

## Stakeholder Written Comments

**From:** angela wai

**Sent:** May 8, 2007 11:03 PM

**To:** FutureYork

**Subject:** Planning for Tomorrow

Dear Sir,

I have attended the Markham Open House Meeting, the presentation was very impressive.

I have a question about the planning for the public transportation. I support public transportation to save more energy. However, I find it is difficult not to drive as I have nowhere to park my car. Are there any plans to reserve some lands for driver to park and ride? In the meeting, the topic of converting parking lots to residential or commercial use was brought up. On the contrary, I would like to see more public parking spaces in York region for commuters to utilize the public transportation.

Regards,

Angela Wai

From: Bill Foster  
 Sent: May 13, 2007 10:42 AM  
 To: FutureYork; jyoung@eastgwillimbury.ca  
 Subject: Comments re Planning for Tomorrow - Public Consultaiton Meeting  
 May 10, 2007

By means of this email, I would like to confirm and perhaps clarify the comments I made at last Thursday night's public consultation meeting at the East Gwillimbury town offices.

Firstly I congratulate York Region and Mayor Young for undertaking this extremely important, comprehensive approach to planning for the sustainable growth of our community. I only wish we had this type of planning approach and discipline years ago!

I have been a resident of York Region for nearly forty years - (initially in Markham and for the last 18 years, East Gwillimbury). Over those years I have witnessed the clear cutting and conversion of extensive tracts of valuable forests and agriculture lands into numerous subdivisions comprised of single family homes. This level of development caused the dislocation of much wildlife and many existing water wells went dry.

There appeared to be an almost insatiable demand for these new subdivisions as they represented the only really affordable single family housing in the north Toronto region. Purchasers were prepared to accept lengthy commutes from these new bedroom communities to their places of employment both for reason that the cost of their new home was "affordable" due to the relatively cheap land costs and the promise of new roads. New home buyers were promised (by the developers) that transportation improvements such as the extension of Hwy 404 into Georgina were just around the corner. These promises were subsequently supported by Regional planning maps which depicted the routes of planned future highways.

This form of housing has turned out to be anything but affordable! The occupants have been required to have at least two cars and likely a third once their children become teenagers. The cost of commuting has skyrocketed as have the commuting times. Costly infrastructure, in the form of municipal, regional and provincial services, has also had to be provided to support these new subdivisions. The costs of these services have had to be borne by regional property tax payers as well as

provincial and federal income tax payers. Simply put, every taxpayer in York Region has been forced to subsidize every major development in York Region for at least the last twenty-five years! The developers of these projects were once considered to be speculators – a dirty word! The province even tried imposing a speculation tax. When that didn't work, government caved into the developer's demands. In recent years, we have even rewarded developers with land swaps because we have imposed permanent usage restrictions on lands held by developers, such as on the Oak Ridges Moraine. These lands were already zoned as agricultural or open space. They were not zoned for development. Why should Ontario taxpayers reward developers who speculated on this land and lost?

We are now seeing a developer “feeding frenzy” for what little white space is left in York Region. While these lands are currently not zoned for development, this is clearly the next frontier for yet further green field subdivision style development. Once the developers purchase this property, they will bring enormous pressure to bear upon the Region to permit early development of these lands. Hence while our policy direction may be to make infill development our priority, developers will be lobbying relentlessly for the go ahead to turn their “speculation” properties into new subdivisions so they can realize yet more profits.

If we are really committed to sustainable development, not only do we have to diligently employ all of the policies and principles contained in the Region's very well developed Planning For Tomorrow document, we need to find methods to “Manage Growth” using a number of basic “demand management” techniques. As I noted above, York Region's urban sprawl has, to a very large extent, been the result of cheap housing in new (distant) bedroom communities. The true cost of this form of development has not been understood and incorporated into the total cost of these new houses. This has necessitated very significant hidden subsidies for infrastructure such as water, sewage, electricity, schools, roads, road maintenance, public transit and all related services including policing, teaching, social services, community centres and hospitals. I firmly believe that if the true cost of all these hidden subsidies were included in the initial cost of these new subdivision houses, demand for these forms of housing would plummet.

Effective use of demand management strategies such as I am proposing would cause affordable housing to be located close to existing services such as public transit thus eliminating the need for one or more cars per household, as is the case when this housing is located in greenfield

developments. My proposal would cause developers and buyers to look much more closely to infill developments where the necessary infrastructure and services already exist but might only need to be somewhat enhanced at modest cost. Greenfield developments would then develop adjacent to existing development thus avoiding costly leapfrogging as has been the practice to date. The Queensville Properties project, which I appreciate enjoys a legacy approval, is a primary example of this type of extremely inappropriate and costly leapfrogging development!

In order to successfully implement this form of market based demand management, the region would need to develop comprehensive financial models to determine the direct and indirect costs per person of supporting infill versus various types of greenfield developments. At one time, this type of financial modeling was beyond our capabilities. I firmly believe this is no longer the case. I would not be at all surprised if work of this nature wasn't already being undertaken somewhere in the world. If all else fails, this would be an excellent project for students at a university such as Waterloo. This important project might even qualify for a federal government grant. Once these costs were known, the final step in this part of the demand management program would be to use these costs as the basis for charging development fees on all future development.

Other forms of demand management that should be implemented are various user fees such as road tolls. Tolls should not used be to recover the capital cost of the infrastructure. Capital costs for items such as new roads that are only necessary because of new development, should be incorporated into the development charges of the properties to be served by these new roads. To the extent that the cost of the new roads cannot be fully recovered by development charges, the shortfall should then be financed by a dedicated financing instrument such as a Regional Bond. Tolls would then be set at a level sufficient to service the Regional Bond and the cost of maintaining and policing the road.

While these proposals appear to be quite dramatic, I believe they would be extremely effective because they rely upon market demand rather than government regulation while being fully transparent to all parties. Development under my proposal will be truly self sustaining as it will not rely upon any form of provincial or federal subsidization. To my way of thinking, the only justification for any subsidization is where government policy is imposed to override a true market economy.

In my closing comments, I also mentioned several points which I believe

are critical to achieving sustainable development in the Holland Landing / Queensville section of York Region.

\*Bradford Bypass Employment Lands Map / Study. \*

This map is currently posted on East Gwillimbury's web site. The positing of this map by East Gwillimbury and the inclusion of the proposed Bradford Bypass in the maps and commentary in the York Region Official Plan has the effect of creating strong demand for greenfield development in this area. As I mentioned at Thursday night's meeting, the developers are already swarming all over this area like maggots! This is an extremely inappropriate location for either a highway or employment lands given that it is immediately adjacent to one of the most highly sensitive categories of Green Belt lands in the province. In the interests of managing demand, I strongly request and recommend that both these maps be removed from York Region's and the town's planning documents.

I also pointed out that these properties and perhaps others likely contain Indian burial grounds. I recommended that the Planning for Tomorrow plan incorporate meaningful consultation with our First Nations residents to ensure we do not encounter another Caledonia incident. I was most pleased to hear Mr. Waller's response to this point confirming that extensive consultations were already being undertaken.

I appreciate that these comments are subject to the Municipal Freedom of Information Act and consent to their release or publication as may be required.

Respectfully submitted

Bill Foster

**From:** Bill Lardner  
**Sent:** April 19, 2007 5:47 PM  
**To:** FutureYork  
**Subject:** Sustainable Plan.

This presentation is confusing. Input from citizens is most effective when it addresses the broader issues. Details such as land inventories simply obscure the fundamental things that we need to see.

A couple of items that I think need to be addressed:

A review of recent residential subdivisions in York Region show that most of them have inadequate social and recreational facilities. Where do people go to shop, to walk & exercise? Where do youngsters go to play? Compare York Region subdivisions with those of an earlier era in, say, North York. (Google Earth is a useful tool). The subdivisions I am concerned about are simply dormitories, where an automobile is needed to get to anywhere of interest. They are not in any real sense proper communities.

I could not find in the document anything that clearly defines transportation policy.. I know, for example that there is a plan to widen the southern part of Yonge Street and incorporate rapid transit or dedicated bus lanes. This seems to be shortsighted. The Yonge Street corridor needs to be serviced with a subway, at least as far as south Richmond Hill, and the adjacent lands developed for high density occupation.

William E. Lardner

**From:** Bill Lardner  
**Sent:** May 7, 2007 2:21 PM  
**To:** FutureYork  
**Subject:** Sustainable strategy

Two points:

1. Planning for industrial development needs more attention. York needs a plan that will encompass a wide range of industrial activities, and must certainly include in that range all the industrial activities that are constantly in demand in York Region and even in the GTA. I particularly draw to your attention the need to provide for open storage areas. These are essential for the construction industry, and this industry is vital for the execution of the Plan. Locations need to be close to major highways and within reasonable travelling distance of the market area for these services so as to keep the cost & environmental impact of transportation as low as possible. Current provisions are totally inadequate.
2. Should we really continue with the proposal to widen Yonge Street and put rapid transit in the centre of it? Surely the proposed densification of the Yonge St. Corridor justifies the expansion of the subway up to Langstaff or even to Richmond Hill. It seems clear that this is potentially so desirable that it really should take precedence over the planned extension of the Spadina line to Vaughan civic Centre.

William E. Lardner

---

---

From: Erica Tsang  
Sent: May 11, 2007 2:43 PM  
To: FutureYork  
Subject: Planning for Tomorrow comment.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I attended the Town of Markham Planning for Tomorrow Session and retrieved a copy of the Sustainability document.

While looking through the document I noticed that it did not contain anything regarding low-income minority families within the region.

As I am very supportive of the future sustainability plans, I feel that no segment of the population should and could be left out when striving for the sustainability of a Region. It would be counteractive to leave a segment of the population out of the sustainability plans. How can a community reach sustainability when only a portion of the community knows about it?

For instance, as you know Markham has a low-income rate of 12.6% (Incidence of Low Income by Municipality Report, Figure 2, 2001).

Thank you for your time and great work,

Erica Tsang

**From:** Neil Thorne  
**Sent:** May 19, 2007 2:58 PM  
**To:** letters@erabanner.com  
**Cc:** FutureYork; 'Taylor, John'; mayor@newmarket.ca; info@durhamyorkwaste.ca  
**Subject:** Sustainability and Incinerator Don't Mix  
 May 19, 2007

Last week I attended York Region's presentation of their Growth Management Plan at which I also received a draft copy of their Sustainability Strategy. According to the latter document, one of the definitions of sustainability is "leaving our communities, our Region, our World in a healthy state for our children and grandchildren."

One of their six themes for action items was "Sustainable Natural Environment" and, ironically, one of the action items was "[c]ontinue to pursue the Energy-from-Waste Incineration Project with Durham Region in order to manage our waste locally." Although I agree we need solutions to deal with our waste at a local level, incineration is not a sustainable solution. This action item is in direct conflict with the idea of sustainability as defined, and with other action items in this draft strategy.

For instance, the region hopes to divert more and more waste (one action item sets an extremely low target of 75% by 2016; why can Markham get up to 70% within only two years then?) the thermal facility will be in direct conflict with this goal, being that it must be "fed" in order to be financially viable and to be able to burn the trash effectively. Most facilities must run for 40 years in order to recover their investment. Do we really want to be burning the enormous amount of garbage it takes to make this facility work efficiently even 20 years from now?

Other action items that a thermal waste treatment would defeat are: to "improve the quantity and quality of the Region...surface water systems including Lake Simcoe" (one of the proposed facility sites in East Guilmory is near the Black River that would carry fallen toxic fly ash directly into lake Simcoe); to "adopt principles for sustainable green communities in order to create...communities with smaller ecological footprints"; to "reduce greenhouse gas emissions in existing and future Regional Facilities"; and to "reduce emissions of smog precursors...and harmful pollutants that impact human health" (the incinerator will dump as much or more CO<sub>2</sub> into our atmosphere than a coal-fired electrical plant, not to mention dioxins, furans, VOC's and heavy metals, all of which cause serious health consequences for humans and wildlife and will worsen our already poor air quality). Does this leave our communities "in a healthy state for our children and grandchildren?"

In addition, research has shown that waste-to-energy facilities, no matter how cutting-edge, are not reliable, are not energy smart, and are not financially viable. Does that sound sustainable to you? I **do** applaud the region for developing a sustainability strategy, and there **are** many important and valuable action items in this document; however, pursuing the "Energy-from-Waste Incineration Project" is not one of them. **Even the document itself** makes it sound as though incineration isn't a desirable destination for waste, explaining that carpet in the York administrative building was removed and reclaimed "guaranteeing that no material would be incinerated or placed in a landfill site." Clearly the ideal path for sustainability is not landfill or incineration; it is to move towards a zero waste scenario including more aggressive waste diversion measures and accountability by companies that produce the products that end up in our garbage.

I am very disappointed that no other alternatives for residual waste disposal were mentioned in this

document. This leads me to believe that, contrary to what I've been told by my municipal councillor, the decision to go ahead with the thermal treatment facility is indeed quite solidified. If, as this document proposes, "[s]ustainability means evaluating the community, environmental and economic effects of our actions," and leaving our region "in a healthy state for our children" then York Region's commitment to sustainability is clearly hypocritical if they do not re-evaluate and find alternatives to the thermal waste treatment project.

L. Higgins  
Newmarket

**From:** Jay Xie

**Sent:** May 7, 2007 11:41 PM

**To:** FutureYork

**Subject:** Questions regarding the Markham Open House

Hello, my name is Jay, I've attended the Planning for Tomorrow 2007 Open House in Markham on May 3rd. I'd like to get the names of the gentlemen who did the presentation for my assignment. I want the name of the gentleman who did the introduction (was it Mayor James Young?) and the gentleman who presented the slides (is his name Gordon Landon?) I know one of them were Tony Wong who did a brief introduction, but I missed the one who did the introduction and the gentleman who did most of the presentation talk, was it James Young and Gordon Landon? Thank you very much, I'd really appreciate your help. You can email me the names or call me directly at 647-887-8833, you can leave me a voicemail message if I wasn't able to pick up the call. Thank you.

Regards,

Jay

**From:** Joan Sax

**Sent:** April 20, 2007 7:50 AM

**To:** FutureYork

**Subject:** Cultural perspective of Planning Strategy

Dear Sirs,

Yesterday I left a comment on the fractionation of York Region by Cities and Towns and the affect on culture. I believe York Region is being hurt by the gap in cultural planning and did not see this addressed in the plan. As an example of an objective, I would like to suggest that a cultural network for the municipalities of York Region be started to grow York Region wide events eg. Festivals I would also like to suggest that some funding support this concept so matching fund can be found at the provincial and federal level.

Joan Sax



**North East Sutton Ratepayers Association Inc.**

*NESRA is an incorporated, not-for-profit organization in the Lake Simcoe Basin*

*Member of Volunteer Canada and the Ontario Greenbelt Alliance*

Margaretha Vandervelden, PhD Director Box 592, Sutton West, Ontario L0E 1R0

Tel 905.722.6958 E-Mail grethav@rogers.com

---

24 May 2007

Re:

Open House

Planning for Tomorrow: Towards a Sustainable Region

10 May 2007 East Gwillimbury Civic Centre

To: Whom It May Concern

An excellent presentation that raised a some questions/comments that I was unable to state at the time due to a prior commitment. I do so herewith. Where appropriate, I have included an explanation (Context).

1. Directing Growth

Comment: The risk of unsustainable growth is not sufficiently addressed by the present tools as per *Planning for Tomorrow* (or *Places to Grow*). Therefore,

Question: What other tools should/could be put in place (see, below) to ensure that future growth in lower municipalities such as the Town of Georgina will indeed be sustainable?

*CONTEXT*

Planning for Tomorrow sets explicit targets for growth to 2031 for each municipality, but does not similarly define (i.e., with clear maximum targets) where such growth occurs within each municipality, an omission that carries risks of an unsustainable region especially in the large semi-rural municipalities such as the Town of Georgina.

That is, as per *Planning for Tomorrow* (and *Places to Grow*, 2006), controls to direct growth in a semi-rural municipality such as Georgina are non-specific growth targets: that is, local growth centre (e.g., Keswick for significant growth) versus modest growth (e.g., Sutton and Pefferlaw). Presently, these non-specific targets are implemented (enforced) only through differential infrastructure (sewer and water ) allocation, as I understand this.

Unfortunately, infrastructure allocation as a “coercive” tool in directing growth is rendered ineffective due to “frontending agreements” with developers. An example follows.

---

*Example of unsustainable growth*

*In the Village of Sutton, a relatively large development (320 units) is about to go in despite the fact that there is no infrastructure in place (this development will be surrounded by existing residences on private services including wells) and despite the fact that the site is a forested wetland (perched water table and a Regionally Significant forest as per ROP definitions).*

*The site is also directly connected to Lake Simcoe via an onsite stream (Sibbald Creek) that terminates at the Sibbald Point Provincial beach: that is added risk of pollution whereas indicators are that the carrying capacity of the lake has already been exceeded from turning a sink (wetland/forest) into an emitter of pollution (housing development).*

*At the OMB Hearing the site was recognized as hydrogeologically sensitive by all parties as well as per OMB Decisions. We note that the OMB hands were tied thanks to previous municipal land use decisions as per the 1994 Sutton Secondary Plan Study and a frontending agreement between the Sutton Landowners group and the Region in 2001.*

---

*As for car dependency and unsustainability, the residents of this development (that will double the population in north east Sutton) are entirely car dependent for **all** their needs.*

In other words, from a sustainability perspective, this development is a disaster and the Region of York relinquished its only tool to stop it. In the Village of Sutton, this situation can and, in my opinion, will occur again and again (e.g., in 1994, the Sutton Secondary Plan was expanded to 2550 hectares which even at the now “dated” 12.3 u/ha density could potentially accommodate a total of 31,365 units or a population in excess of 60,000).

2. Development Charges: Growth does not pay for growth. It also mitigates against more sustainable forms of development?

QUESTION

What is the Region’s position and action (e.g., lobbying the province) on this issue?

CONTEXT

That development charges at their present level do not cover the public cost of new growth was also recognized at the *Places To Grow Summit* hosted by the Ministry of Infrastructure Renewal on May 17 2007 as was the need to address this shortfall situation.

Example: Growth does not pay for growth? This was an issue for our organization in 2005 when, in fact, the Town of Georgina was set to lower development charges. Our organization opposed and, consequently, development charges were readjusted upwards despite a Fiscal Impact Statement Study (we had asked for) that supported the premise (growth does not pay for growth) only for multiple unit buildings and townhouses (there was a shortfall), but not single (detached) homes.

Which raises another problem: that present development charges schedules mitigate against the building of more sustainable forms to accommodate housing needs.

### 3. Climate Change.

Within the context of climate change, natural heritage takes on added significance for human health and quality of life, for all life, in fact. On that matter, the Significant Woodlands Study takes on added significance.

### QUESTIONS

- a) When will the Significant Woodlands Study(November 2005) be “translated” into effective policies (present policies under Section 2.are not effective!) for woodland protection under the Sustainable Natural Environment section of the York Region Official Plan (awaiting amendment for some time now), and,
- b) If adopted as part of the ROP, how will the Region ensure that this will make a real difference in woodlands protection as part of the lower tier municipalities’ land use planning decisions: in planning documents such as secondary plans as well as through the development approval process?

Submitted on behalf of the membership

Margaretha Vandervelden  
North East Sutton Ratepayers Association Inc.

**From:** michael white

**Sent:** April 20, 2007 11:36 PM

**To:** FutureYork

**Subject:** Climate Change

To the Chair and Council of the Region of York

What is your plan to assist the people of York Region to address Climate Change/Global warming. I suggest the Library borrowing or purchase of Tim Flannery's "Weathermakers" as soon as possible to help.

Michael White, Oak Ridges

**From:** John O'Gorman

**Sent:** April 25, 2007 11:13 AM

**To:** Tuckey, Bryan; Jeffrey, Barb; Draper, Patrick; EconDev, Chait, Stephen; mayor@king.ca; jheath@markham.ca; fscarpitti@markham.ca; Baird, Jim; Elbert van Donkersgoed 3; Janice Etter

**Subject:** Prime farmland shrinking in Ontario

Food production - our food production for York Region by York Region - is a definite part of Sustainability and an integral part of Healthy Communities and yet it is totally ignored in your report!!.

York's blindness in this area must be rectified

Sincerely,  
John

<http://www.hcfa.on.ca/cached.asp?id=1846>

**Prime farmland shrinking in Ontario**

By [JOHN MINER](#), [SUN MEDIA](#)

Canada's thin slice of fertile land that can reliably produce crops is disappearing at an increasing rate — and Ontario is taking the worst hit, losing thousands of acres a year.

For a province with more than half the country's best farmland, the pressures from urban sprawl are ringing more and more alarms.

There's even a risk that with a new greenbelt now designated around the Toronto area, urban growth will punch into prime farmland in the London-Kitchener areas, "the most important land to protect," said Bronwynne Wilton, a co-editor of a new book on farmland loss in Canada.

"It is quite serious," Wilton, a University of Guelph graduate student, said of the erosion of valuable farmland.

"People have become complacent because it is so easy to go to a grocery store and there is food from all over the world readily available at quite reasonable prices.

"People have become disconnected from the agricultural industry and the food system," said Wilton.

While there are no signs of an immediate looming food shortage, Wilton warns situations can change, especially in an era of global security concerns and terrorism.

"If you can't grow food within your own region, you are really cutting off your independence. If you pave it over, you are cutting off all your options for the future," she said.

Statistics bear out why agricultural experts are increasingly concerned:

- Canada is the world's second-largest country in land area, yet only 11 per cent of its land is of any agricultural use.
- Only one half of one per cent of Canada's land is so-called Class 1 agricultural land, the best land for producing food.

For land to actually be productive, it must be in a region with the right combination of a warm growing season and rainfall needed to grow crops. More than half of Canada's Class 1 land is in Ontario, with that right combination.

But Ontario, especially its southern reaches, is also the province with the most urban pressure on farmland. New housing, big-box commercial developments and industrial growth are among the culprits putting the land under siege.

Recent figures from Statistics Canada underline the growing problem:

- In the Greater Toronto Area, more than 2,000 farms and 68,000 acres, about 18 per cent of Ontario's Class 1 farmland — were lost between 1976 and 1996.
- The paving over of farmland hasn't been as severe in the London region, but 8,500 hectares were lost in Middlesex County alone between 1996 and 2001, agricultural census figures show.

"Once converted to urban use, it is done as farmland. It is lost," said Wilton.

"It is not so simple as saying we can grow the food further up north where people don't want to live, because the climate is not favourable up there." The loss of farmland also means consumers will have to rely on their food being transported greater and greater distances, with that extra transportation adding to pollution.

The problem of prime farmland loss can be seen driving along the Highway 401 through the Woodstock area, said Paul Mistele, a vice-president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture.

"When I come down the 401 I see a lot of farmland, some of the best ground in Canada, going under construction. There is steel and there are cranes everywhere," said Mistele, an Elgin County farmer.

While technology and improved plant genetics will make it possible to get larger crops off smaller areas, the question is how far to push the envelope by allowing further loss of farmland, Mistele said.

"They are not making any more (land). We have to work with what we have," he said.

**From:** Hutcheson, Regan

**Sent:** May 8, 2007 2:47 PM

**To:** FutureYork

**Cc:** Shuttleworth, Valerie

**Subject:** Planning for Tomorrow 2007- York Region Growth Management

Further to your request for comments.

A few points from a heritage planning perspective:

- The Region should be cognizant of existing heritage conservation districts and individual heritage resources when considering the growth potential of certain areas as part of this process. It is not appropriate to recommend major intensification to areas where the implementation would not be compatible with the environment that a community is attempting to preserve.
- Also must be cognizant of heritage policies of the Provincial Policy Statement:
  - o 2.6.1 "Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved" (**heritage conservation districts are significant cultural heritage landscapes**)
  - o 2.6.3 "Development and site alteration may be permitted on adjacent lands to protected heritage property where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches may be required in order to conserve the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property affected by the adjacent development or site alteration." (**therefore, even sites adjacent to protected heritage sites would have to address the impact on the heritage resource and its attributes. Heritage attributes is defined in the policy statement and includes the principal features, characteristics, context and appearance that contribute to the properties cultural heritage significance**)

Thanks for the opportunity to provide input.

*Mr. Regan Hutcheson*

Manager, Heritage Planning

Heritage Districts Development Co-ordinator

Development Services Commission

101 Town Centre Boulevard

Markham, Ontario L3R 9W3

905-477-7000, ext. 2080

Fax- 905-475-4739

email: [rhutcheson@markham.ca](mailto:rhutcheson@markham.ca)

---

*This e-mail contains information that may be privileged and/or confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, distribution, copying or other use of this e-mail or the information contained herein or attached hereto is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify this sender immediately and delete this e-mail without reading, printing, copying or forwarding it to anyone. Thank you for your co-operation.*

**From:** Richard Johnson  
**Sent:** May 29, 2007 11:10 AM  
**To:** PMorris@e-aurora.ca; FutureYork  
**Cc:** Sue Fusco  
**Subject:** FW: premier's response

**Attachments:** Premier's response re SAGE report.pdf; PremierSAGEletter.doc; EMF submission to BCUC final.doc; doctors letter april 2 2007.JPG

For your records as well.... please see recent correspondence from BC.

The same issues apply in York Region.

Regards,  
RJ

---

**From:** dbroadfoot  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 29, 2007 12:08 PM  
**To:** Richard Johnson (TOR)  
**Subject:** FW: premier's response

-----Original Message-----

**From:** dbroadfoot  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 29, 2007 7:25 AM  
**To:**  
**Subject:** FW: premier's response

This email will serve as an official record that you have been informed of the following documents in relation to installation of high voltage power lines over backyards and schools in Tsawwassen: letter from Mayor Lois Jackson and Maureen Broadfoot to Premier Campbell regarding the SAGE Report; April 2 letter from Ontario physicians regarding impacts of cell phone towers on children's health; letter from the Canadian Cancer Society regarding the VITR project; new study regarding EMF exposure and cancer in railroad workers in Sweden. Board members of BCTC and BC Hydro will be provided same (hard copies to follow by mail).

Further to the attached letter from Premier Campbell to Mayor Lois Jackson and myself, the Premier has indicated you will be providing a response to our concerns regarding installation of high voltage power lines

over homes and schools in Tsawwassen in light of the recent report from the Stakeholder Advisory Group who found an established link between EMF and childhood leukemia and are recommending that homes should not be built within 60 meters of high voltage transmission lines. Also for your consideration attached is a recent letter signed by 12 physicians in Ontario who state "It is impossible at this time to feel comfortable knowing a cell phone tower is located near an elementary school. These levels of exposure on a daily basis are not consistent with prudent health policy at this time". As you are aware, the Canadian Cancer Society has advised "modification of the transmission project in relation to power line routes over private residential property and school property" due to the high level of scientific uncertainty and public concern surrounding EMF exposure and childhood leukemia. Please include your comments on these attached letters from the Canadian Cancer Society and the Ontario physicians in your response to Mayor Lois Jackson and TRAHVOL.

Please also review this link regarding a highly publicized new study in Sweden which shows a dose-response relationship between exposure to EMF and cancer in railroad workers. Please include your comments on this study in your letter regarding installation of high voltage towers in Tsawwassen. This issue is causing a great deal of anxiety and concern for families in our community. I'm sure the government wants to ensure that the public and particularly children will not be harmed in any way from a public infrastructure project. We would appreciate your response in a timely manner.

[http://www.insidermedicine.ca/archives/Electromagnetic\\_fields\\_linked\\_to\\_cancers\\_in\\_railway\\_workers\\_1142.aspx](http://www.insidermedicine.ca/archives/Electromagnetic_fields_linked_to_cancers_in_railway_workers_1142.aspx)

Maureen Broadfoot  
TRAHVOL

---

**From:** Scott Birchall

**Sent:** May 15, 2007 10:28 PM

**To:** FutureYork

**Subject:** Planning for Tomorrow Input

I believe that additional consideration is required for the following as part of the Planning for Tomorrow Exercise

1. The development of an affordable housing strategy for the whole Region e.g Development Charge Reductions/Exemptions for developments that build affordable housing.
2. Affordable Housing Targets need to be set for each municipality. These targets should include timelines.
3. Require the proper mixing of housing in communities e.g. townhouses on the same street as singles and semi-detached units.
4. Increased transit routes/corridors in the northern region e.g transit route along Green Lane and Leslie Street. Also consider developing transit routes that run along Highway 404 from northern municipalities to the south e.g Newmarket to Highway 7 etc.

If you require any further information or clarification please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Scott Birchall

May 10, 2007

The Regional Municipality of York  
17250 Yonge Street  
Newmarket, ON  
L3Y 6Z1

Attention: John B. Waller, M.C.I.P., R.P.P., Director, Long Range and Strategic Planning

**Re: York Region Growth Mangement**

Dear Mr. Waller:

As a member of the Williams Treaties First Nations, Rama Mnjikaning First Nation acknowledges receipt of your letter of May 4, 2007 which was received on May 8, 2007.

A copy of your letter has been forwarded to Karry Sandy, Barrister & Solicitor, Coordinator for Williams Treaties First Nations for further review and response directly to you. Ms. Sandy's address is 8 Creswick Court, Barrie, ON L4M 2J7 and her telephone number is (705) 792-5087.

We appreciate your taking the time to share this important information with us.

Sincerely,  


Rodney Noganosh  
Head Councilor

c: Council  
Jeff Hewitt, General Counsel  
Karry Sandy, Barrister & Solicitor

RN/sw

5884 Rama Road, Suite 200, Rama, Ontario L0K 1T0 - (705) 325-3611 - Fax (705) 325-0879

***A proud progressive Native community***



May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2007

Sent by fax and mail.

Mr. Hamid Hatami, P. Eng.  
Manager, Water and Wastewater  
The Regional Municipality of York  
17250 Yonge Street  
Newmarket ON L3Y 6Z1

Dear Mr. Hatami:

**Subject: York Region Initiatives**

The Union of Ontario Indians is in receipt of your information package dated March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2007 with respect to various initiatives of York Region. Your package outlines some minor details related to your projects designed to guide York Region's growth and servicing over the foreseeable future including York Region's Sustainability Strategy; Planning for Tomorrow – The Growth Management Plan; Water and Wastewater Master Plan Update; and the Transportation Master Plan Update.

This letter re-confirms that under no circumstance should any of the correspondence exchanged between representatives from this organization and York Region related to the above noted initiative be characterized or construed as a consultation with this organization, its member First Nations or the members of those First Nations. This letter shall serve as evidence that there was no consultation.

We maintain that Aboriginal and treaty rights and any First Nations' interest in its traditional territory, including its resources, cannot be abrogated, derogated or infringed in any way by any government legislation, regulation, policy or initiative.

Section 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982* recognizes and affirms Aboriginal and treaty rights, and in doing so, it protects both the content of these rights and requires a process of consultation and accommodation.

According to recent decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada, in order to trigger constitutional obligations around meaningful consultation and accommodation, First Nations are not required to prove the existence of section 35 rights in a court of law. Instead, First Nations must demonstrate a "prima facie" case for the existence of a section 35 right.

# UNION OF ONTARIO INDIANS

Head Office: Nipissing First Nation, P.O. Box 711, North Bay, ON P1B 8J8 Phone: (705) 497-9127 Fax: (705) 497-9135



In light of the high standard that has been set in law and by the Courts for governments to consult with First Nations, we are recommending that you meet with all Anishinabek First Nation communities whose traditional territory may be affected by this initiative. It is only through direct discussions with Anishinabek First Nation communities that you will be able to work towards the development of a meaningful consultation process with each individual First Nation.

However, your correspondence on the above issue is not satisfaction of any legal obligation of the government to consult with First Nations.

Yours truly,



Allan Dokis  
Intergovernmental Affairs Director

Copy to:     L. Cheah, P.Eng. – York Region  
                 J. Waller, M.C.I.P., R.P.P. – York Region  
                 D. Richardson, P.Eng., PTOE - MMM

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, July 20, 2007 11:48 AM

To: Regional Clerk

Subject: Request to present sustainable development information to countil

To whom it may concern,

My name is Leslie Luxemburger; I am an Environmental and Urban Development Specialist working on behalf of the Sustainable Urban Development Association (SUDA). SUDA is a registered charitable corporation whose mission is to foster a healthy natural environment through better city-building.

SUDA recognizes the many challenges facing York Region as its population grows over the next 25 years. While Mississauga is managing growth through intensification and infill development, problems of land supply, traffic congestion, environmental degradation, habitat fragmentation, public costs of development, and the financial/economic well-being of residents and commerce will be a challenge to address. As a concerned organization, SUDA will be speaking with members of Regional and municipal Council to exchange ideas and offer support for sustainable urban development in York Region and its constituent municipalities.

As part of the Official Plan Update in conformity with Places to Grow, and the newly emerging Vision 2021, there are tremendous opportunities for input into sustainable and healthy city building at a regional and local scale. In particular, we wish to help inform and guide policy making and land use within York Region, by offering our research and input into the Official Plan Review and encouraging developers to implement energy efficient/LEED design and low impact development. We would like to share our research and strategies with you and other environmentally minded councillors, including our current model of sustainable communities.

We will adjust our calenders to match your availability. SUDA looks forward to meeting with the Regional Council, and wishes to make a presentation of its sustainability work to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Leslie Luxemburger,  
Environmental and Urban Development Specialist  
Sustainable Urban Development Association (SUDA)