

## I see the maps but I don't see the plan !

I understand that we are facing significant and rapid changes in demographic, economical, climate and many other aspects of our everyday life. It is the mandate of governments on different level to act preemptively to avoid critical situation. We have to be very cautious with land using – as the changes are virtually irreversible.

We all should understand, that the agricultural land is scarce (and will be even more precious in the near future; just now Earth has 8 billions mostly hungry human inhabitants), environmental reservations are as important as the former; Greenbelt is supposed to provide protection of these areas against what the actual government is intending to do.

My main argument against proposed changes is we have the maps but we have no plan. The proposal “1.5 million houses” seems to be mandated, but not planned nor calculated.

As the aim of the proposed legislation is to provide living conditions (“shelter”) by assigning land for further development, I rather expect that the first step should be thorough analysis of very basic aspects of such gigantic project<sup>(1,2)</sup>:

1. Where are the jobs?
2. Demographics & financial abilities:
  - number of dwellings<sup>(2)</sup> proposed should be related to changes of the population and evolution of family unit size - and within projected financial abilities of future residents – Owners or Renters
3. What kind of dwelling should be built to:
  - optimize cost of building
  - minimize amount of land to be used <sup>(3)</sup>
  - provide convenient and low-maintenance place to live
  - provides high flexibility of the dwellings sizes available
4. Locations of the new development which should:
  - not unnecessarily extend transportation routes to work places and schools
  - use the existing city infrastructure (water, sewer, power line, road system, etc) as much as possible
  - provide framework for future development of public transportation

5. Nearly all the maps are indicating that proposed locations are on the extension of the actual suburban sprawl; looks like urbanistic concepts from ‘50. It seems that rejuvenation of declining part of our cities and support for development of alternative economical centers in Ontario has been not taken into account.

More arguments can be easily made but I believe that these 5 points above are a good reason to oppose this legislation which will add even more chaos to our cities.

-----  
(1) Project seems to be gigantic indeed – after more than a century of intensive home building Ontario has little above 5 million dwellings. <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/98-200-x/2016005/98-200-x2016005-eng.cfm> Tab. 1

(2) I prefer using “dwelling” instead of “home” as dwelling is a term commonly used in planning considerations, see for example: <https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Var.pl?Function=DEC&Id=323163>

(3) as above More than 54% of Ontario dwellings are single detached houses. This seems to be inefficient land use and contributes to our transportation problems.