Mayor Ann Mulvale	Good Evening. Ladies and Gentlemen, members of Council staff, welcome to the continuation of the Planning and Development Council Meeting.
	As you know last night we had an overwhelming response to our invitation to speak to the Official Plan Amendment. So ensuring that everyone who wishes to speak has the opportunity to do so, Council felt it was necessary to adjourn last night's meeting due to the space limitations we have here in the Council Chambers.
	On behalf of Council and Town staff, I apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused. Staff have made provision to accommodate a large number of citizens here at Town Hall.
	Before we begin, I'd like to outline the procedure for this evening. To accommodate everyone tonight, we are obviously live in the Council Chamber, but we also have broadcasting into two other locations within Town Hall. The Oakville Trafalgar room has been combined and also in the cafeteria.
	In each room you will notice people wearing bright blue Oakville T-shirts. These are our marshals for the evening. Digressing from my script I gather we've borrowed them for one night only from Parks and Recreation, they're part of their program. We want you to know we're being very parsimonious with your tax money. We just recycled them. The T-shirts, not the staff. The people wearing the shirts are here to assist you in any way. If you have questions, the only way they can be helpful to you.
	We have a list of 43 delegations from last night. That list is posted in each room immediately behind me. If you're already on that list from last night, please let the marshal at the entrance to each of the rooms know that you are present.
	Again digressing, we understand that there are graduations in place tonight, some people may be coming later because of that. In fact, I believe Councillor Franklin is at his son's graduation. He'll be along as soon as that is

C' ' 1 1
finished.
If you're not in the Council Chamber, one of the room marshals will escort you to the Council Chamber three delegates before your turn. If you're in the Council Chamber, please approach the podium when your name is called.
If you're not on the list and you wish to address Council, please approach the marshal in the room that you're in and ask to have your name placed on the list.
Due to the number of delegations already on the list, we may need to schedule further meetings. Should that be necessary, we will hold two additional meetings, one this Thursday, June 28 commencing at 7:30 and one more at this point in time, I gather there's been some discussion. At this point in time, staff are indicating on Thursday July 5, again commencing at 7:30.
These meetings will also be here at Town Hall and be run in the same fashion as tonight's meeting. If you have any questions about this process, please address your question to the marshal in your area.
There seems to have been some confusion with respect to needing to speak to Council in order to preserve appeal rights to the Official Plan Amendment. The Planning Act requires that an individual either provides the Town with a written record of their concern or to make a presentation to Council at the public meeting.
The intent is that individual participants in the process, individuals participate in the process in a constructive way and not just throw in appeals at the last moment without giving an opportunity for an attempt to resolve the issues.
So, if you have written to Council or staff on this matter at an earlier date by e-mail, by conventional mail, affectionately known as slow mail, you do not have to speak this evening. There is no need for you to do so unless, in terms of protecting your right to appeal.

When you speak at the podium, the sign-in sheet that I've spoken at other meetings about is now on the podium itself. So you can make your presentation, you can register it that way as well if you wish. Thus the requirement is fulfilled then to sign the delegation sheet that's listed at the podium.
I have two Items that I'm required to read into the agenda tonight, as per the provisions of the Planning Act. If there's anything that I've missed Madam Clerk or Town Manager, please at the conclusion of those draw it to my attention.
This is a required meeting, being held under the Planning Act, the purpose of which is to permit persons to make representation to the plan.
During the course of the meeting, questions may arise and Council may ask staff to respond. In consideration of the complexity of some issues, it is appropriate to hear all the submissions and respond later in a report on an issue basis. So we will in essence be capturing the issue and the question, and we will have a response. Staff will make their final adjustments to the plan prior to Council considering adoption.
Last piece: The Official Plan Amendment statement. Please be advised that if any person or public body appeals all or part of the decision of Council regarding the Official Plan Amendment being considered tonight does not provide this Council with an oral submission at this public meeting or does not provide this Council with a written submission before the Official Plan Amendment is adopted, then the Ontario Municipal Board may dismiss all or part of the appeal without holding a hearing.
Members of Council, are there any conflicts that you have neglected to declare that you need to declare tonight, having realized that you have a conflict and this being your first opportunity relating to the OP Amendment Item 16 of tonight's agenda?
Seeing not, Madam Clerk, Madam Town Manager, is

	there anything I have neglected to speak to, other than the usual requests to solicit your co-operation.
	There are a range of opinions in this Council Chamber tonight. On any given issue in a democratic society, that is always been my experience. I would once again ask you to extend the same respect and courtesy to what others say, as you will receive when you make your delegations. It can, and especially in the heat of the moment, applause can be spontaneous. I'd ask you to resist that urge. Also,
	any other sounds that might express opinion for or against what has just been said. If we can do that, we will all support the democratic process and ensure that everyone who wishes to speak is given that same courtesy.
	So with that, with the presentations – Councillor Flynn, excuse me.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Thank-you Madam Chair. I would like at this point to confirm the meeting schedule that you have outlined so that some people who maybe can't be here Tuesday or Thursday can plan to be here on the 5 th .
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Well, my problem as you know was a series of e-mails that I observed as well. And I know, just so everybody understands this, the Region of Halton were contacted this morning because there's a public – the meeting we're hosting for the public tomorrow, Regional Councillors would have been at in any likelihood. I certainly would.
	So one of the thoughts was we determine that the Region did not need us there, no recommendations would be dealt with and that we'd get a report. So Councillor Franklin, who's not here, had the intention of asking Councillor Knoll to move that we met tomorrow night in addition and thus giving the three meetings in the one week.
	Councillor, I've read into the record the dates that at this point have been determined by staff: That would be Thursday evening and the 5^{th} of July.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	And I would move at this point that the Council confirm

Part II - June 26, 2001

Mayor Ann Mulvale	 those as the meeting dates for the OPA amendment so the public can plan in advance, for July the 5th especially. Okay. I have that as a motion. We do not need a seconder until we're in committee of the whole, so Councillors can feel quite comfortable being seated if they wish.
	So, is there anyone speaking to that motion?
Councillor Jeff Knoll	I'd like to speak to it.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Councillor Knoll.
Councillor Jeff Knoll	In light of the gravity of this debate that we're about to undertake I would feel strongly that we take up Councillor Franklin's suggestion and consider meeting tomorrow night instead so that we have a continuous three night window of discussion so we're not allowing the week-end to come and break up the string of debate. The Regional staff have made it very clear to us that our
Mayor Ann Mulvale	participation is not critical at tomorrow night's meeting and I think that we owe, especially in light of last night's cancellation, we owe it to the folks that have spent so much time to give them their opportunity to be heard. Thank-you. So you'd be speaking opposed to the motion
	on the floor?
Councillor Jeff Knoll	I am opposed to the motion on the floor.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Speaking order is Councillors Robinson, Oliver and Caster at this point. Councillor Robinson.
Councillor Ralph Robinson	I speak in support of the motion. I'd just like to draw to the attention of anybody else that's interested in anything else that's happening in Oakville and that's Councillor Flynn and I have a longstanding commitment to deal with some constituents in the form of a public meeting tomorrow night, your worship, regarding some land activity in Ward 1 and it's totally imperative that Councillor Flynn and I be in attendance at that meeting.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank-you for the clarification. I think the assumption of when that date first started to surface was that everybody

	was going to be at the Region. So I appreciate knowing that. No, I'm sorry. And nobody can be in two places at once. Councillor Fred Oliver.
Councillor Fred Oliver	Thank-you your Worship. I'll be voting in favor of the motion on the floor. I want to make it quite clear that the e-mail that was sent out by Councillor Franklin was not sent to five members of Council, three of which are Regional Councillors. And I resent that, not being included, and I resent a Member of Council other than the Mayor telling me which meetings I have to attend. Thank- you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Even as the Mayor, I think I'd think long and hard about that. Councillor Caster.
Councillor Janice Caster	Your Worship I'm in a little bit of a dilemma here. I'm actually in favor of the two motions that are out here. I feel that we as Councillors need to put as much time as we need to to hear all the delegations and if we need to be here tomorrow night, if we need to be here Thursday night, if we need to be here next week, I have no problem being here.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Just so we don't get into a divisive debate, I want to refocus the discussion. I believe that the e-mail was sent on the premise that the Regional Councillors would all be at the Region. We have learned tonight that there's an issue in Ward 1, which would preclude one of the Regional Councillors. Anybody around here is going to put in whatever time it needs to get done. Councillor Elgar is next.
Councillor Allan Elgar	Thank-you. I will be supporting Kevin Flynn's motion also. I was one of the Councillors also that's been left out of the loop. And I hope there isn't a lot of other e-mails that I'm missing from this.
	My concern is I want to represent the residents of Oakville, and I want to listen to what they have to say about the strategic plan also at the Region. I know staff

	will be there making reports, but I like to make my own reports, so I will be supporting Kevin's motion. Thank- you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Councillor Tedd Smith, thank-you.
Councillor Tedd Smith	Yes, thank-you your Worship. I think I'll support Councillor Franklin's request in the hope that most of the people in the audience tonight or tomorrow night that would be here would expect that we would deal with this in a continuous basis.
	I presume that there's no way to poll the speakers to determine whether or not they would prefer tomorrow night or not, but that being said it's not going to impact me but I'm sure it's going to impact some of the Councillors who couldn't make it on the 5 th of July and that's the other reason why I would like to see it go ahead tomorrow night and Thursday.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Again, I can ask the audience if they would like to meet tomorrow night, but it's not going to help you in terms of the fact Councillor Flynn will not be here because he's given a commitment to be doing work in his own ward. Again, I've been at Queen's Park for a chunk of today so I caught up on the e-mails as I left the office around 5 o'clock tonight. I believe it was, no matter how things got off the rail later, it started on the premise that everybody could be freed up for the night.
	So, Councillor Hardacre.
Councillor Linda Hardacre	Maybe the way to approach it is to see how many Councillors are available and the most Councillors for quorum, we don't know that, which night and then number two, co-ordinate it with the number of people - which they prefer. Maybe they prefer a break between. Maybe they prefer to come back, I don't know. Maybe if we can do a little polling in that way and come up with the best of the both.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	One of the things, before I call a vote, how many

	Councillors could be here, notwithstanding what you've heard from Councillors Robinson and Flynn, Councillor Hardacre is asking me to determine how many Councillors could be here on tomorrow evening to continue the meeting? And Councillor Franklin can't. Madam Clerk, can you There's five. We don't have quorum. So, I mean I can be here. I'd switch whichever way was needed. Six. But you need seven for quorum. I'm sorry. The 5 th of July, excuse me, it was a very short night. Okay, how many people could be here on the 5 th of July? I can be here. Okay, we've got more on the 5 th there's no question. I think it's redundant to poll the audience given that we don't have quorum for tomorrow night. So if everybody's quite comfortable with that, I have the motion on the floor from Councillor Flynn, Councillor Flynn.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Yeah, it really was and I didn't place the motion on the floor to impact on Council myself on my own attendance. I believe after last night that we owe it to the public to give them a little bit of notice if they'd planned on speaking last night and they couldn't speak Tuesday or Thursday, that they now have a date the following week that they can plan to speak at. It was all just for respect for the public. It had nothing to do with the ulterior motives contained in the e-mail today that I received inadvertently, I suppose. It had everything to do with the public addressing this Council.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	As Councillor Flynn knows, it got quite comical at one point because there's a little bit of a repartee between two Members of Council that I'm never sure whether they're being nice to each other or being angry with each other. It turns out that they were actually being nice and it was some humor, so I though that's what was taking place. That's what I thought had taken place, so excuse me. So let me read into the record, the motion is that following the conclusion of this Council meeting, should we be in a recess, that the meeting would continue firstly on

	 Thursday June the 28th in this municipal building commencing at 7:30, that any subsequent meeting, if we have not concluded on that night, will be reconvened on Thursday July the 5th at 7:30. I spoke to that last night. All in favor of the motion
Councillor Ralph Robinson	Your Worship, your Worship, I think there's something that we're maybe not addressing.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Did I miss anything from the motion?
Councillor Ralph Robinson	Well yes. Could it be that the wording of this motion could create a situation on July the 5^{th} where Council's going to make a motion or motions, debate it and pass it and I think we need to clarify that this Council probably doesn't want to do that in either the month of July or August.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	No, my intent - because I'm not going into that debate. If I might Councillor. The people have been out now two nights in a row, we fumbled the ball logistically. We're going to get to presentations and hear delegations and I listened to Councillor Flynn. He wished to confirm two other meetings because our intent originally, we advertised three meeting dates. We lost one of them. So we're picking up the slack, we're advertising tonight before everybody here, it's on the cable; it'll go into the newspapers.
	I think you're going to have a protracted debate with second-guessing where we may go if you try into that at the moment. The Chair is suggesting that you don't want to do that.
Councillor Ralph Robinson	I understand. But would it not be politically correct to include in the motion that Councillor Flynn made that the final public hearing be held sometime after Labor Day.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	I think that's a separate issue. What I'm going to do is call the vote on this motion.

Part II - June 26, 2001

	If you want to try another motion, although the Chair is saying to you, there are people who can't be here on Thursday, I know. There are graduations all week. I think we're wasting time and that motion would be premature. If you want to put it after I've called the question on this one, that's up to you. But could we just move on? The people would like to move on, Councillor Robinson.
Audience member	Yes, let's get on with it.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank-you. All in favor of those meetings please signify. Opposed, if any. They carry.
	Right, now. Thank-you for your indulgence. The presentations will start. The Town Manager is the lead presenter. Again, thank-you for your indulgence in those housekeeping matters. We will now proceed.
	We have a series of presentations and then we have delegations. And thank-you again.
Joann Chechalk, CAO Town Manager	Thank-you Madam Chairman. It's a very, very serious set of events that brings us here. Logistically we're back on track. We have a couple of our staff preparing to talk about the issue of the Official Plan tonight, but as an introduction I thought I would spend a few minutes talking about where we have been and the process we've gone through.
	Since 1960, which was the passage of the first Official Plan, residents of the Town of Oakville have been concerned with the development of their community, which is no different today when we see people concerned with the values to be reflected in a setting each person chooses for their home.
	In today's high tech setting, even children busy themselves with the interest in their communities by bringing home educational literature on recycling and smoking and spending numerous amounts of time with their parents talking about making it a healthier environment in which they live.

In fact, Sim City has become one of the notable products of today's environment for children, where they spend copious amounts of time playing simulating cities. Over the past number of months, I've watched both a 14-year- old and an eight-year-old in my own home spend endless hours planning communities with the game, only to end with a community that is unsustainable financially, socially or environmentally.
Our planning staff take the development of a community far more seriously. As professionals, our planning staff are watchful and conscious of the various reports and approvals that were started by Halton Region to bring North Oakville into the urban area.
This process began in 1987 and culminated with the Regional approval of OP8 in 1999. With the passage of this plan by the Region, the Town of Oakville was now required to amend the Town's Official Plan and put it into compliance with that of the Region.
To prepare for this, staff recommended to Council that a number of studies be undertaken early in the process to establish the ground rules for moving forward. Most notable in those were the 1996 Economic Development Strategy, the 1998 Oakville Natural Heritage Inventory, completed by LGL and in 2000, the North Oakville Strategic Land Use Option study, which was conducted by Hemson Consulting.
The LGL study was established to allow for keeping with Oakville's Official Plan to create a green land system of park land, open spaces and natural areas, which preserves the integrity of the natural environment, enhances urban form, improves the quality of life and provides for a diversity of recreational opportunities, which minimizing disruption of natural features. And, to identify and protect areas that have a high natural value, perform important ecological functions, have high biological value, contribute to the ecosystem linkages, provide significant wildlife habitat or represent the range of natural landscape types that characterize the Town of Oakville.

The purpose was to develop a defendable and functional natural heritage framework green land system as a step towards promoting ecological integrity and help within the context of future urban development within North Oakville.
Our strategic land use option study provided a recommendation of land use strategy for the future of Oakville. In particular, the amount and location of residential and employment land and the phasing strategy for the lands north of Dundas Street, up to the future Highway 407.
I would be remiss in not mentioning the Economic Development Strategy, which identified as a prime objective, the need to designate more employment lands. It was actually a precursor to Oakville's thoughts on smart growth. In fact, increasing local employment opportunities for Oakville residents was identified as a worthwhile and important goal.
Oakville saw a need for increasing the activity rate - activity rate is the local employment, as compared to population – from approximately 48% in 1996 to 58% in the next $15 - 20$ years. To achieve this goal, it was estimated that approximately 2,500 acres of employment land north of Dundas would be required.
These three reports were prepared with input and involvement of the general public and the development community, working with the various staff groups. The studies were done at the appropriate times, allowing all parties to enrich their understanding of the complex needs of the community.
Once these preliminary reports were generated, staff undertook the next stage of the process, which was to write the Official Plan Amendment. During this process, at the recommendation of staff, the planning firm of Macaulay, Shiomi Howson were contacted to undertake a peer review and assist in continuing the public process towards adoption of the Official Plan. Miss Howson undertook that work and is with us here tonight.

The OPA that is in front of you tonight has been before the public for some time in various draft stages. Tonight, begins another opportunity to allow the public input to the document.
Recently, a number of Town staff attended a Smart Growth summit, hosted by Mayor McIsaac in Burlington. A review at that time showed that the Maryland Smart Growth concept identified encouragement of strong, friendly neighborhoods, cross-purpose businesses, good schools and a healthy environment, while retaining green pastures and forests.
But the Maryland model speaks to reducing housing lot sizes from five acres to one acre. In Ontario, we are actually further ahead than those average density ranges. Our average is between five and 10 units per acre.
In Ontario, Smart Growth is looking to reduce smog, pollution and gridlock by promoting live/work communities that will allow more people to take public transit, bike or even walk to work and even offer opportunities to at least decrease driving time.
These issues require inter-municipal, provincial and federal partnerships in order to be resolved. Strong inter- regional transit delivered from a commitment of funding from all levels of government will need to be negotiated.
Currently, AMO is lobbying both senior levels of government to obtain their commitments on a various number of agendas that will promote Smart Growth in the Ontario style. It is being currently reviewed by the Ontario government.
Our own mayor, in fact, as President of AMO, is doing a considerable amount of that lobbying and it is that way that we feel that Oakville again shows its leadership in promoting the idea of moving towards a smarter, more environmentally sustainable community.
Specific to Oakville's OPA, guiding principles have been

included to minimize pollution and traffic congestion on local roads, while ensuring for the provision of full urban services.
Phasing growth does not let development proceed ahead of the Town's ability to deal with it. Principles have been included to respect quality of life in new and existing neighborhoods. New development will encourage a closer relationship between home and work, with a broad range of jobs and a real focus on live/work opportunities and a greater eye to public transit.
From a policy standpoint, staff have been reviewing methods of improving policies to provide better servicing and balancing in our communities. We are looking at policies in other communities with regard to education and other issues. In fact, to that end, in the educational field, we are working with developers in the school boards to have the first school delivered in Oakville prior to the community surrounding it being developed.
Looking back to the first Official Plan written by the Town of Oakville over 40 years ago, the purpose of the Official Plan has not changed.
In the introduction to the Town's first Official Plan, it states: "The basic objective of the plan is to secure the health, safety, convenience and welfare of the inhabitants through the promotion of controlled and orderly growth as opposed to premature and haphazard urbanization."
This evening staff will provide you with an amendment to the Official Plan. Much of the stewardship and safeguards to protect this community are contained in the present Official Plan. The amendment adds to the policies and framework to allow for the inclusion of the lands north of Highway #5.
Tonight offers the public opportunities to voice their concerns on this important amendment. After this public session, staff will return to Council with an Official Plan Amendment, taking into account what has been said tonight at this public hearing and in following nights.

	I'll turn the podium over now to Mr. Salisbury and Ms. Gough, who will now go into the details of the process of this amendment. Thank-you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	While Mr. Salisbury's coming forward, it was suggested with so many people, we might lower the lights, thus lessening some heat. If we do that, the camera cannot pick it up to broadcast it to the other areas. So we have thought about that, but for anybody wearing jackets, unless you really want to wear your jacket, Members of Council and the audience, staff, feel free to be comfortable. It will be a full night. Thank-you Mr. Salisbury.
Ted Salisbury, Director of Planning Services	Thank-you, your Worship. I'd like to build upon what the CAO has said to you this evening and ironically, while I was preparing this evening to speak to yourself and members of the public and other staff persons and consultants, I too was looking at the purpose of our Official Plan. It's strange that this has happened.
	What, in addition to what the Town Manager and CAO has said, is the plan provides the framework within Council will carry out successive and more detailed steps in the planning process as it applies to the area.
	Our Official Plan is a document that is more than 318 pages long. This amendment is only a few pages. I think what we need to remember is that when we make an amendment to our plan we improve our plan, we increase policy, we place better controls and it builds. The amendment does not stand on its own. It is grouped together with all other policies and, taken as a whole, the document provides a long-range policy perspective and the guiding direction to the municipality in consideration of its physical growth.
	The recommendation that we have for you is that you would be adopting a plan subject to any fine-tuning that may arise as a result of public comment. We understand that members of the public are concerned with respect to growth in their community and it's very obvious by the number of persons here this evening that it's an issue that

has become foremost in many people's minds.
What we want to do, and what we wish to convey this evening, is that we believe we have those concerns well in hand. We believe we've developed the appropriate policies, we've retained the appropriate consultants, we've conducted the necessary studies. We believe we have some of the best information available to us in making these decisions and better information than has ever been available to a municipality in the consideration of any change to its plan.
What the amendment does is it increases the urban area of our Town. It also establishes conditions of development. It also changes our municipal structure.
This evening, what we wish to do is talk about how we got here. Then, Ms. Gough, the Manager of Long-Range Planning and the principal author of the amendment, will describe in detail the amendment to you, so you understand how the amendment works in context of the plan. And then, finally, we'll talk about where we're going.
We have a history of long-range comprehensive planning, both in Halton Region and the Town of Oakville. When I came to the municipality 12 years ago, I learned of something called the Halton Urban Structure Review and I wondered what that was all about.
And what I learned was that it was the review of urban form, when we looked at the whole of the Region. It was a recognition that we needed to understand growth and, much to my surprise, I learned that the GTA is growing by about 100,000 persons every year.
And that increase in population is something that's not controlled. We don't control birth rates, we don't control death rates, inter-provincial migration or immigration. Those matters take place either in higher forums in terms of government, or they're personal choices of people much like many people here this evening who choose to make Oakville their home or choose to work here.

During the preparation of the Halton Urban Structure Review, there were a number of public forums that were held and needless to say, some of the comments, such as, 'We don't want to look like Mississauga,' and please I don't wish to criticize the City of Mississauga, but it was a comment that was heard.
And some would ask, 'What is wrong with the City of Mississauga?' It's a beautiful city: It has a wonderful waterfront, a magnificent core now. Many beautiful neighborhoods. But in terms of urban form, the comment was that, 'We can't tell where Mississauga begins, where it ends, where Brampton begins.' I know that Steeles Avenue is the boundary.
So there were concerns with respect to how the Region as a whole was going to develop. There was no urban separator. There was nothing that was able to be defined in terms of where one community began and where it ended. There was concern with respect to identification and identity of communities.
And, further, when the plan was prepared, you can see that the concept began to take form because they used something called an urban separator. And that was the use of natural areas to provide definition to the municipalities. And if you look at the overhead, what you see is the Town of Oakville, separated by a green space, which is Bronte Creek Provincial Park, the City of Burlington. To the north of our municipality, an urban separator, much of it being conservation land, being the area called Glenorchy.
The Town of Milton was determined to be the first priority area for urban growth. The decision of the elected representatives at the time was that growth should be encouraged in Milton. If growth didn't occur in Milton, the natural build-out and the general force of population increase and growth pressures, would mean that the Town of Oakville would grow probably at twice the amount, if there was not a way in which growth could be accommodated elsewhere.

And the Halton Urban Structure Review provided for new urban areas to accommodate growth, because there were no other areas in the urban boundaries left. And think about our municipality. If you live in some of the communities that have been built since the 1970s, all of the land is developed. All of the land is lotted out in plans of subdivision or it's in blocks. If it's not that, then it's owned by the municipality as right of ways, easements, storm water management facilities, green lands and parks. Boards of Education own some of the land as well. But there are very few vacant parcels of land, unless they're in blocks that are still subject to future development.
The opportunities for infill development in our Town are very limited. One needs only to go and drive along Lakeshore Boulevard, Lakeshore Road, excuse me, to see how the estates have been developed in recent years. The opportunities for infill are limited.
The Halton Urban Structure Review became a plan and the process went through until 1994. The determination was that 50,000 persons should be accommodated in North Oakville and another 50,000 persons in Milton. In addition, there was also consideration given for further expansion of the industrial area along the 401 corridor in the Town of Halton Hills.
I've talked about Official Plans and I've talked about our Official Plan. The Region of Halton also has its own, and as a matter of fact, under law, Halton Region is required to have an Official Plan, local municipalities may prepare plans.
The Halton Region Official Plan says that policy is to be reflected, and it's to be required in the local official plans. Now what that really means is whatever the Region of Halton Official Plan says in terms of its policy direction, we need to conform to it.
In 1999, the Region of Halton, after considering its Halton Urban Structure Review and Plan, began its implementation. And the implementation was something called 'Regional Official Plan Amendment #8.'

Amendment #8 implemented HUSP. What it did was it brought a significant amount of land into the urban area. The lands north of Dundas Street in the Town of Oakville were designated as non-urban: They were zoned Agricultural. A portion of the lands are Parkway Belt.
The land north of Highway 407 shall remain in a Parkway Belt designation. There is no intention of the municipality in developing north of the 407. It was determined that that would be the barrier for the phasing of urban growth.
The other component of the Official Plan Amendment #8 dealt with the urban expansion of Milton. If you were to drive up to South Milton today, you will see that the lands are under development. It was the intent all along that South Milton would be the first area to develop. While it was developing, Oakville would continue with its controlled and managed growth south of Dundas Street. We estimate that it will be a number of years still remaining of development south of Dundas, notwithstanding the fact that we see a lot of development occurring along the Dundas Street frontage.
It's important to note, again, that when a regional municipality changes its plan, it is incumbent upon a lower tier municipality to conform. It's law. It's in the Planning Act.
We aren't doing this just to conform to the Region's Official Plan. We have been on a very long path in terms of understanding the ramifications of growth, the implications of the Halton urban structure, and how we wish to keep a separator between Oakville and Milton, and how Oakville will plan for the future.
As was indicated by the CAO, one of the first initiatives that the municipality undertook was the economic development strategy. What was identified was that we were too specific with respect to our policies. We had a number of land use designations and the finding was that we would become an encumbrance to economic development. What that meant was that we would get in

the way of jobs coming to our municipality.
We also knew that our zoning was outdated. We had seven industrial zones and recently Council, after a number of evenings, considered and passed a bylaw that reduced the number of zones and will make it less complicated, with less red tape, and have a bylaw that is much more readily understandable, and more friendly to economic development.
Economic Development Strategy recognized that we should increase work opportunities, we should also try to reduce the need for persons to commute to work and we should provide employment opportunities in our own community. Many persons in Oakville, I am sure, would choose if it was possible to actually just work in their community as opposed to having to get on the highway, the provincial highway systems, and commute to their work and spend up to three hours a day in their cars. We also wish to increase the activity rate and the density, in terms of employment in our areas.
Finally, for a number of years, we've thought about Highway 403, then called Highway 407. It's now a reality and we need to capitalize on Highway 407 with respect to employment opportunities.
As a result of the Economic Development Strategy, 900 hectares of land was recommended to be designated for employment purposes. This amendment reflects that.
The next step in our evolution concerned the natural heritage inventory. Now the Town actually started in 1995, when we initiated a study to look at our environmental policies. We recognized that some of them were outdated and we wish to review those policies, update them and move to a more holistic and watershed- based approached. We wish to establish a green lands system. We also wanted to balance the environment and other competing land interests.
As a first step, the natural heritage inventory was prepared. We needed to categorize the green lands, the

open space and the woodlots. Many times in our jobs as planners, we look at policies and Official Plans and we need to interpret them. We see woodlots put on plans and we need to understand the significance of those.
The natural heritage inventory provided us with categorization. We now know, from a scientific point of view, what is most important to the municipality.
We also wanted to look at the woodlot system and move beyond just the pure forestry approach, recognized that there was intrinsic value to woodlots from a standpoint of passive recreation as well.
The natural heritage inventory was a first step and it has become a basis for land use planning and this amendment.
It should be noted that the development community now utilizes what we call the LGL Study in the preparation of any of its documents in support of development. It uses that categorization. It's recognized now as being a standard in our municipality.
I wanted to talk about acquisition history in Town and the best way to do it is to show it diagrammatically. I'm not sure where everyone lives who's out here this evening. If you live south of the Q.E.W., chances are you like in an older section of our municipality. And it there is a creek system around you, chances are that you're not permitted to walk on it, because it's owned by someone.
There is no public open space system, generally south of the Q.E.W., where one might use the natural heritage system to move from south to north.
Some of the major systems the municipality has been successful in establishing as green. But again, even the 16-Mile Creek sections do not permit an individual to walk freely along the top of the bank.
When you get beyond the Q.E.W., however, things begin to change and that's as a result directly of policies that were placed in our Official Plan and the way in which we

managed and controlled development.
For persons who wish to be able to use the creek systems, you are able to walk on something we call the top of bank. That's a setback from the definable limit of the creek edge. And the top of bank has become in the Town of Oakville what is commonly referred to as our Heritage Trail System.
Our policies are still in our plan that would say whenever there is an opportunity, we would try to make an attempt to put into public ownership sections of valley land. We're able to succeed wherever there are development applications, principally anything that's been developed since 1980. But those opportunities south of the Q.E.W. are quite limited.
When you look at the green space on this plan, you can see quite clearly the amount of open space that has been retained as we move as a progression through time. It is very obvious that the policies, both Provincial Policy Statements, Regional Official Plan policies, Town policies in our Official Plan, all helped to contribute to maintain an effective natural heritage open space system.
It is the intent of the municipality, through this amendment, and building on all the policies that already exist, to create a natural heritage inventory system that is identified in that LGL report and also, provides us with the best information in assisting Council in making decisions with respect to future land use. The categorization feature will permit Council to make a determination as to the value that it places on green spaces.
In terms of acquisition, I would like to elaborate briefly. The municipality operates under something called the Planning Act of Ontario.
Many systems are protected by law. Those would include regulated creeks, provincially significant wetlands, lands below the top of bank. When they're protected by law generally the lands become owned by the municipality.

After that, the municipality has to use the tools of the planning act to acquire land. We're able to do that because there's law that lets us take five per cent of a developer's property and use it for open space purposes. Or if it's commercial/industrial, we get to use two per cent.
I'm sure when you look at plans or you've read the newspaper, you'll see that there are quotes that are made that said, "The Town has been successful in acquiring 16 or 20 per cent open space."
Now how do we do that if we're only allowed to take five per cent or two per cent? Well, a lot of that has to do with negotiation on the part of the municipality. And, using its best information, in being able to ensure that the protected areas are conveyed and that we utilize those tools in the planning act.
Finally, there are other options as well. Occasionally a development interest will accede to negotiations and, in fact, gift some of its property to a municipality.
And when that fails, what we then do is we look at ways of acquiring and in some cases we've had to do direct purchase. In one case in West Oak Trails, the municipality spent \$1.1 million purchasing a wood lot. That's how serious we are when it comes to the retention of green space in our municipality.
Finally, a number of years ago we were able to avail ourselves of something called 'development charges.' Unfortunately that Act got changed. We used to be able to establish a value and have the development community pay on a per-lot basis, moneys toward acquisition of wood lots. That was taken away from us. We're not able to do that ever again. That has had a significant impact on the way in which we are able to pursue the acquisition of green lands. But we're vigilant and we shall use all the tools and the policies of our plan to continue with our efforts.
Finally, there was the Strategic Land Use Option study. We initiated that in 1999 and we did it after the Region of

Halton had passed its Amendment #8, which said that the lands between Dundas Street and Highway 407 were going to be urban.
Did we do it just because the Region said it was going to be urban? No. We understand that there's going to be continued growth in the GTA. We have seen a buoyant economy. The seat of Mississauga is in its last phases of development. Highway 407 is under construction and you can drive to Neyagawa Boulevard today.
The Phase II area in the Town of Oakville south of Dundas Street was at about 40 per cent build-out when we initiated the study and it's close to 60 per cent now.
We understood that we would have a longer-term requirement for employment lands. We also understood, by way of our natural heritage inventory system that green lands would be available to the municipality.
And finally, we wanted to take control of the process. The study told us what would be developed, where it would be developed and when. Mrs. Gough will go into detail with respect to those conditions.
The plan said that we would be able to house approximately 55,000 persons and employ another 35,000. About 10,000 persons will be employed in other means, either in their homes or in various service activities.
The study also looked at a number of other types of community facilities. We know that there would be the requirement for three or four fire stations. We have an understanding of the municipal park requirements, community centers, libraries. We know that the Public School Board would need eight schools, elementary schools and that they would require one or two high schools. The Separate School Board likewise.
The Strategic Land Use Option study provides the basis for this amendment. We have taken all the information in that study and translated it into policy. We believe that

	we've made the appropriate land use policy decisions and this evening we would like to hear from you with respect to those recommendations that have been made to Council.With that information, I'd like Mrs. Gough to go through the amendment with you.
Lynne Gough, Manager of Long Range Planning	Your Worship I will present the highlights of the amendment to you tonight.
	The first change that we have made to the Official Plan is in the Plan Concept. This is Item 7 of the Official Plan Amendment and we have made four additions and one deletion on that.
	First of all, we're adding that we want to enhance the quality of life in Oakville. We also want to add that we're conserving the natural heritage and open space system. We want to talk about minimizing traffic congestion and we're talking about minimizing pollution.
	The one item that we need to delete from the Plan Concept is the undue consumption of better agricultural lands, because as you would understand, we are basically going to be developing the last remaining agricultural land.
	This Plan Concept is at the beginning of the Official Plan. It's in the introduction section and it's what sets the stage for the whole Official Plan.
	The next item that we're recommending to make changes to is in the Municipal Structure of the plan. This again is in the introduction to the plan and in the previous plan, it was based on a different concept of the plan, in terms of having an agricultural area. This is Item 8 of the Official Plan Amendment.
	What we are recommending here is to restructure the section to focus on identity, structure and organizing features. We also want to add the open space features, define the identity of the Town. That's relating to the

major creek systems.
We are mentioning the business districts. They are serving as focal points for development, the downtown area, the Midtown Core, the Uptown Core. And we talk about the organization of employment in residential areas.
I'm now going to briefly go through some of the maps of the amendment.
The first map here is the general land use and it's not in the vibrant colors as some of the rest of the maps I have, but please bear with me.
What we have in this map, the change to this is in the north area, in here, the lands north of Highway #5 and this shading is bringing this area into the special study area. Previously, it was an agricultural area in the existing Official Plan. We're changing it in special study area means that there will be secondary plans done in this area. So that is the major change to this.
In the north of #5 lands, you can see that it's all special study area, also a park and landfill site, the green areas in the middle here. Those were identified previously in the existing Official Plan.
The next highlight is in the phasing map. Essentially, this map has added a Phase 3 of development. The green area in the north is the new Phase 3. Previously, we had in the plan the development of Phase 1, which is shown in orange and Phase 2, which is shown in pink.
When Mr. Salisbury was talking about 75 per cent of development, he was talking about that pink area - that we are nearing about 60 per cent of that area's development and when 75 per cent is developed, that is the trigger to move into Phase 3.
Within the Phase 3, we have four sub-phasing areas. We start off in the west end of town, with areas Phase 3A, which is the 407 West Employment Area. Then we go to Phase 3B, which is named the new Glenorchy community.

Phase 3C is the new Joshua Meadow. Phase 3D is the Sixteen Hollow. This would be a new schedule in the Official Plan.
The next change on maps is on Figure F-1 on the Natural Features. The change again is the north of #5 area, up here, and what we have done, there were previously, the major things you can see on this map is the green that shows the valley lands and the purple color that shows the wood lands.
They were previously both of these shown in the north lands, but after having completed the LGL study, there was minor changes, mainly to the woodlands that we've made to this map so that this map now reflects the LGL study.
The next map is the Community Organization, Figure G. This is the only one of the schedules that actually shows the breakdown between the residential lands and the employment lands. So, in some ways this is the map that reflects the Hemson study.
Some people had asked why hadn't we shown this on the land use map. It's because the very first map I showed you where it's shown Special Study Areas, that map would require us to show commercial areas and the other major facilities. We have not done that work yet, that is part of the secondary plan exercise.
Therefore this map, which shows the communities, and the residential communities and employment districts, this map reflects the recommendation of the Hemson study.
One thing I would point out on this map is that the dividing line up here between the residential and the employment lands is an irregular line. On the first draft that you saw if you came to any of our public information meetings, it was a straight line. Now, it's not such a straight line and that was to reflect the Hemson study. And it also reflects that that line is to follow the main wood lots.

The next part of the amendment, going back to the words of the amendment, there are some requirements that must happen before development may occur. The first of three requirements that the Region of Halton had placed on us: First there must be an adopted secondary plan before there can be any development. There must be an infrastructure staging plan, which includes water, wastewater and major transportation services, and there must be a development charge bylaw in place. None of these things are in place yet.
The Town also has requirements. And our list is six items: We also want an infrastructure staging plan. Secondly, we want a sub watershed plan or plans. There would be a sub watershed for each creek system. We also want a transportation study and traffic studies to ensure that we can have good movement of traffic. We need retail market studies so that we can determine the most appropriate commercial areas. We need financial impact analysis and we want an urban design study or studies.
The next part of the amendment deals with the general development objectives and in this part of the amendment, we go into some detail on what we want on each of these five items.
Under the residential requirements, we talk about housing densities and we also talk about efficient land use and energy conservation.
Under employment, we talk about the live/work relationship and providing a range of employment opportunities.
Under transportation, we talk about a safe and efficient transportation system. We talk about cycle ways and walkways and talk about promoting transit.
Under environment and open space, we talk about establishing a natural heritage and open space system and about preserving and protecting significant heritage features.

	Under servicing we talk about the provision of water, wastewater services and storm drainage. And finally, I just wanted to emphasize one of the policies under the environment and open space. And I've highlighted in yellow what I think is the most important. To establish a natural heritage open space system, including potential east/west linkages, which attempts to
	maintain the existing natural environment and accommodate a wide variety of recreational and planning functions.
	Your Worship, that is an overview of the amendment and Mr. Salisbury will now come back and explain the next steps to you.
Ted Salisbury, Director of Planning Services	Your Worship, Members of Council, members of the public, I want to talk about when and how does development occur and I'm afraid there are times when I speak to groups and students and this becomes a two-hour lecture, which is something I don't intend on doing this evening.
	But what I wanted to try to convey to you is that notwithstanding the fact that we've talked about years and years of study and history and consideration by Council and public meetings, forums and all different forms of community contact and community access, we're not complete yet.
	In terms of when development would occur next, it really depends on a number of different facts and Mrs. Gough has explained the conditions prior to development that we've put in our plan.
	Also to be considered though, are the steps that municipalities need to take and one of those concerns something that we call secondary planning. And what I've got on the slide here in the center is really a Concept Plan. You can't read it because it's actually got a lot of detail there. It's a finer grain.

When you looked at the plans of this amendment that Mrs. Gough put on the overhead, they're not very clear. That's because we haven't made a lot of decisions yet in terms of the land uses.
We have a basic transportation system, but in each one of those planning areas that were identified, I couldn't tell you how many local streets there are going to be, whether or not they are going to be cul-de-sacs, avenues, ring roads, arterial roads – that has not yet been decided.
We know that there is a lot of concern that people have with respect to the provision of schools. And although we've talked to the school boards in terms of what would happen when the whole area was developed, how many schools would there be, we haven't talked about the individual communities because when we start to look at school planning, there's other criteria that come in to play.
That is, what sort of densities are there. How close would the schools be located to the greatest number of students? How many streets would a child have to cross to get to school? Would the school be located close to a community park? Would it be able to be a campus system? Would the school be near to a natural heritage open space system so that the children would be able to walk along paths to work? We don't have the answers to those questions yet because we have not got to that level of detail.
In terms of the retail market, it's always changing. We can't really confirm today what the market will be like in the future. How many people would have actually predicted the Big Box phenomenon? And that's an option. Yet at the same time, there are many people who avail themselves of all the ambience and the quality that we have in our own downtowns; in Bronte, Kerr Street and downtown Oakville.
We also have to consider public transit. Because we know, in terms of 'Smart Growth,' there will be a continued focus on people being able to use local transit to move within the community, to move to inter-regional

transit to go outside of the Region and, hopefully, be able to use our transit to go to work.
In terms of community facilities, again, we need to think about libraries, community centers, arenas, sports fields. All that's done in secondary planning.
Only after Council has considered this amendment and we have established the framework and the structure and a secondary plan.
And the first secondary plan we would be preparing is actually for an employment area, it's called the 407 West and that's located West of Bronte Road and North of Dundas Street. And that's because it's established as the first phase of development and we have a need for new employment lands in our community.
But how do we deal with the natural open space system? We've got a lot of information about it. How do we integrate that into our plans?
Well, you've heard about sub-watershed studies. And for many of you, you may actually have a storm water management facility around you. You might not recognize it, because it probably looks like a pond. It's a natural area; your children may actually go around it to play.
Sub-watershed studies have evolved significantly over the years. Originally the concept of storm water management came out of Maryland. Ironically, the same location that Smart Growth comes from.
What the sub-watershed studies do, would be to take all the information that we would have in our LGL study and then go to that finer grain of detail. They'll look at all of the receiving streams. They'll look at the existing flow of water in those creeks. They'll ensure that when development does occur that the flow of the water in the creek before development is equalized with that after development.
Ponds will be developed as well. That's to ensure when

there's a storm that run-off is collected and we don't have floods. Those types of controls, actually to the 100-year storm, come about as a result of something called Hurricane Hazel in the 1950s. That's regulatory now. We ensure that whenever we have a storm, it is not going to cause significant damage or result in any loss of lives.
But beyond the aspect of quantity control with storm water management, now we're looking at quality and what we're trying to ensure is that we improve the natural systems.
Now, when I initially started looking at a secondary plan in North Oakville, most of the land was agricultural. The creek systems, as a matter of fact, were those areas where the farmer had last taken heavy equipment. And for the most part, the creeks were used as drainage ditches. You could jump from one side to the other; four, five feet.
When the municipality starts to do secondary planning and has sub-watershed studies and storm water management studies done, what it does is it determines what the future capacity of those creeks would be; how the creek could be more natural; how the municipality would be able to use it and integrate it into part of its natural heritage open space system.
Those creeks that were five feet wide in 1989 and 1990 in areas such as West Oak Trails, at development now they're in excess of 30 meters wide.
People are able to bicycle along paths that the municipality has made above the top of bank. The creeks have been deepened, they've been naturalized and, in accordance with the requirements of scientists and biologists, there are opportunities for more natural growth and in some cases habitat and fish habitat.
The sub-watershed studies provide for linkages, ponds and bridges. They create systems and we link those systems with all the other physical planning, in terms of how many houses and where and what densities and what will they look like.

Finally, when we complete a secondary plan, we get a better understanding as to what the costs to a municipality are going to be. What major roads are there? What are the community facilities? How many parks?
When we do that, that becomes part of a Town's capital budget and that's then translated into something called Development Charges. And that's the cost that the development community needs to pay to ensure that those facilities that are required as a result of new development are paid for by the development community and not by the municipality.
Finally, after secondary planning, we do subdivisions. And I'm sure many of you have seen subdivisions develop around you. And subdivisions rely on zoning. And on individual sites there are something called site plans.
It's actually only through that mechanism of the subdivision that lands are actually finally conveyed to the municipality. It's only when a subdivision is registered does a municipality actually acquire the roads, the parks, the paths, easements, right of ways. That's when valley lands are conveyed to the municipality. That's when the natural heritage open space system is created. That's when the municipality purchases land. That's when the lands are serviced.
We are quite a ways away this evening from going through all of those steps to actually see development occurring North of Dundas Street. But what I did want to explain to you is that there is still a long process ahead.
And, you also need to know, that you also become involved in that process as well. And I know there are many persons here this evening who would be very interested in knowing how many houses could be on their particular property. Or what Greenlands would be maintained. And what opportunities will there be in the future.
Those questions can be answered in part this evenings, but

Mayor Ann Mulvale	 can only be answered in more detail when we proceed with the next steps. Your Worship that concludes our presentation. We're very interested in hearing from the public and the delegations. We'll keep record and keep note and, in terms of questions being asked, we would like the opportunity to respond in written form, given proper consideration. Thank-you. Thank-you to all the presenters. We appreciate that.
	Madam Clerk will now commence the - with Council's concurrence - we are going to move straight into delegations.
Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk	Yes your Worship, Members of Council and the audience. I'll be calling forward each of the delegations to address Council at the podium. In addition, in order to provide a status report on our delegation list, and to provide an opportunity for speakers to be ready for their turn at the podium, I will be announcing in groups of five the next set of speakers. Having said that, the first grouping of speakers are David Bazar, Janet Trinder, Carol Westwood, Harry Wogden, Michael Lansdown. So at this point I will call forward David Bazar
David Bazar (Delegation)	And would you like me to sign in before I start here?
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Whichever way you want to do it, sir.
David Bazar (Delegation)	I think I should do that first.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Then while you're doing that I'll make a community announcement. I've been advised by the staff in the other overflow rooms that the chairs are more comfortable than the benches and that the sound system is a little better and the temperature they tell me is cooler. But you're welcome to stay. But just if anyone's getting uncomfortable on the benches, the system is working very well in the overflow room.
David Bazar (Delegation)	Okay. Good evening Madam Mayor, Members of Council, Council staff, members of the public. My name

is David Bazar, I live at 1205 Burnhamthorpe Road West,
and that's situated on the north side of Burnhamthorpe
Road, west of Neyagawa Boulevard.
In your material, you should have a copy of a petition.
The petition asks that you designate the area between
Burnhamthorpe Road West and Highway 407, from
Neyagawa Boulevard to 16 Mile Creek for residential
uses.
The potition is signed by the owners of a majority of the
The petition is signed by the owners of a majority of the lands west of Neyagawa Boulevard to 16 Mile Creek on
both the north and the adjacent south side of
Burnhamthorpe Road that is already designated for
residential.
I'm have creating not only for mysalf, but also on babalf
I'm here speaking not only for myself, but also on behalf of my neighbors, whose names appear on that petition.
Madam Chair, at the outset, before I get into the rest of
my discussion about the petition, I have to say that I'm
totally and completely shocked, as are most other
landowners, with the surprise which has been thrust upon us at the 11^{th} hour.
us at the 11 nour.
And Ted spoke about the LGL Report and the importance
of the five categories of wood lot. In short, we've been
told for over 1 ¹ / ₂ years that the basis for protecting wood
lots would be the LGL Report.
As you know, LGL recommended the use of five distinct
categories for wood lot classification. This was adopted
by Council and the rules of the process for all
stakeholders were clear.
For some unexplained reason, the staff has discarded the
LGL categories, even though they're being spoken of
even tonight. But the Official Plan Amendment replaces
them all with the woodlands category without any notice
or previous public consultation.
Now, we don't really have any idea anymore of the true
priorities for saving woodlots. This is going to have a
significant impact on all the landowners and everyone else

who's interested in preserving woodlots. And accordingly, we strongly request that you re-instate the Council- adopted LGL categories in OPA 198 before it's passed.
The proposed Official Plan Amendment would at least initially designate the subject lands - the ones I'm speaking of, which again are west of Neyagawa Boulevard on the north side to the creek up until Highway 407 – it would designate those lands for industrial and other employment uses.
We're not shy to say that such a land use designation to us would be a travesty of good planning. Fortunately, you have the opportunity to set things right. We've spoken with Town Planning staff at length over the last number of months. They've been very co-operative and helpful and we want to thank them.
We also want to make it abundantly clear that we don't blame staff for the planning errors in this draft OPA. To us, the errors are a direct result of inappropriate political interference and meddling.
It seems to us that the proposed OPA does not faithfully reflect the good planning advice that the Town staff had to offer. Or the good planning advice that Hemson Consulting had to offer – advice that was solicited at no small cost to the taxpayer.
Rather, it seems to us that the proposed OPA 198 is especially tainted by one former Councillor's hypothesis that is rather misguided. The hypothesis is that residential proximity to Highway 407 must be avoided at all costs and that new residential communities should be adjacent to the ones south of Dundas.
If there were no other factors to consider, they might be good, reasonable objectives. But good planning requires consideration of all factors. And it looks like other important factors have been ignored.
All in all, the whole plan seems rather ill-conceived to us. For example, it seems silly to us to put even more

residential communities abutting Dundas Street and to put any employment lands along 16 Mile Creek. It seems like a waste.
And again, Ted was talking about preserving access to the 16 Mile Creek and other creeks and here we are putting employment lands along them and along probably the nicest part of the whole creek.
Yesterday, a young woman stood up and asked why we should be expected to trust the Town to do a good job with planning for land use north of Dundas when they couldn't properly plan for a public meeting. And I think people were insulted by that.
But instead of being insulted and having excuses, I know that at least some of you will have the maturity to appreciate the positive value of the irony and take an honest look at what's being proposed for OPA 198. It truly seems to have missed the forest for the trees.
For many of us here today are like me. We're residents who don't want to see our homes enveloped in employment lands or bordering on it.
The draft shows that the vast majority of existing residents north of Dundas will be put into exactly that position. And that's really important. The vast majority of existing residents north of Dundas, where most of the homes are now, are designated to go on this draft into the employment lands. Is that really the best we can do?
Anyway, even burdened with those directives – the directive that we would have no employment land or no residential land adjacent to the 407 and that we'd have all the residential land adjacent to Dundas to provide continuity from the existing community – the February 2000 Hemson Report, which was their first attempt at giving a pristine view of what this plan should look like still recommended that most of the subject lands that I'm talking about, and the lands adjacent to the west side of the creek, be designated as residential.

Unfortunately for us, the Chair of the Land Use Committee was still not satisfied it seemed to us and once again directed Hemson to come up with a recommendation that included absolutely no residential land adjacent to 407. The subsequent Hemson Report, on which proposed OPA 198 is based, designated the subject lands on the west side of the creek, that Hemson had originally said should be residential, for industrial employment uses.
When being questioned about that report, that subsequent report, Mr. Simpson of Hemson Consulting clearly stated at one public meeting that I think some of us will remember quite clearly, that the area should really be designated for residential uses, but his report was consistent with the instructions of the Land Use Committee.
It should be abundantly clear that when the Town hires professional planning consultants to advise us as to good planning practices, it is counterproductive to manipulate those professionals so that their advice becomes merely a reflection of the directions thrust upon them.
One concession is found in Item 21 of the draft OP Amendment. It requires that the designation of the subject area, and although this doesn't include the land on the west side of the creek, sadly enough, be re-evaluated once the environmental assessment associated with any bridge crossing of 16 Mile Creek has been completed. I think that's more or less what is says. But basically, once we decide where we're probably going to put a bridge, we're going to revisit this concept of where the residential lands are going to start and end.
The recognition's appreciated, but it doesn't really go far enough for us. While we're quite confident that the environmental assessment will recommend that the bridge be built adjacent to the 407, not aligned with Burnhamthorpe Road's current footprint, and that the subject lands will ultimately be designated for residential uses, it seems to us that the best location for the bridge would likely be one adjacent to the 407 bridges, if we

	have a bridge at all. Either on the south side, but preferably on the north side of the 407.If Burnhamthorpe is eventually rerouted, so the traffic crosses the 407 using the existing Neyagawa underpass, and follows the 407 on its north side, it would link with Burnhamthorpe on the west side of the creek, without the need for an overpass over 407.Just think about the cost savings, if no new overpass is
	required. I'm not sure what they cost. Does anybody here have an idea what an overpass over the 407 costs?
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Probably a lot of money David. Keep going.
David Bazar (Delegate)	Thank-you Ann. Environmental impact would be minimized as well as costs. But what if the Council at that future point doesn't make the change to residential?
	We ask you to do the right thing now, otherwise you'd be forcing us to appeal your decision to the OMB within 20 days. Because if we don't do it, we won't have any choice in the future. We don't want to enter into a confrontational process. We want to work with the Town. If we don't appeal now, we'll have no choice but to accept whatever is thrust upon us.
	We think that there are some other pretty compelling planning reasons why this subject area should be residential.
	First, let's compare the area to Clearview. Everybody familiar with Clearview in Council? Linda, Jody, are you familiar with Clearview very well? Thank-you.
	Clearview is an existing relatively small community that unfortunately is isolated from other residential neighborhoods by major arterials and employment lands. It consequentially lacks major recreational and other public facilities such as a public elementary school that other Oakville communities enjoy.
	Council and staff have repeatedly stated that Clearview was a mistake and should not be repeated. Look at the

Part II - June 26, 2001

	proposed residential neighborhood on the south side of Burnhamthorpe west of Neyagawa. I don't know if we can get a slide that will show that very well. The only one I thought I saw was Figure G.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	We'll get something put up. Feel free to continue and we'll just put it up.
David Bazar (Delegate)	The issue is that that residential neighborhood will be relatively small. Clearview's down on the right-hand side there.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	If you'll just stay there, I'll have planning staff point at it. We can see Clearview and the area south that Mr. Bazar is talking to, if you could also show. I think we're trying to illustrate a case in terms of lack of continuity.
David Bazar (Delegate)	Now, when you look at the yellow area there it looks quite large. Unfortunately, the actual amount of land that will be able to be available for residents themselves isn't that much different than Clearview. You've got the old dump, you've got a bunch of park land in there, you've got valley lands that can't be developed.
	So, if you look at the actual hectares, I'm not sure how many acres there are, but it doesn't look much different than Clearview at all.
	And if you look to the north, you've got employment lands, you've got the creek to the west, and you've got employment lands to the east, with Neyagawa. So what you're doing is you're creating an orphan community.
	So, it would be another orphan community and to us by designating the lands on the north side of Burnhamthorpe as residential, you'll go a long way to making the whole community more serviceable and more desirable. It's going to be a lot easier to justify the cost of putting in schools in the neighborhood.
	It would also help, to me, if the adjacent lands on the east side of Neyagawa, rather than there being that jog as there is right now, if at least there was a spit of residential that

came up diagonally or at a square to be adjacent to that residential area so that there is a continuity of the
residential area to that triangle or square, as it ends up
being in there.
I think the idea is to not create another Clearview and I hope Council and staff will take a very close look at what the effect of that's going to be in the long term, in terms of the ability to develop that area effectively.
The process has taken a long time, as we know and things have changed during that time. The original map provided with the draft OPA showed the new Christian private secondary school - what is it, King's College? King's Collegiate – being constructed in an area for employment uses, surrounded by employment lands on three sides. I guess we all agreed that wasn't very good planning. And of course, Council didn't know about the school either last August when the August Hemson Report was put to the staff to develop OPA 198 out of.
So I just learned on Friday though that since those public meetings, the draft OPA has now been changed and the secondary school's lands are now designated as residential and the lands to the south of that.
So our package tonight shows it as residential. And I understand that the change was made because it's inappropriate to have schools on employment lands and the school didn't want it. And of course, the owners of the lands adjacent didn't want to be a little triangle of employment land with residentials north of them – they'd have no access.
So that was easy enough to change, and that school wasn't even built yet, but it seems to merit the consideration to have it changed to residential while dozens of homes that have been on these lands for decades don't. And I'm not sure why that is.
Why are lands that are currently being used for residential purposes more suitable for employment uses than lands that a private group decided only recently to plunk a high

school on? Of course, even that doesn't satisfactorily address all of the issues related to the school. It's still surrounded on two sides by employment lands and it is adjacent to a major arterial.
As you know, CNR has recently announced that they intend to build a major inter-modal facility in South Milton, adjacent to Northwest Oakville – an area that's outside of the study area. I've read what Hemson has to say about it. But we already have a distinct impression that the reports aren't necessarily pure and pristine.
I'm not sure that any of us are likely going to want to have residential communities that are going to be next to that thing. They have these big 60-ton diesel tractors that run around, they're extremely noisy. It seems rather likely to us that businesses with goods to transport will prefer to be in close proximity to the inter-modal facility.
So let's expand the study area and designate some of the lands along Bronte Road for employment uses, instead of our areas so that we may still comply with the employment land use targets.
The proposed plan surrounds 16 Mile Creek north of Burnhamthorpe with employment lands on both sides and it condemns an entire area of exceptional natural beauty with large woodlots be cut off from the people of Oakville forever and I think to likely decimation.
Residential uses would provide another opportunity, the kind of opportunity that Ted Salisbury spoke about, for people to enjoy and co-exist with our natural heritage.
Businesses are generally a lot less interested in vistas and views than residents are. They are primarily interested in making money. Some point to woodlots preserved in Winston Park as an example of businesses coexisting with woodlots. Yes, they are there today, but who knows what future Councils will allow. The residents aren't there to watch to be concerned about it.
Woodlots in residential settings are much more likely to

P	
	be defended in our opinion and preserved in the future.
	You now have an opportunity to make right a serious wrong. This Council is new, and should not be held responsible for what went on before. Unless it endorses those mistakes. The Town's own Planning staff has made it absolutely clear to me that they agree with us and as recently as Friday we were told that we could quote them on it.
	I call on you to ask your own staff, especially Lynn Gough, who I spoke with on Friday, of your Planning Department, right now to confirm for you and for me that the Town's Planning staff's own professional opinion is that this area on Burnhamthorpe Road west of Neyagawa to the creek should all be designated residential and that we should find other locations for the employment lands.
	Please right the wrong. Please designate our areas for residential uses. And I thank you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank-you for your presentation. The audience, we appreciate you recognizing the presentation, but we're trying not to do that. We agreed earlier, Mr. Bazar and I think you were here, that the staff will answer all the questions at a later date. They're going to go through them and then they'll research them. We'd like to keep to that so that we can hear as many delegations tonight as possible.
David Bazar (Delegate)	I'm sorry, just if I may, I wonder, like last year we went through this too except when it came time to answer questions, not one question was every answered.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	No, no, no. We've got a commitment for a written report. Now, I'm sorry. I'll Chair the meeting any way the majority of Council wants. I understood we were going to take each issue, we were going to have a written report back so that everybody can receive a copy, we can have them at Town Hall so that people who are interested can just stop by, whether they're here or not. So I think the strategy is to try and get as many

	delegations as we can and the commitment has been given by the Planning Director for answers to the questions in writing.
David Bazar (Delegate)	Okay, I thought that would be the case if the questions were more detailed. But I though if it was just a quick question, where Lynn Gough would get up and say, 'Yes this plan is wrong,' that that would be allowed.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	I'm at Council's discretion here, but I think I've never seen a simple answer to a planning matter.
David Bazar (Delegate)	It seemed pretty simple when I spoke to her on the phone, so I'd really like to get clarification for everybody's benefit, and if I'm wrong, I'm wrong.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	I'm seeing a non-verbal shaking of heads and I believe we should, unless Council directs me otherwise, that we should deal with this as was announced beforehand. I'm at Council's direction, I'm just trying to keep the meeting going. I have questions from Councillor Flynn, Councillor Bird.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Thank-you Kevin. I've got a few questions of you myself. You said that most individual residents in the study area are being put into employment lands.
David Bazar (Delegate)	I think that's correct. There are no houses on Neyagawa. Most of the homes as far as I know are along Sixth Line, especially a lot along Burnhamthorpe Road. In the area where we are west of Neyagawa, it's full of homes. There's a large number. It's probably one of the largest density, or the most dense concentration of homes is in that dead-end area.
	Of course there's homes at the corner of Sixth Line, there's a little concentration there. As we get farther east I think there's fewer homes, but there's very little in the yellow sections that actually have any homes in them, other than on Sixth Line.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Okay you said that perhaps we could make up the

	employment acreage on some portion on Bronte Road, which I think might make some sense. But if you just transpose a blue area there onto Bronte Road, I don't think you could do the whole thing.
David Bazar (Delegate)	Oh absolutely not.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Did you have anywhere else in mind or had you thought about another place for the employment lands.
David Bazar (Delegate)	The impression I have had from the planners that I've spoken with, including Mr. Simpson, is that perhaps there would have been more employment land adjacent to Dundas itself and that there would have been that separation between the two communities.
	It seems that there's been a lot of discussion that the proximity of residential lands to Dundas has not been very satisfactory, relative to what you might find along 407. In the evenings and weekends when people are home, the 407 is not a very heavily used highway and as long as it's a toll road it probably won't be. It's open now, we just don't really hear much of it.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Councillor Bird.
Councillor Keith Bird	David, you intrigue me by your comment with regards to not planning in here some of the challenges that we did when we created Clearview by basically taking an area that was zoned industrial and making it residential. And you say this plan up there repeats that mistake. Would you point it out, what area is going to be isolated that is currently residential that replicates the Clearview problem.
David Bazar (Delegate)	It's hard to see with that map. If I could draw with my pen.
Councillor Keith Bird	Yeah if you can sort of point out the area that does not look like it's going to be contiguous to the other residential areas, I don't see it up there.
	As far as I know, when you look at this area here, the dump is here, the square there that's not going to be

	developed and most of this is sort of the expanse, you can sort of see it now. The area up there above where I've got my little scratch now and I'll get a piece of tape to fix it, is the residential neighborhood. If you look at it, it actually goes a little higher there. You've got on the right here, this is employment lands here.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Excuse me just a second, do we have the hand mike, because I'm just bothered by people who aren't picking Mr. Bazar, there are people in other rooms. Thank-you. We're trying to ensure that everybody can hear. Thank- you.
David Bazar (Delegate)	I apologize to the people in the other rooms. So we've got this area here where the Mattamy, I guess the former Firestone property is in this corner here, is across the road and that's employment land. So if you have residential land here, there's basically no continuity. You've got Neyagawa, which is going to be a four-lane eventually I suppose once it's attached to the James Snow Parkway. And then across the road, it's going to be employment here. You've got the creek and then we don't know what's going to happen here, but it's going to be parkland, it could be a stadium, I've heard of talk of a soccer stadium in there. It's hard to tell.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	The land use of the north park - we'll know something further depending on what happens with the Olympics. If it's what you're alluding to, as we've got some of the soccer if the Olympics are awarded to Toronto. And that will accelerate the development of the park and indeed will be a lasting soccer stadium, but it'll be one that will be added on to for the purpose of the Olympics.
David Bazar (Delegate)	In any case. Oh, that certainly is working better, I can lower my voice.
Councillor Keith Bird	I've got the point. It's the area between south of Burnhamthorpe, Neyagawa over to 16 Mile Creek north of the closed dump that is currently zoned residential but in your opinion to leave it as such could create a problem.

Part II - June 26, 2001

David Bazar (Delegate)	Well, I wouldn't want to suggest that it shouldn't be residential.
Councillor Keith Bird	Well that's what is being proposed and you're suggesting that could be a problem if we leave the residential zoning on there.
David Bazar (Delegate)	Thank-you very much Tedd. Now this is a much more illustrative map. (laughter from audience) This is also another illustrative and, uh
Councillor Keith Bird	At least we can approach this with a sense of humor.
David Bazar (Delegate)	And I like this one. In fact, a lot of the land along here it's going to be difficult to develop as well, so you can see it's a rather irregular piece of land, cut off from the rest of the Town.
	If I look down to Clearview, it's hard to tell if it's bigger or not, but if it is, it isn't a lot bigger and I'm just not sure why we want to create this little isolated orphan. If we put this piece of land here in and we perhaps bring the residential adjacent up here or something along that line, although we have Neyagawa, at least certainly on the south side we'd have some continuity. To me, that would make it a lot easier to have a contiguous community.
Councillor Keith Bird	Okay, was not - the previous slide up there indicated I thought that that quadrant there with the bridge and the connection was one that we're going to set aside as a special study area. Isn't that what – his concern of an isolated residential community
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Councillor Bird, we're not doing the questions right now. They'll be a written response, we're not trying to be difficult. We're trying to
Councillor Keith Bird	In other words, this is the third slide. The previous one sort of indicated what David was talking about.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	No, no Councillor Bird, I'm sorry.
Councillor Keith Bird	Okay.

Part II - June 26, 2001

Mayor Ann Mulvale	Councillor Flynn is quite right. Okay. Thank-you. If there's no, Councillor, I think that concludes the questions. Thank-you very much. We appreciate your presentations. We extended a lot of courtesy because we understood you were speaking on behalf of other people than yourselves. We'd ask others if they wish to speak on that Burnhamthorpe issue, if they could try and be very succinct in their fairness to other speakers.
Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk	The next speaker is Janet Trinder
Janet Trinder (Delegate)	Good presentation, David. I agree with a lot of his points. I happen to live on that part of Burnhamthorpe Road. I am Janet Trinder and this is my neighbor Mark Francisco. We live with our families on Burnhamthorpe Road west
	of Neyagawa. We live on the dead-end block of Burnhamthorpe Road. And we are both here tonight representing our families and we urge you to please vote no to the plan as it is written.
	My family just can't understand why this plan designates the north side of our block employment, actually we can't understand why any block of Burnhamthorpe Road is designated employment.
	Today, as I was reading the staff report, which is Addendum 1, I was amazed by the statement on page five. Under the heading, 'Existing character of the area,' I quote, "There are some existing residential uses, which are both farmhouses and rural lots along the concession road system. The only settlement area is concentrated within the Palermo area."
	The north side of Dundas Street does fit that definition, but it is totally untrue of the whole of Burnhamthorpe Road. Burnhamthorpe Road is settled and it has been settled for many, many years.
	In fact, on our block, the one that David was just talking about, it is – you have the old Fourth Line, you have one little empty lot and then you have house, house, house, house, house, house, house. That's seven houses in a row.

	Then you have a field. Then you have David's house. Then you have a few more houses and a few horse barns
	and then you have the creek. I don't know where you will put an IBM building there.
	Burnhamthorpe Road is an established neighborhood and it should be designated residential. And if you truly believe in the plan concept, regarding due regard to quality of life or whatever the verbiage is now, I don't know how you can support that idea, to designate Burnhamthorpe Road employment.
	I actually urge you to drive down Burnhamthorpe Road tomorrow. Note that this is a residential neighborhood. Not some existing residential uses, but currently residential. Please do not designate Burnhamthorpe Road employment.
	I agree with David Bazar's ideas on the potential crossing of the creek, where if we do have lots more people living up there and lots of traffic, that's something we need to look at. But I urge you to adopt Iris McGee's recommendation, which is also in Addendum 1, page A104.
	In regard to Item 21, she states, "Plan the community so that crossing a 16 Mile Creek will not be necessary. And use the millions in savings from not having to build a bridge on acquiring woodlands now."
	This was originally suggested by E.E.A.C. in their report on the Hemson study in 1999. Vote no, as the plan is now written and Mark has a couple other comments.
Mark Francisco (Delegate)	Okay, thank-you, good evening. My points differ a little bit from the previous presentations and that my situation is radically different from older people who are more concerned with different issues. I use that respectfully and all that.
	This evening, or within the next couple weeks, Oakville Town Council has an important decision to make. This decision they make will affect the quality of life in

Oakville today and for a very long time to come. The decision once made and applied will be permanent. There will be no chance for further discussion or debate or any chance to fix anything that happens.
Future generations will be unable to leave their mark on Oakville. They will be unable to learn from both the good and the bad of each phase of development in Oakville.
All of the lands north of the Queen Elizabeth Way will have been developed within a 30 to 40 year period with no chance to really evaluate the effects of each phase of development over a long period of time.
As a young person living in Oakville my whole life. I've lived here for 19 years, I was born in Oakville and raised my whole life here, the changes I have seen in my short time here have been incredible.
I can still remember the days driving down the old Fourth Line with my parents and facing a huge field in front of me when we reached Dundas. I can remember traveling down the old Fourth Line, the old windy road, past a cemetery, seeing farmer's fields as far as you could see, until you reached Upper Middle, where development was just starting.
But those days are long gone. Now, driving or cycling into Glen Abbey or River Oaks, one is bombarded with advertisements for 50 foot lot homes.
These supposedly great new communities are being built, but at what cost? Is this sustainable development? The lands of Southern Ontario are recognized as some of the world's best farmlands yet it continues to be destroyed at an incredible pace.
Now all future generations have left is a relatively small portion of land north of Dundas in Oakville to enjoy. The rest of Oakville has been built up hastily, with the attitude that bigger homes are better, without the recognition of the problem of urban sprawl. As long as the homes look good, their environmental impact means nothing.

It doesn't mean anything to the people buying these homes that the sprawl is causing spread-apart communities that require driving. And in Oakville, driving big gas-guzzling SUVs or minivans around everywhere, adding to the already very poor air quality in Oakville.
If you bothered to take a look at the air quality index every so often, a trend emerges. Oakville is consistently near the wrong end of the index. The bad air is an extreme negative impact on the lives of everyone living in Oakville and this is completely unacceptable.
The plan mentions the need to minimize pollution, that is easy to say. Yet the communities in Glen Abbey and River Oaks do not take air quality into consideration at all.
Some steps have been taken in small parts of these new communities, particularly the Oak Park community. Taller homes on smaller lots are part of the community. We need to take some time to evaluate the impact of these new communities, the ways in which we are planning these new communities, before we go ahead with a hasty, poorly-planned, money-driven plan to develop north of Dundas.
There are many questions and not enough answers with these plans to urbanize north Oakville. It is clearly evident that Mike Harris and the government of Ontario have decided 'Smart Growth' is a nice phrase to use. Yet they have no clue what it is.
How are all these 55,000 plus new residents of Oakville going to get around? Senior levels of government are not willing to invest in high speed mass public transit. Their idea of a solution is to widen highways and to build toll highways so that the expense to them in terms of money is low.
With the gridlock being faced in this area today, it is clear that more population growth will only add to the problem.
Air quality will continue to degrade, the quality of lives in

	the area will continue to degrade as well. The loss of a natural air filter, the lands north of Dundas, will obviously not help the situation at all.While many older residents of the area, I use that respectfully as I have said before – for this discussion, we'll look at people over 40, 45. Many of them consider
Mayor Ann Mulvale	We do not allow age discrimination, young man.
Mayor Ann Mutvale Mark Francisco (Delegate)	I'm sorry: I use it respectfully. They consider this to be an economic issue, looking to protect their land value or rezoning the land in the plan.
	I consider it to be a much more important plan than money. My parents own land north of Dundas so I could say I do have a direct economic interest. I could agree with development that would make me the most money and never have to worry about things like the mortgage on the home. However, this land is too important to think of in terms of money.
	I am willing to forego whatever money could be made from the sale of this land to protect it. A native Canadian quote I once read sums up my opinion quite well: "The real owners of the land are not yet born."
	I do not own the land. You do not own the land. None of us owns the land. We are merely caretakers. As caretakers we do use the land in ways which damage it. But we must use it in ways which have the least long-term impact.
	We must follow sustainable methods of development, not our current patterns. We must take a step back for awhile and look at our options.
	To do this I propose an amendment to the plan, which would see all the lands not yet slated for development in Oakville to be protected from development for a minimum of 15 years.
	I would personally like to see it undeveloped as long as I live, but we could give the next generation a chance to

look at the situation. In 2016 or thereabouts, we'll have a better idea of the true impact of the development between the QEW and Dundas. We'll have time to develop infrastructure to support more growth: Public transit ways need to be developed and we need time to allow services to catch up to our current population boom.
Right now in Oakville, finding a family doctor is a chore. Getting around is more difficult than it should be. Gridlock and air quality are serious problems. These issues will not be solved by packing more people into an already overpopulated city.
Now Town Council has a decision to make: To preserve the natural environment of Oakville for future generations, allow time for the effects of our recent growth and protect the quality of life of those currently living in Oakville.
Some Councillors and others mentioned the 1978 decision by the Ontario Municipal Board in favor of developers against the Town of Oakville, which resulted in the communities of River Oaks and Glen Abbey.
First of all, as I was not yet born for another four years after the decision, I can only assume certain things about it. Second of all, is the elected Town Council of Oakville, responsible to the bureaucratic Municipal Board, or to the people of Oakville.
Also, I'm sure the current situation differs from that of 1978. Oakville's air quality is among the worst in Ontario, and we have grown significantly, especially in the last few years.
This is the last land to develop in Oakville and we want to do it right. We don't have the transportation, nor the support from the province for more public transportation. We don't have enough family doctors and it appears the province would be hesitant to open any new hospital beds or a new hospital altogether.
When I started at Loyola five years ago, there were two

	portables. I can't recall any more than that. Now there's over 30. Obviously, schools have not kept pace with development. How will this be dealt with? Will the province give money to build the new schools? How are we going to deal with this? This needs to be dealt with before any plans are made, not after.
	We do have a case for the Ontario Municipal Board. The citizens are opposed and the OMB must recognize this. It may cost money to prepare a case, yes, but these lands are priceless and the cost to current Oakville taxpayers in terms of air quality and health are high, if unsustainable development continues.
	So I issue a challenge to the Mayor and Town Council: Amend the Official Plan so that all of the lands north of Dundas are protected until at least 2016. This would be the Official Plan, at which time it could be reviewed. The next Council would obviously have the right to amend this plan, but if the public supports it, they would not want to change it.
	It is time for Oakville Town Council to stop worrying about the concerns of developers and the OMB and listen to the concerns of those most impacted by this decision. Amending the plan and protecting the land is the best choice for Oakville. And it is up to Town Council to make it. (Applause)
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank-you. Councillor Oliver you have a question?
Councillor Fred Oliver	I have a question, but I have a statement first your worship. I want to congratulate you. I think you covered all the aspects and you're the spokesperson for everyone in attendance. May we have a copy of your presentation?
Mark Francisco (Delegate)	I will give you a copy
Janet Trinder (Delegate)	What about mine? (laughter)
Councillor Fred Oliver	Thank-you.
Mark Francisco (Delegate)	I can give it to you tomorrow.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Yeah, or if you deliver it to the Clerk's Department
	tomorrow, we'll copy it for the Councillor. Thank-you
	very much Sir. Next speaker.

Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk	Carol Westwood (pause) Harry Wogden.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	People who aren't here will be kept on a list and we'll call them back at a subsequent meeting or we'll check with them when they're available.
Harry Wogden (Delegate)	Your Worship, ladies and gentlemen of Council. I appear as Chairman of the Ennisclaire Government Affairs Committee. For those who don't know us, I should say we're a condominium community on Marine Drive in Bronte, miles away from there.
	I wish to state our attitude towards this plan revision and to give some of our overall views about the objectives.
	Our attitude is that growth and expansion in the Golden Horseshoe communities is continuous and it's inevitable and it's rather pointless to wish otherwise.
	The concept of 7,400 acres accommodating 55,000 people will add about 40% to the present population, making Oakville up to about 200,000 people. Obviously, guiding principles are essential. It's entirely appropriate to seek this kind of public input.
	We want to stress several aspects of the proposal, the first of them being what one might describe as opportunity factors. First, concerning the assessment base, there is a legacy from the Town's history, giving an imbalance of assessment between business and residential.
	This plan provides a chance to redress that balance to be more even. That has been touched on in the presentation tonight.
	A much larger assessment base will spread the fixed costs of administration more widely and thus lessen individual tax burdens.
	Respecting the Town character, an early start to planning can better envisage an ideal Town concept and indeed the topography of the north area lends itself to very

imaginative creations.
The Oakville Heritage Trail Association has a thoroughly admirable program. Co-Chairman David Carter recently updated our committee on this and it's totally natural to extend that work to the new area and integrate it with the environment plans.
Looking at Oakville past, present, and future, old Oakville has evolved over about 200 years. It will not be replicated. Mid-Oakville is typical of its time, but there exists a good reputation for new community creation.
The future Oakville can expect to have more improvements, based on new ideas and on experience and one hopes with less suburban sprawl inherent in it.
There are on the other hand some factors which give us some concern. The first of these is transportation. I think we're all aware that facilities always lag the actual needs.The plan will encourage people to live and work in the same area and we think that's a very good idea indeed.
We should say to planners and Council: Don't fear highrise buildings. High-density accommodation frees land for a wider community use. By way of example, our condominiums at Ennisclaire have 575 housing units, occupying about 10 acres of land and to provide the same amount of accommodation in single-family dwellings, would take about 150 acres.
And on our properties, about half the surface area is on gardens. A further advantage of this kind of development comes if this kind of property is contiguous to public land, which gives some advantage for landscaping private and public land and some advantage in terms of water run-off to natural landscape.
I should mention too that the new Condominium Act is rather more flexible than the old one, for both business and residential properties. And that should point to some different kinds of opportunity.

The live and work close by philosophy is worth a very big effort. Otherwise, traffic congestion will simply worsen.
The environment is always a major factor in people's minds. Recently, Michael Lansdown and Renee Sandelowski updated us about the Oakville Green Conservation Association's work.
I can't claim that we are environmental purists, but we do endorse the main thrust of their aims. We are for example disturbed that some environmentally significant areas have been lost and that forest cover in Oakville is shrinking.
We therefore urge that the plans take fully into account the North Oakville Natural Heritage Inventory and Analysis study. Of particular interest to us are the watercourses having sources in the north area. They're bound to be affected, we think with potentially negative impact, on old Oakville.
Ted Salisbury has assured us this evening that provincial legislation and the attendant practices will not cause those water streams to be neglected and that the flow and quality will be retained. We're comforted to know that.
In the Regional context, the plan gives some information about green belt, and we would like to see larger green belt lands between the communities. Ted has again added quite a lot of information tonight to what the plan says.
Now a point about clarity and specification. The staff papers and discussions with staff cover or imply all of the points that I have mentioned. They're summarized nicely on page 53 and they've been expanded eloquently here this evening.
But, and this is a rather big but. Some of the commentary makes rather liberal use of conditional expressions such as conserve, minimum, maximum, optimum etc. All fully understandable at this stage, but the studies must quickly get beyond generalities, which may lapse into being empty platitudes.

	Council will need to insist on specific values. The message is: Sit the parameters early in the game. Otherwise, good intentions tend to degenerate into mediocre results. There was for example an article in the Globe & Mail yesterday about Toronto's dilemma concerning planning and the temptation and pressure for regulations to be distorted. And I needn't say to Council that Council must be diligent to avoid the Ontario Municipal Board's intervention and influence – negative influences could
	easily upset very good plans.
	In conclusion, the creation of these new communities will take two or three decades. In the case of our rather ancient committee members, most of us will not see its completion. Indeed, within committee we joked that some of us may not even see it start.
	This Council and those which will follow will have many reports and studies to consider and countless delegations to hear. We can only wish you well and at the same time, urge close attention to sensitive details and apply appropriate rigor to adhere to the principles expounded in this present study. Thank-you your Worship.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank-you very much. Any questions? Councillor Flynn and then Councillor Wright.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Harry, short question. You made a point that I think a lot of people think is true and I just wanted to explore it a little further, where you said that a larger tax base should lead to more people sharing the fixed costs of the community, which everyone would like to believe is the outcome of growth.
	But if you read what's in the Official Plan Amendment on Page A113, it says that it's at a rate and in sequence with the economic means of the municipality.
	It's come to my attention in recent years that growth is costing existing taxpayers money. It's not lessening the

	tax base, it's actually increasing the cost to existing ratepayers. Would you agree that this is a time to explore that sort of relationship.
Harry Wogden (Delegate)	Yes, of course. Because if it's a case of the arithmetic of more volume, but a fixed amount of ongoing costs, it must have a beneficial effect somewhere in the arithmetic.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	You would think it would and you would hope it would and it would make sense that it would in the infrastructure of the community
Harry Wogden (Delegate)	If it doesn't, there's something wrong.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Exactly. Thank-you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank-you. Councillor Wright.
Councillor Janice Wright	Thank-you Harry for your presentation. I just wanted to say that I appreciate your open approach to the task at hand and was wondering if we could receive a copy of your presentation.
Harry Wogden (Delegate)	If you can read it, certainly.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	If you will, Kathy Patrick will come and get it and we can reformat it if there's a problem. Thank-you very much Mr. Wogden. Before we call forward the next delegation, the microphone system has been changed here and you don't have to get as close to it. There's normally a note that says that on the podium in recent weeks, but because we've got the registration sheet there, it might be covered up. Just so that speakers know that, you'll hear it's very sensitive so if you touch it in any way, it sort of communicates in a way you hadn't intended and it's reverberating through the other rooms as well. So, the next speaker?
Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk	The next speaker is Mike Lansdown, and as Mike makes his way down here, I'd like to advise that the next five speakers are Moira Lansdown, Liz Behrens, Ben Phillips, Owen Godfrey and Peter Pellier.

Part II - June 26, 2001

Mayor Ann Mulvale	I may have, Councillor Caster, did you have a question
	that I'd missed, I'm sorry.
Councillor Janice Caster	Your worship, maybe perhaps we could ask for each presentation to get a copy of each of them so we could look at them.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Sure, so we don't have to ask them. If people would leave or subsequently deliver to the Clerk's Department by electronic means or whatever, a copy of their presentation, they'll all be circulated to the Members of Council.
Councillor Janice Caster	Thank-you.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate), Oakville Green	It'll just take us a minute to set up the projector your worship.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Mr. Lansdown, I understand you're speaking as an individual and then you're speaking in terms of the Oakville Green, so feel free to just take the one presentation, what?
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	I would rather not speak continuously. I will probably run out of gas. And I think the audience would be extremely bored, if I might suggest. So, if I may present on behalf of Oakville Green and then perhaps you'd have the courtesy of calling me back later as I might
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Certainly. Just trying to understand how you'd like to be dealt with. That's fine.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	Thank-you. Just need to fire up the machine here.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	I think the Planning Director's a little concerned about the term 'fire up.' We'll get some help from the IT department for you.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	I'm hearing noises.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	It's probably warming up. It's probably less threatening than firing up.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	Yes, thank-you. Perhaps while we're waiting for the machine, through your worship I'd just like to compliment Councillor Sanderson on her change in pen. We really like the green plume, Councillor Sanderson, as a replacement for that rather vivid vermilion. The green is a great

Part II - June 26, 2001

	improvement, your honor.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	I need to know Mr. Lansdown if someone bribed her with it or if she just came as a coincidence with a change of pen.
Councillor Jody Sanderson	If I may, it was a gift from Councillor Wright.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Okey-doke. We needed a little brevity while the machine was working - it's always good to do that.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	Could you switch to slide, please? Technology is a marvelous thing, your worship, when it works. We do have a back up.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	It looks like it's working.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	Fantastic. Now we'll see if the speaker can work.
	Good evening Mayor Mulvale, Members of Council, Town staff and fellow residents. My name is Mike Lansdown, I am a resident of Oakville and it is my duty to address you on behalf of Oakville Green in regard to OPA 198.
	First I would like to describe the current situation as we see it. The present situation to us looks somewhat as follows:
	First of all, traffic gridlock. Halton Region stated in these meetings last summer that the traffic will at best only stay the same, even with the opening of the new roadways and the widening of the existing roads. So as far as traffic is concerned, when we develop these lands north of Highway 5 we will have no improved situation than we face in Oakville right now.
	Air quality has been spoken to far better than I could by a former speaker, so I'll merely add to his comments to say poor air quality isn't acknowledged in this particular corridor right now. We've had a smog alert this last week and another smog alert this week. And so I think that substantiates what the former speaker was telling us in the

area of air quality. And also, part of an information package which Council received last year told us that 1,500 people die in the GTA each year with air-quality related illnesses. So, I think we have fair evidence that air could be improved in the GTA area.
Creek health is declining. We had a report from the Conservation Halton at a Council meeting recently and they told us that, they gave us a report card for the creek situation in our area. This is their watershed report card and they said even with good progress demonstrated in the conservation plan, watershed creeks are more threatened than ever before. Rapid urban expansion and watershed population growth will have a negative effect on creeks and groundwater if careful planning and conservation efforts are neglected.
So we believe that the situation in our creeks is one that has to be watched very carefully and we're hearing from a gentleman who happens to monitor the number of Redside Dace in 14 Mile Creek that that population is declining too. And they are kind of, I'm told, the canaries of the creeks.
Forest cover is the lowest in Halton. That's already been referenced. It's 13.5 per cent right now and that does not include, excuse me, that data is from 1995 and since then we've lost further chunks of forest from the Shell lands, West Oak Trails, along Dorval and along 407. We're about to lose woods on Richview golf course. The 13.5 per cent also includes the forests north of Dundas that await your protection tonight if the OPA is amended.
When Doctor Kenny, Professor of Forestry at U of T spoke to the Town last week, a very interesting panel, we learned from their survey, by the form of Environics Report, that 84 per cent of Ontario residents said that trees were 'very important' and 14 per cent in the survey said 'fairly important,' for a total of 98 per cent.
Growth is costing us money, excuse me, Oakville has also lost three out of seven ESAs since 1976. As people probably know an ESA is an Environmentally Sensitive

Area, as designated by the Region. The Region had designated in about 1976, I think it was 37 or 38 ESAs. Seven of them were in Oakville. At the moment, we only have four left. We lost Burloak Woods, Wildflower Woods, Joshua Creek and a large chunk of Iroquois shoreline woods through development.
Growth is costing us money. The Region recently produced Report CS30-10 that tells us that growth is having to be funded out of operating costs. And frankly, the debt servicing charges going forward for somebody on a fixed income are somewhat scary.
We lack the infrastructure and that was also referenced by a former speaker so I won't go into detail but we continually hear about the lack of doctors, hospitals, schools and roads.
There's a growing public outcry against rapid growth and its effects. Last year you might have said that the Oakville Green were tree huggers who threw around dead animals and spray paint. We were accused of that at one meeting. We might have been considered not mainstream. But when the National Geographic Magazine comes in, your worship, for this month and it is talking about urban sprawl and Toronto Life is talking about urban sprawl, I rather think that this topic has become a mainstream item. We're no longer on the outside.
But, apart from all this, we're still about to grow by 50 per cent or more without what we see as solutions to these problems.
This is what we call the line in the sand. To emphasize the importance of corporate change back in the late '80s, a rather gruesome story was used in many corporate meetings involving a frog.
The story, which I rather hope was fabricated, compared corporate reaction to change to that of the autonomic reaction of a frog to temperature change. The story purported that if a frog was dropped into a beaker of hot water, its autonomic nervous system recognized the

temperature shift and caused the frog to jump to safety. The story went on to claim that, on the other hand, if the frog was placed in a beaker of water at room temperature and the water was then gradually heated up, the frog would continue to swim around happily in the beaker with no attempt to escape until it finally succumbs to the heat.
The moral of the story, of course being, that the corporation that neglects to react to changes in its business environment will surely perish.
Likewise with the residents of Oakville, Mayor Mulvale. Every development application that Council approves just keeps turning up the heat on the frog in terms of our natural environment, with particular regard for both traffic and air quality.
The question then is, who will draw the line? Oakville Green brought the growth issues to Council's attention back in June of last year and as we prepared for this meeting it was disappointing to look back on our presentations to Council last year and find that so little had changed. If you'll forgive my French, plus ca change, plus c'est la meme chose.
Le Maire, the major issues we talked about last year still remain on the table unaddressed. Except that some, like traffic and air quality, have become, in our opinion, measurably worse.
For example, just consider the development applications which have frequently raised the traffic issue in these Council chambers. And the last one was the Metrus Lands and Council, in that case you might recall, had to put a cap on the build-on of that at 900 until we do another traffic survey to make sure that people are able to move. And that is the importance of traffic as it appears in Oakville.
As was referenced by a former speaker I seem to be repeating continuously - and I agree with Councillor Oliver, I think it was an excellent presentation, the young man made, he stole my thunder totally – Toronto, the

provincial government has come up with their get engaged in Ontario Smart Growth. I'm sure you've all seen the ads and I'm sure you've all written your letters - have you - to Mr. Hodgson? I did and I copied your Worship.
Queens Park is now running expensive ads asking how do we tackle gridlock, protect the environment - tell us how to make this happen in your community. Well, that's what we believe Oakville Green has been doing for over a year. This acknowledges that these are province-wide problems, not Oakville's alone. It also acknowledges that nothing concrete is being done at either provincial and regional levels and frankly I was heartened to hear the Mayor interviewed on CBC this morning and telling us that she is working on these items at those levels.
OPA must be deferred, as far as we're concerned, until the issues are resolved. We are asking Council to draw that line in the sand. We the frogs are asking Council to draw that line in the sand and tell both regional and provincial governments that further development is morally irresponsible until mass transit and air remediation plans are in place in the Toronto/Hamilton corridor.
Please note, we are not blaming anyone, we are merely asking that our elected representatives, particular with Mayor Mulvale as current President of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, take a strong leadership position on Ontario's behalf, using Oakville as a role model. We truly believe the residents of Oakville will support the Mayor in this effort, including challenges at the OMB.
And in the meantime, while we're waiting for that to happen, because that is not going to happen overnight, we realize that, let's work on improved on an improved and stronger OPA for Oakville. These are the reasons why we need a stronger OPA in our opinion:
First of all, it provides a stronger defence when and if challenged. And challenged it certainly will be. Developers have been known to file their applications for

subdivision with the municipality and simultaneously file a challenge with the OMB. It's happening all the time, it's happened here in Oakville.
Our children will not have to fight for the preservation of every forest in every development application for the next few decades. Currently the OPA does not protect the forest in the north, especially the establishment of a system.
We believe the roads are weak and will require fighting every step of the way to ensure preservation. Nature does not understand boundaries. Only human beings understand boundaries. Nature does not understand lines.
Developers need to know, excuse me. Regardless of future personnel changes, both staff and Council will clearly understand the vision of the plan, if we can get the wording right now. Developers need to know what sections of land will be protected. The intent of the plan must be straightforward and clear at the outset. Problems arise when goals are not clear, is what LGL told us and I can believe that to be the case.
Now what's missing in the OPA 198 in our opinion is the following:
First of all, protection for the natural heritage system. Protection for the Trafalgar Moraine, a plan to eliminate the need for the Burnhamthorpe bridge, recognition of growth problems and plans to resolve them, an environmental management plan and conformity to an updated Regional Plan.
The, as Ted I think noted, the Region is currently updating its Official Plan, which is likely to provide recognition and additional protection for tableland woodlands, which isn't there right now, and other environmental features.
So, I was interested Ted when you told us that when the Region changes their Official Plan, then it's important for the municipalities to fall into line with those changes. The problem would be though that if they changed their plan

too late, and we'd already built over those forests, it
would be awful hard to put those forests back in again. I don't know how we'd do that.
I will now handle each one of these items.
The natural heritage system: We would like to see the OPA map and lock in the natural heritage system from Burlington to Mississauga. The natural heritage system, for those who are not aware of it, are 1,250 acres of identified environmentally significant lands plus their linkages. This is under 20 per cent of the total area to be develop, not one third as some had suggested in the press.
The value is in the system as a whole, not as fragmented pieces of forest and right now when you see the maps they appear as fragmented pieces of forest and the intent that LGL gave us, was to develop this into a system and that's what we want to shoot for.
We want to see unconditional wording used in the OPA. For example Item 23 in the OPA merely refers to refining boundaries. That does not, it says nothing about protecting or maintaining it as a system. Although Item 23 does refer to the natural heritage system, it only refers to refining boundaries when we get to the secondary planning process and that's no way to embed the system into the plan. Those words are weak.
Item 26 in the OPA refers to a natural heritage/open space system. Well what, you know, we haven't made up our minds quite what it is and as far as LGL was concerned, it was totally clear, it was a natural heritage system.
We don't know this is the same one that we're talking about in the LGL study the way it's referenced right now. If it is, let's say, clearly: 'To establish a natural heritage system, including east-west linkages from Burlington to Mississauga, which implements the recommendations of the North Oakville Natural Heritage Inventory and Analysis.' It's quite easy to do and that would be totally clear and understandable.

The rest of the OPA is very clear and concise. The section about the natural heritage system is vague, unclear and imprecise. We're using words like potential, attempts and that kind of thing.
We'd like to suggest that we know in Oakville, we know full well, how to write unconditional wording. If we look at what we've got in the present Official Plan for the linear waterfront park system, we say there, "The linear waterfront park system will generally form a linear corridor of open space along the Lake Ontario shoreline, consisting of etc., etc., etc." It's very precise and unconditional. That's what we'd like to see for the natural heritage system.
The Trafalgar Moraine: The Trafalgar Moraine, it transverses two thirds of the North Oakville study area, as explained in the LGL study and forms the headwaters of six Oakville creeks, which flow through Southeast Oakville. And it's identified as being important for the groundwater recharge of those creeks. And most of the tableland woodlots and virtually all of the mature stands occur on top of that Trafalgar Moraine area.
At present, it is not identified, it is not even mentioned in the OPA. And our belief is that further study is necessary for two reasons. First of all the General Manager of the Credit Valley Conservation Association - the past one I guess, she's just changed – she said that rivers act up when 20 per cent of their watershed is paved over and is seriously stressed when 40 per cent is under development.
NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center specializes in satellite mapping. They tell us that, in general, once 10 to 15 per cent of an area is covered by impervious surfaces, increased settlements and chemical pollutants in run-off have a measurable effect on water quality. They go on to say that when 15 to 25 per cent of the watershed is paved over, increased run-off leads to reduced oxygen levels and impaired streamline. When more than 25 per cent of surfaces are paved, many types of stream life die from the concentrated run-off and sediments. And that work was done in Maryland, regarding the tributaries that flow into

the Chesapeke Bay. And that's available on their website if anybody wishes to verify that information.
So, our position is that the Trafalgar Moraine needs to be written into this OPA, because it needs further study.
The Burnhamthorpe bridge has been again spoken to by a previous speaker so I'll abbreviate my comments. The community needs to be designed so the bridge will not be necessary. We respectfully submit that a do-nothing alternative is no help to anyone. If it's going to be rephrased, perhaps as a preserve approach, it might be better. But our suggestion is that what we look for is to design a community so that a bridge won't be necessary and you heard some excellent suggestions this evening on that.
The money saved can be invested in preservation and acquisition and as was noted earlier, this was a recommendation that came from EEAC.
We believe that Oakville needs to develop an environmental management plan. This is something new, we have not addressed this before, but from the time we've been working on this, this is one of the products that we've come up with.
We believe that Oakville needs to develop an environmental vision, strategy and an implementation plan. This is to cover not just North Oakville, but the whole Town, the whole municipality.
We believe it needs to contain measurable benchmarks for environmental factors, including but not limited to forest cover, air quality and water quality. And those benchmarks need timelines – when we're going to meet them. We believe the plan should be co-ordinated by a qualified environmental planner who reports directly to Town Council because of the importance of this particular area. And we want to see citizen involvement in each phase of the plan: The design phase, the implementation and then the auditing phase.

	Part II	- June 2	<u>26, 2001</u>
--	---------	----------	-----------------

We'd also like to address, before we finish, some of the perceived obstacles which have been brought up in the past.
One is the OMB. The OMB in 1978, the Town said no to any development. No, they said, no to any development in the north of QEW. This was challenged, this was 25 years ago, and we submit that things have changed. We know that the OMB itself has changed. We're told that they've gone more from direct arbitration, more to a mediator type of position. We now have demonstrable problems, like poor air quality, sprawl, traffic problems. We have things we can talk to these folk about, which I think they would understand because they must be reading the same newspapers that I am.
Now we accept growth. But it must be responsible and ecologically sustainable. So we've changed from when we lost at the OMB, we were always told about this back in 1978. We've heard it so many times I repeat it in my sleep.
We took a no growth position at that time. And we're not now saying no growth. What we're saying is responsible growth, ladies and gentlemen.
So we don't believe that the OMB, and we only hear when we lose at the OMB. Let's remind ourselves that we were taken to the OMB by I think it was Home Depot or their representatives or something. We won that. So it is possible to win at the OMB. You don't just lose at the OMB and at some point one has to stand up and be counted and test the water.
The second point is we've been told we need to grow in order to generate revenue. We've been told we need to grow to increase net revenue. As I mentioned earlier, this is not true. Growth is actually costing us money.
We know the report from the Region tells us quite clearly that the development charges, which are assessed to the developers, which they tell me are very substantial, are not adequate to cover the cost of the infrastructure that has

to be put in to support growth. It's as simple as that.
Air quality is not a local issue. That's what we're being told. When we bring up the question of air quality, we're told, that's not a local issue, there's nothing we can do about that. Well, we'll eventually die from non-local issues if we don't do something about it. We need to at least make our best effort to control this problem. In Item 7 of OPA 198 the Town says it will minimize pollution. This is not good enough. Pollution must be reduced is where we're coming from.
We can't afford to save the forests, that's what we've been told. We can't afford to save the forests. Well, we believe we can't afford not to save the forests. They provide ecological, social and economic benefits. We've pointed this out to the task force. We've covered this quite clearly and it's quite obvious that there is a big value to forests. We don't know of any other way to clean air, ladies and gentlemen, other than forests and vegetation. We don't know of an air cleaning plant that we can put in, you know a manufacturing plant that we could put in here that will clean the local air. So our feeling is that we can't afford not to save the forests.
Also, we've been told we'll do it later, usually at the secondary planning stage. Well, it seems to me that if we leave it until the secondary planning stage, you can't plan things piecemeal. If you're going to have a system, and that's what we're looking for, a natural heritage system, it's got to be done in one fell swoop. You can't piecemeal plan a system. It doesn't make logical sense. Nature, again, does not understand boundaries.
So, in summary, our position and I know this may annoy some people, but we're saying whoa, let's defer development until we get control of the transportation systems and the air quality. Let's strengthen OPA 198 and let's develop and implement an environmental management plan for Oakville. And while we're doing it, let's ensure that we will have meaningful public participation throughout the process.

This doesn't come out to clearly, but this is our frog who has hopped out of the boiling water and is sitting on a button bush leaf. This is the same swamp which is mentioned in OPA 198. The conclusion we believe is - our conclusion is that we can release the frog from the pot by ensuring development is right for all stakeholders.
And in terms of development, the right for all stakeholders, the provincial policy statement says, "Wisely managed growth can result in communities which are economically and environmentally sound and which meet the full range of needs of their current and future residents. Doing things right the first time can avoid the need for costly remedial measures to correct problems." And that's the provincial government talking.
A simple question to you, Mayor and Councillors: Are you committed to preserve the natural heritage system in North Oakville? If the answer is yes, then we ask you to put your commitment in the OPA, place that commitment in the OPA.
And finally, this time, please let's not just call the question as we did last year. We wait to hear your discussion and debate about this very important issue. The people want to hear, would like to hear, directly from their Councillors on where they stand on these things.
And in conclusion, I have one specific question that I would like to pass on to staff, because I mentioned that you said we could pass on questions, and that is the question of timing.
We've heard a range of timing in relation to the development of North Oakville, which ranges from on one hand fast-tracking the employment land on the west end. And of course we know there are no phasing, phasing does not apply to employment lands so all we need for that to have in place is the pipes and then we can go ahead and we can develop that employment land. So that would be sort of the short term area as I see it.
And then the longer term measure I've heard is that, I've

	heard the Mayor talking about a 30-year, this is going to go over 30 years. And of course in the plan itself, we talk about having most of the build-out in place by 2016. So, at some point, from staff, I'd like to understand is it 30 years way out here, is it like three years hence for the employment land to start. Where are we, what is the timing? I think Mrs. Gough told us this evening that was Phase II, is 60 per cent built out right now so Phase III can start when we get to 75 per cent. And that's probably three, four years away or something like that. So, I think we would like to understand a lot better what the timeline is on this plan.
	Thank-you for your indulgence. I'm sure I've gone over the stipulated 10 minutes and I do appreciate that. And if there are any questions your Worship, I would be happy to answer.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	We appreciate your succinct and very thorough presentation and also the fact you circulated copies of your overheads to us all in advance. It's most useful. Questions? Councillor Wright.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	The frog didn't come out well. (Laughter)
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Well you never can depend on those frogs. Councillor Wright.
Councillor Janice Wright	Yes Michael, I wanted to thank you for circulating this issue of the article in National Geographic, quite informative. And it states in there that the solution to sprawl is higher density within the existing boundaries. So I then wanted to know if you would submit that Oakville Green is in favor of higher densities in residential areas.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	In general I'd say yes we are. We have not had, I can't say that we've had a long and extensive debate to reach a complete consensus that I would be able to pass directly to you, but in general Oakville Green would support higher densities, yes.

Councillor Janice Wright	All right. Would you also submit, then in the Smart Growth initiative that's outlined in here that it's imperative that part of the planning process has to incorporate both employment and residential uses so that we can eliminate some of the pollutants in the air by making work/live situations possible.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	I'm sorry, do we support, it was a bit of a long question, would you mind repeating it? I may have missed something.
Councillor Janice Wright	I wanted to know if you were in agreement with the Smart Growth policies outlined also in this article that it is imperative that we create environments where there are work/live situations so that we can then utilize that as one of the ways of minimizing pollution.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	Thank-you. I'm sorry I missed the question. Yes, we certainly would and at no point in the discussions or debates or whatever meetings that Oakville Green has been involved in have we ever taken any other position. We've always been in favor of a balanced approach to planning for North Oakville, which means that we would have a balance of, and in fact the very fine article which David Cash, the Managing Director of OEDA, did I get that right? Oakville Economic Development Alliance, the excellent article that he put into the Oakville flyer in a recent copy of the Globe & Mail talked about one-third, one-third. We'd love to see that. That would be ideal.
Councillor Janice Wright	Thank-you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Councillor Robinson.
Councillor Ralph Robinson	Thank-you your Worship. Mr. Lansdown, in my opinion Oakville Green has arrived and that you're a very credible and recognizable force in our community and I thank you for what you're doing. In your personal deliberations and in your talks and in
	In your personal deliberations and in your talks and in your e-mails and your correspondence, you identified three factors that are very significant to the Town, in your opinion. And I think in the opinion of many others.
	opinion. This I think in the opinion of many others.

	One was the need for better transportation and this has been alluded to – not alluded to, specifically talked about by different people here this evening – the quality of air and the improvement and then your research – and you used Whitby as an example – of how the public are more specifically legislated to become involved in planning matters. Those are three major points and as I understand it, you and Oakville Green, think it would be appropriate for those three points to be incorporated into this OPA. Am I correct?
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	Um, you embarrass me sir.
Councillor Ralph Robinson	Well I didn't mean to do that.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	No, no, no. The comments you refer to I submitted as a private resident of Oakville. They were not submitted on behalf of Oakville Green. On the other hand, of the three points you make, you mentioned, I can confirm that Oakville Green would certainly support the points one and two about the need for mass transit and air quality. We have not had a discussion regarding involvement of people in the planning area, in the planning process, but I don't think they would disagree with it.
Councillor Ralph Robinson	I'm sorry Michael, I didn't mean to embarrass you. I thought there were three, I thought there were three
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	No, no. I just wanted to, I had to divorce myself privately from my connections with an association.
Councillor Ralph Robinson	So, can I talk to you as Michael Lansdown or a member of (laughter). Is it correct that at least you feel the time has now come for these three factors to become a significant part of our Official Plan.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	Yes, it is Councillor Robinson. And I'll elaborate if I may for a second on the item and that is the third one, which has not been discussed by Oakville Green and therefore I can't give you a definite Oakville Green position on it, but my personal position because of my – I've been part of this subcommittee on Councillor Sanderson's Open Space

	Task Force.
	We reviewed a whole bunch of OPAs and secondary plans for I think it's what eight or so other municipalities and I found in those other official plans that other towns are doing a lot of work in that area.
	And so I have yes, some definite recommendations to make about involving residents in the planning process and very much so when we get into the secondary planning process.
Councillor Ralph Robinson	Thank-you for those three initiatives. Thank-you your Worship.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Councillor Sanderson.
Councillor Jody Sanderson	Thank-you your Worship. Now Mike there's several things that we agree on and this is one of them: We agree that there should be measurable benchmarks to the things that we're using to identify for example woodlots. So we have categories one to five identifying woodlots. One of the things that you said
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	I'm sorry, what categories for woodlots?
Councillor Jody Sanderson	One to five.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	Uh, okay.
Councillor Jody Sanderson	One and two, three and four, and five.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	I see, okay.
Councillor Jody Sanderson	But what I'm referencing that to is qualitative and quantitative benchmarks. You're asking for a deferral of consideration of OPA198 based on that we would deal with air quality and transportation. And what I'm asking is how would you, how would we know that we've achieved the right place. How would we
	know that we've achieved the point where yes, we've addressed air quality and yes, we've addressed transportation and we can go ahead. What would be those benchmarks?
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	That's an extremely good questions and I'll try and answer it. May I just comment on the woodland categorization first of all.

	The one through five I think was LGL, and I believe our Official Plan actually categorized them as environmental one and environmental, oh, Town area one and Town area two, I don't know whether or not staff can help me with that, but I think there is a difference between the categorization system for LGL and the OP.
	In regard to your direct questions on benchmarks Councillor Sanderson, I believe that the first one on mass transit would be satisfied when and if we could get, when and if Council could get a commitment from either the regional or the fed or the provicinal or if Mayor Mulvale could work that high at the federal level and I think she probably can and does, to increase the amount or install, however you want to put it, high speed mass transit system through this corridor that will service this area better than it's being serviced right now.
	I'm told that, I believe I'm right in saying that the 407 corridor was built or designed with space for an eventual transit corridor and it might make sense to have that in place, or at least the commitment for the funds to pub that in place before we actually go ahead and start work on that land.
	Now, your second question is a more difficult one and I have to admit to you that I don't think I can answer that one tonight. I would have to go back and take that under consideration and try and come back to you. And that's the one on air quality. Because I've not studied that deeply enough to understand what the present standards are and I need to go look at that and come back here. So I'm sorry I can't answer the second question.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Councillor Flynn.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Thank-you your worship. Mike you explained in your presentation the importance of including the Trafalgar Moraine in your presentation.
	Now I've heard politicians sort of go to the point of even laughing when somebody mentions that we have a moraine up there. For some reason, people find some

	humor in that. You can confirm that there is a moraine in North Oakville, and what sort of a response do you get, it would seem to me to be almost a slam-dunk that you would include that in your Official Plan. What sort of a response have you got to date as to why it should not be included?
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	I think there are two questions there, I'll try to answer two questions.
	First of all, is there a moraine there? The LGL study is quite clear on that point. The LGL study - I forget the date 1999, whatever it was June, May – is perfectly clear on that point. It delineates exactly precisely where that moraine is, it describes it and it describes it as running through two-thirds of the study area.
	I haven't been up and measured it myself, I'm not familiar with moraines, so. Ah, but that's where, that's the source of the information.
	Your second question was related to
Councillor Kevin Flynn	The sort of a response you've got so far when you bring up the point that we should be including this in the official plans. What are the reasons for not including it?
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	The reason for not including it, and we've had discussions with staff on that, the reason for not including it is that it will be handled perfectly satisfactorily in an automatic fashion when we get to the sub-watershed management planning stage. And if you read Section F, Appendix 2 of the Official Plan, which describes how we, what we require in our sub-watershed planning studies. You will see that the staff comment on that is totally correct.
	Where we tend to differ a little bit is the fact that this is rather an unusual feature and it has, we believe if LGL is correct, it could have a very high leverage effect on the six creeks that flow out of it. And the way it's designed right now, most of the tableland woodlands, and those are going to be the difficult ones to preserve, the ones in the valley of course are easy because that's hazard land. The

Councillor Kevin Flynn Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	 ones on the tablelands are the difficult ones because we don't have this revised Regional Official Plan yet. Most of the tableland woodlots are located on top of the moraine. Okay. Did the staff explain to you any reason why it would be of any detriment to the community to mention it in the Official Plan, even if in their opinion it was not necessary. No sir.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Thank-you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Any further questions for Mr. Lansdown? I see not.
	Thank-you sir.
Mike Lansdown (Delegate)	Thank-you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Next speaker, Madam Clerk.
Christine Shewchuk,	The next delegation is Moira Lansdown.
Assistant Clerk	
Moira Lansdown (Delegate)	 Good evening Mayor Mulvale and Councillors. My name is Moira Lansdown and I spoke on the subject of traffic a year ago and I'm going to repeat myself. At the meeting a year ago, I expressed my concerns regarding total gridlock traffic and the fear that with growing non-stop development this situation could only get worse. We are now faced with the Metrus development of the shoal lands north of Lakeshore Road, west of Burloak and south of Rebecca; construction on Bronte Road above Upper Middle Road; development on Bronte north of Halton Region offices; and the future development of the Richview golf course – due I believe to start in three or four years. All of this, before any development of the huge tract of lands north of Highway 5. I would like to draw Council's attention to the fact that Bronte Road has not been widened to meet the increased traffic once the Rebecca Bridge and the 407 are opened.
	And it seems to me the 407 will be obsolete before it

	opens, given the development in Burlington, Hamilton, Ancaster, Grimsby and towns further west to say nothing of the expansion of development on the lands to the south of Milton – all of which, all of whom will presumably be using the 407.
	I would like to know why Oakville Council insist on rushing along with development, with no plans in sight for increased public transportation – railway, buses, even to use the waterways.
	I would also like to know how local business will be able to cope with an ever-increasing gridlock. As an example, I know of at least one business where the owner has told his people to get off the road by 2:30 p.m. because it's just a waste of time sitting in gridlock.
	This is a terrible advertisement for the pious live/work statements incorporated in the OPA. Or for attracting new business to Oakville. As Councillor Sanderson told us a year ago, if we can't move, we can't grow.
	I want to know what positive steps Oakville Council has taken, or is prepared to take to coerce the regional and provincial governments into funding rapid mass transit systems for the Niagara/Toronto corridor. Thank-you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	If I can assist you on the latter category, there was announcements yesterday on moving forward on the inter- provincial connection that did not exclude water and rail. Now I brought back the copies from the press conference for Councillors. They should have gone in your boxes today.
	We continue by our role, Councillor Bird and myself at the Greater Toronto Service Board, to support resolutions to speak to them. I did speak to the Premier yesterday and I also spoke to the Minister of the Environment today.
	And Council empowered me, encouraged me in fact, to seek the office of Presidency of AMO, because we have a commitment to increasing our sphere of influence beyond the boundaries of our Town.

	And I can tell you, my schedule has increased. Technology helps. I'm trying not to not be at the helm of the ship as the Mayor, but this Council and the staff have been very – and the public, given I was acclaimed after I was elected President in August of last year. So we continue to work on those fronts because we agree with you totally in terms of unless the federal and provincial governments come back to the table in a meaningful way on infrastructure
	Yesterday, Monday, I also, before I met the Premier at the announcement in Grimsby, met with a representative of the Federal Government on the task force that the Prime Minister has called together.
	From a Federation of Canadian Municipalities viewpoint, we think right focus, wrong timeframe because they've given it 18 months. I was encouraged to learn that there was at least one member of the Liberal caucus who believes the same and is working to shorten the time frame.
	And none of these issues on Smart Growth, or the task force of the Prime Minister, in my mind as an individual, have any credibility at all, unless they very quickly address the funding issue.
	So we're striving for sustainable funding, for sustainable community. The FCM report, which is posted on the AMO website, deals with the fact of whether our communities will in fact be competitive in a global marketplace without similar funding achievable in the United States particularly on inter-regional transit and elsewhere in Europe and other continental America countries.
	So we are aggressively – we've sent staff to the Trade Corridors conferences and we report back. Now, we believe totally the need to continue that pressure.
Moira Lansdown (Delegate)	Thank-you.

Mayor Ann Mulvale	Any questions? Councillor Flynn.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Yes, just sort of following up on that Mrs. Lansdown: Is your point, is the point you were trying to make, is that until – is this Council prepared to say that it will not grow until these transportation modes are in place. That seemed to be the thrust of your presentation.
Moira Lansdown (Delegate)	Yes. I would like to see Council slow down until something is done about the traffic. Absolutely.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	So, until a senior level of government perhaps comes to the table and says, yes we will help, we'll assist in some way, you're preference would be that this Council say up until that time, perhaps we'll take a very slow approach to growth.
Moira Lansdown (Delegate)	Yes. Exactly.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	And Councillor Bird, did you have a question?
Councillor Keith Bird	 Yeah, I think what you're trying to say and it's been consistent is that we know of no other area in the world that runs mass transit out of property tax. So as long as our tax structure is the same, the question is simple, that in fact do we have the right to put a moratorium on growth because the existing tax base doesn't have the wherewithal to fund the cost of mass transit. And as long as mass transit is put on there, I mean we might as well adjourn the meeting, say that the existing zoning stays and go home. But I don't think that we have that, although as you know, we've talked to Colinette a great number of times. And I don't know. We're the only municipality that we could find out, or jurisdiction in the world that does not have the senior levels of government fund mass transit. I wish you and Oakville Green and everybody to help us to suggest if you're going to have a proper system as you say, that it's being unloaded to now.
Marion Lansdown	I would have thought it would have been the Federal

(Delegate)	Government and the Provincial Government that funded the money for mass transit.
Councillor Keith Bird	No that has been downloaded. That's the problem, you've listened to the debate with the TTC and everything else that there is not the tax base to continue to support mass transit on the, at the municipal level. But it has, that's where it rests and as I say we're unique in the world. I don't know if they're expecting it to work or not to work. My gut feeling is they're expecting it not to work, if that's the way it's going to be funded.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	If I could add that there are clear signs, both from FCM and from AMO's connections and the staff certainly had some signal of this, that there was serious consideration for them coming back into the funding of inter-regional and mass transit. It'll be on the capital and not necessarily the operating, but that's a significant step in the right direction.
	Someone referenced the corridor for mass transit in 407. That has, there have been reports on that in terms of, and we're trying to aggressively add onto that a link down to the Go Station in Oakville and the 403. So high-level macro planning, they are getting the message. I can assure you. Because I bore myself with the number of times I repeat it. It's constant and I think we're going to start to see some announcements. We may well, they're holding them back in part because of the outcome of whether there's an Olympic announcement or not.
	But we have made it clear. With or without an Olympic announcement, we need mass transit, we need the Federal and Provincial governments – We're now getting less resistance on the sustainability issue to even considering fuel tax, a percentage of fuel tax.
	Germany, for instance, gives the municipality somewhere in the range of 15 per cent of income tax to deal with infrastructure. So those models are actively being pursued. Minister Hodgson is actually doing an update on Smart Growth later this week. We will have someone from AMO there. So we're tracking The Town Manager

	made mention of the fact that some Councillors and certainly staff have been attending some of those forums. So we appreciate anybody's voice on that. I made mention of that. I think I probably went somewhere where the interviewer this morning didn't want me to go. But I wanted to get on the record the fact that we need the Federal and Provincial monies. So thank-you for re- articulating that.
Marion Lansdown (Delegate)	Thank-you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Next speaker.
Christine Shewchuk,	The next speaker is Liz Behrens
Assistant Clerk	The next spouror is the Domons
Liz Behrens (Delegate)	 Thank-you very much your Worship. Mayor and Members of Council, I'm here this evening actually wearing two hats and I will split them into two presentations. My name is Liz Behrens and I'm the Executive Director for the Bronte Village BIA. And I'm here this evening basically because it has been brought to my attention that there is probably an oversight that has taken place in the OPA and it would be on Page A125, Number 3, which only specifically mentions three major business districts and totally leaves out any reference to the Bronte Business District and the Kerr Street Business District. I would ask that when you deliberate this that in fact those omissions be corrected and that they be brought in under that category. I tried any way that I could to think of why they would not have been there, and it just didn't make any sense your worship, so I would just ask that that correction be made. My second presentation is as an individual, as a citizen that lives within the Town of Oakville. And I would like first of all – perhaps it might seem that I am starting on a negative note. That's not my intent and I promise you that I will end my presentation on a very positive note.

	But first of all, I would like to request if there is a, if the remarks are being taped, I'd like a transcript of Mr. Bazar's remarks, because I would like to take them to my solicitor and consult him on the basis of whether or not I can sue him for slander, libel or defamation of character. He could have stopped by just referring to a Councillor who was not re-elected. The minute he named the individual as the Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee, he made it absolutely clear who he was referring to. So if there's not transcript, I would like a copy of the tape from the television.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	We can make you a copy of the tape - as you know as a former Member of Council, this meeting is being taped. The Clerk will dialogue with you on that tomorrow to ascertain how we'll transfer it to you.
Liz Behrens (Delegate)	Thank-you very much. I also wanted to
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Excuse me. It's also being taped on television so you can do it right off the VCR.
Liz Behrens (Delegate)	Yeah. I would also like just to point out that although I am pleased that someone thinks that I, as a Member of Council had as much influence as I am presumed to have had, I found it to be a total affront not only to the professionalism of the staff of the Town of Oakville, but also to the consultants who did the study as well as to the Councillors who served on the committee.
	In making my presentation, I would like to commend Council and staff for this particular publication, which was I presume sent to every household in the Town of Oakville. It's very informative and I'm sure, for some people who have no understanding of what responsibilities Council have and the number of studies that Council have to go through in order to be able to make decisions, that it is a step closer to bringing citizens up to date on just what exactly does happen within the walls of government, at least local government.
	I am here this evening as I indicated to express my personal opinion. And I said throughout the election

campaign that in fact if I were to have expressed my personal opinion and my personal wish, I do not want Oakville to grow. I like Oakville just the way that it is.
However, I also know realistically that that is not likely to happen. Because growth in this GTA area has certainly as far as I can remember, has been predicted to grow. And Oakville, working with the other municipalities as well as Halton, has been designated over the years a certain population which it had to incorporate within its boundaries.
I have the right to be here this evening to tell you how I feel. Developers also have rights. Landowners have rights. And they have a right to have their views heard. I as an individual expect you as the elected officials representing the interests of this community to maintain control of this municipality.
I also am encouraged by the fact that you will do what you think is in the best interest of the citizens of the Town of Oakville.
I am a little concerned about the wording with respect to the environmental open space, as indicated in the paragraph on Page A29. However – that's the one that refers to the natural heritage link – however I also recognize that there are many factors that will come into determining where that natural heritage link will be and how it can be accommodated on an east/west or north/south basis and may in fact have to wait until you have done your sub-watershed studies, until you have commenced your secondary planning stages so that in fact you can put them into a more concrete form in your zoning by-laws as opposed to it being completely nailed down within the Official Plan.
In conclusion, I would like to ask the Clerk to come down because I would like to make a presentation to Council. And I don't do this to grandstand or to make a specific headline in the newspaper, but I was reminded as I was thinking about what I was going to say to you this evening about a poem that I read probably about 20 years ago or

	more that talked about things that needed to be done, and
	although I can't remember the actual verses of the poem the context was that somebody should do something.
	Well, I would like to be somebody this evening, because nobody has ever defined what somebody is and I would like to be the first to make a pledge of \$100 towards the establishment of that natural heritage link or the preservation of environmental lands, if in fact we do not and cannot get all of it from the developers or through the, without having to raise taxes in order to achieve it. So my pledge to the municipality is \$100 and I would ask certainly if anyone feels inclined to follow my lead, I would certainly think that would be appropriate, but that's not the reason for doing it.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thanks very much for the gesture. We appreciate it and it talks to a voluntary user-pay or philanthropy we could of course, and we would of course, be able to, once realizing our pledges, issue tax receipts. So thank you for that gesture. Is there any questions? Thank-you very much.
Liz Behrens (Delegate)	Thank-you your Worship.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	And just so to help, I'll remind yourself and the audience that Cogeco's taping of this tonight Council session will be broadcast tomorrow Wednesday June 27 th at 1:30 in the afternoon.
Liz Behrens (Delegate)	Thank-you your Worship but that won't do me any much good because I have never had cable TV because I would have to watch myself.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Okay. Well it's just as much for the viewing audience as yourself. And the Clerk will work with you pertaining to the copy of that area of the meeting. Madam Clerk.
Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk	Yes. Ben Phillips is the next delegation.
Ben Phillips (Delegate)	Good evening your Worship and Members of Council. My name is Ben Phillips, I'm with Weston Consulting Group and I'm here tonight on behalf of four landowners who own a combined total of approximately 170 acres of

land within the North Oakville area.
We've already submitted letters to Council and staff outlining our concerns. I believe they're within the Appendix 3 document of the Agenda tonight.
The first landowner that I'd like to speak on behalf of is Dangire Holdings Inc., who are owners of approximately 43 acres of land east of Trafalgar Road, south of Burnhamthorpe Road.
And we'd just like to express our client's opposition to the identification of employment uses for their lands, as is shown within OPA 198.
The proposed General Land Use Map designates the North Oakville area as a Special Study Area. As such, future secondary plans are to determine residential, employment, commercial, institutional and open space land use components for North Oakville.
Yet the proposed Community Organization Map, I think it's Figure 3 that was up on the screen earlier on this evening, it shows the location of residential and employment uses. It's essentially, as we've heard this evening, the same Hemson land use study map that was completed last year and endorsed by Council.
Now, it's our position that this map is inappropriate as it may prejudice the potential land use patterns that are yet to be determined specifically as part of the future secondary plan process.
If Council is to designate North Oakville as an area for future land use studies, it's improper to have a map in the same document that lays out where the land uses are to be.
Ms. Gough acknowledged earlier on tonight that the line between residential and employment has been modified to make sure it matches the environmental buffer recommended in the Hemson study.
If the exact interface line is flexible, as the text in the

OPA seems to suggest, why was the alignment changed over the past month to exactly match the Hemson study?
We ask that the entire North Oakville area be referenced as a Special Study Area in the Community Organization Map, consistent with the proposed general land use map.
We would also ask that the proposed text associated with the proposed community organization map be removed as it implies that only minor changes to the residential employment interface line can be considered during the secondary planning process.
Along with Dangire Holdings, three additional landowners have concerned with the proposed phasing mechanism that will allow for residential development in North Oakville.
Specifically, these landowners are Diam Contractors Limited, who own approximately 85 acres west of Ninth Line north of Dundas Street; 808306 Ontario Limited, who own approximately 38 acres west of Sixth Line; and Grandi Holdings Limited, who own approximately two acres west of Sixth Line.
OPA 198 states that a minimum of 75 per cent of the net developable area within the Phase 2 area located south of Dundas Street must be within registered plans of subdivision prior to any residential development beginning in North Oakville.
Planning staff have confirmed that Phase II includes the West Oak Trails Special Study Area, even though future land uses are still being studied for this large parcel of land and a very general estimate, based on available Town mapping, indicates that it comprises approximately 10 to 15 per cent of the gross Phase 2 area.
In order to create some level of certainty for the timing of development in North Oakville, it's our opinion that only lands currently designated for residential uses in Phase 2 be included in the base land area used to determine when the 75 per cent threshold is achieved.

	This will set the rules as to when North Oakville can start to develop residential uses and add some certainty to the development process. As such, we would request that staff be directed to apply the 75 per cent Phase 2 build out requirement only to lands designated residential in Phase 2 as of June 2001. Thank-you for your consideration of these matters.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank you Sir. Are there any questions for the delegation? Again, staff are noting there will be a response. Thank- you Sir.
Ben Phillips (Delegate)	Thank-you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Could I get a motion to go past the 11 o'clock, Ladies and Gentlemen of Council? Councillor Caster, thank-you. All in favor? Past 11. I need some hands. I don't have any. I have one. I have four. Ralph, sorry did you have your hand up? I have five. Those opposed. Two-three-four. It carries by one vote. A four-five vote. So we're going past the hour of 11 to finish no later than 11:30. Okay. Next delegation.
Christine Shewchuk,	The next delegation is Owen Godfrey. And as Mr.
Assistant Clerk	Godfrey makes his way down to the podium, I'd just advise that the next five delegates are Jim McGowan, Brian Hopkins, Laura Knowlton and Carol Keene.
Godfrey Owen (Delegate)	 Mayor Mulvale, Councillors, Planning Staff, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Godfrey Owen. I am a 32-year resident of Oakville speaking of my own personal concerns and those of GreenTrans, a citizen's committee seeking to educate an inform the public of the true costs of the movement in an auto-dominated society. I speak to Section 7 of the plan concept, which now appears on Addendum Page A118. It is very apparent that this amendment is devoid of vision, just a litany of motherhood planning statements from a textbook. The only element of vision lies with the creation of the natural
	only element of vision lies with the creation of the natural heritage system. That will contribute to our quality of life

and contribute to the planet significantly.
Council, with Regional support, is charged with leadership, to guide us into better ways. These platitudes are unconvincing.
I speak specifically to the transportation concepts. Four concepts are offered: These must be given new focus so that Item 2, which is to establish an efficient link to pedestrian movement system etc., must be elevated to the first priority.
Any incentive for industry and commercial activity must be linked to a convenient labor pool where balance in life between work and play is not jeopardized by spending hours in commuting and polluting.
New design criteria must recognize convenience and provide systems accordingly. Directives to Phase 3 secondary plan must be clear to achieve this.
Item 1 states, "To create a system of roads and transportation corridors." This is a delightfully loose and wooly statement. The sort that has given us Ford Drive. No trucks, but make damn sure our groceries are available.
Development design must have pedestrian-accessible shopping facilities, supported by service corridors that are an integral element that will avoid future selfish conflict and be written in as part of the design vision.
Into this new development area, Council must inject new vision for people and freight movement that is non- polluting and practical. Specifically, a right-of-way for urban transit – probably light rail that would service the area.
And typically, I would suggest this right-of-way would embrace existing areas and facilities. For example, a route from the Bronte Go Station, along an upper hydro right- of-way to service the Regional headquarters, along Bronte Road to the West Oakville Trails community, and into the

	 Palermo terminal. On then into the employment lands crossing 16 Mile Creek and Arrow Point, to connect with the Burnhamthorpe Road alignment. After Trafalgar, it would break east toward Dundas Street and the Mississauga boundary, then along the greenbelt hydro right-of-way to a new terminal adjacent to a new Go transit station at the Ford plant. Future spur developments exist for a loop along Upper Middle Road, with southwesterly potential to connect with Burlington and Hamilton. Likewise, connections in Neyagawa for Milton and along Burnhamthorpe to the Mississauga terminal at Square One. Such a vision would add clear definition to the statement of paragraph three and the fourth paragraph as a result could be deleted, as it's already addressed and included in paragraph two.
	This vision would make Oakville different, a place to live, a place to work, a place to play that would of necessity strengthen a vibrant community that shows leadership to Ontario and Canada.
	I challenge you to get out of the textbook and into a practical, less polluting community more fitting the 21 st Century. I thank you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank-you very much, Mr. Owen. Are there any questions for Mr. Owen? Councillor Elgar.
Councillor Allan Elgar	Yes. I just wondered if we could get a copy of that presentation also.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Yes. We've asked as you may recall, we've asked everyone to file them and we'll circulate them. Thank-you very much.
Godfrey Owen (Delegate)	Thank-you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Next speaker.
Christine Shewchuk,	Yes. Two individuals, your Worship, have requested to
Assistant Clerk	speak at the next meeting so at the appropriate time I'll be

	calling forward Gisela Benke and Michael Benke, but at this point Peter Pellier could come forward to the podium. (Pause) Jim McGowan. (Pause) Brian Hopkins.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank-you Sir. Again, we'll keep a list of the people who are not here. We understand that, with the rescheduling there may, that may have put some stresses on and we will endeavor to slot them in at a subsequent meeting.
Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	My name is Brian Hopkins and tonight I'm speaking on behalf of GreenTrans, a community group of Oakville citizens promoting environmentally friendly and sustainable transportation, such as public transit.
	Unless people can move easily about, a city cannot function properly. As Oakville becomes home to more people, its past patterns of urban sprawl reveal their inherent problems.
	The Official Plan Amendment, as it stands, is a plan for more sprawl. This is neither an efficient nor an effective way to accommodate the growing population.
	Unless transit planning is integrated with land use planning from the outset, people may not be able to move about easily and Oakville may not be able to function properly.
	Urban sprawl is problem growth. One of the problems of sprawl is dependence on cars. Too much land is required for transportation in a community designed to be dependent upon cars. Car dependence causes traffic congestion. Car emissions cause smog.
	The Lung Association of Ontario tells us that everyone is at risk of health effects from smog. The elderly and those living with chronic heart or lung disease, including asthma are at risk. Young children and adolescents are also at risk as their lungs and airways are still developing.
	Car emissions also add substantially to greenhouse gases. Faced with such known problems, there's a challenge to design communities to accommodate more people without

urban sprawl.
Fortunately, we don't have to plan for problem growth. There are better ways to grow. Let's hear what a 1992 report had to say: Transit support of land use planning guidelines is a report by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Ministry of Municipal Affairs.
It contains a set of guidelines which provide ideas and guidance on planning and development practices which support the provision and use of public transit. These include development patterns, which make transit less expensive, more efficient and more convenient, as well as those which make access to the system more attractive to the potential transit user. These guidelines are applicable both to new development as well as to the re-development of existing urban areas.
The best approach is to design a new area to be transit supportive from the outset since it is expensive and difficult to transform an auto-oriented urban area into a transit-supportive urban area once buildings and roads have been constructed.
So why should a municipality wish to move in this direction? The simple answer is that transit is a more effective and efficient way of moving people within cities and towns than the private automobile.
Transit is more space-efficient than the automobile. Less land is required to move a small number of transit vehicles than to move a large number of automobiles carrying the same number of people. Land not used for transportation is freed up for other active uses or for public open space.
Transit is more energy-efficient that the automobile. Less energy is needed to move a person by transit than by automobile. Transit is cleaner than the automobile. Since less energy is used to move people, smaller amounts of air pollutants and greenhouse gases are produced by transit per person kilometer of travel.

Projected increases in automobile usage around the world will cause motor vehicle emissions to skyrocket, with potentially significant impacts on global weather patterns and air quality.
Emissions can be reduced by designing more fuel- efficient vehicles. However, less fuel consumption is the real key to lowering emissions. Transit can play a significant role in reducing fuel consumption.
Since transit is more frugal with resources such as land and energy, it is often cheaper to meet a mobility need with transit, rather than through road widenings or extensions.
Since good transit planning requires higher density, more compact development, planning for transit can also provide a significant cost savings for other municipal services such as sewer and water mains or municipal roads and utilities.
Other benefits resulting from increased development densities include protection of land devoted to agricultural uses, protection of environmentally sensitive areas and increased opportunities for cycling and walking.
Transit provides mobility to all persons. People who can't drive, can't afford a car, or simply wish to lead a more environmentally friendly lifestyle can use transit, if it is available and convenient.
Transit usage benefits from and encourages greater pedestrian activities. Thus, a transit-oriented city promotes greater public presence on the sidewalks and greater informal surveillance and safety.
In short, transit is an excellent tool to help achieve sustainable development and an improved urban environment. In many cases, quality of the environment, the quality of life and the economic competitiveness and vitality of a transit-oriented urban area is higher than those of automobile-oriented urban areas.

The Region of Halton's Official Plan states that the goal for transportation is to provide a safe, convenient, affordable, efficient and energy-conserving transportation system in Halton, while minimizing the impact on the environment.
The transportation objectives include: To achieve by year 2011 a level of public transit usage that represents 20 per cent or more of all trips made by Halton residents; to promote land use patterns and densities that can be easily and effectively served by public transit; and, to ensure that the design of development will promote and support traffic movement by walking, cycling and public transit.
Earlier this year, the City of Toronto produced a report which outlines transportation options for Toronto's new Official Plan. It is based on a transportation vision which includes: Urban design that leads to fewer and shorter trips; public transit that is more competitive; less need to use an automobile; and reduced air pollution from transportation.
The main thrust of the vision is to reduce automobile dependence and improve the competitiveness of transit. The report states that merely improving transit access to areas that are now poorly served provides no guarantee that transit use will improve if land use characteristics, notably densities, and travel patterns are not conducive to effective transit service.
The report notes that there will be trade-offs to be made in the evaluation process regarding the allocation of road space among different users, such as autos, transit vehicles, trucks, cyclists and pedestrians. These trade-offs should be made within the context of reducing auto dependence.
Most recently, our Provincial Government has started talking about growth being well managed when decisions on transportation and land use are linked. They suggest transportation measures that aim to reduce environmental impacts. They suggest that transit agencies should participate in growth plans at all stages, such as reviewing

	official plans before they are passed. They suggest that growth is well managed when government and community groups work together. Let's stop having problem growth and start having some smart growth that conserves natural areas and farmlands, that creates pedestrian-friendly communities, that provides alternatives to cars and that fully involves citizens in designing their own community's future. It's time to curb sprawl and do some development that eases congestion and pollution with more and better public transit. It's time for Oakville to write an Official Plan with land-use planning principles that clearly support public transit.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank-you Sir. You've generated at least two questions. Firstly from Councillor Sanderson.
Councillor Jody Sanderson	Thank-you Mr. Hopkins for your presentation. It was well thought-out. I didn't hear at the beginning who you were representing.
Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	I'm speaking this evening on behalf of GreenTrans.
Councillor Jody Sanderson	GreenTrans, okay. And Mr. Hopkins is your – you seem sold on the idea of mass transit and moving people and I'm fascinated by that, I want to know more of that. You talked about high densities. Have you worked in attracting those higher densities or can you cite any examples of where planning has been done in such a way that that whole idea of increasing densities and you tell developers, give us higher densities, we can put this transit in. Can you tell me where it's happened and where it's worked?
Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	I'd have to get back to you on that.
Councillor Jody Sanderson	Okay. Well, when you're looking that up, could you tell us what the drive would be, what the marketing scheme would be and how they would attract them. I would be interested in hearing that.
Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	How?
Councillor Jody Sanderson	How they would attract people into a higher density. How

	to make that feature attractive to buyers. And to developers to build them.
Brian Hopkins (Delegate) Councillor Jody Sanderson	Why it would be attractive to people to live in them? How. How would you do it, is what I'm looking for. Because I agree with you on mass transit, if you can move them and you're saying that high density supports transit and that's how you make those two things click. I want to know how to make that attractive to people who will build high density and to people who will move into high density, in an area like North Oakville.
Brian Hopkins (Delegate) Councillor Jody Sanderson	Well we're talking about an area that hasn't been built yet. Yes, that's right.
Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	I think it's very attractive by the real estate prices, I think it's very attractive to live near downtown Oakville in high density.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	It's not a trick question. What the Councillor is saying is that she'd like any other data that you might have.
Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	Okay, you didn't want an answer right now.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Not necessarily. No. That's okay. Thank-you. Councillor Wright.
Councillor Janice Wright	Thank-you for your presentation. I think we all agree that an improved transit system would go a long way to relieve the current traffic congestion in Town. I was just wondering if your group has made any efforts to lobby the Provincial of Federal government on this issue.
	Frovincial of Federal government on this issue.
Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	Well tell the truth we're a very new group, okay. So we're just forming this year. This will probably be one of our initial
Brian Hopkins (Delegate) Councillor Janice Wright	Well tell the truth we're a very new group, okay. So we're just forming this year. This will probably be one of our initial Do you have plans
	Well tell the truth we're a very new group, okay. So we're just forming this year. This will probably be one of our initialDo you have plansThis will be one of our initial lobby efforts, okay.
Councillor Janice Wright	Well tell the truth we're a very new group, okay. So we're just forming this year. This will probably be one of our initial Do you have plans
Councillor Janice Wright Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	Well tell the truth we're a very new group, okay. So we're just forming this year. This will probably be one of our initial Do you have plans This will be one of our initial lobby efforts, okay. Do you have plans, because that, it seems from what I've heard, the conversation, because it seems to me that's where the initiative seems to come from. Has to come

Councillor Kevin Flynn	Brian I was intrigued when you said the City of Toronto had put its transportation plan right in its Official Plan.
Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	They're preparing, I believe they're in the process of preparing a new Official Plan.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	And is it part of that?
Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	And there's a transportation component to it. So what I read you from, the excerpt from, is a report, okay, prepared with respect to the transportation options that may be written into the new Official Plan.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	And at this point it's a work in progress, but it's your understanding that's their intent?
Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	That would have been as of the beginning of spring, it would have been a work in progress. I haven't followed it since then.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Okay, because I tend to agree with you. I think that was a good point you made. I mean, you see we've got transportation is in our plan, but it's four nice paragraphs, or four nice sentences, but it certainly isn't a plan.
Brian Hopkins (Delegate)	No.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	 Any further questions? All I can tell you is as the mother of two sons who live in lofts in Toronto, they're intensifying. People love it. They can't build them fast enough. And one of the reasons people want to be there is they can take a very cheap ferry ride over to Toronto Island and they can move everywhere by foot or by cab or by streetcar. And for the younger people, it certainly is the lifestyle they want and you just can't – just look at the cranes
Christing Showshuk	building new condos and converting into lofts. So. Thank- you for your points sir. Next speaker.
Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk	Yes your Worship, we've had an update on our speaker's list so there's two individuals who have requested to speak at our next meeting. Our next delegate is R. Kemp and just to advise that the next grouping of delegation speakers is Joanne Ringrose, Carel Schoch, Frank Price,

	Renee Lahen or Andy Kranz.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank you, sir.
Russell Kemp (Delegate)	Thank you. I live in Bronte and your Worship, Councillors, staff and Ladies and Gentlemen, it is incredible that at this point in time with all of the negatives that are known about urban sprawl that Council is still planning the wholesale implementation of urban sprawl in Oakville.
	When I read the amendment, I receive three messages. One is, urban sprawl is inevitable. Two is, don't worry. And three is, trust us.
	I guess my response to that is: I don't think urban sprawl is inevitable; I do worry; and I do not trust those in control of the process.
	The community elected this Council to manage the Town and when it comes to ensuring expected results and maintaining accountability, managers generally follow a basic rule and that is, 'If you can't measure it, you can't manage it.'
	However, when it comes to the environment and open spaces in this document there is absolutely nothing that lets us measure it. So how can we manage it?
	When OPA 198 addresses the environment and open spaces it does not provide Oakville citizens with a way to ensure expected results or to measure the performance of the plan or of Council.
	But, when OPA 198 addresses development issues, it is liberally sprinkled with numerical targets, which provide a clear objective and clear means of management. But when it comes to the environment and open spaces, it is riddled with generalizations, ambiguity and there is not one single number.
	For example, with respect to development, OPA describes its targets in clear terminology and with numbers such as: Population target of 55,000 people; employment target of

35,000 people; employment lands of 900 hectares; property tax ratio of 70 per cent residents and 30 per cent non-business. To me as a businessman, that makes sense. I can latch onto that. And I can make an informed decision as to whether I want to go there or not.
In contrast, when OPA 198 addresses the environment and open spaces, the fudge factors come in to play, as in the following examples, and I quote, and you've heard most of these before:
"Potential east/west linkage; sustainable natural heritage open space; preserve significant open spaces; conserve open spaces – sounds like a canning factory; minimize pollution; minimize traffic congestion." Not a target number in sight.
The covering report contains much of the same. Two items: "Consideration for the protection of the natural environment; attempt to maintain the existing natural environment." Not much commitment there either.
Nowhere in its 90 pages, does this document mention the size of the natural heritage system. And this number is clearly available in the consultant's report on the natural heritage system.
With so many omissions of numbers, when it comes to the natural heritage system, I'm sure you can't fault me for concluding that it's not merely an oversight, but rather a deliberate act.
To be frank, I find the plan inadequate and the process is suspect. I ask Council to please return to the drawing board and advise your planners to include some clear and measurable targets for the environment and open spaces.
Why not declare yourselves upfront now on items such as: Woodlands, open spaces, tree cover, retention of plants, retention of animals, retention of aquatic life, retention of birds?
Why not tell us now, upfront, how much pollution will be

	added to our environment by another 55,000 people and 35,000 workers?
	Why not tell us now, upfront, how many more vehicles will be added to our roads by 55,000 more residents and 35,000 more workers?
	I'm sure the development industry and the planning industry has some factors in their little black books that would identify those things very readily.
	If you do choose to go through the exercise of including the necessary information to permit the residents to determine the future of their community, may I suggest that you exclude the input from the development community during that exercise.
	Open up with us, let the people know clearly what is going to happen and what your environmental commitment is. Please give us the tools to clearly see the total picture of your plan for these lands so that we can make informed decisions and to ensure that we can hold you clearly accountable for the end result. Thanks for your time.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank you, sir. Any questions? Councillor Wright.
Councillor Janice Wright	Thank you, sn. Any questions? Councilion wright. Thank you for your presentation. Oops, I just lost my
Councillor sunice might	knob. I was just wondering, if we don't make a plan for growth, and that we understand that the GTA's going to grow by two million people. Where would you suggest that we put these people?
Russell Kemp (Delegate)	I would suggest some more density within the current urban area and I would suggest that some of the lands north of Dundas could be available for residential development, but I think it's just going to far to plaster residential development and commerce over all that wonderful agricultural land.
	There is absolutely nothing in the plan that ensures me at this time that you're going to do your homework in terms of protecting our natural heritage futures up there. And, for all the good work of the heritage trails that does - their

	work to date, and I don't want to demean it, because it's been terrific, but it's really a retro-fit project. It's trying to grasp, you know, I guess, rework what's out there know. It's a clean-up, a mop-up kind of action.And I don't want to see that happen in the lands north of Dundas, where the development has occurred and then we pay attention to try to reclaim our so-called natural heritage. I think we have to do it upfront.
Councillor Janice Wright	Thank you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Further questions? Thank you very much. I think we've got time probably for one more speaker.
Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk	Joanne Ringrose.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	We don't see the lady, but she was here last night so again we'll make sure that she's called forward and given the opportunity. We will be contacting everyone on this list to advise them of the next scheduled meeting in July.
Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk	Carel Schoch.
Carel Schoch (Delegate)	It's difficult to talk after we've been sitting here for four hours. That's about right, so.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Unfortunately, we do it most Mondays. So, and that might explain some of the debate, hmm?
Carel Schoch (Delegate)	Keep your mind awake. I just would like to talk here because I don't like to have my back to people.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Not a problem. Did we call your name correctly, sir?
Carel Schoch (Delegate)	No. It's almost unpronounceable in English, so the first name is Carel, is Carl in English and the last name is Swiss German, it's got like a guttural och in it, Schoch.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Well thank you for that enlightenment. I just wanted to make quite sure, I didn't think you looked like a Carol so I was a little
Christine Shewchuk,	And I apologize for the pronunciation.

Assistant Clerk	
Carel Schoch (Delegate)	No, that happens all the time. So, just so you hear it pronounced properly, my name is Carel Schoch. I recently moved to the area of Oakville in December and heard about this process and these developments north of Dundas and as we live just south of Dundas, I felt I wanted to involve myself in the process because I think everybody needs to involve themselves in a process such as this.
	When I reviewed everything, I thought about all the opposing viewpoints and that it's easy to complain, but much more difficult to stand up and speak to what you believe. Nonetheless, the more people that do, the greater our Oakville voice will be, especially if it supports a collective strategy and tangible outcomes.
	There are a lot of obstacles to our collective and individual agendas that initiate outside of Oakville. That's our reality. So we need a unified voice. From what I've read, there are many people who have done significant work on developing this amendment and doing other impact studies for developing the area north of Dundas. I commend them for it.
	The concern I think is the lack of hard commitment to a concrete vision that will satisfy in a balanced way the needs of both the developers and the Oakville inhabitants.
	The reality for my family is that much of what attracted us to Oakville north of Upper Middle was the 16 Mile Creek nature area, and the other small creek systems, whose ecosystems could be at jeopardy by development north of Dundas, if environmentally sensitive areas are not either bought by the city, which has limited resources, preserved by the developers, or gifted by the province.
	As well, there is no doubt to me, having lived across Canada, that there will be increased traffic congestion, air pollution and taxes will increase, as many people have mentioned already this evening.
	After reading many of the related documents for OPA

100 I water a the second a later from the second the
198, I noticed there was a lot of work to make sure the
wording was accurate for what the Mayor calls
sustainability and decision-makers, decision-making.
Developers will tend to contest restrictions that add to their costs in terms of both money and time to the Ontario Municipal Board. It is their right to do so, as far as I am concerned economics is always an important and necessary consideration.
·
Another thing I came away with from this research process is that no matter what is actually decided by Oakville, the decision to create an urban area between Dundas and Highway 407 is part of a much bigger design, as many people have mentioned this evening.
The fact is, that the GTA is growing by 100,000 people per year and there is a lot of vested interest in this growth. So if Oakville tried to drag its feet for too long, I am sure there will be people, including the Government of Canada, that will step in and push along the process.
The larger perspective is key when considering how much power Oakville actually has to control its own destiny or to fulfill its commitment to a better quality of life, for instance.
The third fact that stuck in my mind were the words, and I quote, "Balance between environmental protection and other competing interests, such as developmental potential and economic considerations."
There are a lot of people concerned about our environment. Thank god. And they have voiced their concerns as they know that developers historically think much more about the bottom line than environmental impact.
This unfortunately has often included the Government of Ontario, the province's largest single landowner. They, in fact, own a good part of land around 16 Mile Creek north of Lion Valley Park, which is environmentally sensitive.

<u>_</u>	
	I mention these three specific points - the wording of the OPA 198; development of the Greater Toronto Area being mostly out of our hands; and the balance between environmental and competing concerns – because they all tie into the need for collective action, trust and honesty.
	First, one reason why wording is so crucial these days is because there is a general lack of trust, especially in the government. The reality is, is that many unfulfilled promises have been made by governments of all levels with respect to the GTA area, especially as it relates to growth and development.
	Words like 'improve the quality of life,' 'minimize pollution,' and 'minimize traffic congestion,' in OPA 198 seem to many people I have talked to, to be empty words. And in fact, much of what really impacts these factors are outside of Oakville's power to control or change or require a significant increase in resources through intergovernmental transfers or increased taxes.
	Nonetheless, it's almost impossible to write a document to fill everybody's needs. Trust, both in each other and in the process, must play a role if a compromise is to be achieved, first between Oakville residents, and then the larger community.
	The question is how can this trust be formed? One way, of course is to be honest. Another is to make promises you can and intend to keep.
	In reference to GTA development and the need to improve systems and networks that will limit the impact of explosive growth, when I came back to the GTA area after a 10-year absence, I noticed few improvements, which shocked me, to the transportation network in and around the City of Toronto – other than the 407, which on my way from Oakville to Brampton every morning creeps along like every other highway once passing over the 401. To top it all off, I have to pay for it.
	I thought about public transit, but I quickly had to forget about this alternative as doing it under two hours from my

house in North Oakville to Brampton was next to impossible. The public transport grids simply don't match up effectively between municipalities.
I have noticed that there have been negligible improvements in Go Transit and the schedule of buses from North Oakville down to the Go Train is limited, even if you are just commuting to Toronto. In addition, parking areas at the Go Train Station are becoming fuller and fuller.
It needs to be easy if you want people to give up using their vehicles. The worst pollution culprit in Oakville and the GTA area, as many people have mentioned this evening, are gas and diesel-driven vehicles.
Yet with all the billions of dollars funneled into developments, so very little has been allocated to improving alternative means of transport. Building more highways or widening existing ones has proven not to be an effective long-term solution, yet we keep doing it.
The air quality just gets worse and worse and in fact Oakville has one of the worst, as was mentioned a number of times this evening. No wonder people don't trust and are constantly looking for reassurance.
Canada in comparison to many other countries I've both lived in and traveled through has an obsession with unchecked change and what I think many of the people speaking out are concerned about, including myself, is that we maintain a balanced perspective on our development and don't development get out of hand, like an epidemic, destroying for instance the natural environment which offers us the only solution to certain oblivion.
In fact, Oakville has a good track record in comparison to many other communities I've lived in in Canada. The environmental crisis is all around us and I think what most people who are conscious of this problem really want is government accountability and a firm commitment to offer a needed balance, instead of buckling under the

pressure from competing interests or offering excuses about budget cuts at every turn – not to say that balanced budgets are not important.
You only need to read the newspapers everyday to see the revelations – whether it be Canada being used as a dumping ground for chemical wastes being sanctioned by the government, Toronto sewage flowing into Lake Ontario every time there are heavy rains, the Walkerton (sic) water quality incident, or the Ontario Government promising to build a super-highway from Hamilton to Niagara Falls. Again, an improved highway system around the GTA area will not help to limit the problems people are most concerned about, with respect to quality of life.
If we don't build the needed infrastructure before initiating new developments, like new public transport routes, nor preserve the natural environment, which filters the CO2 out of the air and adds to our quality of life, and just level the existing landscape, including our mixture of trees, for what is perceived to be a better design, I think there is no hope to fulfill any of the positive outcomes of developing north of Dundas. That is a fact for me.
The buckling health system, seen through recent revelations by nurses, and environmentally related cutbacks – all of this does not help us in creating a better quality of life. Another government promise unfulfilled.
In conclusion, for most people I think the Provincial and Federal Governments seem far out of reach. It is mostly at the municipal level that we still hope to be received by elected officials who we hope will sincerely listen to our concerns, reassuring us that we need not lose hope in the system.
I think if we build a degree of trust through honest commitment to realistic goals as a community, in respect to this development north of Dundas and other issues that come up, we can build the needed infrastructure to realize our collective vision.

	We can even be a force to contend with at higher levels of government if there is the necessary backing by numbers. I would certainly give my valuable time.
	I am interested in being part of a unified voice, willing to commit time and energy to seeing our shared vision for Oakville become a reality, supported by trust. Thank you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank you very much Sir and we'd welcome a copy of your presentation. We're at four minutes to go. I'd just like a motion to recess to reconvene on Thursday evening, June 28 th at 7:30 in this building.
Councillor Jeff Knoll	So moved.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Councillor Knoll. All in favor. Thank you very much. We will have all the rooms and spaces available to accommodate the audience. Thank you again for hanging in with us. We'll see you on Thursday.