

Delegation to PPW Committee Dec. 2 2009 Re: ROPA 38
By Kurt Koster, President, BurlingtonGreen Environmental Association

Chair, members of the PPW Committee,

The changes to the ROPA 38 were available to the public on Nov 28 or 29, insufficient time to do a proper analysis of all the changes.

A "thank you" to Staff for all the work that has gone into the process leading up to ROPA 38

Urban areas

We are disappointed that the intensities in the greenfield areas are not higher. The implications of peak oil and climate change were not considered enough. Higher densities would have resulted in:

1. Smaller urban foot print
 - a. Less loss of farm land
 - i. Allows farming to be more viable.
 - ii. Lower GHG contribution
 - iii. More carbon sequestration
 - iv. Less dependence on imported foods
2. Less dependence on cars
3. More easily justifiable transit

We are disappointed that a Carrying Capacity was not completed. It would have provided:

- i. A stronger case to argue for a review of the population targets under the Places to Grow legislation.
- ii. More justification to adopt higher urban density

On page 263 and 264 of Response Document, Attachment #3 in response to BurlingtonGreen's comment: "We urge that a comprehensive Carrying Capacity study and ecological footprint determination be carried out and the results published" The staff Response: "The Region undertook a study to research the carrying capacity concept. The study results indicated that the ability to measure carrying capacity is challenged by the lack of a list of more readily measurable environmental indicators. Furthermore, the complexity of the environment makes measuring an overall carrying capacity **very difficult**." The development of the Sustainable Halton Plan and ROPA 38 must have been difficult also, but not impossible.

We feel that a Carrying Capacity study and ecological footprint determination would provide invaluable insight on Halton's "sustainability".

NHS

We are pleased with the concept and science that was used to develop the NHS as it was shown on MAP 1 before the current changes.

(Comments below are made after listening to comments and questions/answers during the Dec 2 PPW meeting.)
We are concerned about the implications to the changes to the area above the brow on MAP 1. There are more permitted uses in the Greenbelt such as golf courses and quarries. In response to a question about a comparison of NHS versus Greenbelt, I heard Mr. Glenn state that the NHS is treated as one "system" whereas the Greenbelt is not. It has some linkages and connectedness, but it is not one "system". This concerns us as it implies a weaker overall NHS.

In Conclusion

We have appreciated the many opportunities to comment on the development of this plan and we look forward to continuing to be involved in Regional planning and policies.