

June 28, 2018

John Linhardt, MCIP, RPP
Commissioner of Planning and Sustainability
Town of Halton Hills
1 Halton Hills Drive
Halton Hills, Ontario L7G 5G2

Dear Mr. Linhardt:

Re: Planning Opinion on the Private Official Plan Amendment Submitted by the Southwest Georgetown Landowners Group Inc. ('SWGLOG') - Vision Georgetown

I am writing to provide the Town with my land use planning opinion on whether the Southwest Georgetown Landowners Group Inc. ('SWGLOG') application to amend the Official Plan ('Private OPA') is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement ('PPS 2014') and in conformity with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe ('Growth Plan 2017').

The focus of my land use planning opinion is on the differences between the Private OPA submitted in November 2017 and the final Secondary Plan that is being recommended for Council approval on July 9, 2018. It is recognized that the SWGLOG have continued to participate in the Vision Georgetown planning process subsequent to the filing of their Private OPA with their submissions being different than proposed in their Private OPA. However, the SWGLOG has not formally advised the Town that the Private OPA has been revised in any way. As a consequence, the focus of this letter is on the Private OPA and the supporting materials as submitted in November 2017.

The differences between the Private OPA submitted in November 2017 and the final Secondary Plan are below:

1. The Private OPA shows two full east-west collector roads extending between the Eighth Line and Trafalgar Road, while the final Secondary Plan shows three such east-west collector roads.
2. The Private OPA shows five elementary schools with one of these school sites including the Stewarttown School while the final Secondary Plan shows five elementary schools in addition to the Stewarttown School.



3. The Private OPA shows one high school site while the final Secondary Plan shows two high school sites.
4. The Private OPA does not co-locate the secondary school and the library/community centre and the community park while the final Secondary Plan does co-locate all of these uses in a proposed Community Core.
5. The Private OPA shows one major commercial area in the southeast corner of the Secondary Plan area plus one other commercial area on Trafalgar Road while the final Secondary Plan includes a third commercial area on the Eighth Line.
6. The Private OPA largely locates medium and high density residential areas on the boundary arterial roads while the final Secondary Plan proposes that much of the high density residential uses be located in the Community Core, and proposes more medium density housing on the internal collector roads.
7. The Private OPA incorporates a Natural Heritage System ('NHS') that differs from the NHS established in the final Secondary Plan, most notably in the southwest quadrant of the Secondary Plan area. In addition, there are also differences between the Private OPA and the final Secondary Plan as it relates to the width of buffers, the location of enhancement areas and the spatial extent of a woodland area on the Eighth Line that is dominated by Black Locust vegetation.
8. The Private OPA does not identify the cultural heritage resources that have been identified on the Vision Georgetown lands whereas the final Secondary Plan does.

The above represents the more significant differences between the Private OPA and the final Secondary Plan.

On the basis of my review of the Private OPA, it is my opinion that certain aspects and components of the Private OPA relating to the differences above do not conform to the Growth Plan 2017 and/or are not consistent with the PPS 2014. In addition, it is my opinion that the Final Town Plan is superior to the Private OPA LUP for reasons that are detailed in this letter. Below is an overview of my opinion.

PPS 2014

I reviewed the following sections in the PPS 2014 in developing my planning opinion: Sections 1.1.1 a), b), g) and h), 1.1.3.1, 1.1.3.2 a), 1.1.3.6, 1.1.3.7 b), 1.4.3 c) and d), 1.5.1 a), 1.6.1, 1.6.5, 1.6.7.1, 1.6.7.2, 1.6.7.4, 1.6.7.5, 1.7 b) and i), 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.6.1.

In reviewing these sections of the PPS 2014, it is my opinion that the final Secondary Plan:

1. Establishes a more efficient land use pattern particularly as it relates to the provision of three continuous east-west collector roads instead of the two such collector roads proposed in the Private OPA, with these three east-west collector roads being more supportive of active transportation and public transit;
2. Is much more supportive of the creation of a vibrant and dynamic people place in the form of the proposed Community Core than the Private OPA, which largely directs high density residential uses to the boundary roads and which does not co-locate the



proposed secondary school with the proposed library/community centre, thereby creating inefficiencies;

3. Is more supportive of providing opportunities to access local goods and services by establishing three distinct commercial areas than the Private OPA, which only proposes two such areas;
4. Ensures that projected needs for school facilities will be met, while the Private OPA has one less secondary school site and one less elementary school site than required; and
5. Ensures that cultural heritage resources are identified and considered through the implementation process whereas the Private OPA is silent on cultural heritage resources.

On the basis of the above, it is my opinion that certain aspects and components of the Private OPA summarized above would not be consistent with the PPS 2014, if approved as proposed.

In addition, there are a number of differences in the approach to watercourse management that distinguishes the Private OPA from the final Secondary Plan, which was informed by a subwatershed study that was endorsed by Council in June 2017. Specifically, the watercourse management plan advanced by the SWGLOG recommended that a number of watercourses be removed, which does not comply with the guidance from the subwatershed study.

In addition, there are also differences between the Private OPA and the final Secondary Plan as it relates to the width of buffers, the location of enhancement areas and the spatial extent of a woodland area on the Eighth Line that is dominated by Black Locust vegetation. It is therefore my opinion that the Private OPA does not properly reflect the policies of the Region of Halton Official Plan on natural heritage and the recommendations made in the Town's subwatershed study. This means that the Private OPA would not be consistent with the section of the PPS 2014 that deal with natural heritage.

GROWTH PLAN (2017)

The intent of the Growth Plan (2017) is to significantly reduce urban sprawl and land consumption while making more efficient use of existing infrastructure. The Growth Plan requires that municipalities look to new ways to accommodate growth that breaks from the past, in terms of how communities are designed, and how land uses are mixed, all in an effort to improve our quality of life, our health and our general well-being. With this in mind, there is a significant focus in the Growth Plan (2017) on the creation of complete communities.

In this regard, I reviewed the following sections in the Growth Plan (2017) on the need to plan for complete communities in developing my planning opinion: 2.2.1.4 a), b), c) d), e), f) and g) and 2.2.7.1.

In reviewing these sections of the Growth Plan (2017) dealing with complete communities, it is my opinion that the final Secondary Plan is superior to the Private OPA since it:



1. Provides enhanced connectivity and additional opportunities for active transportation in the form of three east west collector roads;
2. Provides enhanced opportunities to access local goods and services in the three proposed commercial areas;
3. Provides for a more attractive and vibrant public realm in the Community Core by the co-locating of community uses such as the secondary school, library/community centre, Community Park and the Town Square Park, which provides significant opportunities for the creation of a viable community core that is anchored by public uses;
4. Supports the future vitality of the Community Core by the clustering of high and medium density residential uses in the Community Core; and,
5. Fully meets the needs of the school boards with respect to the provision of schools.

On the basis of the above, it is my opinion that certain aspects and components of the Private OPA summarized above would not conform with the Growth Plan (2017), if approved as proposed.

I trust that this is the information you require at this time.

Yours truly,

MERIDIAN PLANNING CONSULTANTS

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Nick McDonald". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Nick McDonald, RPP
President