

AN INSPIRED CONVERSATION *ON GROWING THE GREENBELT*

FOLLOW-UP REPORT
JULY 2016



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 THE EXISTING GREENBELT	3
1.2 GROWING THE GREENBELT	3
2. AN INSPIRED CONVERSATION – TRANSCRIBED	4
2.1 THE EVENT	4
2.2 THE MODERATOR AND PANEL	5
2.3 INTRODUCTIONS, WELCOME, PLENARY SPEAKER	8
2.4 MODERATED PANEL DISCUSSION	14
2.5 ATTENDEE QUESTIONS TO PANEL	24
2.6 ATTENDEE ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS	31
3. FOLLOW-UP OF AN INSPIRED CONVERSATION	34
3.1 ISSUES ARISING	34
3.2 UNANSWERED QUESTIONS	36
3.3 INTERACTION WITH EXISTING POLICY	37
4. RESPOND TO THE GREENBELT REVIEW	39
4.1 SUBMIT FEEDBACK ONLINE.....	39
4.2 SUBMIT WRITTEN FEEDBACK.....	40
5. CONCLUSION	41
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	42
REFERENCES	43
APPENDICES	44
A1. LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	44
A2. PROPOSED GREENBELT EXPANSION AREAS.....	45
A3. PROVINCIALLY PROPOSED GREENBELT EXPANSION AREAS.....	46

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 2005 the Greenbelt has successfully protected agricultural land, water resources, forests and other natural heritage features from urbanization. The Province of Ontario has recently performed a 10-year review of the Greenbelt Plan, presenting an opportunity to grow the Greenbelt in areas under threat from development.

In response to the opportunity to grow the Greenbelt in Wellington County, the Wellington Water Watchers hosted *An Inspired Conversation* on February 18th, 2016 at the Puslinch Community Centre. There panel speakers David Crombie of the Crombie Commission, University of Guelph lecturer and former City of Guelph politician Lise Burcher, Jeremy Grant of Seaton Ridge Communities Ltd., local farmer Gerry Stephenson and John Fitzgibbon of the University of Guelph School of Rural Planning and Development addressed stakeholders and land rights holders of Greenbelt expansion. Questions regarding proposed expansion areas, appropriate responses to climate change, and appropriate responses to population growth within the Grand River Watershed were answered by the panellists, and then by attendee roundtables. In this report we have transcribed the panellist portion of the event, and attempted to address issues arising and unanswered questions from the day.

The most compelling points about issues pertaining to Greenbelt expansion remain within the words of our Panelists, and we hope you find in them the same inspiration we did.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE EXISTING GREENBELT

In 2005, the McGuinty government created the Greenbelt in an effort to prevent urban sprawl from impacting the Oak Ridges Moraine, the Niagara Escarpment and areas of Protected Countryside. Today the Provincial Greenbelt is a permanently protected area of green space covering more than 1.8 million acres. In addition to the major plans that form it, the Greenbelt protects other important features of the Greater Golden Horseshoe's landscape, including prime agricultural land, wetlands, forests and urban river valleys.

For 10 years the Greenbelt has successfully preserved drinking water sources for millions of residents, safeguarded productive farmland from urban encroachment, sustained carbon-sinking forests, and prevented the disruption many vast environmental systems. The 10-year-review of the Greenbelt has shown economic, environmental and popular success, and an opportunity now presents itself to grow the Greenbelt to permanently protect even more of Ontario's natural systems.

1.2 GROWING THE GREENBELT

The originally proposed Greenbelt expansion areas were identified through extensive consultation with community organizations, professional ecologists/hydrologists, Conservation Authorities and elected officials, leading up to the release of the Greenbelt Plan 10-year-review. For a map of existing and proposed Greenbelt expansion areas, please refer to Appendix A2.

On May 10th, 2016 the provincial government announced their proposed changes to the four plans. The Province has received praise for setting stronger intensification targets as part of their proposed amendments to the Growth Plan, which is congruent with the objectives of the Greenbelt Plan. In terms of the Greenbelt Plan itself, proposed expansion areas include 21 major river valleys and seven associated costal wetlands under Urban River Valley designation, and four parcels of land in Hamilton and Niagara Region under Protected Countryside designation. For a map of the Province's proposed Greenbelt expansion areas, please refer to Appendix A3.

Although the existing Greenbelt boundaries will hold and indeed be incrementally expanded, community groups and organizations have expressed disappointment in the fact that many at-risk rural areas, natural heritage features and water resources have been overlooked for Greenbelt expansion. The proposed changes announced on May 10th are, however, not finalized. The Province is seeking feedback on their proposed changes, and is considering possible expansion of the Greenbelt outside the GTA and Hamilton area where important water resources are facing pressure from urban growth. Please refer to Section 4 of this report regarding directions and a prepared response for commenting on the Province's proposed changes.

2. AN INSPIRED CONVERSATION - TRANSCRIBED

2.1 THE EVENT

In July 2015, Wellington Water Watchers (WWW) formed a volunteer Greenbelt Committee with the aim of educating stakeholder/rights holder groups, including community leaders, about the benefits of expanding the Greenbelt into Wellington County. Over several months the committee reached out to community groups, educators, academics, politicians, developers, farmers, planners and NGOs, providing them with information about Greenbelt expansion in the context of Wellington County. On February 18th, 2016 the committee successfully hosted the event *An Inspired Conversation* in Puslinch, ON with 80 people attending. The event brought together a diverse group of attendees (some in support of Greenbelt expansion, some against and many undecided) to engage with a knowledgeable panel of speakers from a variety of sectors and with each other. Panel speakers included David Crombie of the Crombie Commission, University of Guelph lecturer and former City of Guelph politician Lise Burcher, Jeremy Grant of Seaton Ridge Communities Ltd., local farmer Gerry Stephenson and John Fitzgibbon of the University of Guelph School of Rural Planning and Development.

The event promoted discussion between individuals and organizations from diverse backgrounds regarding the value of the Greenbelt. After some words of welcome, each panellist was given an opportunity to introduce themselves and their own stance on the Greenbelt. Following that, the panellists were each asked to respond to one question at a time of a total of three prepared questions. After the prepared questions, the panel received questions from the attendees. Following a brief intermission, attendees partook in roundtable discussions, formulating their own answers for the three prepared questions and eventually presenting their keys ideas and concerns to the rest of the room.

The event served as an informative platform for many of the attendees, but the event also served as an opportunity for individuals and groups to express issues, concerns and questions. Such concerns were expressed during the attendee questions period, the roundtable discussions, or through the ideas parking lot.

2.2 THE MODERATOR AND PANEL



ARLENE SLOCOMBE

Moderator

Executive Director, Wellington Water Watchers

Arlene has been actively committed to the work of Wellington Water Watchers since its founding in 2007, and has been employed as the Executive Director since 2009. In her time with Wellington Water Watchers Arlene has played a critical role in organizing many community events to educate, advocate and celebrate the precious water resources Wellington County has to offer. Arlene has been involved in organizing many community events over the past 9 years. She has worked to ensure that Wellington Water Watchers has been an organizing partner in the annual H2O Go Festival, the annual H2Awesome and the annual 2Rivers Festival. Working towards an expanded Greenbelt to protect source water in Guelph/Wellington is a legacy Arlene would be proud to be a part of.

THE HONOURABLE DAVID CROMBIE, P.C., O.C., O.Ont.

Panelist, Plenary Speaker

Former Toronto Mayor, MP and Federal Cabinet Minister



David Crombie has served as mayor of Toronto, Member of Parliament and federal cabinet minister. He is the former president and CEO of the Canadian Urban Institute, former chair of Ontario Place Corporation and founding chair of the Waterfront Regeneration Trust. He has received honorary degrees from the University of Toronto, University of Waterloo and Seneca College. David Crombie is president of David Crombie and Associates Inc. and currently serves as chair of the Advisory Council for the Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO), a director of Mount Pleasant Cemeteries Group and chair of the Toronto Lands Corporation. He is chancellor emeritus of Ryerson University and an honorary fellow of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada. He has been appointed to the Order of Ontario and as an officer to the Order of Canada.



LISE BURCHER

Panelist

Associate Professor, School of Environmental Design and Rural Development, University of Guelph. Director, Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Federal Green Municipal Fund

Championing innovation and striving for what is possible in her leadership roles as an elected official and educator, Lise has made a difference in the condition of Guelph, and communities throughout the country and internationally with her role as a Director of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Federal Green Municipal Fund. Through both her elected council position and her role as a faculty member in the School of Environmental Design and Rural Development at the University of Guelph over the past decade, Lise has mobilized the community, improved public consultation and engagement processes, and enhanced the quality of life in Guelph. Lise draws on her academic and applied practice background in community design and research explorations in human behavior in designed environments to support integrated approaches to the planning and design of physical, social and cultural environments. She directs her energies to creating interdisciplinary teaching and learning opportunities for students and citizens within a community outreach framework. Integrating natural systems and social and cultural needs, Lise advocates for holistic and sustainable planning and design strategies.

JEREMY GRANT

Panelist

Vice President, Planning and Development of Seaton Group



Jeremy Grant is Vice President, Planning and Development of Seaton Group, a Toronto and Guelph-based land development company. Jeremy earned an Honours Bachelor's Degree in Environmental Studies (BES) from the University of Waterloo School of Urban and Regional Planning in 1983. Jeremy is a Registered Professional Planner and member of the Canadian Institute of Planners and Ontario Professional Planners Institute. Jeremy has been a land development planner for over thirty years and is involved in projects from inception to completion. Jeremy was the lead person in the Alton Mill Arts Centre rehabilitation project and continues to manage the day-to-day business of the Mill with his brother. He is responsible for all aspects of the planning and approvals for the project, coordinating the project team, dealing with Tenant/Project partners on a day-to-day basis, and dealing with contractors. Other projects Jeremy has been involved in include Quaker Village in Uxbridge, Boyd West in Woodbridge, Balfour Woods in Muskoka, Rockwood Ridge in Rockwood and

Downey Trail in Guelph. Jeremy lives in Guelph, Ontario with his wife Sheila and two children Elly and Isaac. Jeremy's interests include music, hockey, politics, camping, canoeing, golf, travel and the occasional R & R. He has served on the Board of Directors of the Hills of Headwaters Tourism Association, Board of Directors of Big Brothers of York, the Guelph Roundtable on the Environment and Economy, as well as various arts committees in the Headwaters region. Jeremy presently is the chair of the Alton Millpond Rehabilitation Project committee and co-chair of the Alton Millpond Hockey Classic.



GERRY STEPHENSON

Panelist

Organic Farmer, Drumlin Farm

Gerry Stephenson is a retired teacher with 34 years experience. He operates Drumlin Farm, located in Puslinch with his spouse; it is an organic enterprise specializing in heritage fruits and vegetables and focusing on sustainable and

ecological farming practices. Gerry is a board member of Yorklands Green Hub and is chair of the Urban Agriculture committee.

JOHN FITZGIBBON, PHD

Panelist

Professor, School of Rural Planning and Development, University of Guelph

John FitzGibbon has been a faculty member of the School of Rural Planning and Development since 1982. John is the Graduate Coordinator of the Rural Planning and Development program.

He served as Director of the School from 1996 and then of the new School of Environmental Design and Rural Development from 1998 to 2006. He has taught a variety of courses in the program including: Watershed Planning Practice; Water Resources Management; Qualitative Methods; Qualitative Analysis; Rural Research Methods; Biophysical Resource Analysis; Rural Land Use Planning; Environmental Impact Assessment; Rural Planning and Development Theory. He has served as a chair of the Ontario Farm Environmental Coalition for 12 years, member of the National Advisory Committee on Environmental Policy for Agriculture (APF) AAFC, as a Board Member of the Walkerton Centre of Excellence for Clean Water, and as a member of the Provincial Advisory Committee for Source Water Protection.

Currently, he is working on a project funded by the Agricultural Environmental Stewardship Initiative with David Armitage from the Ontario Farmers Association. He is currently an advisor to Trout Unlimited Canada on the Angler Dairy Program.



His primary areas of academic interest include: source water protection, environmental management, community based natural resource management, environmental farm planning and nutrient management planning.

2.3 INTRODUCTIONS, WELCOME, PLENARY SPEAKER

2.3.1 INTRODUCTION FROM MODERATOR, ARLENE SLOCOMBE

Thank you for joining us today for this really important conversation. We are really pleased with the turnout today. I wanted to start the conversation today with a territorial acknowledgement, by acknowledging the original peoples of this land, on whose land we are making all these important decisions. I want to mention the Attawandaron Nation, the Anishinabek Nation, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, and also send good biddings to our neighbours, the Métis and the Inuit Peoples. Very many diverse peoples have called this land home. I know that the relationship with the land of the First Nations is and was that of caretakers and stewards. I feel a lot of gratitude to those people for the legacy they have left for us. In that I feel a weight of responsibility for all of us to leave our own legacies as we move forward. I feel honoured that you are all here to be part of this conversation and legacy. I'd like to pass it over to Matthew Bulmer to say a few words of welcome from Puslinch Township where we are currently hosting this important conversation.

2.3.2 WELCOME FROM COUNCILLOR, MATTHEW BULMER

Thank you very much Arlene. This is a great opportunity as an environmentalist and a farmer at the top of the Paris moraine in Puslinch Township, and a member of local municipal council. It's an honour to have a group like this here today in what couldn't be a more appropriate location. Puslinch has long history of environmental stewardship by farmers, residents, the municipality and the County. Puslinch is home to the Province's first Green Legacy, and the largest municipal tree nursery in Canada, inspiring the Province to pursue similar initiatives elsewhere. Puslinch was the first municipality to establish it's own groundwater monitoring network. Over 20 years ago we put in a system of monitoring wells because we care about what is happening to the water supply here. We see ourselves as a green emerald in the middle of the surrounding municipalities, with several drinking straws coming into our location. So we know we're not the only ones interested in protecting our groundwater.

It's great to have people here with such diverse backgrounds, because one of the things we've learned, based on our location geographically and politically in the County, is that we always get more done when we talk and listen to one another, and are willing to consider alternative perspectives. None of us have all the answers but together we can perhaps find a solution that will work for all of us. I notice from the mix at various tables that there are going to be some challenging discussions. Keep

your ears open. I'll close with something a former mayor here used to say – make sure you leave your baggage at the door; it'll be there when you go to leave. Thank you all for coming here and enjoy your day.

2.3.3 WORDS FROM PLENARY SPEAKER, DAVID CROMBIE

Thank you for the invitation to this event, and congratulations to the organizers. Putting on an event like this is difficult and takes a lot of energy and effort. When I was asked to speak at this event, the suggestion was to use the report I chaired as a framework for the discussion. I would like to spend some time giving you a sense of what the report is about, and how it connects with what you are going to talk about this morning. Included in your attendee packages is an executive summary. Executive summaries are notoriously not very informative, however it is this Report that I would like to talk about, *Planning for health prosperity and growth in the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2015-2041*.

The Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) first of all, is an immensely large region. It goes from as far south as Niagara County up to and including the Bruce Trail, and goes from Peterborough County over to Wellington. The GGH contains two-thirds of the population of the Province, produces 70% of its GNP. It is one of fastest growing regions in North America, with 100,000-125,000 people coming to the region every year. We can expect the population of the GGH to grow from 9.5 million to 13.5 million by 2041. This is no small event you are engaging yourselves in as you look at your part of it and your connection with the whole. Land use planning in this area is shaped by four major plans; the Niagara Escarpment Plan (1985), the Oak Ridges Moraine Plan (2002), the Greenbelt Plan (2005), and the Growth Plan (2006). All of these plans came into effect towards the end of last century and beginning of this one, and are each an immense achievement in planning. It also needs to be said that the Provincial government in particular, in the early part of the 21st century, has made advances in regional planning not seen in many years. These advances required a lot of foresight from politicians, bureaucrats and many people in civil society, pushing for these four plans.

Of the four major plans, three required review every 10 years. The Provincial government decided to take all four plans together and review them as one. Thereby establishing a panel tasked with aligning the four plans using similar language, making appropriate changes in how they operate, and reviewing their implementation. I was asked if I would chair that excellent panel, which included; Keith Currie, Vice President Ontario Federation of Agriculture, former MNR Director; John MacKenzie, Planner for the Province, Chief Planner for Vaughn, and Deputy City Manager; Leith Moore, of Fieldgate Developments; Debbie Zimmerman, CEO of Grape Growers of Ontario, former Chair of Niagara Regional Council; Rae Horst of the MOE, Chair of Credit Valley Conservation Authority. We met over the course of mid/late 2015 and reported to two ministries, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and the MNR. By the force of the work that needed to be done,

we engaged the interests of six other ministries. Out of the eight total ministries, there were on the order of 70 people forming part of a constant forum of discussion for the Report. We had 17 public meetings across the GGH, many stakeholder meetings, community groups, site visits, and thousands of written submissions. All of that served to underline the point that the interest in this matter is really high. The product of all that effort is this Report and its 87 recommendations.

Let me talk about the themes of the report. Sometimes the language is dry and plodding, because we were trying to take advocacy of all four plans and bring it down a notch to practical language, so we can get it into practitioners' handbooks. The way you change the world begins with advocacy, but ends with implementation on an ongoing basis in the handbooks of the professionals going about their jobs. Let me take the 87 recommendations and condense them for you into 5 basic themes useful for your discussion.

First, and to some the most important, is growing the Greenbelt. A large portion of the report is devoted to growing the Greenbelt. It's an attempt at understanding the implications of what we've been doing for the past 25 years and trying to get into the implications of watershed planning. In a single generation watershed planning has become the basic building block for this kind of regional planning. 50 years ago, and even 30 years ago, watershed planning was viewed as something people did a long time before, but nobody was doing at the time. The Report spends some time talking about watershed planning in the GGH, in particular, following the water, making sure we understand the major implications with respect to source water river valleys, recharge and the like. Watershed planning becomes fundamental then for understanding how you etch out and grow the Greenbelt. In fact there's a new word/phrase people are using, and trying to combine with the Greenbelt by saying you have to develop at the same time the "Bluebelt".

The second theme is building complete communities. This is another core concept of the Report, which connects to how we will deal with sprawl, and community development throughout the region. This theme regards recommendations with respect to intensification, more compact, and walkable communities, many of them transit based. The notion that you can just organize community building any way you like is now gone. We need to try to be more sensible, useable, and compact. From a policy point of view, this means linking policy and programs to investment. Too often we find that investments from the Province are not as related to local planning as they ought to be. The Report is in some way a plea to link public investment with issues of policy and programs, and at the same time link transportation investment to land use planning.

The third theme is to strengthen local and regional economy, particularly in relation to agriculture and agri-food sector. Take a look at recommendations 28-39, which are an attempt to rescue slow erosion of the agricultural food business in this area. These recommendations are worthy of your attention even beyond this morning's

activities and discussions, in order to understand what needs to be done to bring back a more robust agri-food business.

The fourth theme is that we need to engage in climate change. I can't think of another concept/idea/advocacy/issue from my lifetime that has so grabbed hold of land use planning and municipal politics, and will increasingly do so as the century moves on. The solution will require a drastic shift in thinking by human kind. This issue will bear itself and be dealt with at very local level, in handbooks of practitioners.

The fifth and final theme out of the Report is how do we hold our government accountable? Wherever we went, almost everybody has said we need a responsive, open, transparent and accountable government. Our recommendations 85-87 are how we think the government, internally and externally, can move forward.

Let me conclude by saying we very often think that our participation in these things will not come of much account. I think this is an historic turn of the wheel for the Province and certainly the GGH. It is worthwhile remembering that the Province is already saying that they want to do something. The government will respond to our recommendations, and will be looking for public comments between the end of March and beginning of June. So it's now an opportunity to take one more really good shot at what we think ought to happen regarding the matters in the Report. If you don't have vigilant citizens speaking up to their government, the government will only respond when being pushed. This is not because we're bad people; it's just human nature. Speak up. Speak strongly. And feel that you will be heard. There are people and groups like this already organizing in other parts of the GGH. I'm really looking forward to what you have to say today. We spent a lot of time on this report, but it's not the Mosaic Law. There are some things that we probably did wrong and some things we didn't think about. It's up to you to explain that to us so that we can explain to the government at the same time what it is we need to do to move forward. So thanks very much, it's great to have you here.

2.3.4 PANELIST INTRODUCTIONS AND STANCES

LISE BURCHER

I'm thrilled to be here on many fronts. I'm a long time Guelph community member, and have been an engaged elected leader in many capacities. One of my great pleasures today is to be here with my friends, colleagues and counterparts in Wellington County. And I can say this now because I'm not elected, that I think we don't have enough relationship or ongoing connection with the County.

As a leader and an educator, I did my homework. I went with Arlene to the County and had wonderfully engaging and free ranging discussion with the Planning Committee. I went on to meet with other leaders in the planning area and with my friend/colleague, Matthew Bulmer in Puslinch. I'm absolutely committed to this

ground-up initiative and we need to look at municipal government as very autonomous order of government, not creatures of the Province. It is critically important that we don't put ourselves in a situation where we are one election away from having these things taken away from us. In some ways we are always one election away from having the things we've contributed to in a very robust way, undermined. I agree with David, that with autonomy comes the responsibility to do things in very rigorous ways. When I see the work going on in our communities, in Guelph the downshifting of what would have used to be considered significant development applications, I know that we need to take more responsibility. I'd also like to say that we're looking to other examples, like how wonderful it was what Vancouver did with similar policies. But their community decisions are final and they have no OMB. We really need to deal with that – if we're really going to take this on we need to use all our tools and resources to implement this effectively. Thank you all for being here.

JEREMY GRANT

When Mike Nagy invited me to attend at first I was a little hesitant, because to be honest I had not been following the Greenbelt discussion. I said to Mike that I've been focused virtually 100% on running my business, primarily Alton Mill Art Centre. Mike said that's ok we don't need you to be an expert about the Greenbelt. We want someone who can talk about development and how that interacts with the bigger picture.

David has already touched on some of the basic facts that I'm going to summarize briefly. Canada has a growing population, with about 250,000 immigrants per year. This translates to about 100,000 immigrants to Southern Ontario, primarily in the GTA. This means there's a need for approximately 35,000 new housing units every year. Whatever percentage of those 35,000 new houses allocated to Wellington County and Guelph, somehow has to be accommodated. It goes without saying that development in a broader sense is a necessary and important driver of the economy. It fulfills basic human needs such as housing and jobs, so we can all agree that development itself is part of our world. It's also safe to say that in the development industry, which I've been part of for more than half my life, we also agree that clean air, a healthy, biodiverse ecosystem, and clean water are critical to the planet. So it is not a question of should we grow, rather how should we grow.

I think if we're going to go into a discuss about Greenbelt expansion we should do so with our collective eyes wide open, because I think – and this may sound like a development industry knee jerk reaction – there may be a potential for increased cost. I'm not a land economist so I can't say yes or no with 100% certainty, but usually the principles of supply and demand apply. If there's less supply of land the cost will potentially increase. All of these things combined with the existing process for planning and development being very thorough and comprehensive, have potential to affect housing costs and other costs of production.

GERRY STEPHENSON

When I started teaching in 1979, I thought I would change the world, then I realized when I retired that I could probably do that better by farming. Local food is sustainable, and organic operations can feed the world. The poisoning of our environment has to stop.

Local farms can and should be hubs in and of themselves, sustainable, quality and providing food for many. Local communities should, as the Honourable Mr. Crombie said, be compact, walkable, sensible, usable, and transit-based. But they also need to be local food based. Our issue is how are we going to encourage and make this happen?

JOHN FITZGIBBON

I'm going to take a bit of a rural point of view with respect to the Greenbelt, and the rural people that I interact with are broadly ambivalent. They're ambivalent because they see it as an urban-driven agenda. Indeed there are some very good functions that this Greenbelt, as it is and will be, does serve. These functions include such things as controlling or at least limiting sprawl, increasing density and efficiency of urban infrastructure, and providing opportunities for transit. At this point however, the initial argument from agriculture is that folks that who are in the Greenbelt are going to lose property value. This, however, didn't happen. In fact, one of the things that creates a serious barrier in rural areas today is the cost of land. Land had doubled in price from about \$10,000 per acre to well over \$20,000 per acre in last 5-6 years. As a result the economics of agriculture have changed significantly. Getting into it is really difficult. What we should be looking for however, doesn't relate to any of these smaller details, all as important as they are.

Our decisions should be linked to what we want to have in the long term. How do I see the future? I see rural Ontario being more diverse. The Greenbelt can contribute to that by providing different kinds of opportunities. We want rural Ontario to be more stable. I'm not sure the Greenbelt can do that because many of the things that affect us today are not from within this Province, and not even from within this country, but are driven by much larger trends and issues. It should be resilient and yes the Greenbelt can contribute to that by providing us with opportunities to deal with rapid change and to try and provide for us the opportunity to deal with some of the issues that climate change will bring. These changes include such things as changes in the hydrologic cycle, and changes to the risk of damage from severe weather.

Finally, I think it can contribute to, but is not the whole picture of sustainability. You have to stand back from the Greenbelt and look at broad categories of things we've done. David pointed out that this is part of much bigger picture. This government and the previous government have changed their agenda from probably 30 years of governments before, and have gotten into regional planning again. I was around for

the first regions, Waterloo, Niagara, etc., and it was a change that was resisted, but it seems to work relatively well.

The idea of the Greenbelt was not new. It was originally generated as one of three scenarios for the development of Southern Ontario, in a report done in the early 90's. We had opportunities there to centralize growth or decentralize it, and the choice was to decentralize. We've been very successful in increasing the residential development of cities, but have failed in terms of creating commensurate job density in those communities. The result has been increased folks on the road. This means greater demand for more 400-level highways. I don't think this is the way to move forward. However, we don't have many tools to mold the economy. The economy is driven by who invests where, and we don't restrict that. We also don't restrict people's choice of where to live, so in the rural settlements of Ontario, in the area around the GTA, growth will be less sprawling. I hope we don't get more megahouse subdivisions because in the long run they aren't sustainable. Hopefully in long term will solve our water problem, because right now we are at the limit of what we can take out of the landscape without pipelines.

2.4 MODERATED PANEL DISCUSSION

2.4.1 QUESTION 1

The expansion of the Greenbelt doesn't have to be a yes or no proposition. What changes to the current expansion proposal would you make? What would YOUR expanded Greenbelt look like?

DAVID CROMBIE

Municipalities, conservation authorities and local bodies need to be part of the process, but without provincial leadership, I don't think the Greenbelt will grow. I thought the comments made down the table were terrific. There's no doubt that one of the things that has changed is the relationship with agriculture with respect to the Greenbelt. I can recall when that was talked about as a battle years ago between the Martins and the Coys, because there was very little understanding. The truth of the matter is that the very first meeting I was requested to appear at when I became chair of the panel was an assembly of environmentalists and agriculturalists. They were reporting that they had their differences, but they were ready to sing the same songs on a number of important issues.

Land development is a harbinger of change. Developers' needs and business models must be paid attention to. If there are going to be changes, we need to recognize that we're changing the business model for land development at the same time. Lastly, I'll say all this has to do with how you combine the needs of ecology, economy and community at same time. Anybody can set up policies in any of those three, but it takes real talent, energy, patience and creativity to bring them all together.

LISE BURCHER

I want to talk not about what I would specifically change about the boundaries of the Greenbelt, but about the process. During my examination of what's already happening in the County and the City of Guelph, the County already has significant policy that protect the Paris-Galt moraine. A study was released in January, which took a look at moraines and there are already protections in place. While this is coming from the Province it's also coming from the ground up, looking at what's out there and really understanding with our local context will require us to look at what protections are already here. What's the purpose of this new layer of protection, and how do the policies fit together?

There have been a number of progressive initiatives in last decade with respect to land use planning. This might provide an opportunity to revisit the Growth Plan. One of the challenges is that it's not easy to look at a contiguous municipality like Guelph, working with adjoining townships, and deciding not to expand beyond the boundaries until 2031, keeping all growth internal. Which has been great, but very challenging. Maybe an easier scenario to look at is Morriston, just South of here. When the Growth Plan came in, all expansion was stopped, which may or may not be a good thing, but if you're looking at very small hamlets or villages, it may make more sense to take opportunities to round out into a complete community.

As someone who's had to deal with policies coming from the top down, through a legislation and community level, we need to ground truth that stuff. What does it mean when it hits the ground? What does it mean for the processes at the local level that will enforce or deal with related issues. The Growth Plan is a fantastic initiative, but we were always promised funding to implement it, and we didn't receive any. Implementation is very costly. For example, the 750 units build out by the river has taken 4 years of highly engaged citizen involvement, planning, and hundreds-of-thousands of dollars. That's what it takes, and how you do that is important.

JEREMY GRANT

This doesn't have to be a yes/no proposition, as it is a tremendously complex subject. David, your report is tremendously complex and well done. At first glance of the Greenbelt proposed expansion areas map, for the region we're in now, I must admit the swath of blue seemed very daunting. I'd like to find out how did that blue come into existence? Who drew the boundaries?

The possibility of expansion should be carefully looked at. The science that exists, and that many people in this room have spent their entire careers on, is critical. I'm not in that category. Much of this conversation has to be left to people who know the intricacies of groundwater, biology and ecosystem planning. When I was thinking earlier about this question I thought of my past when I spent 15-20 years developing a significant project in Rockwood. A Discussion about how the expanded Greenbelt accommodates population in the region should include places like Rockwood, Erin and Fergus. We should not throw out possible innovative solutions

to servicing these small urban centres. The current regime is that one must hook up to pipe that exists nearby. That regime has limited the possible solutions to growth and development and has also limited housing choices. I know that some people think we should not go back to having discussions about communal rural service sites, because in the past people have frowned upon the idea.

GERRY STEPHENSON

For me the key word is protection. Protect the watershed. Farmers are doing this and more farmers must do this. We need to do something to control the skeletons in the closet so we don't end up with a situation similar to the one in Flint, Michigan. We all know that there are brown spots all over the place that are not being dealt with, and we are not acknowledging as many as there are do exist. We need protection from government intervention and the freedom to develop rural experiments, succeed or fail. We need protection of local food. Local farms. Local arable lands. How do we protect these while also acknowledging that people want to move here and want freedom of choice? We need protection of communities as local, concentrated hubs. What does that look like? How is that designed? Are we prepared now to move ahead with designing communities where everything from food to water to housing to waste is looked after? We need protection of marginal lands. I call them marginal lands because this is land that won't support agriculture, or people don't want to live there. However, any geologist will tell you, many people do now know that this land serves a purpose for protecting groundwater.

There are questions we are not sure how to deal with right now. The Greenbelt as it exists now, and in the proposal, does not really limit aggregate extraction. How do we deal with that? Aggregate regulations supersede any Greenbelt legislation, so we can have all the Greenbelt we want, meanwhile permission is given to pull out gravel. How is that protecting and sustaining community? Most people here will own a car, and for many it is necessary. Drivers want nice roads. How do we do that? Can we control where people live? This is usually controlled by where they work, by what they can afford, by what kind of environment they want. To form hubs where everything is sustainable/together – that does, to me, imply we are attempting to control where people live. How do we get through that in our minds? Finally, how do we control agricultural activities so that they are indeed sustainable, how do we enforce accepted practices? All of these questions do not have simple answers in my opinion.

JOHN FITZGIBBON

When I look at the Greenbelt, I think it's an opportunity for protection of the environment more generally. The big challenge is it's a planning instrument. It just says this plan is used for this, but it doesn't say how it can be used for this. The activity itself is at least as important as designation.

That gets us to implementation. This is where we always fall down, because every time you intervene, somebody is going to be affected and there will be changes to what people do. If the Greenbelt is going to be successful, it will rely on a whole suite of additional legislation and regulation. On the topic of watersheds, the government recently passed the Great Lakes Protection Act. This provides a significant opportunity for protecting water resources. The Greenbelt is reserved for more natural areas and is also going to harbor invasive species. So we now have an Invasive Species Act. The government has been very active in its legislative approach, however in the end we can't police this. We don't have the capacity, nor do we really want to live in a place where activities are constantly under regulation and someone is watching us. So it takes people deciding that this is the right thing to do. That we don't care if there's legislation or not, we're going to do it because it's the right thing to do. What does that mean for the Greenbelt? Farmers farm the best land in the best way. This is a very positive approach to agriculture. Farmers are constantly being pressed in agriculture to produce more because the margins are so narrow. And volume is the only way to make a living. That has huge implications in terms of development in rural areas. Many of the small towns in the area around Toronto have prospered with residential development. That's a choice made by people who want to be in a more amenity-based community, rather than living in a cliff for many years, as I did in 13th floor of a building that wasn't superstitious. We can look at these kinds of alternatives, which will be difficult because it means changes in the choices we make. People may not want to live on the 13th floor, but that may be an opportunity.

The biggest problem for the Greenbelt is a lack of a thorough and sensible transportation plan for Southern Ontario. Right now we have a vision of more 4-lane highways – It's kind of a field of dreams thing – If you build it, they will come. The Greenbelt has to have more strength in dealing with broader provincial issues. Things like a transport plan, and an industrial development plan, so that we can have healthy, fully engaged and functional communities in our Province, not only in urban areas (which will have to do some things too) but also in the rural areas.

2.4.2 QUESTION 2

We know we are going to have to plan for climate change going forward. How can we plan to increase the resiliency of our communities and reduce our carbon emissions? What role do natural systems and watersheds play in adapting or mitigating climate change?

DAVID CROMBIE

Our report deals extensively with climate change. The Province has a ministry responsible for climate change, and they are responsible for moving advocacy down to practical implementation for professionals and practitioners. That's the most important thing to be able to do. Already there are schools and colleges where that

is starting to work, but there needs to be some provincial leadership and support with respect to municipalities going about dealing with climate change.

The financial basis upon which many municipalities have to work does not allow them to easily deal with climate change requirements. Outside of what needs to be done in practical terms is how we find the way in which it is funded.

LISE BURCHER

Following up on David's comment, I'll say it's a huge challenge for communities. In terms of whether it's downloading of costs, or the number of things that are increasing costs to municipalities to deal with on an everyday basis. They're certainly looking at investing more, and looking at hitting climate change targets in meaningful ways. It has a lot to do with the autonomy of the order of government. Municipalities are going cap in hand to the Province and the Feds, looking for funding. This is not sustainable consistent or dependable. You're rolling the dice every year to see what you get.

One aspect that is enhancing communities is encouragement and insistence from those communities to deal with this with very clear asset management strategies. Money is just not thrown around without meeting certain targets. With all of that together it has to be that communities are given access to resources. I think it's moving in that direction, where communities are taking responsibility. There must be recognition that to get anywhere with that there must be reallocation of resources. For every tax dollar 8 cents goes to communities. And that's not nearly enough.

JEREMY GRANT

In my career, I've spent the majority of my efforts in the implementation realm. John, earlier today, you mentioned that implementation is where we fall down. So I think that's where I focus my efforts, to try to do the best possible work within my control. How can we promote increased resiliency to climate change? We've had a tremendous surge in some elements, which are well documented in David's report. Energy efficiency in buildings, community energy plans, here in Guelph we're one of the leaders in that area. We're coming along in other elements like traffic planning, the idea as simple as a roundabout is an idea that promotes not only better movement of traffic, but also reduces emissions as far as I know.

We need to continue our efforts with water conservation on all levels. The notion of density along corridors is very well put forth in the City of Guelph official plan, as well as throughout much of Ontario. Toronto had dozens of avenues designated as corridors for more midrise type development. Those are indirect, but direct ways of helping to deal with climate change. Greenfield and brownfield, although very different types of development opportunities, should look at and really push the concept of mixed housing types. Not just within the overall block, but also within

individual streets. In a way this reminds me of what we attempted to do in Rockwood, without much success, because at the time, the market didn't seem to embrace the idea of house type mixing within a given street, notwithstanding that the zoning bylaw does permit it. When I read in the Report about the concept of implementation as alternative development standards, my eyes lit. David, it was like watching the movie *Back to the Future*, because in 1997 the Province did a tremendous amount of work to promote and highlight different projects throughout Ontario called *Breaking Ground*. That was in 1997 and makes me ask why did we stop talking about alternative development standards? That's just one aspect of implementation that can contribute to the notion of resiliency and helping deal with climate change.

GERRY STEPHENSON

When you have a problem with business or family you sit down and talk about it. The first thing we haven't done and perhaps need to do, is sit down and look in the mirror and ask what is causing climate change and realize the person in the mirror is causing climate change. It's us, it's our numbers, practices and lifestyles. How do we deal with that? The Greenbelt is part of that.

A disadvantage I have as a new farmer is that I grew up in Toronto. I didn't have the background of growing up and learning all those practices. The advantage I have is that I have to go to books, farms, conferences, and talk to people to learn things. This puts me on a more leading edge of technology. I don't pretend to know it all in regard to new farming practices. I have made an effort to visit farms of the same style as mine, diverse organic farms. When I went to visit Joel Salatin's farm Polyface – he was part of the *Food Inc.* documentary, which started a lot of it for me – I had a chance to talk to him about what he does with his 400 acres of which he only farms about 80 acres. We talked about how what he does becomes a local food hub, how he can support the local community through the food that's offered. I could go to a town near where he lived and buy his products in the store, or buy them on his farm.

I visited Eliot Coleman's farm in Maine. He's at the leading edge of mentors for organic farmers, farming year round in North America. He had only 10 acres of land; it was in scrub in Maine and started from nothing in '77. He farms year round in 14 unheated grain houses. How does that all connect to Greenbelt? It makes it sustainable. One of the biggest issues we have is transport costs, and what it's doing to the climate. On my farm now I don't have a lot of big machines, but I do have a diesel tractor. I don't have any other way, but would love to have alternatives. And there just aren't any now that would allow me to sell my product at a competitive price.

A sustainable hub would need to focus on planting. Everyone needs to plant. Food has to be local, with transport, energy and water sourced and cared for locally. One of the biggest things contributing to carbon emissions and climate change is waste, the fact that we are of a society that sends waste away. Where is away? Away should

be right here. It shouldn't be transported to Toronto. Or into Guelph, which is not necessarily far but Guelph takes some of Waterloo's waste too and some is sent to the States and that simply is not sustainable. It has to happen at the farm and in house.

JOHN FITZGIBBON

In addressing climate change, you have to think about what we're in for. I do believe now it's pretty much inevitable. The recent reports suggest temperature increases of 3-5 degrees. That would probably mean no snow cover in Southern Ontario. Which means there are a lot of things we won't do like shoveling snow, but things we're going to have to do, such as dealing with issues of heat in the Summer, and dealing with issues of changes in things that happen in the natural environment. For example, there will be an opportunity for things like malaria to return to Ontario. In the time of settlement, malaria was rampant on the Lake Erie shore. Some people may think it was a good thing we got rid of the wetlands there, but I'm not too sure.

In terms of water however, we're probably going to get 10% more moisture. That's the kind of thing initially we didn't think would happen. And that's good in a way, but bad in others. It's how we're going to get that additional precipitation that matters. It's going to be through more severe storms. Storms that cause significant damage to the environment. They're going to increase in frequency and severity. Things like ice storms at the edge of the freeze thaw area. We're going to have higher costs of maintenance of roads, because freeze thaw is the enemy of roads.

In terms of adaptation, everyone's going to have to make changes. In rural areas farmers are not going to be able to leave bare ground. Cover crops will become the norm, for a whole bunch of good reasons, but to protect soil through what will be a much more active winter in terms of precipitation and runoff. Groundwater may be slightly affected because our rainstorms are more intense, so there will be more surface runoff and less recharge. This means we're going to have to manage the parts of our landscape that capture water naturally, like moraines. We're going to have to deal with issues in redesigning urban infrastructure. Much progress has been made with LID standards and standards that are being developed as say by the Credit or Metro Toronto Conservation Authorities. But those kinds of things will be standard and that's going to cost a lot of money.

An issue we face today in terms of mitigation is we need a big scale provincial transit plan. No more 400 highways. I gave advice to the MMAH about 25 years ago. He asked what do we do about it? I said don't fix the roads! It's a little radical. And I've kind of moderated my views somewhat. They could put in dedicated bus lane, put in a 25-minute service to distribution points. Until we solve the local job problem, commuting is going to be with us. If we want to reduce our carbon footprint, getting 60 people on a bus will take 60 cars off the road. That's going to be what we need to do. And today rather than not fixing the roads, we'll need dedicated bus lanes. Take the billion dollars you were going to spend on the subway out to

York University, and put it into busses. And then gridlock will be greatly reduced. Then we will have time to work on local employment. The kinds of things that climate change effects on 400 highways are really significant. They produce huge amount of contaminated runoff, which is not good for the environment in many ways. I'm not saying I'm against them. I use them. But we can do better, and I would use the bus. I hate driving.

2.4.3 QUESTION 3

The population of the Grand River watershed (6,800 km²) is expected to increase by 30 percent within the next 20 years. This means 300,000 more people. How can we best expand the Greenbelt while accommodating this increase, and the accompanying need for more infrastructure, food, and resources? (Numbers from the GRCA 2009 Integrated Water Budget Report)

DAVID CROMBIE

In terms of accommodating the future increases in people, the most important recommendation we made was recommendation number 1. That is about the development of complete communities. It's a long list of things that need to be done with respect to development of communities, and they require public sector involvement, levels of government, etc. I would simply suggest to you to read recommendation 1 and the subsequent recommendations connected to it. That would be shortest answer that I could give. I'm not an expert in the Grand Valley so I'll leave that with the others.

LISE BURCHER

I think one of most important things is looking at the Growth Plan in Southern Ontario and how that's been received, and how communities have responded to that, it's very encouraging. What's been happening is communities have seen tremendously high quality infill developments. For example, in Guelph our growth plan included increasing the population by 40%, and doing that within the already existing boundaries. So much of that is taking place already in the downtown.

Others are planned on nodes, corridors, arterial streets, etc. This is a fairly common approach. In terms of getting there, I think that one of most important things we undertook was to engage the community in significant ways over a long period to get that buy-in. We held meetings regarding just the basic Growth Plan to see where things might go, and what it might look like. This involved over 100 face-to-face gatherings of people getting together to talk about what might happen in the area, followed by number of very intense community approval plans. Getting there is very possible. It's about shifting our views about what we want, and what's essential. There's a lot of fear in that. We're hitting our numbers faster than we thought, but are fairly happy with the results. It's about our collective view and all of us shifting

attitudes about do we need what it is that we have, and are we willing to accept intensification? We have lots of ideas, and lots of examples throughout country that we can draw on, lots of people that know how to do these things. It's about shifting attitudes, which takes time and is unfortunately, looking at situation we have now, with my involvement for past years with Federation of Canadian municipalities, many of the leaders that participate say that people are fearful. These episodes are happening in communities on a regular basis across the country, time is short and people are fearful. I think bringing it all together, and people understanding the whole scenario, giving them certainty is critically important for what's going to happen and what's going to take place. I think it's about shifting attitudes.

JEREMY GRANT

One of the recommendations that were put forward in your report, David was the idea of educating the population. I think that is one of the things that everyone who cares about their community should become involved in. I've had many examples, many hours of work trying to educate clients, customers, and communities I've worked in, trying to do infill development, about some of the issues we have to balance as developers. On the whole I would say that the development and building industries want to do good work. That encompasses all professionals that are part of the industry, including architects and engineers. And we all want to do good work to some degree.

One of the elements of our industry trying to do good work is to mitigate or reduce risk. One of the risk factors is how do you do small or large-scale infill development, and how do you deal with risk that there will undoubtedly be opposition? This sort of thing promotes the growth of grey hair and stress on the proponents. I think education is key. One thing I'd like to encourage the Province and city of Guelph to try to come up with is some innovative ways of educating (online, social media). There's a whole world out there of people using online networks to learn about what's happening. That's part of this conversation.

Another tool to reestablish in this area and beyond is the idea of round tables. Before I moved to Guelph I was doing my project in Rockwood and was invited to sit in on a round table. I sat in for a number of years and it allowed me to meet people and share ideas about development in terms of social and environmental issues. Round tables are a great way to exchange ideas and if we were to add to that agricultural discussion it's beyond just development, social, environmental but agriculture. I think there's a tremendous amount of potential for people to learn from each other.

GERRY STEPHENSON

For the first question I focused on protection, the second one I focused on hubs. For the third one I will refocus on both of those, with protection through the use of hubs. To be sustainable, to fight climate change, everything has to be local. We have to

protect the land as much as possible. Are we doing as much as we can? When my wife and I moved onto Drumlin Farm, one of first people I contacted was Larry Halyk at the GRCA, and asked what do I need to do to protect the water on this farm? We're in the headwaters of Mill Creek. There's a dredged canal and pond (done before we got there), then its natural until it flows onto the land of my neighbour Matthew Bulmer, and we're both working very hard to protect the water. He told me, cool that water. Plant as many local native trees as you can. And it's working. The large mouth bass that were there are gone and the trout have returned.

We need to grow up. Density will take a mindset change for many people. Canadians from my biased point of view want a big space. We're used to having big spaces. Frankly I like not being able to see my neighbor, but I'm spoiled I understand that. I think we need to also limit water extraction by large companies that think we can send bottled water (I'm next door to a hot bed for that topic) has to stop. For emergencies, like for when ease of access to potable water just isn't possible, of course, but as far as buying it on special at local grocery store for 15 cents a bottle and we throw the bottles away. How can we look at ourselves and say we care about environment if we do that? One of the greatest resources that are getting more and more tapped into are our Aboriginal Canadian friends. They have set wonderful examples for how to look after the environment. They know what they're doing. We need to tap into those resources and bring them onto table with us. Communities have to be centralized. Human communities need to stay local. How do we do that? It will take a lot of planning. We have some wonderful planners at the table right here. But it's going to take a long time to fix. We need to interconnect with other communities with efficient transportation. Technology exists to control our waste, so lets use it. When a city like Montreal is permitted to offload raw sewage when there is a rainstorm, sustainability is a long way off, and severe climate change is closer.

JOHN FITZGIBBON

The Grand River watershed is kind of a mixed bag. You could look at it in terms of three areas, the upper, mid and lower watershed. They are all quite different. The upper watershed is agricultural, with fairly heavy soils. The mid watershed is very diverse, with moraines and a lot of urban development. In the lower watershed, we're back into a mixed bag of cultural environments, and where it's probably about 2.5 degrees Celsius warmer on average. There are a variety of crops that don't do so well here. In dealing with 300,000 more people to the watershed, presuming we don't limit peoples' ability to move, they're free to move. The first thing that needs to be done, and it's something cities need to do, is cut water use. I got in a terrible fight with a number of my farmer friends dealing with source protection. Why should we protect water when they just waste it? Yeah, well it's a problem.

What will the Greenbelt contribute to that? It's areas are most of areas we get recharge of groundwater. Groundwater we take a bit of it, but the bulk of it moves through aquifers and discharges to lower parts of the Grand and into Lake Eerie in

huge system. Much of the recharge is generated in the upper and middle regions of the watershed, and almost nothing in lower part. We have to look at where we are protecting that water.

The Greenbelt needs to deal with issues of drainage. Drainage is a critical factor. Gerry, you mentioned that there was a drain that had been dug near your farm. Two weeks ago I had a meeting with Environmental Justice and Federation of Agriculture looking at issues of drainage. Lots of people are thinking about it, both within Greenbelt and more generally. We all have to do better. No one's arguing that.

This is not independent from climate change. We have population growth and climate change together, so we have a very difficult problem. And the challenge then will be everybody has to do some things differently. At this stage, because we're not too sure, these are wicked problems. Every solution creates another problem. That's one of the fundamental characteristics of wicked problem. So what we have to do is be very different in the way we approach our problems. That is we have to be learning constantly and we have to be very nimble in making decisions. Not the way we do now where it takes however many months to years to do things. We have to be quicker, because everything is going to speed up. So in the Greenbelt we have to figure out that you've got a designation, now how does it get managed down to every individual who lives and works the land within it?

2.5 ATTENDEE QUESTIONS TO PANEL

2.5.1 QUESTION 1

What are the social, economic and environmental costs of status quo and not restricting urban sprawl and expansion?

JEREMY GRANT

The cost of not restricting urban sprawl, I think we all agree it's a huge cost. It's a cost we can't nor should continue to bear. It's a cost to everybody. One example of a cost is that the idea of having unrestricted sprawl, which doesn't support transit or walkable communities. Where do you begin? There is a health cost for driving everywhere and never walking. Parks aren't designed for experience other than maybe walking a dog. The idea of only walking in a park as a segregated activity as opposed to part of daily life is a cost, and that's a model of suburban development that I think we need to get away from.

LISE BURCHER

What I would say is that for decades the financial costs have been quite clearly documented. If you look at some of more severe examples – like in USA depopulation of cities that point to the challenge of maintaining things without

sufficient resources. There's a practical financial cost approach, looking at road length as the municipal cost of servicing for roads, utilities, services, garbage collection, transit, etc. Those numbers are very clear. What's not clear, and Jeremy started to point to that is the whole aspect of the social challenges that accrue. You'll see neighbourhoods, even in Guelph communities that are shifting in terms of their socioeconomic base/age grouping. Schools have been shut down 10-15 years after construction because entire populations have shifted. One run through the school system then neighbourhoods are emptied out. There are lots of challenges, financial and social. The whole problem with connectivity and isolation has many issues, but many of those are clearly documented.

One gap I see now and point to much more is intensification of communities and looking at complete communities in order to encourage people to move in that direction. We need to focus much more on civic amenity (what it's like to walk to the bus stop and stand there for 20 minutes with no cover, what its like to move through downtown to go to a local grocery store). The livability factor is the one we really need to address. It's not just about the nuts and bolts; it's about how people can enjoy a good quality of life in that environment.

DAVID CROMBIE

This may be a bit off the target, but it struck me that even the sense of the question is that if we don't change this happens and therefore we have a choice to change. That's partly true. That's why we engage in policy discussion. I think it's worth mentioning that things don't remain the same even if we make a decision or not. Things keep moving. We should recognize that there is already a change being made by human beings as they try and cope with the reality they find themselves in. There's generational change. I know people for whom the living space needed has changed. Trying to figure out how to live in this new economy. How do they live in an economy that's already here? It's not some future choice we're making. They're going to begin to move in directions just in order to survive in ways they understand life. Our job is not necessarily to decide if we can change or not, but to find out where new generations think they might be going and help them get there.

GERRY STEPHENSON

In agriculture we are importing so much of our food. What's the cost of that? What's the effect on the climate from that? I'll underline what's already been said – the cost of not intensifying.

JOHN FITZGIBBON

The costs in terms of the environment are very significant, because something we tend to ignore in our urban development is the fact that most of our pipes leak. 17-20% of Guelph's sewage leaks out of the pipes. It's really good recharge, with lots of water getting in there, but it's not good stuff.

Other costs of not intensifying, and how intensifying ties into that are to have shorter pipes, more connections, less cost. If we can do that then we can improve the economy of our housing, but we're going to have to see housing as being different. It'll be differently designed. I think there's a great example in Baltimore where they've integrated commercial, business and residential in single building. There's an example in Montreal. This kind of thing, from a planning point of view, it's kind of off topic from the Greenbelt, but it's what the cities have to do. They really have to be more nimble in dealing with development, accepting that differentiation of land use is a model we'll have to give up and integration of land uses is a model we'll have to adopt. So if we do that our cities are more efficient and there's less pressure to expand and I don't believe it has to detract from quality of life.

How many of you know of development along Gordon Street, the area there that is the Torrance Creek? If you look at that the form of development has already changed. The linear development of stormwater systems is all surface and it's paired with recreational space. The parks set-aside required became overlapped with the stormwater management. That's the kind of thinking that we need to look at, and it will reduce the cost of development and eventually reduce the other costs.

2.5.2 QUESTION 2

The following questions were asked in conjunction with one another:

How do we address planning for an aging population? Consider such issues as access to services, transportation, healthcare delivery, and aging in place.

What changes need to be made to the Municipal Act in order to help realize Greenbelt goals?

In order to draw a new Greenbelt boundary in Guelph-Wellington, what information/data needs to be brought into the discussion?

JOHN FITZGIBBON

I think when we look at the demographics we can see we're getting pretty top-heavy with folks who are over the 60-mark. I think we combine the aging process with the changing status of people in what quote unquote is called retirement. I don't believe people want to be put on the shelf, that sort of thing is not what we're looking for. I think as aging people, we're looking to see that we can continue to live in a community, which we can cope with as we become less mobile and as we start to suffer the problems that aging generates. But I think that, as much as the previous statement I made, it needs to be integrated not separated. I don't like the idea of being in what my wife calls the white-hair ghetto. That's not good for anybody, we

still have lots to offer, and I think it's important that we continue to be engaged in society. Housing for folks who are aging needs to have a much more thought out plan. Expecting we will move from the point where we are retired, but active, to where we're beginning to suffer some limits to mobility, to the point where we're not mobile, because that happens. So we need to integrate that into the community.

There's a First Nations community that I know quite well in Northeastern Ontario, and they've integrated housing for seniors within their community, and it's working very well, and in fact it's part of the revival of their culture. When we look at this, we really need to change the model that we have now. We build senior centres, which are really nice, but they isolate people. It doesn't deal with the progression that inevitably takes place.

GERRY STEPHENSON

Small towns are in trouble. Perhaps these areas that are having trouble with population are because in Ontario and throughout Canada young people are leaving, because there are no jobs for them. It could be a solution for smaller towns where they're having population issues; there is some infrastructure there. It may not be suitable for seniors as it stands but we're looking at changing, improving, fixing the leaks in the pipes so that we don't contribute so much to climate change. Perhaps the small towns could be hubs for people that are used to the rural environment and want a smaller place to live that is not the big city. I'll give an example, my own father who is 90 now, moved from Toronto to our farm in the summer of 2013 and he loves it. It's a small place, close to access to services that he needs and I think that kind of example could happen for the population in which so many of us are getting to the point where we need some extra assistance and a simpler lifestyle in order to remain vital.

JEREMY GRANT

The development industry and housing industry generally would tackle seniors housing the way they would any other market. They would identify the market, design, look for sites, and they proceed. And that suits a lot of people. Larger scale projects are generally what the development and housing industries work towards. The economies of scale are generally what make those industries tick. For some people that is a totally acceptable way of being. The arboretum is an example, the people who live there that I know love it. But it's not for everybody. We can't look at industry as the solution for all of the housing needs that exist. Smaller scale solutions in existing neighbourhoods, whether they're older neighbourhoods, or newer suburban neighbourhoods, they need to be seriously considered. An example would be in some fashion to see existing single-family homes retrofitted to perhaps create a main floor unit that's separated from a second floor unit. There are all sorts of tools that can be employed by the City and the Province, like energy programs and retrofit programs. That's one example that's at a smaller scale in existing

neighbourhoods. I'm not going to tackle the question of Municipal Act because it's beyond my experience.

LISE BURCHER

I'm not going to tackle that one either, Jeremy. I think that the planning act and the Provincial Health Regulations present a huge barrier to creating the kind of housing that people can age and transition into the neighbourhood. What we're seeing now are large self-contained residences for seniors with varying provisions for various needs. To look at that more holistically, even within the Planning Act we have huge challenges even dealing with something as simple as an accessory apartment within an existing house. We're looking at existing infrastructure where the costs are committed already, much better utilization of those properties could occur, but we're stuck quite often with very restrictive planning regulations, things that preclude mixed housing and mixed use development. It is coming forward in some instances, but I think we have a long way to go. The foundational piece to that is it's really all about mobility. I've seen many people who have moved into Guelph to various locations, and when people can't drive in a rural community, that's it. You really don't have an option. If we look at the Greenbelt more broadly, that area is a huge factor of midsized cities, and is characteristic of a transition we're going through from very broad low-scale densities to becoming much more intensified, to being able to support greater transit. So we're going through those growing pains. I think we'll get there, but perhaps not fast enough.

Look at the example of Waterloo that took a very bold step towards integrating transit, and it's been years in the making. Those decisions are never done until it's built. Those are very bold and courageous moves that need to take place, but it is a factor that is very common for the mid-sized city.

DAVID CROMBIE

A concept that's been emerging in the past few years and will continue is greater sharing of public assets, and that is being further melded to the idea of community hubs. They are perhaps a more urban answer right now, but clearly the concept can be spread to suburbs and rural areas. An example, I chair an outfit called the Toronto Lands Corporation, and we get all of the excess schools of the City of Toronto school system, of which there are about 100 sites, and we approach the provincial government to see if they can help us out with the use of community hubs. The government responded quickly and well, and what they said was that they are going to require ministries in the Province of Ontario to see their mandate through the eyes of community hubs. Six of those ministries are already required to do that. So the Province is on the march, trying to see how they can use community assets and share those with the idea of hubs. We're using an example now, at the corner of Bloor and Dufferin in Toronto. It's a 15-acre plot right at the subway, with three schools on it. That will all be changing as we find a way – we have to do it by the end of June, at least in concept – to bring affordable housing, seniors housing,

and other family service that are required for the neighbourhood. We have a working group with the City of Toronto, two of the school boards, and the Toronto Lands Corporation. The reason I mentioned this model that we are working through is that it can be used anywhere, small or large. If we get used to the idea that we had more money than brains when we decided that we were going to have every silo, every ministry, for 4 levels of government all have their own requirements. That's what we're trying to change. How do you provide the opportunities that we're talking about? Our answer is, I think, community hubs and the sharing of these assets. Now it's not an easy crank. Everybody is protective of his or her own thing; everybody lives within his or her own little rules. It's very difficult, but there is a broad attempt within the Province to try and do it.

I might go back to a point that was mentioned earlier. In schools, there are two places in New York and one in Toronto, looking for new space, and so there is a building that is going to be owned/controlled by the school board and the City, they share the ownership, they're building senior housing on it, affordable housing, and they're going to try to put the high school somewhere between the 6th and the 13th floors. In New York they're already doing that. So the imagination that's possible is already upon us.

2.5.3 QUESTION 3

What distance out from the Grand River would be within the Blue Belt?

JOHN FITZGIBBON

The Haldimand Tract, as a result of the treaty, represents a significant interest to Six Nations here in the Grand. The relationship is one of sharing a space, and certainly the Supreme Court decisions on consultation and now on accommodation become very important. Clearly the dialogue around the latter, the accommodation, and the degree to which the accommodation can be expected and is owed are important. I don't think anybody sees the clock rolling backwards, those things have been done, I don't think there's any use in spending time in the past, but many things that should not have happened, did.

The question is, where do we go forward in terms of how First Nations and non First Nations should interact with each other regarding the use of this watershed? One of the big complaints is that there is a level of tokenism that I think is intolerable. There's always someone from Six Nations on a committee or this and that, but the degree to which they influence decision-making has become very limited. It leads to civil disobedience as a simple description of what has to happen to get your voice heard. I don't think that's the most positive way, but I do think that every jurisdiction which has authority over land use needs to consult and discuss accommodation at points in the planning cycle, particularly around the Official Plan zoning bylaws, so that they can influence and have a say that is effective about

where this watershed goes. Certainly it is owed both under treaty and inherent rights.

DAVID CROMBIE

I did spend a part of my life as the head of the Ministry of Indian and Northern Affairs, federally. And I've spent time in my life since then participating in Aboriginal matters. The duty to consult is now the law of the land, therefore what the consequences are no one really knows. The advice that's just been given to slow down, and simply have some discussion really is worthwhile because there are lots of problems. Even outside the territory here, the ring of fire, James Bay, a great opportunity for the exploitation of natural resources has come to a standstill. No one knows how to move forward, there'll be something coming, the duty to consult has become both a boon, but also an immense difficulty. We are in a new world when it comes to the relationship with Aboriginal people, lead primarily by the Supreme Court. And trying to figure out what the Supreme Court means by this is going to be with us for some time. So that's really good advice, just slow down and have some conversation, because there are some people that think that the duty to consult is simply the opportunity to say "no". And if that survives our ability to move forward will be very difficult.

GERRY STEPHENSON

I think the time for the abuse of First Nations treaties has to end. Areas not under First Nations control next to the Grand are prime agricultural land. That being said, how do we mix that with efficient housing, sustainable hubs, and previous site decisions made by proximity to waterways is not really a consideration anymore. We as humans enjoy water for recreation, so it's a difficult decision. If hubs are going to be locally sustainable, agriculture must be a part of it.

LISE BURCHER

The federation of Canadian municipalities actually took on an initiative to work with adjacent First Nations communities. An example is Brantford being very involved in that. They're looking at ways that partnerships and conversations can help build those relationships, and look to planning communities together. There's also a program that much like the international program is building an initiative, which is peer-to-peer sharing. Communities get together with their skill sets their people and work together on whatever is coming forward. It's very apolitical. Those kinds of things are certainly helpful. That kind of initiative within the Greenbelt area and its communities would be very beneficial.

JEREMY GRANT

I mentioned earlier the idea of roundtables. The roundtable concept is one that attempts to bring people with diverse backgrounds together. Maybe that is a model

that could incorporate and should incorporate this question on an ongoing basis. I also think that the Ontario Provincial Planning Institute has a role to play. There's a tremendous resource there in terms of engagement, consultation, and people who are planners are trained in that area. Many planners are trained in the exercise of consultation on an ongoing basis.

2.6 ATTENDEE ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

After a period of roundtable deliberation, a spokesperson from each table presented their group's key points of discussion regarding the same three questions asked of the panelists. An even larger diversity of ideas were expressed through this format, but even so, an echo of ideas from the panel could be heard within many of presentations.

The following is a summary of the ideas presented during this part of the event. The ideas highlighted are some of the more emphatic or recurring ideas expressed by attendees, gathered from each table's presentation and written points. Specific concerns and questions are addressed in Section 3. Follow-Up of An Inspired Conversation.

2.6.1 QUESTION 1

The expansion of the Greenbelt doesn't have to be a yes or no proposition. What changes to the current expansion proposal would you make? What would YOUR expanded Greenbelt look like?

Attendees expressed concerns about the Aggregate Resources Act. Why is the Act so powerful, and could the Greenbelt do anything to override its power?

Several groups cited the importance of outreach and education. Promotional resources should point stakeholders/rights holders and the public to success stories, incremental benefits and gaps in existing policy filled by the Greenbelt. There needs to be an increased understanding of existing acts and how they interact with the Greenbelt.

Although the Greenbelt boundary draws a line in the sand, it must be recognized that natural and rural areas outside the Greenbelt also need protection.

The Greenbelt needs to include or be supplemented by a sensible transportation plan.

Concern was expressed that the Greenbelt Plan and other planning documents like it need to be improved from a practical point of view. As David Crombie expressed during the panel, what really counts is how practitioners and professionals implement these plans. These documents must be accessible at ground level.

2.6.2 QUESTION 2

We know we are going to have to plan for climate change going forward. How can we plan to increase the resiliency of our communities and reduce our carbon emissions? What role do natural systems and watersheds play in adapting or mitigating climate change?

Attendees expressed a rich array of ideas, many of which were attached by a common thread. Answers to this question really emphasized that combating climate change will require serious changes to everyone's thinking, a paradigm shift. Presenters stated the importance of educating the public about biological assets, watersheds, groundwater and the like. Media and advertising stigmatize sustainable living and environmentally ethical practices such as intensification, moderation and transit.

In accordance with the Panel's comments on 400-series highways, it is true that building such highways further encourages their use. Conversely it is true that building bus lanes, commuter lanes and bike lanes encourages *their* use.

We must act locally to combat climate change.

Use watershed-planning model to expand the Greenbelt with higher degree of protection for floodplains, wetlands and other water resources.

If the Province sees alternative development standards as a means worth mandating, municipalities should be able to apply for funding proportional to the level of implementation achieved.

2.6.3 QUESTION 3

The population of the Grand River watershed (6,800 km²) is expected to increase by 30 percent within the next 20 years. This means 300,000 more people. How can we best expand the Greenbelt while accommodating this increase, and the accompanying need for more infrastructure, food, and resources? (Numbers from the GRCA 2009 Integrated Water Budget Report)

Although intensification is usually discussed in relation to urban centres, we should also look to the great examples of successful intensification achieved in our rural communities. One such example is the Erin Centre 2000, which incorporates a school, library, arena, nursery, seniors' room and many other useful amenities all into one facility.

There need to be communal systems for energy, water reuse, dual pipes, and water conservation.

Leapfrogging growth has forced the Region of Waterloo to reconsider planning and implement new policy to accommodate growth coming from the GTA.

Need to examine growing the Greenbelt in the context of Ontario's stewardship and the effectiveness of all four plans. Need to readjust jobs strategy within the growth centres.

A common theme brought up in response to all three questions was the need to solve transportation network inadequacies.

3. FOLLOW-UP OF AN INSPIRED CONVERSATION

3.1 ISSUES ARISING

Although the Greenbelt boundary draws a line in the sand, it must be recognized that natural and rural areas outside the Greenbelt also need protection.

It is true that the existing and proposed expanded Greenbelt boundaries cannot perfectly envelope all natural areas in need of protection in the GGH. Many natural boundaries have more details and complexity than any of our policies can hope to mimic. Furthermore, natural systems at various scales are seldom well represented by regional boundaries. The Greenbelt Plan acknowledges this issue by stating that a lack of inclusion in the Greenbelt does not imply that any area is of less environmental importance, and that the natural connection of these adjacent lands should always be considered. From the Greenbelt Plan (2005), “the analysis and management of the Greenbelt’s water resources must therefore be integrated with the management of water resources outside the Greenbelt.” This is an aspect of watershed planning, an approach to land-use planning that is regaining popularity and importance.

Use watershed-planning model to expand the Greenbelt with higher degree of protection for floodplains, wetlands and other water resources.

As noted in response to the previous item, the Greenbelt Plan bases its water resource policies on a watershed planning approach. This means encouraging planning, designing and implementation considering natural boundaries instead of political boundaries. In their Co-ordinated Land-Use Planning Review, the Province is basing their decision regarding growing the Greenbelt outside of the GTA on issues relating to water resources. They are considering possible expansion where important water resources are under pressure from urban growth.

How will Six Nations be engaged in this conversation? Where will the partnerships be grown? How are First Nations rights and interests included in legislation, policy regulations?

As part of the Co-ordinated Land-Use Planning Review, a commitment was made by the advisory panel and urged of the Province to consult Aboriginal communities, representatives and rights holders. This commitment included the following requirements (MMAH, 2016):

- Two workshops specific to Aboriginal interest
- Additional opportunities for one-on-one meetings with individual Aboriginal communities and/or organizations with issues or concerns that cannot be adequately addressed during a workshop

In 2015 the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry hosted two information sharing meetings with Indigenous communities on April 21st in Vaughan (First Nations) and April 23rd in Midland (Métis Nation of Ontario). In 2016 the MNRF held additional meetings on the proposed changes to the plans on June 3rd in Midland (Métis Nation of Ontario) and June 14th in Toronto (First Nations). Follow up meetings are being planned with First Nations and Métis communities with interests in the region, including additional one-on-one meetings with those communities that request them.

The concerns expressed by the attendees of these events are held confidentially between affected communities and the MNRF. However, the Ministry has broadly stated that the Provincial government is aware of First Nations' concern holding regional municipalities responsible for engagement and consultation.

[Need to examine growing the Greenbelt in the context of Ontario's stewardship and the effectiveness of all four plans. Need to readjust jobs strategy within the growth centres.](#)

The Co-ordinated review of the four plans states that for designated urban growth centres, the Growth Plan sets a minimum density target of 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare. One of the places we can look to achieve this target is the objective of the Greenbelt Plan to encourage complete communities. This point, which was also made strongly and often by our panelists, means moving towards mixed-use neighbourhoods providing opportunities for people of all ages and abilities. Complete communities involve providing an appropriate mix of jobs, local stores, services and facilities and can take many forms depending on their local contexts.

[There needs to be an increased understanding of existing acts and how they interact with the Greenbelt.](#)

There is ample opportunity for plans, policies, designations and even natural features to intersect and overlap in complicated ways, historically creating many challenges for the stakeholders concerned. The four plans comprising the Co-ordinated Land Use Planning Review are no exception to this issue, and as such the Crombie Commission has made various recommendations to improve the implementation of the plans. The Commission calls for updated legal and planning boundaries to make them consistent and reduce confusion about designation, and updated and consistent language to be shared by all of the plans.

To address concerns about interaction between the Greenbelt and existing policy, it is stated within the Greenbelt plan that in the case of overlap, the more specific of the overlapping policies shall apply. This way the strongest possible protection for a given area is ensured.

3.2 UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

The following includes questions that were not directly answered to all attendees during the event due to limited time. Also included are questions from the ideas parking lot.

Are there any Initiatives to compensate farmers for protecting water resources through their farming practices? What initiatives, subsidies and/or tax breaks exist for farmers to help protect agricultural land from development?

Farmers in the Grand River watershed can apply for grants through the GRCA's Rural Water Quality Program. Funding can cover anywhere from 30 to 100% of the cost of activities deemed related to protecting source water. Select best management practices include but are not limited to stream fencing, tree planting, manure storage, and well decommissioning. The GRCA can also assist farmers in attaining funding for their conservation initiatives from the Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association (OMAFRA, 2015). The GRCA receives part of their funding from the Province, making these initiatives also partly provincially funded.

Is "whole-cost accounting" and attributing value to environmental capital part of the solution to improving land use planning?

Evaluating environmental systems through a lens of natural capital value will certainly play an important role in improving land use planning. Natural capital value is a way of assessing the economic value of natural ecosystems, functions and stocks (David Suzuki Foundation, 2008). This is a useful perspective to take to establish the natural environment's place in a modern economy.

Protected natural areas like the Greenbelt provide important economic benefits through such functions as water filtration, flood control, and carbon sinking. The existing Greenbelt's wetlands, forests and moraines save Ontario \$2.3 billion annually in water treatment and stormwater management alone (FGBF, 2015).

How does a community increase density in established urban areas without experiencing backlash about noise, garbage, aesthetics, etc.?

Such a shift will be very challenging for communities that have not yet experienced major increases in urban density. Solutions to the problem of potential backlash will not come from a single source or initiative, but will likely come on gradually as mindsets begin to shift on the subject. From a land-use planning perspective there are, however, some initiatives that can help alleviate public anxiety, and incentivize density.

Developers can be encouraged to pursue density bonuses, which allow them to build more densely in exchange for providing a public good, such as affordable housing,

parks or other public facilities/services. Form-based codes offer an alternative to conventional zoning that can regulate block size/scale for more efficient and livable dense urban neighbourhoods (King & Qureshi, 2015). More dense and populated streets also make neighbourhoods safer to walk at night.

Do alternative energy policies form part of complete communities?

Alternative energy policies and practices will continue to grow as communities and organizations both pursue sustainable solutions to energy needs. While wind, solar and geothermal energy sources present some possible alternatives to traditional, higher-pollution energy sources, they also present an opportunity for communities to embrace the cutting edge of energy technology and increase job density in the sector. The City of Guelph is already emerging as a national leader in the renewable energy sector, having almost 2,000 jobs related to alternative energy.

Does the Aggregate Resources Act truly supersede all other acts? How can the Greenbelt Plan hold the aggregate industry accountable for their actions?

The purpose of the Aggregate Resources Act is to manage aggregate resources in Ontario, regulate aggregate operations on Crown and private lands, require rehabilitation of former aggregate extraction sites, and minimize adverse environmental impacts from aggregate operations (Aggregate Resources Act, 1990). These are statements from the Act document, but in practice, the MNR and the Act itself have been criticized for inadequately protecting prime agricultural lands and groundwater. The Province's proposed revisions to the Greenbelt Plan include revisions intended to enhance protection of lands within the Greenbelt from damage caused by aggregate operations. An "agricultural impact assessment" will be required in cases where aggregate extraction is proposed in a prime agricultural area.

3.3 INTERACTION WITH EXISTING POLICY

It is a natural concern of the policy makers within proposed Greenbelt expansion areas, that there will be conflicts with existing policy and procedure. Outer ring municipalities already have Official Plans and/or additional literature that include policies regarding agricultural land, green space, stormwater, source water, and growth – So why is it important that they also adopt the Greenbelt Plan?

It is important to consider that the Greenbelt Plan contains many important policies, descriptions, and definitions that can work to benefit municipalities that lack specific policy and strengthen the policies of those that do. The inclusion of such policies would be automatic, with no need for OPA appeal. Any potential for conflict with existing policy is avoided by a constraint of the Greenbelt Plan that the more specific of the two policies shall apply.

3.3.1 BENEFITS OF GREENBELT OVERLAP

Outer ring municipalities can expect certain benefits from the Greenbelt expanding into their areas. As stated previously, the objective of Greenbelt policy is not to contradict, replace or otherwise interfere with existing municipal policy, but rather to provide additional protection to natural and agricultural systems. The Greenbelt plan can provide a comprehensive Natural Heritage System for municipalities that do not have one, explicitly or at all. The System provides the definitions, descriptions, and policy necessary to protect core and linkage areas within the Protected Countryside. Natural Heritage Systems, properly utilized, are a proven method of maintaining and improving forests, wetlands, animal migration corridors, urban river valleys, and other water resources.

In addition to the Natural Heritage System comes the Agricultural System. The Agricultural System describes an inter-connected agricultural sector composed of specialty crop areas, prime agricultural areas and rural lands, which support both natural heritage and hydrologic features. The Greenbelt plan seeks to protect such areas from encroachment by development and fragmentation, while still providing flexibility for agriculture-related and on-farm diversified uses. Requiring an “agricultural impact assessment” where non-agricultural uses are proposed within the Agricultural System helps ensure proper protection and due diligence.

Modifications to the Proposed Greenbelt Plan (2016) aim to encourage the adoption of proper Low Impact Development (LID) measures. LID’s are an approach to stormwater management that aims to manage runoff on-site in order to reduce negative effects caused by increased runoff and stormwater pollution. LID designs can vary greatly, but include designs like permeable pavement, bio-swales and green roofs. Many projects in the GTA have already adopted the use of LID’s, as encouraged by the City of Toronto. This represents a big step for many outer ring municipalities, which often omit LID’s from their municipal standards to instead favour outdated stormwater management practices.

By far the greatest benefit provided by Greenbelt designation is the permanent protection of water resources. This includes significant recharge areas, groundwater storage areas, wetlands and other surface water, as well as recreational features. The Water Resource System is so important because it has such significant effects on the health of all other systems described by Greenbelt policy or otherwise. Without well-protected clean water, the Natural and Agricultural Systems would fail – not to mention the direct adverse effects on human life. The Water Resource System policies emphasize the point that watersheds are the most meaningful scale for hydrological planning, and that proper watershed planning is undertaken where decisions regarding growth, development, settlement area boundary expansions, and infrastructure expansion are concerned. This is particularly important when considering cross-jurisdictional and cross-watershed development, where collaboration between all stakeholder groups should be sought.

4. RESPOND TO THE GREENBELT REVIEW

We encourage you to send feedback to the Province of Ontario regarding growing the Greenbelt in Wellington County. The Province will be accepting comments about their proposal until September 30th, 2016. Feedback can be submitted online, or by mail.

4.1 SUBMIT FEEDBACK ONLINE

The #GrowOurGB coalition has prepared an excellent campaign website to promote growing the Greenbelt in areas all across Ontario. Available at:

www.growourgreenbelt.ca

The website's *Take Action* tab can be used to send and/or edit a pre-written email to the Province urging them to grow the Greenbelt further into outer ring municipalities, permanently protecting source water.

Alternatively, The Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing website can be used to submit feedback. Available at: www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page14851.aspx

If you prefer to comment using the MMAH form, please consider using the following prepared response, modifying as needed to include the key areas that matter to you or your organization:

I commend the Province of Ontario for proposing stricter intensification targets under the Growth Plan, and for proposing to expand the Greenbelt to include 21 new Urban River Valleys, seven coastal wetlands and four parcels of Protected Countryside in Niagara and Hamilton. However, it is disappointing to see that proposed expansion areas identified by the many engaged community groups, experts and diplomats of Wellington County, Guelph and beyond have been omitted from the Province's proposal.

The GRCA Integrated Water Budget Report (2009) states that the Paris-Galt and Orangeville moraines are highly permeable and greatly contribute to recharging local and regional aquifers. Although policy within the Wellington County Official Plan describing protection for only the Paris-Galt moraine is significant, we believe Greenbelt designation will provide much needed protection for all moraines within the County.

I urge the Province to modify their proposed expansion of the Greenbelt to include the Orangeville and Paris-Galt moraines as Protected Countryside, and the Speed, Eramosa and Grand Rivers as Urban River Valleys.

4.2 SUBMIT WRITTEN FEEDBACK

Feedback can also be sent by mail to the following address. Please also feel free to use and modify the prepared response in the previous section in your letter:

Land Use Planning Review
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Ontario Growth Secretariat
777 Bay Street, Suite 425 (4th floor)
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5

5. CONCLUSION

The event *An Inspired Conversation*, and the questions and concerns it stirred, has indeed been an inspiring experience. We have learned – or have had reinforced – the notion of creating complete communities, strengthening local/regional economies through empowering agri-food businesses, engaging in the gripping issue of climate change, and holding our governments accountable for their actions/decisions encouraging them to continuously improve. We are living in one of the fastest growing regions in North America, and we need to be tactical with that growth in order to ensure the Greater Golden Horseshoe remains such a desirable place to live. Growing the Greenbelt in the right way will be an important part of that process. Our panelists drew on inspiring regional, national and international examples where growth is on the right track. Regional examples came from inside and outside of the Ontario Greenbelt, but shared the common threads of smart intensification and a reverence of natural systems. We have also heard concerns aside from Greenbelt expansion, regarding regional jobs and transportation, and the need to charge our government to refocus their existing approach to transportation away from building more 400-series highways. Additionally, we hope that specific concerns of the Planners and Councillors among you have been assuaged regarding policy interaction and overlap with the Greenbelt Plan.

Much has changed since *An Inspired Conversation* transpired on February 18th, but the most consequential change was the unveiling of the Province's proposed revisions as part of the Co-ordinated Land-Use Planning Review. Although not all of the changes we had hoped to see have been incorporated, and the proposed new boundaries of the Greenbelt do not represent the wishes of so many grassroots groups and organizations, we still have the time and the opportunity to continue imploring the Province to grow the Greenbelt.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Wellington Water Watchers would like to thank all the individuals and organizations involved in this project for their initiatives and contributions. Our events and this report would not have been possible without your help.

A big 'thank you' to our panelists David Crombie, Lise Burcher, Jeremy Grant, Gerry Stephenson and John Fitzgibbon; Felix Whitton and Friends of the Greenbelt Foundation; Debbe Crandall and STORM Coalition; Susan Swale and Erin Shapero from Environmental Defense; our Town Hall speakers Kevin Thomason and David Donnelly; our Greenbelt Committee Arlene Slocombe, Mike Nagy, Anne Brett-Hall, Lin Grist, Nora Chaloner, Hugh Whiteley and Patti Maurice; Trevor Hall and Ron Grist for lending their AV equipment and time; Jan Beveridge for contributing her research and assistance; the many unlisted volunteers and helpers for their support; and finally the participants of our events and readers of this and other Greenbelt literature for engaging yourselves in this important cause.

REFERENCES

- Crombie, D., Currie, K., Horst, R., MacKenzie, J., Moore, L., Zimmerman, D. (2015). *Planning for Health, Prosperity and Growth in the Greater Golden Horseshoe: 2015-2041*. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- David Suzuki Foundation. (2008). *Ontario's wealth, Canada's future, appreciating the value of the Greenbelt's eco-services*. Vancouver, B.C.: David Suzuki Foundation
- Friends of the Greenbelt Foundation. (2015). *Ontario's Greenbelt, learn about the Greenbelt* (informational flyer). Toronto, Ontario: Friends of the Greenbelt Foundation
- Grand River Conservation Authority. (2009). *Integrated Water Budget Report: Grand River Watershed*. Prepared by AquaResources Inc.
- King, R., & Qureshi, M. (2015). 3 Ways Land-Use Planning and Zoning Can Increase Urban Density. *World Resources Institute, Ross Centre for Sustainable Cities*. Retrieved from: <http://thecityfix.com/blog/three-ways-land-use-planning-zoning-can-increase-urban-density-mona-qureshi-robin-king/>
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs. (2015). *Programs and Services for Ontario Farmers*. (Fact Sheet 15-027). Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. (2016). *Advisory Panel to the Ministers for the Coordinated Review*. Background. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario. Retrieved from: <http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page11105.aspx>
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. (2005). *Greenbelt Plan*. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. (2016). *Proposed Greenbelt Plan*. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.
- Revised Statutes of Ontario. (1990) *Aggregate Resources Act*. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

APPENDICES

A1. LIST OF ACRONYMS

BMP	Best Management Practice
FGBF	Friends of the Greenbelt Foundation
GGH	Greater Golden Horseshoe
GRCA	Grand River Conservation Authority
GTA	Greater Toronto Area
LID	Low Impact Development
MMAH	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
MNRF	Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
MOE	Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
OMAFRA	Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs
WWW	Wellington Water Watchers

Protecting Vulnerable Water Supplies in the Greater Golden Horseshoe

This map recommends growing the Greenbelt into adjoining areas of critical ecological and hydrological significance, including:

- 1) important surface water features, and
- 2) important surface water features, and
- 3) important surface water features, and
- 4) urban river valleys.

Vulnerable surface and ground water features without Greenbelt protection

- Key natural area
- Natural feature connection
- River headwaters
- Urban river connection

Current Greenbelt Boundaries

- Niagara Escarpment
- Oak Ridges Moraine
- Protected Countryside
- Built-up areas as of 2006
- Planned growth to 2031
- Road
- River
- Greater Golden Horseshoe

This map was produced for Earthroots, EcoSpark, Ontario Nature and STORM.

Built-up areas and planned growth were data provided by Metrolinx, 2015. Greenbelt boundaries provided by Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, 2014. Lakes Inquiries Panel based on map by Nature Conservancy of Canada, Waterloo, 2014. Oak Ridges Moraine based on map by Ministry of Natural Resources and Forests. On-Metrolinx based on map by Metrolinx. Map design by As the Crow Flies Cartography.

A3. PROVINCIALY PROPOSED GREENBELT EXPANSION AREAS

