

## General comments

It is my understanding that the OMB approved parcels of land for this development in 1997, almost ¼ century ago. Since then, there have been significant advancements in science, technology and the benefits of the natural environment. For example, I am sure most men are extremely glad that a simple blood test is now used to check for prostate cancer. In the same vein – no pun intended – it is important to incorporate the current scientific progress related to the impacts this development will have on the significant environmental features in this area. As evidence provided by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, it has never been more important to defend and restore natural areas like forests and wetlands to help reverse wildlife decline, protect us from climate change impacts and prevent feedback loops that could take us into a climate system that could spiral out of control. Today there is <15% of the original wetland area globally than was present 300 years ago. In the Greater Toronto Area, 10 percent of our original wetlands remain.

I have done a layperson's review of the staff report and attachments and have come to the conclusion - This development lacks imagination, it needs to go back to the "drawing board". I'm sad to say, it has no forward-thinking concepts included in it. It provides relatively no benefit to the community. If indeed this area has no alternative but to be developed, surely, we can do better than the standard car dependent "cookie cutter" approach of row upon row of townhouses, where people can confuse their neighbour's home as their own. A significant lack of cultural and recreational resources in the area warrants that this development should include these types of amenities. In addition to providing services to the community, it will help to decrease the temptation of people congregating in the sensitive areas for bonfires and beer. Another thought, instead of rezoning agricultural land to residential, this area could be turned into a community and pollinator garden.

## Questions/concerns

I am a bit confused on the purpose of the meeting. The staff report indicates:

The applicant is seeking Council's approval of its submissions to facilitate the construction of a medium density residential development comprised of 455 town-house. But the staff report is for information purposes only, with a recommendation that all comments be referred back to staff for consideration.

1. Is this meeting for information purposes only? If Council approves 455 town-house units at this meeting, is that a "done deal"? With subsequent comments only adjusting design to accommodate that number? How can Council approve anything without a complete review being made? It seems premature at this time to request approval since there are quite a number of outstanding items and only a preliminary review has been made (see some examples below). Especially important are the Natural Heritage Evaluation and Hydrogeological Assessment currently being reviewed by City staff and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, given the sensitivity of the area.

This statement is also confusing to me: "The OMB-approved Plan of Subdivision 19T-93027 provided for the development of approximately 650 dwelling units on the subject lands, in addition to the creation of blocks for school, park, stormwater management and environmental protection purposes (refer to Map 5) The approved Plan of Subdivision and related approvals reflect a medium density residential development comprised of single detached and townhouse dwellings, **the majority of which have already been constructed.**"

2. Does this refer to the previous 1997 OMB decision? What are the implications of the previous OMB approval on this development? There have been many advancements since 1997. What is "the majority" of which this comment is referring? Did it approve which blocks could be developed? Has a school been created?

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry have identified a number of at risk or endangered species in this area including the Black Ash, Midland Painted Turtle, Eastern Wood Peewee and Snapping Turtle. What provisions have been put in place to protect or enhance their habitat?

3. I have seen no discussion of at-risk/endangered species in the staff report. Has this not been assessed yet? Will it be assessed? Turtles killed crossing the road to lay their eggs is a well understood phenomenon and can be prevented with proper land-use planning.

There is discussion in the Development Engineering Division section and TRCA's about infilling and grading. This is a "Category 1 Oak Ridges Moraine Landform Conservation Area disturbance within a Landform Conservation Area should be kept to a minimum for development within the Settlement Area and must demonstrate conformity with the provisions of the ORMCP."

4. How much of these characteristics are being preserved? It appears the development areas will be graded to remove the distinct moraine characteristics of undulating topography and gravel, sand and silt eg. the report requests the grade difference of 5 to 8 metres be addressed. Has it been deemed moraine characteristics are not important in the development areas? If so, why?
5. How do the infilling soil characteristics differ from the moraine and what are the long-term implications of this with respect to recharge and surface water runoff from impermeable surfaces? Given the amount of impermeable surface being added to the moraine in York Region, will the Region be assessing recharge on a cumulative, more holistic, regional scale in addition to requiring applicants provide a site-specific assessment? This would help to provide a better picture of moraine water balance and impact from this and any future development.
6. How is it that citizens have been told that there will be no development on the ORM but developments of this size and impact continue to be approved, especially in areas with such sensitive features? Observing the water quality of the East Humber River and Oak Ridges Marsh over the past 20 years it would be nice to prevent the same degradation to these sensitive wetlands. eg. the Greenway System contains Significant Woodland, Wilcox-St George Wetland Complex Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW), and Candidate Life Science Oak Ridges Bog Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI) The lands are located within an Area of High Aquifer Vulnerability are susceptible to contamination from both human and natural impacts on water quality.

Considering the natural core and natural linkage requirements (to maintain and, where possible, improve or restore the ecological integrity of the natural features and functions. Furthermore, lands located within the Natural Core designation shall be protected over the long term in order to maintain, and wherever possible, enhance the size, diversity, health, connectivity, and resiliency of the Greenway System. Natural Linkage areas function as movement corridors between natural features and functions within the Greenway System and the larger Regional Greenlands System - designation include fish, wildlife and forest management, conservation and flood and erosion control including stormwater management works, low intensity recreational uses, essential public works, legally existing uses, buildings and structures, and accessory uses.)

7. It appears the lower portion of Block 8 is detrimental and an impediment to the connectivity to the Environmental Protection 1, Block 5. Can the Block 2 restoration linkage from the EP1 Block 5 area to the EPA section to the east be improved? It seems inadequate to comply with the Policy requirements to enhance size, diversity, health, resiliency and connectivity.
8. Why has the buffer zone been reduced to 10 metres when under the ORMCP and the City's Official Plan 30 metres is prescribed? Considering the sensitivity of the area, shouldn't the more stringent be used?

"The Hydrological Assessment indicates that dewatering in the southwest portion of the Study Area (to facilitate the condo blocks, the SWM south pond and underground servicing), could result in a large volume of groundwater discharge, in excess of the MECP's threshold limit of 400,000 litres per day. Please demonstrate that permanent dewatering will not be required.

9. What is the impact/length of time of dewatering during construction on surrounding ground and surface water features with respect to quality/quantity/erosion? What will be the impact to terrestrial features?

"A portion of the subject lands is proposed to be rezoned from Agricultural (A) Zone."

10. Given food security issues and that medium density dwellings have little access to soil in which to grow plants, would this be a perfect opportunity to turn this into a community garden area?

11. Have traffic lights been considered at Street A/Coons Road? This will become a busy intersection.
12. What is an unelevated wetland?
13. How have none of the forward-thinking aspects discussed by the City such as walkability features, those discussed under CEEP, etc. been incorporated into this design? Are these aspects not applicable to this development and will only be considered under a revised OP?
14. Could educational materials be distributed in packages to new homeowners or site-specific bylaws be considered to prevent invasive species from impacting natural heritage features from residential properties? (Why can nurseries sell these??) Walking the Seneca Trail in King Twp. one can see the devastating effects of periwinkle.

**Examples (not limited to the below, others can be found in the staff report):**

“It is noted that the applications remain under review by a number of City departments and external agencies.”

“...the amount of grading/fill proposed within the required buffers is not supported and the proposal does not conform with the applicable parkland provisions established in the Plan with respect to the acceptance of stormwater management facilities as part of parkland dedication (Section 3.1.8). A detailed review and evaluation of the subject development proposal relative to the above noted policies will be completed following the receipt of comments from Council, the public, City departments and external agencies.”

“The City’s Park and Natural Heritage Planning Section has identified concerns and outstanding technical matters to be addressed with respect to matters including parkland dedication, natural heritage system and buffers, tree inventory and vegetation, hydrogeology, stormwater management and grading (refer to Appendix “A”). not supportive of the location of the Community Park as shown on the revised plans, nor the proposed strata parks with underground stormwater management facilities.”

The Urban Design Section – indicates “modifications needed.”

“The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) advises that the submitted technical materials do not satisfy the TRCA’s requirements, that the key issues identified in past correspondence have not been resolved and that the submission has not established the viability of the proposed development (refer to Appendix “D”). Staff advise that the extensive grading proposed within the 10 metre buffer area is not supported and revisions to the plans are required in this regard. Furthermore, revisions to the submitted Natural Heritage Evaluation, Functional Servicing Report and Stormwater Management Report are required, and a Geotechnical Report must be submitted.”

“The subject lands are not located within the boundaries of an Major Transit Station Areas as currently endorsed by Regional Council”

Still under review:

The draft Zoning By-law submitted in support of the development proposal is currently under review.

The applicant has submitted a Natural Heritage Evaluation and Hydrogeological Assessment which are currently being reviewed by City staff and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

As of the writing of this report, the subject applications remain under review by the City’s Development Engineering Division – Transportation Section, as well as the Regional Municipality of York and Canada Post. Preliminary comments were received from the City’s Development Engineering Division, with formal comments to follow.