



COMMUNITY SERVICES

Memorandum

DATE: February 2, 2016

TO: Mayor Friel and Members of City Council

FROM: Paul Moore, Director of Planning

SUBJECT: Additional Public Consultation Comments- Municipal Boundary

Please find attached copies of the latest public correspondence on the proposed municipal boundary that has been received since the 2 packages were distributed to Council on January 26th, 2016 associated with Staff Report CD2016-041.

Paul Moore, MCIP, RPP
Director of Planning
Community Services

Boundary Deal = Dumb Growth
No Boundary Deal = Smart Growth

Today, Brantford Council meets to hear delegations about the revised boundary deal. The original boundary Memo of Understanding was signed by Brantford Mayor Chris Friel and Brant County Mayor Ron Eddy on January 6, 2016. Brantford would acquire 6,064 acres of mostly farmland, mostly in the "protected agriculture ribbon" to pave over.

Many residents from Brantford and Brant County oppose the megasprawl deal. Yet, now, both councils have agreed to **increase** the amount of land that Brantford would annex from **6,064 acres to 6,412** acres.

To see the new maps, click [here](#) and go to page 11 and 12. Many people feel that the "public consultations" were simply "window dressing" and that their councils are not really listening to their concerns.

The megasprawl deal is much bigger than it appears on the map because of the sprawl that it enables in Brant County. Brantford would acquire Tutela Heights, the Innis-Welton and Hopewell properties on the north-east (all the way to Adams Rd), and a vast amount of mostly farmland to the north of Brantford, much if it all the way to Governor's Rd.

In exchange for the 6,412 acres, Brantford would provide Brant County with water and sewer services. The **Airport and Cainsville** communities will be areas of "**joint ventures**" for Brantford and Brant County. These joint ventures involve another **2,157 acres** of land, 1060 acres in the Airport area, and 1097 acres in the Cainsville area, much of which is currently farmed. That's a total of **8,221** acres of land that would be developed, much of it prime farmland (Class 1-3) and Class 4 farmland!!!

At the same time, the Ontario Federation of Agriculture (OFA) is "demanding the provincial definition of prime agricultural land be expanded to include Canada Land Inventory Class 4 soils, along with Class 1, 2 and 3 soils."

Most of the land in the megasprawl deal is also in the "**the protected agriculture ribbon**", which was created by provincial law in 1980. The catch is that if Brantford and Brant County agree to pave over the "protected agriculture" ribbon, they can! So as the Ontario Government is trying to expand the Ontario Greenbelt, our local municipalities are in a rush to pave over one of the very first "greenbelts" in Ontario. Sustainable Brant, Tutela Heights Phelps Road Residents Association and the National Farmers Union

of Ontario (NFU-O) all call for the preservation of the "protected agriculture" ribbon.

This sprawl proposal flies in the face of the Crombie Report and the joint report by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture and Environmental Defence (Farmland at Risk). Both reports stress that there should be **no more urban boundary expansions**. In order to support public transit and reduce energy demands and carbon emissions, the Crombie report recommends increasing the density of cities and promoting intensification. This is smart growth.

The decision by Brantford and Brant County Councils to pave over this "protected agriculture" ribbon is **dumb growth**. The megasprawl deal will only support more sprawl development. It will not reduce carbon emissions or address climate change. The decision is not democratic. The process is rushed, and has not been transparent. The megasprawl deal is not informed by best practices to address climate change, support transit and protect farmland.

In addition, the Six Nations community has outstanding land claims. On January 21, 2016, the Men's Fire delegation and Jan Longboat of Six Nations reminded Mayors Field and Eddy of outstanding land claims. These include the Johnson land claim on the north-east and east of Brantford and concerns in Tutela Heights.

We urge Brantford Council, Brant County Council and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing **not to approve** this boundary expansion deal. If Brantford follows smart growth principles, it will increase the density of Brantford and stay within its existing boundaries. This will facilitate public transit, reduce taxes for residents and reduce climate change, while still preserving adequate green spaces and employment lands within Brantford.

Grow up Brantford and Brant County, not out.

Paul Moore

From:
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 11:41 AM
To: Paul Moore; Geoff Rae
Subject: Fwd: Thank you

FYI

Begin forwarded message:

From: _____
Date: February 1, 2016 at 11:39:02 AM EST
To: _____

Cc: _____

subject: Thank you

As a resident of Tutela Heights I would like to thank you for standing up against the pressure to sign the MOU in such a hasty manner. We in Tutela feel like we are pawns in a chess game. There are so many reasons why this is such a bad move for both the city and the county and developers are the only winners.

The river bank is a precious resource that is fragile and should be protected. It is wild and beautiful. Unfettered development will undermine what little stability it has and potentially cause a horrific landslide. This is not a new phenomenon to this part of the bank.

The city will have to spend millions to bring unwanted services to the area. The only users will be the comparatively few new homes that will be built. Why would the city agree to such an unwarranted expenditure.

If the adjusted boundaries are agreed upon, Tutela Heights Road will be the only access road to this new subdivision. Tutela Heights Road is a narrow winding country road that can barely handle the current level of traffic. It will cost millions to move it and secure the riverbank. Again, another huge expenditure.

David Crombie in his recent report decried the unrestricted sprawl that is occurring in many areas. He encouraged the preservation of farmland which is being paved over at an alarming rate. Tutela Heights has a rating of 1-3. Why would you want to take such fertile farmland out of use when other areas with poorer lands are readily available.

The people of Tutela are certain that this totally unwarranted land grab is developer driven and would not stand up to careful thought and reflection. The speed with which this is being railroaded through makes us believe that there is a race between the developers and some potential provincial initiative which would interfere with their plans to bulldoze all of the character out of Tutela Heights.

I am including your fellow councilors in this email and ask all of you to take the necessary time to do your due diligence.

Sincerely

Sharon Terry

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Paul Moore

From:
Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2016 9:15 PM
To: Paul Moore; Geoff Rae
Subject: Fwd: Brant/Brantford Boundary

FYI



Begin forwarded message:

From: Viviane Wise
Date: January 30, 2016 at 8:39:43 PM EST
To:
Subject: Brant/Brantford Boundary

I am writing to request your support in delaying finalization of the Memorandum of Understanding dated Jan. 6, 2016 between Brant County and the City of Brantford and the Amendment presented on Jan. 26, 2016.

I would like to draw your attention to a letter addressed to both Paul Emerson, CAO, Brant County and Geoff Rae, CAO, City of Brantford dated December 18, 2015 from Laurie LeBlanc, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. On the second page of this letter, they are requested to draw their attention to the recently released report, planning for Health, Prosperity and Growth in the GGH 2015-2041. In particular, recommendations 19, 20 and 21 of the Report focus on land needs assessment, making specific reference to consideration of over-supply situations.

It is my understanding that the recommendations for our area from the Province will be relayed in March, 2016 – just a few weeks away. I feel it would be irresponsible of Council of both Brant County and City of Brantford to finalize the MOU prior to receiving direction from the Province regarding recommendations. Brant County Council voted “no” to Greenbelt Expansion but the Province in all likelihood, will mandate the expansion of the Greenbelt into Brant County.

If the Greenbelt is expanded into Brant County, it is likely, a River Bank Greenbelt/Bluebelt will be implemented, thus, the area of Tutela Heights will likely be included for the following reasons:

- a) Lies within River Valley
- b) Recognized as Natural Heritage and Cultural Heritage/Archeological
- c) Consists of a large Carolinian Forest
- d) Grand river watershed
- e) Class 1 soil in the area of proposed development

The Gardener Church Study prepared for the Province in 1980 clearly recommends City of Brantford grow to the West and North for both residential and industry. It is important to note that these areas consist of Class 4 farm land and appropriate gravity for sanitary.

The G.S.P. Study prepared for the County, April 10, 2014, Principle #5 –adjustment to the boundary will not include areas of the County that impacts on prime agriculture land. Principle #6 – adjustment to the boundary will not include areas of the County that do not have nearby access to City services.

An option worthy of consideration was presented by Wilbert Long at the January 21, 2016 Public Consultation Meeting. Mr. Long has since put in writing details of this Option, which would appear to be a better and more cost effective plan than development in Tutela Heights would be.

It is my understanding that the Indigenous People of the Grand River Territory have a registered land claim on the land in Tutela Heights – Elder Jan Longboat clearly stated at the Jan. 14, 2016 Public Consultation Meeting that “there will be no development on this land – it is illegal”. Elder Jan Longboat and men from “Men’s Fire” attended the Jan. 21, 2016 Public Consultation Meeting and reiterated this message. Would it not be better to exclude Tutela Heights from the boundary adjustment until this land claim is resolved?

Your help in a delay of finalization of the MOU will be appreciated, as elected Officials it is your responsibility to adhere to policies which protect the environment and ensure climate change initiatives are implemented.

Regards,

Viviane Wise