

Submission – Country Residential Area Concept Plan –Bylaw 18-2022

This submission is made on behalf of the Campbelltown Residents Association. We support the proposed Plan in principle subject to some clarifications/changes :

1. **Parcel size where no ASP is required.** The draft wording stated “ all parcels shall be a minimum of 0.4ha (1.0ac) including where an ASP may not be required . The “final” version deletes the minimum of 1 acre **for non - ASP** areas and simply says “parcel areas shall be sized to maintain the character of existing country residential development within the surrounding area.”(P. 14. Area Structure Plans # 12 (a))

However:

- a) Some high density and medium density country residential developments have been approved with minimum lot sizes of .3 acres and .5 acres. If such developments are within the surrounding area, lot sizes within a new non ASP area can be argued to be less than 1.0 acre
- b) The preceding is inconsistent with the 1 acre minimum **for ASP areas** (p. 14 # 13 (d)).
- c) Planning has stated that any changes from the draft version did not change the intent – deletion of the specific 1 acre requirement in non ASP areas would be a change in intent .

2. **Provision for non ASP proposals.** The preceding does not appear to be a problem **IF** the following is confirmed :

- a) Notification will occur to other residents / landowners, and
- b) Public information meetings are required ,and
- c) Public hearings remain a requirement .

Lack of any of the foregoing would be problematic

The last point we wish to make is about process. It is extremely disappointing that no public information meetings were held. Planning’s response to the question of why no public information mtg was that :

1. The project was limited in scope and specificity but extensive in the size of the ACP,
2. Impacts could vary based upon resident location and context- many inquiries were specific and could not be addressed in a public meeting but could in individual discussion; and
3. They have been able to provide residents with information through in-depth emails, phone calls and conversations throughout the engagement process.

We submit that there should have been at least one public information meeting held for the following reasons :

1. **The fact that an extensive area is impacted** (three rural wards) supports holding public info meeting(s) rather than not holding them ,and
2. The deletion of **high density targets ,although welcome , are very significant** for all country residential west of highway 21.

3. **Shared vs Restricted Information** . The problem with one on one exchanges with Planning is that they are not always shared or if done so, are after the fact. All discussion in a public info meeting is immediate, shared information. Attendees become aware of concerns, can identify if they have a like concern or the point may stimulate other discussion/points. Planning may see some things as specific only to certain individuals or locations but should not assume that concerns and information are not of value or possible interest to other residents. Attendees at public info meetings also share info with other residents in their community so the impact of public info meetings is broad. Specific questions which cannot be answered immediately can always be answered in follow up – in a public info mtg attendees have a chance to ask for a copy of the response.
4. During the previous introduction of the CR-ACP, there were 6 open houses prior to a public hearing.
5. Public information meetings occur when a private person/company proposes an ASP - they should also occur when the County proposes a Plan which not only has broader impact but also guides subsequent ASP proposals.

There seems to be increasing reliance on surveys and one on one exchanges. Contrary to the principle of public engagement, the effect is one of limiting full discussion and the immediate sharing of information and concerns.