

GREENSPACE ALLIANCE RESPONSE TO WITNESS STATEMENTS

WS of Ian Cross

1.
On p. 3 Mr. Cross states: "The methodology for evaluating urban expansion parcels commenced with a review of evaluation criteria used in other studies. These were discussed with ... representatives of the Greenspace Alliance at meetings through mid-2008."

Greenspace Alliance members have collective memory of meetings about endangered species, airport lands, country lot estates and expansion of the urban boundary but have no recollection of meetings dealing specifically with evaluation criteria for urban expansion used in other studies.

Please provide more particulars.

2.
On p. 19, giving reasons for his opinion about Greenspace Alliance issues, Mr. Cross states:

"Proposed policies 3.12 and 3.13 in OPA 76 require studies to identify the natural heritage system in expansion areas and the preparation of an environmental management plan. "

Ministerial Modification #46 replaced OPA ss. 3.12 and 3.13 with a new s. 3.12, which is explicitly written to guide proponents of Plans of Subdivision (ref. Policy #2). Ref. Annotated OP, p. 3- 61/62.

Would you please confirm that:

- a) as a result of the Board's Decision of 3 June 2011 (Urban Boundary Phase 1, p. 22), the new s. 3.12 is in effect;
- b) in principle no further Official Plan Amendment is required for development to proceed, except that "an amendment may be required to implement infrastructure and open space provisions of plans approved for individual areas. Development may proceed once the City is satisfied that the requirements of this section have been met and the City has approved the plan of subdivision." (ref. s. 3.12, Policy #5).
- c) therefore the distinction drawn in the May 4, 2009 Staff report (Vol 4, Tab 31) and summarized on page 11 of Mr. Cross's WS, namely that "Urban Expansion Study Areas" would require a subsequent OP amendment to implement the plans, whereas "Developing Community (Expansion Areas)" would not, is no longer relevant.

+++++

WS of Bruce Finlay

1.

The syntax at the end of para. 14 (page 6) appears to be deficient, or else the sentence may be incomplete.

2.

In para. 15, Mr. Finlay states:

"Once the natural heritage system is accurately defined the City's Official Plan also requires that the land, containing the natural heritage system, be transferred to City ownership and 'further an Official Plan amendment is required to designate the land general urban."

This appears to contradict Policy #5 of the new s. 3.12 (Annotated OP, page 3-62):

"5. An amendment to this Plan will not be required to remove the designation of Developing Community (Expansion Area) and replace it with General Urban Area, but an amendment may be required to implement infrastructure and open space provisions of plans approved for individual areas. Development may proceed once the City is satisfied that the requirements of this section have been met and the City has approved the plan of subdivision."

Please clarify.

+++++

WS of Nicholas Stow

1.

In par. 4, on the 4th page, Dr. Stow states:

"Only seven of the 11 candidate expansion areas currently have coverage by a watershed or subwatershed study, and only in the case of candidate area 1 does the relevant subwatershed study explicitly address natural linkages at a watershed or subwatershed scale."

Please provide a table showing what parcels in Areas 1-11 are covered by what (sub)watershed study, indicating the date of Council approval or otherwise the status of each study.

2.

Following the above-quoted words, Dr. Stow makes specific comments about the subwatershed study related to Area 1. We would challenge some of the assertions made. We had prepared testimony on this matter, but in light of the P.O. and discussion on November 7, decided to hold such arguments until Phase 2B. Alternatively, we would need to engage in a detailed discussion of the implications of that study for various parcels in Area 1 and would wish to supply supplementary evidence. A verified map combining the Area 1 parcels with, e.g., Figure 3.3a of said watershed study, would also be helpful (and will be needed in Phase 2B).

We would suggest instead that the text "*In the case of candidate expansion area 1, ...*" up to and including "*...and the remaining corridor lies outside candidate area 1.*" be stricken for the purpose of Phase 2A.

3.

On page 6 (6th para.), Dr. Stow states:

"There are, however, several initiatives underway by the City of Ottawa and the National Capital Commission to identify and map the natural heritage system, including natural linkages, at a regional level."

Please provide a list of these initiatives and their status.

+++++

WS of Greg Winters

In para. 3.2, Mr. Winters refers to Sections 3.11 and 3.12 as proposed in OPA 76, presumably meaning 3.12 and 3.13 (Item 145 of OPA 76). These have been superseded by a new Section 3.12 (Ministerial Modification 46) and it is our understanding that by Board Order of 3 June 2011, this section is in effect.

In the new section 3.12, critical distinctions in the old 3.12 and 3.13 have disappeared, making the section now directed solely at guiding proposed Plans of Subdivision. This gives a new perspective to otherwise identical language such as Policy 4 b quoted.

See also response #2 to the WS of Ian Cross.

Would the Witness recognize that much of what is concluded in section 3.2 of his statement is therefore dated.

+++++

WS of Lloyd Phillips

In para. 11 and again in para. 18 Mr. Phillips makes reference to work underway towards "Completion of Sustainability Principles."

Would you please clarify what work this refers to.

+++++

WS of Nancy Meloshe

On pages 3 and 4 Ms. Meloshe references section 3.6.4 of the Official Plan (Developing Community designation) and the 2005 Leitrim Community Design Plan respectively.

For the sake of clarity, could there be confirmation that Area 8A (Idone lands; 4840 Bank Street) is not covered by section 3.6.4 nor part of the Leitrim CDP.

+++++end+++++