or social benefits as the supply of oil declines.</p> <p>Sustainable planning requires Intensification within existing built boundaries and opportunity abounds to accommodate all provincial growth requirements while improving our lifestyle.</p> <p>Intensification provides reduced dependence on the cost transport and its infrastructure, a robust local economy, skilled local employment, an affordable local breadbasket, convenient public amenities, energy efficient lifestyle, intelligent deployment of taxes, and a vibrant, healthy, active community.</p> <p>Please distribute this to all members of Halton Regional Council.</p>	<p>We agree.</p>
<p>Townsend and Associates for Mattamy Group of Companies</p> <p>December 1, 2009</p>	<p>Region of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, ON L6M 3L1</p> <p>Attention: Mr. Perry Vagnini</p> <p>Dear Sir:</p> <p>Re: Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38 Planning and Public Works Committee - December 2, 2009</p> <p>We act for the Mattamy Group of Companies and have made a number of submissions regarding ROPA 38. We understand that ROPA 38 is proceeding to Planning and Public Works Committee on December 2, 2009 with a staff recommendation for approval at the upcoming Regional Council meeting.</p> <p>We have reviewed the documents released over the weekend. It appears that none of the changes we requested have been made although there are some references to changes in the staff report that do not appear in the text of the draft OPA. It also appears that additional revisions have been made to ROPA 38 since we last commented.</p> <p>We reiterate our previous objections to the extent they have not been addressed and object to any modification that would adversely affect the development of our clients' lands. Please ensure these comments are distributed to Committee and form part of the public record.</p> <p>Yours Truly,</p> <p>Townsend and Associates Lynda J. Townsend</p>	<p>Staff has provided a verbal clarification regarding Section 116.1.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
<p>Sorensen Gravely Lowe Planning Associates Inc. on behalf of the North Oakville Community Builders Inc.</p> <p>December 1, 2009</p>	<p>Dear Ms. Lathan:</p> <p>Re: ROPA 38</p> <p>We represent the North Oakville Community Builders Inc. ("NOCBI") who own or manage large portions of North Oakville. The North Oakville East Secondary Plan (OPA 272) was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in January 2008 after extensive negotiations and settlement discussions.</p> <p>We continue to have five main areas of concern. These concerns have been raised previously with the Region through submissions by Stonybrook Consulting Inc. (Nov 12, 2009) on behalf of NOCBI, by Bousfield Inc. (Nov 12, 2009) on behalf of Trinison Management Corp. one of the land managers in North Oakville East and by the Remington Group (Nov 20, 2009) one of the landowners in North Oakville East.</p> <p>Recognizing the Natural Heritage System in North Oakville</p> <p>Our first area of concern has to deal with deletion of Section 115.1 in the current Region Official Plan. This policy was inserted through an Ontario Municipal Board settlement of the ROPA 25 appeals by the NOCBI landowners. The intent was to recognize the extensive work done through Oakville's OPA 272 including the subwatershed study and through the very lengthy settlement discussions that established a natural heritage system along with policies that govern the system, its boundaries, study requirements and its permitted uses including policies governing Optional Linkages. The NOCBI concern is detailed in the previous submissions as noted above.</p> <p>The response from Regional staff has been that they have modified Section 116.1 to recognize the previous commitment under the old Section 115 and that the mapping delineates the North Oakville Natural Heritage System. Although we agree that Map 1 reflects the agreed upon Natural Heritage System, we do not agree that Section 116.1 addresses our client's concerns. Section 116.1 is a forward looking policy. It does not explicitly recognize previous work done in approved subwatershed studies or area specific plans. As well, Section 116.1 only discusses boundaries not permitted uses nor does it recognize that some of the Natural Heritage System shown on Map 1 is in fact Optional Linkages and may not form part of the final Natural Heritage System.</p> <p>Our clients are concerned that the permitted uses of ROPA 38 and subsequent natural heritage planning could affect the agreed to boundaries and permitted uses in OPA 272. OPA 272 was intended to be a long term planning document to be implemented over a 20 year planning horizon. ROPA 38 needs to explicitly recognize that fact.</p> <p>We propose that the Region incorporate a new policy 116.2 that states:</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p><i>“The boundaries and permitted uses within the Natural Heritage System in North Oakville between Dundas Street and Highway 407 is set out in the Town of Oakville Official Plan Amendments 272 and 289. Where there is a conflict, the mapping and policies of Official Plan Amendments 272 and 289 shall prevail.”</i></p> <p>Linkage of Intensification to development in Designated Greenfield Areas</p> <p>Our second area of concern is with respect to Section 77 (2.3) b & c. These policies could potentially significantly curtail designated greenfield area development if a deficit arises in achieving intensification in the built up area. Considering Oakville’s significant allocation of intensification in Table 2 and the history of achieving intensification in Oakville, this policy raises significant concerns.</p> <p>The policy calling for “joint application for development” is also potentially problematic for a number of reasons. First, there is no legislative basis under the Planning Act for requiring a “joint application for development”.</p> <p>Second, how is a “joint application for development” submitted when it is potentially separated by many kilometres, and what happens when the portion of the application within the built up area is appealed by residents groups or turned down by the municipality? These scenarios are not discussed in the policies.</p> <p>Third, this policy could have a chilling effect on achieving the significant residential densities contemplated in North Oakville in the Trafalgar, Dundas and Neyagawa Urban Cores if landowners are forced to develop in the built up area concurrently with development in the designated greenfield areas.</p> <p>We urge the Region and the Town of Oakville to consider other alternatives to encourage intensification within the built-up area.</p> <p>Achieving the Designated Greenfield Density Target</p> <p>Our third area of concern is with respect to Section 77(2.4) which “requires development occurring in Designated Greenfield Areas to: a) achieve the development density target of Table 2.” The North Oakville East Secondary Plan was developed to meet and exceed the density target set out in Table 2 as a whole. It is planned to contain areas of differing densities including Sub Urban areas, General Urban Areas, Urban Core Areas, Transitional Area, and Neighbourhood Centre Areas. Some of these residential designations will not achieve the density target for Oakville in Table 2; others will significantly exceed it. As well, some of the Employment Area designated lands are anticipated to be at lower densities.</p> <p>However, the policy as written requires “development” to achieve the density target. Development as defined would include any plan of subdivision or site plan. As a result, a plan of subdivision within the lower density Sub Urban area would now need to achieve the density target of 46 persons and jobs per hectare; so would an application within the Employment Area. That is not how OPA 272 was</p>	<p><i>We propose to introduce a new Section 116.2 and 116.3 to address this.</i></p> <p>We are open to other suggestions that will help implement the 40% intensification target of the Growth Plan.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>developed. It is not the intent of the Growth Plan, and it is unachievable in some designations.</p> <p>We note that Section 77(5) g) dealing with Area Specific Plans requires the Plans to demonstrate how the density will contribute towards achieving the minimum overall development density for Designated Greenfield Area. In our opinion, this is a more appropriate policy approach and similar wording should be added to Section 77 (2.4) a.</p> <p>Requiring the development industry to absorb its share of the cost of human services. Our fourth area of concern is with regard to Section 77(12), (13), (14) and (17) and inclusion of “human services” but in particular the latter two policies which explicitly requires “the development industry to absorb its share of the cost of the provision of infrastructure and human services.”</p> <p>The concerns of the NOCBI landowners on this policy have previously been raised. The response from staff is that, “there is no suggestion to impose these new requirements on the industry, unless so permitted by the DC Act.” If that is the case, this matter should be left to the DC Act and the reference to “human services” should be struck from Section 77 (15) and (17).</p> <p>Right of way for Dundas Street Lastly, the right of way width for Dundas Street in the Current Official Plan is 47 metres. This is reflected in the OMB approved OPA 272 for North Oakville East. We note however that ROPA 38 has changed the right of way width to 50 metres in Table A2 but with no explanation give with respect to the change.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to further discuss our concerns with staff.</p>	<p><i>We propose to amend Section 77(2.4)a) to clarify the intent of the policy.</i></p> <p>We disagree. The DC Act permits funding for cultural and recreational services (part of human services).</p> <p>The 50 metre right of way is to support the ongoing Dundas Street Bus Rapid Transit Corridor Feasibility and Implementation Study. The Dundas Street BRT was identified in the Metrolinx Regional Transportation Plan.</p>
<p>Clay Brick Association of Canada</p> <p>December 1, 2009</p>	<p>RE: CLAY BRICK ASSOCIATION OF CANADA ROPA 38 RESPONSE</p> <p>Dear Chairman Carr and Members of Council</p> <p>We have been retained by the Clay Brick Association of Canada (CBAC) to monitor and provide constructive input to your Sustainable Halton planning program, since 2006. Our two Client members of CBAC are Brampton Brick Limited and Hanson Brick Ltd. The following response is respectfully submitted on their behalf. Brampton Brick Limited and Hanson Brick Ltd. produce approximately 95% of Ontario’s clay brick and employ more than 400 persons in the Regions of Peel and Halton. Together they have invested more than \$300 million in these regions, paying more than \$1.8 million annually in local taxes. Shale of the Queenston Formation is the primary raw material from which clay brick are made. Our Clients require about 1.6 million</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>tonnes of shale annually - about 1% of Ontario's total aggregate production.</p> <p>We attended the 10 meetings of your Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), from February 2008 until April 2009 and provided several technical submissions. My Clients contributed about \$25,000 toward the shale drilling program, conducted by the Region and the Ontario Geological Survey (OGS) and Brampton Brick provided substantial laboratory testing of shale samples recovered by the OGS. The following submissions, which have not been reflected in your Draft ROPA 38 are respectfully resubmitted:</p> <p>May 20, 2009: Long Environmental Consultants Inc. - Aggregate Resource Management Response McKibbin Wakefield Inc. - Natural Heritage System</p> <p>June 23, 2009: Long Environmental Consultants Inc. - ROPA 37 and Places To Grow Growth Plan</p> <p>We have reviewed ROPA 38 Map 1F "<i>Identified Mineral Resource Areas</i>". There is no indication, other than a reference to <i>policies</i>, in Draft ROPA 38 Section 112(1) as to how the identified shale areas were reduced from more than 14,000 ha to 3,070 ha. Many of the identified areas are reported as overburden thickness of more than 8 m and some exhibit extensive land fragmentation. Ontario's clay brick industry needs an average of 1.5 million tonnes of shale annually. Based upon the predicted yield of Hanson's new Tansley Quarry, that represents about 5 ha of shale quarry area.</p> <p>During your TAC Meeting No. 7, last December 17th, we concluded that the Province: "<i>prefers to protect for centuries worth of the resource</i>". Two centuries of shale at 5 ha per year corresponds to the protection of about 1,000 ha. My Clients do not intend to access shale resources within the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area (NEPA), but quarries are explicitly permitted within the Greenbelt Plan, including North Aldershot.</p> <p>We have reviewed the available shale mapping and applied our normal aggregate planning criteria to develop the attached conceptual "<i>CBAC Proposed Shale Areas</i>", as an overlay on your draft Map 1F. We have eliminated, as much as possible, areas with more than 8 m overburden depth and considered fragmentation and transportation, in addition to the criteria already applied by the Region. We do not recommend significant shale quarry development within the NEPA. Area A1 is in North Aldershot, adjacent to Hanson's existing quarry. H8 and H9 are located in Halton Hills. Part of area H9 may be affected by the conceptual Halton-Peel Freeway, as presented on November 24th.</p> <p>Together, these designations will comprise about 1,100 ha of potential shale quarry area representing in the order of 220 years supply.</p> <p>With respect to our attached natural heritage comments, May 20, 2008, we believe Amendment 37 addresses some of the concerns</p>	<p>These correspondence has been reviewed previously as part of the Sustainable Halton process.</p> <p>Correct reference is 110(7.1). North Aldershot</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>raised, but these changes do not go far enough. Further, CBAC objects to proposed policy 107(7.1) that prohibits the expansion of shale quarries within the North Aldershot Policy Area. There is insufficient rationale to justify this blanket restriction and it is inconsistent with the <i>Greenbelt Plan</i>.</p> <p>Further, the recently released Phase II Report, <i>Cootes to Escarpment Park System, Conservation and Land Management Strategy</i> makes recommendations on lands adjacent Hanson's shale quarry and brick plant situated in the North Aldershot Policy Area. Specific policy recommendations for the Bayview Park and Burlington Landfill Site and adjoining lands have not been reviewed publicly and Councils have not made decisions on these recommendations. It is premature to include the prohibitions on quarry expansion without public consultation and review.</p> <p>We look forward to assisting the Region in the development of appropriate shale planning policies which are consistent with the <i>Provincial Policy Statement, Greenbelt Plan</i> and reflect the 15 months of reasoned submissions from the Province and the local aggregate industry.</p> <p><u>Supporting Documents:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. May 20, 2009: Long Environmental Consultants Inc. - Aggregate Resource Management Response (See the Region's response on page 161 of Report 3.14 Attachment #5 to Report LPS69-09) 2. May 20, 2009 McKibbin Wakefield Inc. - Natural Heritage System (See the Region's response on page 170 of Report 3.14 Attachment #5 to Report LPS69-09) 3. Map of CBAC Proposed Shale Areas 4. June 23, 2009: Long Environmental Consultants Inc. – ROPA 37 and Places to Grow Growth Plan (See Below) <p><u>June 23, 2009: Long Environmental Consultants Inc. – ROPA 37 and Places to Grow Growth Plan</u></p> <p>RE: PROPOSED ROPA 37 AND THE PLACES TO GROW PLAN, 2006</p> <p>Dear Chairman Carr and Members of Council:</p> <p>We have been retained by the Clay Brick Association of Canada (CBAC) to monitor and provide constructive input to your Sustainable Halton planning program, since 2006. Our two Client members of CBAC are Brampton Brick Limited and Hanson Brick Ltd. The following response is respectfully submitted on behalf of these Clients. Brampton Brick Limited and Hanson Brick Ltd. produce approximately 95% of Ontario's clay brick and employ more than 400 persons in the Regions of Peel and Halton. Together they have invested more than \$300 million in these regions, paying more than \$1.8 million annually in local taxes.</p> <p>I attended the June 17th meeting of your Planning and Public Works Committee and have re-examined Proposed Amendment 37 in the</p>	<p>Policy Area is a highly environmentally sensitive area that an Inter-Agency Review (including the Province) has been carried out to protect the features and functions. As well, a large portion of this Area is eligible for urban services.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>context of Report LPS69-09 of June 5th. Staff Report Recommendation No. 1 is that Council endorse the June 16th map titled: <i>“Preferred Growth Option”</i>, included as Attachment No. 1. Recommendation No. 2 is to endorse the April 14th <i>“Directions Report”</i>. Our Clients recommend the following revisions to the April 9th draft of ROPA 37 and the June 5th Report No. LPS69-09:</p> <p>Part A, Basis, page 5, 7th bullet: in addition to <i>“identifying natural systems and prime agricultural areas”</i> should include <i>“mineral aggregate resources”</i>;</p> <p>Amendment, Item 1, page 13, Section 38F(11), insert: e) <i>“in mineral aggregate areas, development and activities which would preclude or hinder the establishment of new operations or access to resources shall only be permitted if:</i> <i>[i] resource use would not be feasible; or</i> <i>[ii] the proposed land use or development serves a greater long-term public interest; and</i> <i>[iii] issues of public health, safety and environmental impact are addressed.”</i></p> <p>Part C, the Appendices should exclude Attachment No. 1 to Report LPS69-09, the <i>“Preferred Growth Option”</i> map or, alternatively, the conceptual <i>“Natural Heritage System”</i> should be deleted from that map until it has been refined in the context of competing prime agricultural and mineral aggregate areas.</p> <p>Our Clients also recommend that the <i>Directions Report</i>, now intended as the basis for revisions to the Regional Plan, be corrected to recognize the provisions of the <i>Places To Grow Plan</i> and your Sustainable Halton program by including, as resources which are valuable <i>“mineral aggregates”</i>, in the following sections:</p> <p>Section 2 - the need to identify natural systems, prime agricultural and <i>“mineral resource”</i> areas;</p> <p>Section 7 - include <i>“mineral aggregates”</i> in <i>“Protecting and Enhancing What is Valuable to Us”</i>; and</p> <p>Direction 11 - include a schedule titled <i>“Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas”</i>.</p>	
<p>Townsend and Associates for GLBP Nominee Company II</p> <p>December 1, 2009</p>	<p>Region of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, ON L6M 3L1</p> <p>Attention: Mr. Perry Vagnini</p> <p>Dear Sir:</p> <p>Re: Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>We act for GLBP Nominee Company II. Our clients own lands north of Rebecca, west of Great Lakes Blvd and east of Burloak, legally described as Part Lots 34 &35, Concession 3 S.D.S.</p> <p>Recently, after discussions with our clients, the Town of Oakville requested modifications to Livable Oakville which we understand were approved yesterday by the Region. The modification reads as follows:</p> <p><i>""vii) Page C-22 Section 7.1.2 h) should read as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Notwithstanding section 7.1.2 ha) ii), existing educational facilities and existing places of worship in Employment Areas on sites greater than 2 hectares may be permitted. On the lands designated Business Employment located north of Rebecca Street, west of Great Lakes Blvd. and east of Burloak, a place of worship and associated educational facility on a site greater than 2ha may be permitted. Development applications for places of worship on sites greater than 2 hectares made prior to the adoption of this Plan may be permitted in Employment Areas. Policies relating to places of worship within all land use designations will be considered through further study. "</i></p> <p>This modification is supported by our clients. The Harvest Bible Church has committed to purchase some of our clients' lands and did so after consultation with Oakville staff to ensure its use was permitted. The zoning on site allows for Places of Worship over a2 ha threshold.</p> <p>We would ask that ROPA 38 be revised to ensure that the provisions mirror those in Livable Oakville and allow for the proposed use and that this correspondence forms part of the public record.</p> <p>Yours Truly,</p> <p>Townsend and Associates Lynda J. Townsend</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Please refer to our response to Harvest Bible Church.</p>
<p>Davis Webb LLP for Joshua Creek Community Developments</p>	<p>Mark G. Meneray, Commissioner of Legislative and Planning Services and Corporate Counsel and to Members of the Regional Council The Regional Municipality of Halton 1151 Bronte Road OAKVILLE, Ontario L6M 3L1</p> <p>Dear Sirs: RE: Joshua Creek Community Developments Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38</p> <p>We represent Joshua Creek Community Developments who own an approximately 52 acre property known municipally as 1359 Burnhamthorpe Road East, in the Town of Oakville (the " Property").</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>As part of the settlement of our client's appeal of the Town's Secondary Plan, it was agreed by Minutes of Settlement that were incorporated in the approved Secondary Plan, to include "institutional uses including places of worship", as permitted within the Employment Areas/Districts. The Region was a party to these proceedings and did not object to these permissions being allowed in the Employment Areas.</p> <p>We understand that in addition to the Secondary Plan, the Town of Oakville has approved a bylaw that permits places of worship in Employment Zones.</p> <p>We would add that the Provincial Policy Statements specifically contemplate institutional uses within Employment Areas.</p> <p>'We hereby request modification to ROPA 38 to permit institutional uses and specifically places of worship within Employment Areas to reflect the OMB approved settlement and Secondary Plan for this Property.</p> <p>We will not be in attendance at the Public Meeting of December 2, 2009 but would ask that this correspondence be available to Council Members and the Committee.</p> <p>We would ask that you notify us of any recommendation by the Committee and when this matter will be dealt with by Council.</p> <p>Yours very truly, Davis Webb LLP</p>	<p>The definition for Employment Areas in the Provincial Growth Plan does not expressly permit institution uses, in our opinion. The Growth Plan directs that these Employment Areas be protected for "pure" employment uses. Otherwise, it will lead to premature expansion of the urban envelope, against the objectives of the Growth Plan.</p> <p>However, ROPA 38 policy 77.4(1) a) recognizes as an exception, uses permitted by specific policies of a Local Official Plan on the date of adoption by Council of this Plan. As the North Oakville East Secondary Plan is an approved plan, the land use permissions of that plan will apply in this circumstance.</p>
<p>Davis Webb LLP on behalf of Milton Heights Landowners Group</p>	<p>RE: Halton SHP Draft ROPA38 Policies • MILTON HEIGHTS LANDOWNERS GROUP</p> <p>As you know, we represent the Milton Heights Landowners Group and have advised that, unfortunately, we can't be in attendance today.</p> <p>We provided a submission on November 12, 2009 (copy attached)</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
December 2, 2009	<p>outlining our concerns with respect to ROPA38.</p> <p>Yesterday, we were able to secure a copy of the Staff recommended modifications to the Draft. We acknowledge that there has been some movement towards addressing the issues raised by our clients. We still, however, believe that the process to require a modification to the Regional Official Plan should not be necessary. Unfortunately, given the very short time line, we have not been able to convene a meeting with all of the landowners comprising the Milton Heights Land Owners Group but will do so shortly and provide any additional comments to our November 12th letter in face of the modifications as proposed.</p> <p>We would be pleased to attend any meetings that could assist in resolving our clients' concerns.</p> <p>Yours very truly</p> <p>Supporting Documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submission Dated November 12, 2009 – Response included in Attachment #3 to Report LPS 114-09 “<i>Response Document: Staff Analysis of Comments Received on Proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38, September 30, 2009 to November 19, 2009</i>” 2. Map Showing Subject Lands 	<p>Comments noted. As stated in staff’s response to your submission dated November 12, 2009, policy 116.1 of Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38 should provide clarity on the concerns raised in that submission.</p>
Landscape Ontario December 2, 2009	<p>Profile of our Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · We are the ones that grow the trees that line the streets of your community · We also provide the plants that beautify the homes in your community · One sector maintains the green infrastructure {lawns, annuals, perennials, shrubs and trees) That provides oxygen and traps greenhouse gases · We install beautiful landscapes that increase property values · We even have a sector that clears snow and ice And helps make our community safe · We are an essential industry. A green force that provides huge economic, environmental, aesthetic, recreational, therapeutic, tourism, community pride, and even spiritual benefits . · We are a humble hard working sector employing over 70,000 full time jobs green jobs in Ontario · Our industry generates 7 billion in economic value · We are valuable contributors to society and to this Region, but have essentially been declared homeless · We are the horticultural industry aligned with the agricultural industry. We use the same tools and equipment. We belong on agricultural and rural land. • As growers our crops are high value, labour intensive and able to generate income on much smaller parcels Of land than traditional agriculture • We should be embraced not shunned • The majority of the industry is operating very Peacefully within rural 	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>and agricultural Neighbourhoods without a problem. In the rare instances when issues arise they are usually caused by insensitive industry members or can easily be dealt with through property standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are hoping that you will simply understand that all of our industry fits under the horticultural banner and should be allowed to operate on agricultural and rural land. <p><i>The Region should be embracing our activity</i></p>	<p>Staff is proposing a change to the definition of “existing uses” that may allow some of the current illegal uses to seek a legal status.</p>
<p>Councillor Jan Mowbray December 2, 2009</p>	<p>To members of PPW</p> <p>Mayor Burton said at the July 29th Brookville meeting that “farms would not be affected” by the NHS designation. He said that if you come to council – “we’ll bend over backward to give you the assurance that you want”. He said that he had heard a bunch of generalized stuff – “the NHS would take away a bunch of rights the farmers wouldn’t have anymore.” He said in fact that “It’s going to lighten the restrictions – buffers will be lowered.</p> <p>How much evidence does this committee need in order to be convinced that there will be an impact? How many times must the ag community speak?</p> <p>A large brush has been applied to Map 1G to create a swath across a large area and designated as all Key Natural Heritage features. That means, by definition, 30 meter buffers and 100 meter linkages – there <u>WILL</u> be an impact. That these “Key Natural Heritage Features have not yet not been mapped but which are to be established through an Environmental Impact Assessment is problematic. In my opinion, the exercise becomes a fishing expedition, and an expensive one in terms of dollars and time.</p> <p>By the way, the word “Natural” should be reconsidered in a different context – many of the woodlots in rural Milton were planted by the farmer/landowner.</p> <p>Under definitions: While the Region maintains mapping showing the general boundaries of the ESA’s, precise boundaries of ESA’s are to be established through an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).</p> <p>An enhanced natural heritage system is NOT supportive of farming. The farmer is the best steward of the land as acknowledged by the current Regional Official Plan – what has changed that all of a sudden the farmer needs a new layer of restrictive legislation?</p> <p>2/3 of all Ontario farmers are already involved in environmental Farm Stewardship programs – they are paying to involve themselves and their farms with money out of their own pockets in the protection of their, and our, environment. The rural resident and farmer has a vested interest in the land being viable now and into the future for himself, his family and generations to follow.</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>On another note, I would also ask why no material was provided to me as registered speaker/ commenter on the NHS? How many others have also been excluded in the material distribution? It's one heck of a lot of material to go through in a few hours.</p> <p>I would respectfully ask that the NHS decision be deferred. There is no need to have their completed now. I note in the current O.P. that deferrals have taken place before, so to defer this issue today would not be setting a precedent.</p> <p>Peel is deferring it.</p> <p><u>Peel November 2009 RECOMMENDATION GC-201-2009</u></p> <p>That the policies related to the Natural Heritage and Agriculture within Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) Number 21 be received and deferred to a future meeting of Regional Council;</p> <p>And further, that Regional staff, along with staff from the Town of Caledon, continue to work with the Peel Federation of Agriculture on an Ecosystem/Conservation approach on Agriculture and Natural Heritage and engage in dialogue with the Province and neighboring Regions and Municipalities.</p> <p>Let's have that discussion.</p> <p>As a result of the October 14th PIC, Ron Glenn proposed a workshop round table that was set for Oct 27th. It was to be a round table to discuss rural/ag concerns. That meeting was subsequently inundated with Greens outnumbering the ag/rural people 16-10.</p> <p>An Oakville Green person at my table was clearly upset during the conversation. I drew her aside to see what was wrong. She complained that one of the farmers at our table kept talking about the "fuzzy stuff". She wanted to see the big picture discussed. I explained to her that all those fuzzy pieces are part of the big picture that is destroying farming. I told her of the agricultural community's concern about Oakville Green president's comment that she 'shouldn't have been so naïve as to think that farming meant only planting and reaping crops'; that she was concerned because 'permitted uses including farm outbuildings' (where she thought farmers might store their grain or house their animals doesn't bear thinking about); and about Conservation Halton's comment that "true biodiversity will never be achieved as long as farming exists in the rural area". (I paraphrase both those comments but the gist is clear).</p> <p>I told her that the agricultural community is looking 5 years down the road to when the next ROP review occurs and people like the Greens and CH take another look and say, "hey, in spite of the last OP review, we still haven't achieved true biodiversity, we need stricter by-laws!"...and the farmers are embroiled in yet another of these exercises where the ag community spends thousands of hard-earned dollars to produce a report by experts on their behalf.</p>	<p>Staff made attempts to ensure all on the mailing list are informed of key events leading to Council's consideration of ROPA 38.</p> <p>It should be noted that Halton is faced with a contractual deadline for Council adoption of ROPA 38 by December 16, 2009, failing which may result in decisions on key components of ROPA 38 being made by the OMB.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>The Region has spent thousands of dollars on its own reports, one of which (Phase II report by Planscape – Agricultural Countryside Strategy – April 7, 2009) seems to have been largely ignored by staff and council.</p> <p>This Green person got it and expressed the wish that I could have had the opportunity to speak with the Oakville Green chair.</p> <p>If Halton Region truly supports agriculture remaining here for the long term, then outside of the NHS we need real policies that support agriculture, not make the agriculture community have to pursue ROP amendments and other studies that cost many thousands of dollars.</p> <p>But most importantly you need to truly listen to the Ag. community.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Jan Mowbray Councillor, ward 3, Milton</p>	<p>Many of that report's recommendations were adopted as policies in ROPA 38 and the ROPA 38 planning framework is supported by the consultant.</p>
<p>Bell Canada</p> <p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p>Re: Halton Region Official Plan Review (December 2009 Revision) Dear Mr. Glenn,</p> <p>We appreciate the Region of Halton's process to prepare its new Regional Official Plan and are pleased to have the opportunity to continue to participate and comment on the December 2009 revision of the document. Further to our letter of September 28, 2009, we offer the following detailed comments to supplement our previous remarks.</p> <p>We have reviewed the "December 2, 2009" version of the draft Regional Official Plan and are pleased to see that the Region had taken the time to review and address our comments. We appreciate that some of our suggestions have been incorporated in the revised document; however, we continue to have concern with respect to discrepancies in the terminology used, particularly as it relates to the use of the term "infrastructure".</p> <p>In your Response Document (November 25, 2009), Regional staff indicate that our request to ensure that sufficient infrastructure is or will be in place to meet the needs of new growth areas is addressed in Section 77(5)n. We have reviewed the proposed wording and note that although it discusses a community infrastructure plan, the focus is on public community services, not the provision of fundamental hard services such as water, wastewater, storm water and utilities. Although water, wastewater and storm water management are addressed elsewhere in Section 77(5), utilities are not addressed anywhere in this section. This is a concern particularly as the definition of infrastructure in the document does not include utilities.</p> <p>As indicated in our letter dated September 28, 2009, the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Places to Grow) both strongly support the integrated planning of communities, including telecommunications infrastructure.</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>The PPS specifically requires that “planning for infrastructure and public service facilities shall be integrated with planning for growth so that these are available to meet current and projected needs” (Section 1.6.1). Furthermore, the PPS states that infrastructure should be located to support the delivery of emergency management services (Section 1.6.3). We note that the definition of infrastructure in the PPS includes communications/telecommunications.</p> <p>As a result, we do not feel that Section 77(5)(n) addresses our concerns adequately and would ask that the following be added to Section 77(5):</p> <p><i>“p) a utility servicing plan, which describes where, how and when utility services will be provided to serve the community.”</i></p> <p>This modification would provide greater clarity as to the Region’s intent to ensure that adequate hard and soft services are available to meet the public need.</p> <p>Definitions</p> <p>To further build upon this, we would also ask that the definition of infrastructure be revised to better reflect the broader scope of infrastructure required to meet the Region’s development and growth objectives as identified in our September 2009 letter. As both soft and hard services are required to meet the needs of existing and future growth, we would recommend that the following additions be included in the existing definition of “Infrastructure” in order to fully encapsulate the infrastructure required to meet the public need.</p> <p>“INFRASTRUCTURE means <i>physical structures (facilities and corridors) that form the foundation for development. This includes the collection of public capital facilities, such as including highways, transit terminals and rolling stock, municipal water and wastewater systems, solid waste management facilities, storm water systems, schools, hospitals, libraries, community and recreation centres, other public service facilities and any other public projects involving substantial capital investment. It includes not only the provision of new facilities but also the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing ones. Infrastructure also includes public and/or private systems such as electrical power generation and transmission, communication/telecommunications, oil and gas pipelines and associated facilities.</i>”</p> <p>We were pleased to see that the definition of “Utilities” was modified to include the needs of communications/telecommunications infrastructure. However, we would further recommend that the term “communication and telecommunication lines” be modified to <i>“communication and telecommunication infrastructure”</i>. Utility infrastructure consists of more than transmission lines, and includes a multi-tiered system of facilities (including walk-in cabinets, pedestals, etc.) that have been put into place to ensure that essential telecommunications services are provided. Including our proposed</p>	<p><i>Instead, we propose to add “provision of utilities” as a new item.</i></p> <p>We do not support such a change as it will affect the use of the term throughout the Plan, which attempts to separate publicly funded and privately supplied services.</p> <p><i>We suggest changing the word “lines” to “facilities”. The word “infrastructure” is a defined term.</i></p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>wording will ensure that the Region acknowledges the needs of telecommunications infrastructure.</p> <p>Bell would be more than happy to set up a meeting with Regional staff to further discuss our concerns.</p> <p>We would ask all documents and information including any further meetings, reports, decisions, etc. related to this matter be forwarded to our Development and Municipal Services Control Centre:</p> <p>If you have any questions, please direct them to the undersigned.</p>	
<p>PERL December 2, 2009</p>	<p>Reference: ROPA 38 Delegation to Halton Region PPW Committee Dec 2, 2009</p> <p>Committee Chair and Committee members My name is Roger Goulet, PERL Executive Director</p> <p>PERL has provided written comments on ROPA 38 draft policies. Our comments today will be on the draft policies for Agriculture, enhanced Natural Heritage System and Aggregates.</p> <p><u>Natural Heritage System and Agriculture:</u></p> <p><i>Greenbelt NHS implications??</i></p> <p>Firstly, on the Regional Natural Heritage System and Agriculture, which are presented together, because they are intrinsically inseparable.</p> <p>PERL strongly supports the Halton Region's 'enhanced' Natural Heritage System; and advocates for the protection and preservation of our prime agricultural lands for farming use. Far too much of these natural resources have been lost to development.</p> <p>We are concerned that an NHS 'overlay' opens these areas up to development.</p> <p>Frankly we find the ROPA 38 policy debate over Natural Heritage System and Agriculture troubling.</p> <p>Why is it that so many view 'nature' as something separate from humanity?</p> <p>All life forms including human beings are part of nature. It is when humans try to separate from nature that we do so at our peril.</p> <p>There are many examples throughout human history where humans have destroyed the natural environment, only to be themselves destroyed in the end...<i>Easter Island, Pitcairn Islands, the Khmer Empire of Cambodia, the Anasazi of S. West USA, and modern day Haiti, etc.</i></p> <p>Jared Diamond's book "<i>Collapse</i>" should be required reading by anyone involved in land use planning decisions.</p> <p>So what does this have to do with ROPA 38?</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>We assert that without a healthy Natural Heritage System there can be no viable Agriculture. The reason being... The land itself, plants, animals, insects, birds, etc. are all parts of the same whole, a single entity made up of interconnections and interdependent species, that intercept, overlap and depend on each other. We must live within the natural world of integrated interdependent biodiversity. Biodiversity is at the very heart of life's resilience and adaptability. This also speaks to the need to create, restore and preserve connections and corridors between core habitat areas.</p> <p>The ROPA 38 Official Plan on Natural Heritage and Agriculture needs to connect biologically and geologically rich natural infrastructures of plants, animals, insects, species at risk, forest and wetland habitats, and life-giving sources of water; and Niagara Escarpment and Greenbelt lands. Some of these connections and corridors will need to incorporate agricultural lands.</p> <p>Agriculture needs a robust Natural Heritage System; the Natural Heritage System needs healthy Agriculture. I refer you to Dr. David Suzuki's book "<i>Good News for a Change</i>". In it are many examples of failed Agriculture as a direct result of a failed Natural Heritage System; juxtaposed to examples of a resilient Agriculture biosynergistically co-dependant with an integrated Natural Heritage System.</p> <p>We need to put an end to EITHER – OR; ...to one over the other. We need both for there to be an ecologically sustainable Agriculture, and an ecologically sustainable Natural Heritage System for the long term. Both need protection from development. The bees need the crops as much as the crops need the bees.</p> <p>Let us together find a way to assure the long term survival of both Agriculture and the Natural Heritage System, thus helping assure our own survival. If we can't, we will continue down the path towards <u>environmental, economic and social collapse</u>. The insanity must STOP! It starts by becoming students of rich biodiversity and sustainability. It starts by committing to true ecological sustainability. It starts by standing in our great great grandchildren's place, reflecting with pride on the selfless foresight of their forefathers. You are those forefathers. Be bold, be selfless. Lead us to a better place for the sake of our future generations. Let's trust each other to do what is ecologically right for the land, and the generations to come.</p> <p>Ø <u>Aggregates:</u></p> <p>I want to comment of the draft Aggregate policies, by highlighting a couple areas of concern...</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>The first area offers possibility, but could have unacceptable consequences. I speak of the “Net Environmental Gain” concept, which is just that..., a concept. Yet, the aggregate industry is already making claims of net environmental gain in their quarry license applications. How can a “gain” be claimed without guidelines as to what constitutes a gain? Or how is this gain measured? Or what natural heritage <u>value</u> is being placed on the ecological capital that was destroyed versus that proposed in its place.</p> <p>The net environmental gain policy concept could be a good way to truly enhance our natural capital. <i>Or</i> it could be a disastrous fraud on the environment and society. The destruction of essential life-giving systems, which are replaced by artificial recreations of nature, which do not restore the original balance... not to mention creating any <i>net gains</i>.</p> <p>PERL does not want Net Environmental Gain to become the latest argument by developers to justify the stripping of the land of important features and functions; without full consideration for what was lost. The “gain” can only be claimed <u>after</u> the original value is surpassed; otherwise we will be left with a Net Environmental <u>LOSS</u>”. We are advocating for “quality” over quantity. There must be real and measurable gains to our natural capital.</p> <p>For this reason, PERL supports “Net Environmental Gain” ONLY if definitive parameters, measures and methods are put firmly in place to determine the original ecological value or natural capital versus that of the proposed development; otherwise, we will oppose Halton’s proposed Net Environmental Gain policy.</p> <p>The Halton Region needs to critically re-examine “Net Environmental Gain” and its design before it gets adopted into ROPA 38.</p> <p>The second area of concern is with the lack of governmental initiatives on aggregate conservation. Throughout the Halton Region some 10 million tonnes per year of aggregates are extracted, mostly from the Niagara Escarpment. We are consuming and wasting our aggregate resources like there is no tomorrow. Halton Region needs to take a leadership role in aggregate conservation.</p> <p>The first conservation strategy should be Reduction of aggregate use, which is driven in large part by urban sprawl. Intensification strategies optimize <u>existing</u> infrastructures, thus the need for aggregates for roads, watermains, sewers is less.</p> <p>A second aggregate conservation strategy is Replacement of virgin limestone with <u>alternative materials</u>, such as metal refinery slag, mine tailings, glass, etc. Why do we irresponsibly use our high quality dolostone aggregate for non critical applications, such as basement</p>	<p>Enhancement is the objective of the “net environment gain” approach. It is not meant to be a replacement of the “no negative impacts” PPS test. Modifications to this part of the Plan have clarified this position of the Region.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>and garage cavity filling, and shopping mall parking lots.</p> <p>A third aggregate conservation strategy is to Reuse construction demolition materials like bricks, and the reprocessing of asphalt and road base materials in-place / in-situ. <i>Refer to presentation from the MTO</i></p> <p>A fourth aggregate conservation strategy is to Recycle the aggregate containing construction materials like asphalt, concrete, cement blocks, roofing shingles and bricks.</p> <p>What can Halton Region do to conserve its aggregate resources?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v Mandate the reuse and recycling of all Halton Region construction wastes containing aggregates... <i>roadbeds, concrete, asphalt, blocks, bricks, shingles, etc.</i> v Mandate that all Halton Region construction projects must utilize recycled aggregates or alternative materials v Change the building codes, building standards, and procurement practices v Provide incentives for the development of alternatives to virgin aggregates v Provide incentives for the development alternative extraction technologies, which reduce or eliminate negative environmental impacts v Institute a \$5 to \$10 per metric tonne 'environmental fee' for all virgin aggregate extracted from the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area. This money could be used to fund the Halton Green Fund <p>Other countries such as Belgium, Holland, Denmark and the UK have taken the necessary steps to conserve their natural resources by applying significant environmental fees per tonne of aggregate. This has resulted in a substantial reduction in aggregate use...three times less aggregate per capita.</p> <p>Halton Region needs to institute aggregate conservation strategies which won't leave future generations with a Swiss cheese landscape and compromised ecosystems.</p> <p>Thank you for accepting our input. We hope our ideas will help make our Region a better place. PERL</p>	<p>This will be considered as part of Halton's corporate sustainability initiatives. Other initiatives suggested here will require legislative changes.</p>
<p>Sernas on behalf of Smitas et al.</p> <p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p>Re: Comments on proposed ROPA 38 With Respect to Part of Lots 17 and 18, Concession 2 Our Project No. 09385</p> <p>We represent the owners of Part of Lots 17 and 18, Concession 2, Trafalgar, in the Town of Milton (PINs 249290143 and 249290196). The property is owned by descendants of 4 business partners who purchased the property many years ago. None of the current owners <i>live</i> on the property, and none of them <i>live</i> in the Region of Halton, consequently they did not see the notices for the Sustainable Halton process published in the various newspapers.</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>The owners became aware of ROPA 38 and the impact it may <i>have</i> on their property just a few days ago. The owners are not developers, nor are they <i>involved</i> in the development industry in any way. Thus, they did not realize that Halton had embarked on a process to update its Official Plan and that their property <i>value</i> could be affected by it.</p> <p>We understand that a significant amount of work has gone into creating this Official Plan Amendment, and that changes may not be possible this late in the process.</p> <p>We <i>have</i> the following concerns with the Natural Heritage System designation on Map 1 - Regional Structure and Map 1G - Key Features of the Natural Heritage System:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We would like to confirm that the ultimate boundary of the Natural Heritage system in the rural area of Halton is not being defined at this time. As we understand from our quick <i>review</i> of the reports available, the Region intends to define this boundary later, when the surrounding land will be included in a Secondary Plan. 2. We would also like to confirm that when the extent of the Natural Heritage system is being defined, that there is some flexibility to adjust the apparent limits that are currently shown in ROPA 38 through a science based approach. 3. If the Region does not intend to define the full extent of the Natural Heritage System now, why is it being shown on Map 1 - Regional Structure? <i>Even</i> if the policy text indicates that there is flexibility in defining the boundary, it will be difficult for the land owners to <i>remove</i> the designation from Map 1 in the <i>eventuality</i> that a detailed study determines that some or all of the Natural Heritage System designation is unwarranted. 4. The <i>Remaining Natural Heritage System</i> designation appears to be unfairly skewed to the east in the location of the above noted property. The subject property is located right at the connection between the 16 Mile Creek watercourse and the east-west portion of the Greenbelt; this connection leads to the west only. It may be more beneficial from a linkage and connectivity framework to expand further on the west side to take advantage of a stronger connection into this portion of the Greenbelt. 	<p>The Regional Natural Heritage System has been defined on Map 1 in both the urban and rural areas of Halton. Section 116.1 permits refinements to the boundaries of the Regional Natural Heritage System through the preparation of Area-Specific Plans, Sub-watershed studies and individual Environmental Impact Assessments</p> <p>Map 1 shows the full extent of the NHS based on the best available information. Landowners' obligation is to provide technical studies to support refinements to the boundary. Changing Map 1 is a housekeeping task for the Region after accepting the results of those technical studies.</p> <p>With respect to the Regional Natural Heritage System in this area, please note the following:</p> <p>The east branch of 16 Mile Creek that runs parallel to Trafalgar Road and extends northward to the Niagara Escarpment, forms a regional-scale ecological connection. As such, enhancements were identified along this corridor</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>5. The ROPA 38 Natural Heritage System is vastly different from the Natural Heritage System contained in the Subwatershed Study for Areas 2 and 7 of 16 Mile Creek, as prepared by Philips Planning and Engineering for the Town of Milton. Both ROPA 38 and the subwatershed study indicate that they are using a systems based approach, and have similar environmental objectives. Why is there such a significant difference? Understandably, the subwatershed study was prepared prior to the implementation of the Greenbelt Plan. In the subwatershed study, only the two hedgerows on the subject property are proposed as linkages, and the ratings of these two hedgerows are relatively low.</p> <p>We would like the <i>Remaining Natural Heritage System</i> (Map 1G) designation on the subject property to be removed, or at least reduced substantially. If the detailed study has not yet be conducted to determine that this is the appropriate location for these boundaries, please do not show it on the map without any supporting documentation.</p> <p>If you should have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.</p>	<p>to provide substantial ecological connections and robust ecological core areas where possible.</p> <p>The enhancement area located on the subject property is part of a core enhancement meeting a minimum woodland target threshold of 20 hectares while also reducing the amount of NHS edge, thereby contributing to interior woodland conditions.</p> <p>Despite the fact that core and linkage enhancement areas may lack visible natural heritage features such as woodlands or wetlands, they are in fact critical components of the Regional NHS. As such, we are not recommending any changes to the Regional NHS in this area.</p> <p>The Regional Natural Heritage System is based on the systems approach as outlined in the Sustainable Halton technical report 3.02: Natural Heritage System: Definition and Implementation, while the approach taken in the subwatershed study was developed through the workplan for that particular study.</p> <p>Report 3.02 is the technical basis for defining the NHS as shown on Map 1. Section 116.1 provides a process for refinements based on technical studies with peer review. We believe this to be a reasonable planning process.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
<p>The Synod of the Diocese of Niagara and FRAM Building Group</p> <p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p>RE: Region of Halton ROPA 38 - An Amendment to Incorporate the Results of Sustainable Halton, Official Plan Review Directions and Other Matters</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of The Synod of the Diocese of Niagara and FRAM Building Group in regards to the development of S1. Luke's Retirement Home and an addition to S1. Luke's Church in Palermo Village, south of Dundas Street in the Town of Oakville.</p> <p>We are concerned with the requirements of Section 58 that any developer must secure allocation before zoning can come into effect. While it may be appropriate to consider the servicing potential of any development during the evaluation of a planning application, it is not appropriate to require allocation be granted prior to the approval of a change in zoning.</p> <p>I look forward to working with you further on resolving this matter prior to the adoption of the amendment by Regional Council.</p>	<p>The policy speaks to "securing" services to the satisfaction of the Region. This does not necessarily imply "allocation". If existing services are available and meet Region's conditions for servicing, then services will be considered secured.</p>
<p>Lieven Gevaert</p> <p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p>Presentation on sustainable halton ROPA 38 public works committee dec 2 09</p> <p>A. OVERLAY B.CONFORMING USE AGRICULTURE C.REGIONAL PHILOSOPHY –AGRICULTURE, NO URBAN DEVELOPMENT D.SPECIFIC DRAFT CONCERNS</p> <p>There seems to an overwhelming concern about urban development.this concern suggest in the draft that NH is still the designation on rural farmland.there is a process that will allow the rural agricultural areas in halton to continue to be designated rural/agricultural, yet satisfy the regional policy of not having urban development in the rural areas.</p> <p>Map 1 in the just released draft should show agricultural/rural just as shown in map1 of the present [2005] regional plan. A subsequent explanatory map could have a halton region NH OVERLAY,similar the map 1C which has the "future strategic employment area" as an overlay.</p> <p>This philosophy ,of NH OVERLAY, over the agricultural designation would allow agriculture to be the designated use,the conforming designated use.Were NH to become the designated use, agriculture would be the nonconforming but presently permitted use,a tenuous situation for agriculture.</p> <p>The regional philosophy of not urbanizing agricultural land would be met with the overlayIf any application for a zoning change were to be</p>	<p>We do not agree with this interpretation that agriculture is rendered a non-conforming use under an NHS designation approach.</p> <p>Zoning changes typically change permitted uses and</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>initiated,the overlay would take precedence over that change requested agricultural land,and would hence be under the aegis of the now NH designation.Under this process, farming would keep its designated land use,and the land use would automatically change to NH with an application.</p> <p>In keeping with the PPS [2005] agricultural principles{2.1.7,2.3,2.3.3}, in keeping with the natural heritage reference manual{3.4.5. It is a common municipal practice to use an overlay approach in the official plan to identify natural heritage systems within prime agricultural areas},the recommendation in this presentation will not only keep agriculture as the designated use,but will also protect it further from urban development with the initiation of an application. This recommendation will be part of the conformity exercise for the “places to grow legislation”</p> <p>Because of the extreme hurriedness to respond to the public meeting[the latest draft of last Friday was nowhere to be found on the internet] because I could not properly digest the changes made I cannot properly respond to all the contentious points,I would respectfully recommend to this committee that they recommend to council that the rural/agricultural policies be delayed in the discussions with the appropriate rural/agricultural community until say February 2010.</p> <p>I fully agree with the HAAC submission{response document nov 25,2009 pp 238,239.and I do not agree with the 2nd response pp239.} I fully agree with theHRFA submission {response document pp128-184}</p> <p>I do not agree with the responses ,top pp129- this presentation suggests another alternative}</p> <p>SPECIFIC DRAFT CONCERNS a.map 1 the legend is confusing.the green speckled area should be renamed:regional natural heritage system OVERLAY.instead of greenbelt natural heritage system. The overlay should include the farmland. below the brow.differentiating in designation for agriculture is confusing and seems illogical.the agricultural community wants consistency in its designation</p> <p>b. key natural features are acceptable.[greenlandsA-B,not woodlands] there seem to be confusion on the footprint differences between 2005 and draft proposal</p> <p>c.115.3,115.4 this does not apply to the overlay?</p>	<p>hence the designation, not the overlay (the constraints).</p> <p>We agree with this approach for areas that are not subject to urban development pressures such as above the Brow.</p> <p>We disagree because we don't want to apply the Regional NHS policies above the Brow, as advocated by some rural residents and farmers in that area.</p> <p>The differences in footprint are due to updated information from MNR and Conservation Halton.</p> <p>That is correct.</p> <p>We will clean this up in the final version of the Plan.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>d.1141.[6]the underlined words are supposed to lead to an action word on the right side of the page.d,e,f are underlined but lead to no action word. Very unclear. There are other such examples throughout the latest draft, this leads to an inability to properly comment.-</p> <p>e.101.4“shown as an overlay”I have commented on the legend on map 1, where there is no “overlay”</p> <p>f.101.4k should that not also include the C.A. under the same encouragement?</p> <p>g.101.4 ij[i] “or a retiring farmer” a second dwelling without a lot will make it somewhat difficult to get financing.</p> <p>h.101[1.6]c “minimize adverse impact to the natural environment” who will judge?i recommend HRFA and/or HAAC</p> <p>ij100.the word “may” does not provoke confidence in continuity. Consider the word that embraces some continuity such as “will” or “shall”.</p> <p>J] 99.4 “to protect farms from incompatible activities[such as a nonconforming but permitted use] this is why regional NH must be an overlay, not a designation</p> <p>k]99.1 to recognize agriculture as the primary activity and land use in the agricultural rural area. Again that is why an NH overlay in the agricultural area is essential.</p> <p>l]226[3] this statement is unacceptable because it is contrary to halton’s agricultural philosophy, and the PPS</p>	<p>Overlays are shown in pattern, not in solid colour.</p> <p>We don’t think the CA’s have sufficient holdings or are interested in such arrangements. The policy does not preclude them from doing so.</p> <p>The second dwelling is for farm help or for a retiring farming to live in.</p> <p>We agree.</p> <p>This is to allow Local Official Plans to be more restrictive.</p> <p>We believe that agriculture and NHS are compatible uses.</p> <p>We would think this statement is in support of agriculture because as such it is not considered as “development” which is subject to planning control.</p>
<p>Halton Agricultural Advisory Committee</p> <p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p>HAAC Presentation To: Planning and Public Works Committee, Region of Halton Council Re: Regional Official Plan Amendment #38 (ROPA 38)</p> <p>Introduction The Halton Agricultural Advisory Committee is an Advisory Committee established by Regional Council to “advise and assist the Region in its effort to develop and maintain a permanently secure, economically viable agricultural industry as an important component of Halton’s economic base, and as a source of employment for Halton’s rural community.” (Terms of Reference) HAAC represents a cross-section of the Region’s farming community and is composed of members representing the Halton Federation of Agriculture, the Junior Farmers, dairy farmers, pork producers, fruit and vegetable growers, cattlemen etc. There is one member of Regional Council and an alternate, and up to five citizen members</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>appointed by Regional Council.</p> <p>It is perhaps interesting that I, as an appointed citizen representative, and the only non-farmer currently active on the committee, was elected Chair.</p> <p>The Regional Official Plan HAAC notes that the stated purpose of the Regional Official Plan is to solidify decisions taken in the past and to give clear direction to the development planning that will meet the current and future needs of Halton. The Plan outlines a long term vision, and the Policies included indicate positions to which Regional Council is either committed or will strive to attain.</p> <p>In Halton's stated 'vision' the future landscape will always include a rural countryside where agriculture is the preferred and predominant activity.</p> <p>As we review the proposed ROPA 38, first I must state that this presentation today reflects the submission endorsed unanimously by HAAC on November 12th (Response Document pg. 238), plus consensus positions of a HAAC sub-committee following what can only be described as a hasty review of the document. HAAC submits that with a document as detailed as this one is, and as significant as an Official Plan is, particularly to the farmers and those who own the rural lands, it is unreasonable to expect a thorough, accurate examination of the document in a 48 hour period. HAAC is not pointing fingers or laying blame, we are simply stating the process is flawed.</p> <p>Benefits HAAC strongly supports the designation of Agricultural Rural Area with its goal of maintaining a permanently secure economically viable agricultural industry – and its key objectives, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizing agriculture as the primary activity and land use • Preserving prime agricultural land • Maintaining as much as possible lands for existing and future farm use • Promoting normal farm practices • Protecting the right to farm • Encouraging a strong farm support service industry • Promoting a diverse, innovative and economically strong agricultural industry • Preserving the farm community as an important part of Halton's rural fabric. <p>Further, HAAC notes that the Region is, through the Official Plan,</p>	<p>Given the extensive processes leading to the Public Meeting for ROPA 38, we believe that members of the public and stakeholders who have been following these processes can focus on the changes that are being proposed and staff responses specific to their respective areas of interest. The Response Document is well indexed and the changes are summarized in table form and highlighted in the document—we hope such would assist the reader in a relatively quick review of the matters of interest to him/her.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>committed to supporting and developing plans and programs to sustain agriculture – such as actions to promote diverse and innovative farming, support a farm-fresh produce network, attract new, young and immigrant farmers to Halton, and introduce innovative tax policies to attract venture capital for innovative agriculture. In a positive manner, ROPA 38 addresses many of the issues facing agriculture, farmers and the rural community of Halton.</p> <p>However, the document also raises some concerns that if not changed and corrected during what is a very short period for review, will have a negative impact on the future of farming in the Region and very much put in jeopardy the stated goal of maintaining a permanently secure, viable, agricultural industry.</p> <p>Concerns Among the concerns expressed by members of the HAAC sub-committee members are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The response that ROPA 38 policies do not place any further restrictions to agriculture (Response Document pg 239) • The relative status of the Agriculture Rural Area designation vis-a-vis the proposed Regional Natural Heritage System (NHS) designation. • The division of the Region into areas above the brow and below the brow of the escarpment with respect to the proposed Regional NHS • The protection of designated Key Features <p>To explain briefly. HAAC submits that the long-term future for agriculture will be in jeopardy if the NHS designation is given precedence in the planning process, and as stated 116.1 the mapping of certain components of the Regional NHS may be up-dated, with additions, deletions and/or boundary adjustments through programs of the Ministry of Natural Resources, Conservation Authorities and/or the Region.” This suggests the strong possibility of constant change in the NHS with no consultation and no input from the farmers who own the land. It is a situation that does not lend itself to long term stability for the agricultural sector. HAAC submits that Agriculture Rural Area should be the designation, NHS should be the overlay when and where needed.</p> <p>Farmers have, since the area was first cultivated, been the stewards of the land. It is in their own interest to continue to follow best practices, to be good stewards, to protect the environment and our natural heritage. They are not unreasonable people to deal with but they do require long-term stability of land use, and flexibility to be able to adapt to the ever changing economic conditions of the agricultural/food production system.</p> <p>To divide the Region into different land use policies or restrictions for those areas above the brow and those areas below is to add yet one more division to an already complicated process (i.e Greenbelt Protected Countryside, Greenbelt Natural Heritage, Niagara Escarpment Plan, Parkway Belt West Plan) that finds farmers facing a</p>	<p>This is really business as usual.</p> <p>We are in total agreement with these observations.</p> <p>The recommendation of this approach is based on the fact that Milton and Halton Hills Councils have taken different positions on implementing the NHS, especially in the area above the Brow. As well, ROPA</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>myriad of regulations often differing from one side of the concession to the other, even one part of a farm to the remainder of the property. HAAC submits this 'above the brow, below the brow' initiative steps away from the consistency that an Official Plan is expected to achieve. Protecting Key Features as a component of the proposed Regional NHS is an area that raises the concern of HAAC members – both the extent to which linkages and buffers would be included in key feature designation and mapping, and the extent of the area of protection with respect to the sensitivity and significance of the key feature, particularly noting the restrictions on new buildings or building expansions.</p> <p>Conclusions HAAC is encouraged to see the many positive steps in ROPA 38, as mentioned earlier, including a commitment to consult with and support Halton's farm organizations, and a commitment to maintain a broad-based Agricultural Advisory Committee. However, agriculture is not like many industrial and service businesses that can be set up one day, in operation the next – and often profitable within a few weeks. Agriculture is a long term investment with land and land use being key components of any decision to enter, continue or expand a farming operation. Farming is not an 'in today, out tomorrow' business.</p> <p>There must be surety of land tenure, and what can be done with the land must not be left to interpretation or changes desired by one lobby group or the next, by one council or the next. And particularly if we are to look to future generations continuing to maintain a productive agriculture in Halton they must not be subjected to constant changes – or the fear of constant changes – in land use restrictions that are not in the long-term best interests of both the farmers and the public. As a Committee established to advise Regional Council through the Planning and Priorities Committee we respectfully request that there be a deferral to allow for time to reach an agreement that will bridge the differences and remove the points of ambiguity that exist in ROPA 38 as currently proposed.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted by Glenn Powell Chair, Halton Agricultural Advisory Committee (HAAC)</p>	<p>38 has been criticized by both MMAH and HRFA's consultant, among others, as being not in conformity with the Greenbelt Plan in many respects. There is also the general concern that the Greenbelt Plan area is being over-regulated. With the Region being the approval authority of the Local Official Plans that will introduce detailed implementation policies based on Regionally generated mapping, we hope to achieve some degree of uniformity. Perhaps at the next OP Review, the Region can revisit this approach of above and below the Brow policy framework for the NHS.</p> <p>Staff is appreciative of HAAC continued interest and valuable input on ROAP 38.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
<p>Peter Hoyle December 2, 2009</p>	<p>Regional Chair, Councillors, Ladies and Gentlemen ROPA 38</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to address the Committee today to bring the concerns of the United Church of Canada. My name is Peter Hoyle - I am the Mission Development Officer for Halton Presbytery which represents congregations in Burlington, Oakville and Milton in Halton Region and Mississauga in Peel Region.</p> <p>I want to say thank you to the Council for the amendments to the plan that make life better for citizens in the Region. These include several changes that are helpful to the faith communities as we seek to serve the wider community. However, I would like to make mention of a concern that is general in nature.</p> <p>In Burlington, Oakville and Milton there are 20 United Church congregations of a diverse nature. Some are large urban congregations while others are small rural communities. We represent some 15000 members with property holdings of \$140,000,000. The significance of those findings is multiplied by the fact that the United Church is only one of many faith communities in Halton Region and is, in fact, one of the smaller faith communities.</p> <p>In all of the United Churches and dare I say all faith communities there is a strong will to serve the neighbourhoods and wider society in which we worship and serve. Not only do the faithful members seek to serve individually in their work and leisure but the congregations seek to use their buildings and properties as tools by which people's lives may become healthy spiritually, socially, emotionally and physically. In that regard all of the United Churches are heavily used daily for community activities at a low cost if any and at no cost to the municipalities or other levels of government. In other words no public funds are used for public activities such as children's programming, sports, social development, treatment for various forms of addiction and obesity, seniors' leisure activities and many other social and recreational activities.</p> <p>One of the other activities of the church in response to need has been in providing a variety of housing alternatives. In the Region the United Church has successfully established Van Norman House (known now as Bill Shackleton Place) in Burlington, the Delmanor at Glen Abbey in Oakville. There are many other examples like Victoria Park Housing in Hamilton and the Fred Victor House in Toronto.</p> <p>My point today is that it is not clear to me that the United Church and other faith communities will be able to continue in this small service to meet the housing needs of the wider community. There have been no conversations with faith communities about any of the decisions affecting them nor is there any mention of faith communities in the report unless the church is an NGO or an institution and one doubts if that was the thought. If churches are defined as developers - if church lands are defined as residential only, this is a mistake that will become complicated in the future.</p>	<p>The Region appreciates the important role that churches play in meeting the housing needs of the community. Policy 86(14) supports the involvement of private and non-profit sectors, which encompasses faith communities, in the</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Faith Communities are unique and need to be consulted about their concerns. Thank you for making an adjustment to the Use of Employment Lands to recognize several churches in such situations although the changes are not identified as such. We hope in the future when we come to propose changes to our land use that we will not simply be regarded as something else other than church and that our plans are recognized as being healthy for the whole community and the whole person.</p>	<p>provision of Assisted and Affordable Housing.</p> <p>We welcome the faith community's participation in development of guidelines for Community Infrastructure Plan and Healthy Communities that will take place in 2010.</p>
<p>Interfaith Council of Halton</p> <p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p>Chair, Members of Committee</p> <p>The Interfaith Council of Halton is made up of representatives from faith groups in Halton along with representatives from the Separate and Public School Boards, Halton Regional Police Services; the Halton Multicultural Council; and other community organizations. We represent over 150 worshipping communities in Halton.</p> <p>We appreciate the time Mr. Ron Glenn has taken to meet with us to hear our concerns directly and this is a follow up to those discussions in the light of some welcome amendments and recognizing that we still have some concerns about ROPA 38 and the Draft Halton Region Joint Municipal Housing Statement.</p> <p>Addressing our Particular Issues</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>Faith groups have an important role in providing a range of housing, meeting a variety of community needs – St. Stephen United Church provides residential hospice care for the dying in Burlington; Maple Grove United Church is seeking to provide the most affordable type of housing in Halton for Seniors; Kerr Street Ministries is a faith based initiative initiated and supported by the faith community. Faith groups have established group homes, housing for the poor and seniors' housing.</p> <p>P. 32 Item 112 Section 86(14) is welcome.</p> <p>86(14) Support the involvement of the private and non profit sectors in the provision of Assisted and Affordable Housing by removing planning impediments and financial disincentive that may exist.</p> <p>We are pleased to see support for the removal of planning barriers to proposals that are generated by a concern to service the community – particularly prohibitive development charges which faith groups have to raise in charitable donations and which they have no possibility of recouping later as developers do. The necessity for an Official Plan amendment to provide needed community services becomes a daunting obstacle for mainly volunteers to hurdle.</p> <p>p. 16 We are pleased to be specifically mentioned in the Item 65 Section</p>	<p>Those sections are</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>77(5)e and would like to be included in 77(5)f).</p> <p>p. 29 Item 104 Section 85 85(12) To consider the use of surplus public lands <i>and not for profit sites</i> for developing Assisted housing and Affordable Housing.</p> <p>The land resource of the faith communities provides the region a priceless resource for creating complete communities. Housing policies need to encourage faith communities to continue to meet the needs of the community for special needs and affordable housing.</p> <p>Employment Areas</p> <p>We appreciate the amendments that are proposed for not for profit groups in employment areas with one exception that institutional uses must provide a needed community service to the immediate neighbourhood.</p> <p><i>77.4b)[i] states</i></p> <p><i>b) for institutional uses identified in a Local Official Plan, as a result of a detailed study that sets limits and criteria on such uses based on the following principles:</i></p> <p><i>[i] the use provides a needed community service for the immediate neighbourhood.</i></p> <p>We represent a wide diversity of religious groups and some do not directly service an immediate neighbourhood but can serve the whole region even though they may not have a large congregation. The Zoroastrian Community is an example. To be inclusive to every faith group in Halton, this policy needs to be amended.</p> <p>Cemeteries</p> <p>Cemeteries not only include large and small burial grounds but memorial gardens and columbaria and each of these facilities have different land requirements and impacts on adjacent uses. The Region throughout this ROPA treats all forms of cemeteries as the same.</p> <p>While we recognize that large commercial cemeteries may need to have one set of limits, it would be helpful to recognize the variety of burial practices and the unique needs of faith communities throughout Halton.</p> <p>Our General Concerns</p> <p>Faith Groups must be treated as unique for these reasons:</p>	<p>complementary to one another: the former about principles, and the latter about implementation.</p> <p><i>We will incorporate this proposed change.</i></p> <p>We agree—getting broader community support for the multiple uses proposed is the key.</p> <p><i>We will delete this reference to "immediate neighbourhood".</i></p> <p>Small-scale cemeteries should be part of the fabric of a complete community. Such uses are generally allowed in the urban area. The planning process for an Area-Specific Plan under Section 77(5) would make such provisions.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are in the business of promoting healthy communities, providing affordable and assisted housing, often for those with special needs. 2. We are not developers. We provide important community services and are integral to the creation of complete communities. 3. We are positioned to fulfill emerging community needs, particularly in the service of special needs groups. 4. Our constitutional right to practice our faiths needs to be protected. <p>The Town of Oakville Council has already recognized that Livable Oakville has not addressed these issues adequately and has directed a town wide study of worshipping communities.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>It is not possible to have a sustainable, livable, complete community without the presence of the worshipping communities. The Region of Halton and the local municipalities must do what is necessary to understand and support places of worship. We provide a level of service and a quality of service to the community that is unique and irreplaceable and should be valued as such.</p> <p>We are willing to engage further with your committee and with Regional Council to further our joint efforts on behalf of all of the people of Halton.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted by The Reverend Dr. Morar Murray-Hayes Executive Secretary Interfaith Council of Halton</p>	<p>We suggest that the faith community participate in our development of guidelines for Community Infrastructure Plan and Healthy Communities, which will take place in 2010.</p>
<p>Isabelle Harmer</p> <p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p>Re: Sustainable Halton ROPA 38 Delegation to the Planning and Public Works Committee of Halton Region on Dec 02 09.</p> <p>Greetings, Chairman Adams, Chair Carr, and Mayor Bonnette, Councillors and staff.</p> <p>I am Isabelle Harmer, I live on a farm in Burlington. Our working farm grows alfalfa and clover and has Bobolinks in the fields, endangered species in our wood lot and tributaries of the Grindstone Creek crossing the fields. Because I wear two hats I think that I can speak about natural heritage and agriculture as being complimentary systems that are dependent on each other.</p> <p>We are working on ROPA 38 with sustainability as our focus. My hope is that farmers will follow the fundamental principles of environmental sustainability which promotes biodiversity, increases soil fertility,</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>protects of the water supply by fencing ponds and creeks from cattle to avoid contamination, and uses no-till methods where possible. Environmental sustainability asks us to live by the principle of 'do no harm'</p> <p>To sustain biodiversity we need to plant trees in the fence rows and leave weeds to flower for birds and insects. When one gets rid of milkweed you can say goodbye to the Monarch Butterflies. These treed fence rows also provide connectivity for wild animals to travel where they feel safe. We also need to plant trees along creek beds to retain moisture and to anchor the soil. Planting as many trees as possible helps take carbon from the air and they add greatly to the health of all.</p> <p>In order for agriculture and natural places to flourish and be healthy they both need the humble pollinator, the honey bee. One-third of our food depends on pollination by beesbut they are disappearing in large numbers.</p> <p>In the US in 2007,30% of all bee colonies in the country were completely wiped out. I know that the bee keeper just down the road from me had no honey this year.</p> <p>In Britain in 2007-2008 losses averaged more than 30% and there were huge losses around the globe.</p> <p>In China they have been forced, in one area, to hand pollinate as there are no bees in some areas.</p> <p>Bees thrive in places where nature supplies all kinds of pollen from flowering meadows, from weeds, and from tree blossoms Bees are like humans in that they need a varied diet of vitamins, protein, minerals and fat to thrive. The natural heritage places provide all these as do the farmers who plant different kinds of crops. Today's massive mono crops do not provide that variety.</p> <p>One third of our diet comes from flowering crops and bees pollinate 80% of these crops. They pollinate forage and hay crops that feed the animals that supply meat, milk and cheese. Other pollinators like the bumble bee, the moth, the butterflies, bats, and humming birds are also in steep decline .Three species of bumble bee, common to southern Ontario have disappeared.</p> <p>Why the loss of pollinators? There is consensus among scientists that habitat loss, the intensification of agriculture, and the routine use of agro chemicals are playing havoc with the bee population The loss of ecological diversity has a knock out effect on the insect world. They're malnourished and more prone to disease.</p> <p>Pesticides, especially, a new group called neonics, a synthetic form of nicotine which is soaked up by the leaves, stems, and roots is deadly to bees. France banned them in 1999 after they were used on sunflowers and honey bees began to die en masse. These neonics are still legal for 140 crops in 100 or so other countries. Let's hope that</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Canada bans them soon. All of these factors can lead to what Guelph University pollination biologist .Peter Kevan calls unnatural "stress" on bees. Their immune system weakens and they fall prey to disease and die.</p> <p>Pollinators, especially bees are what Rachel Carson (Silent Spring) called a keystone species, at the very centre of the entire food web. Remove the keystone and the whole web collapses.</p> <p>Agriculture needs what the natural places have to offer-a variety of crops, no pesticides, meadows with flowers, wetland and nourishing habitat for bees and other insects and birds. The two systems compliment each other if farmers can provide a safe place for the honey bees and other species to live safely, without threats to health and well being.</p> <p>The goal of the natural Heritage System as noted in ROPA 38, is to increase the certainty that the biological diversity and ecological function within Halton will be preserved and enhances for future generations.p73 In Agriculture, this same document states that it wants to promote environmentally sensitive and sustainable farm practices. P.49</p> <p>I want our farm and all farms to protect our natural systems so that my grandkids can hear the bobolinks and count the Monarchs and see the bees in the clover. We could not find them this summer. Remember that the honey bees are the 'keystone' for our entire food web.</p> <p>Ropa 38 must protect and preserve our agricultural lands for sustainable, environmentally friendly farm uses and our rich, diverse natural heritage areas to sustain our biosphere.</p>	
<p>Mike Grimwood</p> <p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p>Delegation to Public Meeting, December 2, 2009, regarding Proposed Region of Halton ROPA #38</p> <p>RE: Natural Heritage System</p> <p>It's good news that Region staff have affirmed that there will be no Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) requirements in the case of repairing, restoring, rehabilitating, maintaining and renovating existing buildings upon the existing footprint (page 393, Response Document: Staff Analysis of Comments Received on Proposed ROPA #38, September 30, 2009 to November 19, 2009, hereafter, the Response Document), nor for the rehabilitation or replacement of a septic system.</p> <p>I have asked staff, however, to provide the relevant OP reference, for the sake of good order. Also, there seems to be some difference between the response on pages 200 and 393, and the OP regulation would, I presume, clarify the matter definitively.</p> <p>It is also noteworthy that staff has affirmed that accessory buildings and structures are exempted from any EIA requirement (the Response Document, page 392 re: 117(10) and 118(3.1)); this is good news for rural residents as it relieves them of inappropriate and</p>	<p>Section 234 regarding "existing uses".</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>onerous financial obligations.</p> <p>Regarding quiet enjoyment of one's private property (the Response Document, page 392, 118(6) and 199 re:114(6)), I am aware of, and recognize the legal right to quiet enjoyment of property. However, the intent of my suggestion is to : - support the MRRRA position that the Region explicitly recognize and support the right to human residence on Natural Heritage System lands;</p> <p>- encourage the Region to require proper regard for this right - the landowner alone should not have to seek legal address or redress to ensure that proper regard is given to this legal right. The Region provides for landowners to be consulted only; this is not sufficient as it puts an undue onus and undue potential financial burden on landowners seeking to protect their legal right.</p> <p>The response to protection for landowners (the Response Document, page 392 re: 118(8)) against frivolous, vexatious, wanton, nuisance or other noxious interventions by third parties with respect to stewardship issues, is disappointing. While a policy promoting land (or more properly, ecological) stewardship is laudable, there should be protection against undue interference by private individuals or non-government organizations, in an owner's use and stewardship of private property.</p> <p>Regarding the response to concerns about invasive species (the Response Document, page 392, re: 114.1(8)), the response is illogical and does not address the issue. We have seen the impact of invasive species (the devastation caused by the emerald ash borer, for example, or the nuisance caused by purple loosestrife and garlic mustard), and greater thought, other than "larger habitat", must be given to address and impede transmission vectors. In the same way, thought needs to be given to restrict continuous corridors in the case health-threatening outbreaks, such as rabies or Lyme disease, or potential life-threatening migrations by wild animals (e.g., wolves moving south to a more abundant food supply).</p> <p>Interestingly, dominant species will likely be encouraged by "larger habitat" to expand, and the goal of ROPA#38 114.1(12) would be unlikely to be achieved.</p> <p>Re: Aggregates</p> <p>It is disappointing that the Region has proposes a policy to not protect rural residents from aggregate (mineral resource extraction) developers. It adopts a policy restricting aggregate development to non urban areas, but cites Provincial policy and regulations as the reason for not restricting aggregate development to areas remote from, or at least not immediately adjacent to, smaller rural residential concentrations (e.g. Milborough Line, residential concentrations which are smaller than hamlets). If Provincial policy and regulations are so accommodating to the aggregate industry, the Region should adopt a "Principle" that it encourages aggregate development in areas remote from rural residential concentrations.</p>	<p>None of the ROPA 38 policies has infringed on Charter rights or common laws. Any restrictions placed on uses through ROPA 38 are based on the Planning Act and other Provincial legislation.</p> <p>There are other legislation such as the Trespass Act and Local By-laws that will provide such protection. ROPA 38 is not such an instrument.</p> <p>The point being made is that with a larger habitat, indigenous species will have a better chance, through natural means, of surviving an invasive species.</p> <p>This is a matter for the science of bio-diversity to address and clarify.</p> <p>An encouragement policy has little effect before the OMB. The applicant is obligated to study and</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>The record of quarry rehabilitation is not encouraging; the Region needs to aggressively promote timely post-extraction rehabilitation; a ten year (at most) window for rehabilitation should be adopted as policy or 'Principle'. I see the so-called "Kelso Quarry Park" almost every day - it is a gross embarrassment and, in my opinion, a testament to the failure of the Region in ensuring rehabilitation, that it is in its current condition after all this time.</p> <p>ROPA3#8 110(6) and 110(7.2) d) should be revisited; consideration should be given to alternative uses (such as proposed recently by the County of Renfrew (EBR Registry #010-8449)) for post-extraction use.</p> <p>107(3) should read "...minimizes social, <i>ecological</i> and human health principles." Minimizing <i>ecological</i> impact is more comprehensive and desirable.</p> <p>Other</p> <p>Regarding planning terms, I am not as sanguine as staff that the definitions of planning terms are as commonly accepted as implied in the Response Document, page 391 re:114.1(2). Without the Region defining what its definition is of any planning term (such as "open space character"), subjectivity, rather than objectivity comes in to play. I well recall the disagreements which I heard at the CMHL Ontario Municipal Board hearings in regard to planning terms (for example, what is meant by "open landscape character", which might be the same as "open space character", or not). Such disagreements are costly to the taxpayer, as she/he is footing the bill for resolution, as well as counter-productive.</p> <p>I suggest ROPA#38 should provide a comprehensive schedule of definitions (expand ROPA#38 Part VI) or provide specific references to a source for definitions, e.g. Niagara Escarpment regulations, to ensure objectivity, not subjectivity.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Michael Grimwood</p>	<p>mitigate impact on rural residents. The lack of enforcement on violations by the operator causing nuisance to the neighbours is the main root of the problem. Hence Sections 110(12) and 110(14)b)</p> <p>See Sections 110(8.1) and 110(14)c).</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>When terms are not defined in a planning document, the common dictionary definitions are normally advanced for the purpose of interpreting policies.</p> <p>See Section 21.</p>
<p>Barbara Halsall</p> <p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p>STATUTORY PUBLIC MEETING ROPA 38 December 2, 2009</p> <p>ROPA 38 HAS NOT ADDRESSED ENERGY DEPLETION SOMETIMES CALLED "PEAK OIL"</p> <p>The following diverse sources are telling us that we will experience oil depletion in the planning period of ROPA 38. Here are a few</p>	<p>Peak oil has been raised throughout the Sustainable</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>examples but it is not limited to the ones below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Geological Survey of Canada (Natural Resources Canada) ◆ US Army Corp of Engineers Report ◆ CEO's of US Oil companies ◆ Former head of exploration & production for the Saudi national oil company ◆ We have Warren Buffet, one of the most savvy investors in the world ◆ We have hundreds of books on this topic and books on how people will cope <p>THE EVIDENCE IS OVERWHELMING! WE MUST SEE SERIOUS TREATMENT OF THIS TOPIC IN ROPA 38.</p> <p>Planning Department Decision: Halton's Planning Department was aware of the concept of "peak oil". A word search of the previous set of 15 documents from April 2009 tells us, in <i>Report 3.11 – Connecting Sustainability in Halton Region 1) Not Over-Using Natural Resources...</i></p> <p><i>...Supplies (of oil and natural gas) may be at their peak and it is important not to overuse them. Adopting a conservative approach to their use and seeking out alternative and renewable sources of energy is necessary.</i> (Underlining added.)</p> <p>This does not appear in the ROPA 38 DOCUMENTS. Someone in the Planning Department at Halton Region has made a DELIBERATE decision to leave out this constraint, which will affect the future of our Region in countless ways.</p> <p>Problems are best dealt with by recognizing and naming them, then working to mitigate the consequences.</p> <p>DO WE NEED THE AGRICULTURAL LAND IN THE PRIMARY STUDY AREA TO GROW FOOD?</p> <p>Preservation of Agricultural Lands Society</p> <p>CANADA'S PRIME FARMLAND ■</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * 94% of Canada's lands cannot be farmed * Only 0.5% of Canada's lands are class 1 (no significant limitations for farming) * Less than .004% of Canada's lands are suitable for growing tender fruit. * 85% of urban growth has taken place on classes 1-3 lands and fruit lands. * Class 1 land is twice as productive as Class 4, and fruit lands are more productive yet. * Canadian land continues to be lost at an alarming rate to erosion, salinization and urbanization. * Since 1966, over 6 million hectares of land in Canada and over 1.5 million hectares of land in Ontario have been lost from 	<p>Halton process. The Climate Change and Energy studies from Phase 1 of Sustainable Halton were prepared to get a better understanding of the energy issue today and in the future, and what Halton could do in light of shrinking oil supplies and climate change.</p> <p>Peak oil is addressed in ROPA 38 in a number of ways indirectly. The entire Plan is premised on making Halton communities more healthy, complete, and sustainable and less reliant on fossil fuels. To this end, ROPA 38 policies focus on influencing the form and function of communities – increasing the density of people and jobs in both intensification areas and greenfield areas, reducing sprawl and commuting distances, increasing public transit use, and increasing active transportation (walking, cycling). Healthy Communities Guidelines will be prepared to give guidance and clarity on Regional intent and expectation for all developments. It is the Region's opinion that these policy changes will help to mitigate the impacts of peak oil.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>agriculture. FARM INDUSTRIES * One farmer feeds up to 90 persons. * 2/3 of the value of Canadian, food imports consists of food already grown here commercially. * Canadians spend only 15% of their net income directly on food, compared to Europe at 31% and India at 60%.</p> <p>WORLD RUNNING OUT OF FOOD National Geographic Magazine, June 2009, <u>The Global Food Crisis, The End of Plenty</u>, p.1 “Between 2005 and the summer of 2008, the price of wheat and corn tripled, and the price of rice climbed fivefold, spurring food riots in nearly two dozen countries and pushing 75 million more people into poverty. But unlike previous shocks driven by short-term food shortages, this price spike came in a year when the world’s farmers reaped a record grain crop”. “Simply put: <u>For most of the past decade, the world has been consuming more food than it has been producing. After years of drawing down stockpiles, in 2007, the world saw global carryover stocks fall to 61 days of global consumption, the second lowest on record.</u>”</p> <p>Sustainable Halton Report 3.03 An Agricultural Evaluation p.1 of the Executive Summary: LEAR EVALUATION A Land Evaluation/Area Review confirmed, the land in the Primary Study Area is all prime agricultural land, as defined in the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)! Therefore these lands are subject to <u>policies protecting agricultural land both in the Growth Plan and the PPS.</u> p.25 of the Conclusion: Agriculture continues to be a strong and productive sector.</p> <p>Report 3.04 Agricultural Countryside Strategy p.1 of the Introduction: We should all repeat out loud 3 times. <i>“As the issues of sustainability, local food supply and climate change become more pressing the importance of maintaining a strong, local agricultural presence grows.” And that does not factor high priced oil into the equation.</i></p> <p>Key information on Carrying Capacity is missing. Environmental Commissioner, Gord Miller, raised the issue of Carrying Capacity in his <u>Annual Report 2006-2007, Reconciling Our Priorities</u> pp.18-20.</p> <p><i>p. 20 “Failure to consider basic questions of ‘Where to grow?’ and ‘How much to grow?’ is the fundamental problem with many provincial initiatives in Southern Ontario. Provincial planning efforts do not employ sustainability perspective to evaluate which communities have the carrying capacity available to accommodate population increases.”</i> (Underlining added.)</p> <p>The Region was repeatedly asked for a carrying capacity study. Some members of Council believed that one was being prepared BUT</p>	<p>The Region undertook a study to research the carrying capacity concept. The study results indicated that the ability to measure carrying capacity is challenged by an inability to find a proper set of readily available and measurable environmental indicators. Furthermore, the complexity of the environment makes measuring an overall carrying capacity very difficult. The challenge facing carrying capacity is how to move from a more theoretical concept to a more practical, quantifiable concept.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>the Director of Planning, who has since left the Region's employ, managed to side step the real request and respond with a literature review which told us NOTHING about Halton's ability to feed this population increase.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the "carrying capacity" report is the precise information that would have allowed Halton Region to push back on the provincially mandated growth numbers. WE STILL NEED THAT CARRYING CAPACITY INFORMATION!</p> <p>Intensification Environmental Commissioner, Gord Miller's, <u>Annual Report 2006-2007, Reconciling Our Priorities</u>, p. 25 Under Summary and ECO Comments: <i>"...The ECO believes the GGH Plan will not succeed unless it can meet certain tests, and demonstrate continuous improvement:" ...</i> (Including:) <i>"Improve intensification and density targets – The Plan's goal of allocating 40% of new builds in existing urban areas is not substantively different than a business-as-usual approach. Also the province needs to revisit the density targets of those centers that are already very close to their target and seek ways to adjust those targets upward."</i></p> <p><u>Intensification Must Happen BEFORE we consider building on farmland.</u> We must absorb as much of the projected population increase as possible within the existing urban boundary, not just the minimum 40%. It is really critical to keep farmland to sustain a food supply for the residents of Halton (not to mention all the hungry people in Toronto).</p> <p>The Town of Halton Hills Intensification Opportunities Study 4.2.2 p. 29: Guelph Street Corridor, talks about intensification in <u>the long term</u>. This should happen immediately with a Main Street or Paris-style of live-work, where businesses are on the first floor with apartments above for a building of 3-4 storey height. These can be stepped down with roof gardens to make them more appealing. The Super Store and all one storey commercial need apartments on the top.</p> <p>The <u>Town of Halton Hills Intensification Opportunities Study</u> gives some excellent examples of low-rise and mid-rise development i.e. Victoria Terrace, that would be compatible with our existing neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Table Two p. VI would appear to show a deficit between conservative market demand number and predicted units available. I read that as, <u>more mid-rise needed</u>.</p> <p>An outstanding example of a different type of community. Dockside Green mentioned in the Environmental Commissioner's</p>	<p>Halton is only achieving approximately 15%; so 40% intensification is a significant departure from business-as-usual. In addition, the targets in Table 2 are minimum targets and can be exceeded. Policy 77(2.1) does not preclude the evaluation of opportunities for further intensification in the future.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Annual Report 2006-07 Docks Green – Victoria, British Columbia</p> <p>p. 21 “Docks Green www.docksidegreen.ca is an innovative, mixed use development underway on the harbourfront in Victoria, British Columbia. This development project will transform a six hectare brownfield site into a complex, including residential, retail, office and light industrial uses, housing a total of 2,500 people. The density of Docks Green – 417 residents and jobs per hectare – is comparable to the 400/ha target for the densest urban growth centres in the GGH Plan developed by the Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal (MPIR).</p> <p><i>The development is intended to be the first LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) platinum-certified, master-planned community in the world, as well as the first greenhouse-gas neutral development. LEED is a rating system that awards points for sustainable site development, water efficiency, energy efficiency, material selection (including reuse and recycling), indoor environmental quality, and innovation in design.</i>”</p> <p>Peak Oil Hamilton 2006 Report by Dr Richard Gilbert http://www.ibiblio.org/tcrp/lib/hamilton_peak_oil_report.pdf In December 2008 I emailed this report to Gary Carr, Pat Moyle, Mark Meneray and Ho Wong. Mr. Wong responded thanking me and saying, “We will definitely benefit from the contents of the paper in moving our Sustainable Halton process forward.” I was pleased to have been of assistance.</p> <p>p. 14 “Application such analyses to the kind of potential shortfall... suggests nevertheless that fourfold real increases in pump prices can be expected by 2018. Similar considerations could apply to natural gas. Thus, in each case a rough quadrupling in price is taken to be where we could be headed, i.e. to about \$4 per litre in the case of gasoline and diesel fuel and \$2 per cubic metre in the case of natural gas, in today’s dollars.”</p> <p>These numbers were not meant to be precise predictions but to illustrate the new reality. p.20 “Prices of \$4/L (for gasoline) and \$2/m³ (for natural gas) could be clearly above the point at which price increases can be accommodated within present arrangements. If such prices are expected, as assumed here, radical changes in many aspects of society should also be expected. We will travel differently because everyday use of present kinds of automobile will be unaffordable. We will live differently because the heating and cooling of present types of building will be unaffordable. We will eat differently because importing our food from afar will be unaffordable (and because artificial fertilizers, made from and with oil and natural gas, will be much more expensive).”</p> <p>p. 44 “Hamilton also has some of the best agricultural land in Canada, much of which is unused and some of which is vulnerable to development. Food is sufficiently important ... to warrant a separate report ...”</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>“A constant flow of food into Hamilton’s supermarkets, kitchens, and restaurants is presently taken for granted. <u>A sharp increase in the cost of transport energy could disrupt this flow. The consequences could be severe, ...</u>”</p> <p><u>Jeff Rubin former Chief Economist for CIBC World Markets:</u> In an interview on May 25th 2009, Jeff Rubin predicted that there will be more jobs in farming. In the US with falling housing prices and rising food prices when those lines intersect the abandoned suburbs will be ripped up and turned back to farming.</p> <p>If there is the faintest possibility that this is somewhat accurate, how can we now, from today’s vantage point, propose to build more single family detached suburbs sprawling across our needed farmland?</p> <p>How can we protect farmland? TEN YEARS AGO, Professor Tom Daniels documented in his book, <u>When City and Country Collide: Managing Growth in the Metropolitan Fringe</u>, (ISBN 1-55963-597-5) that 15 US states had bought ‘development rights’ on farmland. Because the preservation of the land was considered so important, farmers were paid for ‘development rights’. This allowed the farmer to continue farming, to sell the land as one piece but not to subdivide. The money received could be invested for the farmers’ retirement.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Region should pass a motion asking the provincial government to investigate buying development rights, and other measures, such as adjustments to taxation, to protect our farmland.</p> <p><u>Creative intensification is key to absorbing the population increase.</u> We must redouble our efforts, as recommended by the Environmental Commissioner, to increase density targets within the existing urban area.</p> <p>WATER – The Big Pipe to Halton Hills would be a mistake. In Australia and some other parts of the world water is being used much more wisely. It is encouraging to see that Halton Region through programs such as toilet replacement is working to reduce water consumed. This has been a long time coming. Speaking to Planning and Public Works around the year 2000, I brought information about water conservation programs in Waterloo where they were light years ahead of Halton. No action was taken. We are now playing catch up. We have a long way to go but we can make great strides.</p> <p>Public transit is necessary in all 4 municipalities. ROPA 38 must plan for this. Oil depletion will demand it.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Barbara Halsall</p>	<p>We agree that a Provincial, or even a National, strategy for farmlands and food production is needed.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
<p>Halton Diversity Advisory Committee</p> <p>December 2, 2009</p>	<p>Power Point Presentation</p> <p>Diversity Considerations for ROPA 38 By Halton Diversity Advisory Committee Represented by Pastor Dan Phannenhour and Heather Colquhoun</p> <p>Halton Diversity Advisory Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizen’s advisory committee, appointed by the Regional Council to give advice and insight on issues of diversity and inclusion so that all feel welcome living and working in Halton • Fourteen members with a diverse range of age, culture, gender, language, race, and sexual orientation represented • Wealth of knowledge, experience and perspectives from a variety of industry backgrounds including corporate, elected representatives, faith, health, media, social services, and policing <p>Link to 2007-2010 Strategic Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Plan Theme 3: Create and Improve Safe, Healthy, Liveable, Inclusive Communities • Communities that intentionally include a wide diversity of people are Safe, Healthy and Liveable • Participation as a <i>whole citizen ... is not</i> easy. It needs the understanding and support of a society that takes the concept of a whole person as its starting point — a society that recognizes that one’s identities (ability, age, ethno-cultural, gender, language, racial, sexual orientation and spiritual) are fundamental to being a whole person. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From: Faith/Cultural response to the Transforming Services document , online http://www.oasisonline.ca/pdf/OasisSpecialDocs/Faith-Cultural.pdf <p>The Whole is Greater Than the Sum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What we share is what makes a community • Leaving where we live in order to live our lives robs of us the opportunity to build whole, diverse communities • Shared experience knits us closer together and needs to happen close to home to create a supportive community = social cohesion • When social cohesion is working, it results in lower crime rates, better physical health, less reliance on government services and less hate <p>Current Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disconnect between ROPA and local implementation, specifically with respect to faith groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrow definition on the functions that places of worship provide, thus restricting their ability to locate within the community, serve the community and act as an agent of social cohesion 	<p>ROPA 38 protects Employment Areas from being eroded by incompatible uses so that</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal-level plans highly restrict faith communities in established areas from developing their properties to better serve the needs of the changing community • Starting a community based on single family housing units is limiting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural, extended family and financial needs are not being met • If we don't consider issues of inclusion now, we will end up managing a crisis later – let's build inclusive communities to begin with <p>When you live with someone, it's harder to form stereotypes, misunderstandings and hate.</p> <p>Our Request</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We believe the most sustainable communities are the ones where a wide range of diversity of people are supported in living together sharing their gifts and perspectives • HDAC would like to be part of the implementation process to help ensure that the communities we construct in Halton do not end up unintentionally isolating specific groups and/or individuals <p>Our Request: Select Planning Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve all stakeholders in developing inclusive planning that recognizes HDAC when considering consultations in the future • Build varied housing <i>at the beginning</i> of a community so all ages/socioeconomic levels/abilities are able to live in a community from the start • Provide services within the community including safe space (i.e. for seniors, LGBTQ, people with disabilities, youth, homeless), worship, daycare and arts and culture space to allow people to live their lives within their community • Recognize places of faith as providers of community services and contributors to social cohesion (i.e. relax current zoning in municipal official plans to include range of use of space as faith communities are left with no choice but go to the employment lands) <p>Making inclusion of diversity Halton's first priority is the key to</p>	<p>there will be industrial jobs for the population in Halton. This is good planning and is not directed at the faith community.</p> <p>Local zoning decisions are largely based on community input, which should be given weight in the land use planning process.</p> <p>Staff is in agreement with these principles.</p> <p>The Halton Diversity Advisory Committee will be consulted throughout the process as the Healthy Community Guidelines are developed. Such guidelines are intended to give direction on the requirements to achieving complete communities in Halton.</p> <p>Please refer to the comment above regarding public input and land use planning process.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	building our Safe, Healthy and Livable Communities	
<p>Region of Peel</p> <p>December 3, 2009</p>	<p>Dear Mr. Vagnini;</p> <p>Subject: Halton Region Draft Official Plan Amendment NO.38</p> <p>Thank you for circulating the Draft ROPA 38 for our review. We have reviewed it and the latest version of the Draft ROPA 38 posted in Halton Region's web site on November 30, 2009, and have the following comments to offer.</p> <p>As you know the Regions of Halton and Peel together with the Town of Halton Hills, City of Brampton and the Town of Caledon initiated the Halton Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study (HPBATS). This is an important transportation study and we anticipate it to recommend a north- south transportation corridor linking Highways 401 and 407 serving the Town of Halton Hills and the City of Brampton.</p> <p>The transportation policies in ROPA 38 do not appear to make reference to the HPBATS and Halton Region's intent to protect lands for a potential north-south transportation corridor, for the portion within Halton Region. Furthermore, some of the lands on the north side of Highway 401 designated Employment Area on Map 1, and Future Strategic Employment Area on Map 1C may be required for this north-south transportation corridor. Accordingly, we suggest that you incorporate appropriate policies in the Draft ROPA 38 and revise Maps 1 and C to address our concerns.</p> <p>Also, we are of the opinion that it would be appropriate to have a policy included in ROPA 38 recognizing the potential for a six lane right-of-way for that part of Winston Churchill Boulevard between Highway 407 and Steeles Avenue as per the Official Plan for Peel Region.</p> <p>We are of the understanding that water and waste water treatment services for the forecasted growth in Halton's Urban Area will be provided by Halton Region.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please call me at 905-791-7800</p> <p>Yours truly, Basil Gurusinghe Principal Planner Development Planning Division</p>	<p>It would be premature to indicate such a corridor in ROPA 38 before Halton's municipal Councils take position on the results of the on-going HPBATS. Given the highly restrictive list of permitted uses in the Agricultural Rural Area, the corridor is effectively protected.</p> <p>The Region's current Transportation Master Plan shows a 4 lane widening for Winston Churchill Boulevard. Until the Transportation Master Plan is updated to 2031, a process currently underway, it would be premature to support any six lane right of way proposal.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
<p>Burlington Green Environmental Association</p> <p>December 3, 2009</p>	<p>Delegation to PPW Committee Dec. 2 2009 On ROPA 38 BurlingtonGreen Environmental Association</p> <p>Chair, members of the PPW Committee,</p> <p>The changes to the ROPA 38 were available to the public on Nov 28 or 29, insufficient time to do a proper analysis of all the changes.</p> <p>A "thank you" to Staff for all the work that has gone into the process leading up to ROPA 38</p> <p>Urban areas</p> <p>We are disappointed that the intensities in the greenfield areas are not higher. The implications of peak oil and climate change were not considered enough. Higher densities would have resulted in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Smaller urban foot print <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Less loss of farm land <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Allows farming to be more viable. ii. Lower GHG contribution iii. More carbon sequestration iv. Less dependence on imported foods 2. Less dependence on cars 3. More easily justifiable transit <p>We are disappointed that a Carrying Capacity was not completed. It would have provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. A stronger case to argue for a review of the population targets under the Places to Grow legislation. ii. More justification to adopt higher urban density <p>On page 263 and 264 of Response Document, Attachment #3 in response to BurlingtonGreen's comment: "<i>We urge that a comprehensive Carrying Capacity study and ecological footprint determination be carried out and the results published</i>" The staff Response: "<i>The Region undertook a study to research the carrying capacity concept. The study results indicated that the ability to measure carrying capacity is challenged by the lack of a list of more readily measurable environmental indicators. Furthermore, the complexity of the environment makes measuring an overall carrying capacity very difficult.</i>" The development of the Sustainable Halton Plan and ROPA 38 must have been difficult also, but not impossible. We feel that a Carrying Capacity study and ecological footprint determination would provide invaluable insight on Halton's "sustainability".</p> <p>NHS</p> <p>We are pleased with the concept and science that was used to develop the NHS as it was shown on MAP 1 before the current</p>	<p>Please refer to our comments to OakvilleGreen in the November 25, 2009 Response Document.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>changes. (Comments below are made after listening to comments and questions/answers during the Dec 2 PPW meeting.) We are concerned about the implications to the changes to the area above the brow on MAP 1. There are more permitted uses in the Greenbelt such as golf courses and quarries. In response to a question about a comparison of NHS versus Greenbelt, I heard Mr. Glenn state that the NHS is treated as one "system" whereas the Greenbelt is not. It has some linkages and connectedness, but it is not one "system". This concerns us as it implies a weaker overall NHS.</p> <p>In Conclusion</p> <p>We have appreciated the many opportunities to comment on the development of this plan and we look forward to continuing to be involved in Regional planning and policies.</p>	<p>The planning policy framework will be strengthened through detailed implementation policies by the Local Municipalities.</p>
<p>OakvilleGreen Conservation Association December 3, 2009</p>	<p>Urban Areas</p> <p>Throughout this process Oakvillegreen has argued for tighter urban boundaries, more protection of agricultural land and higher intensification targets. While we acknowledge this plan calls for much higher densities than Halton's communities have traditionally had, we have made the case that the rapidly escalating cost of fossil fuels will make growth patterns that rely on transportation by automobile untenable. We have also made the argument that if we are going to get serious about combating the Climate Crisis and avoiding runaway global warming we need to make radical changes not incremental ones. So we are disappointed to note that although proposed new growth will be denser, it is still not high enough to support an efficient public transit system.</p> <p>We have heard all the arguments about why tighter urban boundaries, less intrusion onto prime agricultural lands and higher densities cannot be, however, we maintain our belief that future residents of Halton would be left with more livable communities if we had been able to get these things in place now.</p> <p>Carrying Capacity</p> <p>We were disappointed that, despite a motion by Regional Council that said: "2) staff be directed to update and complete the study done by FCM to determine the current ecological footprint of Halton Region and its carrying capacity and report back to Council as part of the next phase of the Official Plan process", no actual carrying capacity study was carried out. What was done was a literature review of carrying capacity studies done by other municipalities/levels of government/institutions. We do not believe that what was done fulfilled the intent of what was asked by Council. Contrary to the report, we believe it is possible to measure certain essential things such as whether the Region of Halton has enough agricultural land to feed its people. We hope that the request to do a proper carrying capacity study will be revisited and that the results will help to inform future</p>	<p>Please refer to the Region's response to your submission dated November 11, 2009, found on page 215 of the Response Document (Attachment #3 to Report LPS114-09).</p> <p>This concern has been addressed in the above noted Response Document.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Mineral Resources Areas</p> <p>Oakvillegreen joins with PERL and other concerned groups in the belief that no new quarries or expansions to quarries should be allowed on land in the Niagara Escarpment Area.</p> <p>NHS</p> <p>We are very pleased with the Region of Halton's plan to create an NHS that will preserve our Region's valuable ecosystems for future generations. We are pleased to see the planned NHS recognizes the importance of preserving an interconnected system of features, buffers and linkages that connect to other greenspaces, river valleys etc. so that over time, species will thrive rather than diminish.</p> <p>We believe this is a forward-thinking plan that will be a great gift from current politicians and planners to our children and grandchildren.</p> <p>The Regional Council's commitment to including the NHS on Map I is critical to ensuring the protection of the NHS and we are very pleased Council has given their full support to this.</p> <p>We realize that it was difficult to achieve the right balance given concerns by landowners. We are pleased that the NHS in urban areas will be "no-go" areas where development will not be allowed and we are equally pleased that agricultural uses will be allowed to continue (with the exception of within the features) in the NHS because Oakvillegreen supports and values Halton's farmers.</p> <p>We are, however, concerned by the recent move to rename land above the brow Greenbelt Natural Heritage System. In our reading of Greenbelt legislation, it seems this opens up NHS land for more mining and we are concerned it may also widen what is allowed on Agricultural land in the NHS. We have spent 5 years going to meetings on the new official plan and only this weekend do we see the word "Greenbelt" in front of "Natural Heritage System" above the brow. Why is this word needed? We developed good policies around the NHS designation. Are they now being altered? What are the implications to the agricultural land within the NHS? These last minute changes are frustrating to all the citizens who have spent countless hours of their time, attending in good faith, all the meetings on Sustainable Halton.</p> <p>In Conclusion</p> <p>Oakvillegreen would like to thank Regional Council and Regional staff for the long hours, hard work and thoughtful consideration that went into the creation of ROPA 38. We have appreciated the many opportunities to comment on the development of this plan and we look forward to continuing to be involved in Regional planning and policies.</p>	<p>during the entire study process. It would be impractical and interminably long to subject all new ideas to another round of public consultation.</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Such are Provincial policies that the Region is unable to undo.</p> <p>See comment above.</p>
<p>Councillor Jane Fogal December 5,</p>	<p>Open Letter to Halton Regional Council – ROPA 38 From Councillor Jane Fogal, Town of Halton Hills December 5, 2009</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
2009	<p data-bbox="402 243 878 275">Dear Chair Carr and Halton Regional Councillors</p> <p data-bbox="402 304 1065 453">Over 3 years ago Halton began an exercise to bring Halton Region's official plan into compliance with the Places to Grow Act and the Greenbelt Plan. The purpose of the exercise was to locate the most appropriate places to accommodate the growth that was allocated to Halton and to recognize the policies of the Greenbelt.</p> <p data-bbox="402 487 1084 758">However, the actual exercise undertaken and the end result are well beyond the original intent and this has been turned into a virtual attack on the rural area and all who work there. When I add up all that is contained within ROPA 38 I can only draw the conclusion that the vision for rural Halton is that it be the preserve for the rich who wish to live unencumbered by any working operation. I am absolutely beyond angry at what is transpiring here and the complacency shown by Halton staff and council to the situation as ROPA 38 moves quickly and inexorably towards the final vote on December 16th.</p> <p data-bbox="402 791 1068 940">I spent a full day last Wednesday at the public meeting listening to over 30 delegations on ROPA 38 and 11 of those delegations identified problems with the plan as it relates to the rural area. These problems are all issues that concern people who are making their living in rural Halton.</p> <p data-bbox="402 974 1084 1276">Halton was founded on agriculture and through time has had residential uses creep into the rural area. Today we have rural residential and agricultural uses coexisting with little complaint when one considers the big picture. Decades ago Halton stopped the expansion of residential expansion into the rural area with the goal of keeping it a working agricultural zone. Now we are attacking every form of employment possible in the rural area. Under ROPA 38 we are restricting agricultural uses, attacking landscapers and limiting agri-tourism. Why is this going on and who is benefitting? Why are we so intent on killing all of these economic forces in Halton?</p> <p data-bbox="402 1310 1084 1850">Last night I happened to meet a landscaper who has his operation in rural Halton. He has operated from this location for close to 30 years without complaint. However, his property is only 6.5 acres and therefore under ROPA 38 will become illegal with no grandfathering provisions. If there is a complaint from a new neighbour he will be forced to move his operation. Where do you think he could move to? Is it reasonable to make him sell his home and search for a property elsewhere that is at least 10 acres in size? Why on earth does this make sense? We are virtually chasing him and hundreds of his colleagues out of Halton. Landscaping is a large industry in Halton, 10,000 strong, serving all of the urbanites and yet we are unreasonably changing all of the rules without grandfathering anyone who is currently in business. When have we ever done this to any business before? And who benefits? I suggest it is the rural residential owners who have moved to the rural area in full knowledge that there are different rules in the rural area than the urban area. Perhaps this makes sense in rural Burlington but it certainly does not in rural Halton Hills.</p>	<p data-bbox="1109 548 1377 819">There are three technical studies on agricultural issues as part of the Sustainable Halton process. Many of the recommendations, in support of the industry, are captured as policies in ROPA 38.</p> <p data-bbox="1109 1125 1382 1365">ROPA 38 does not place further restrictions on agricultural uses. As for agri-tourism, we have doubled the amount of floor area in support of these businesses under ROPA 38.</p> <p data-bbox="1109 1430 1385 1759">Staff is proposing a modification to the ROPA 38 policies to allow existing landscapers who are operating in contradiction of current Local Zoning By-laws to gain legal status by the local municipality. That will permit these operations continue as "existing uses" under the Regional OP.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>In my opinion, if Burlington finds it necessary and desirable to change their rural area into a playground for the rich then let them do it. But in Halton Hills we have a working rural area where I have never had a complaint about landscapers and in fact I happily live next door to one myself.</p> <p>The issue of agriculture verses the natural heritage system is another illustration of urbanites wishing to takeover the rural area and push out those who work there. As it pertains to the goals of the environmental lobbyists it is a blatant effort to kill agriculture and virtually steal the land for the benefit of the urbanites. These same people don't want the urban area expanded but it is my belief that they are in fact hastening the process. When there is no functioning economy in the rural area there will be no reason to slow the conversion to urban uses. Forget the 100 mile diet and Eat Local campaigns. When the environmental lobby cannot even accept that agriculture is a reasonable and sustainable use of the rural area then I question their motives. Perhaps their ranks have been infiltrated by developers. When the environmental lobby says that agriculture is dead in Halton it seems like wishful thinking. I fully accept that much of the land has been bought by developers but anyone can clearly see that the land is still being actively and profitably farmed. New barns have been built and fences replaced. Investment in farming is occurring and yet the urbanites are encouraging the demise of agriculture. Again I have to wonder who is driving this agenda.</p> <p>On Wednesday those who attended the public meeting were besieged with farmers who only asked to be able to continue on their business of producing food without added encumbrances. They are telling us that agriculture is in fact viable in Halton at least for the next 20 or 30 years. If they haven't given up on agriculture, why should the rest of us give up on it?</p> <p>It is difficult to think of another example of a municipality giving up on an industry before the industry has given up on itself.</p> <p>ROPA 38 also limits agri-tourism. Apparently we don't want any more businesses like Chudleigh's or Andrews Scenic Acres or even Sheridan Nurseries. They are all too big for the rural area. Why we are trying to restrict agri-tourism? The only conclusion can be that once again it conflicts with residential uses.</p> <p>As I reflect once again on the vision for rural Halton I can only conclude that is for abandoned fields awaiting development surrounded by a residential estate greenbelt. There is absolutely no way I could possibly support ROPA 38 in its current form and can only hope that my colleagues will reflect on the direction we are currently moving in and consider the long range consequences before it is too late.</p> <p>Sincerely Jane Fogal, Councillor Town of Halton Hills</p>	<p>There are no new policies in ROPA 38 directed at limiting agri-tourism. Both Sections 100(21)c) and 117.1(16)c) have doubled the limit of floor area from 250 to 500 sq m for agriculture-related tourism uses.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
<p>Tony Petrelli</p> <p>December 5, 2009 (received December 8, 2009)</p>	<p>Ms. Alana Fulford Intermediate Planner, Long Range Planning Legislative and Planning Services Department Region of Halton 1151 Bronte Road Oakville, ON L6M 3L1</p> <p>RE:ROPA #38</p> <p>Dear Ms. Fulford,</p> <p>Thank you for your email response on December 3, 2009 for allowing further submissions for Council's consideration on the above subject matter.</p> <p>As a landowner in the 401/407 Employment Corridor on the North side of Steeles Avenue West, my comments specifically relate to those parts of ROPA #38 that deal with "Employment Areas" and "Future Strategic Employment Areas".</p> <p>Firstly, let me state my strong support for the proposed designation of a significant portion of lands on the North side of Steeles Avenue West in the 401/407 Corridor as Employment Lands. My reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the geographical location and physical proximity of these lands to major highways, other growing cities i.e Brampton, Mississauga and Milton, it makes sense that such a designation will attract future investment by the private sector, which means job creation for Halton Hills, additional tax revenues to support other public endeavours. The characteristics of this particular corridor, I do not believe, can be replicated and the protection of this area, both on the South and North side as a future employment hub is critical, again because of its proximity to major transportation systems and other growing cities. The surrounding infrastructure would make future servicing of this area much easier and less costly, and it provides exceptional visibility for future businesses. As well, the proposals contained therein are in line with the Provinces' Sustainable Growth guidelines • It is my understanding, that Steeles Avenue West is scheduled to be widened next year i.e 2010 (i.e 2 to 4 lane road) and that the south side of Steeles is also to be serviced by 2011. If this is correct, then it make obvious sense, from an economics/cost efficiency and development perspective, that such major undertakings should be coordinated to be implemented together. • Compared to other municipalities such as Mississauga, Brampton, Milton and Oakville, Halton Hills is significantly smaller in area and therefore it has fewer lands that are prime for Employment uses. By including the North side designation, this will have a significant economic contribution to the future of Halton Hills 	<p>Comments noted.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not seem to make sense that other municipalities such as Brampton and Milton have and continue to develop the North side of Steeles Avenue West towards their respective boundaries and yet Halton Hills does not. I am quite certain that if these lands belonged to Brampton or Milton that these lands would not be precluded from future development • As part of this submission, please include as well the ATTACHED letter with comments regarding HPBAT, which certainly has an impact on the 401/407 corridor in Halton Hills. The lands located within the Halton Hills 401/407 corridor are prime employment lands, regardless if located on the North or South side, and almost impossible to replace. The fact, that ROPA #38 also includes parts to protect the employment designation so as to restrict other types of designations is very significant. However, it should go further, given that the inventory of such lands with these irreplaceable features is very limited, compared to other surrounding municipalities, by strongly restricting and opposing any possible designation for a future freeway/highway through these lands. • I believe by providing such a designation as Employment Use on the North side of Steeles Avenue now would provide a clearer blueprint for municipalities, current and future landowners, future businesses and all other relevant parties, to plan future development more effectively and efficiently. <p>I respectfully request that these comments and the attached letter be submitted for Council's consideration. I would also appreciate any communication on the above and related matters in the future, specifically the outcome of December 16, 2009's decision regarding the pending designation on the lands on the North side of Steeles in the Halton Hills 401/407 Corridor.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Tony Petrelli</p> <p>Cc Claudia Petrelli Perry Vagnini</p> <p><u>Supporting Document:</u></p> <p>TO : Mr. Tyrone Gan, Consultant Project Director HDR/iTRANS Consulting Inc.</p> <p>RE: HPBAT Study (the "Study")</p> <p>Dear Mr. Gan:</p> <p>After attending the Public Information Centre on September 24, 2009, please note my following comments which I trust will be considered as part of the above study:</p>	<p>Comments so noted.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>I have significant reservations and objections to the Brampton Freeway Option HPF, which shows a proposed freeway going through Halton Hills. I believe this to be an inefficient and impractical long term solution for the issues currently being addressed and has the potential to create more problems both now and in the future than it endeavours to solve, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Halton Hills is relatively small compared to Brampton and to have a freeway going through a critical area such as its employment lands along Steeles Avenue West is extremely detrimental since these lands are prime Employment Lands that cannot be replaced in terms of geographical proximity to current highway systems and general commerce, now and in the future. This hampers potential development in the future to this area for a freeway that may not happen for another 30 plus years and has the potential to be detrimental to Halton Hills since there will be significantly less land for development and reduce its source of revenues such property taxes, utilities, etc. 2. It would seem very problematic to align any new interchange with the existing 401/407 interchange; the creation of Basket weave effect is very inefficient, much more expensive and could possibly cause more disruption to flow than it endeavours to solve. Therefore, this should be avoided. Taking this potential technical inefficiency along with the fact that the vast majority of potential use will be on the Peel side of the study area, it would seem highly impractical to consider this option. 3. There are various communities along this corridor that would be negatively disrupted i.e along 10th Line North. It does not appear that such communities have been given any regard or standing in this study, unlike communities in Norval and Brampton 4. There are current traffic problems in the area which will not be addressed now by this option which may again not take place for another 30 plus years especially given that governments are running significant deficits at all levels, funds may never be available for such a project and stifle development in this corridor for Halton Hills in the meantime. I do not believe the economic feasibility of this option has been thoroughly investigated as it appears to be one of the most costly. 5. It is extremely unfair and punitive to Halton Hills that it should subsidize Peel's growth since the vast majority of such growth is in Peel. It is unfair that Halton Hills should have its communities disrupted, its future Employment Lands taken away, its Greenspace area as protected by Provincial legislation, compromised for a growth largely concentrated in Peel. As well, since the vast majority of the growth is in Peel i.e urban and business expansion, it would appear to make sense that proximity to any transportation system should be closer to the growth area i.e Peel. As a 	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>compromise, I think the second best solution (the first being a freeway or arterial in Brampton area) is along the North-South border along Winston Churchill since there is an existing road, not as disruptive to either Halton Hills or Peel and along the border.</p> <p>6. The Study needs to consider that currently there are many North-South interchange connections both in Peel and Halton Hills such as Hurontario, Mavis, Mississauga Rd, Winston Churchill, Trafalgar Road and many of these roads are 4 and 6 lanes. As well, there are plans to widen Steeles Avenue West from Trafalgar to Winston Churchill and the Study should incorporate the benefits of these existing and near future improvements which may prove that such a costly and disruptive proposal such as Option HPF is impractical and inefficient.</p> <p>7. Similarly, it is not evident if this Study has considered the widening of Heritage Road which is already under construction, that it could act as an interchange to 401/407 in the future, it will certainly alleviate some of the north-south traffic flows (because wider now) and at least this is located closer to where the vast majority of the development is to occur. I question given, all these road systems that do and could connect to the 401/407 all within less than 1km of each other, why we need a superhighway or arterial through Halton Hills.</p> <p>I trust that these points will be considered in the course of your Study. I will email these points as well as fax them to your attention at 905-882-1557.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>C. Petrelli/T. Petrelli</p>	
<p>Barbara Halsall</p> <p>December 6, 2009</p>	<p>With 5890 hectares already designated but not built on yet, we are fast throwing away the land that we truly need for farming to feed our Halton population, now and in the future.</p> <p>I would like to know the timetable of when greenfield housing will be built?</p> <p>If new population is to be received in 2021 (probably environmental refugees) Halton can accommodate this new population with intensification. I was pleased to hear about pre-zoning.</p> <p>It is catastrophic to think that another 2780 hectares will disappear under ROPA 38, as it currently stands.</p>	<p>Under the current OP, plans are in place to accept about 150,000 people between now and 2021 within the currently designated urban envelope. When exactly this will happen will depend on market conditions and the economy.</p> <p>On the other hand, without the intervention of the Growth Plan, an extra</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>If the Region's staff refuses to save the farmland from being designated for housing, at the very least the intensification should come first. That would delay destroying the farmland. Conditions may develop (fuel shortages, and climate change), so that the province would step in to save the farmland in a few years, perhaps buying up development rights. So at the very least, intensification before any development on farmland.</p> <p>I am shocked to hear about the deferral that was moved on the NHS. I thought that during our NHS consultation that most issues were resolved. Can you quote which section of ROPA PERMITS farmers to keep on farming. It must be made clear to them that, this amendment will not affect their current operations. Of course, some may be thinking about selling to a developer.</p>	<p>3,000 ha of lands may have been consumed by the 2021-2031 growth.</p> <p>Staff agrees with the intensification-first idea but landowners and the market will drive the pace and location of new developments. ROPA 38 will now require that at least 40 per cent of these developments must be intensification.</p> <p>Table A1 on page A9 of ROPA 38 shows that the list of permitted uses for the Agricultural Rural Area and NHS outside the Key Features are virtually identical. This means that the enhancement areas, buffers and linkages added to the old Greenlands System (essentially the Key Features) to form the new NHS have no impact on agricultural uses. The claim of the agricultural community is that designating these enhancement areas etc. will impact agriculture.</p>
<p>W.D. McIlveen December 7, 2009</p>	<p>To - Regional Clerk for Halton</p> <p>I am aware that the Region of Halton is presently attempting to develop a Natural Heritage System to protect the natural features that currently exist within the Regional boundaries. I also understand that the topic is to come before Council as ROPA 38 at the meeting scheduled for December 16.</p> <p>I would like to make you aware that I am a landowner in the northern part of Milton and my property would be subject to the proposed Plan amendment. Despite this, I would most strongly urge the Council to proceed with the proposed amendment and thus provide the maximum possible protection of the natural features that exist in the Region of Halton.</p> <p>I hope that my wishes can be made known to the Regional Councilors before they proceed with the vote.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
<p>Margaret Wilkes</p> <p>December 7, 2009</p>	<p>Dear Sir:</p> <p>The debate in council regarding ROPA 38 has come to my attention. When it comes before council on December 16, 2009, please respect the wishes of people like James Fisher, and find an alternative to the natural heritage system.</p> <p>Your attention is very much appreciated.....Margaret Wilkes, Halton/North Peel Naturalists Club.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>O'Connor MacLeod Hanna LLP on behalf of Harvest Bible Chapel Oakville</p> <p>December 7, 2009</p>	<p>Re: Planning and Public Works Committee Meeting No. 17-09 ROPA 38 - Report LPS 114 -09</p> <p>Further to my letter of November 30,2009, and my presentation to Regional Planning and Public Works Committee Public Meeting on Wednesday December 2,2009, I am writing first to thank you and your staff on behalf of Harvest Bible Chapel Oakville ("Harvest"), for your ongoing assistance. Secondly, and further to your remarks at the lectern with me, I am writing to set out our understanding of the combined effect of Livable Oakville (Part C -Policy 7.1.2.(i)) and ROPA 38 (December 2 version of Policy 77.4(l)(a)) for Harvest and its new site.</p> <p>I would appreciate your confirming I am correct, or pointing out any errors.</p> <p>ROPA 38, as it reads in the December 2 version, proposes to prohibit non-employment uses in the Employment Areas unless, as set out in Policy 77.4(l)(a), there is a specific local official plan policy in place at the time ROPA 38 is adopted by Regional Council.</p> <p>The Region's view is that a specific local official plan policy now exists with respect to Harvest's new site; specifically in Livable Oakville Part C, Section 7.1: <i>"7.1.2.(i) On the lands designated Business Employment north of Rebecca Street, between Great Lakes Boulevard and Burloak Drive, a place of worship and associated educational facility may be permitted on a site greater than 2 hectares."</i></p> <p>The result of this modification is that it recognizes existing land use permissions on Harvest's new site and it acknowledges the fact that Harvest has an agreement to purchase the new site, and a subdivision application in process with the Town.</p> <p>Further, staff have committed that if the wording in ROPA 38 is modified, even as modified ROPA 38 would continue to recognize and respect policy 7.1.2.(i) as it applies to Harvest's new site.</p> <p>Our client is very appreciative of the Region's and Town's ongoing support for its new site and we look forward to your written response.</p>	<p>That is correct.</p> <p>That is correct. Livable Oakville policy 7.1.2 i) reads "On the lands designated Business Employment located north of Rebecca Street, west of Great Lakes Boulevard and east of Burloak Drive, a place of worship and associated educational facility on a site greater than 2 hectares may be permitted."</p> <p>The current wording of ROPA 38 is quite clear: Section 77.4(1)a) will confirm the legal status of Section 7.1.2.i) of the Livable Oakville Plan since the latter is an approved policy prior to Council adoption of ROPA 38.</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
<p>Robert S. Lackey for Maple Lodge Farms</p> <p>December 2009</p>	<p>Dear Clerk,</p> <p>Please consider this as part of Maple Lodge Farms' input to you meeting on December 2, 2009.</p> <p>Halton ROPA 38 provides for an employment opportunity along the entire Hwy 401/407 frontage of Halton Hills without making any provision for a Halton Peel Freeway that would connect Hwy 401 and Hwy 407 to points north. Running concurrently with the Halton ROPA 38 is the Halton Peel Boundary Area Transportation Study which recommends a Halton Peel Freeway connecting to the HWY 401/407 interchange. Part of the Halton ROPA 38 presentation indicates a future employment area that would occupy the lands along the south end of the eastern boarder of Halton Hills but does not contemplate the Halton Peel Freeway that would provide the stimulus necessary to its success.</p> <p>I would like to appear at the Statutory Public Meeting scheduled for 1:30p.m. on Wednesday December 2, 2009 at the Region of Halton Council Chambers, 1151 Bronte Rd., Oakville.</p>	<p>Please see the Region's response to your submission dated November 5, 2009, found on page 192 of Attachment #3 to Report LPS114-09.</p>
<p>Brackley, Kevin</p> <p>December, 2009</p>	<p>Kevin Bracklev Oakville, Ontario Halton Region Public Meeting - Planning and Public Works Committee - Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 38 Dec 2nd 2009 @ 1:30 P.M.</p> <p>Mr. Chair, Members of Council. Mr. Chair for the record I have been a resident of Halton for over 30 years. This presentation will be from a very different perspective on ROPA 38. Over the last several weeks I have traveled the Region doing research on this important issue. I hope Mr. Chair, Committee members and our local planners, builders, architect and engineers will listen very carefully and consider how important this is to a healthy Halton Community. Over the last 15 years the Region of Halton has changed from the shorelines of Oakville, Burlington on Lake Ontario, north to Milton, Acton, Georgetown and over to the Beaumont Mill In the Hamlet of Glen Williams in Halton Hills.</p> <p>I would like to highlight the following to this Committee: Over the last 15 years of growth I believe we have seriously forgotten or overlooked accessible and affordable housing. In order to keep Halton a healthy community we must consider accessible and affordable housing. I would like to quote University of Southern California Professor Jon Pynoos, 'Peter Pan housing' - designed for people who are never going to grow up and never going to grow old or never have a disability.</p> <p>On June 12, 2009 the Ontario Government appointed Charles Beer to conduct a review of the accessibility of Ontarians with the Disabilities Act, 2005. The review will help us make sure we are all on the right track to building an accessible province by 2025.</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>Residents, who call Halton home, have lived in the Region for over 50 years. These residents have worked, played and paid their fair share of taxes and also raised a family. For some reason if this resident falls into hard times they might have to sell their house, downsize and look for an affordable home or even an accessible home if the person has a disability; that can't be found in Halton at the moment due to a large shortage.</p> <p>In 2005, the Province of Ontario passed a new law called the Accessibility for Ontarians with the Disabilities Act, 2005 (AODA). The AODA provides for the development and enforcement of accessibility standards. Under the AODA, businesses or organizations that do not comply with these standards could be fined up to \$100,000 per day. There have currently been five standards developed under the AODA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Customer Service which will come into Law January 1,2010 (2) Transportation (3) Information and Communications (4) Employment (5) The Built Environment, including buildings and other structures. <p>The Built Environment was released for public review from July 14 to October 16, 2009.</p> <p>The Standard Development Committee of the Ontario Government is currently reviewing feedback received during a public review period. The feedback from across Ontario has been overwhelming with over 10,000 submissions. Is there a lack of affordable, accessible housing in Halton? A big Yes·</p> <p>ROPA 38 will bring Affordable housing with specific targets, medium &high densities. Rental conversion will only be permitted when the vacancy rate is 3% or higher.</p> <p>People with disabilities represent a significant and growing part of the Halton population.</p> <p>In 1993, the European Institute for Design and Disability (EIDD) developed the mission statement: "Enhancing the quality of life through Design for All". After ten years as the European platform on Design for All, involving the development of external relations and an internal structure – national member organizations, corporate members and individual members now in sixteen European countries - EIDD European Institute for Design and Disability believe that the time has come to issue a Design for All Declaration. Design for All has roots both in Scandinavian functionalism in the 1950s and in ergonomic design from the 1960s. There is also a socio-political background in Scandinavian welfare policies, which in Sweden in the late 1960s, gave birth to the concept of "A society for all" referring primarily to accessibility. This ideological thinking was streamlined into the United Nations Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities, adopted by the UN General Assembly in December 1993. The focus of the UN Standard Rules on accessibility in a clear equality context has inspired the development of the Design for All philosophy, which became a generally accepted concept in EIDD at its Annual General Meeting in Barcelona in 1995.</p> <p>Comparable concepts have developed in parallel in other parts of the</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>world. The Americans with Disabilities Act contributed to the evolution of Universal Design, while Inclusive Design has gained ground in the UK. "Today, Planning and Design for All are being recognized increasingly as necessary elements in pro-active strategies for sustainable development." Across Europe, human diversity in age, culture and ability is greater than ever. We now survive illness and injury and live with disability as never before. Although today's world is a complex place, it is one of our own making, one in which we therefore have the possibility - and the responsibility to base our designs on the principle of inclusion. Design for All is design for human diversity, social inclusion and equality.</p> <p>This holistic and innovative approach constitutes a creative and ethical challenge for all planners, designers, entrepreneurs, administrators and political leaders.</p> <p>Design for All aims to enable all people to have equal opportunities to participate in every aspect of society. To achieve this, the built environment, everyday objects, services, culture and information - in short, everything that is designed and made by people to be used by people – must be accessible, convenient for everyone in society to use and responsive to evolving human diversity.</p> <p>The practice of Design for All makes conscious use of the analysis of human needs and aspirations and requires the involvement of end users at every stage in the design process.</p> <p>The European Institute for Design and Disability therefore calls on the European institutions, national, regional and local governments and professionals, businesses and social actors to take all appropriate measures.</p> <p>The history of Universal Design began in the United States in the Seventies. Like a bean sprout that emerges only after its root is deep and strong, universal design has its beginnings in demographic, legislative, economic, and social changes among older adults and people with disabilities throughout the 20th century.</p> <p>Changing Demographics At the beginning of the 20th century, older adults and people with disabilities were true minorities. The average human lifespan was only 47 years, and people who received spinal cord injuries had only a 10% chance of survival. Most people with chronic conditions lived in nursing institutions.</p> <p>People are living longer today. The average lifespan has increased to 76 years, largely due to healthier living, better medicine, and vaccines and sanitation that have virtually eliminated many killer infectious diseases (The Denver Post, 1998). Nearly 80% of the population now lives past the age of 65. Projections based on U.S. Census Bureau estimates indicate that the number of persons ages 65 and over will grow to almost 40 million by the year 2010 (Jones and Sanford, 1996). Last year, 4 million people in the United States were over the age of 85 and about 60,000 topped age 100. By 2020, the Census Bureau estimates that 7 million to 8 million people will be over age 85 and 214,000 will be over age 100. By contrast, at the end of World War II,</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>only 1 in 500 made it to age 100 (The Denver Post, 1998).</p> <p>In addition, more people are now living with disability. Two world wars created a huge population of veterans with disabilities, and antibiotics and other medical advances enabled people to survive accidents and illnesses which were previously fatal.</p> <p>At the end of 1994, 53.9 million people in the United States (20.6% of the population) had some level of disability and 26.0 million (9.9%) had a severe disability.</p> <p>It is estimated that among the population 6 years and over, 8.6 million people had difficulty with one or more activities of daily living and 4.1 million needed personal assistance of some kind (McNeil, 1997).</p> <p>These demographic changes result in a population that is older and more disabled than many realize, and these trends continue. The limitations imposed by products and environments designed and built without regard to the needs and rights of all Canadian citizens are significant but often unrecognized. Public acknowledgment of people with disabilities and progress toward universal design has developed in the last few decades along three parallel tracks of activities: legislation fueled by the disability rights movement, the barrier-free design to universal design movement, and advances in rehabilitation engineering and assistive devices impact key areas of daily living.</p> <p>About 1.8 million Ontarians will develop a disability as the baby boomer generation ages.</p> <p>Disability in Halton's population continues to rise daily with new home closings. By 2026, as the population ages, it is estimated that 16.9 per cent of people in Canada will have a disability. In November of this year I was invited to attend Halton Region's third annual be a Hero a Voice for Affordable Housing Contest. This contest was open to High School students from across Halton to express their voice in Video, Photograph, Multimedia, Art and Song. Students from Acton High School exhibited exceptionally drawings. These students displayed very intense drawings of Affordable Accessible architectural drawings including a wheelchair elevator and a totally accessible and affordable home.</p> <p>Design and build solutions for aging which are affordable and accessible.</p> <p>Baby boomers - who have seen their own parents age and tried to provide support in housing that doesn't work - have come to the realization that there's a better way to do it</p> <p>The maturing of the Halton Baby Boomer population is a huge opportunity for everyone in Halton to build a healthy community. As this consumer group expands, more and more are interested in this model for their home to fit their new lifestyle and abilities. As mentioned earlier, ROPA 38 sets specific housing targets. Healthy Community Guidelines is the key document to put this theory to practice. Halton needs a fresh new approach to development.</p> <p>A complete healthy community, intensification with a quality built</p>	

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>environment includes accessible and affordable homes for every Halton resident. This comprehensive approach to the urban area expansions will support a complete Halton community infrastructure under ROPA38.1 encourage our building community to start building universal (UD) concepts and educating Halton residents. The state of California has passed a voluntary code that cities can adopt. The city of Irvine, Calif. developed a voluntary UD code education program.</p> <p>"The intent of universal design is to simplify life for everyone by making products, communications and the built environment more usable by as many people as possible at little or no extra cost," according to the Center for Universal Design at North Carolina State University in Raleigh (Wake County). Universal design benefits people regardless of age, ability or situation.</p> <p>A UD home can cost zero- to 5-percent more than a comparable house without universal design features: "These things don't cost very much more if done early on" and are "much more expensive and difficult and cumbersome to do after the fact." Universal design is a lot more than just helping those with difficulties getting around the home. It's about making a home both functional and beautiful in the same moment, because even the homeowners, who might require their home to be universally designed, don't necessarily want it to look that way. In its truest essence it's really about making the home usable by everyone to the best extent possible without overt specialization being done to the home.</p> <p>Organizations and studies on universal design are popping up all over the United States. As the population continues to age and live longer, there is a developing want to continue to live the active lifestyles everyone else is living.</p> <p>"What universal design means for homeowners is that you can live and stay in a home without having to move because your home doesn't support your activities any longer. If you need to customize it later on, you won't have to spend as much money or have nearly the hassle that you would normally have with standard housing. For contractors, include elements, features and ideas that contribute to components of universal homes. These concepts include areas such as the entrance, making all doorway widths a minimum of 32 in. wide; interior circulation; bathroom; decks, building decks at the same level as the house floor; kitchens; garages and carports; switches and controls; laundry area; storage; home automation; windows; hardware; light and color; and sliding doors.</p> <p>There's a whole range of things in kitchen design: pantry style storage that puts storage at different heights; differential counter heights; and full extension drawers and slide out shelves in base cabinets to be able to get to the things at the back without a lot of bending and stretching to get at those things. Adding room lighting and under counter lighting, which is really popular right now, especially for older eyes that need the extra light.</p> <p>A universal design of the home means that you've included some key</p>	<p>ROPA 38 has strengthened</p>

SOURCE	SUBMISSIONS	RESPONSE
	<p>usability features in a way that's fully integrated and blended with the overall design of the home and that makes the features invisible. It also gives the homeowners a market advantage if they decide to resell the house.</p> <p>Mr. Chair, Committee members and your dedicated flexible staff, by looking at long term growth in a universally designed home. You have given everyone the new vision for a New Halton Healthy Community that I support 100%.</p> <p>It is up to every member of Council to make ROPA38 happen.</p> <p>Respectfully Submitted by Kevin Brackley Resident Town of Oakville</p>	<p>the Region's policies on the provision of both Affordable Housing and Universal Access/Design, including direct intervention through Community Improvement Plans. Our Housing, Elder Services and Diversity Advisory Committees of Council will continue work towards the objectives advocated by Mr. Brackley.</p>