

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

15. Industrial Land Review: Recommended Urban Growth Boundary Expansion for Future Industrial Growth and Official Plan Amendment (O-8014)

- Tommy Faulkner, 3700 Old Victoria Road – asking a question of the Managing Director, Planning and City Planner about exactly what he said; enquiring as to whether or not the reason he would like to not discuss things now because you plan on going to have certain Industrial lands redesignated as not Industrial and then, at the next meeting that you have with us, that you will say that there is a shortage of Industrial land and it is needed; advising that, if that is what your plan is, he thinks that they need to inform Council today that it is kind of a backhanded approach that you are taking because there is a lot of Industrial land now and if you are going to get rid of some so that you can come with an argument that says we need some more now, that would not be very fair; *(Secretary's Note: Councillor Polhill responds to Mr. Faulkner's comments by indicating that he does not believe that that is what staff is doing; advising that he believes that they are just proposing to exchange land from one place to another, we are not adding any more to the growth area, we are just adding Industrial land to the area where most of our Industrial land is);* indicating that that is not part of their new proposal; *(Secretary's Note: The Civic Administration advised that they appreciate the question from Mr. Faulkner and they have been very clear that they have an Industrial Land Strategy, they have prepared criteria relating to what lands are and are not seen as well located, well planned, desirable for economic opportunities, when you look at the Provincial Policy Statement, there are a number of policy directions that need to be considered; one of them is economic prosperity and that does relate to Council's Industrial Development Strategy, the desire to make sure that there are lands that are properly and well located to attract economic opportunities; in the meantime, we have had a couple of things occur; one is through the Southwest Area Plan, they have identified that there were lands that were designated Industrial that were not well located for Industrial opportunities and we removed those from an Industrial designation to a Community Growth or a Residential designation; similarly, we have recently received enquiries, and in fact, requests, for some major land owners that are in Industrial areas that are, again, not well located from the Industrial perspective, do not meet our criteria well for the location of Industrial uses and that is what they came forward with at the last cycle of the Planning and Environment Committee, recommending removal of those lands from the Industrial designation and moving them over to Community Growth. The idea is, in keeping with good planning, to move lands that are now designated Industrial out of an Industrial designation. Why leave them there sitting fallow? They are already in the Urban Growth Boundary, they are serviced in most cases. It is not an efficient use of services, it does not represent good planning and we are missing economic opportunities, or we could, as opposed to removing them from the Industrial designation, turning them over to Residential designation and then, as Mr. Faulkner points out, expanding the Urban Growth Boundary, but putting those Industrial lands to locations that do have the opportunity to attract those economic opportunities that fit well within our Industrial Land Development Strategy. In working with the Province, the condition that they are imposing, consistent with what they have done in other communities, is they have said that if you remove an Industrial designation over to a Residential designation, then what you are doing is preventing an expansion of an Urban Growth Boundary from Community Growth or Residential purposes and that is what happened as a result of the Southwest Area Plan. That additional residential land that we ended up with prevented an expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary for residential purposes and this, again, would have the same impact with the next five year review potentially by dampening the need, depending on the growth rates, for expansion to the Urban Growth Boundary for Community Growth. That is what the Province is looking at, saying on one hand, you are expanding the Urban Growth Boundary but you are putting these Industrial growth in the appropriate locations but, on the other hand, you are not expanding the Urban Growth Boundary for residential which you would otherwise have*

to do. It is a little easier to explain in a graphic form but I think you get the sense that we are not doing this in a backhanded way, as Mr. Faulkner had suggested, but rather we are being very clear and upfront about this is the approach, this is how the Province suggests that we are maintaining the integrity of the Provincial Policy Statement and, in fact, trading off the Urban Growth Boundary expansions that would have occurred versus what will occur and getting in tune those good planning of getting those lands where we are going to be able to see some opportunities. I will say that, again, a really important piece to us, which relates to the agricultural operation that Mr. Faulkner is involved with, which is a huge economic generator in and of itself and we recognize that, we recognize the importance of it and the significance of it; we need to make sure that we are respecting the minimum distance separation requirements of the Province in doing that as well.); indicating that he is not talking about the merits at all, but he would like to point out that, at the last public meeting, they did not have this idea of taking land out of the Industrial use so that they can make this argument, it is a new one, so, when it is like a backdoor approach, he would like to suggest to everyone that if you have the power to say to them that you cannot do that, because it is a backhanded way of accomplishing what you want, that would be great; (Secretary's Note: Councillor Polhill indicated that is not a backhanded way, it is the way the Province wants us to do this and we have to take land out of certain designations to put something into another designation. That is what we are doing here and that is how the Province has told us we have to do it so that is what we are doing.) (Secretary's Note: The Civic Administration indicated that it is the very same recommendation; that it is reliant on the redesignation of lands in the White Oaks area as well as lands that were redesignated in the Southwest Area Plan in order to justify the number that staff provided. This is not a different approach, this is exactly what was in front of the Committee the last time. The only thing that is different is the areas that they are recommending.) (See attached submission).