



Unbalanced
Planning

Policy 7.B.2.1 in the current official plan

- “An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) required under this Plan shall be submitted with the development application and **shall be prepared and signed by a qualified biologist or environmental planner** in accordance with the Environmental Impact Study Guidelines (EIS Guidelines) adopted by Regional Council. An EIS shall be prepared to the **satisfaction of the appropriate Planning Authority, in consultation with the NPCA and the other commenting body**. Within Settlement Areas as delineated in this Plan, an EIS shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the appropriate local municipality **in consultation with the Region and the NPCA**. Outside of Settlement Areas, an EIS shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the Region, in consultation with the appropriate local municipality and the NPCA. The Planning Authority, the other commenting body and the NPCA shall work collaboratively throughout the EIS process.”

Biased contrary to the public interest

The EIS shall be prepared and signed by a qualified biologist or environmental planner.

- * What are appropriate qualifications?
- * Why isn't this process regulated in any manner, i.e certification?
- * What is the penalty for an incomplete or inaccurate EIS?

More bias

The EIS is carried out at the owner's expense.

- * Why would the owner hire someone to write produce an EIS that agrees with the Region's conservation or environmental overlays?
- * Are there any examples of an EIS that actually stated the property or parts of the property should not be developed?

More bias

- Although the municipality, region, MNRF and NPCA have some authority in the decision making, they have few staff members with expertise i.e. scientific backgrounds in ecology, biology etc..
- * Those with expertise in MNRF are not allowed to do site visits, leave the office or attend meetings.
- * Many experts were fired from NPCA several years ago. See the Auditor General's Report on NPCA.
- * In some cases site visits are minimal, and in some cases done by Planners not biologist.

Rapidly decline in natural areas that the public now wants due to COVID

- Although developers can have zoning designations on environmentally sensitive areas changed the opposite is not true e.g. increasing floodplains
- I am also wondering how many times this policy has been effective in retaining environmental sensitive areas within the past 10 years?

Buffers

- Most regions that have responsible planning for flooding mitigation and healthy environments have adopted 120 metre buffers around sensitive areas. Encroachment of environmentally sensitive is increasing.

Neighbourhoods

Cutting trees down or destroying Provincially Significant Wetlands can have negative impacts on neighbouring properties in terms of flooding issues etc. (See Point Abino Road and the Palmwood development in Fort Erie)

Developing for communities

- Why is the region developing for developers and not developing for the communities.
- Remember we voted for you to change this!!