

Town of Oakville
 Lands North of Dundas
 Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Ladies and Gentlemen, could I ask everyone to take their seats as we reconvene this Council meeting that was recessed on Tuesday evening.</p> <p>I hope as you've come in that you've had an opportunity to pick up a news release that's on the back table. It's very relevant to tonight. It has been announced that the Ontario Government by ORC has indeed heard the lobby, which has gone on for some considerable time. They will be selling the lands that they own north of Oakville but excluding 300 acres in estimate, the 16 Mile Creek valley, connected woodlots and other table woodlots.</p> <p>So we were lobbying strongly for the Provincial Government to lead by example. Our argument was why would they sell something that was in the stewardship of the people of Ontario for the people of Oakville to have to try to buy back or negotiate back. So this is extremely good news and the media release is there for you.</p> <p>On the reverse side, in case you haven't caught it, although it's been all over the radio, and I presume television, is the issue of the Supreme Court of Canada regarding the pesticide matter. Is it on the reverse side or is it separate. No, no. Sorry. It's separate. But there's more information about the ORC lands on the reverse of that.</p> <p>But essentially, the Supreme Court has ruled that the community in Quebec, which had banned – Hudson, the Town of Hudson – which had banned the spraying of pesticides on private property has been upheld. So lots of things to track, coming out of today's announcements, most of which we perceive to be very positive.</p> <p>Madam Clerk, do we have any regrets for this evening?</p>
<p><i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i></p>	<p>No, the Clerk's Department did not receive any regrets, your Worship.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Are there any, anyone who has realized they have a conflict of interest they didn't know about at the beginning of the meeting? At the other meetings. Seeing none, we'll proceed. Councillor Robinson has given notice of wishing to present a motion.</p>

Town of Oakville
 Lands North of Dundas
 Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

<i>Councillor Ralph Robinson</i>	Your Worship, I would like to move that Council not deal with any motions or Council debate on OPA 198 until after September 9 th and that adequate public notice be given.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Thank you. I'm just talking to – and seconded by Councillor Oliver.
<i>Councillor Fred Oliver</i>	Yes your Worship. I'd like to ask the mover a question, if I may.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Please, go ahead.
<i>Councillor Fred Oliver</i>	Councillor Robinson, by this you are saying that Council will review the public input and comments from these meetings and we'll await the report back from the staff and we will discuss it and study it through the summer months and deal with it in September?
<i>Councillor Ralph Robinson</i>	Absolutely, Councillor Oliver. And if you'd like that incorporated in the motion, it will but...
<i>Councillor Fred Oliver</i>	Yes, I think it should be.
<i>Councillor Ralph Robinson</i>	I will include those words.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	That would be useful. The staff report, however, we don't have a Council Meeting, so the staff – well, we do and we don't – the staff will circulate that report as expeditiously as possible. At this point we still have many delegations.
<i>Councillor Ralph Robinson</i>	Yes.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Thank-you very much. Now, we're conferring here on logistics because of our obligations under the Planning Act. And the Clerk, having sought legal counsel, is advising me that we do need to set a date because the public hearing is in process. So, we have the 10 th , which is the Planning and Development Council meeting, if that's acceptable. If there's a problem with that, we would convene and then we would restate another date, but we're required to have a date.

Town of Oakville
 Lands North of Dundas
 Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

<i>Councillor Fred Oliver</i>	The 10 th would be fine your worship.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Thank-you. Okay. Councillor Flynn, sorry.
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	Thank-you. I'm going to support the motion on the floor. I think it's a very wise way to approach this. At what point would members of the public and Members of Council be apprised of the information that will be available, now we know it's going to be September the 10 th .
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	As soon as it's complete. And the reason that I didn't give you a specific Councillor Flynn was out of respect for the fact we know to date the magnitude of what we've been asked for, we don't know the other. We would send that information out. We have quite an extensive mailing list on this.
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	I was just going to suggest, it seems like we still have an awful lot of listening to do and maybe during that period, the staff could turn their attention and at least give us an approximate date as to when they think they may have it ready.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Sure. We're saying at this point late August. And what we will do as I've said we've got an extensive mailing list. We will undertake, either by e-mail or slow mail to notify people when it is available to give them the maximum amount of time to have that material. And if Council would just empower the Chair and the Clerk that we could send it out to the public or make it available to the public as soon as it's ready, we don't have to wait for Councillors to receive it.
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	Absolutely.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	So that would be most useful. Councillor Wright.
<i>Councillor Janice Wright</i>	Thank-you your worship. I was just wondering how the process would go as far as delegations are concerned. Would we have to go through this whole process again, or can we just accept written...

<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>I've had the Clerk look at the provisions under both the Planning Act and the Procedural Bylaw, in terms of second time speakers.</p> <p>It would be our practice and a courtesy to allow people to speak to the changes to seek clarification from their question. If there are people who have not spoken before, certainly I would expect Council to extend that courtesy. We would likely move, if we'd had the option and we've done that before, move into, having had appropriate circulation time, to hear delegations in Council.</p> <p>There are some time restrictions that way and it should not in any way disadvantage anyone because we have heard the last two nights and we'll hear again, next week, and other meetings if we need them, that people responding to the existing proposed for consideration OPA.</p> <p>So with everyone's concurrence, and with the co-operation of the audience, I think that's an expeditious way of doing things so people would have the opportunity to seek clarification of the newly circulated materials, which we hope, let me restate again, to have out at the end of August - but that they would be speaking to that if they had spoken before, second-time speakers.</p> <p>If they have not had an opportunity to speak before, or have only just become aware of the issue, then they would be extended the same courtesy, which we've been extending to every delegate today.</p> <p>If that's acceptable, then we could certainly paraphrase that in some way and send it out with the material so that people all had the same understanding.</p> <p>So by consensus I'm indicated from Councillor Robinson and others that that is the expectation.</p>
<p><i>Councillor Janice Wright</i></p>	<p>Okay, that's good.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Is there anyone wishing to speak to the motion? If not, I'd like to call the motion so we can get back to hearing from the delegations.</p> <p>All in favor please signify. Opposed, if any. It's</p>

	<p>unanimous. We'll move now Madam Clerk to the next delegation.</p>
<p><i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i></p>	<p>Yes, just to recap for the audience that I will be calling forward each delegation's name to address Council at the podium. And, in addition, in order to provide a status report on our delegation list and to give each delegate an opportunity to prepare for his or her turn at the podium, I'll be announcing the next five speakers in order.</p> <p>Having said that, our first speaker this evening is Frank Price. The five speakers after Mr. Price is Renee Laren or Andy Krantz, David Lee, David Faye, Randolph Smith and Cheri Bain.</p> <p>So again, Frank Price.</p>
<p><i>Frank Price (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>Good evening, your Worship, Members of Council, Town staff and members of the public. I'm Frank Price, a resident of southeast Oakville. I come to you tonight as a concerned citizen.</p> <p>I'll try not to repeat what the other speakers have said before. Instead, I would like to expand on some of the comments made from the previous night.</p> <p>I'm particularly concerned about traffic, the natural heritage system, phasing and the planning process. We've already heard from a number of previous speakers with concerns about public transportation and the lack of any significant statement in OPA 198 that will relieve the gridlock problem.</p> <p>A number of speakers from GreenTrans have already come forward with excellent suggestions and comments. I would like to elaborate on one comment in particular. That is, the Toronto Official Plan and the recognition that Toronto gives transportation as a vital part in the development of sustainable communities and the level of detail necessary in the preliminary planning process.</p> <p>The Toronto Official Plan states that it is an Official Plan like no other. And it is made up of one vision and three lenses. The most applicable of these lenses, in my opinion,</p>

	<p>can be compared to Part A of the Town's Official Plan, the Town of Oakville, that is. Can we still call it a town?</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>We intend to always call it a town.</p>
<p><i>Frank Price (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>Of course. In Part A, the general aims and approach plan to establish, in general terms, the pattern of physical development concerning land use, density of population, community organization, development phasing and major roads.</p> <p>The Toronto Official Plan will be both a strategic vision for the next 30 years and an operational plan for how to get there. This, in my opinion, shows one of the serious shortcomings in OPA 198 and necessitates further detail and studies prior to the secondary planning level in order to also meet the goals and objectives of Part A, Section 7 of Oakville's Official Plan where, I quote, "The plan concept is to provide for a settlement pattern which will consider full urban services, including roads."</p> <p>We've heard from many other speakers the other day about natural heritage systems and one point in particular also bears repeating. That is, a natural heritage system must be contiguous in order to be effective. The procurement of land will fall in subsequent stages of the planning process, but again it is imperative that OPA 198 develop a vision to guide the procurement of these lands.</p> <p>The downgrading of woodlots and wetlands will reduce the ability to create this system and will result in the fragmentation of fragile natural systems.</p> <p>Toronto once again has included this vision in its Official Plan but, closer to home, the City of Burlington is taking an active role in promoting sustainable development, with a Sustainable Development Committee that follows the definition as set out by the Bruntland Commission that, and I quote again, "Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."</p> <p>Oakville has already established the impetus in an excellent stewardship initiative, the Heritage Trail</p>

	<p>program. We can further learn from other municipalities and jurisdictions that have recognized that these programs can be expanded to include partnerships with industry and developers when they have recognized the importance and value of natural heritage systems.</p> <p>Already, many developers have recognized the value of natural areas being adjacent to their projects. With the use of a variety of other planning tools already mentioned the other night, and I'm sure Ted knows many other tools as well, we can further preserve these natural areas.</p> <p>But, as you and I'm sure you'll – as you know and I'm sure you'll continue to hear throughout this public hearing, these areas must be recognized at this stage so their protection can be assured further along in the secondary and tertiary planning process.</p> <p>The sub-phasing of the lands north of Highway #5 is also a concern of mine and I feel that the inclusion of the special study area as part of the calculation in moving to the next phase is important. This is supported in the Official Plan of Oakville and outlined in Part A 3C and Part B4.</p> <p>One of these major inconsistencies that I've also found in the sub-phasing of the lands north of Highway #5 is in the sub-phasing of 3A, the employment land to the extreme west of the developed areas.</p> <p>Unless the Town of Oakville has already made an agreement with the Town of Burlington to service these lands, I feel that by developing these lands first and by leaving them open to no restriction from other phasing, the Town is in contravention of Part B4 – and that's the goals and objectives.</p> <p>And they state, "The goal, for Part B, is to phase development, thereby creating a compact, orderly urban form and the objectives in particular are so as to maintain an acceptable tax burden for the citizens of Oakville. Also, to ensure that new communities are developed in regard to the timing of development in a logical geographical sequence and land use balance. Also, to minimize the time</p>
--	--

	<p>that each individual community is only partially supplied with a full range of urban services. To provide an urban form that is consistent with energy and resource conservation and to provide for the efficient and economic use of the existing urban infrastructure.”</p> <p>So by asking Burlington to take these lands and service them, Oakville is in contravention of this part of the Official Plan. The phasing, in my opinion, should be consistent with these goals and objectives.</p> <p>The Mayor and Council have already gone to great lengths to see, and Town staff, to see that the planning process for OPA 198 is defensible. But I have concerns about the decision to allow staff to respond in writing to speakers.</p> <p>The fact the Council will deliberate on this issue and come to a decision without the opportunity for the public or Council to hear or respond to the expert opinion of our staff, may be seen as a breach of natural justice.</p> <p>This in my opinion contravenes Section 17-21 of the Planning Act, and also has a precedence in Spence et al and the City of York – that decision was made by the OMB in 1985.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Mr. Price, could I just jump in. I’m sorry you have that understanding because we weren’t clear in our earlier discussion. How we proceed is outlined by this: Staff are taking notes. There will be a response. Councillor Flynn asked when will that response be available to the public. It will be circulated immediately it’s available to the public, it will be simultaneous to the Council. And then the public will indeed have the opportunity to ask clarification and to make comment on the conclusions reached.</p> <p>So the – it will still be a full public hearing. So I wanted to reassure you that we understand and recognize. That was the point that Councillor Wright rose on as to how we would proceed. There will be consultation with the public following the circulation of those materials.</p>
<p><i>Frank Price (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>But decisions will be made prior to...</p>

<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	No. No. Recommendations, new wording, responses, advice as to whether Council should do something or not do something. But no decision will be made until we have that meeting on September the 10 th – prior to that the material will be circulated and again, we’ll have a full public process. And then Council will restrict to table. We’ll have resolution and then there’ll be debate.
<i>Frank Price (Delegate)</i>	But in the interim, staff is available now for comment. And I feel...
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Oh, at any time, as you know, from your work with Trafalgar Chartwell, although I understand you’re speaking as an individual, the staff have all sorts of opportunities and the public have all sorts of opportunities to ask staff questions one on one. And always have done and always will do. So I want to reassure you on that because it’s something pretty fundamental to the way we do business at the Town.
<i>Frank Price (Delegate)</i>	I understand that. Thank you. But it’s the response in the public forum that I believe Section 17-21...
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	We’ll talk to that on September 10 th , but I can assure you, we will make very sure we have fulfilled the letter and the spirit of the law on this Official Plan amendment.
<i>Frank Price (Delegate)</i>	I know. You’ve gone to great lengths to see that and I wanted to make sure that you were aware of these concerns. And I just wanted to bring it to your attention.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Legal counsel for the Town is looking precisely at the area of the Planning Act you have cited as you’ve been speaking.
<i>Frank Price (Delegate)</i>	Uh-huh. But I have my copy too somewhere.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	If there’s anything further, I didn’t want you to leave with that false concept. Well, I’m glad you asked the question so I’ve been able to clarify it. Is there anything further, Mr. Price?

Town of Oakville
Lands North of Dundas
Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

<i>Frank Price (Delegate)</i>	I think that would be all. Thank you.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Price? Councillor Hardacre.
<i>Councillor Linda Hardacre</i>	Now Frank, you talked about a Sustainable Development Committee in Burlington. What is the role of that committee or maybe you could tell me a little more about it.
<i>Frank Price (Delegate)</i>	I have their web page here. I'll just take a minute to...
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	We can certainly get terms of reference on who serves and what the composition is of the committee, it's part of what I believe drove their Smart Growth one-day seminar recently. But, Mr. Price don't trouble yourself, we'll get that circulated and we'll make it part of the, included in the notes, but we can get that out early.
<i>Frank Price (Delegate)</i>	Okay, I can copy that to you as well, I'll give you the web page. And you can look at the web site for them. You're welcome.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Anything further? Thank-you very much. The next delegation Madam Clerk. I'm sorry, Allan, I didn't see your hand.
<i>Councillor Allan Elgar</i>	That's okay. I just, Frank, is that the Citizen's Advisory Group you're referring to in Burlington?
<i>Frank Price (Delegate)</i>	Yes, it is.
<i>Councillor Allan Elgar</i>	Okay, they pay them to go to conferences and everything then, okay. Thanks.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	I think the next speaker. Thank you very much.
<i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i>	The next speaker is Renee Lauren or Andy Kranz.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	And thank you Frank for reminding me. There is a sign-in sheet there and so people can fulfill that registration if they wish. Sorry, Councillor Flynn.
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	Yeah, just on a point your Worship and I think it should be a point of assistance. Probably when Frank was

	<p>preparing his notes, he had no idea that Councillor Ralph Robinson and Fred Oliver would be moving that motion. It may be smart of us to tell people who have spoken to us already that we have decided that that's going to be the process from now on.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>If I might, that's why I said we have an extensive mailing list. We certainly have registrations. We'll make sure we communicate that.</p> <p>And I wasn't sure when Mr. Price came in, whether he'd heard Councillor Wright's question. Yes Sir.</p>
<p><i>Andy Kranz (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>Is the mike working?</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>It should. If you speak into it, it should work.</p>
<p><i>Andy Kranz</i></p>	<p>Okay. Right, it's working. I'm the 'or' person, Andy Kranz, and I've only got a two-pager, so it's relatively short.</p> <p>Madam Mayor, Councillors, fellow citizens of Oakville, I would like to just start off by saying that Council's first duty is to the current residents of Oakville when making decisions, not to the developers who stand to make money at the expense of the larger community. Not to the future residents of proposed developments. Not to the outmoded idea that growth is always good.</p> <p>Now it seems that it has been decided long ago that Oakville will expand northward to the new Highway 407, otherwise there wouldn't have been so much recent commercial development along the south side of Highway #5, especially around Trafalgar.</p> <p>Growth is apparently inevitable. But sprawl is not inevitable. Environmental degradation is not inevitable. A negative impact on Oakville's current residents is not inevitable.</p> <p>I ask you on Council to put the brakes on any further development north of Dundas so that the public can have some more input into the Official Plan Amendment and the patterns of future development so that Oakville gets it right.</p>

	<p>I realize that you had mentioned some things earlier on before, this speech was written last night. I'm sorry I couldn't include today's comments into it.</p> <p>But, we don't want more smog, water pollution, traffic or higher taxes. Therefore, I suggest that before a single bulldozer be permitted on the lands north of Highway #5, that the following occur: That the public be consulted more extensively in the planning process. This has been addressed recently, just today.</p> <p>That the minimum of 20 per cent of the land north of Dundas be set aside as urban wilderness. And that linked natural areas be protected from development in the official plan.</p> <p>That Oakville plan compact, walkable neighborhoods with efficient, convenient public transportation in any future development projects.</p> <p>That Oakville insist that the lands south of Highway #5 be fully utilized before anything goes up north of Highway #5.</p> <p>That development not occur until the province and the Town together ensure that proper provision for public transportation is in place.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to recommend that all Councillors drive, or better yet bike, up any of the regional roads leading into the area in question. We have some breathtakingly beautiful natural and agricultural areas. You, on Council, have a huge responsibility to do what is best for Oakville residents, including our children.</p> <p>That was a speech that my wife made me say write, made me say right now. She couldn't be here tonight.</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	I'm glad you follow direction well, Sir.
<i>Andy Kranz (Delegate)</i>	Although I agree with most of what she wrote. I do admit that she was more eloquent and polite in the wording. I do wish to add my two cents worth.

	<p>My first cents worth is that I would like to draw your attention to the Report CS30-01, which is on the web site for Halton, in where is states that the shortfall of \$240 million worth of growth-related water, waste water and road projects, will have to be paid out of the operating budget. And that's because development costs will not cover it, if my understanding is correct.</p> <p>I through my taxes am paying for this operating budget. It does not make sense to me that I should pay for this shortfall so that my quality of life here in Oakville will go down. And that there will be more people in Oakville, the more number of cars coming in and the more pollution because of the future development.</p> <p>I request that Council find a way so that, should any new development occur, the full costs of it be borne by the developers and that this be written down before the first bulldozer starts digging in.</p> <p>My second cents worth is a repeat of comments made by a gentleman on Tuesday night. He made mention that there are no numbers or measurable yardsticks included in the amendment relating to green spaces, parkland, heritage trails or the amount of pollution that would increase with the extra people around. Only such vague words like potential or minimize pollution are mentioned in the amendment.</p> <p>Therefore, my final request is that Council include specific numbers relating to the amount of green space that will be set aside, the amount and the manner in which pollution will be reduced, not just addressed. And, since I didn't bring my wallet and I don't have any spare change left, I would like to stop right here. Thank you very much.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>You don't need to bring money, Sir. But we would ask you if we might have a copy of the presentation. In fact, to all presenters, if you could make a copy available. Either tonight or subsequently, we'd appreciate it. You could just hand it to one of the staff there, Sir. We appreciate the time you and your wife have taken in presenting. Is there any questions? Councillor Sanderson.</p>

Town of Oakville
 Lands North of Dundas
 Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

<i>Councillor Jody Sanderson</i>	I'm always curious to know about who the folks are that come and talk to us. Have you lived in Oakville a long time, Andy?
<i>Andy Kranz (Delegate)</i>	I've been here for five years.
<i>Councillor Jody Sanderson</i>	Five years? And whereabouts do you live now?
<i>Andy Kranz (Delegate)</i>	McCraney and Sixth Line.
<i>Councillor Jody Sanderson</i>	And do you and your family, or you and your wife use the trail system or how do you access what green space we have now?
<i>Andy Kranz (Delegate)</i>	We do go biking around with the kids up around 16 Mile Creek, north of Upper Middle and we do go driving around that area north of Highway #5 quite frequently.
<i>Councillor Jody Sanderson</i>	Great. Thank you.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Next delegation, Madam Clerk.
<i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i>	The next delegation is David Lee.
<i>David Lee (Delegate)</i>	<p>Good evening, your Worship and Members of Council. First off, I'd like to say that my presentation basically is found in the addendum, so I will just refer to parts of that.</p> <p>I would also like to commend the Council on its wisdom about considering this whole issue in September. That is very, very encouraging. This is a really good move.</p> <p>There are major concerns I have, but I'd like to focus on a very important concern that many of us have, not only about lands north of 5, but about our entire city or Town. And that is the issue of toxic waste, and specifically, nuclear waste.</p> <p>We want to attract clean business to Oakville. We have a wonderful Town, we have a wonderful environment to invite only the best to this community.</p> <p>Unfortunately, past experience has been that we have welcomed into our community people who are involved in the transportation and repackaging of nuclear waste. At the time that it was invited in, it seemed like a good idea. And I have a letter from the Mayor representing us as a community saying that the community is pleased to</p>

	<p>welcome this facility into this Town. That was October 26, 1994.</p> <p>Since then, I believe, we have got a greater insight into environmental matters. And into the tremendous possibilities of accidents and the effect on human health of nuclear, radioactive nuclear waste.</p> <p>We were very distressed when in the latest Official Plan, reference to nuclear waste, or reference to prohibited substances, under Section 63 was removed. We had requested the inclusion of radioactive nuclear waste. Instead, 63 got excluded.</p> <p>The feeling we were given was that, in fact, if we had included nuclear waste, it would be appealed. And the quotation was, regards the Supreme Court of Canada. Well, the Supreme Court of Canada does not get into planning issues. It comes from the Superior Court of Ontario and what I believe we have been – there’s been confusion – the Supreme Court decision as I understand refers to billboards.</p> <p>We do have the right under the Municipal Act to prohibit substances and I believe that 63 and the inclusion of radioactive nuclear waste could be sustained and would withstand court or OMB challenges.</p> <p>Very briefly, that is my concern.</p>
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Mr. Lee, could I just help the audience understand where you’re going.
David Lee (Delegate)	Yes.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	The presentation is really relating to a previous Official Plan Amendment and zoning by-law. It’s close to the line on a topic tonight, so I’m not in any way ruling the gentleman out of order. But I am seeing looks of puzzlement on the faces of the audience. So this is not the issue that is before us. It was another OP amendment to deal with zoning that was here a couple of weeks ago.
David Lee (Delegate)	Thank you, your Worship. To follow-up on your explanation, obviously this Official Plan Amendment, which will be contested, does become law, then we can

	<p>expect that the issues of toxic waste, radioactive nuclear waste, in fact could be an issue in future development and industrial uses within the lands north of #5. This is a concern and I think you should be made cognizant of it as a people.</p> <p>I think that basically covers the concern, your Worship.</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Any questions of Mr. Lee? Thank you very much.
<i>David Lee (Delegate)</i>	I thank you very much.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	And as indicated, we do have a copy of that in your addendum agenda. The next delegation.
<i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i>	The next delegation is David Faye.
<i>David Faye (Delegate)</i>	<p>Good evening your Worship, Members of Council, members of the public.</p> <p>I represent Star Oak Developments, which owns property northeast of the Sixth Line/Burnhamthorpe Road intersection, which is designated for employment lands, and southwest of the Sixth Line/Burnhamthorpe intersection, which is designated for employment and residential uses.</p> <p>In the staff report on pages A106 to A108, you will find a letter which outlines my client's comments on proposed OPA 198. I want to address each of those points with you this evening.</p> <p>Firstly, some comments regarding employment lands. In OPA 198, there's a very significant change in current Town policy regarding the development of employment lands. As Council is aware, current Town policy permits industrial development within the urban area, without reference to any phasing policies, subject to the availability of suitable urban infrastructure.</p> <p>However, in OPA 198, the current Official Plan policy regarding the timing of development of employment lands within the urban area would not apply to lands north of Dundas Street. What is proposed for lands north of Dundas, with the exception of the 407 employment</p>

	<p>district, is a linking of the development of employment lands with the development of residential lands in the same sub phase.</p> <p>This is a significant change to current Town policy. It was not recommended in the Hemson study. In fact, there are several references in Hemson to the fact that Oakville does not apply phasing policies to employment areas.</p> <p>But this change should concern Council because it could hamper your efforts to attract new employment uses to Oakville in a very competitive marketplace. And for a municipality that is being proactive in promoting “red carpet not red tape,” this policy change was seen to be a step backwards.</p> <p>The policy I’m questioning is in Section 26FA on pages 130 and 131 of the Official Plan Amendment. And this policy change is important for two very practical reasons.</p> <p>First, the employment districts north of Dundas Street have been very deliberately located along the 407 corridor. That highway, as you know, is partly opened in Oakville already. It will be opened in the next few weeks through to Burlington. So improved access to the employment districts is a reality.</p> <p>But it’s also a reality that urban servicing north of Dundas Street is still a number of years away. We doubt that it is Council’s intention that the employment lands along the 407 should languish for many years waiting for urban services to be extended northerly from Dundas Street through residential lands before these employment lands can develop. Particularly, when there are other technically sound ways of providing service.</p> <p>But the policies in OPA 198 do not explicitly provide for the use of new servicing technologies, which could provide an interim servicing solution to advance the timing of employment lands by several years.</p> <p>You have the example of Zenon Environmental in Oakville, using their water and waste water technology to develop in advance of the extension of urban services. We</p>
--	--

	<p>suggest that a similar approach would be appropriate as an interim servicing solution for employment lands north of Dundas Street. Once urban services were available, the interim servicing would be replaced and connections made to the Region's services.</p> <p>It seems to us that any advancement in the timing of development of employment lands would benefit the Town with new assessment and assist in proving the live/work relationship mentioned by Mr. Salisbury and other speakers. We would ask you to consider providing for this possibility in OPA 198.</p> <p>The second issue I want to address is woodlots. My client's lands contain woodlots, which have been categorized as category three and four woodlots in the LGL Natural Heritage Inventory and Analysis.</p> <p>One of the purposes of the LGL study, as Mr. Salisbury pointed out in his presentation a few nights ago, was to provide an objective assessment of the relative significance of all biophysical features on lands north of Dundas Street. This objective assessment was to assist Council in setting priorities for preservation of natural features.</p> <p>But in OPA 198, there is a revised Figure F-1, Natural Features, which uses the LGL quantitative information to classify the size, shape and number of woodlots, but it doesn't use the LGL qualitative to indicate any relative ranking of the woodlots.</p> <p>By doing this, in our opinion, staff have accorded to all woodlots shown on Figure F-1 the same significance, which in our view was not the intention when Council authorized the LGL study.</p> <p>The LGL study identified but also analyzed and categorized all woodlots. The analysis and categorization portions of the LGL study need to be recognized more explicitly in OPA 198. We would ask Council to consider adding policy to the amendment to address this point.</p> <p>My final comments relate to the phasing strategy</p>
--	---

	<p>contained in OPA 198. My client supports the phasing as proposed, subject to my earlier comments regarding the undesirability of linking the timing of development of employment lands and residential lands.</p> <p>Madam Chair, that concludes my comments. I'm pleased to answer any questions you might have.</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>Thank you Mr. Faye. Are there questions for the delegation? Councillor Flynn.</p>
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	<p>Just one on the first issue, David, when you were outlining the lands in question, I didn't have a map in front of me. Could you point to the lands?</p>
<i>David Faye (Delegate)</i>	<p>Yes. Perhaps Mr. Thun could point to the northeast quadrant of Sixth Line and Burnhamthorpe and the southwest quadrant.</p>
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	<p>Thank you.</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>Any further questions? Councillor Sanderson.</p>
<i>Councillor Jody Sanderson</i>	<p>Yes, thank you. David, your number two concern are the natural features and primarily decategorizing the woodlots. Could you tell me why, like, you said they're significant on there, can you go into a little more detail about why that's so significant?</p>
<i>David Faye (Delegate)</i>	<p>Yes. Through you, Madam Mayor, to Councillor Sanderson. In my opinion what Figure F-1 is doing in showing various natural features is providing all of those natural features with the same relative significance, meaning that they are all categorized to the same standard without the benefit of the analysis that LGL did, which would suggest to you that there are some areas which are more highly preferred for preservation and conservation than others.</p> <p>And it seems to me that Figure F-1 doesn't necessarily lead you to conclude that there will be some decision to be made and some woodlots obviously of a lower category would be candidates for development. And I don't see in F-1 and the policies in the Official Plan sufficient clarification that in fact, that's what will happen.</p>

Town of Oakville
Lands North of Dundas
Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Anything further? Seeing, oh sorry. Councillor Tedd Smith.
<i>Councillor Tedd Smith</i>	Just for clarification. Your comment that a woodlot would become a candidate for development would mean that it would no longer be a woodlot, is that the comment?
<i>David Faye (Delegate)</i>	Not necessarily, no. I've been involved in development in Oakville for over 20 years.
<i>Councillor Tedd Smith</i>	Okay.
<i>David Faye (Delegate)</i>	In the Glen Abbey Community and River Oaks and certainly at the secondary plan stage. The opportunity is there to determine which woodlots should be preserved in their entirety, which woodlots, based on a qualitative determination, location and other considerations, would be candidates for partial development or, in the extreme, full development. So my comment doesn't necessarily mean that a woodlot of low category would be lost to the community, but there certainly would be recognition of the opportunity to utilize a portion of the area for development.
<i>Councillor Tedd Smith</i>	Thank you.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Seeing no further questions, we'll move to the next delegation. Thank you and I know we have your material already. If there was anything supplementary to that that you wish to leave, that would be fine.
<i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i>	The next delegation is Randolph Smith. And as Mr. Smith makes his way down, I would just like to advise the next grouping of speakers, and they are Karen Nadeau, Alfred Dobell, David Debella, Roberta Need and Cathy and Sid Dick.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Go ahead, Mr. Smith.
<i>Randolph Smith (Delegate)</i>	Thank you, your Worship. Good evening, Members of Council. I represent Trinison Management Corp., which owns or manages various parcels north of Highway #5 within the Official Plan Amendment's study area. Trinison did submit a letter outlining its position that was circulated on Monday evening and I would like now just

	<p>to very briefly summarize that letter.</p> <p>Firstly, Trinison very much appreciates the opportunity that it's had over the last two years to participate in the planning process. Although there has been a great deal of work done so far, Council is still in the early stages of the planning process and there's even more work yet to come in the future.</p> <p>As the staff presentation indicated on Tuesday evening, there are quite a number of additional studies that are required both by the Town and by the Region before the next steps of the process can go forward. And all of these steps will require a very likely public process.</p> <p>I'd like to state that Trinison supports the proposed Official Plan Amendment. And recommends that Council adopt the amendment so that all stakeholders, and the municipality, have a clear understanding of the policy framework for future growth.</p> <p>And notwithstanding the support as Trinison's letter indicates, there are three concerns with the proposed Official Plan that Trinison has.</p> <p>First, and this has been indicated by the speakers, Figure F-1 shows designated woodlots without any categorization and, as Mr. Faye just stated, that makes it difficult for any stakeholder to determine which are the woodlots that are most worthy of preservation. In some ways it may even work against the preservation of high quality woodlots if there isn't any categorization. So, Trinison suggests that the map be amended to reflect the categories in the LGL report.</p> <p>Secondly, to the east of Trafalgar Road, there is a wetland designation on lands of Trinison's Management. And, it's Trinison's position that that wetland designation should be deleted. It doesn't belong on the same map as the only two other wetlands designated as provincially significant – that being in Bronte Creek and in 16 Mile Creek.</p> <p>The third concern is perhaps just a matter of clarification. The text of the plan should be modified to make it</p>
--	--

	<p>absolutely clear that the 75 per cent of residential lands south of Highway #5 that must be registered before Phase III north of #5 will go ahead, includes only those lands that are currently designated residential in the Town's Official Plan. That may be the way this may be interpreted in any event, but I think it would be helpful to everyone to know that if lands, for example west of Highway #25 south of #5 are designated for residential that it was not intended that they be included in the 75 per cent area.</p> <p>And I think that's the way, since the language of your Official Plan is reflective of Regional Official Plan #8, then both of them would probably be interpreted to apply only to lands at the date of passing of the Official Plan Amendment, but it would be helpful to make it clear.</p> <p>Now, aside from these three concerns, Trinison is very supported of the proposed Official Plan Amendment, and would ask that Council adopt it with these three changes. I think it's worth noting that all of the studies, and the planning work and the public meetings, that are necessary to bring the process to this point have been done.</p> <p>In addition, as all of you know, there have been multiple stakeholder task force and committee meetings. At the end of this process, at the end of these public meetings, and deputations from the public, and the review of those comments by staff, Council will have before it all the necessary information to make the decision. So I would respectfully suggest to Council that it is time to move forward to the next step of the process.</p> <p>Now, there is a clear diversity of opinion on the Official Plan Amendment. And Trinison is very committed to continue working co-operatively with all of the stakeholders throughout the future steps.</p> <p>Thank you your Worship for the opportunity to address Council.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Thank you. Are there any questions on Mr. Smith's presentation? Councillor Wright.</p>
<p><i>Councillor Janice Wright</i></p>	<p>Yes, thank you your Worship. Randy, you just mentioned</p>

	that not categorizing the woodlots would lead to the potential lack of preservation of the woodlots. How is that?
<i>Randolph Smith (Delegate)</i>	Well, I – through you, your Worship to Councillor Wright. Not necessarily, but there would be a danger if there isn't a clear distinction between what are the most worthy of preservation and what are the least worthy of preservation, that it might not help the process of preserving the most valuable woodlots.
<i>Councillor Janice Wright</i>	If they were all considered equally valuable, the idea would be to preserve all of them.
<i>Randolph Smith (Delegate)</i>	Through you, your Worship to Councillor Wright. The process of refining in the secondary plan the natural features that are identified in the LGL report is going to require some choice between the very highest qualities of woodlots and those that have very little merit, very little value for preservation. I think, I'm simply suggesting your Worship that those categories continue clearly through to the next stage of the secondary planning process.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Thank you. Councillor Flynn?
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	Just so I can be clear Randy. During the public open houses and the public process that preceded these meetings, we received information from LGL and it referred to Trinison as their client. Now, LGL had been the author of our report, and then LGL appeared to be a consultant then for Trinison. But this evening, you're making the presentation on behalf of Trinison and you're talking about the LGL report. My question is, is LGL in the employ of Trinison at this point in time?
<i>Randolph Smith (Delegate)</i>	Through you, your Worship, to Councillor Flynn. I'm not aware of the background or the details of that letter. I do know that the ecological consultants for Trinison throughout this process, going back to before Council adopted the LGL report in June of '99, has been EcoPlans and nobody else. That's all I know.

Town of Oakville
 Lands North of Dundas
 Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	Okay. I was quite surprised and I think other members of Council were, as we were going through some of the public information, I was reading a letter from LGL and it was referring to its client. I thought it was referring to the Town. When I read deeper into the letter, it appeared to be referring to your client. Is there a way of confirming that some time during this public process.
<i>Randolph Smith (Delegate)</i>	I will have to consult with my client.
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	Thank you.
<i>Randolph Smith (Delegate)</i>	Thank you.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Councillor Elgar.
<i>Councillor Allan Elgar</i>	Yes, on the – you’re asking the wetlands to be removed from I think I heard, was that point three? Like where the button bush was, I think I heard that.
<i>Randolph Smith (Delegate)</i>	Yes.
<i>Councillor Allan Elgar</i>	Okay. You are aware of what it does state in LGL about that button bush. That it’s the largest single wetland beyond the ESA, the largest example of provincially rare and uncommon plant community and a presence of regionally rare species and it goes on. You’re aware of that?
<i>Randolph Smith (Delegate)</i>	<p>Yes, if I could explain briefly, your Worship, to Councillor Elgar. The figure which shows the wetlands consists of the two existing designations of 16 Mile Creek and Bronte Creek. And with the addition of this button bush swamp that you’ve just referred to - what separates a provincially significant wetland from the others is whether or not the Ministry of Natural Resources has designated that wetland as a PSW or Provincially Significant Wetland. The MNR has not designated the button bush swamp as a PSW. Therefore, that land should not show up on the same map as the two others which have been designated PSWs.</p> <p>I believe that at some stage in the future, the proper designation for that wetland would be derived and it may be a lower category, regionally significant, it may be locally significant, but it certainly is not a PSW and it shouldn’t be on the map.</p>

Town of Oakville
 Lands North of Dundas
 Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Thank you, I think that concludes the questions. Madam Clerk, call the next delegation.
<i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i>	Yes. Cheri Bain is the next delegation.
<i>Cheri Bain (Delegate)</i>	<p>Mayor, Members of Council, my name's Cheri Bain. I'm here tonight representing a South Territory Iroquois Ridge Society.</p> <p>Back in 1987, when the Region of Halton started the Halton Region Structural Review, I think a lot of this Town was sleeping and we didn't realize what was going to be happening. But in 1987 when we really didn't have a traffic problem, we really didn't have very many homes north of the QE, definitely none, I don't believe, north of Upper Middle Road. And the situation was a lot different than what we're dealing with today.</p> <p>In 1990, I had actually started to pay attention to what was going on, but we were talking about the Halton Urban Structural Plan. I didn't realize we were dealing with rural lands, so I didn't get too involved with it. If rural had been mentioned, I probably would have been paying attention and wondering what was going to be planned for north of the Dundas.</p> <p>In 1999, when the Official Plan Amendment #8 was approved, that started this ball rolling. Oakville's Official Plan has to agree with the Region's. So the question here tonight is do we send this back to the Region, to ask them to redo it? If the Town does that, you're going to end up at the Municipal Board by developers.</p> <p>If the Town just doesn't plan on approving it, we're going to end up at the OMB by developers. So the option that we have here is to get the best Official Plan Amendment that we can get.</p> <p>I'd like to read a couple of comments that were in the Burlington Post on September 20th. It's headlined 'Governing Urban Growth at Heart of GTSB Draft Report.'</p> <p>“ ‘Over the next 20 years, we're going to have another two million people coming in. The countryside strategy is</p>

	<p>aimed at governing growth to prevent endless urban sprawl in the GTA,' said Tonks.</p> <p>“ ‘By gathering input from effected municipalities, the GTA could avoid costly planning mistakes made by other areas,’ said Tonks.</p> <p>“...7.5 million people by the year 2013 in the GTA.</p> <p>“The past Mayor of Halton Hills said she wanted to know how many communities are subsidizing their agricultural industry, and suggested a pooling policy to share the costs may be a better way to pay.</p> <p>“ ‘The questions need to be answered,’ agreed Tonks. ‘Once you arrive at a strategy that says protecting agricultural lands is critical to quality of life, I don’t think there’s any question, you get back who pays and how it’s paid.’ ”</p> <p>The problem is Oakville didn’t have any viable agricultural land left. Or we wouldn’t be doing this process. You wouldn’t be putting businesses out of work.</p> <p>I’m quite concerned that we’re going to be facing a day in the not-to-near future, when none of our food or beef or pork is local, if it continues going the way it is.</p> <p>What I’d like this Council to do, and I know you’re doing a lot of listening and it’s going to be a lot of nights, is to look at some of the ideas that are brought forward.</p> <p>Pages A97 to A100 have been authored by an unsigned person. I could take a guess that it was Michael Lansdown. There are quite a few good ideas in those pages that should be incorporated into this Official Plan Amendment.</p> <p>I really believe this Council should wait until the GTSB report is finalized and infrastructure can handle the development, before the development is allowed to go forward.</p> <p>There’s another article I’d like to read a bit out of. It’s</p>
--	---

	<p>called, "Controlling Growth Vital to the Community." It was also in the Burlington Post on September 27th.</p> <p>"How serious is urban sprawl? Growth is occurring primarily at the edges of the urban envelope. The author – another two million people expected to move into the GTA over the next 20 years. If we continue to go the way we're going, those two million people will be accommodated predominantly at the edge of the urban environment as it currently exists.</p> <p>"That means a really insufficient use of the infrastructures that we have throughout the whole of this economy. It will be very expensive for all of us."</p> <p>He noted that Burlington and other GTA communities are growing, while closing schools in older areas and struggling to find money for new ones elsewhere.</p> <p>The other thing that follows urban sprawl is a greater reliance on the use of the automobile. Along with the resultant traffic gridlocks and air pollution. If growth continues subdivision after subdivision after subdivision, it becomes almost impossible to have a viable and functional transit system.</p> <p>Pointing to the traffic that daily overwhelms the QEW, our highways are operating way beyond the capacity that anybody thought they would have and congestion is more than just an inconvenience to us.</p> <p>That in turn affects our economic health. When we asked our business community why they located, a quarter of them said because we have a viable transportation network. So to the extent that our highways are becoming clogged, the reason that those businesses came to Burlington is negated.</p> <p>Nearly as many businesses said that they came or have stayed here because we have a great quality of life. That too is threatened if people are stuck in their cars.</p> <p>The other serious implication that comes from urban sprawl and traffic congestion is smog. It is very frustrating</p>
--	--

	<p>to me the number of days that we have every summer when we are warned on radio for people with health problems to stay indoors. It is really important for us not to take that and accept it.</p> <p>The competition is also starting to get ahead of us. Other cities the GTA is up against for economic growth, such as Miami, San Francisco, Baltimore, Boston, New York and Chicago, are all going through a renaissance. They are reinvesting at an incredible rate in their waterfronts and their urban amenities. It is very impressive to see what they are doing. It certainly exposes some insecurities in our own backyard.</p> <p>In the GTA, the investment is taking place at about 20 per cent of the rate that other economic regions on the continent are investing in their infrastructure. Of the money we are investing in the GTA infrastructure, most of it is not dedicated to revitalizing our downtown areas or waterfronts.</p> <p>It is allowing growth to continue to expand our urban envelope. Investing is really greenfield investment. Much of the problem lies with the treatment which cities and economic engines of Canada's economy receive from the Provincial and Federal Governments.</p> <p>American cities are benefiting from federal infrastructure spending. According to Mayor McIsaac, the U.S. government has committed \$21.7 billion in transportation funding for cities. It commits another \$1 billion annually for redevelopment of old downtown areas.</p> <p>If the GTA were in the U.S., it could expect to receive about \$240 million a year from the Federal Government in transportation, housing and other redevelopment. But the GTA receives nothing from Ottawa.</p> <p>I know this Council has been working with the Region to try to change some of these situations, but I think it's a situation that has to be looked at strongly before we really let rapid development go ahead.</p> <p>It's very evident that the people are not happy with this</p>
--	---

	<p>development for the future. I don't think it can be stopped. To make the matter worse, this development is going to cost us all money, because the development does not pay for itself.</p> <p>I personally don't like the idea that you're designating residential on the Dundas. We have a problem with it south of the Dundas, I do not understand why we're looking at repeating it.</p> <p>I think we should put development in residential in that area, along the 407, in the form of high density condominiums and apartment buildings to encourage people that live there to use the 407.</p> <p>I'm very concerned that we have a hospital that cannot handle the added population. I don't see any funds coming in for a new hospital. We have trouble with infrastructures for schools. I don't think the time is to do a heavy residential at this time and I think we should have that infrastructure money in place before we go ahead with any residential development out there.</p> <p>The special study area. I happen to agree that it should be studied again to see if there's going to be a bridge going across, but I'd like to see you recommend a green lands designation for those lands now. I think it's quite unfair the residents there seem to want residential there - it's designated employment. Until we do an environmental assessment, why can it not be green lands and then decide what it's going to be. Instead of let speculators buy those properties figuring it's going to be one or the other, let's do that decision later.</p> <p>I want to thank Oakville Green. I think they've done a wonderful job. They've worked hard, their efforts paid off. But their work's not over. Their hardest work is going to be following all this development, working with the developers, trying to save the trees with the developments when they go in, working with the Town to see if bonusing provisions can be used to save some of the space.</p> <p>I'd also like to thank ex-councillor Liz Behrens. I also</p>
--	---

	<p>wanted to request that residents put a donation of \$100 in to try to buy this land, and let Council buy it on our behalf so that it can be owned by the Town of Oakville permanently. And I'd love to see a fund set up for that purpose.</p> <p>There are going to be some of the citizens in this Town that are going to be affected negatively. The developers and speculators have bought wisely. The people that bought their homes to live as residential that did not know what was going to happen, some of them are going to be very negatively affected, and it's their retirement money and I believe, even though there's not a legal obligation through expropriation, I believe that the Town should be compensating some of these losses.</p> <p>On my last note, I want to say I really sympathize with the Councillors. You've got a hard decision. You've got a decision that I don't think that the majority of the citizens are going to be happy with. But I do have faith in you that you can listen, you can modify this Official Plan Amendment, you can get the best for the citizens in.</p> <p>And hopefully, we can wait until the GTSB final report is done, until this development can be done properly and the developers will give you the time that is needed to do this development properly. We don't need to have a whole bunch of businesses built that businesses don't want to stay and house in the future.</p> <p>That's all. Thank you.</p>
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank you very much. Councillor Sanderson.
Councillor Jody Sanderson	Thank you Cheri. I appreciate that. Just a short question. You're not – when you talked about that you don't understand why residential would go across, along Dundas on the north side, you don't understand that. Are you saying that because you don't want to see that single family, sort of urban look that's there? Because you did say you would support high density. Are you thinking of apartments, that kind of thing?
Cheri Bain (Delegate)	I would support high-density development along the 407 corridor. Condominiums and apartment buildings can be

	<p>built very sound proof, they would not be affected as badly and it would encourage people to live there that were going to travel on the 407.</p> <p>I have problems with residential being built on Dundas. We now have noise abatement features for walls. I think this could be very costly in the long run.</p> <p>I believe the Region right now is just redoing the berms on the south side because residents that bought on the Dundas are not happy and I can see it being a future nightmare if we allow any type of residential development going along the Dundas.</p>
<i>Councillor Jody Sanderson</i>	<p>Subsequent to that, your Worship. Just, so, why couldn't the same sort of sound applications, if you built highrises along the 407, couldn't that be applied on 25? To achieve some of the densities that some of the residents are saying we need for public transit. And that's all, your Worship.</p>
<i>Cheri Bain (Delegate)</i>	<p>My experience with highrises is that the first few floors might get the noise, the upper levels seem to be above the noise. And apartment buildings, they aren't out using their backyards. It's not the same kind of a use in them, so I don't think they'd be as negatively affected. Like people tend to buy a town house and home and they expect to be able to use their yards.</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>Anything further? Thank you very much, Mrs. Bain. The next speaker.</p>
<i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i>	<p>The next delegation is Karen Nadeau.</p>
<i>Karen Nadeau (Delegate)</i>	<p>Good evening. Good evening Mayor Mulvale, Members of Council. My name is Karen Nadeau. I live at 503 Burnhamthorpe Road East and am here tonight representing my husband Ray and myself.</p> <p>I spoke to you in August of 2000, but since there are four new Councillors, I thought I would give you a brief history.</p> <p>My husband and I purchased our home in 1995. We</p>

	<p>planned to retire there, as we had found our dream home. Prior to purchasing, we contacted the Planning Department of the Town of Oakville to inquire as to future plans for the area.</p> <p>We were told there would be no water or gas until 2011. We were not told about the 407 or the proposed rezoning. The Town of Oakville's Planning Department has neglected their legal responsibility to inform us that the Region had completed Phase II of HUSP and that the lands were to be changed from rural to urban.</p> <p>To compound the matter further, because we moved in 1995, we did not receive notification from the Region of any meeting prior to the Official Plan Amendment #8 being passed in 1999. Also, as a resident of Burnhamthorpe, we do not receive delivery of the Oakville Beaver.</p> <p>We have \$750,000 invested in our home. We don't want to spend additional funds on improvements. We cannot sell our home, with this proposed rezoning hanging over our heads. If you re-designate these lands, our retirement nest egg will be significantly reduced.</p> <p>We realize you have no obligation to pay these damages. But we feel you have a legal obligation. We checked with the Town prior to purchasing and were not given any disclosure on the future of this area.</p> <p>We also think that we probably can't stop this but, in fact we know that at the moment there are things happening on the Burnhamthorpe that no one seems to know what's going on.</p> <p>We were told that a certain company was given permission to move land, or move dirt around on the property. Not only are they moving dirt around, they are bringing in great big dump trucks full of dirt and dumping it on the property, thereby distributing it around. They're also digging in the creek. They've put up pylons for fences and stuff.</p> <p>And yet, when I questioned it, I was told that they have,</p>
--	---

	<p>there's no site plan started, nothing's been done but yet they're doing all this.</p> <p>This morning when we drove down the Burnhamthorpe, we couldn't even see on the road, there was so much dust and dirt being – around, because all these darn big trucks were bringing in dirt. We have some pictures to show what's going on, but it just seems that things have started up there and there's been no – nothing's been approved, we've got no re-designation of the property, or anything like that.</p> <p>And they've also got a request in right now for a tennis bubble on the Burnhamthorpe. They've got requests from the Memorial Gardens for a site plan approval. And they're doing all this and nothing's been decided. We think that nothing, you know, it shouldn't be going on.</p> <p>And we received a letter. I've only received a copy of it today so we haven't really had much chance to acknowledge. But Mr. Salisbury wrote to us last August, saying that the Town is not really committed to pay damages for people like ourselves who are going to lose a significant amount of money. But I really think that you do have a moral obligation and that you protect our future retirement by compensating our losses caused by no fault of our own.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Thank you, Ma'am. I'd like to, with Council's permission, deviate in terms of what's happening on Burnhamthorpe Road now. The Planning Director can update us all, and I'm sure we're going to reference the fact that people can still do things while we're doing the Official Plan, as long as they fall within the present zoning and OP.</p>
<p><i>Ted Salisbury, Director of Planning Services</i></p>	<p>Yes, your Worship. I just wanted to comment with respect to the deposition of fill on a property north of Dundas Street and south of Burnhamthorpe.</p> <p>There's a bylaw in Town, which deals with site alteration and there are permits that are issued for site alteration and this concerns the deposition of any material and prior to any alteration of any site, there is a plan that must be submitted to show any proposed grades, changes and so</p>

	<p>on.</p> <p>It is not development activity. There is no proposed development. It is simply an activity that takes place and it is site alteration. And site alteration goes on in a number of different locations within the municipality.</p> <p>But I just wanted to clarify to Mrs. Nadeau there is no development happening north of Dundas Street. And she is correct, there are no site plan applications, because there's no construction taking place.</p>
<i>Karen Nadeau (Delegate)</i>	This is actually north of the Burnhamthorpe.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>Well if we've got the wrong location, we'll definitely look into it. And I don't wish to disagree with the Town Planning Director, but there is some development going on because we've approved the King's Collegiate, but those are things, as I've indicated, that are properly zoned existingly, and so that's why the site plan and that process can go through.</p> <p>But the lands that you're submitting Madam, are north of Burnhamthorpe, and east and west of where, please.</p>
<i>Karen Nadeau (Delegate)</i>	Well, just west of the Ninth Line.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	West of Ninth Line. Will, John Kwast, who's part of our site plan and development section, can, is...
<i>Karen Nadeau (Delegate)</i>	They're bringing tons and tons and tons of dirt in there.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Yeah. Yeah. We'll certainly look into it.
<i>Karen Nadeau (Delegate)</i>	And you know, there's supposedly no site plan has been approved.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	It may well be some sort of site alteration, but what we will do, we will have dialogue back with you Ma'am, and we will e-mail to all Members of Council so they're aware of what is taking place.
<i>Karen Nadeau (Delegate)</i>	They're actually digging right in the creek, so...
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Well that is definitely of concern, so we'll be looking at that location tomorrow. Could you please come and take the photographs? That would be grateful. Thank you. Mrs. Kramer. Are there any questions of the delegation?

Town of Oakville
 Lands North of Dundas
 Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

	Councillor Elgar.
<i>Councillor Allan Elgar</i>	I did, but I think she cleared it up. I thought I misheard her that she said they were digging in the creek, but in fact you did say they were digging in the creek, didn't you?
<i>Karen Nadeau (Delegate)</i>	They're digging in the creek, yes. We were in there, actually because we live so close and we're quite, we're really upset about the devaluing of our property. So we see all this going on, and we wonder what it is and we were in there on Monday night after we had the meeting here and they were digging in there on Monday night while there was nobody else around. But there was a man with a backhoe in there digging down into the creek and stuff.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	We will follow up on it. Any further questions. Thank you. At any time you see that, I mean, call us right away and we'll get people out.
<i>Karen Nadeau (Delegate)</i>	Well, we did speak to Janice and she gave me some information. But since then, we've had, we thought the best thing would be to show people pictures of what actually happened.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Oh sure. We appreciate it, and I'm glad you've contacted your Ward Councillor and again we'll check into this tomorrow. Thank you. Councillor Caster.
<i>Councillor Janice Caster</i>	Just for clarification, your Worship. The staff has been out once to check the site and we spoke again and they will be out there in the immediate future and check it again.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Appreciate that update. The next delegation.
<i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i>	Yes. The next delegation is Alfred Dobell.
<i>Audience Member</i>	(Inaudible)
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Oh, I apologize. Councillor Caster is doing yeoman's service on notes for us. She was merely saying that staff have been called to the site once and they're continuing their investigation and will be back there tomorrow. Did I capsulize that adequately? Okay. And if at any time

	<p>you can't hear, just let us know. Thank you.</p> <p>So you may, if you want to adjust the microphone, Mrs. Bain's a little smaller than many of our delegations, so that's great.</p>
<p><i>Alfred Dobell (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>That sound all right?</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Sounds fine to me, but it's the back of the room that I'm concerned about. Thank you.</p>
<p><i>Alfred Dobell (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>All right. Well anyway, your Worship and Members of Council, my name is Alfred Dobell and I've lived in Oakville for about 24 years.</p> <p>And I'd like to start, been said before, but I'd like to start anyway, by stating that I for one am very glad we have Oakville Green. They must take much of the credit for the very large turnout three nights running to express our collective determination never again to allow the kind of development that ignores sensitive natural land, wooded and wetland features, wherever they occur.</p> <p>Council should be mindful of that determination and instruct its planning staff to avoid the temptation of acting in defiance of it.</p> <p>On being interviewed recently by the CBC Radio, Mayor Mulvale made a statement to the effect that it would be fairly easy to satisfy these concerns, pleasing the delegates in Council Chamber to the point of loud cheering. Except, the developers would automatically run to the OMB as they did successfully a quarter of a century ago when the Town had said no to development.</p> <p>We are fully aware that it is impossible at this point in time to again say no to development. The land north of highway has already been zoned urban.</p> <p>But this also is a very different ball game and people are no longer willing to accept uncontrolled environmental devastation as the price of future development. And doubtless, the current OMB has been made very aware and will come onside as well, making its decisions reflect current environmental realities.</p>

	<p>After all, not too many decades before that particular fateful decision, 25 years ago, in various parts of the country's coastal regions, garbage scows were being towed offshore to dump their wastes into our seas and waterways. Scow operators of the day, no doubt, pleaded with local authorities to allow them to continue these practices on the grounds of protecting their investment.</p> <p>Environmental factors are considered last if they are addressed at all. In the 21st Century, however, they rank about number one and all industries must adapt, including the development community.</p> <p>If fears of a 25-year-old OMB ghost were going to remain the chief motivating consideration of Oakville's Council and Planning Staff, then the forests and wetlands of North Oakville would be condemned to be bulldozed and extinguished forever. We are all here to prevent that happening.</p> <p>However, this has been mentioned before tonight and touched on, but on the encouraging side, I thought it was encouraging at the time, in the original LGL Limited report, Appendix G, they describe the natural features of an area east of Trafalgar, west of Eighth Line to a depth of about 1 ½kilometers north of Highway #5 as follows, as the button bush swamp area.</p> <p>Described as follows: Contains single largest wetland area beyond the environmentally sensitive area, largest example of provincially rare to uncommon plant community, presence of regionally rare species, candidates significant wildlife habitat, acquire and protect Category 2 wetland features, key component of natural heritage system, surrounding Category 3 woodlands priority for acquisition and protection. Integrate undisturbed woodland parcels as a buffer to the wetland and review opportunity to restore linkage connection with Joshua Creek Valley to the east.</p> <p>I thought that was very nice to have that. I thought, well at least that button bush swamp will be saved.</p>
--	---

	<p>Multicolored maps serve a purpose. There's one of them up there – to a point. But I thought I'd go and see for myself, armed with strong binoculars I spent several hours climbing about in quite difficult terrain and I saw that indeed there are wetlands, woodlands stretching from Joshua Creek in the east to Trafalgar in the west. And they are indeed as described by LGL and ought to be protected. I even heard Mike Lansdown's bullfrog croaking in one of the swamps.</p> <p>Now I also approached it from all angles, from the south, from the west and the east. And as I say, with strong binoculars, you can see just about everything that's on.</p> <p>Now if what I seem to have learned subsequently is true, Addendum #1 on the Official Planning Amending process, they are being requested by this same LGL Limited, now acting for a developer, to cancel all that about wetlands, rare plants, rare species etc.</p> <p>Our client the developer, our client brackets the developer, is requesting that the wetland designation be deleted to provide flexibility for the integration of essential infrastructure requirements, such as storm water detention pond.</p> <p>Where are we going? LGL we paid, I don't know, \$175,000 to do a survey. Along comes a developer and LGL says something else. I don't know. Are they paying them more? What is it? I don't know.</p> <p>This is only one example of why the Official Plan Amendment should not be adopted, not be adopted until there are firm ground rules with teeth. The end product will be useless unless all the players are clear beyond doubt over whether this woodland or that swamp or that creek is to be saved or bulldozed. It cannot be otherwise. It wouldn't make sense. You cannot negotiate after the fact with a developer, who chooses to demolish a woodland or a sensitive marsh and build on it. You can't negotiate after the fact.</p> <p>Please get the rules in place first before any adoption. You will also need to put in place the facilities necessary for</p>
--	--

	<p>monitoring and enforcing these protective provisions. Otherwise, it may go on and you don't know it.</p> <p>Only after that, and teaming up with federal, provincial and regional planners on the matter of necessary mass public transport, so that we can breathe the air, can this Council and its Planning Staff adopt an Official Planning Act Amendment or otherwise.</p> <p>The numbers of people you see here are about the tip of an iceberg that is getting bigger. We want ironclad protective environmental provisions, not vague and ambiguous loopholes that you could drive a developer's bulldozer through.</p> <p>That is my submission.</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>Thank-you, Sir. Any questions? If not, as you raised the quote I'd like to give all of the quote, if I may, and I can't give it verbatim because I don't have the text in front of me, but I believe you to be an honorable gentleman and you'll recognize the validity of the paraphrasing of the quote. Firstly, I...</p>
<i>Alfred Dobell (Delegate)</i>	<p>I'm missing something.</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>I said I'd like to paraphrase the rest of the quote. You read a quote from what I said on the radio.</p>
<i>Alfred Dobell (Delegate)</i>	<p>Oh yes, sorry.</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>Thank you very much. And I know you to be honorable so I just want to read the rest of it into the record.</p> <p>In essence what I said, we're looking for sustainability on three fronts: Sustainability environmentally, financially and decisions. I was not saying that we were continuing to be fearful of the OMB. And if I might, Sir, what you have just illustrated by reading into the record the two comments, you have just given a little vignette of what takes place at an Ontario Municipal Board meeting.</p> <p>And so, I understand the guarantees that you want. But at the beginning of the program, because I followed a comment from Mike Lansdown that had been broadcast</p>

Town of Oakville
Lands North of Dundas
Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

	<p>the previous day, I said I've appreciated Michael's comments, because he was speaking about not no growth, not anti-development, but things that we needed to obtain. And in my summation of my part of the program the subsequent day, was we not only needed sustainability environmentally, and financially, but also in decision-making. That was my comment, so I've...</p>
<i>Alfred Dobell (Delegate)</i>	Oh, I heard it clearly, your Worship.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Thank you. You only referenced part of it, that was all, Sir.
<i>Alfred Dobell (Delegate)</i>	<p>Oh, I did hear it clearly, but it simply, may I just add that the only part of your interview which I wanted to comment on was you quite clearly said that you could set all the delegates cheering, but that would mean the developers would go to the OMB.</p> <p>That's the only part of your interview that I, that was relevant.</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	We're agreeing. We're agreeing, Sir, but I was saying, I was talking about process of sustainable decision-making, that was all. Thank you.
<i>Alfred Dobell (Delegate)</i>	Oh yeah, well I didn't... Anyway. Thank-you.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	No. I appreciate it. Next delegation.
<i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i>	David Debelle.
<i>David Debelle (Delegate)</i>	<p>Good evening Mayor Mulvale and Councillors. Thank you for the chance to speak tonight. My name's David Debelle, I've lived in Oakville for approximately 35 years.</p> <p>The Region of Halton advertises itself as a world class place to be and Oakville is famous for its picturesque characteristic neighborhoods, lakefront and a beautiful downtown.</p> <p>Many people come here from all over the GTA to walk down through the parks and neighborhoods, to go to the restaurants and they come from well beyond that area. In fact, the other day I just met a couple, some friends of mine from Buffalo who had come up just for a visit and were walking right around the neighborhood and I just</p>

	<p>bumped into them as I was in the park.</p> <p>These beautiful areas exist, particularly in old Oakville, because there are many, many bylaws and safeguards very specific and very strong that limit development in the area, that protect public spaces and preserve the character of the neighborhood.</p> <p>Now obviously not all areas are going to look like old Oakville down by the lake. But if we truly want to be a world class place to be, and to have something special, which I believe we all do, then we'll have to make stronger commitments to things like establishing a natural heritage system, as recommended in the LGL study.</p> <p>In today's paper I look at, talk about a world class place to be or being the best in the province, well, yesterday Oakville had the province's worst air quality reading, with a poor mark of 64. I don't think we're very proud of that.</p> <p>And in many ways it's very difficult to find measures to reduce this because some of them are beyond our control. But some of them are not. And it doesn't make sense to me that we would proceed to develop further, without making a stronger commitment to preserving more of our natural heritage areas.</p> <p>We know, right ahead of time now, that we're going to have more cars, more congestion and less vegetation. There's not one person here who thinks their air quality is going to improve. I think we have to try harder in this regard.</p> <p>Often issues come down to, of course, money. Can the Town afford to purchase land from private property owners as well as from the Ontario Land Corporation. In many ways, I don't think we can afford not to.</p> <p>I think that a stronger commitment could be made to a public fundraising campaign. The numbers of people you see here today are just a representation of the feelings of the Town. And I think that there would be much stronger support for people contributing to help purchase parcels of land to ensure that a natural heritage system actually</p>
--	--

	<p>comes into existence.</p> <p>We do not want to see Oakville continue to grow into an endless series of subdivisions. Desirable places to live, that what know about, such as for example High Park, The Beaches, or many nice areas in Oakville that I've mentioned, it's the natural features that make the neighborhoods attractive.</p> <p>So, I believe that we should try to build something really special and that we need a stronger commitment to preserve the natural heritage system in the lands north of Highway #5. Thank you very much.</p>
<p>Mayor Ann Mulvale</p>	<p>Thank you, Sir. Any questions? Thank you. The next delegation.</p>
<p>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</p>	<p>The next delegation is Roberta Need. The next five grouping are Iris McGee, Donna Endles, Rob Burton, Marianne Hawthorne, Blair Taylor.</p>
<p>Roberta Need (Delegate)</p>	<p>Okay. I wish to commence by questioning the use of the extra security, uniformed and un-uniformed, during these meetings. This is Canada and we the people here tonight and other nights have been civilized and courteous, so why the extra guards? It's not something I've ever seen here before and it disturbs me.</p> <p>The Oakville Beaver of February, June 22nd, contained an article regarding the Town of Oakville and, prompted by Councillor Kurt Franklin, to ban smoking in public places. Nine days earlier, the Council said they were deleting a section of the industrial bylaw because it gave the illusion the Town could ban things. So the Town feels it can ban smoking, but not nuclear waste.</p> <p>In advance of this meeting tonight, the Town of Oakville's Planning and Development Council made changes to its industrial bylaw, which will have a great impact on the lands above #5.</p> <p>On June 13th, 2001, at the request of Ward 6 Councillor Kurt Franklin, the Town of Oakville deleted Section 63 of the new industrial zoning bylaw. By doing so, Oakville</p>

	<p>now permits every noxious industry previously banned by this Town to apply for sites in Oakville. At the same time, this new industrial bylaw allows nuclear and toxic waste storage facilities in the Town's E2 industrial zones.</p> <p>The lands above Dundas tonight are proposed to be divided 60/40 in favor of employment lands, including numerous E2 industrial zones.</p> <p>With Canada importing large quantities of toxic waste, it is not beyond imagination to assume we will be seeing these industries seeking such sites in Oakville. Though the Town reassures us that 800 meters set-backs from residential properties are enough to protect us.</p> <p>Multiple sites of toxic and nuclear waste can be established in Oakville, thanks to this Council, and there is nothing we can now do to stop it. The Town has tied its own hands.</p> <p>The lands above #5 should not be re-zoned at this time and not until this loophole is plugged or the virgin territory above Dundas may still be the breeding ground for very rare species indeed, including some two-headed ones. Thank you.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Thank you are there any questions for Mrs. Need? Thank you very much. Next delegation.</p>
<p><i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i></p>	<p>The next delegation: Cathy and Sid Dick.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>And again, just to clarify. People who are not here when they're called, given the series of meetings, we place them at the rear of the list and we'll gladly call them again or fit them in at a subsequent meeting. Next speaker, Madam Clerk.</p>
<p><i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i></p>	<p>The next speaker is Iris McGee.</p>
<p><i>Iris McGee (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>Good evening Mayor and Members of Council. Actually, the comments I was going to make have been covered already this evening, so I won't repeat them again.</p>

	But I just would like to ask for a technical clarification about what's going to be happening in September.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Please.
<i>Iris McGee (Delegate)</i>	You said there would be an opportunity for public input at that time to address changes within the OPA that are going to be made between now and September?
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>Sorry. Yes. Not changes so much as a response to all the questions and clarifications that are being sought. So we've asked staff, as I understand it, they'll make that statement, they'll give us their input, they'll give us their suggestion, the consultant will also, and legal will also be consulted with. And so they may then as a result, make changes to the document that we're working from tonight.</p> <p>And we'll have them highlighted, so that people will not only have the commentary, but they'll have the end result of what the staff might, would be recommending. Then it will be up to Council as to whether they make any, embrace that or not.</p> <p>And before we do that and have that debate, the public will have the opportunity to seek clarification and to speak, in terms of their viewpoints of what is, or may be, proposed.</p>
<i>Iris McGee (Delegate)</i>	Okay. So when you said that there would be limited opportunity for public input...
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>No the limit, what we were saying is that our procedural bylaw normally says that if you'd spoken to an issue, unless there is new information...</p> <p>For instance, let's go back to the issue that Roberta Need and David Lee have spoken to. We, people were able to come back to the podium because there were changes being proposed in some of that discussion, or reaction to what had been said. We were able to contain that in a shorter period of time.</p>
<i>Iris McGee (Delegate)</i>	Okay. Thank you. I just also wanted to make a comment on what happened in Hudson, Quebec today. And that I

	<p>was very impressed with an example of a municipality that challenged the status quo and took it right to the Supreme Court. And despite the odds, they one.</p> <p>So I think there are examples out there that we can look at as far as leadership, and what a municipality can do. And whether it be the OMB or any other perceived threat, I think we have an opportunity here and can really do something.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>There's no question. And earlier tonight, I can tell you, many of my elected colleagues and some staff members at the province and elsewhere told me, we would never get ORC to do what they did today.</p> <p>And so we have lobbied with our staff, with ourselves, with going to Kitchener to see the Minister of the Environment to suggest to this government that that would be an indication of respect for the environment and assist us greatly in how we deal with these lands.</p> <p>So there were many people who told me we were dreaming in Technicolor. So certainly there were two, as I indicated today, two decisions which say that there's an evolution that's taking place. An evolution is always preferred to revolutions.</p>
<p><i>Iris McGee (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>I also applaud that and I think that's a real step forward, that we're going to see some urban forests in the north. And now when we talk about our achievements and we talk about 16 Mile Creek and the valleys, we can also include urban forests into those achievements. So I'm really looking forward to hearing Council and Staff talking about urban forests in the future.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Thank you. Are there any questions? Thank you. The next delegation.</p>
<p><i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i></p>	<p>Donna Endles.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Thank you. You may wish to sign the registration as well. That would be useful. And, the mike is very sensitive so once you've positioned it, you may want to try and avoid</p>

Town of Oakville
 Lands North of Dundas
 Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

	touching it, just because it may be beeping somewhere. Thank you.
<i>Donna Endles (Delegate)</i>	I'm a very short person.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	No, no, please adjust it so we can hear you. That's not the issue.
<i>Donna Endles (Delegate)</i>	Hi, my name is Donna Endles, not Dawn Endless as they said. My husband and I...
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	We apologize if we got it wrong. We'll correct it.
<i>Donna Endles (Delegate)</i>	My husband and I moved here about four years ago and we love living here in Oakville. And we live between Dundas and Upper Middle Road.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	I'm not sure everybody's hearing you. So...
<i>Donna Endles (Delegate)</i>	<p>Sorry. Anyway, within the last four years we've noticed the change in Oakville, how it's grown and the new homes on Neyagawa and the Third Line area. And everyday we travel up Neyagawa to Burnhamthorpe Road and we notice the beautiful scenery, which is all greenery and people even out of town coming to visit me because I'm from Aylmer, Quebec, they love the area up there because it's country, as they say, right? And we'd hate to see it being built up, but we know it, it's progress, as they say.</p> <p>But my reason here tonight is to say that the animals, I'm concerned about the wildlife north of Dundas, because I know there's lots of wildlife, lots of birds, raccoons, I've seen red foxes, all kinds of wildlife, and I'd hate to see it all be killed because of progress, as they say, and I'm getting very nervous.</p> <p>Anyway, with the industry being - that you're contemplating on industry being built north of Dundas on 407, that would be the only area of 407 that I would notice industry because if you go along Mississauga, that's all country and agriculture land, beautiful scenery, with creeks and wildlife hanging around in the creeks and the waterways and stuff.</p> <p>Anyway, with the waste of precious land, once we make the way of our agriculture land we can never bring back</p>

	<p>what we take away.</p> <p>Also, in today's paper it says that, yesterday's Oakville was the worst air quality reading in Ontario, with a poor mark of 64. Toronto only had a 50. With building more homes and industrial buildings north of Dundas, it will only add to the bad air quality we already have, which means that more people will get sick and with no doctors taking on new patients here in Oakville, health care will get even worse.</p> <p>So how can we accommodate more people in Oakville? Why are we, why were the lands sold to corporations before the rezoning of lands were approved. And the corporations do not care about the wildlife or the air quality or the woodlands or wetlands that need to be preserved. All they want is enough space for parking and such things. Is this what's called progress? And that's all I have to say.</p>
Mayor Ann Mulvale	<p>Thank you very much. You did very well. Is there any question? Thank you. I'd just like to tell you I live south of Upper Middle Road and after Monday night's meeting I sat on my patio and I watched a mama raccoon, who gave birth under my deck, and her four babies.</p> <p>So there's a great resilience in that 16 Mile Creek trail and valley system. And that would be the sixth year in a row that we've been the habitat for a birthing process. So, and they're really cute. So thank-you.</p>
Donna Endles (Delegate)	It's a wondrous thing.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Yeah, it is. Thank you. The next delegation. (<i>Aside: I haven't given birth to coyotes yet.</i>)
Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk	The next delegation is Rob Burton. The next grouping of speakers are Stephen Dankowich, Jeffrey Davies, Steve Baker, Tom Scott, Catherine Balmer.
Rob Burton (Delegate)	How does the projector work? Where do I find it? Oh, okay. Here we go.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	I'd just like to know from the audience if you'd like a

Town of Oakville
Lands North of Dundas
Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

	five-minute break while Mr. Burton sets up. Is there anybody who would like a... So, just five minutes, 9:20 we'll come back together.
<i>(RECESS – 5 minutes)</i>	
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Ladies and Gentlemen. If you'd please take your seats. I have a quorum of Council. We'll reconvene and we think we've set everything up. Had a little bit of a casualty with the hands-free mike that should be here and none of us are sure where it's gone so we're going to make what we can. Thank you for your observance of the comfort break. We do indeed Madam Clerk have a quorum of Council. Whenever Mr. Burton is ready, he can start his presentation.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	I heard in a previous, I think on Tuesday night, that the miking has changed, so I'm going to try to adjust.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	We can hear you. The issue with the, because the other mike was so ineffective, people, we used to ask them to go very close to it. If you do that, you get a sound that isn't quite as clear as if you can just find your right distance. And I know you have an ear for those things, so...
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	Well, I'm on a short tether. I'm on a short tether. That means I'm married.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Rob, is that mike on? Is that mike on here? Is that on? If it is, maybe you could pick that up. Let's see if that's on. Turn the switch. There you go, I think that'll help your short tether. No Councillor Sanderson, this is not karaoke. Behave.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	My neighbor had a karaoke party the other day. All night. None of them could sing.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	You only have them if you've consumed a certain beverage in adequate supply and everybody has to have done it. That's the rule of the game.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	Then I understand you sound very good. So is the hearing okay? Can I still – testing one, two, three, four.

Town of Oakville
 Lands North of Dundas
 Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	That's the old mike, so...
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	Oh, okay. I remember how to use the old one. All right. I guess I should look this way.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Whichever way works for your presentation.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	<p>Ladies and Gentlemen, friends and neighbors, thank you very much for letting me share with you a few thoughts on Official Plan Amendment 198 and a few other things that have occurred to me to be connected to it.</p> <p>Your Worship, Councillors, I'm here tonight representing Joshua Creek Ratepayers Incorporated. I'm the past president and a current director and my colleagues and associates on the board of the Joshua Creek Ratepayers Incorporated fully endorse and share with me these thoughts that we're going to share with you tonight.</p> <p>And for those who don't know and would like to, we're in Oakville Ward 3, between Winston Churchill and Maplegrove and Royal Windsor and the lake. Which is this area.</p> <p>And on Tuesday night, I believe I might have heard someone say that south of the QEW you can't walk on the Town's creeks and enjoy them up close and personal and whoever that was I'd like to invite to join me and my family in Joshua Creek Park, where you can do exactly that and for the entire seven years that I've lived here have always been able to do that and...</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Rob, I think it referred to old Oakville, the 16 Mile Creek in old Oakville, but I could be wrong. But we take your point.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	<p>So anyway, it's very nice to have that green space and our appreciation of that green space informs what we're going to share with you tonight.</p> <p>Now over the years a number of ugly black objects have dropped in on us and some of them dropped in on us before I moved to Oakville in '94. This black blob's meant to remind me to tell you we've learned a lot about</p>

	<p>the negative impacts of development and the environmental problems that face us.</p> <p>And St. Lawrence Cement - which isn't quite that close, it's really down a bit, but we'd be off the screen – that black blob's supposed to represent St. Lawrence Cement in our fight 25 or more years ago since then. Then there's the Petro Canada refinery.</p> <p>We also learned a lot about how development can tear a neighborhood apart. When Ford Drive was built, which is approximately the black blob I just dropped in there, our community was torn apart in a bitter and ugly fight, the residue of which still continues today, although I'm very glad to say I find that people who used to be unable to speak to each other are now approaching the point where they can be civil again to each other. And that's a good thing.</p> <p>Ice Sports built an arena approximately there. That taught us an important lesson about development, which was crystallized for us in a conversation that I had with Mayor Ann when she explained to us the lesson of development is that if it isn't in a site plan agreement, registered on title, it's just fancy words.</p> <p>Also in our community, we had an opportunity to respond with a startled look when a gigantic warehouse that looked like the Berlin Wall was built on Cornwall Road, across from the homes that you see there and that fight still echoes today.</p> <p>And in 1998 approximately, the Halton Regional School Board decided they wanted to close our only school, Chisholm Public School, which is where that black dot dropped in. And only when we got them to admit that we had enough kids coming out of Joshua Creek to populate that school totally did they relent.</p> <p>Where were our kids? Why was the school looking empty? Our kids had been bused west to fill other schools. That taught us a little bit about the way everything in Oakville and the rest of Halton seems to be stitched together in an intimate web of interlinking ties that are</p>
--	---

	<p>very hard to sort out and can damage your community.</p> <p>Now the same Berlin Wall people want to extend up there and we're presently involved in a lot of anxiety and battling over that.</p> <p>And on top of that, there's a waste transfer operation going on right there, which doesn't seem to want to operate, doesn't seem to need to operate with the benefit of any inspection, and appears to everyone to be operating without the benefit of observing any of the applicable environmental laws or guidelines or procedures.</p> <p>And on top of that, there's an 800 Megawatt power plant that's going to be built there on Winston Churchill right next to us, 700 yards from the homes on Clairmont Crescent.</p> <p>So, troubles we've seen a few. Now, it hasn't all been bad. The green area that just dissolved in is some industrial land that the residents were able to buy and take out of industrial use, donate to the Town as park, and, we hope, serve as a buffer between the residential area and the industrial development to come there.</p> <p>Out of all that experience, we have a few concerns about OPA 198.</p> <p>Now, in addition to our concerns, we live in a Ward that I'm very glad to say enjoys an instinct and a practice of talking to each other and trying to make common cause together and work together. And so we've consulted with our fellow residents' associations in old Oakville and that would be this area, which is called the Trafalgar/Chartwell Resident's Association and this area, which is called the Oakville Lakeside Resident's Association.</p> <p>Now, owing to scheduling conflicts, Brian Emo, who's the President of the Oakville Lakeside Resident's Association, couldn't be here tonight. But he did ask me to tell you that OLRA fully endorses what we're about to share with you. And, I believe that Marianne Hawthorne of the TCRA follows me for the purpose of reassuring you as to that fact.</p>
--	--

	<p>So, two areas of an old part of Oakville here to try to share what we've learned. Our goals tonight are to share the consensus views of JCRI, OLRA and TCRA to reject the proposed OPA 198 for being too divisive and too destructive. And to recommend steps toward a wider public consensus to build a vision we can all believe in for our future.</p> <p>We, as we went through the material, identified 10 core concerns, which we'll phrase as questions tonight.</p> <p>First, are we endangering having a natural green system, across the north? Second, are we undermining Official Plan Amendment 158? Third, is there a hidden cost burden here that will produce a tax disaster? Fourth, are there infrastructure deficiencies that need to be addressed? Are there, in land use terms, area controls that are missing or suffering from loopholes, which will bite us in a rear location later? Are we, if we adopt this amendment, planning to pollute? Are the assumptions in the proposed amendment about what the Environmental Assessment Act says out of date; wrong? Does our reach exceed our grasp on this project? Have public meeting rights been abused? Has the process been tainted by the role of developers in it?</p> <p>I'll discuss each of these in sequence to try to make them a little clearer because there could be some doubt or confusion about what we mean by each one.</p> <p>Concern number one, question number one: Are we endangering our chances of having a natural forest, green way and linkages across the north? Does the language of OPA 198 seek to avoid commitment? Does it say we should put off until another day our concern about the natural heritage system?</p> <p>In our view, the secondary planning process is too late for this. If it's not, we'd like to know why, especially in regard to the observation we have that it appears the waterfront assurances weren't putting in the Official Plan and so, by a process that I would call reasoning by analogy, we ask, shouldn't we be doing the same thing</p>
--	---

	<p>vis-à-vis a natural forest system across the north. And if we decline to do that, are we admitting up front, aren't we admitting up front that we have no similar commitment to the idea?</p> <p>So the question we're trying to put is, is there any value to saying something in a halfhearted way? Is there any value to giving something only lip service, or is there a negative consequence of so behaving in that expectations are raised which are guaranteed to be dashed? Does that build a community or does that divide it? We submit it divides it.</p> <p>In our view, there's too much language that's worded with attempt and potential. We want clear intent, clear commitment and the test that we would apply is, is it as good as we have in the section for the waterfront.</p> <p>And we think we should have legal and planning write and deliver reports on this, considering the alternatives and perhaps obtain peer review as well. And I think that you're going to hear a consistent theme tonight with us.</p> <p>This material should be provided in a timely and effective way for citizen participation. That means, we're hoping for a process where we don't only just ask questions, that may or may not get answered later, but we get the answers and we get them in time to inform further interaction with the Town about the plan. We're talking about a participatory style of democracy that I wouldn't have thought in the year 2001 any of us at my age would have to be talking about.</p> <p>Concern number two concerns whether or not OPA 198 undermines OPA 158. Does everybody remember how we got OPA 158? Ted (inaudible) organized a public meeting. I think we began downstairs, but there were too many of us. We came up here. It was a huge crowd. Or did we start up here and go down there because there were too many of us?</p> <p>Many of the planning people that we have here tonight were there - I believe some of them. And it was a remarkable experience because it was a fairly large crowd of several hundred and they had a remarkable ability to</p>
--	---

	<p>express themselves in a really clear way that in no time, I don't believe at any time it ever was anything other than correct and polite, but my it was clear, wasn't it?</p> <p>And out of that, and that message for those of you who want to hear, that message was: The citizens of the Town don't like it when the established pattern of the Town is degraded by developers coming in with projects that don't fit the existing zoning and seem to persuade the Town that it's okay to degrade the zoning to suit their preference.</p> <p>So, in that particular instance there was a project that wanted to go into an RO1 area, where the density permitted 10 homes for the land that they had and they wanted to put, depending on which stage of their tactics you looked at, 30, 18 – the number was coming down. And in the end, we went to the OMB and, as part of a mediation and negotiating process that's involved there, they got 12, instead of 18.</p> <p>But we got an OPA amendment that said that development in Oakville should be consistent – I can't quote it exactly – I think Lynn, I don't know who wrote it, did you write it? I think Lynn wrote it. I should ask her to read it. But basically, the way I remember it is, it said that development needs to be in character with, or consistent with the character of – help me out here, but you understand – with the existing neighborhood. Which is a lovely concept and I call it now the OPA 158 defence. Before we had nothing. There are people that consider it's a very weak reading with which to do battle, but it's better than nothing and I appreciate that we have it.</p> <p>Now, if its language was about making development consistent with the character of the community, doesn't OPA 198 radically remake the character of the Town? We think it does. Will our OPA 158 defence be open to charges that Oakville tries to suck and blow at the same time? Can we have legal and planning prepare reports on this, possibly with peer review, given the importance of it?</p> <p>Concern number three is the residential tax disaster that would appear. In April of this year, the Halton Region Finance Department issued a report that's been referred to</p>
--	--

	<p>earlier in this public meeting. I read it with some growing alarm. As I understood it, it represented that the impact on residential taxpayers from the preferential discounts that have been given to developers is pretty negative.</p> <p>It said property tax needs to increase 49.5 per cent over the next 15 years at an average of 3.3 per cent, but higher in the first few years and lower at the end. And if I understood it correctly it said that that is what's going to be due occurring known growth. It wasn't clear from reading the report, whether or not OPA 198's urban area is included in that cost.</p> <p>So, the question is, is it 49.5 per cent just for what we know about already or is it 49.5 per cent including what's going to go on in the lands north of #5. We'd like some clarification.</p> <p>It also said that utility rates need to rise 44.5 per cent over the same period. Same question. Is that just for known or does that include for this? Is this more? That's pretty clear, I would say.</p> <p>So the question arises in our minds, can we afford a massive subsidy from residents to developers? And can we have the Town's Finance Department do an impact analysis of the OPA's costs, followed by peer review?</p> <p>Are there infrastructure problems? Same report says that water and wastewater projects have been delayed for two years. It identified Oakville Phase 3, Milton Phase 2 expansion to the mid-Halton, Oakville and the Skyway, all delayed out there in the decade that we're in now. If I recall correctly, the years were like from 2004 to 2006 or somewhat, that kind of thing.</p> <p>Are we building homes before we build the arterials and the highways needed to relieve the existing gridlock? Let alone service the new gridlock.</p> <p>Does this development threaten to suck the schools out of the cell? I'm taking it as an assumption that you understand what I mean by the schools being sucked out of the cell. Basically, you can't build a new school unless</p>
--	---

	<p>you close an old school, seems to be the policy of the Halton School Board. And what that means is, you put 55,000 people in a farmland, you're going to close 55,000 people's worth of schools in the south to give them schools. That's the way it's working. That's the way it's worked for at least 10 years, and there's no visible means of support for a belief that that's going to change.</p> <p>And so, you need to understand if you do this, that's what you're going to do to the established areas of Oakville. And when I say the south, I mean not below QEW, I mean below the #5.</p> <p>You're going to create a sucking sound to the north, and it's going to be sucking your schools away. And that's the way it works. And I don't want to speak unfairly or leave out the sucking force that comes from the west, but I just remind you that we're closing high schools in Oakville and keeping open less-utilized high schools in Burlington and in my considered opinion that's because they have more votes than we do.</p> <p>So you're always going to hear two sucking sounds: One from the west, and one from the north if you do this the way you plan to do it, in my opinion.</p> <p>And P.S., are you aware that the high schools kids in the lands you've just developed in the west of Ward 1 have been earmarked by that Board to keep Burlington high schools open.</p> <p>I invite you to consider that there's a lot of unintended consequences. This OPA 198 has a few. This is only one.</p> <p>We think you're speeding development ahead of its support and we think there needs to be an extensive impact/costs study to identify these kinds of problems and identify the mitigation that needs to be adopted to protect us. I don't think a growing Oakville should destroy the existing Oakville. That's a bad bargain.</p> <p>Are there omissions of controls in the planning portion of the document? Here I'm not trying to pretend to be a planner, I could never be that clever, but we were involved</p>
--	---

	<p>and are involved in an extensive fight over a power plan, part of whose struggle involves land use questions. And so, it's been an ugly education. All I can do is share with you the questions that it's taught us to ask.</p> <p>Have you provided special zones for power plants and other heavy land uses of the like? Mississauga didn't and it had to wring their hands and say, 'nothing we can do,' about the applicant's choice of a location that was right next to residential land, in Mississauga, and within 700 meters of residential land in Oakville.</p> <p>Will you be wringing your hands and saying the same words if you don't look after this now? Because as it stands right now, under the province's accelerated screening process for natural gas fired electricity projects, anywhere they can find 10 acres of industrial land, they can drop one in. And as I understand it, having just received this hard lesson, there's nothing we can do about it. Are you going to be content with that? I hope you'll do something about it. I hope you'll send it back to see that this is looked after. You gotta decide where you want them, because they're coming. And if you don't decide, someone else will.</p> <p>In our opinion, the buffers between residential areas and conflicting uses, which is a big theme on the JCRI land, are still too weak. I don't want it to sound like there's nothing in OPA 198 that I like. You know that the basic design concept of putting the residential area in the middle and employment lands above and below it, or putting the, so we have the pattern, I don't have a slide to show this but the basic pattern is to put the residential lands in the middle – are we all on the same page about that? – we like that, we think that's good.</p> <p>We think that if the industrial lands divided the new residential lands from the rest of the residential area of the city, we're basically going to wind up with two cities sharing the same name. So, we support that.</p> <p>But we think there should be planning and legal analysis of these issues and perhaps peer review as well to try to fashion the prophylactics that we need to protect ourselves</p>
--	--

	<p>from these power plants.</p> <p>Concern six is that we're authorizing pollution, the way it's worded. Others have raised this. I'm going to attempt to do my bit.</p> <p>Your goal, you state, is to minimize pollution. This won't do. Doesn't it guarantee that you'll increase pollution little by little if your goal is only to minimize it? Somebody's going to come along with a polluting application, going to point to your Official Plan, it's going to say, 'Well your goal is only to minimize pollution and I'm doing as minimal amount of pollution as I can.' And when you add a lot of littles together, don't you get a lot?</p> <p>In 1997, the Ministry of the Environment announced that Ontario's air is so dirty it kills 1,800 a year. In the year 2000 – In 1999, the Toronto Board of Health did a study that confirmed that, but said that the number was higher.</p> <p>In the year 2000, the Ontario Medical Association did an extensive study – there was peer review – that corroborated that, but said, 'Actually, you know it's 1,925 a year.' And they quantified the excess hospital visits, the lost days of work and unbelievable toll taken on society by air pollution in Ontario.</p> <p>So the facts are in. Pollution kills. We have a duty of care not to kill each other. By your duty of care, I don't believe you can aim to increase pollution by any amount. You have to have a higher goal. I think we have to require offsets for anybody who wants to – our goal has to be prevention and reduction and among the ways that you can work towards that is with the concept of offsets so that if somebody wants to add to pollution, he's got to take some out.</p> <p>It's a concept that's been working in the States now. The Ontario government is adopting a similar scheme. With their typical ingenuity, the government's proposed plan, which I commented on before the deadline yesterday, actually manages to do the opposite of what it says it will – a pattern I'm beginning to see with our government. And today the United States' Environmental Protection</p>
--	---

	<p>Agency denounced that it's guaranteed to increase the pollution.</p> <p>We have to do better. So we need the environmental impacts of this OPA analyzed and peer reviewed – not just for air, but for the other pollutants.</p> <p>In short, in our view, this is so radical an amendment to the Town's Official Plan, that it qualifies for a full environmental assessment and we think it should happen.</p> <p>There's another part of the plan that we're calling 'A bridge too far.' That's the Burnhamthorpe bridge. In there, your wording on the bridge seems to assume that the Environmental Assessment Act will keep covering consideration of alternatives.</p> <p>Well, in fighting the sites battle we've learned that for electricity projects, at least, the EAA no longer does that. The EAA has been gutted. The other element that's been removed from consideration by the government is the question of need. You just gotta want to do it, you don't have to prove that it's needed.</p> <p>Even if the EAA may still consider alternatives in land use cases, and I don't know, can you write the OPA for the possibility that that might be gutted too? I think you should because if you pledge to consider alternatives, no matter what, then you've made a sincere promise.</p> <p>If you pledge to consider alternatives under an EAA that's under attack and being gutted are you making a sincere promise or are you hoping a year down the road to be able to say, 'Ah, you know what? It's not required.' 'But you promised.' 'Yeah, but we didn't know.'</p> <p>So, it's a question of how do we treat each other, what do we owe each other by way of the quality of our promises to each other. I think we need legal analysis and peer review of these issues to be sure that we're doing the right thing and doing it well.</p>
--	--

	<p>Concern number eight is are we reaching too far too fast? Do the deficiencies in OPA 198 indicate that we're going too far too fast with too big of a change? Might we need greater checking and correction steps than in a smaller change to the Official Plan?</p> <p>In a small change to the Official Plan, like OPA 158, it wouldn't be reasonable to ask for the extra level of diligence and the extra checking loops that we're asking for. But this is a major transformation of a third of the town. A complete radical change from agriculture to urban. This is from here to here. Massive impact.</p> <p>When we attempt to do really big things, because we're all human and humans make mistakes, the only way we can protect ourselves from error it seems to me is to take the time to have correcting loops, where we check each other's work, and we hire others to check our work. And we struggle to make sure we're getting it right. Otherwise, error is guaranteed because we're human. And because it's big, the error will be big.</p> <p>So our recommendation for a three step cautious approach, peer review, environmental assessment, and referendum. This ain't no casual deal that's being proposed here.</p> <p>I can't do Jack Nicholson, but I was hoping to remind you of him with a little parody: 'Growth, you want growth? Are you sure you can handle it?'</p> <p>Now, concern nine is what looks like us to a pattern of public input prevention. The appearance of a wish by some Council and Staff to avoid or deter hearing or considering the public's concerns troubles us greatly.</p> <p>Now, I don't know what their intent was and actually I believe they're all honorable and worthy people. And so I'm willing to extend the benefit of the doubt and to assume that they didn't intend the way it appeared. But I do want to talk about the way it appeared.</p> <p>The way it appeared is as I describe: Now, in keeping with appearances, some of us are still waiting to hear</p>
--	--

	<p>planning's report on its time devoted to developers, which I thought I heard last August planning agreed to provide. But I never saw the result of it. If they did provide it, I'd be amused to see it. And if they produced it, it would balance the appearance that was given when they reported their peeved little report in August about how they'd spent 100 hours speaking to Oakville Green.</p> <p>Still, asking that question, can we see your time with developers - Ladies and Gentlemen, I've got to say it in public because he deserves it, Kevin Flynn, one of Kevin Flynn's finest moments – the finest moment I've seen, he may have done better but that's the one that gets my vote.</p> <p>We want you to appear to eagerly consider all public input and plan well for it. Plan well for it. That's how we tell whether you really want to hear us. Can I say that Monday sent an ugly message?</p> <p>Here's the way it looked in The Beaver on the web site. The headline's smaller but the words are the same. Let's zoom in, shall we. 'Development Meeting a Debacle.' Didn't enjoy that. It would probably end up a fiasco. I didn't enjoy that. Hundreds of disgruntled and skeptical residents left. I didn't enjoy that.</p> <p>It was determined that there were at least 500 in attendance. There's a question here. Can we confirm that it was 500? It's important. We need to know. Was it 500, was it 400, what was it? I'm willing to trust the newspaper, if I have to. But I am only talking about appearances here and the appearance is as I'm showing you.</p> <p>So further to the subject of public input prevention, is this meeting properly constituted? The Town hands out a Provincial Guide and Planning Act. This is what it says, I have no idea if I can rely on it. But you're handing it out today. It says here municipal council must give you as much information as possible when preparing its Official Plan. Later it says, and that applies to changes to the plan.</p> <p>It says notice must be given at least 20 days ahead of time. I have a copy of the notice for this meeting. It's dated May</p>
--	---

	<p>16, that seemed to be more than 20 days ahead. Good. But it says the meeting's on Monday. And it didn't happen. Because we weren't ready. And we should have been ready, because nobody was surprised when people turned out. Right? Come on. Who was surprised? Put your hand up. Okay. So we're admitting to that, right? So, I think that was poor.</p> <p>Further to more public input prevention, does the act encourage the use of mediation to resolve conflicts over changes to Official Plans? I don't know. That's what your handout says. It's just a handout, printed by the province. It's not the act. I'm a civilian. I'm just asking questions.</p> <p>But if it does, how does a mediation process come into action? Does the Town have a duty of disclosure about procedures to the public? If there's a mediation component to the planning procedure, does the Town have an obligation to put a spotlight on it and say here's where we'll go?</p> <p>Or does the Town get to just sort of ignore that unless somebody finds out about it and asks them about it? This is a question to what's in your heart. What's in your spirit? What are you trying to do? Are you trying to create a vision for the future of Oakville that we all can share? Or have you made up your mind and want to get past us as fast as you can?</p> <p>I don't know what's in your heart. But I'm here to tell you what it looks like. I'm here to tell you about the appearances.</p> <p>Does the Planning Act require processes that are fair, open, accessible, timely and efficient? Are we doing that? Do we, are we meeting our obligations to each other? I don't know. Like I said, it's just your handout and you didn't write it.</p> <p>Now, there may have been 500 here Monday night to have a meeting. And they may have been discouraged, accidentally or on purpose, we don't know, we don't need to know, you know that? We don't need to dig into that. All that's important is that they were discouraged and the</p>
--	---

	<p>next night, I was here, I counted them there were 300.</p> <p>Okay. Does that mean 200 were discouraged away? And I'm here tonight and I counted and there's 85, fewer than that because I've been talking too long but... What are we doing here?</p> <p>Now if your goal was to get rid of public input, you'd have to call this a qualified success. But if your goal is to encourage public input, I think you'd have to be tugging your forelock a little and going, 'Gee, could I have done this better?'</p> <p>I think we should be asking did we lose anything valuable when we chased 200 people away? I think we might have. Are we succeeding in our obligations to each other? And I'm starting to sound like a Bible tent revival creature. 'I'm calling on you to account for your sins.' I don't mean to. But I do mean to ask do we want to put this right?</p> <p>Earlier tonight I was unable to hear on the sound set in the other room, the exact nature of what was being talked about in terms of extending the process and so I don't really know the details of how you might be intending to put it right.</p> <p>But, optimist that I am, I leapt to the belief that you had intended to put it right. Because I heard that you were extending the process. So, I'll just delete that remark. And that one. And I'll ask when we extend the process are we going to extend it with a willing ear, an open heart and an open mind or are we just gonna play (<i>Inaudible</i>), where people come and speak at you and you go ahead with your preconceived notions?</p> <p>Is there going to be a process where people's questions are answered by whatever delay is required and then they have a chance to present you their considered second thoughts, you know: Here's my concern, here's your answer, here's my considered opinion. Is that what it's going to be like? That would be in my mind, an ideal process.</p> <p>Why are the developers so happy with you and the</p>
--	--

	<p>residents so unhappy? (<i>Applause</i>) Can you ask yourself how (<i>Inaudible comment to audience</i>). It's a clue, okay. It's a clue that everybody can understand I think and I'm grateful to them for having praised you so much because it gave me a cheap shot.</p> <p>Now, more importantly does this appearance taint your process, does it wound your integrity and do you care? Do you need steps to mitigate the damage and restore your credibility?</p> <p>Here's the minimum that I think we need. We need to know that all the information on which you will base your votes will be available to inform our timely input to you. This is a test of open government that I put before you for your consideration. I should say we put before you for your consideration.</p> <p>You meet this test, you won't have the situation you have where the developers love what you're doing and the residents have some reservations.</p> <p>But you know what, if you don't meet that test, it won't be Oakville. In my seven years in Oakville, I've come to expect that as a right. And up to now, I've always seen that kind of behavior so I'm having a lot of trouble reconciling what I'm seeing with what I'm used to. I don't understand what got going here, but it doesn't look right.</p> <p>So we've identified 10 opportunities for improvement. Fix and reconcile the LGL and Hemson reports. You'll remember that was the subject of my talk last August. By the way, while I remember, was that the 8th of August?</p>
<p>Mayor Ann Mulvale</p>	<p>I think that was the date of one of our meetings, but we can certainly confirm when the meetings were.</p>
<p>Rob Burton (Delegate)</p>	<p>The reason I ask is, in the OPA it says – well, here's what I know. The night I spoke you passed or adopted those studies. You considered carefully my recommendation that you fix the errors and correct the inconsistencies and make the numbers add up and you passed them instead. It was the same day. And the OPA says that was August 9th. My calendar says it was August 8th and it's been</p>

	bedeviling me all day. So.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	We'll get the Clerk to, I mean it's a matter of record, so we'll fix...
Rob Burton (Delegate)	<p>The (<i>Inaudible</i>) in question is, if it matters and if the 9th is not the day, you might fix that.</p> <p>Second, an opportunity to improve the plan exists in adding clarity to the provision for the natural forest and links system.</p> <p>Third, the third opportunity for improvement is to make clear the intent about preserving and protecting the 1,250 acres, and let's loop back to number one. We don't really know, do we, that it's 1,250 acres? Because you can't get the same number twice when you go through those two reports. Have I demonstrated to you extensively – p.s. I still have that presentation and if you want I could give you that one too. Now, maybe I should say the quantum, whatever it turns out to be if we reconcile.</p> <p>Fourth, there should be provision in the Official Plan for individual environmental assessments for all projects to go on Trafalgar Moraine. Or you're going to destroy our creeks.</p> <p>As we've said, there needs to be a cost impact study in the OPA, so. And that needs to be subjected to rigorous peer review. We may not be able to afford what you're thinking about doing. And I think we deserve to know what it's going to cost.</p> <p>Similarly, because not all negative impacts are financial, there needs to be a net negative impact analysis of the OPA. The infrastructure needs and timing and costs are murky for us and we'd like them to be clear.</p> <p>We think the OPA, whenever you decide to go forward with it, should have the benefit of a rigorous peer review. It should have the benefit of a full, fair, open public environmental assessment. And it should be subjected to a referendum. Those are the 10 ways we think we could improve the situation.</p>

	<p>Now, as we looked at the work, we were able to identify – we want to give out some prizes tonight. We were able to identify the most unsupported claim in the work that’s been given to you about the Official Plan. Here it is. What evidence supports the belief that any of Oakville’s population will have any significant number of the hoped for jobs in the employment lands. I see some puzzled faces. We mean, can you verify live/work?</p> <p>I think there should be a discussion paper, with successful examples and unsuccessful attempts and I think it should be given wide circulation so that we can see what it takes to have successful live/work, if there is any such thing.</p> <p>How much worse will traffic and pollution be if live/work fails? There has to be the negative analysis to know – I know you believe it. I know you believe. You believe live/work’s going to work. But what if not? What’s the kind of cost (<i>Inaudible</i>)? What’s going to be the damage if you’re wrong? Where’s that?</p> <p>What evidence supports our belief that this attempt at live/work will fail and only worsen traffic and pollution and everything else? Well, wasn’t live/work part of the Official Plan in ’76 too? Haven’t we heard this song before? Isn’t that anyway what the then Town Solicitor Cliff Demaray - I probably mangled his name and I apologize. But isn’t that what he told the famous 1978 OMB deliberations? I have a newspaper clipping from 1978 that says that’s what he said.</p> <p>Why can’t this notion of live/work come true? Why is it a fantasy? Well, what power do you have to link people’s live and work choices? Huh? None. What power have you to make people who get the jobs live in the homes near the work areas? Huh? None. None. What power have you to make who buys the nearby homes take the jobs in neighboring work areas? For sale, house with job. (Laughter and applause). None. None. None. How do you get these people hired? You don’t know. And the reason you don’t is because you can’t.</p> <p>The most disappointing claim prize, I think we should</p>
--	---

	<p>address those questions. Believe in live/work if you want, but sell it to us. Prove it for us. Show us how you're going to make it happen. Right now, all you have there is what I think could be fairly and generously described as a pious wish. Wishful thinking. The future of the Town should be based on more than wishful thinking.</p> <p>The most disappointing claim prize goes to the claim that you can't win at the OMB so you have to give the developers what they want. And I want to ask you do you think about what people think when you say that to them? If I had a nickel for every time I heard that, well, I could buy everybody a beer at least.</p> <p>Do you worry when you say that that you're impeaching yourselves and your staff as to their abilities and intelligence and diligence in representing the Town's interests at the OMB? That's the way it sounds. Now, why would you say that? Why would you give that impression about yourselves? I don't understand.</p> <p>And as I thought about it I decided that maybe you didn't even know what went on in 1978. So I thought, I don't know what went on. I don't know what went on in 1978. So I went and looked. How sure are you of what occurred in the great OMB defeat of '78? This leads to a most interesting history discovery.</p> <p>The great OMB of '78 plays such a huge role in the official mindset of the Town. Might everyone benefit from a review of what really happened? Could this process, this OPA 198 process and all future processes of the Town benefit from official reports from Planning and Legal on what lessons they learned? I mean, besides give the developers whatever they want if they say they're going to the OMB.</p> <p>I'm going to show you a clipping from the OJR, Oakville Journal-Record, before my time. And it suggests there might be some parallels. Now you remember I had some unkind things to say about LGL and Hemson, remember? And they bothered some people and I'm sorry for that. But I don't think I said this: 'So riddled with inconsistencies and contradictions, convinced it was written by a</p>
--	--

	<p>schizophrenic' – I'll show you more of that later. That was the headline in the OJR, possibly they're not around today because somebody got mad at them. But you know, anyway. That was the headline at the time.</p> <p>Remember last August when I suggested that this was important enough to deserve work that actually avoided inconsistency and error and added up? You were assured that it didn't matter and you believed your assurers that it didn't matter and you adopted them. And I was duly chastened. Do you still think it doesn't matter?</p> <p>Let's read the whole thing: "The Woods-Gordon report is so riddled with inconsistencies and contradictions, I am becoming increasingly convinced it was written either by a schizophrenic or by two people with totally opposing points of view. The sections written by these two people were simply shuffled together to make a report."</p> <p>Are you sure it's prudent to move ahead in 2001 on a similar (clause)? I understand that was then, and the Town Planner was Ron Foy. And today is today and our Town Planner is Ted Salisbury. Different day, different people. But now we know that sloppy work is what did us in at the OMB in 1978. Who still thinks today's planning studies don't need to add up? Good, terrific. Progress.</p> <p>Now on the way out of that meeting that night, a Councillor who's no longer with us in this chamber said to me, "Don't you know, you don't criticize our consultants in Oakville?" Now, all of you know that my good friend Steven would say exactly that, exactly in that way and yes he did. I think he would admit it to you today, Steven being Steven. And I said, "Even when they're wrong?"</p> <p>And this is the question: When do you want to find out? Do you want to find out when the kid tells you that there's no clothes on the emperor or do you want to wait until the OMB? I think you're better off to find out from us. Because then you can fix it. And then you're not risking defeat at the OMB. Do we want another generation to look back and say, 'Well you know we lost the great battle at the OMB in 2002 and so we can't go there.'</p>
--	--

Now somebody's been seriously misled and misled the rest of us about the nature of the OMB disaster in 1978, I think. Now I actually took a degree in history and I know enough about history as a result to know that just because it's in a newspaper, doesn't mean it's true and my little tour of the history of 1978 is from a dead newspaper. So all I have is indications that it might have been like that. If somebody knows better, it should go in a report, like the one that I suggest so that we can all be learned by this disaster, avoiding future disasters and not just giving up.

But as far as I can tell from looking at the record, the culprit wasn't saying no to growth, as we have often been told. Oakville didn't actually say no. The problem was sloppy work that yes, there was means to remind me, that actually said inconsistent, inaccurate, I forget, schizophrenic. But I've lumped those together and called them sloppy for our convenience here. Oops. That was my (*Inaudible*). That you'll think it wise to take the time to do it right now and even do it well because, this is the other big discovery that we made for your benefit, you've got the time. There's no hurry. It's going to be okay. You've got lots of time.

Well. It might be possible this time. It's a question. Should we check and see how much time there really is? Here's why we think you should check. This is what the cabinet said: Those of you that don't know this, the Town made a planning decision, it was appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board, and the Ontario Municipal Board ruled against the Town on the grounds that the work was sloppy.

And the Town, everybody, appealed everything to the Ontario Cabinet, which is the final Court of Appeal for these things. And the cabinet upheld the OMB. And it said, in its decision, "An Official Plan Amendment is not to be approved for the lands above #5 until after 75 per cent of development has taken place in the urban envelope Phase 2 area," and that's the area below Highway#5. So that's just a brief little explanation.

But it raises the question, is OPA 198 really premature? I'm not a lawyer. I'm a civilian. I'm just raising questions.

	<p>You have lawyers and I think you should task them to study the question. And it'd be nice if they'd share it with the rest of us.</p> <p>But if the cabinet really said that, can the Town ignore what cabinet said? There should be a legal opinion and I think probably a peer review because this is a pretty important one, unless the cabinet's irrelevant, but I don't think it is, but just make sure.</p> <p>So, the most important thing about the OMB that's been lost sight of here, you're going to the OMB, you're going to the OMB no matter what. One way or the other. You're either going to be there fighting the developers for us, or you're going to be there fighting your citizens for them. But you're going to be there. (<i>Applause</i>). (<i>Inaudible comment to the audience</i>).</p> <p>What quality of work do you want to be spending our money to defend when you get there? I guess, actually, if you decide to be there fighting us, don't fix your work. We could use every advantage we got.</p> <p>But if 1978 teaches any lessons, I think it teaches that there's danger in half-hearted efforts and half-baked work. And I think it would be great if we could learn from this.</p> <p>What's at stake? In our opinion, which after all represents thousands of southeast Oakville residents who earnestly hope you'll pay attention, we don't think developers should have a subsidy from residents. We're against that. We're shocked that it happened. We don't know how it happened. We can't wait to ask our Regional Councillor how it happened. We will, eventually ask him.</p> <p>Developers take their profits and move on. We're stuck with the bill and the negative impacts. These planning tools are all we have to minimize the bill and mitigate the impacts. You're our guys that we look to to do that. Please do that.</p> <p>We have a duty of care to our environment and we have a duty of care to each other. Our children will thank you or condemn you for your choices. If they can't see the forests</p>
--	---

	<p>for the lollypop trees, is that the legacy that we'll be proud to give them?</p> <p>There are steps forward for public support. The Town doesn't have to be divided over this. You could refer the OPA for improvements and I gather than you might have decided to do that before I entered the Chamber, but I'm not sure. But that's what I've heard. And if it's true, it's well truly delightful.</p> <p>You could peer review the new OPA. You could EA the new OPA. You could conduct extensive public debates. The Mayor may remember that last August we had a discussion about the cost of development. And she suggested at the time that Mo Lewis and I should debate this question. And she, I understood that she was going to set about to create that debate and in the end it wasn't possible or whatever but nothing came of it.</p> <p>But I'm still willing to do that. I would enjoy a debate on the costs of growth in Oakville. And I think that – the precipitating incident was his anecdote about how an acre of shopping center yields more taxes than an acre of homes, to refresh your memory.</p>
<p>Mayor Ann Mulvale</p>	<p>No, my memory was that you did not want to proceed with it because I would gladly have done that.</p>
<p>Rob Burton (Delegate)</p>	<p>No I'm keen.</p>
<p>Mayor Ann Mulvale</p>	<p>So well, we'll pick the ball up but I do apologize because I remember the discussion and my recollection was you thought it was redundant to debate it, so.</p>
<p>Rob Burton (Delegate)</p>	<p>I think it would be very useful. And I volunteer this in the hope of sparking a series of public debates. I think there should be extensive public debate. And, whichever side of the question you're on, you should show up and defend it and share your reasons and sell it. Get people to believe with you.</p> <p>I think you should consider amendments after the debates. The debates will identify people's further concerns. Ensure that the process is open and untainted by special privilege or private access. Keep everything on the record.</p>

Town of Oakville
Lands North of Dundas
Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

	<p>Submit the new OPA to a referendum. And enjoy a future which we all support instead of fighting about it.</p> <p>I thank you for any consideration of these ideas and I assure you that my intention is only to try to be helpful. Thank you. (<i>Applause</i>)</p>
Mayor Ann Mulvale	<p>Thank you. You've generated a... (<i>Extensive applause</i>) Okay. Councillor Robinson has a question. And then I have a couple of comments.</p>
Councillor Ralph Robinson	<p>Thank you your Worship. Mr. Burton I have to tell you that I believe in all my years here that I found that to be the most exhilarating and enlightening and informative and well-presented presentation that I've ever had the pleasure of listening to any delegate perform for the length of time that you did. It was absolutely superb in my opinion.</p> <p>There's only one problem with it. The entire Town of Oakville wasn't able to hear it at the same time.</p>
Rob Burton (Delegate)	<p>Am I blushing? (<i>Applause</i>)</p>
Councillor Ralph Robinson	<p>Now, I have one very serious question.</p>
Rob Burton (Delegate)	<p>Sure.</p>
Councillor Ralph Robinson	<p>What should we do next?</p>
Rob Burton (Delegate)	<p>Well...</p>
Councillor Ralph Robinson	<p>You've given us a lot of food for thought, there. What should we do now?</p>
Rob Burton (Delegate)	<p>Consider these ideas, they're free. It'd be easier to answer if I knew what you'd done earlier, in terms of the process, but my short answer is, reconsider the way you're doing this and approach it on a much more consensus-building, public inclusive style. Seek, eagerly seek, public opinion and participation. Sell don't hide. And let's build a future we can all believe in.</p> <p>Now, the reason I can't be more specific is I don't want to look silly by recommending what you may have already just decided to do, but I hope what you just decided to do, so I'll ask a question, if I may. Did you guys decide earlier to extend this process? To send it back for more work?</p>

<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>We have said right from the beginning of these meetings this week that we will write, we will have responses, we'll group the questions, we'll have responses. We committed to get it out to the public ahead of Council if the courier wasn't going for a few days. We've committed to notify everybody on our mailing list to give the lead time and then to reconvene on September the 10th.</p> <p>And Councillor Robinson moved the motion. We had it seconded by Councillor Oliver, although we were not in Council so I really didn't need that. And we confirmed the process from here. And so certainly, Councillor Robinson, if you're finished your question?</p>
<p><i>Councillor Ralph Robinson</i></p>	<p>Thanks I think I'm finished, I was just interested...</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Okay. Sure.</p>
<p><i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>I really appreciate though knowing what happened. Thank you. Just for interest, was it a unanimous agreement?</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>It was unanimous.</p>
<p><i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>That's so beautiful. That's the Oakville that I love.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Well could I just say to you I'm sorry when you met last night or Tuesday wherever it was that you didn't get an update on the Millenian waste, because there's a, as I understand it, I Chaired a meeting with both Councillor Flynn and Councillor Smith and Councillor Bird and your President of Joshua Creek. And we seemed to have had a wonderful response from the gentleman. He's ordering a noise wall to deal with the major issues.</p> <p>We also had St. Lawrence Cement in attendance. And of course St. Lawrence Cement was built long before many of the houses in your immediate neighborhood.</p>
<p><i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>Totally.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>I feel compelled to just say that the process that we're following is, meets or exceeds every aspect of the Planning Act. And I spoke earlier to the spirit as well as the letter of the law.</p> <p>We are, and have always been, very serious about the public participation process. And I don't want to engage in</p>

	<p>a debate with you.</p> <p>Certainly, my recollection pertaining to the economic analysis was you told me you didn't want to pursue it. So, if I have had a memory lapse on that – I remember the discussion. I did not commit to a debate, I merely said it would useful for you to sit down and have a discussion because this environment isn't conducive sometimes for a good transfer of information.</p>
Rob Burton (Delegate)	Well I'm inflating the idea into the idea of a kick-off for a debate. That's...
Mayor Ann Mulvale	No, okay. The other point that I wanted to use as an illustration: That under the Planning Act there's a wide constituency base...
Rob Burton (Delegate)	Sorry?
Mayor Ann Mulvale	There's a wide constituency base under the Planning Act that we have to meet legal tests.
Rob Burton (Delegate)	Sure.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	<p>So the other thing that I just wanted to say, and I'm sure there'll be lots of other comments at some point is that just as you have said, and I think I wrote it down, "How do we make the people live and work in the area? How do we assure them with a job?"</p> <p>With absolute sincerity, the other side of that is, "How do we make, if we get the funding for mass transit, certain that people will use it?" That's the dichotomy of the challenge that we face. I just wanted to make that point.</p> <p>The other point I want to make on your peer review, is I believe we've retained a consultant to do a peer review on this development. And the other point that you – there's two other points I wanted to make, because I want to make sure there's clarity of this.</p> <p>I'm sure that personally I have spent more time with residents than I've spent with developers. On last year's process, and this process. Both in terms of responding to e-mails and having meetings.</p>

	The other issue that you raised is legal reports. Legal reports as you know under the Municipal Act – because you’re quite right – one way or another we’re going to an Ontario Municipal Board hearing. Because we’re so certain of that, legal reports cannot be released to the public. You’ve asked for that. Under the Municipal Act, there are three areas Robin and you and I both know this that we cannot release. So I don’t want to make it look as if we’re denying anybody access to material that we’re not required, to keep secret, if you will, confidential, not secret, confidential.
Rob Burton (Delegate)	Can I ask you for a small consideration on that point?
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Sure.
Rob Burton (Delegate)	Would you take legal advice as to whether or not The particular legal opinion I asked about needs to be withheld? It may be that not everything you imagine needs to be withheld.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Yeah. Any legal opinion that we can release, we release. I will release. Anything that isn’t required by another legislation, that’s the Council’s total commitment. It’s a matter of public record.
Rob Burton (Delegate)	Great. I just want to say I have names, dates and places of acts I consider to be against the letter and the spirit of the act in terms of public participation.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Then let’s look at them.
Rob Burton (Delegate)	And I don’t want to, I mean I will if you want, but I don’t want to do that here. I don’t think it serves anything.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Doesn’t have to be here, but you and I can sit down if there is any challenge, if there’s any concern we want to deal with it.
Rob Burton (Delegate)	I’d be glad to do that with you.
Mayor Ann Mulvale	Thank you. Councillor Flynn.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	Thank you, Rob. I enjoyed the presentation I’m sure not everybody did but I think most of us did.
Rob Burton (Delegate)	I tried.
Councillor Kevin Flynn	The process will be going on at least another night as I

	<p>understand it, July the 5th and almost all of us will be back to hear that meeting on the 5th. After that, I think from what I've seen of the list, we could be done the delegations by that point. The intent right now is to go to September the 10th.</p> <p>Some of the things you have asked for would take a certain amount of time to complete. The intent as I understood it was that the report that would be coming back from staff would be available to the public and Council somewhere around the end of August, late August.</p> <p>Now my fear is that, under the process which you think is a good one and is a much better process than we had I think when we started the meeting, is that the intent is to start dealing with the issue on September the 10th with some improvements.</p> <p>Given that this will be taking place in the summer, in the summer months, and you've asked for some pretty extensive things, like a financial impact, for example. If staff comes back, and my fear is, I guess this is a question for staff and for Rob, my fear is if staff comes back in the third week of August saying that, 'Yeah, we think a financial impact would be a good idea,' it's going to take us three months to do, so we can't do it because we're dealing with the issue on September the 10th. Is there, how are we going to deal with that? We need staff to highlight the points I would imagine and see if Rob agrees with this, to pick out the points that would be time-sensitive, that would not allow us.</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Yeah. Councillor Flynn, we were required tonight to put a date in.
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	That's right, I understand that.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	If we run into a problem with that date, we can reposition the date.
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	Okay, well the reason I...
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	The procedure, that's all I'm speaking to.
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	Yeah, and I'm asking the question of Rob: Would you

	<p>agree that a request should go to our Town Staff, to ask them to pick out the time-sensitive details of the things you've asked for and perhaps keep Council updated on that. Some of us have been accused of trying to defer the process into obscurity.</p>
<p><i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>I'd like to defer it into perfection, or at least high quality. And, I would like to urge everyone to keep in mind that citizen participation works like this: We have jobs. I don't, I'm retired, but as a generalization we citizens and many of you have day jobs. We give our employers our first, they have first call on our best 40 hours, so to speak.</p> <p>Our families have call and our homes have call on our time. Our time left over for civic duties is small compared to the time available for civic duties to those we employ and pay to provide civic duties. The result is that 8 hours to a staff person probably seems - a 40-hour work week.</p> <p>Thirty days to look at something. Let's try to make this quicker and more concrete. If you give citizens 30 days to comment on something, have you given them 30 days to comment on something? I'm saying no. You've given them maybe 30 hours. You follow what I'm saying? Because they have these other obligations which take their time first.</p> <p>So the result is that as citizens we can measure, we can measure the spirit of your intent to consult us by how long you give us to respond.</p> <p>I'll give you my best and favorite example is: The Ministry of the Environment recently decided that it was going to introduce an emissions credit trading program for the great province of Ontario. And to announce this fact and seek public input, they posted it on a web site in a province where less than half the people have the Internet. And it's behind a front end that gives no clue as to what's on it and it has a search engine that doesn't work very well. And if you put in 'emissions trading credit' in the search engine, you get nothing. But at the end of the process, they will report, 'We had extensive public consultation, 30 days on the environmental bulletin board.' Huh?</p>

	<p>So, it inspires cynicism in everyone about the intention of the Provincial Government when it behaves that way and you can control how your intentions are perceived by how much time you give, how much regard you take for the circumstances of those you say you wish to consult.</p> <p>So I'm saying if the report's ready the 1st of August, and the meeting is on the 10th, and August, is deary me, the biggest vacation month of the year, is that adequate? I don't think so. Could you do better? I hope so. Is there enough time? I think so.</p> <p>So, you know, it should be October. That's my answer.</p>
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	That wasn't really the question, but it was a good answer.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	I thought your question was, oh I see, no your question was if they're going to do this to us, should they get them out as fast as they can?
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	The question is, would you like staff to pick out, I guess from the requests you've made...
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	Oh, I'd like as much as we can get as soon as we can get it.
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	...things that would be time-sensitive. And I'd ask that they do that and inform Council.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>Councillor Flynn I can assure you we're anxious to get answers to questions and to confirm timelines. Counter to what people may think on some of the points, I think we have very good professional staff. The pronunciation of the lawyer of the Town's lawyer was Cliff Demaray. I was there for three of the four days.</p> <p>I have never said the Town lost on no growth. The Town wanted to grow to the north along Trafalgar Road. The developers wanted us to grow to the west. The other major issue was a sub-regional shopping center called Oakville Place. And we did circulate to all Members of Council a copy of the decision.</p>

Town of Oakville
Lands North of Dundas
Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

	The quote you had from the Record-Journal was McCauley, who was legal counsel for Glen Abbey at the time and what he, what was reported in the newspaper was someone's interpretation of a lawyer's opinion and his submission.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	Oh, no, no, no. Excuse me. I wasn't criticizing staff.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	No, no. My point...
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	It was very clear in what I said that it was a consultant's study. Woods-Gordon.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	My point was it formed part of our Official Plan. All I'm saying to you is what was read was someone's opinion of that. Within a couple of days quite likely there was someone else's opinion or interpretation. That's all I'm saying, Rob. And they reported the one opinion.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	The story went on. The story went on that I have quoting Alf Chapman who, as you know is a resident of my area.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Joshua Creek resident, yeah.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	And he was the gentleman who heard the case for those of you who don't know the back story here. And he was quoted in the newspaper as being quite taken with this ladies' testimony about the quality of the report.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Okay, if there's no further question. Sorry, Councillor Oliver.
<i>Councillor Fred Oliver</i>	No, I just wondered could you e-mail me your presentation, please?
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	Sure.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	We'll circulate all of the presentations.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	You realize I spoke off the cuff.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Well, you spoke around a framework of points that you presented, so even the framework is helpful. Now, the Town Manager's been trying to tally up the ability for staff within, to do this work. So there's an update that I'd like everyone to hear.
<i>J. Chechalk, Town Manager</i>	Your Worship, I've listened to Mr. Burton's presentation both in this room and as I walked down the other room to

	make sure...
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	We can't hear you.
<i>J. Chechalk, Town Manager</i>	<p>Your Worship, I've listened to Mr. Burton's presentation both in this room and when I was attending to the other room. I don't want to mislead Council or Mr. Burton or the other people in the audience that some of the requests that Mr. Burton has made in his presentation, are, may not be able to be achieved by September 10th or October.</p> <p>The financial impact analysis for a growth area would need to have a certain number of assumptions and until you've made those assumptions, we could make a financial impact study that could look very very favorable and I, or very very unfavorable. It would be based on assumptions from a group of staff without an understanding of planning, secondary planning process.</p> <p>So, I'm not saying that staff would be in any way unwilling to provide the type of information at the time that it would be appropriate to make it, but I don't want to leave the impression that some of the requests Mr. Burton has made could be achieved prior to a next step in the planning process.</p>
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	<p>Yes. The reason for the suggestion about extensive public debates is to try to help cure that defect by whatever assumptions get chosen and whatever report gets written, then exposing it to the test of public debate, then we test it, you see. And hopefully improve it. It's like tempering steel. So, that's the reason for the considered advice for the three checking loops of peer review, public debate, EA and referendum. Public debate presumed to be part of the referendum.</p> <p>So, I appreciate that it might take longer than right away to do. But since it's the rest of the Town for the rest of time, I think it's worth taking the time it takes. And it might be worthwhile going away and deciding what of those things you think would be of benefit and figuring out what it would take to do them. And then setting a timetable accordingly. Set your goals...</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Yeah. Rob what I had said in one model, in terms of when we started this process of these hearings is to look at in

	<p>terms of a management letter on an audit. So you would say, this is the response, what we think we should do which is what we can do. There may be other legislation. These are some of the points that we don't feel – there'll be a commentary.</p> <p>So what I'm committed to do so everybody understands, is we're grouping all the points. We won't say Mr. Smith said this and this is this. We'll say a number of people raised this issue, we think we cover off a block of things. So that's where we're going and we'll, we will do all in our power to ensure people, one we heard and two they have an answer. If not a complete answer. And there may be something in legislation that precludes as we've indicated on some of the legal issues.</p> <p>But let me say again, anything that we can release, we release.</p>
<p><i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>Am I hearing that you'll do any of these studies that we suggest?</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>We're going to have the staff feed back on those. And they may well include many of the studies. I'm not prejudging either way.</p>
<p><i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>Okay.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>I don't have answers to a number of the points you've raised tonight but we will get some answers. So thank you.</p>
<p><i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>Okay. The practicality of it is, every concern you allay reduces the size of the case that has to be dealt with later.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>There's no question. Anything on all sides of this issue.</p>
<p><i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>Sure.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>You talked about mediation. You talked about the advantages and changes that have happened with the Ontario Municipal Board in recent years. So anything that we can mitigate, in terms of having an understanding and making some accommodations and adjustments is healthy. Thank you for making that point.</p>

Town of Oakville
Lands North of Dundas
Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	Great.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Thank you Sir.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	You guys are done with me, right?
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	You may step down, Sir. Thank you.
<i>Rob Burton (Delegate)</i>	Thank you, thank you, thank you.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Do we have a motion to go past 11 o'clock?
<i>Councillor Janice Wright</i>	I'll give you that, your Worship.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Thank you Councillor Wright. All in favor? I have one. Those opposed? Carries. I think Marianne Hawthorne is next?
<i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i>	That's correct.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	And after Marianne Hawthorne we have Blair Taylor.
<i>Marianne Hawthorne (Delegate)</i>	This one? No, that's fine I'll use this, okay? Thank you.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Use that one if you will, it's easier to hear in the other rooms.
<i>Marianne Hawthorne (Delegate)</i>	This one?
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Yes, please.
<i>Marianne Hawthorne (Delegate)</i>	Yeah, sure. Your Worship, Members of Council. I don't intend to follow that act.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	You are, unfortunately.
<i>Marianne Hawthorne (Delegate)</i>	No, I merely intend to endorse, as Mr. Burton had pointed out, Trafalgar Chartwell Resident's Association is in support of the concerns of JCRS as is Lakeside Resident's Association. Thank you.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Thank you very much. I don't think there'll be questions. The next delegation – in fact as the next delegation comes forward, the, this taping, and we're very grateful to Cogeco still coming to the bat. It was short notice. And this will be aired on Friday the 29 th at 1:30 and repeated on Saturday the 30 th at noon. So people wishing to tape it, or people wishing to see it can take note of those times. Tomorrow at 1:30 and Saturday at noon. Mr. Taylor.
<i>Blair Taylor (Delegate)</i>	Thank you your Worship. Your Worship for the record my name is Blair Taylor and I appear this evening on behalf of the Mattamy Development Corporation, whose head

	<p>office is here in Oakville.</p> <p>With me this evening are representatives of Mattamy, it's President David Stewart and its Director of Development Gary Gregoris.</p> <p>May I say I stand before you as an example of the live/work relationship here in Oakville.</p> <p>Before I begin my comments I would like to congratulate staff. I was here on Tuesday night and I heard their presentation and they took 10 years' worth of activity and reports, and provided an excellent, concise overview of all the events leading up to OPA 198 and I thought they did an excellent job and I want to state that for the record.</p> <p>Your Worship I also want to apologize for the tardiness of my written submission. I have with me this evening 20 additional copies for the clerk, which I'd be pleased to provide now.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Mrs. Kramer will come and get them. And we'll circulate them. Thank you.</p>
<p><i>Blair Taylor (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>Our written submission is in compliance with the requirements of the Planning Act. In our written submission if you've had the opportunity to review it, and I believe it was circulated previously, you will find there support generally and acceptance of much of OPA 198.</p> <p>There are areas where we raise questions and ask for additional information. And finally, the identification of three outstanding issues of concern on my client's part.</p> <p>Other speakers have raised these concerns. I will identify them. I'm not going to dwell on them. But they are as follows: One, woodlots. Two, phasing. Three, the employment lands south of Burnhamthorpe.</p> <p>Our written submission is there. I will leave it with you for consideration by your planning staff and in accordance with what I understand to be the rules in terms of how this process will proceed.</p>

	<p>Your Worship and Members of Council, when I examine a number of the submissions that have been made and I was here for a number of the oral presentations on Tuesday, it seems that there is a threshold question that's being posed. And the threshold question is: Has Oakville been a good steward of its property and resources?</p> <p>And in order to examine that question, I think we have to look at a number of examples. And the first example that I start with is downtown Oakville. It is accepted fact that Oakville has one of the most envied downtowns in Ontario. Our downtown is functional, it's vibrant and it's successful. Is that functionality, is that vibrancy, is that success by accident? Or is it a result of years of hard work and good management? Well, I suggest to you that it's the latter. It's the years of hard work and good management working in harmony with the Downtown Business Improvement Association.</p> <p>Well what about the environment generally, and I think it is very fair to say that Oakvillians, and as citizens of the Region of Halton, have long been proud of their community and protective of their environment. Proof of that statement can be traced to their significant involvement in the protection of the Niagara Escarpment, now designated as a World Biosphere.</p> <p>Well you ask what about locally? Well, from an environmental perspective, Oakville is, I respectfully suggest, the undisputed leader in Ontario when it comes to the Lake Ontario Waterfront Trail. David Crombie, who is sometimes regarded and known as the 'Tsar of the Waterfront,' has stated publicly that the province's involvement has been modeled after the Town of Oakville. Again, I raise the question is the Oakville Waterfront Trail by accident? Or is it the combination of years of hard work and prudent management?</p> <p>You know, Oakville's leadership in terms of trails and linkages isn't limited to the waterfront. In fact, the Town of Oakville, through its active encouragement and support has led the way with the development of heritage trails throughout all of Oakville for the benefit of all citizens. Accident? Or is this the result of hard work and prudent</p>
--	--

	<p>management?</p> <p>I suggest to you that the pattern is clear: It's a combination of hard work and prudent management that has resulted in Oakville being an environmental leader among municipalities.</p> <p>Let me give you some other examples: Oakville's careful visioning and stewardship is also seen in the process and the result of the Bronte Outer Harbor, the park and the marina. Again, all available for use and enjoyment of all Oakvillians.</p> <p>O what about the visioning that took place in 1991. If you remember in 1991 we were in the midst of a recession. In 1991, the Town of Oakville took consideration for, planning for and the acquisition of the North Oakville Park. Accidental? No it was not. It was a deliberate action by this municipality.</p> <p>Now some suggestion has been made to you that somehow Oakville does not measure up now and will not measure up in the future in terms of forest cover. In fact, you were advised that Oakville had 13.5 per cent forest cover, being the lowest in Halton.</p> <p>And your Worship with your indulgence, I'd like to move over now to the overhead, which hopefully is set up there.</p> <p>This is the Regional Official Plan for the Region of Halton. When you look at this map, there's one thing that stands out immediately. And that is the location of the Niagara Escarpment throughout the midst of Halton.</p> <p>When we look at the Niagara Escarpment, you have to look at it in terms of 55,000 acres of land that's protected. Of that 55,000 acres, none are in the Town of Oakville. Thirty-six per cent, 34 per cent and 30 per cent in the towns of Halton Hills, Milton and the City of Burlington.</p> <p>I suggest to you that if you're going to look comparatively at forest cover, I believe that first you need to examine the natural features that are present. Because without that comparison the results might not be meaningful.</p>
--	--

	<p>I suggest that what you might do is look to other comparable municipalities that don't have the Niagara Escarpment and get a measurement, a thumbnail sketch, a guideline in terms of how Oakville stacks up in terms of forest cover.</p> <p>Well we understand that the City of Markham is at three to four per cent. We understand that the City of Brampton is at three per cent. Well, on that basis I suggest to you that Oakville is doing well and that it's not by accident and that Oakville should be proud of its record.</p> <p>Let me just briefly summarize. And I give you these examples: Oakville's downtown, Oakville's waterfront trails, Oakville's heritage trail system, the Bronte Outer Harbor and park and the North Oakville Park. These are all, in my view, and I suggest this to you, components of a report card on the careful and prudent stewardship of property and resources by the Town of Oakville over the years. It is a report card that you should be proud of and one that makes Oakville a leader provincially.</p> <p>Many, many, many other municipalities would desperately like to be in the position that Oakville is right now, with the great track record of proven success that is has on environmental matters.</p> <p>Well you ask, what's that got to do with OPA 198. Well, the clear preponderance of the evidence is that Oakville is a leader among municipalities in terms of stewardship of property and resources. OPA 198 is a document that builds on that tradition of Oakville excellence. It's based on the careful measurement of the existing environment and it seeks to enhance that vision in its Official Plan by moving ahead.</p> <p>Now I've suggested to you that Oakville has achieved provincial recognition. And I can tell you, without boast or immodesty, that my client too has achieved provincial recognition. And it's recognition for being innovative. And it's recognition for thinking outside the box. Being proactive in terms of how it deals with its municipalities.</p>
--	--

	<p>In the early 1990s, Mattamy and the City of Burlington collaborated on woodlots for the Orchard Community in Burlington. That ultimately led to the designation and retention of woodlots in this Orchard Secondary Plan.</p> <p>Recently, Mattamy has also collaborated with Milton in a similar fashion. Mattamy is a leader. Mattamy is committed in terms of working with people in a proactive fashion.</p> <p>There are three conclusions I'd like to leave with you this evening. One, Oakville's history, both present, recent past, clearly indicates good stewardship, in terms of property and resources by the Town of Oakville. And we believe this applies and is seen in OPA 198.</p> <p>In our written submission, which I believe the Clerk has handed out to you, we identify three issues that we see with OPA 198.</p> <p>Now some have suggested that you stop the process. We respectfully submit that the Town has completed the necessary background studies for, and you are in the right position to make a decision with regard to OPA 198, knowing that OPA 198 clearly outlines the additional studies that have to be done before you can get to secondary planning stage. That was point number two.</p> <p>Point number three, and this is as important as all the other ones, is that my client is committed to working constructively with you and to try to resolve these issues through the process.</p> <p>Your Worship, that's our submission this evening. I'd be pleased to try to answer any questions that might arise.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>I have a question from Councillor Elgar.</p>
<p><i>Councillor Allan Elgar</i></p>	<p>Thank you. Blair, I'm glad you brought up that point about the public ownership of the lakefront because actually I was at a meeting earlier tonight and the Mayor mentioned it and I was in discussion with Harry Barrett because I said to him, 'How were you able to do that?' And he said, 'Because I put it in the Official Plan.'</p>

	<p>And he said, he said, 'I wasn't popular at the time, but we got it through and we stuck to it.'</p> <p>So thank you. I'm glad you appreciate that public ownership.</p>
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>I wasn't sure where the question was, but a good reference to Harry's always well taken. Has anybody else got a question of Mr. Taylor? Thank you very much. The next dele... I'm sorry, Kevin, I didn't see you.</p>
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	<p>Yeah, just wanted... It's a pretty basic question. When I read the report, Blair, it says you're in favor of it, of the amendment, but then it ends with wanting to reconsider and refine it. I just wasn't clear as to what you'd prefer Council do.</p>
<i>Blair Taylor (Delegate)</i>	<p>I think the report is, through you your Worship, I think the words in the report are that Mattamy is in general support of the majority of policy directives that are contained therein and I think that's important for the record.</p> <p>Having identified the general support, we they lay out some questions with regard to a couple of areas and then finally, you'll see three areas in which we have clear concerns and we identify those concerns. And they're no different than the issues that have been raised previously by other speakers and that's why I didn't belabor them this evening.</p>
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	<p>No, that's fine. I don't think we have to get into the issue.</p>
<i>Blair Taylor (Delegate)</i>	<p>Our commitment is that we've identified those concerns. Having identified those, we are stating to the public record that we are willing to work with the Town to see where we can come to resolution. Just like we did in Burlington. And just like we did in Milton.</p>
<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	<p>So the timetable that we outlined this evening would actually suit your client's needs.</p>
<i>Blair Taylor (Delegate)</i>	<p>The timetable that's outlined by Council is solely in the hands of Council. We are going to work with you in as constructive a fashion as we possibly can.</p>

Town of Oakville
 Lands North of Dundas
 Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

<i>Councillor Kevin Flynn</i>	That's great to hear. Thank you your Worship.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	Thank you. Next delegation.
<i>Christine Shewchuk, Assistant Clerk</i>	Yes the next delegation is Stephen Dankowich.
<i>Stephen Dankowich (Delegate)</i>	<p>Good evening fellow citizens, Mayor, Council and staff. My name is Stephen Dankowich and I've been the Executive Director for the Oakville Community Center for Peace, Ecology and Human Rights, a storefront located at 148 Kerr Street, just south of Rebecca since our inception in 1992.</p> <p>Our organization is very concerned about proposals for development of the North Oakville area, as outlined in Official Plan Amendment #198, hereafter I'll refer to it as OPA 198.</p> <p>To conclude early and summarily, the Oakville Community Center for Peace, Ecology and Human Rights does not believe we can enhance the quality of life, as stated in the Plan Concept, by increasing the number of people living and working here.</p> <p>We reject this alleged premise and are very dismayed that such lofty statements are liberally sprinkled throughout the document without any factual justification. They are sheer platitudes devoid of any real substance. Please remove all such nebulous assumptions from the document. We do not want to see any unconditional language in the document.</p> <p>We are provided no evidence as to how you will minimize pollution, minimize traffic congestion and respect the quality of life in both new and established neighborhoods. It is in the details that things get done. And unless the details are specified, citizens will have no guarantees that the plan concept is achievable.</p> <p>Oakville is already experiencing overcrowding and the incumbent traffic gridlock. The atrocious air pollution will only get much worse with even more development. We have already heard many excellent citizen representations about our many problems.</p>

	<p>It is very distressing that the OPA 198 will allow for the destruction of our last remaining agricultural lands. Many people are just now starting to realize how important it is to maintain strong links between farmers and consumers in order to ensure that the food on our table is fresh and has not necessarily been transported here from thousands of kilometers away in California or South America.</p> <p>Where are the bold visionaries out there who are willing to put our natural environment first?</p> <p>We have been organizing activities and events in our community for the past nine years and have worked hard to increase awareness and concern for our local natural environment. Interest in our local natural environment is really growing, as witnessed by the great participation in the various events and activities we have recently organized as part of our Oakville environmental awareness project.</p> <p>This project was intended to increase local awareness about the fact that we live in a very environmentally important part of the world. The project encourages people to recognize that we are surrounded by natural beauty right here in our own backyard and that it must be protected.</p> <p>We live in a very special place. We reside in Carolinian Canada, a region in Ontario found south of an imaginary line, which runs approximately from Grand Bend to Toronto. The Carolinian life zone is actually the northernmost edge of the deciduous forest region in Eastern North America and is named after the Carolina state in the U.S.A.</p> <p>Canada has been divided into 15 various environmentally defined life zones. The most unique feature of the Carolinian life zone is the number of rare species found here. Our life zone boasts fully one-third of the rare threatened and endangered species found in all of Canada.</p> <p>We experience the warmest climate in the province, with mild winters and long frost-free periods. Our ecology is comprised of a distinctive suite of trees, shrubs and other</p>
--	--

	<p>plants. We have a great diversity of wildlife of all kinds, including many species not found elsewhere in Canada. There are more endangered and rare species here than in any other life zone in Canada.</p> <p>We live in the most urbanized and intensively farmed landscape in the country, with 25 per cent of Canada's population on one-quarter of one per cent of its total land mass.</p> <p>We have rich soil. Even though Carolinian Canada is quite small, when compared with other Canadian vegetation zones, it boasts a greater number of flora and fauna species than any other ecosystem in Canada.</p> <p>Don Gordon, Director of the Carolinian Canada Coalition, gave us the big picture about Carolinian Canada at a public forum we organized last February 2001 at the public library downtown.</p> <p>This is ground zero, right here, he said. Forests have been reduced from 80 per cent to 11 per cent. Most of what remains of Carolinian Canada is on privately owned land, which has no restrictions on it. Ninety-six per cent of the landscape in Southern Ontario is in private ownership, so incentives and tax breaks will be needed.</p> <p>To develop big picture principles, we must have sustainable corridors and cores for flora and fauna of Carolinian Canada. A 30 per cent forest cover is minimally required to sustain Carolinian Canada.</p> <p>This is a challenge we cannot afford to lose. We need to immediately start developing smart. Today, most of what remains is on Native Peoples' reservations. Norfolk County has the most cover now.</p> <p>Oakville has already taken out too many forests. Such that we have the least amount of forest cover of any community in Halton, just 13.5 per cent is forested. Oakville is part of the problem, and therefore must be part of the solution if we are to get to the attainable goal of 30 per cent forest cover throughout Carolinian Canada.</p>
--	--

	<p>We cannot divorce ourselves from other living things. We must realize, and must sooner than later, that we are a part, and obviously the most demanding part, of a web that sustains life for all species on earth.</p> <p>Once, there was two miles of ice over us, which actually came from the south. There were glaciers from the north too and they converged with the former at the point today of the Oak Ridges Moraine. Oakville has the Trafalgar Moraine - as significant for us as the Oak Ridges Moraine is to the people living in Toronto and north of Toronto.</p> <p>Eighty native villages have been found in Halton. Native Peoples' cultivation of corn and other crops created changes in the flora and fauna. Europeans cleared off a lot more land than did natives, however.</p> <p>Today, there is the huge issue of urban sprawl and its impact on the flora and fauna of Carolinian Canada.</p> <p>Think of the diversity of life here that could be lost to urban sprawl: White chestnuts, of which there are very few; Sycamores, which are abundant in river valleys and ravines; the Kentucky Coffee tree; Oaks, including red and white; burr and Chinquapin; the Red Mulberry, of which there are very few left in Ontario; the Pau-pau, which has a creamy custard fruit filling; Elm, although the Dutch Elm disease is still prevalent; the Red Bud, which was originally found in Canada but gets hit hard by frost; the Flowering Dogwood; Dwarf Chinquapin Oak, which is just one meter tall and not too common; the Shining Sumac, although note that the Staghorn Sumac has fur and is more prevalent here in Oakville, the Bladder Nut found in Bronte Creek Park; the American Hazlenut - you can eat the hazelnuts it produces, but be careful as the nut hairs can stick into you; Native Crabapple, which is shrubby, has a great apple smell and a waxy fruit; Spice Bush - scrape the bark and smell the spice; New Jersey Tea can now be found in Bronte Creek in the prairie area; Leatherwood Shrub, which has early flowers and an interesting texture of bark; Trumpet Creeper; Running Strawberry, prairies remnants which have many flowers, including the Green Cone and Grey Cone flower; Sneezewood; Blazing Star; Bush Clovers; Hypoxis; White</p>
--	--

	<p>Ladies' Slipper; Moss Flox; Birdsfood Velvet, which is very rare; Butterfly Weed; Seneca Snakeroot, which can be found in Bronte Park; American Colombo; Bloodroots; Yellow Trout Lily; Pinesap; Orchid Ladies' Slipper; Pokeweed, which is toxic; Scarlet Pimperel; Lilies; American Lotus; Marshmallow; Green Dragon; Wild Ginseng; Milkweed; and Virginia Bluebells.</p> <p>Many species of amphibians and reptiles live in Oakville and in our southern part of Ontario, including endangered species like the Blue Racer snake.</p> <p>Close to 400 bird species have been recorded in Carolinian Canada, and this represents over half of the species in all of Canada.</p> <p>Certain mammals, such as the badger and gray fox, make their home in our forests.</p> <p>Endangered species in Halton include: The Hoary Mountain Mint; the Red Mulberry, with just over 200 trees left in all of Canada; the Sweet Chestnut; the White Wood Aster; and the American Colombo. Regionally rare species include the Sycamore and the Hackberry tree.</p> <p>Tonight we shall limit our remarks about the fauna of Carolinian Canada and of Oakville to the subject of butterflies. There are numerous butterflies, which exclusively reside here. Various butterflies could become lost to development in Carolinian Canada.</p> <p>The Giant Swallowtail is the largest butterfly in Ontario. There are also the Pipeline, Spicebush, Eastern Tiger and Canadian Swallowtail butterflies. The Ohio Buckeye occasionally migrates into Ontario. Last year, it was recorded all the way into Algonquin Park.</p> <p>Southern species include the Silver Spotted Skipper, which feed on clover, the Striped Hair Streak and the Coral Hair Streak, which are quite common. Some are azure, pale blue on top found near milkweed. Baltimore Butterflies, which eat Turtleheads, a wetland plant; the Compton Tortoiseshell, the Painted Lady, which migrates to Ontario, is said to live on all continents and is part of</p>
--	--

	<p>the thistle-eating butterfly family; the White Admiral; milkweed-eating butterflies like Monarchs, which are bad-tasting for birds; and Halton butterflies including the West Virginia White, which is first on the endangered species list; the Toothwood and the Mustard White, which feeds on any Mustard plant.</p> <p>Before any decision is made on OPA 198, it is incumbent on our decision-makers that they recognize that if we lose the plant species, we lose the butterfly.</p> <p>There are 30 species of fish in Carolinian Canada. We are losing the Brook Trout; Extirpated Atlantic Salmon, Chinook, Coho and Pink Salmon have been introduced into Lake Ontario. The Minnow is the most diverse fish in Ontario; the Hognose Shiner are at risk; and the clear, well-vegetated waters.</p> <p>The Redside Dace is very rare because of urbanization's impacts on streams and can be found in Halton. It has an extremely large mouth and a yellow stripe on its back, with a red stripe on its side. It can be as large as 112 centimeters. It is of no commercial importance. It lives in deep pools and may be sensitive to turbidity. It will leap 6" out of the water to catch flies and other delicacies. A healthy population is still at 14 Mile Creek.</p> <p>As we consider development, it is wise to remember that you must also be able to identify what you don't know. Everyone can do their share to ensure the future of Carolinian Canada's fauna by planting native flora and leaving well alone that little of it that we have left.</p> <p>We need to do more for the restoration of native species, expand upon campaigns for beautification of natural habitats and pay greater attention to creek and roadside management, in order to enhance protection of flora and fauna of Carolinian Canada here at home in Oakville.</p> <p>Hopefully, now that you are more informed about the flora and fauna of our beautiful backyard, you will want to slow down plans for approval of OPA 198 until you know even more about what will be lost – and lost forever if development is allowed to ensue as described in the</p>
--	---

	<p>document.</p> <p>The Oakville Community Center for Peace, Ecology and Human Rights has organized environmental events recently that saw the participation of great numbers of Oakville citizens and students. We want to relate these stories to you because we want to be sure you are aware of the depth and extent of support and concern for our local natural environment, which is really what this debate is all about.</p> <p>Oakville's Tenth Annual Earth Week Clean-Up of 17 local nature sites was a tremendous success – 632 people, including lots of young people and many families.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>Steve I'm sorry to interrupt. If you can summarize in the next three minutes, we have to stop at 11:30. Or if you'd like to determine where you'd like to stop in the next three minutes and then can be our first speaker next week. The gentleman has the floor Sir and he will be respected. I just didn't want – if you use your three minutes to wrap, then you can start again next Thursday. Or if you can summarize in that so you don't have to return. But, it's your time and you're very welcome to be here.</p>
<p><i>Stephen Dankowich (Delegate)</i></p>	<p>Very well. We'll try to conclude.</p> <p>Schools also did a great job for the natural environment. There were 4,000 students from 20 local schools who cleaned up their school grounds for Earth Week this year.</p> <p>The large numbers of volunteers shows that the community appreciates its green spaces and wants litter-free nature sites. The annual clean-up is improving the state of the environment by empowering and helping Oakville citizens and students to take positive action and achieve local solutions.</p> <p>Meanwhile, Oakville just got green at its first-ever environmental fair, the Eco-Festival. Six hundred and fifty mostly local people visited 70 exhibitors of environmental campaigns, products and services. Organized by the Oakville Community Center, the Eco-Festival was convened on the weekend of June 9 and 10 at the Glen</p>

	<p>Abbey Recreation Center.</p> <p>Environmental campaigns, led by local groups like GreenTrans, Oakville Green, Gardens Off Drugs, BANNED, Sustainable Development Committee of Burlington, the Bruce Trail Club, the Halton Outdoor Club, The Activist and the Oakville Community Center were very well received.</p> <p>We are very pleased how the community is responding to environmental initiatives as never before. We are only afraid that, as is too often the case, people wake up too late to be able to really make a difference for our common natural environment.</p> <p>We hope that this is not the case for the remaining chunk of Carolinian Canada land left in Oakville located north of Dundas and extending east to west from Ninth Line to Bronte Road.</p> <p>Just because people are late in discovering what it is that they are about to lose doesn't mean, however, that their newfound democratic expressions should be dismissed. It is not often that people, like those of you on this Council, are thrust into great public prominence because the decision they get to make will subsequently impact upon and influence all future decisions in a very direct way.</p>
<p><i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i></p>	<p>You have 15 seconds, Steve.</p>
<p><i>Stephen Dankowich</i></p>	<p>For politicians of all stripes and from all jurisdictions, whether Federal, Provincial or Municipal, in the near future, a new slogan, 'It's the environment, stupid,' will soon replace its predecessor slogan, 'It's the economy, stupid,' and there is increasingly less local, as there is increasingly less local land to grow food on, less clean air to breathe and concerns for clean water to drink.</p> <p>Let's do a great service to ourselves and to all GTA communities by now stepping outside of the pre-cast die of non-stop industrial, commercial and residential growth around existing cities and put the natural environment first.</p> <p>It is time to recognize that the natural environment cannot</p>

Town of Oakville
Lands North of Dundas
Meeting Transcript

Part III - June 28, 2001

	sustain constant demands for growth as are represented in this document OPA 198.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>Steve, I'm sorry, we are out of time. But we got the gist of it, believe you me. (Applause) Thank you.</p> <p>And, Steve, as the last speaker, if you wish to have the podium when we start next Thursday, just let the clerk know. The speakers immediately behind are? Then, we're in recess.</p>
<i>Madam Clerk</i>	The next group are Jeffrey Davies, Steve Baker, Tom Scott, Catherine Balmer and Jerry Yellowweed.
<i>Mayor Ann Mulvale</i>	<p>Thank you. Now we're recessed. Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen.</p> <p>Sorry, Members of Council, your bundles are here for pick up if you'd see Sandy. Members of Council, if you'd pick up your bundles, Sandy has them.</p>