

R.A.N.D
38 Burnhamthorpe Rd. W.
Oakville, Ontario
L6M 4K4

Mr. Ho Wong
Manager, Long Range Planning
The Regional Municipality of Halton
1151 Bronte Road
Oakville, Ontario
L6M 3L1

January 29, 2003

Re: Halton Region Official Plan Review

Dear Mr. Wong

Residents Association North of Dundas (Rand) represents approximately 50 homes in north Oakville. Our community is bound by Dundas Street to the south, Ninth Line on the east, Tremaine road to the west and the Town boundary to the north. We represent the last remaining rural community in Oakville, with properties ranging from modest bungalows on $\frac{1}{2}$ acre lots, to equestrian and crop farms.

As you are aware, the Town of Oakville through Official Plan Amendment 198 is planning to bring its Official Plan into conformity with the Region's Official Plan, changing the designation from rural to residential and employment. RAND has actively participated and continues to be involved and supportive of The Town of Oakville's OPA 198 process. For this reason we are somewhat focused on issues relating to proposals in the Directions report that may have direct relation to the urbanization of our area, although we are interested in many areas of the Region's 5 year review process.

Representatives of RAND attended your Greenlands Workshop on Nov 11 and 12, 2002 and subsequent Greenlands Workshop No. 2 on Jan 22, 2003. We generally support the Region's proactive approach to protect additional significant environmental features in Halton Region and appreciate the opportunity to submit our comments. However, after review of the significant Woodlands Study and listening to the Region's consultant explain its contents, we have serious concerns with respect to how the implementation of the Greenlands proposals may directly affect our community.

In addition, at the most recent meeting of Jan 22, 2003, staff indicated that amendments have been made to the original directions report, but to date we have not been provided with documents that reflect these amendments and therefore are unable to comment on the proposed revisions. We trust that these revisions will be provided prior to any decisions being made and that we will be given the opportunity to respond accordingly.

Notwithstanding the above, in the interest of meeting your January 31, 2003 deadline, we are herein providing some of our concerns and comments as per the August 2002 version of the Region's Directions Report.

For the following reasons, the proposed addition of a new category "significant woodlands" to Greenlands B is of concern to R.A.N.D.:

- We are concerned that the qualitative aspects of woodlots may not be considered in the methods proposed to identify significant woodlands. We feel further clarifications is needed regarding the criteria concept, e.g. is a woodlot that meets 3 or 4 criteria, not more important than a woodlot that only meets one?
- There is a need to incorporate a full range of compensation and acquisition measures with respect to any woodlands identified for preservation. Such policies will ensure fair treatment of landowners and increase the potential for preservation of the woodlands.
- There may be financial implications arising from this proposal on all Regional taxpayers in terms of both acquisition and long-term maintenance of these woodlots. How is the Region proposing to address this matter? The proposed policies may lead landowners to see woodlots as a detrimental feature. Has the Region considered tax rebates or other incentive programs to encourage landowners to want to retain these significant natural features and view them as a positive attribute?
- We question whether the Region has considered all types of landowners before proposing the new Adjacent Lands policy? Requirements for an EIS for any property alteration in the vicinity of a woodlot would be arduous to individual landowners. Clear and logical criteria should be developed with respect to when studies such as an EIS is required. For example, an EIS should be required when a property is proposed for development or redevelopment, with development being defined as the creation of additional dwelling units or new industrial/commercial buildings. The current proposal could subject individual residents to a costly EIS if they wanted to add a deck or addition to their existing home. What are the parameters of a required EIA to an individual landowner? We request further Clarification of the implications and implementations of the EIA proposal. This policy infers a negative economic implication on all existing landowners.

Prior to any further decisions or staff recommendations being presented we would request a written response to the issues raised above and would appreciate further analysis and clarifications of how the Region's proposed policies will directly impact the RAND residents. Furthermore, Regional policy has the potential to effect all stakeholders in the Region, many of which may not have had input into the preparation of policy formulation criteria, or even be aware of the Official Plan Review process. All landowners and homeowners in the Region of Halton should be given individual notice that their properties could be negatively impacted by the Region's proposed policies BEFORE any decisions are to be made. RAND does not believe that non-descriptive newspaper advertisements constitute sufficient notice given the potential implications of the proposed policies on landowners across the Region.

We look forward to participating in future discussions of Halton Region's Official Plan Review, receiving a response to the issues that we have raised and obtaining revised versions of the Directions Reports.

Thank you for your attention

Yours truly

RAND, Board of Directors

cc: J. Knoh

REGIONAL COUNCILLOR.