

## Brenton, Terri

---

**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL]Re: June 20th meeting follow up

**From:** Meetu Mahendra

**Sent:** 2022/07/02 5:13 PM

**To:** Brown, Patrick - Mayor <[Patrick.Brown@brampton.ca](mailto:Patrick.Brown@brampton.ca)>; Medeiros, Martin - Councillor <[Martin.Medeiros@brampton.ca](mailto:Martin.Medeiros@brampton.ca)>; Bowman, Jeff - Councillor <[Jeff.Bowman@brampton.ca](mailto:Jeff.Bowman@brampton.ca)>; sally.fasulo; Manesh Patel; rohanis; skhundal; Sukhi Baidwan; Henderson, Kelly <[Kelly.Henderson@brampton.ca](mailto:Kelly.Henderson@brampton.ca)>; Fay, Peter <[Peter.Fay@brampton.ca](mailto:Peter.Fay@brampton.ca)>; Urquhart, Chandra <[Chandra.Urquhart@brampton.ca](mailto:Chandra.Urquhart@brampton.ca)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL]Re: June 20th meeting follow up

Hello Mayor P Brown, councillor J Bowman, regional councillor M Medeiros,

This email is on behalf of the residents of Eldorado Mills, specifically on behalf of the residents who spoke and gave input to the city council on June 20, 2022 at the Planning and Development Committee. These residents include Manish Patel, Meetu Mahendra, Sukhi Baidwan, Rohan Periana, Sally Fasulo, Sukhvir Hundal, Dhruvi Patel and Tushar Mahendra

ON June 20, 2022 there was the public meeting where the above mentioned agenda# 5.1 ( City initiated amendment that would delete the requirement to amend the plan before approval to the builder in gaiven in the Eldorado Mills area) and agenda #5.4 (development application within 5.1 area - a builder application for approval of 30 houses and currently required to amend the plan) were discussed.

## Questions still unanswered to date:

1.environmental impact study is done by the builder/planner and is biased towards the builder/planner ; setback from top of the river bank needs to be recalculated

A 10 m setback will destroy the current ecological system and natural features

2.arborist report has the same bias as above - shows over 95% trees to be cut - and they may not even be all replaced due to scope of construction - how is that justifiable towards maintaining current ecology

3. A. The current proposal is NOT in compliance of section 2(a) of the Planning Act

The council of a municipality carrying out their responsibilities under this act shall have regard to among other matters ,matters of provincial interest such as

- the protection of all ecological systems including natural areas features and functions

B the current proposal is not in compliance with section 6.1.4 of the Credit Valley Secondary Plan as applicable to Eddorado Mills Area-read in the section

Office Consolidation , Chapter 45 Credit Valley Secondary Plan section 6.1 , Special Policy area 1 Section 6.1.4

Considering that Eldorado Mills is historically a settlement area , limited development may be permitted (MEANS THE COUNCIL DOES NOT HAVE TO AGREE TO BUILD ANYTHING IN ELDORADO MILLS) in , and adjacent to , the areas designated Primary valleyland within Eldorado mills , provided it is demonstrated , through the preparation of an environmental implementation report that the ecological function and natural heritage features are not adversely impacted.

4. Some questions Re :past application # B19-029 January of 2019

It was approved and the land was severed from 8395 Creditview Road and we were informed verbally on that day a single dwelling was approved

The land was zoned for executive housing as per Credit valley secondary plan recently ,we noticed that the land is zoned as low density 1- why , when and how was this decision made ,when approval was given for only 1 single dwelling at the time of that severance

5. Current way of notice is not a true way of informing Residents. resident proposed change to current way the notice is given informing residents of changes to their neighbourhood by regular individual mail to each resident affected by the proposed changes

6. Clarification and explaining the proposed changes by the city staff to the residents - make this more transparent and clear -

When we are asking a specific q - pls give a clear and direct answer - highlighting the concerned item and bookmarking the relevant pages would be appreciated

7. Amendment to credit valley secondary plan - this plan was made with many consultations and use of resources - amending it to suit builders interest's should not be supported by the city - as it's not in the best interests of the residents

8. City staff is paid using municipal tax dollars paid by the residents and city councillors are elected by the city residents - they need to prove to the residents that they are working for the residents' best interests

To this effect - we the residents of Eldorado Mills ask the city staff and councillors to answer all our questions , satisfy our concerns and planners share the recommendations with the residents - primary stake holders prior to taking it to councillors for voting on this matter and passing something that the residents find out after the fact it's finalized

Thank you

Manish Patel, Meetu Mahendra ,Sukhi Baidwan, Rohan Periana, Sally Fasulo, Sukhvir Hundal, Dhruvi Patel and Tushar Mahendra