

Re: 101 Meadowlily

Dear Members of Council;

At the recent Planning and Environment Committee meeting, Mayor Ed Holder supported the planning application for 101 Meadowlily Rd because he felt that the applicant proceeded in 'good faith' in purchasing the land and filing its application.

The city planner approved the application because it met the zoning requirements of low to medium density housing measured in 'units per hectare'.

If all it takes to approve a development application is 'units per hectare' and a developer moving forward in 'good faith', then where is the public voice?

The city planner used a simple mathematical equation to approve this application without applying any other filters developed through policies aimed at designing liveable cities such as cultural heritage, built heritage, environmental protection, walkability, sustainability and climate action. All policies defined through public participation.

Where is the public voice? People spoke eloquently, intelligently and convincingly at the PEC public participation meeting. Many seemed surprised that a pocket of undisturbed grasslands surrounded by protected lands was open to development. They didn't seem to know, even those long time residents of Meadowlily Rd.

This development needs its own pumping station and stormwater management plan – an indication it is an over intensification of the land. It also did not go through an environment assessment measuring its impacts on ecological function - a requirement under section 2.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement

- 2.1.8 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified in policies 2.1.4, 2.1.5, and 2.1.6 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions.

The City's own guidelines are too old to adhere to the 2014 updated Provincial Policy Statement. For example, a marshland is found 45 meters away from the development site across Meadowlily Rd. At this distance, the City's guideline considers this a safe distance for any negative impacts. However, a small house 20 meters away, and not requiring a water pumping station, a stormwater plan, street lighting and more than one driveway would have less impact on ecological function than a highrise 50 meters away. Therefore, a simple 35 meter buffer is inadequate to determine impacts on ecological function without assessing the development itself.

Anna Hopkins voted in favour of the application because she is afraid of the outcome at the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal, but all those public voices that spoke so eloquently at the public participation meeting will likely be participants at any appeal hearing at LPAT. Those voices will be there too.

If planning is approved solely based on a mathematical equation, that's bad planning and bad planning makes bad cities. I am certain that the Tribunal will understand this.

Thank You

AnnaMaria Valastro

133 John St. Unit 1