

Catherine Gravely  
23 Manor Road  
Bobcaygeon, Ont  
K0M1A0

June 22, 2017

Mayor Letham & Members of Council,

**RE: Proposed Adoption of OPA 13 (General Amendment), OPA 14 (Bobcaygeon Secondary Plan), OPA 16 (Lindsay Official Plan)**

I cannot attend on June 27, 2017, as I have a long scheduled surgeon's appointment on that date. Please accept the following as my comments:

In reviewing the Agenda package for the June 27, 2017 Council meeting that includes Planning Report 2017 – 039, it is clear that the reason for the scheduling of this meeting and the proposed “adoption” of these Official Plan Amendments now, after almost 18 months of inactivity, is solely to avoid the Provincial requirements of the new Growth Plan. This is further clarified by the City's home web page under ‘Response to Growth Plan’ (which provides the same rationale) and by correspondence from the City Solicitor to myself and others, in which it is again confirmed that the motivation for this meeting and the proposed procedure in this manner is to avoid complying with Provincial Policy that comes into effect July 1. This concern, at least in part, is because the City will have “excess lands” needed to 2041 that are included in these Plans – and new, restrictive policy is being proposed for such “excess” - as staff has correctly reported.

Only a few weeks ago, I received written official Notice from the City that all of the Secondary Plans would be **repealed** on May 30 – the exact opposite of the current intent. Then I was included in an utterly confusing email exchange with the City solicitor immediately prior to May 30 that suggested that different Secondary Plans had been prepared and the intent had been to adopt them in July. Despite my request to her for some direction or clarity about the City's true intent on May 30 or thereafter, no explanation was provided of such radically different and contradictory proposals.

I am an experienced urban planner with almost 40 years of practice and I cannot follow what the City is doing with such confusing, contradictory information – such random notifications, and such mercurial change of intent - *how on earth is any member of the public intended to be meaningfully involved?* Sadly, I think the answer has been quite clearly demonstrated throughout my experience (& that of other members of the public) in this long, dismal, process. The dismally low numbers at public meetings speak loudly.

In some respects, it is refreshingly honest of the City to openly acknowledge this over-designation of land within these Secondary Plans, in its rush to shelter under the existing Growth Plan provisions. However, even under the in-force Growth Plan, it is

hard to conceive of the proposed increase of some 8,000 units within the 5 Secondary Plan communities (from approximately 10,000 units to approximately 18,000 units) as set out in policy 5.7 of OPA 13 in the period to 2031, when only a few thousand additional people are forecast for the City. And this is growth planned merely in the “urban” areas of the City, when the municipality has a large rural area, thousands of seasonal residences outside of urban areas, and many hamlets too. Both the current and 2017 Growth Plans anticipate quite limited growth for the City of Kawartha Lakes and these provincial forecasts have been accurate (or optimistic) over the past years. As a taxpayer, it is greatly alarming to see such a discrepancy between Provincial forecasts for the City and these Plans, recognizing the sprawl and infrastructure costs that will be incurred – the exact opposite outcome intended by the Province.

The City’s 2011 Growth Management Study clearly acknowledged that far too much land had then been designated – and yet the City and its consultant took the opportunity of these Secondary Plans to expand community boundaries, convert employment land - and add yet more development land within the “urban areas”.

Flaws in the City’s understanding of the Planning Act, and of any sincere intent to include the public, continue - regrettably. There has been no proper Notice that Council’s meeting of June 27 is an intended “statutory public meeting”; and no invitation for public input, (nor notice that failure to provide such input will restrict the ability to appeal these documents), as required under the Planning Act. Indeed, anyone who did not review Council agendas, would not know of the intent to “adopt” these Official Plan Amendments at this Council meeting, particularly if they had been officially informed, - like me - or seen the newspaper Notice that all of the Secondary Plans and the “General Amendment” were to be repealed on May 30th.

It is alleged that the Amendments before Council are the same as those recommended for “endorsement” in 2015 and endorsed. Since they were only made available today, there is limited ability to verify this. One might think that the City’s word should suffice, if not for the numerous and repeated errors in published documents that have been produced over the course of this exercise.

Staff seem to be of the opinion that the meeting to “endorse” these three Amendments is the same as a meeting to “adopt” them, but obviously that is untrue. Staff and Council were well aware that the process of “endorsement” enabled no right of appeal. Therefore there was no notice to the public that they must present a written submission or appear in order to secure a right of appeal, and any comments that were presented to Council were not designed to set out reasons for appeal, when none was possible.

Indeed the Notice and available documents for the December 8, 2015 Council meeting at which OPA 14 and OPA 16 were “endorsed” did not meet the required Notice period for a “statutory public meeting” either, because it was not intended to be such. Prior to it, the public had been presented with two versions of these Secondary Plans at the public meeting in the summer of 2015 – a Council version and a Staff version. It is difficult to

imagine a process that could be consciously designed to be any more difficult to follow, even for someone experienced in planning matters.

Unlike a typical Secondary Plan process, there has been no strategic consideration of options to ensure the best and most economically advantageous development for the City, because there have been no options presented or considered, merely a “one size fits all” base Secondary Plan used for communities of such diverse character as Lindsay and Woodville. And this twisted process has dragged on for over 5 years, when a normal Secondary Plan process would be completed in a year.

Most tragically to me, any members of the public who might have been involved to make meaningful contributions to the future of their communities were lost (many dropped from mailing lists), or utterly and needlessly confused by this muddled approach, or excluded by means of incorrect notices by the City from this unnecessarily convoluted and aberrant Secondary Plan process.

This June 27<sup>th</sup> meeting will continue that legacy because the City has not followed the proper process to “adopt” these documents but, instead, has rushed into a knee-jerk reaction to avoid the 2017 Growth Plan requirements. No proper notice was issued. In addition, it seems that there is an utterly insincere intent towards public involvement, because new plans have already been prepared to change these documents now before Council, before the ink can dry.

This process has been a travesty that has resulted in huge delays, necessary repeals by the City and great costs in terms of time and money for everyone, including City of Kawartha Lakes taxpayers. The abrupt reversal of published intent with respect to the Amendments under consideration today merely underscores a theme of the entire exercise.

Sincerely,

Catherine Gravely