

Subject:

FW: Report No. 18 Item #1 2013 DEVELOPMENT CHARGE BY-LAW - W

C	15
Item #	1 / 1
Report No.	18 / 7
(SP CW)	(F&A)
Council - May 14/13	

From: Antony Niro P.Eng. [mailto:antony.niro@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 8:22 AM

To: Bevilacqua, Maurizio; Schulte, Deb; DeFrancesca, Rosanna; Rosati, Gino; Shefman, Alan; Racco, Sandra; Di Biase, Michael; Palermo, Angela; Carella, Tony; Iafrate, Marilyn; Clerks@vaughan.ca

Cc: Tim Kelly

Subject: Report No. 18 Item #1 2013 DEVELOPMENT CHARGE BY-LAW – What Happened to Kirby?

Dear Members of Council,

I recently read the communication posted online that mentions Kirby Rd on the Development Charge By-Law. I cross referenced the balance of the Development Charge By-Law mentioned in the communication and concluded of the approximate \$759 Million Capital Expenditures the City Engineering Department requires to invest into the City by 2031, roughly \$100 Million has been removed as “post period benefit”. Of this \$100 Million that has now been removed, approximately \$85 Million (85%) of it is located in the Countryside Areas of Vaughan, mainly Kirby Side Road improvements.

I missed the correspondence that states all development in the countryside of Vaughan (blocks 27 and 41 for example) has been postponed to 2031. If this is not the case how can we further develop our countryside without infrastructure? Residents throughout Vaughan are furious with the traffic congestion in this city. What is occurring here is a clear illustration of why we have traffic congestion in the first place, build 10,000 homes then in 10 or so years maybe improve the roads to accommodate the traffic. Oh, and I liked the part about passing the buck to the region who is less accountable to the residents of Vaughan than our own city council. This is poor leadership from both the ward councillor and the city staff providing recommendations.

This illustrates once again where the residents of the Vaughan countryside are neglected, underrepresented and ignored. I heard, at great length, this Council suggesting they “feel” residents of the countryside are well served and therefore there is no need for an additional Councillor to represent them exclusively. It's clear this is not the case.

The developers should pay their fair share of the infrastructure improvements as needed and as justified. Infrastructure first, then development. Stop pandering to the developers, if they feel they cannot afford to absorb the costs of development then don't develop. It should not come on the backs of the countryside residents with congestion and the backs of all Vaughan residents with higher taxes when the road inevitably needs to be improved and paid for. We have suffered and been ignored long enough.

Set the charges fairly. If we (City and developers) cannot afford to build, we don't build until we can. Raising taxes so developers can increase their profits is unacceptable!

Please be advised that I disagree with this position as outlined in the current Development Charge By-Law and background reports. Any services that are required pursuant to the Vaughan Official Plan or Transportation Master Plan or any other approved plan, should be in the Development Charge By-Law, budgeted and collected accordingly. Any exclusions or inclusions that are not justified as part of those reports, should consequently be amended.

-Antony.

Antony Niro P.Eng.

416-846-6476

Resident of the Vaughan Countryside