

Magnifico, Rose

Subject: December 6, 2016 Committee of The Whole, Item 9

From: Richard Lorello [mailto:rlorello@rogers.com]

Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2016 11:55 AM

To: Bevilacqua, Maurizio <Maurizio.Bevilacqua@vaughan.ca>; Di Biase, Michael

Mario <Mario.Ferri@vaughan.ca>; Rosati, Gino <Gino.Rosati@vaughan.ca>; Iafrate, Marilyn

<Marilyn.Iafrate@vaughan.ca>; Carella, Tony <Tony.Carella@vaughan.ca>; DeFrancesca, Rosanna

<Rosanna.DeFrancesca@vaughan.ca>; Racco, Sandra <Sandra.Racco@vaughan.ca>; Shefman, Alan

<Alan.Shefman@vaughan.ca>; MacKenzie, John <John.Mackenzie@vaughan.ca>; Abrams, Jeffrey

<Jeffrey.Abrams@vaughan.ca>

Cc: Noor Javed <njaved@thestar.ca>; Adam MartinRobbins <amartinrobbins@yrmg.com>; Robert Kenedy

<rkenedy@yorku.ca>; Furio Liberatore <furiof@rogers.com>; Ken Schwenger <ken.schwenger@sympatico.ca>; Tony

Alati <tony.alati@aero.bombardier.com>; Maria Verna <mariaverna@rogers.com>; Eddy Aceti

<eddy@acetiandassociates.com>

Subject: December 6, 2016 Committee of The Whole, Item 9

c 2
Communication
COUNCIL: Dec 13/16
CW Rpt. No. 43 Item 9

Good morning

Mr. Abrams I know this late notice, but please post this communications as it relates to this matter when you have the opportunity.

https://www.vaughan.ca/council/minutes_agendas/AgendaItems/CW1206_16_9.pdf

Earlier this year, I provided a deputation on a development application that included a provision for community bonusing (i.e section 37). In that deputation I pointed out that the bonusing in that particular application was woefully inadequate for what was be asked to be approved. I also pointed out that the city's guidelines as it relates to section 37 provisions were also woefully inadequate and required much needed definition going forward.

While I welcome this initiative to provide better guidelines for community bonusing, it does not go far enough, specifically on 2 fronts;

1. The guidelines do not go far enough to involve community groups and community input into the negotiation, application and definition of community bonusing. Please be aware that it is the affected community that will have to live with the negative consequences of higher density condominiums, townhouses. The community should therefore have and play a bigger role in shaping and defining what the community bonusing should be. I am therefore asking that guidelines reflect that community groups be directly involved from the outset in the negotiations for community bonusing and have a bigger say in community bonusing.

2. The guidelines do not go far enough to value the additional density asked for in any given application that exceeds the official plan. There should be an approximate value attributed to the additional density which can then be assessed and evaluated against any proposed community bonusing. This will help to determine whether the community bonusing being proposed is fair and equitable as compared to the additional density being requested. This will also provide the much needed transparency that the public needs in this process and where the proposed guidelines falls short

I request that these two issues be addressed and beefed up in the guidelines being proposed.

Sincerely
Richard T. Lorello