

160 Third Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 2K1

October 6, 1996

Regional Planning and Development Approvals Department, Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, 111 Lisgar Street, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 2L7

Re: Proposed Regional Offial Plan Amendment 64 Change of Designation of 48 Hectares of Land Near Manotick
from Agricultural Resource Area

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to express my opposition to re-designating the lands in question to allow for the development of 40 "country lot" housing units with an average lot size of two acres.

I am unfamiliar with what developers mean by "country lot", but, at least in this case, I interpret the term as a euphemism for the kind of profligate use of agricultural land that erodes our food land base while lending nothing to the creation or consolidation of viable urban communities. In recent press coverage of discussions about the Regional Government's suggested changes to its official plans to promote more intense development of already developed urban areas, there has been some faint promise engendered that we might be heading for the creation of more compact, more efficient communities. Alas, proposals such as ROPA 64 fly straight in the face of more rational planning. Planning approval of two acre lots of this kind in the shadow of urban Ottawa may make a major contribution to the property wealth of the current title holders, but they are antagonistic to the common good. Houses built on such lots will be entirely car oriented, and their occupants will impose all the easily avoided public costs associated with such kind of ill-conceived development, from demands for school busing, to the extra costs of

Reference Item 1
Planning and Environment Agenda
22 October 1996

garbage pickup, snow removal and road maintenance. These financial costs to taxpayers will, of course, be accompanied by the environmental costs associated with inefficient transportation of goods and products and the loss of productive farmland.

Please bring this letter to the attention of the Ontario Municipal Board panel looking at this proposed amendment.

rs sincerely,

John Merritt