

From: Cheryl Lewandowski
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 12:06 PM
To: Clark, Carol
Cc: Kathleen Wong; dave.barrow@richmondhill.ca
Subject: Fwd: Bill 66

Hi Carol,
Here are my concerns. I am wondering if you can include my email letter and my attachment?
Thanks for your assistance.
Cheryl

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Cheryl Lewandowski"
Date: January 16, 2019 at 10:50:12 AM EST
To: <tasia.slinko@york.ca>
Subject: FW: Bill 66

Hi Tasia,
I am wondering if you could forward my concerns to Christopher Raynor in the event I miss his email since time is so short.

The Province was less than fair when it downloaded the risk of Green Belt development to the municipalities with little time to review and comment. Now the municipalities will be seen as the "bad guy", when NOT if, development happens on the Green Belt and the province will get away "scott free". What a sweet strategy they came up with! Instead of providing a level playing field for development, it opens the door to unfair advantages or disadvantages depending on the site specific provisions as listed under conditions and requirements for implementation from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. It is time for municipalities to band together to tell the province this is not acceptable. Instead of opting for this approach which would threaten the Green Belt, Municipalities should adopt a "Hands OFF our Green Belt" approach! I have included a link to an article in the Liberal. In the pictures, it will show you how much development is already planned on the Oak Ridges Moraine.

<https://www.yorkregion.com/news-story/9124895-bill-66-cutting-red-tape-or-harming-the-environment/> It will be death by 1000 cuts which will put our water resources at risk-among other things as outlined in my letter.

I hope you will find time to answer my questions posed in my attached letter. The decisions you make today will form the legacy for tomorrow. Councils are transient and the health and environment of our future will be decided by today's Council. Please do the right thing for Richmond Hill residents, for your children and your grandchildren.

Best Regards,
Cheryl Lewandowski
Oak Ridges resident
Aurora small business owner

Dear Regional Councillors Carmine Perelli and Joe DiPaola and Local Councillor Greg Beros

January 12, 2019

I was **extremely** disappointed to learn that you did not consider responding to the provincial government on Bill 66 a time sensitive matter at a recent Council meeting, especially considering the consultation period for the Bill under the Ontario Environmental Bill of Rights ends on January 20, 2019. As regional and local representatives for the residents of York Region/Richmond Hill we expect that you will consider what is best for its citizens. In March 2015, Richmond Hill council unanimously passed a declaration standing up for its residents' right to a healthy environment. You made a commitment for our right to live in a healthy environment, including the right to breathe clean air, drink clean water and enjoy nature. Bill 66 threatens these rights. It is ill conceived and threatens our health and environment.

I believe that it is important to create good jobs in Ontario and would encourage all governments to seek healthy means to build our economy. I agree statutes should be streamlined and harmonized to simplify legislation. However, I do not believe that the Ontario government under Bill 66, Section 10, has adequately considered action which will protect the health of its citizens and the environment while attracting new jobs and investment to Ontario communities. What can be more important to the public interest than clean air, safe drinking water, healthy food and a stable climate? The environment and the economy must be given equal consideration to truly ensure a healthy community. Last time the Conservative government was "open for business" Ontario communities were put at serious health risks as evidenced by the Walkerton tragedy. Let's not repeat that kind of scenario under this provincial government's "open for business" legislation. Economic investment in our province is a priority, but not at the expense of the environment and health of its citizens.

I would appreciate if you could **provide me a response** to explain how you think Bill 66 S.10 will attract new economic investment in York Region/Richmond Hill, regain our competitive advantage and strengthen enforcement action to protect our lakes, waterways and groundwater from pollution.

Bill 66 S. 10 exempts large-scale development from a number of Acts meant to protect the environment and health of Ontarians. These are the concerns I have if this Bill is adopted. I have identified the piece of legislation affected at the beginning of each bullet point:

- As you must know, under Bill 66 S. 10, a municipality may pass an open-for-business planning bylaw only if it has received approval to do so in writing by the Minister and if criteria as may be prescribed are satisfied. This seems like a piecemeal approach to large scale economic developments vs. a clear standardized approach for all. How will a level playing field be assured for competitiveness under this haphazard approach?
- Planning Act: Through Official Plans and careful consideration, York Region/Richmond Hill has already identified employment lands that may be developed. What is the purpose of allowing development outside of these areas?
- Planning Act: Bill 66 S.10 removes requirements for public notice, hearings, and appeals process as well as other planning requirements including but not limited to density, storm water management, natural heritage and water features protection, natural or man-made hazards, active transportation and elimination of the "holding" requirement. By allowing this, community interests are being ignored, timing for development is not considered to accommodate infrastructure and local municipal benefits cannot be acquired to offset non-compliance with height or density developments. By removing the required municipal and public consultation outlined by the Planning

Act, feedback on developments by local experts is being terminated and effectively eliminates third party review. Public consultation provides the government with forward thinking strategies of complex issues. Why do you feel denying an appeals process for those with legitimate complaints and eliminating public consultation is in the best interest of the residents of York Region/Richmond Hill? I cannot believe you would be willing to give up the benefits to municipalities outlined in the Planning Act.

- **Clean Water Act:** By getting rid of “red tape” that allows large-scale economic development in source protection areas Bill 66 is threatening our surface and groundwater resources which could negatively impact drinking water and aquatic organisms. The Clean Drinking Water Act was a result of the previous Conservative government’s cuts to government staff to accommodate the “open-for-business” approach. This led to Canada’s worst-ever outbreak of E. coli and Campylobacter jejuni bacteria contamination, sickening more than 2,000 people and resulting in 7 deaths. Abandoned wells continue to be a potential source of contaminants to ground water. Protecting drinking water sources and aquatic biodiversity needs to be a collaborative effort between provincial and municipal governments, conservation authorities and the public. Clean drinking water should be a priority for all governments. Considering the issues York Region has faced with its water supply eg. Mining of aquifers, leachate from landfills and numerous abandoned wells, why do you think Bill 66 is in the best interest of York Region residents? This Bill threatens the groundwater we rely on!
- **The Greenbelt Plan:** If this Bill is approved 2 million acres of farmland and natural areas including specialty crops in the Niagara Region and the Holland Marsh will be put at risk. Why do you think threatening the small amount of arable land we have and putting our food resources at risk is in our best interest?
- **The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act:** The moraine supplies drinking water for over 200,000 residents, feeds into 65 river systems, cleans the air, keeps natural habitats intact, supports species at risk, fights climate change, and provides an opportunity for people to get closer to nature. ORM protections reduce contaminants entering critical groundwater sources, maintain forests which control flooding as well as erosion and also preserve agricultural lands providing local foods. By overlooking the protections provided by this Act, the government overlooks the vital role the moraine plays on the health of the communities that rely on it. Again, why do you believe threatening the environment and health and well-being of Ontario citizens is in our best interest? The previous Conservative government made serious mistakes by not adequately reviewing the programs it was slashing. We need to adequately review and respond in a responsible manner when governments try to pass ill-conceived legislation. We need to call on them to consider the ramifications of their actions.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Cheryl Lewandowski,
Oak Ridges concerned citizen