CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2013

Item 19, Report No. 9, of the Committee of the Whole, which was adopted, as amended, by the Council of the City of Vaughan on March 19, 2013, as follows:

By approving the following in accordance with Communication C15, from the City Clerk, dated March 19, 2013:

- 1) That the communication from Mr. Antony Niro submitting the report by Dr. Ronald G. Landes entitled 'Public Ward Boundary Review' be received;
- 2) That the petition submitted to the Committee of the Whole meeting of February 26, 2013 be formally received by Council; and
- 3) That the options in this report be submitted to the Committee of the Whole (Working Session) for consideration and public input; and

By receiving the following Communications:

C5. A. Niro, Public Ward Boundary Review, dated February 26, 2013; and

C19. A. Niro, dated March 19, 2013.

19

PETITION RE: WARD BOUNDARIES

The Committee of the Whole recommends:

- 1) That the recommendation contained in the following report of the City Clerk, dated February 26, 2013, be approved;
- 2) That the following deputations be received:
 - 1. Mr. Antony Niro, Laurentian Boulevard, Maple; and
 - 2. Dr. Ronald Landes; and
- 3) That Communication C7, Ward Boundary Petition, be received.

Recommendation

The City Clerk recommends:

- 1) That the petition filed by Mr. Antony Niro regarding ward boundaries pursuant to S. 223 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, c. 25 be received; and
- 2) That the City Clerk be directed to report to the March 19, 2013 Council meeting on the petition and any other necessary action.

Contribution to Sustainability

N/A

Economic Impact

Not applicable at this time.

Communications Plan

Not applicable at this time.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 19, 2013

Item 19, CW Report No. 9 – Page 2

<u>Purpose</u>

The purpose of this report is to outline the process for responding to the petition filed pursuant to S. 223 of the *Municipal Act*, S.O. 2001, c. 25 requesting that Council pass a by-law dividing or redividing the municipality into wards

Background - Analysis and Options

Under Section 223 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, electors may present a petition to Council requesting that Council pass a by-law dividing, re-dividing or dissolving wards. The petition requires signatures of 1% of the total number of electors in the municipality or 500 electors, whichever is less, but with a minimum of 50 signatures. Five hundred (500) electors would have to sign a petition in the case of a population the size of the City of Vaughan.

If Council does not pass a by-law in accordance with a petition within 90 days after receiving it, any of the electors may apply to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) to have the municipality divided or re-divided or have the existing wards dissolved. The OMB will hear the application and may make an order dividing, re-dividing or dissolving wards.

A petition pursuant to S. 223 of the *Municipal Act*, S.O. 2001, c. 25 was submitted to the City Clerk's Office by Mr. Antony Niro on February 26, 2013. The City Clerk has not had time to review the petition for statutory compliance and to ensure that the threshold number of signatures is met. It is proposed that the City Clerk report to the March 19, 2013 Council meeting on the petition and to outline any necessary next steps in the process.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council as set out in Vaughan Vision 2020, particularly:

MANAGEMENT EXCELLENCE – Demonstrate Leadership and Promote Effective Governance

Regional Implications

N/A

Conclusion

Staff recommends that the City Clerk be directed to report to the March 19, 2013 Council meeting on the petition filed pursuant to S. 223 of the *Municipal Act*, S.O. 2001, c. 25 and any necessary action.

Attachments

None

Report prepared by:

Barbara A. McEwan, Manager of Administrative Services, Deputy City Clerk Ext. 8628



<u>COUNCIL - March 19, 2013</u> Submitted by A. Niro

PUBLIC WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

Vaughan, Ontario

2012 - 2013

Report prepared by

Dr. Ronald G. Landes

Submitted to Vaughan City Council

February 26, 2013



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Public Ward Boundary Review Process Political Consultant: Dr. Ronald G. Landes Terms of Reference Drawing Electoral Boundaries in Canada Data Issues and Analysis Is There a Need for a New Ward in Vaughan? Defining Communities of Interest in Vaughan The Process of Drawing New Ward Boundaries Description of Ward Boundary Changes

APPENDICES

Appendices are embedded in document and attached as separate documents -

Appendix A: Ontario Municipal Act: Wards and Ward Boundaries

Appendix B: Public Notice of Meeting

Appendix C: Public Petition Handout

Appendix D: Data Analysis

Appendix E: Historical Ward Boundary Maps

Appendix F: Entitlement System: How to Calculate

A regular occurrence in the pattern of Canadian politics is the need to redraw and reconfigure electoral boundaries, usually accompanied by an increase in the number of seats in the respective legislative body, as evidenced in the current addition and redistribution of seats in the Canadian House of Commons. Although less frequent at the municipal level, such electoral boundary adjustments have become increasingly common at the local level as well.

The causes of this more frequent pattern of electoral boundary adjustment are two-fold: 1. Increasing population, as well as shifts in the patterns of population and 2. The impact of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, as interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada. The latter cause has become particularly salient since the landmark decision known as the *Carter Case* in 1991.

Both of these factors are currently prevalent in Vaughan and are the basis of the need for and controversy regarding the last ward boundary review process in 2009, as well as for this new public review process in 2012-2013. The details of this Public Ward Boundary Review Process are presented in the next section of this Report.

PUBLIC WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW PROCESS

In 2008-2009, Vaughan City Council undertook a Ward Boundary Review Process, which culminated in a new pattern of ward boundaries that retained the existing five-ward system. Ward Boundary By-law 89-2009 was passed by City Council on May 5, 2009.

This new By-law was appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board and the OMB, after public hearings, ruled, in November of 2009, that the adopted plan needed to be modified in several significant ways. However, the overall By-law, as amended, was maintained.

In its ruling (at page 26), the OMB indicated that the "Board shares the hope" of the Counsel for the Appellant that "a new process [for a boundary review] be "launched after the 2010 election." The OMB's ruling went on to say that "it can express its expectation that the matter will be revisited, that the task will be done properly, and ...that 'the parties make their best efforts to amend (the By-law) to capture the real successes' of the public process."

In response to this ruling by the OMB, with continuing concerns about the previous process, and with the rapidly expanding population in Vaughan, electors undertook, in the fall of 2011, to petition Vaughan City Council to proceed with a new Ward Boundary Review Process. In early-2012, a petition asking for just such a review was presented to the Vaughan City Council. However, City Council declined to proceed with a new review process.

As authorized under the *Ontario Municipal Act 2001 (sections 222 and 223),* electors are entitled to initiate their own Public Ward Boundary Review Process, which they proceeded to do (see Appendix A). Experts were contacted and hired and a new proposal for Ward Boundaries was developed.

Dr. Ronald G. Landes was hired as the expert on electoral boundaries and oversaw the ward boundary review process. An initial task for Dr. Landes was to develop an appropriate set of guidelines (Terms of Reference) to be used as the basis for the ward boundary review. At the same time initial data analysis, based on the 2011 Canadian census, as well as local municipal data on current and expected housing starts, was undertaken by professional urban planning consultants.

Once the Terms of Reference and initial data analysis were completed, a revised plan for ward boundaries was developed.

This revised ward boundary map was advertised to the electors and public in Vaughan through newspaper ads, flyers distributed in mailboxes, and local newspaper articles. A copy of the "Public Notice of Meeting" is included as Appendix B of this Report. A series of "town hall" style public meetings were held in Vaughan between July 19 – 21, 2012. Six meetings were held in venues throughout Vaughan, including Vaughan City Hall, Maple, Vellore Village, East Woodbridge, North Thornhill, Thornhill, and Kleinburg. A number of interesting and helpful comments were received from the public.

After the public hearings, a detailed look and consideration was given to the public's comments and views. As expected, these concerns focused on the definition of where the communities of interest were currently situated and how those might develop with the continuing population growth pattern in Vaughan.

For example, one interesting idea was to restructure Wards Four and Five by including Blocks 1,2,9 and 10 in a revised Thornhill Ward, moving Blocks 8 and 15 into a modified Ward Four. At this point, it was decided that such a change would be very disruptive of traditional communities of interest, but that the proposal should be considered during the next ward boundary review process, especially if additional ward seats were to be added at that time. Likewise, questions of community of interest were raised concerning the shifting of Blocks 40, 33 (western portion), and 47 (northeastern corner) into the new countryside Ward Six. It was concluded that Major MacKenzie Drive was a suitable boundary of continuing communities of interest.

Moving population areas between wards, as well as creating a new ward, is always a difficult and, at times, a controversial process. Reconciling population, population growth, communities of interest, historical patterns, as well as other factors, is, to be quite honest, an "art" not a "science." At some point, you simply have to draw a boundary! However, by following the "traditional" communities of interest in Vaughan, as well as major natural dividing lines, such as streets or highways that have been used before, the present plan, which adds a new ward is, in fact, a very "conservative" redistribution of electoral ward boundaries.

Following the completion of the final Report, a public petition process was undertaken (see Appendix C). As required by the Ontario Municipal Act, a total of 500 electors or 1 percent of the electors, whichever is less, must be obtained. This petition process was started in October 2012. Each elector was asked to print his or her name, sign his or her name, indicating a present address and contact information. Each signee, before agreeing to the petition, was given a copy of the proposed ward map. Before presenting the petition to Vaughan City Council, the names and signatures of the minimum number of electors were verified.

Dr. Landes will present the final Report, along with the petition, to Vaughan City Council in February 2013. In the next section of this Report, information on Dr. Landes is presented, followed by the Terms of Reference recommended by Dr. Landes.

POLITICAL CONSULTANT: DR. RONALD G. LANDES

A recognized expert on electoral boundaries in Canada, Dr. Ronald G. Landes is a Professor of Political Science at Saint Mary's University in Halifax, where he has taught for 40 years. Dr. Landes is best known as the author of *The Canadian Polity: A Comparative Introduction*, a University-level textbook that compares the politics of Canada, Great Britain, and the United States. First published in 1983 by Prentice-Hall Canada, it went through six editions as a standard textbook on Canadian politics.

In addition to teaching courses on electoral systems and Canadian politics, Dr. Landes has been extensively involved in drawing electoral boundaries at the municipal, provincial, and federal levels in Canada.

Dr. Landes served as a member and Chair of the 1991-1992 Provincial Electoral Boundary Commission in Nova Scotia, which was the first nonpartisan drawing of electoral boundaries in Nova Scotia's history. He also served as a member and as the Director of the 2001-2002 Nova Scotia Electoral Boundary Commission. In addition Dr. Landes has participated as a member of two Federal Electoral Boundary Commissions (1991-1992 and 2001-2002) for Nova Scotia's seats in the House of Commons, serving as Deputy Chair of the latter Commission.

At the municipal level of government, Dr. Landes has been involved with ward boundary issues in Ottawa (2003) and Vaughan (2009). On both occasions the Ontario Municipal Board certified Dr. Landes as an expert witness. The OMB hearing in 2009 concerned Vaughan's most recent ward boundary review process.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

In keeping with the Ontario Municipal Board's Decision of 2009 on Vaughan's Ward Boundary Review, where the OMB recommended a new Review take place before the 2014 Municipal Election, and in order to enhance the effective representation for all residents of Vaughan, a public review of the current Ward Boundaries has been undertaken by the citizens of Vaughan. Two issues are to be addressed: first, how can the effective representation of the rapidly growing urban areas be increased, while at the same time protecting the remaining countryside areas of the township. In order to accomplish both goals, a new sixth ward will be recommended.

The boundary review process will be based on the following guidelines:

1. The primary goal will be to increase the effective representation of all areas of Vaughan on City Council. As a first step, a new ward will be created, in order to reduce the increasing size of the urban wards (where possible) and also to protect the smaller and remaining countryside areas of Vaughan.

2. The guiding mandate will be the Supreme Court of Canada's ruling in the *Carter Case* (1991), which asserted the principle of "effective representation based on the relative parity of voting power." Ward boundaries of approximate equal population size will be created, using a +/- factor of 25 percent.

3. If appropriate, one ward may be created using an "exceptional circumstances" clause, which means it could be greater or lessor than the proposed variance of 25 percent.

4. Population will be the primary consideration, but as specified in *Carter*, other factors, such as community history, geography, and community tradition, may be the

basis for any recommended boundaries.

5. The most recent Canadian census data (2011) will be used, as well as population trends based on approved new developments which will occur in the next few years in Vaughan. New developments will have to be sufficiently along the approval process to reasonably expect voters to be in place on election day. The new ward boundary system will be designed to be in place for the next two municipal elections (2014, 2018).

6. Current, as well as historical, ward boundaries will be the starting point for the revised ward boundaries. Wherever possible, natural boundary lines, such as green spaces, and major streets and highways, will be utilized.

7. A public consultation process will be used to help develop the new boundaries. Special attention will be given to how the public defines the various communities of interest in Vaughan. An initial plan will be presented to the public, followed by a public consultation process. Based on the public's reaction, a revised plan will be developed, followed by a public petition process, with the results to be presented to Vaughan City Council.

8. A *Report* will be presented to City Council, explaining in detail the review process, the specific changes that have been made to the current system, and why both the review process and the recommended changes meet the criteria established by the Supreme Court of Canada in the *Carter Case*.

These Terms of Reference reflect the ongoing principles of electoral reform in the drawing of electoral boundaries in Canada, as described in the next section of this Report.

DRAWING ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES IN CANADA

While most people assume that "representation by population" or "rep by pop" is the accepted standard in drawing electoral boundaries in Canada, in fact, it is not nor has it ever been. Canada has always recognized factors that have moved us away from strict population equality in structuring electoral boundaries. The most obvious one is the rural/urban divide. Especially at the provincial and federal levels, rural constituencies have always been larger geographically but smaller in population, while urban/suburban constituencies have demonstrated the opposite pattern.

In attempting to balance the twin concerns of geography and population, Canada has always used what is known as a "plus-or-minus" factor in determining electoral boundaries. Such a factor recognizes population as the most important variable, even as it recognizes other significant concerns. The federal level uses a +/factor of 25 percent for seats in the House of Commons. Thus, urban/suburban constituencies are typically on the plus side, while rural constituencies are on the minus side. Larger exceptions, as high as +/- 50 percent, are used for seats in Canada's north. Even larger percentages have sometimes been permitted under what is known as "an exceptional circumstances clause".

The conflict between the factors of geography and population have also been evident at the municipal level, especially where formerly rural areas have witnessed major increases in population as a result of the growth of urban/suburban areas. Such a pattern is particularly evident in Vaughan during the exponential population growth during the last several decades – a pattern that is projected to continue into the immediate future. It is this conflict that is the basis for the controversy in Vaughan over the 2009 Ward Boundary Redistribution Process, as well as the current attempt to revise the existing ward boundaries. In order to address the twin issues of population growth and declining representation for the former rural areas, which we have labeled as "countryside," an additional ward is being recommended for Vaughan. By moving from a five to a six-ward structure, urban areas can be better represented, as well providing better representation for the remaining and smaller countryside areas of Vaughan.

With the adoption of the *1982 Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and a subsequent Supreme Court Decision based on it, especially Section 3, the criteria for drawing electoral boundaries have been more clearly defined. The most important ruling to date has been the *Carter Case* on June 6, 1991 (*Reference Re Provincial Electoral Boundaries [Sask] 1991*).

The implications and impact of the *Carter Case* have altered the process and criteria for drawing electoral boundaries in Canada, as outlined below.

- 1. The *Carter Case* applies to the municipal level of government in Canada. This view has been stated in a number of rulings over the past decade in decisions made by the Ontario Municipal Board concerning ward boundaries in Ontario, including its 2009 decision regarding ward boundaries in Vaughan.
- 2. The *Carter Case* specifically rejects the American practice of strict or absolute voter equality and parity. Instead, the basic principal asserted is "effective representation based on the relative parity of voting power." The difference between absolute versus relative parity of voting power is crucial, for it allows other factors, referred to as "countervailing factors," to be considered in electoral boundary redistributions. Such factors cited in *Carter* would include the previously noted rural/urban divide, as well as "community history, community interests and minority representation." The point of including such factors is to ensure that representative bodies "effectively represent the diversity of our social mosaic." It is also important to note that these specified factors are not the only ones that might be considered: "the list is not closed."

In conclusion, any redrawing of electoral boundaries must apply the *Carter Case*. As a result, in drawing up the Terms of Reference for this project, the *Carter Case* plays a major role in both the process of public involvement and the criteria to be considered in the ward redistribution process.

Having developed the Terms of Reference and described the key factors to be considered in drawing new ward boundaries in Vaughan, our next task will be to explain the development of our data set. After that discussion, we will proceed to answer the following questions: 1. Why are we recommending a new ward, increasing the number of wards from five to six and 2. How have we defined the communities of interest in Vaughan?

DATA ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

The following points represent a summary of the key issues in developing the data set for use in the Public Ward Boundary Review. For a more detailed presentation see the Lehman Report (Appendix D).

- 1. This report has used the best available data to estimate, as accurately as possible, where population growth will occur in Vaughan over the 2011 to 2018 period. The calculations are consistent with the legislated policy guidelines for growth at the Regional and Provincial levels.
- 2. The City of Vaughan prepares annual servicing reports that allocate servicing capacity to new subdivisions; the 2011 and 2012 servicing assignments were used as the basis for determining the location and magnitude of future growth on a ward basis.
- 3. The allocations took into consideration the specific and detailed geography of development opportunities in the City of Vaughan based on data obtained from the City.
- 4. An allowance was made in the servicing reports and the ward growth forecasts for intensification in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC) and for Transit Oriented Development (TOD).
- 5. It is considered that the population increases of 33,404 (2011-14) and 28,920 (2014-18) are a reasonable expectation of growth over the two periods. The amount of growth corresponds closely to the blended forecasts from York Region and policy of the City of Vaughan.
- 6. The resulting populations estimates for new wards are illustrated on the following page from the Lehman Report (Appendix D).

Ward	2011	2014	2018	% Growth
1	52,844	55,310	57,446	7.4%
2	52,440	56,518	60,049	12.2%
3	52,805	56,035	58,831	9.7%
4	47,017	52,419	57,095	16.2%
5	58,498	61,003	63,171	7.5%
6	24,697	40,420	54,033	47%
Total	288,301	321,705	350,625	100%

Present and Future Population by Wards (Lehman Report)

IS THERE A NEED FOR A NEW WARD IN VAUGHAN?

A basic issue in any redrawing of constituency boundaries is the number of seats to be allocated: will the number remain the same (in this case five), will it be reduced, or will the number of seats be increased? In the last boundary review a number of such scenarios were initially considered, including several options for both a six-seat and seven-seat ward boundary system. Plans for increased wards to either six or seven were rejected, resulting in the redrawing of the current five-seat system.

The proposed plan increases the number of wards from five to six. Interestingly, Vaughan Township adopted a five-ward system in 1850 (see G. Elmore Reaman, *A History of Vaughan Township*, page 67). Currently City Council has nine members, with the Mayor and three regional councilors elected at-large. However, the number of ward councilors has stayed at five for several decades.

The move to a six-ward system can be justified on several grounds, the most compelling of which is population. The extensive population growth over the last number of decades in Vaughan, which is expected to continue – if not increase, means that, on sheer numbers alone, issues of effective representation have to be considered. Moreover, Vaughan, in comparison to its neighboring municipalities of Richmond Hill and Markham, is quite frankly, underrepresented on a per capita basis (see **Table One**). If anything, the exponential population growth in Vaughan and comparisons to the level of representation in neighboring municipalities could easily justify adding several new wards in Vaughan. Thus, the plan for an additional ward in Vaughan at this time is a very modest proposal for political reform, a very "conservative" approach for electoral boundary changes. By adding only one new ward at this time the issues of representation can begin to be addressed, anticipating much larger changes (more wards) in the future. Moreover,

Table One: Number of Wards - Regional Comparisons*

Comparable York Region Municipalities - Current Vaughan Five-Ward System

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Census 2011</u>	Number of Wards	Population/Ward
	Population		<u>Ratio</u>
Vaughan	288,301	5	1:57,660
Richmond Hill	167,704	6	1:27,950
Markham	301,709	8	1:37,713

Comparable York Region Municipalities - Proposed Vaughan Six-Ward System

Municipality	<u>Census 2011</u>	Number of Wards	Population/Ward
	<u>Population</u>		<u>Ratio</u>
Vaughan	288,301	6	1:48,050
Richmond Hill	167,704	6	1:27,950
Markham	301,709	8	1:37,713

,

* Source: City of Markham, Town of Richmond Hill, Census 2011

by modestly only adding one ward now, the number of actual boundary changes can be kept to a minimum, allowing for an easier approval of this plan by City Council.

It has to be admitted, however, that there is one negative associated with this proposal: cost. Adding a new councilor will increase the cost in terms of salary, benefits, office support, etc. – likely in the range of at least \$150,000 per year. In a time of economic restraint and hardship and an "anti-politician" attitude by the general public, such a concern is not inconsequential and cannot be dismissed out of hand. For example, the cost per person per year in Vaughan would be about \$.50 to \$.75, which, in total, adds up over a series of years to a significant amount of money. Representation and its costs are never easily reconciled and this is a paradox that must be recognized in a democracy. However, given the factors noted above, we believe that more effective representation produced by an additional councilor and the relatively low cost of a new ward is more than justified at this time in Vaughan.

Perhaps it is time to consider why rapidly increasing population numbers impact on the effective representation of the residents in Vaughan? In no way does this argument imply a negative assessment of the job that current members of City Council are doing. In fact, our plan recognizes their difficult and time-consuming tasks and seeks to give them more support in carrying out their representational responsibilities.

The following impacts of effective representation are the result of increased population numbers: 1. A representative has only a certain amount of time in each day to deal directly with the residents and electors of Vaughan. Thus, the more people to be represented, the less amount of time is available to deal directly with their constituents. 2. The volume of phone calls, letters, e-mails and visits to a representative's office is increased substantially, with less time to consider each item. This means that staff rather than councilors have to deal with this volume of demands. 3. The amount of time for councilors to directly participate in community meetings and events becomes problematic: no matter how hard one works, the day is still only 24 hours long. 4. The amount of time a councilor has to read staff reports, do background research, and be totally prepared on all issues brought to City Council is hindered. 5. Councilors and City Council in general become focused on short-term issues - it becomes difficult to adopt a long-range perspective when one is constantly overworked on the minutia and process of politics.

Given these impacts on the representational role of councilors, we feel that an additional representative will at least mitigate some of their worst effects.

In considering the issue of effective representation in Vaughan we also wish to comment on the representational basis for the three regional councilors on City Council. We realize that it is not within the mandate of City Council to deal with this issue on their own authority at this time, but we wanted to raise the issue for possible consideration in future ward boundary redistributions in Vaughan.

What we are suggesting is that the regional councilors be given a ward basis, instead of being elected by an "at-large" vote. If the six-member ward structure were adopted, then each of the three regional councilors would be elected on a twoward constituency structure. Thus, one regional councilor would be selected by electors in Wards One and Six, one in Wards Two and Three, and one in Wards Four and Five. While the regional councilors would still represent Vaughan in total on the regional council, they would now be linked to an explicit representational role at the ward level.

There are several advantages of such a structure. First, the regional councilors could help to alleviate the workload of the individual ward councilors. Second, this plan would focus the regional councilors on more local concerns within Vaughan that may have trouble being recognized at the regional level. Third, this change would help to offset the preponderance of the larger populated areas in Vaughan in selecting the regional councilors. For example, all three current regional councilors reside in Woodbridge. The chance for a person to be elected from one of the smaller areas, such as Kleinburg, is remote. Fourth, the use of an "at-large" election system for the regional councilors is open to a potential constitutional challenge in relation to the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and the *Carter Case*.

The potential legal challenge is based on how "at-large" elections are conducted and in their usual consequences for the representation of significant groups within the total constituency. For a position, such as mayor, "at-large" elections are entirely appropriate. For other positions "at-large" elections allow the majority interest, however defined, to totally dominate minority interests, however defined. For example, if a constituency is electing a number of representatives to a city council (in this case three) and majority opinion represents 50 percent or more of the electors, all three representatives will likely be elected on that slim majority. Minority interests, whether based on race, ethnicity, or urban versus countryside concerns will have only a very slim to nonexistent opportunity for electoral success.

In the American system at the municipal level, "at-large" election systems have been ruled to be unconstitutional because they have been used historically as a cover for racial discrimination. While that is certainly not the issue in Vaughan, it is a potential concern when considering the dominance of the larger population centres versus what we have called the Countryside areas. Certainly the *Carter Case* opens up the possibility of a legal challenge to the "at-large" election system used for regional councilors, because minority interests may not be effectively represented in the electoral process.

DEFINING COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST IN VAUGHAN

While population is the most important factor in producing effective representation based on the relative parity of voting, the *Carter Case*, as previously referenced, includes other factors as well. Most of those factors, in one way or another, involve the concept of community of interest. Community of interest includes issues such as rural versus suburban/urban variations, minority representation, community identities, and community history.

So the issue becomes one of identifying the communities of interest in Vaughan. One way of seeing the communities of interest is to focus on the evolution of the population centers in Vaughan and how they have evolved over time. For this purpose, an excellent study is found in G. Elmore Reaman's book, *A History of Vaughan Township* (University of Toronto Press, 1971 – reprinted in 2004). While some villages rose and prospered, others faded away. Interestingly, the basic population centers were founded and developed early in Vaughan and continue to serve as the fundamental communities of interest to this day. As noted on the City of Vaughan's website, these key communities would include Kleinburg, Maple, Thornhill and Woodbridge. Moreover, past electoral redistributions for wards in Vaughan illustrate that these communities served as the basic foundation for ward boundaries (see Appendix E: Historical Ward Boundaries).

Our proposed six-ward system for Vaughan uses these population centers to define the wards around the communities of interest. Each of the wards has a major defining population center: Ward One: Maple; Wards Two and Three: Woodbridge West and Woodbridge East; Ward Four: Concord; Ward Five: Thornhill; Ward Six: countryside (Kleinburg). These wards recognize, as much as possible, the traditional boundary lines in Vaughan and the current and emerging communities of interest.

THE PROCESS OF DRAWING NEW WARD BOUNDARIES

Having defined the Terms of Reference, developed and analyzed the most current population data, presented the rationale for a six-ward system, and outlined the key communities of interest in Vaughan, the next step was to produce a new set of recommended ward boundaries.

The starting point was the current ward boundary system of five seats. On the next page is the current "Ward and Councilor Area Map," as presented on the City of Vaughan's official website (accessed May, 2012). The map shows not only the wards, but also the various numbered geographical Blocks for Vaughan (see **Map Number One**). For each Block, current population figures based on the 2011 census, as well as projections for 2014 and 2018, were developed. As well, in order to see a clear view of population concentrations and natural dividing lines, an aerial view of Vaughan from Google Maps (accessed May, 2012) was produced (see **Map Number Two).**

For each Block or part thereof, a population estimate was produced, including that areas variance (+ or – of population equality) and seat entitlement (see Appendix F for an explanation of the Entitlement Index). These figures, presented in **Tables Two through Five**, show which areas and wards are above or below population equality.

MAP NUMBER ONE: CURRENT WARD BOUNDARIES



MAP NUMBER TWO: GOOGLE MAP FOR CURRENT WARD BOUNDARIES



Steeles Ave.

Ward	Population	Entitlement	Variance
Ward One	64365	1.116	+11.6 %
Ward Two	52440	0.909	-9.1 %
Ward Three	60163	1.043	+4.3 %
Ward Four	45195	0.784	-21.7 %
Ward Five	66138	1.147	+14.7 %
Total Population =	288,301	Population Equality =	57,660

Table Two: Ward Boundary Data for 2011

 Table Three: Ward Boundary Data for 2011 – Six-Ward System

Ward	Population	Entitlement	Variance
Ward One (Maple)	52505	1.093	+9.3%
Ward Two (Woodbridge West)	52440	1.091	+9.1%
Ward Three (Woodbridge East)	52805	1.099	+9.9%
Ward Four (Concord)	47356	0.985	-0.9%
Ward Five (Thornhill)	58498	1.217	+21.7%
Ward Six (Countryside)	24697	0.514	-48.6%
Total Population = 28830	1 Population	Equality = 48050 (288301)	/6)

.

Ward	Population	Entitlement	Variance
Ward One (Maple)	55310	1.032	+3.2%
Ward Two (Woodbridge West)	56518	1.054	+5.4%
Ward Three (Woodbridge East)	56035	1.045	+4.5%
Ward Four (Concord)	52419	0.978	-2.2%
Ward Five (Thornhill)	61003	1.138	+13.8%
Ward Six (Countryside)	40420	0.75.4	-24.6%
Total Population = 32170	5 Population	Equality = 53618 (321705	/6]

Table Four: Ward Boundary Data for 2014 - Six-Ward System

Table Five: Ward Boundary Data for 2018 – Six-Ward System

Ward	Population	Entitlement	Variance
Ward One (Maple)	57446	0.983	-1.7%
Ward Two (Woodbridge West)	60049	1.028	+2.8%
Ward Three (Woodbridge East)	58831	1.007	+0.7%
Ward Four (Concord)	57095	0.977	-2.3%
Ward Five (Thornhill)	63171	1.081	+8.1%
Ward Six (Countryside)	54033	0.925	-7.5%
Total Population = 350625 Population Equality = 58438 (350625/6)			

By adding a new ward in Vaughan, the size of the urban wards are reduced, while allowing one ward to represent the former rural areas, which we have now called countryside. Ward Six, while initially much smaller in terms of its population, will grow over the next two election cycles to be clearly within the +/- factor of 25 percent by 2018. By allowing the Countryside Ward to be initially smaller, the residents and electors will be better able to effectively represent their interests as development and population increasingly impact Ward Six. The new ward boundaries can be seen in **Map Number Three**, again based on the aerial view from Google Maps. The visual presentation in Map Three clearly shows how the natural boundary lines and communities of interest/population centers are the basis for the proposed revised Ward Boundary system in Vaughan.

In the next section we present the specific changes and descriptions of the ward boundary revisions.

MAP NUMBER THREE: GOOGLE MAP FOR REVISED WARD BOUNDARIES



Steeles Ave.

DESCRIPTION OF WARD BOUNDARY CHANGES

The following changes to existing ward boundaries refer to the current *Ward and Councilor Area Map* as it appears on the City of Vaughan's official website (May, 2012). Block numbers refer to those that appear on that map. The current Ward One becomes the new Ward Six. The new Ward One is based in Maple.

The changes, described below, are meant to alleviate the following issues. Thornhill was too big as to population and the Glen Shields area had previously been in Ward 4, therefore, it made sense to reconnect them with their previous ward, while reducing the extremely high population of Thornhill. Likewise, Block 12 has a clear identity with the countryside ward, as it is predominately open space with large valleys and woodlots. Block 12 connects more with the communities to the north rather than to the south. Major Mackenzie then seemed logical to be a dividing line across the Municipality (except for Maple), putting Vellore Village North into the Countryside ward. This change helped to balance the population a bit better and gives Vellore North the opportunity to create its own strong voice within the Countryside Communities, rather than being drowned out by East Woodbridge. While this area is a bit more densely populated than the balance of the Countryside ward, its variance is acceptable in my opinion. The Countryside ward remains the largest geographically and is unique as it has smaller villages (Vellore North, Block 12, North Maple, Kleinburg) and is dominated by open spaces. It also will have the largest growth factors over the years. Maple is a unique area and is deserving of its own ward. Ward 2 was left untouched, as its population and communities of interest remain somewhat static (except for some intensification) and within the proposed threshold. The population figures were all kept within the variance of 25% outlined in the Terms of Reference.

Given these proposed changes, the proposed six-ward system has the possibility of remaining effective for at least two, perhaps three, elections.

Ward One (Maple): This is the new ward that is being proposed. Blocks 25 and 26, the western portion of block 18, and the eastern portions of blocks 32 and 33 form it.

Ward Two (Woodbridge West): No change.

Ward Three (Woodbridge East): Western, eastern and southern boundaries remain the same, except that it loses current areas above Major Mackenzie Drive. Ward Three loses block 40 and the western portion of block 33.

Ward Four (Concord): Ward Four loses blocks 19 and 12 and gains the eastern portion of block 15.

Ward Five (Thornhill): Ward Five loses the eastern portion of block 15.

Ward Six (Countryside): The new Ward Six is a reconfiguration of the current Ward One. The new ward gains block 40, the western half of block 33, and blocks 19 and

12. The current ward loses the eastern portions of blocks 32 and 33, blocks 26 and 25, and the western portion of block 18.

APPENDIX A

Ontario Municipal Act: Wards and Ward Boundaries

Establishment of wards

<u>222. (1)</u> Without limiting sections 9, 10 and 11, those sections authorize a municipality to divide or redivide the municipality into wards or to dissolve the existing wards. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 96 (1).

Conflict

(2) In the event of a conflict between a by-law described in subsection (1) and any provision of this Act, other than this section or section 223, any provision of any other Act or a regulation made under any other Act, the by-law prevails. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 96 (1).

Notice

(3) Within 15 days after a by-law described in subsection (1) is passed, the municipality shall give notice of the passing of the by-law to the public specifying the last date for filing a notice of appeal under subsection (4). 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 96 (1).

Appeal

(4) Within 45 days after a by-law described in subsection (1) is passed, the Minister or any other person or agency may appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board by filing a notice of appeal with the municipality setting out the objections to the by-law and the reasons in support of the objections. 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 96 (1).

Notices forwarded to Board

(5) Within 15 days after the last day for filing a notice of appeal under subsection (4), the municipality shall forward any notices of appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board. 2001, c. 25, s. 222 (5).

Other material

(6) The municipality shall provide any other information or material that the Board requires in connection with the appeal. 2001, c. 25, s. 222 (6).

Board decision

(7) The Board shall hear the appeal and may, despite any Act, make an order affirming, amending or repealing the by-law. 2001, c. 25, s. 222 (7).

Coming into force of by-law

(8) A by-law of a municipality described in this section comes into force on the day the new council of the municipality is organized following,

(a) the first regular election after the by-law is passed if the by-law is passed before January 1 in the year of the regular election and,

(i) no notices of appeal are filed,

- (ii) notices of appeal are filed and are all withdrawn before January 1 in the year of the election, or
- (iii) notices of appeal are filed and the Board issues an order to affirm or amend the by-law before January 1 in the year of the election; or
- (b) the second regular election after the by-law is passed, in all other cases except where the by-law is repealed by the Board. 2001, c. 25, s. 222 (8); 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 96 (2).

Election

(9) Despite subsection (8), where a by-law comes into force on the day the new council of a municipality is organized following a regular election, that election shall be conducted as if the by-law was already in force. 2001, c. 25, s. 222 (9).

Notice to assessment corporation

(9.1) When a by-law described in this section is passed, the clerk of the municipality shall notify the assessment corporation,

- (a) before January 1 in the year of the first regular election after the by-law is passed, if clause (8) (a) applies;
- (b) before January 1 in the year of the second regular election after the by-law is passed, if clause (8) (b) applies. 2009, c. 33, Sched. 21, s. 6 (10).

Regulations

(10) The Minister may prescribe criteria for the purpose of subsection (2). 2001, c. 25, s. 222 (10).

Petition re: wards

<u>223. (1)</u> Electors in a municipality may present a petition to the council asking the council to pass a by-law dividing or redividing the municipality into wards or dissolving the existing wards. 2001, c. 25, s. 223 (1); 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 97 (1).

Number of electors required

(2) The petition requires the signatures of 1 per cent of the electors in the municipality or 500 of the electors in the municipality, whichever is less, but, in any event, a minimum of 50 signatures of the electors in the municipality is required. 2001, c. 25, s. 223 (2).

Definition

(3) In this section,

"elector" means a person whose name appears on the voters' list, as amended up until the close of voting on voting day, for the last regular election preceding a petition being presented to council under subsection (1). 2001, c. 25, s. 223 (3).

Failure to act

(4) If the council does not pass a by-law in accordance with the petition within 90 days after receiving the petition, any of the electors who signed the petition may apply to the Ontario Municipal Board to have the municipality divided or redivided into wards
or to have the existing wards dissolved. 2001, c. 25, s. 223 (4); 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 97 (2).

Order

(5) The Board shall hear the application and may, despite any Act, make an order dividing or redividing the municipality into wards or dissolving the existing wards and subsection 222 (6) applies with necessary modifications in respect to the hearing. 2001, c. 25, s. 223 (5).

Coming into force

(6) An order of the Board under this section comes into force on the day the new council of the municipality is organized following,

- (a) the first regular election after the order is made, if the order is made before January 1 in the year of the regular election; or
- (b) the second regular election after the order is made, if the order is made on or after January 1 in the year of a regular election but before voting day. 2001, c. 25, s. 223 (6).

Election

(7) Despite subsection (6), if an order comes into force on the day the new council of a municipality is organized following a regular election, that election shall be conducted as if the order was already in force. 2001, c. 25, s. 223 (7).

Deemed by-law

(8) Once an order of the Board is in force, the order shall be deemed to be a bylaw of the municipality and may be amended or repealed by the municipality by by-law described in section 222. 2001, c. 25, s. 223 (8); 2006, c. 32, Sched. A, s. 97 (3).

APPENDIX B: Public Notice of Meeting

See attached document

•

APPENDIX C: Public Petition Handout

See attached document

APPENDIX D: Data Analysis

See attached document

Lehman & Associates letter to Dr. Ron Landes Re: Population by Ward in the City of Vaughan

APPENDIX E: Historical Ward Boundary Maps

See attached document

APPENDIX F: Entitlement System: How to Calculate

Take the total population used for the last revision in 2009 and divide it by the number of wards (5) to be produced.

The resulting number is the population size if all wards were to be perfectly equal.

Divide the population for each of the five wards by the population number representing population equality.

The resulting number may be less or more than 1.0, which indicates that a ward is either smaller or larger than exact population equality. For example, a figure of 1.20 would indicate that the ward is 20 percent above the average and a figure of .85 would indicate that it is 15 percent below average.

Take the new population figures (Census 2011, estimated populations for 2014 and 2018) for Vaughan and divide them by six. The resulting number is the population size if all 6 wards were equal.

Take the population numbers for the new ward boundaries and divide each by the population equality number. This will tell us how much any of the new boundaries are above or below population equality (that is, how much variation we are proposing for all of the 6 wards).

This process can also be used for any area, such as the blocks that make up Vaughan. Divide the population numbers for any block or area and that will tell you how much will be added or subtracted (i.e. its entitlement) if we move any particular area between wards.

PUBLIC NOTICE OF MEETING

City of Vaughan - "New Ward" Boundary Review

You are invited to undertake in a public review of a proposed new Ward 6 in Vaughan. The terms of reference and analysis of the data used to support the proposal will be presented by Dr. Ron Landes, electoral boundary expert.

In keeping with the Ontario Municipal Board's Decision of 2009 on Vaughan's Ward Boundary Review, where the OMB recommended a new review take place before the 2014 Municipal Election, and in order to enhance the effective representation for all residents of Vaughan, a public review of the current Ward Boundaries has been undertaken by the citizens of Vaughan. Two issues are to be addressed: first, how can the effective representation of the rapidly growing urban areas be increased, while at the same time protecting the remaining countryside areas of the township. In order to accomplish both goals, a new sixth ward is being proposed.

Date	July 18th & 19th, 2012	July 17th, 2012	July 18th, 2012	July 19th, 2012
Time	1-3pm	7-9pm	7-9pm	6-8pm
Location	Vaughan City Hall Multipurpose Room	Vellore Village Community Centre Room 3	North Thornhill Community Centre Room B	Kleinburg Library Downstairs
Address	2141 Major Mackenzie Dr. Maple	1 Villa Royale Avenue East Woodbridge	300 Pleasant Ridge Ave. Thornhill	10341 Islington Ave. N. Kleinburg

This Open House is scheduled for:



If you are unable to attend we invite you to visit the Ward Boundary Review Website: www.VaughanWardBoundaryReview.ca to view material and provide comment, or contact

Antony Niro P.Eng. Resident of Vaughan • 416.846.6476 • antony.niro@gmail.com

•

PETITION – New Ward Map for Vaughan

To: The Residents and Citizen's of Vaughan, Ontario:

We are asking for your support for a plan to revise the Ward Boundaries for City Council.

During the past year, a group of citizens has undertaken to conduct a Public Ward Boundary Review Process. The proposal calls for the addition of one new ward to City Council, increasing the number of wards from Five to Six.

The additional ward will allow for the growth in the size of the urban wards to be moderated, while creating a new Ward to better represent the Countryside The tremendous population growth in Vaughan during recent decades has not been matched by an increase in your level of representation on City Council. Communities areas of Vaughan.

re-dividing the municipality into wards in accordance with the attached map on the reverse side of this Petition: In accordance with the Municipal Act, the Undersigned hereby request Vaughan Council to pass a by-law

	 	 	 		 	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Signature							ntryside.com
Phone Number				-			/w.vaughancou
Email Address							antony.niro@gmail.com WWW.Vaughancountryside.com
Address							
Printed name							Contact: Antony Niro P.Eng. 416-846-6476

LEHMAN & ASSOCIATES

Dr. Ron Landes St. Mary's University

Sent by email only

Re: Population by Ward in the City of Vaughan

Dear Dr. Landes

This letter responds to your request related to the Public Ward Boundary Review of the City of Vaughan. The work carried out first established the 2011 population for the City by census tract, concession blocks and groups of concession blocks and then, based on data obtained from the City of Vaughan, estimated the change in population for these areas over the 2011 to 2018 period.

After review of the data, you provided a map of new ward boundaries and asked that we estimate the population in each ward for the next two election years - 2014 and 2018. The following text explains the method used to make this determination, the assumptions and the sources of the data.

Methodology

Much of the growth in Vaughan that will occur over the next few years has already received the necessary planning approvals. For new subdivisions on greenfield sites, plans are already approved and registered, are draft approved, or are in the approval process. It takes several years for plans to move through the approval process, for the land to be prepared and for new homes to be built.

The length of the approval process is more variable for intensification, that is development within areas that are already built up. Apartment buildings take longer to build than other housing forms, so the time period from plan approval through building to occupancy can take several years. Other forms of intensification, such as infilling of a few homes, can proceed much more quickly and can take as little as a year. This variation makes the timing of intensification more difficult to estimate.

Servicing is an important factor in planning for new development. For new subdivisions, the City of Vaughan and the Region of York coordinate and plan servicing, and allocate servicing capacity annually. Once servicing is allocated, the new subdivision can be developed and homes can be occupied. Although the servicing is allocated annually, it can take several years for a subdivision to be built and occupied. For intensification, in some cases new servicing is required, and will be allocated, but in other cases servicing is already available. The fact that there is usually unused servicing allocation carried over to the next year illustrates this lengthy process.

The location and density of future development in Vaughan is established by the policies of the Vaughan Official Plan, and is also subject to policies in the Region of York Official Plan and the Provincial Growth Plan. These policies were taken into account when determining the location of future growth. In particular, the policies in the Growth Plan specify that intensification will comprise a minimum of 40% of future growth after the year 2015. The Vaughan Official Plan specifies that intensification will constitute 45% of future growth after 2015. The process followed the following steps:

- 1. Establishment of the 2011 population by existing ward and by census tract, concession block and group of concession blocks.
- 2. Determination of the forecast growth for the City between 2011 and 2014 and between 2014 and 2018.
- 3. Determination of the location of growth in the near future based on planning applications and approvals as listed in the servicing allocation reports of the City of Vaughan and the assignment of this population to the census tract, concession block and group of concession blocks.
- 4. Assignment of projected Vaughan Corporate Centre growth and growth in Transit Oriented Developments in the quantity estimated by the servicing allocation reports.
- 5. Calculation of the amount of growth and population in each ward in 2014.
- 6. Assignment of the 2014 to 2018 growth based on the same proportionate growth by ward as in the 2011 to 2014 period.
- 7. Calculation of the amount of growth and population in each ward in 2018.

Population by Ward in 2011

The ward boundaries were changed in Vaughan in 2009. The table below shows a comparison of the 2011 population distributed three ways - using the 2009 ward boundaries, the 2011 ward boundaries and the proposed ward boundaries. All figures are based on StatsCan census data:

Ward	2009 Boun	daries	2011 Bounda	aries	Proposed Bound	laries
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	90,618	31	63,893	22	52,844	19
2	52,582	18	52,582	18	52,440	18
3	52,868	18	60,493	21	52,805	18
4	53,324	18	45,195	16	47,017	16
5	38,909	13	66,138	23	58,498	20
6	-	-	-	-	24,697	9
Total	288,301	100%	288,301	100%	288,301	100%

TABLE 1: POPULATION BY WARDS 2011

*The population data does not include adjustment for any undercount

2014 and 2018 Forecast Population - Regional Data

Based on the mandatory population targets provided by the Provincial Growth Plan, York Region has forecast population for Vaughan in 2016 to be 329,100 and in 2021 to be 360,600. These forecasts carried forward to 2031 represent Vaughan's share of the total population growth allocated to York Region by the Growth Plan.

Using these forecasts gives an average population increase between 2011 and 2016 of 8,160 people and between 2016 and 2021 of 6,300. For the election years, this translates to a population growth of 28,560 (three and a half years at 8,160 per year) for a 2014 total of 316,861. On this basis the next four years would have a growth of 28,920 persons (two years at 8,160 and two years at 6,300 per year) for a 2018 population of 345,781.

Servicing Allocations by Ward - City Data

The City of Vaughan prepares annual servicing reports that allocate servicing capacity to new subdivisions; the 2011 and 2012 servicing assignments were used as the basis for determining the location and magnitude of future growth on a ward basis. The 2011 report was used as the starting point to coincide with the data available from the 2011 Census. Census population numbers are as of May 2011.

The servicing reports provide the specific location of where new greenfield development is expected, but in some circumstances only indicate a general area for intensification. An allowance was made in the servicing reports for intensification in the core, the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC), and for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) as noted later in this report.

Some of the development provided for by the servicing allocation does not include a location as it is a reserve set aside for unanticipated projects. This allocation was distributed equally across each proposed ward except for the VMC, which was first given 50% of the total growth allocation based on the City policy directing growth to this area. The appendix provides the details of the calculations.

The 2011 City of Vaughan Servicing Allocation report provided the locations for a total population increase of 6,211, and the 2012 report for a population increase of 27,193, which included some of the 2011 allocation (beyond 6,211) that was unused. In total this is a population growth of 33,404 which, as indicated by the reports, includes all applications and anticipated applications for a 36 month time frame.

It is considered that a population increase of 33,404 is a reasonable expectation of growth over the 2011 to 2014 period. It is not inconsistent with the blended forecasts from York Region for Vaughan, which total 28,560 for that period. By way of comparison the City grew by 49,435 persons between 2006 and 2011. The various forms of development contemplated in the servicing reports are likely to have a 2 to 3 year build-out, as explained later in this letter.

Vaughan Corporate Centre and Transit Oriented Development

The servicing reports assign capacity to the VMC and to TOD. The VMC is proposed new Ward 4. The location of the TOD development is not known, so it was evenly allocated to all wards. The 2012 servicing report allocated a population capacity of 2,000 to the VMC and TOD - this has been assigned as 1167 to Ward 4 (VMC) and 167 to each of the other wards. The 2012 servicing report allocated a population capacity of 6,900 to the VMC and TOD - this has been assigned as 4025 to Ward 4 (VMC) and 575 to each of the other wards.

It is likely that a higher proportion of intensification will occur in the VMC in the later years of this projection, between 2014 and 2018. The subway will arrive at the VMC in 2015 and then the pace of development is likely to increase. As illustrated in Table 2, the projections meet the intensification targets of 40% and 45%.

The allocations in 2011 and 2012 were calculated by ward; which gave the following total additional population by ward:

Ward	2011*	2012-2014	Total	Percent of
			Population	Growth
1	906	1560	2466	7.4%
2	851	3227	4078	12.2%
3	0	3230	3230	9.7%
4	82	5320	5402	16.2%
5	229	2276	2505	7.5%
6	4143	11580	15723	47%
Total	6211	27193	33404	100%

Table 2: Servicing Allocations by Ward

*only includes allocations assigned to specific developments, unused allocations are included in 2012-14 totals

The population increase projected from the servicing reports is 33,404 as shown in Table 2. When this amount is added to the 2011 population of 288,301, the total population for 2014 is 321,705. The City of Vaughan servicing allocation reports are provided in an appendix to this letter.

Allocation of 2014 to 2018 Growth

For the 2014 to 2018 period the Regional population increase for Vaughan of 28,920 was used based on the annual growth of 7,230. The growth of 28,920 was discounted slightly by 1,367 persons to account for the slightly larger than forecast growth assumed in the 2012 to 2014 period (28,560 was assumed, 27,193 was forecast). This amount of growth was distributed to each of the proposed 6 wards based on where

population was expected and allocated according to the City of Vaughan servicing allocation reports of 2011 and 2012 as illustrated in Table 2. The growth was allocated proportionately such that if the servicing allocation for a particular ward was 30% of the 2011 and 2012 total it was assumed to be 30% of the total for the remainder of the forecast period between 2014-2018.

These forecasts were cross referenced for reasonableness with the Places to Grow allocations and the City of Vaughan Official Plan policies which mandate intensification within the built boundary to be at least 40% and 45% respectively over time. It was also cross-referenced for reasonableness with York Region Official Plan that estimated the population for Vaughan, using a blended rate, to be 345,781 in 2018. Most of the Greenfield development is located in the new proposed Ward 6 with some in the new Ward 4. This comparison confirmed the reasonableness of the amount and location of the projections.

The allocation results in the populations by ward by future year as shown in Table 3.

Ward	2011	2014	2018	% Growth
1	52,844	55,310	57,446	7.4%
2	52,440	56,518	60,049	12.2%
3	52,805	56,035	58,831	9.7%
4	47,017	52,419	57,095	16.2%
5	58,498	61,003	63,171	7.5%
6	24,697	40,420	54,033	47%
TOTAL	288,301	321,705	350,625	100%

TABLE 3: PRESENT AND FUTURE POPULATION BY WARD

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. The calculations have used the best available data to estimate, as accurately as possible, where population growth will occur in Vaughan over the 2011 to 2018 period. The calculations are consistent with the legislated policy guidelines for growth at the Regional and Provincial level.

- 2. The City of Vaughan prepares annual servicing reports that allocate servicing capacity to new subdivisions; the 2011 and 2012 servicing assignments were used as the basis for determining the location and magnitude of future growth on a ward basis.
- 3. The allocations took into consideration the specific and detailed geography of development opportunities in the City of Vaughan based on data obtained from the City.
- 4. An allowance was made in the servicing reports and the ward growth forecasts for intensification in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC) and for Transit Oriented Development (TOD).
- 5. It is considered that the population increases of 33,404 (2011-14) and 28,920 (2014-18) is a reasonable expectation of growth over the two periods. The amount of growth corresponds closely to the blended forecasts from York Region and policy of the City of Vaughan.
- 6. The resulting populations estimates by new ward are provided in Table 3.

Conclusion

While population projections at such a fine scale as municipal wards cannot be exact, the above assumptions and resulting projections are considered reasonable given the data available. The new Ward 6 will receive the majority of growth, which is consistent with historical trends for the City as the urban boundary expands and low rise units are in demand. These projections also allow for intensification within the more urban wards, which is also consistent with both recent trends and planning policy. When compared with policy documents such as the Vaughan Official Plan, the Regional Official Plan and the Growth Plan, the findings are considered to be reasonable.

As such, it is our opinion that these findings can be relied upon for the purpose of determining populations for electoral boundary alignments.

LEHMAN & ASSOCIATES INC. Robert Lehman, F.C.I.P., R.P.P.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE - JUNE 5, 2012

SERVICING CAPACITY ALLOCATION STRATEGY ANNUAL UPDATE <u>CITY-WIDE</u>

Recommendation

The Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works and the Commissioner of Planning, in consultation with the City Manager, recommend:

- 1. THAT Council pass the following resolutions with respect to the ALLOCATION of servicing capacity to specific development applications:
 - "IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT development applications described by file numbers 19T-05V10, 19T-06V04, 19T-06V14, DA.10.052, DA.11.070 and consent applications B021/11, B034/11, B035/11 are allocated servicing capacity from the York Sewage Servicing / Water Supply System for a total of 876 persons equivalent (as detailed on the Allocation Schedule included as Attachment No. 3)"; and
 - ii) "IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT the development application described by file numbers 19T-84076 is allocated servicing capacity from the Kleinburg-Nashville Sewage Servicing / Water Supply System for a total of 167 persons equivalent (as detailed on the Allocation Schedule included as Attachment No. 3)".
- 2. THAT Council pass the following resolutions with respect to the RESERVATION of servicing capacity to specific development applications:
 - i) "IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT the development applications described by file numbers 19T-08V01, 19T-11V002, 19T-11V003, 19T-12V001, DA.07.092, DA.09.070, DA.09.071, DA.09.078, DA.11.041, DA.11.069, DA.11.071, DA.12.018, DA.12.039, Z.06.005, Z.06.079, Z.08.022, Z.08.039, Z.11.032 are reserved servicing capacity from the York Sewage Servicing / Water Supply System for a total of 6,029 persons equivalent (as detailed on the Reservation Schedule included as Attachments No. 4 and 5). This reservation shall automatically be revoked after a period of 12 months in the event that a Draft Plan of Subdivision has not proceeded to registration, or in the case of a Site Development Application, that a Letter of Undertaking (or Site Plan Agreement, whichever is in effect) has not been executed"; and
 - ii) "IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT the development application described by file numbers 19T-08V06, DA.10.046 is reserved servicing capacity from the Kleinburg-Nashville Sewage Servicing / Water Supply System for a total of 264 persons equivalent (as detailed on the Reservation Schedule included as Attachment No. 5). This reservation shall automatically be revoked after a period of 12 months in the event that a Draft Plan of Subdivision has not proceeded to registration, or in the case of a Site Development Application, that a Letter of Undertaking (or Site Plan Agreement, whichever is in effect) has not been executed".
- THAT servicing capacity for 1,020 persons equivalent be RESERVED from the York Sewage Servicing / Water Supply System for distribution to development applications at Council's discretion;
- 4. THAT servicing capacity be RESERVED in accordance with the Reservation Schedule included as Attachment No. 5 as follows;

- i) 6,900 persons equivalent (3,450 apartment units) for specific Vaughan Metropolitan Centre, High Density and/or Transit Oriented Development applications;
- ii) 3,400 persons equivalent (1,700 apartment units) for LEEDs development applications;
- iii) 2,596 persons equivalent (unrestricted) for distribution to development applications within the Kleinburg-Nashville service area as required to facilitate intensification in the core and development within the approved Kleinburg-Nashville Community Plan area; and
- iv) 1,650 persons equivalent (unrestricted) for distribution to other development applications proceeding to approval over the next year (and not included on any of the attached schedules) within the York-Durham Sewage System in accordance with the City's protocol;
- 5. THAT servicing capacity for 5,950 persons equivalent (1,750 residential units) be ASSIGNED in accordance with the Assignment Schedule included as Attachment No. 6;
- THAT an annual review of the City's available servicing capacity and related development process and distribution protocol, be undertaken by staff and brought forward to a future Committee of the Whole meeting; and
- 7. THAT a copy of this report be forwarded to York Region.

Contribution to Sustainability

The yearly distribution of servicing capacity to active development applications contributes to orderly and sustainable development.

The availability of future servicing capacity is dependent upon the City's active participation in joint Regional and Local Municipal Inflow and Infiltration Reduction and Long Term Water Conservation initiatives. These efforts are consistent with the objectives of the City's Community Sustainability and Environmental Master Plan (Green Directions Vaughan). The policies, decision making framework and implementation strategies related to the reduction of inflow and infiltration, water conservation, and the procurement of long-term servicing capacity will assist in the pursuit of:

- Sustainable growth and development;
- Minimizing energy consumption;
- The conservation and protection of our long term water supply;
- The creation of a City with sustainable built form; and
- Sharing sustainable best practices and ideas between and among municipal staff and the community.

Economic Impact

There are no immediate budgetary impacts resulting from the adoption of this report.

Communications Plan

This report will serve to inform and update the development industry with respect to the City's current position and priorities relating to development approvals and the distribution of servicing capacity.

<u>Purpose</u>

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an update on the status of available servicing capacity and to obtain Council direction with respect to the Allocation, Reservation and Assignment of the City's available capacity.

Vaughan's available servicing capacity is adequate to meet short-term development needs

This report confirms adequate servicing capacity is available to meet the City's short-term development needs. On a move forward basis, York Region will generally maintain a four year supply to all local municipalities. Staff has reviewed the Region's capacity commitment and is satisfied with the methodology and approach. The capacity being recommended for distribution as part of this report will allow for the effective management of capacity and the orderly progression of development throughout the City.

A healthy reserve has been established for high-density development within the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre to support transit-oriented development. Servicing capacity remains available for distribution at Council's discretion to priority developments that may come forward over the next year.

Background – Analysis and Options

Council adopted protocol ensures servicing capacity is effectively and strategically managed to achieve sustainable growth

On November 14, 2005, Council adopted the City's Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol as a means to effectively and strategically manage the distribution of Regional servicing capacity to development applications.

The Protocol has provided staff and Council with an efficient tool for prioritizing the allocation of the City's existing and future servicing capacity. Implementation of the protocol has proven itself successful in ensuring:

- Efficient allocation of Regional supply
- The prioritization of development applications based on specific qualifying criteria
- Fairness and equity amongst all development interests throughout the City
- Adequate local and regional infrastructure has been constructed
- Consistency and cooperation with Regional initiatives

To ensure infrastructure capacity is available at occupancy and to limit the premature sale of residential units, imposed restrictions on pre-sales and on final plan registration continue to be 12 months and 6 months respectively. This approach is reflected in the City's Protocol and continues to work well for low density residential developments (singles, semis and townhouses).

In order to accommodate longer construction periods for high density type developments and more complex hi-rise developments (greater than 200 units with multiple levels of underground parking), Regional Council has endorsed the City's ability to release building permits for these types of developments up to 18 months (for high density) and 36 months (for complex high-rise) prior to the completion of specific infrastructure triggers.

The complete Council approved 'Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol' and 'Allocation Capacity / Development Approvals Timeline' are included as Attachments No. 1 and No. 2 respectively to this report.

City reconciles available servicing capacity

The City's last annual update report on available servicing capacity was approved by Council on May 24, 2011. A detailed reconciliation of available capacity has been conducted by staff accounting for development activity over the last year. The results of this review are described below and summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

Council's discretionary reserve still available

For a number of years, staff has recommended a Council reserve be set aside for allocation to priority development applications identified throughout the year. Typically, Council's discretionary reserve contains capacity for approximately 300 residential units (1,020 persons equivalent). Over the last year, Council's total reserve remains un-changed from the 2011 reserve. Thus, a total of 300 units (1,020 persons equivalent) will be carried over to the recommended 2012 Council reserve, as outlined in Item 1 of Table 1 below. This capacity remains unrestricted and available for distribution to applicable development applications.

LEED Buildings and Vaughan Metropolitan Centre reserves remain available

On May 24, 2011, Council reserved servicing capacity for development applications qualifying for York Region's Sustainable Development through LEEDs program and for transit-oriented development within the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC). Over the last year, minimal take up has occurred from these reserves with only one development application receiving allocation from the LEED Building reserve. No capacity has been used from the VMC reserve. The available capacity from 2011 has been carried over to 2012 as outlined in Item 2 of Table 1 below. This capacity remains unrestricted and available for distribution to applicable development applications.

Development applications reserved capacity in 2011 reconsidered

On May 24, 2011, Council reserved capacity to active development applications expected to proceed to final approval within one year. Based on a recent review by staff, the majority of these applications have proceeded to draft plan / site plan approval with allocation by Council resolution.

The other applications reserved capacity last year that have not proceeded to approval will be reserved capacity for an additional year as part of this report. Only two development applications have been automatically revoked reservation by Council resolution and will not be recommended for reservation again this year as they will be substantially revised. These applications are detailed below:

1) Naser G. Jureci (OP.07.012, Z.07.050) – The site is located at Highway 7 and Lansdowne Avenue. It was originally reserved 6 townhouse units (20 persons equivalent) in May of 2011. The applicant has advised a substantial change in density will now be proposed. However, no formal resubmission has been made as of yet. The application has been reserved for a number of years and has not proceeded to final approval.

2) **1620144 Ontario Inc.** – The Maple Group (OP.06.003, Z09.014) – The site is located at the southwest corner of Major Mackenzie Drive and Keele Street. It was originally reserved 39 townhouse units in May of 2011. The parcel was subsequently purchased by Gold Park (Woodbridge) Inc. A new set of development applications (OP.12.007 / Z.12.016 / DA.12.038) with a revised development proposal for 188 apartment units (376 persons equivalent) has now been submitted.

The capacity reserved to specific development applications and not allocated, amounting to 1,779 persons equivalent is now available for redistribution. This capacity remains unrestricted. Refer to Item 3 of Table 1 below.

2013 Regional commitment restricted by Southeast Collector Trunk Sewer

The City's 2011 Regional commitment of restricted capacity was 12,377 persons equivalent. This capacity is linked to the anticipated in-service date for the new Regional sanitary trunk sewer expected to serve as a twin to the existing Southeast Collector Trunk Sewer. Additional reserves were set aside last year from this capacity for LEED buildings and transit-oriented development within the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre. These reserves have not been used and remain available. A commitment to Block 40/47 was also made for 600 residential units (2,040 persons equivalent) which also remains available. Item 4 of Table 1 below identifies a current breakdown of this capacity.

Post-2013 Regional commitment targeted to ensure local municipalities have a minimum four year supply

Based on the Regional staff report to York Region's Environmental Services Committee meeting of April 11, 2012, Regional Council endorsed a post-2013 commitment of servicing capacity to four of the nine local municipalities. Based on the City's efficient management of capacity commitments to date, Vaughan was considered one of the four to receive a post-2013 commitment.

The City's post-2013 capacity commitment is 8,070 persons equivalent. Refer to Item 5 of Table 1 below. This capacity is also linked to the anticipated in-service date for the Southeast Collector Regional Trunk Sewer twinning. The Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA) for the Southeast Collector Sewer twinning was approved by the Ministry of the Environment on March 11, 2010. The construction timeline for the sewer remains on schedule with an anticipated completion date of late 2014.

This sewer is necessary to meet the projected growth in both York and Durham Regions for the next 25 years and will provide needed backup support for rehabilitation of the existing Southeast Collector Trunk sewer. The approved sewer route is approximately 15 kilometres in length spanning large sections of both Markham and Pickering in York and Durham Regions. The majority of the sewer will be constructed using four tunnel boring machines able to tunnel with minimal construction and groundwater related impacts.

TABLE 1 2012 AVAILABLE SERVICING CAPACITY - YDSS

lten	/ Description	Servicing Capacity (Persons Equivalent)
1.	Council Reserve (300 units)	1,020
2.	Committed / Unused	
	LEED Building Applications (291 units) VMC / Transit Oriented Development (1,000 units)	582 2,000
3.	Applications Reserved in 2011 – Not Allocated	1,779
	UNRESTRICTED TOTAL:	

4. 2013 Regional Commitment (Restricted):

RESTRICTED TOTAL	20,447 people
Post-2013 Regional Commitment (Restricted):	8,070
Uncommitted 2011 Capacity	2,937
Block 40 / 47 Assignment (600 units)	2,040
	4,000
LEED Building Applications (1,700 units)	3,400
	Uncommitted 2011 Capacity

City's available capacity to YDSS maintains adequate supply for development applications

Based on the above noted reconciliation, the City's available unrestricted capacity to the York-Durham Sewage System is 5,381 persons equivalent (Refer to Items 1, 2 and 3 of Table 1). All infrastructure triggers have been met for this capacity. It is available for reservation or allocation to active development applications.

In addition, 20,447 persons equivalent of restricted capacity is available for assignment. Refer to Items 4 and 5 of Table 1.

City's commitment to reduce inflow and infiltration and water conservation continues

Ministry of the Environment (MOE) approval for the Southeast Collector Sewer is based on specific sustainability targets related to inflow and infiltration reduction and water conservation. Any Regional capacity commitments related to the Southeast Collector are conditional upon successfully achieving these targets.

Since April of 2010, staff has participated in a joint Regional / Local Water and Wastewater Steering Committee to establish a strategy by which the MOE sustainability targets can be achieved.

On March 21, 2011, staff provided a report to Priorities and Key Initiatives Committee on the Inflow and Infiltration Reduction / Water Conservation Strategies developed in collaboration with York Region and all area municipalities.

Also in March of 2011, a second staff report to Priorities and Key Initiatives Committee was presented on the Inflow and Infiltration Reduction Pilot Project currently underway by the Huntington Landowners Trustee (Block 61 Developers). Developers in Block 61 continue to undertake field monitoring work to identify inflow and infiltration (I/I) within the City's sanitary sewer system. The main objective of the pilot project is to identify and remediate extraneous sources of flow within the sewer system in exchange for servicing capacity.

The pilot project is progressing well. With over one year of monitoring data now collected, a presentation to City and Regional staff will be made this summer to identify key findings. Once the data has been reviewed and approved, the release of servicing capacity will be staged as field remediation work (to eliminate the sources of extraneous flows) is proven successful. Accordingly, staff will report back later this year to summarize the key findings of the I/I Pilot Project and to outline a streamlined allocation process for development applications within Block 61.

Key infrastructure projects to support growth are underway to address system constraints

Future Regional capacity commitments to local area municipalities will be subject to successful completion of specific Regional infrastructure projects. The triggers associated with Vaughan's current and future capacity commitments are identified in Attachment No. 7.

Attachment No. 7 provides a summary of key Regional wastewater priority projects, anticipated in-service dates for these works and resulting serviceable population. The information is based on current Regional forecasts to a planning horizon year of 2031. Staff will continue to work closely with York Region to ensure availability of capacity remains in step with short and long-term development projections.

Regional four year capacity supply is adequate to meet Vaughan's current needs

The distribution of capacity by York Region has been updated to meet each local municipality's demonstrated growth rate based on previous assignments of capacity and on subsequent building activity. Additional capacity will be recommended by the Region in 2013 with the objective of maintaining a minimum four year supply for each local area municipality. Staff has reviewed the Region's calculations and is satisfied that Vaughan's allotment of capacity is adequate to meet the City's short-term growth projections.

Kleinburg-Nashville Community to receive lake-based water supply and connection to York-Durham Sewage System

The Kleinburg-Nashville service area must be connected to the existing lake-based Regional Water Supply System and York-Durham Sewage System (YDSS) in order to service the planned growth within the Community.

The existing Kleinburg Water Pollution Control Plant (KWPCP) has recently been expanded to service a maximum population of 7,500 persons. Sewage servicing capacity for the balance of the planned growth will be diverted to the YDSS with a new sanitary sewer along Huntington Road connecting to the Woodbridge Service Area and a proposed pump station to convey flows to the Maple Service Area.

To connect the Community to a lake-based water supply, the construction of new Regional trunk watermain along Huntington Road (Rutherford Road to Nashville Road) and along Islington Avenue (Sunset Ridge to Bindertwine Boulevard) is underway and scheduled for completion this summer.

Based on this servicing scheme and on the construction progress of the new Regional infrastructure, York Region has advised the City that pre-sales of allocated units within the Kleinburg-Nashville Community may proceed.

Table 2 below reconciles the available servicing capacity to the Kleinburg Water Pollution Control Plant. In May of 2011 a balance of 2,771 persons equivalent was available and reserved for future development. This capacity was not used over the last year and remains available. Refer to Item 1 of Table 2. Also, 256 persons equivalent reserved in 2011 (Item 2 of Table 2) has reverted back to the City as these development applications did not proceed to final approval but will be recommended for reservation once again or allocation as part of this report. Items 3 and 4 of Table 2 identify the amount of capacity from the KWPCP service area to be reserved and allocated as part of this report. A breakdown of individual applications is included in Attachments No. 3 and 5.

A balance of 2,596 persons equivalent remains available for distribution. Refer to Table 2 below.

Accordingly, it is recommended this capacity be reserved for distribution to development applications within the KWPCP service area as required to facilitate intensification in the core and development within the approved Community Plan area.

TABLE 2 2012 AVAILABLE CAPACITY KLEINBURG-NASHVILLE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PLANT (KWPCP)

lten	/ Description		ing Capacity ons Equivalent)
1.	Remaining 2011 Capacity		2,771
2.	Reserved Applications in 2011 – Not Allocated	plus	257
3.	Proposed 2012 Allocation Schedule:	minus	(167)
4.	Proposed 2012 Reservation Schedule:	minus	(264)
	2012 BALANCE:		2,596 people

Capacity considerations to the proposed YDSS service areas within Kleinburg-Nashville Community are not represented in Table 2 above but have been considered in the YDSS section of this report.

Available capacity distributed to active development applications in accordance with City Protocol

On a move forward basis, and in consideration of the Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol, staff has completed a detailed status assessment of all active development applications City-wide such that new Allocation, Reservation and Assignment Schedules may be established to effectively distribute the City's current capacity.

From a planning approval status perspective, immediate consideration was given to those applications having Draft Plan of Subdivision or Site Development approvals in place. In sequential order of priority, consideration was also given to those applications that have the appropriate zoning in place for the intended use, followed by those that are Official Plan approved. Consideration was also given to those applications that represent infill development or completion of partially built communities.

Table 3 below provides a summary of the recommended 2012 distribution of capacity from the YDSS. A detailed breakdown of individual development applications recommended for Allocation, Reservation and Assignment is included in Attachments No. 3 to 6.

An administrative adjustment for draft plan of subdivision 19T-00V21 of 892 persons equivalent has been noted as Items 2 and 7 in Table 3 below. This application was allocated phase one capacity for 446 residential apartment units (892 persons equivalent from the Bathurst / Langstaff Collector capacity stream) in 2006. The development proposal is located within the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre and will proceed in phases. The current proposal envisions 5 residential high-rise towers qualifying as complex high-rise. Accordingly, an administrative change has been made to replace the 2006 allocation with capacity from the City's 2013 Regional commitment. This allows staff to more effectively manage allocation capacity by aligning development timing

with available capacity. This change will have no impact on timing for development approvals or building permit release.

TABLE 3 2012 DISTRIBUTION OF AVAILABLE CAPACITY - YDSS

ltem	/ Description		ing Capacity ons Equivalent)
1.	Unrestricted Capacity		5,381
2.	19T-00V21 Adjustment (from Bathurst / Langstaff) *	plus	892
3.	Proposed 2012 Allocation Schedule: (Attachment No. 3)	minus	(876)
4.	Proposed 2012 Reservation Schedules: (Attachments No. 4 & 5)	minus	(3,747)
	Unrestricted Uncommitted Balance:		1,650 people
5.	2013 Restricted Capacity		12,377
6.	Post-2013 Restricted Capacity	plus	8,070
7.	19T-00V21 Adjustment (to Southeast Collector) *	minus	(892)
8.	Proposed 2012 Reservation Schedule: (Attachments No. 4 & 5)	minus	(13,605)
9.	Proposed 2012 Assignment Schedule: (Attachment No. 6)	minus	(5,950)
	2013 Restricted Capacity Balance:		0 people

* Exchange of available unrestricted capacity for 2013 restricted capacity. Based on the Region's policy for complex high-rise developments building permits can be issued 36 months in advance of infrastructure triggers being met. The current infrastructure trigger is the southeast collector (Q4-2014).

Based on the recommended allocation, reservation and assignment schedules, 1,650 persons equivalent of unrestricted capacity remains available for future distribution.

In keeping with the City's protocol, and in order to maximize the efficient distribution of available capacity to high density and complex high-rise development applications, the proposed 2012 assignment schedule recommends that 13,605 persons equivalent be reserved for high density development applications. These include high density applications qualifying for the Region's Sustainable Development through LEEDs program and for transit oriented development particularly within the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre. Refer to Attachment No. 5.

In addition, it is recommended that 1,350 low density residential units (4,590 persons equivalent) be assigned to the Block 40/47 Trustee to allow for build-out of this block. An additional 400 low density units (1,360 persons equivalent) is recommended for assignment to the Helmhorst Investments Limited draft plan of subdivision 19T-03V13 in Block 12. It is expected these units will proceed to registration within the next 24 months.

In anticipation of the City's annual update report, eleven written requests for allocation have been received over the last few months. Each request has been formally acknowledged by staff and considered as part of the detailed review process associated with the preparation of this report. Two of the eleven requests could not be accommodated as there have been no formal development applications made by the applicants. The other nine requests have been recommended for allocation, reservation or assignment of capacity in accordance with the City's protocol.

Accordingly, it is recommended that applications identified on the Allocation, Reservation and Assignment Schedules included as Attachments No. 3 to 6 be committed servicing capacity in accordance with the City's protocol.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

In consideration of the strategic priorities related to Vaughan Vision 2020, the recommendations of this report will assist in:

- The pursuit of excellence in service delivery;
- Planning and managing growth and economic vitality; and,
- The demonstration of leadership and promotion of effective governance.

Specific Strategic Plan Initiatives applicable to the recommendations made in this report include Vaughan's corporate priorities to:

- Establish city-wide master phasing and servicing allocation plans;
- Provide annual update reports to Council; and
- Support and plan high capacity transit at strategic locations throughout the City.

This report is therefore consistent with the priorities previously set by Council and the necessary resources have been allocated and approved.

Regional Implications

There is an opportunity for better coordination of development information between the Region and local municipalities

Regional staff has identified the need for better coordination of development information between local municipalities and consistency amongst reporting and accounting methods. Staff has prepared annual update reports on available servicing capacity for many years. Vaughan's yearly update reports and associated information tracking tools have been referenced as a leading model for consideration by all local municipalities. Staff will continue to work with York Region to share information as required.

Regional staff engaged with local municipalities on growth forecasts and objectives, capacity needs, continued inflow and infiltration reduction and water conservation efforts

Adoption of the City's 'Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol' by Council has maintained consistency with Regional practices. Identification of the City's servicing capacity priority

schedules as included in Attachments No. 3, 4, 5 and 6 will ensure timely release of Regional development approval conditions. Accordingly, it is recommended that a copy of this report be forwarded to the Region of York.

Conclusion

Given the ongoing Regional limitations imposed on servicing capacity to all local area municipalities, the allocation, reservation and assignment of available capacity to development applications throughout the City must be effectively and strategically managed. The recommendations of this report will serve to implement the City's 'Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol' and to allow the orderly progression of development within established urban boundaries.

Staff will continue to work closely with York Region to ensure the City's future servicing capacity requirements will be met in a timely manner. Yearly update reports will be brought forward to Committee of the Whole to reconcile available and future capacity.

The City's post-2013 allocation capacity as assigned by York Region (8,070 persons equivalent), is dependent upon the anticipated in-service date for the Southeast Collector Sewer twinning project (currently estimated to be the fourth quarter of 2014).

Attachments

- 1. Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol
- 2. Allocation Capacity / Development Approvals Timeline
- 3. Allocation Schedule
- 4. Reservation Schedule (Page 1 of 2)
- 5. Reservation Schedule (Page 2 of 2)
- 6. Assignment Schedule
- 7. Key Infrastructure Capacity Triggers YDSS Service Area

Report prepared by:

Tony Artuso, Senior Engineering Assistant, Ext. 8396 Michael Frieri, Manager of Engineering Planning & Studies, Ext. 8729 Mauro Peverini, Manager of Development Planning, Ext. 8407

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL JANKOWSKI Commissioner of Engineering And Public Works JOHN MACKENZIE Commissioner of Planning

ANDREW PEARCE Director of Development / Transportation Engineering GRANT UYEYAMA Director of Development Planning



ATTACHMENT No. 1

SERVICING CAPACITY DISTRIBUTION PROTOCOL

(Revised May 10, 2011)

In this policy, Servicing Capacity means water supply and wastewater treatment capacity within the York Sewage Servicing System, York Water Supply System or the Kleinburg/Nashville Sewage Servicing System as distributed by the Region of York and allocated by the City of Vaughan. Council will be solely responsible for the allocation of water and wastewater servicing capacity to specific developments as defined by the Region of York. The approval of all development applications shall be subject to the availability of adequate municipal services, including transportation related infrastructure at both the local and regional level.

Allocation, reservation or assignment of servicing capacity by Council resolution, is specific to a proposed development application. In the event that a development application is closed, withdrawn, or significantly revised (thereby requiring a site specific Official Plan Amendment), any previous commitment of servicing capacity shall become null and void and shall not be transferable to the subject lands or to a subsequent application for the subject lands.

Development Approvals

Where the availability of servicing capacity is not dependent on the construction of specific regional or local infrastructure improvements, development applications shall be allocated capacity by Council resolution in conjunction with development approval.

Where the availability of servicing capacity is dependent on the construction of specific regional or local infrastructure improvements, Council may consider granting development approval approximately 18 months prior to the anticipated operational/in-service date for the related infrastructure, subject to the implementation of a Holding Symbol on the implementing Zoning Bylaw and a No-Sale Agreement. Development applications which generally meet this timeframe shall be reserved servicing capacity.

Allocation of Servicing Capacity Linked to Infrastructure Improvements

Where the availability of servicing capacity is dependent on the construction of specific regional or local infrastructure improvements, development applications shall be allocated servicing capacity by Council resolution in conjunction with the removal of the Holding Symbol and enactment of the applicable Zoning By-law for the subject lands. This may occur no sooner than 6 months prior to the anticipated operational/in-service date for the related infrastructure improvements, thereby allowing a previously approved development application to proceed to registration.

Allocation Priority Categories

Residential development applications shall be placed in a cue for allocation of servicing capacity based on the following priority categories, Reservation and Assignment.

The reservation and assignment of available and/or future servicing capacity to an active development application shall be prioritized with consideration for; status of planning approvals, anticipated timing of development, location and density of built form, environmental sustainability, and the availability of adequate local and regional infrastructure including transportation.

ATTACHMENT No. 1



RESERVATION of SERVICING CAPACITY

A development application shall qualify for reservation of servicing capacity where:

- It is demonstrated with reasonable certainty that the Draft Plan of Subdivision will proceed to registration, or in the case of a Site Development Application, that a Letter of Undertaking (or Site Plan Agreement, whichever is in effect) will be executed, within the next 12 months; and
- The City is satisfied that adequate municipal services and transportation related infrastructure, both at the local and regional level will be available to service the development upon occupancy; and
- 3. A minimum of two of the following conditions apply;
 - a. Official Plan Approved, or
 - b. Zoning Approved with or without a Holding Symbol, or
 - c. Represents infill development or completion of a partially built community.

Development applications shall be reserved servicing capacity by Council resolution for a period of 12 months. The reservation shall automatically be revoked after a period of 12 months in the event that the Draft Plan of Subdivision has not proceeded to registration, or in the case of a Site Development Application, that a Letter of Undertaking (or Site Plan Agreement, whichever is in effect) has not been executed.

Servicing capacity may be reserved by Council resolution regardless of its dependency on specific regional or local infrastructure improvements.

ASSIGNMENT of SERVICING CAPACITY

A development application shall classify for assignment of servicing capacity where:

- It is demonstrated with reasonable certainty that the Draft Plan of Subdivision will proceed to registration, or in the case of a Site Development Application, that a Letter of Undertaking (or Site Plan Agreement, whichever is in effect) will be executed, within the next 12 to 24 months; and
- 2. The City is satisfied that adequate municipal services and transportation related infrastructure, both at the local and regional level will be available to service the development upon occupancy; and
- 3. A minimum of two of the following conditions apply;
 - a. Official Plan Approved, or
 - b. Zoning Approved with or without a Holding Symbol, or
 - c. Represents infill development or completion of a partially built community, or
 - d. Geographically located within an area where the City strategically chooses to provide for deliberate growth.



ATTACHMENT No. 1

Servicing capacity may be assigned by Council resolution regardless of its dependency on specific regional or local infrastructure improvements. The assignment of capacity to specific developments may be amended at any time.

High Density / Complex High-Rise Developments

The timing for release of building permits for high-density and complex high-rise developments may be advanced as noted below, in order to implement these larger complex intensification projects and to accommodate a longer construction period.

- 1. For High-Density Developments Building Permits may be released up to 18 months prior to the completion of required Regional infrastructure; and
- For Complex High-Rise Developments (consisting of over 200 units and multiple levels of underground parking) – Building Permits may be released up to 36 months prior to the completion of required Regional infrastructure.

Accordingly, the timing for allocation of servicing capacity to such development applications may occur in conjunction with Site Plan Approval and consistent with the release of building permits.

Sustainable Development Through LEED[™] Program

If a development application meets all eligibility criteria required to participate in York Region's Sustainable Development Through LEEDTM Program, and formal confirmation has been issued by the Region of York identifying the allocation credit applicable to the specific application; the application may be reserved or allocated servicing capacity from the City's LEEDTM Reserve, thereby allowing the development to proceed with pre-sales and / or registration (final approval / building permit release) in a timely manner.



ALLOCATION SCHEDULE INMESTATION SCHEDULE <th colspa<="" th=""><th>TION SCHEDULE There construction The field of the f</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>ATTACHME</th><th>ENT No.</th><th>0. 3</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></th>	<th>TION SCHEDULE There construction The field of the f</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>ATTACHME</th> <th>ENT No.</th> <th>0. 3</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	TION SCHEDULE There construction The field of the f				ATTACHME	ENT No.	0. 3			
TRECTED CAPACITY - YDB35 TRECTED C	TRECTED CAPACITY - YDS3 TRECTED CAPACITY - YD				LLOCATIO	U U U	5				
No. No. No. No. Ma 1 1 1 1 1 Ma 2.5 1 1 1 1 1.3 2.5 1 1 1 1 1.3 2.5 1 1 1 1 1.3 2.5 1 1 1 1 1.3 2.5 1 1 1 1 1.3 2.5 1.5 3 1 1 1.3 2.5 1.5 3 1 1 1.4 1.5 2.5 1.5 3 1 1.4 1.5 2.5 3 1.5 1 1.4 1.5 1.5 3 1.5 1 1.4 1.5 1.5 3 1.5 1 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 </th <th>Non-output Non-output Non-out</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>UNRESTRICTED CA</th> <th>PACITY - YD</th> <th>33</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Non-output Non-out				UNRESTRICTED CA	PACITY - YD	33				
Mat P No No<	Image:	BLK				Constant of the	Manual States	没 很			
AG 21 PT PT<	Mat Pin Pin <td>26</td> <td>DA.11.070</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>- V</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	26	DA.11.070				- V				
2.8 1 3 9 Unrestricted Servicin Case: IV 13 13 0 13 13 0 12 PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDGS 13 295 B66 Unrestricted Servicin Case: IV PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDGS 13 295 B66 Unrestricted Case: IV PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDGS 13 13 Unrestricted Case: IV 14 PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDGS 13 Unrestricted Case: IV 14 14 PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDGS 13 Unrestricted Case: IV 14 <	2.5 1 2.5 10 10 10 1.6 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.8.2 0 1.8 1.7 1.7 1.7 PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDGS 1.8 1.7 1.8 1.7 PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDGS 1.8 1.7 1.8 1.8 PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDGS 1.8 1.7 1.7 PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDGS 1.7 1.7 1.7 PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDGS 1.7 </td <td>50</td> <td>DA.10.052</td> <td>Sandro Palezzo</td> <td>Site Plan Approved by ONE</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>191</td> <td>Urrestricted Servicing Category</td>	50	DA.10.052	Sandro Palezzo	Site Plan Approved by ONE				191	Urrestricted Servicing Category	
182 0 183 181 285 181 Caserty PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDS3 182 0 182 0 182 0 PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDS3 0 0 0 0 0 0 N Privation Construction 0 0 0 0 0 0 N Privation 0 0 0 0 0 0 Notation 0 0 0 0 0 0 Notation 0 0 0 0 0 0 Notation 10 10 10 10 10 10 Notation 10 10 10 10 10 10 Notation 10 10 10 10 10 10 Notation 10 10 10 10 10 Notation	182 173 123 187 174 422 PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS · VDS 182 Unrestricted Generity PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS · VDS 182 0.0 0.0 N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	403	197-06//04	Greentrooke Davetooments Inc.	Draft Pan Approved	25		6	0	Urrestheted Servicing Capacity	
PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDSS Biol Unmetricted Cepecity SUB-TOTAL PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDSS Image of the state of t	PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS · YDS: Biol Unrestricted Cepacity SUB-TOTAL PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS · YDS: Image: Static State	85	191-05/14	Remote Urreponents inc. Retess Keinburg inc.	Dratt Plan Acoroved Dran Plan Acoroved	124		12 2	187	Urrestricted Servician Capacity Investments Servician Descripto	
PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDSS PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDSS PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDSS PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDSS Pacific Pacific Pacifi	PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDSS PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS -								A R R	Investing the second	
N Province PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS. YDSS N Province Province	PACITY CONSENT APPLICATIONS - YDS3 1 3										
N. P. S. M. Proposition of Market Provided Resonance Services Market Provided Resonance Services I. B. P. Service Team I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. P. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. Service Service Comments I. B. Service Service Comments I. Service Service Comments I. Service Service Comments <	N. P. S. M. S. M.				NRESTRICTED CAPACITY CON	SENT APPLI	CATIONS - YDS	s			
Normality Normality 1 1 1 1 1 1 </td <td>Production Constrained 1 1 1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>N. 312 V.V.</td> <td></td> <td>N. C. S. S.</td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Production Constrained 1 1 1				N. 312 V.V.		N. C. S. S.	1.0			
II I Jurraticed Servicing Canacity 1 3 Unraticued Servicing Canacity 1 10 Unraticued Canacity SuB-10TAL 1 10 Unraticued Servicing Canacity 1 10 Unraticued Servicing Canacity 1 45 10 0 1 45 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	If I Jurgitiest Servicity Canely 1 3 Unstituted Servicity Canely 1 10 <	BLK	- A. I.			V-SYC PROP	DSED.UNITS COS	č∕da L		to active a fitter fructure / Contradits	
1 1 3 Unreathered Servicing Cancerby IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 3 Unreathched Capacity SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 Unreathched Capacity SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 Unreathched Capacity SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 Unreathched Capacity SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 1 1 IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 1 1 IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 1 1 IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 1 1 IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 1 1 IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 1 1 IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 1 1 IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 1 1 IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 1 1 1 IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIN	1 1 3 Unreathered Servicing Cancerby 1 3 0 0 3 Unreathered Servicing Cancerby IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 3 10 Unreathered Capacity SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 0 3 10 Unreathered Capacity SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 0 0 3 10 Unreathered Capacity SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP 0 0 0 10 0 <td< td=""><td></td><td>1111208</td><td></td><td>Content Approved</td><td>-</td><td></td><td>-</td><td>m</td><td>Unresticed Servicing Case(IV</td></td<>		1111208		Content Approved	-		-	m	Unresticed Servicing Case(IV	
1 3 Unrestricted Schedy Sub-TOTAL 13 0 0 3 10 Unrestricted Schedy Sub-TOTAL 18G - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KNPCP 10 Unrestricted Sched Schedy Sub-TOTAL 1 13.5 Mass Schedy	1 3 Unrestricted Schedy Conecty 1 3 0 0 3 10 Unrestricted Capacity SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KNPCP 10 Unrestricted Capacity SUB-TOTAL 1 UNR Extra Canacity Extra Capacity SUB-TOTAL 1 1 1 UNP Extra Capacity SUB-TOTAL Extra Capacity SUB-TOTAL 1 1 1 1 UNP Extra Capacity SUB-TOTAL Extra Capacity SUB-TOTAL 1	-	B034/11		Consent Approved	-		1	3	Unrestricted Servicing Cenecity	
3 0 0 3 10 Unrestricted Capacity SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XMPCP Insertic constraints Insertints Insertic constrain	3 0 0 3 10 Unrestricted Capacity SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP IRG IRG SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP IRG IRG SUB-TOTAL IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP IRG IRG IRG IRG IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP IRG IRG IRG IRG IRG IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO XWPCP IRG	1	6032/11		Carteau Acororad		-		**	Un esticted Scriding Cauectry	
IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KWPCP NAME APPLICATIONS TO KWPCP NAME APPLICATIONS TO KWPCP NAME APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KWPCP NAME APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KWPCP NAME APPLICATIONS TO KWPCP NAME	IRG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KWPCP NAME APPLICATIONS TO KWPCP NAME APPLICATIONS TO KWPCP NAME APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KWPCP NAME APPLICATIONS TO KWPCP NAME APPLICATIO						0		10	Unrestricted Capacity SUB-TOTAL	
Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine <t< td=""><td>Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>UNRESTRICTED</td><td>APACITY KLEINBURG - NASHY</td><td>ILLE APPLIC</td><td>ATIONS TRIBU</td><td>TARY TO</td><td>KWPCP</td><td></td></t<></td></t<>	Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine Marcine <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>UNRESTRICTED</td><td>APACITY KLEINBURG - NASHY</td><td>ILLE APPLIC</td><td>ATIONS TRIBU</td><td>TARY TO</td><td>KWPCP</td><td></td></t<>			UNRESTRICTED	APACITY KLEINBURG - NASHY	ILLE APPLIC	ATIONS TRIBU	TARY TO	KWPCP		
Convertised Conv	Bits State Main				1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	HOMA CE CO	Alfaction of				
018 45 0 0 45 45 0 0 0 45 Grand Total 343 1.6	MB 45 46 45 45 45 46 45 46 45 46 45 46 46 45 46 45 46 46 46 45 46<	BLK	File No.		これなどないというの	にあると言葉に	R. Lounds An	1 CURLER	1 Population	\$	
45 0 0 45 Grand Total 343 1.0	45 0 0 45 45 14 45 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	(telriburg	197-84076	Bartley Developments Inc.	Dreft Plen Approved by OMB	45		45		Urreatricked Servicing Capacity	
Grand Total 343 1.0	Grand Total 343 1.6	İ					0		167	Unrestricted Capacity SUB-TOTAL	
Grand Total 343	Grand Total 343										
01ES: Six rifera to Sias Pari Aperoval. Di Pratiars to Official Pari. 201. refea to Ziarko. 201. refea to Ziarko.	OTES: SPA refers to Deal Plan Agenoral DPA refers to Deal Plan Agenoral On refers to Donello Mancteal Board On refers to Oriento Mancteal Board Officiences part unit (con recursioned, series & London, 2002 Revense - Nachweb reserves ther (con recursioned and series & London)					Gran	id Total	343	1,042		
A SYA MINES D SSA FAM APONAL De Tratiers Do Gifsul Pan. 20. refers to Circuit Pan. 20. refers to Zoning. 0. De Tratiers Amondal Band.	DPA reties to Date Para Actoronal DPA reties to Date Para Actoronal Con refera to Conscient Para Actoronal Con refera to Chianto Ikanectosi Board ORE rekens to Chianto Ikanectosi Board Arekense - Nest-Nest Activentia et referens storeta, asemis 48, 2050.	OTES:								<u> </u>	
OP refers to GReal Pan. Zon, refers to Zaring. . ORE refers to Zaring. . ORE refers to Zaring.	OP retears to GRead Ran. Zon, refers to Zoning. 2004. refers to Zoning. ONE refers to Consciond Statutes and a 3 stort, a postmons of 2 Opcu. Areborar - Nechwer test reports a refersa i storts, and a 3 stort, and consciond a 2 Opcu.	COA met	sta to Sta Plan Appro sta h Draf Staa Appro	v.2V 							
Zon refers to Zoning. ONE refers to Zoning Marciol Board - One marked to rear source a server it was \$7.3 km a partments \$7.3 (not.	Zon refers to Zueiro. OKE refers to Charlos MarceloBoard Prescue seu ruice for charles storget, serrité & tennes (§ 2.0pcu, sontronts (§ 2.0pcu. Kreichter - Nechner enstroer per unit (cou) excitement series a senie & lones (§ 2.0pcu.	OP relet	s to Official Plan.								
Cher Refers to America Marchael Board.	. ONEI refers to Cheino Marceol Board. Precore per un fiction (concerned for storbest, servite & terms \$3,5000, apartments \$2,2000. Krechter - Nechter ersters per until (con) excitentia is fictions, servit and \$3,5000, exercitentis \$2,8000.	. Zon, refe	va lo Zening.	والمحتمد والمحتمد والمحتمد والمحتمد والمحتم والمحتم والمحتم والمحتمين والمحتم والمحتم والمحتم والمحتم والمحتم والمحتم							
	Kredone - Nichride betreiten in kredonen in fredering fredering in die State	ONE RY	ers to Onlario Munck	sel Board. Moi es feñtus : stortes - sante E futus - 612 47011 - stantants - 620							

2102 4000

Allocation Schedule

Attacteded No. 3

			ATTACHI	ENT	No. 4				
		N L	EKVALION	ビ ビ ン	оспеиисе (1 01 Z)		(7)		
			UNRESTRICTED CAPACITY - YDSS	APACITY-	YDSS				
ĐĩK	File No.	Contraction of Contra			Canol 1: Amaging to State				
СПУ	COUNCH	Chy of Verogran - Council Reserva	VN	8			300	U 020,1	1,020 Uneselded Servicing Capacity
				300	0 0	0	300	1,0201	1,020 Unrestricted Capacity SUB-TOTAL
			UNRESTRICTED CAPACITY - YD8S	APACITY-	YDSS				
BLK	F116 NO.	Description (Developer	Anna Santa Anna Santa Anna Santa	E Dens	Anna anna anna anna anna anna anna anna	A STREET	index (199		in the second
4	191-17-001	Kitamov of Davadoveratic Inc.	100 Port				ç		
; ; ;	D4.09.078	nited	SPA Received	8		182	182	1 PCC	Unit defaultion Servicing Grandony 11 Investment Statute for Constants
17	19T-11V002		Zoning, DPA & SPA Received		Ē		31	105/1	visiting Services Consider
MEC	19T-11V003	(ce	Zoning, DPA & SPA Received		12		71	241 []	241 Unrenticiad Servicing Capacity
8) (P	Z06.005	Royal Poe Harres (1968972 Ontario Inc.) D. Gatriete and Speet Instact	IOP, Zoning and SPA Required			8	8	<u>8</u>	Unrestricted Servicing Consciry
8	DA 69.071		OP, Zoning and SPA Received			8 5	85	102 10	Users score Sarvetra Canadra Users steled Sarvetra Canadra
ę	Z.08.039	Ciectino Holdings Limited	SPA Recured		02		70	238 U	restricted Servicing Capacity
	7 0A 078	Vince Lets (2245108 Ontario Inc.) Markert Ann Huttorit (no	OP, Zoning and SPA Regulated OP. Zoning and SPA Resided			12	<u>2</u> 2	415 U	415 Unrestituted Servicing Capacity 148 Il Insertituted Servicing Association
44	DA.12.039	Ravinas of telegran	SPA Required		13		13		44 Unrestricted Servicing Capacity
44	DA.11.071	1678575 Onterto Inc.	SPA Recuted			131	131	262 U	262 Unreathcred Servicing Capacity
¥	DA 07 000	Vista Parc Lintad	ISPA Reduied			88	88 24	178 U	78 Unreathctad Servicing Canadry
				38	0 307	680	980	2,533 U	Unrestricted Cepecky SUB-TOTAL
				-1-	TOTAL (1 o	of 2)	1,290	3.553	
					-		-		
NOTES: 1. SPA rote	HDTE6: 1. SPA milen to She Plan Acorded				******				
2. DPA rote	2. DPA rofers to Draft Pan Approval.	0v#i.							
3. 0P refer	 OP refers to Official Plan. Zvn refers to Zoritm 								
5. OMB rate	5. OMB raters in Ontario Muncipal Board	al Board.							
8. Parona	per unit (ppu) equiva	 Parson per util (ppu) benéralert az fizikows: síngles, santis & taonis (3.3.4.ppu, apariments (5.2.0.ppu) Vicinia North Bartinett and Santis Science of Santis Science and S Santis Science and Santis Science Science and Santis Science /li>	Apri, spárimentis (§ 2.0ppu.						
1. S.C.W.	STATE LES SHALL IS AN A	and the second second second and the second second and the second s	Trivillary as causal male in						

Recording Schoolds

* on East large

2102 101
RESERVATION SCHEDULE (2012) SERVATION SCHEDULE (2012) SERVATION SCHEDULE (2012) SERVERIA CULTE ACTOR ALLET ACTOR	RESERVATION SCHEDULE (2012) SERVICE CONCULT UNCED DEFECTION SERVICE OFFICIALITY CONTINUES TO FILE SERVICE CONCULT UNCED DEFECTION Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Other Defection Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Other Defection Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Other Defection Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Other Defection Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Service is an interviewed bearer Serv	and the second sec]w]	ERVATION	CHED		10 40		
SERVICING COACTTY LANCED TO DRIVE VALLEY WORTH PAURE SYTTERA INTER SYTERA I	SERVICING CARACTTY LANCED TO PARE YALLEY NORTH PARE SYTORY AND WITTER SYTORY AND WIT	and a second			and the state of t		3		
And The And Th	Market Interest (Interest (Interest) Market Interest Market Interest (Interest) Market Interest Market Interes Market Interest <thma< th=""><th></th><th>SERVICING CAPACITY LD</th><th>KKED TO PINE VALLEY NORTH</th><th>PUMP STATION</th><th>AND WATER</th><th>SYSTEM</th><th>NPROVEN</th><th></th></thma<>		SERVICING CAPACITY LD	KKED TO PINE VALLEY NORTH	PUMP STATION	AND WATER	SYSTEM	NPROVEN	
OD VARY Christments Inc. Den Prime Aground Reported SY D D SY No SY No No <th< td=""><td>OD VARY Christment Inc. OPEN Previous Manual Regiment S <</td><td></td><td>1 State 1 State</td><td></td><td>Propo</td><td>2</td><td>16 1 11 41 5 2</td><td>Providence</td><td>boji indictionation (commute)</td></th<>	OD VARY Christment Inc. OPEN Previous Manual Regiment S <		1 State		Propo	2	16 1 11 41 5 2	Providence	boji indictionation (commute)
SETRACTED CAPACITY - YDSS - SOUTHEAST COLLECTOR MIPPONEMENTS (04 - 2814) RESTRACTED CAPACITY - YDSS - SOUTHEAST COLLECTOR MIPPONEMENTS (04 - 2814) Restraction Ammental ataat Ataat Ataat Ataat Ataat Ataat Ataat Ataat Ataat Ataa Ata	State State <th< td=""><td></td><td>Kaet n Dooveau</td><td>Draft Plan Agenual Required</td><td>57</td><td>and the second sec</td><td>31</td><td>¥.</td><td>Poe Valey Horth Pung Staton & Water Syl Jaminy.</td></th<>		Kaet n Dooveau	Draft Plan Agenual Required	57	and the second sec	31	¥.	Poe Valey Horth Pung Staton & Water Syl Jaminy.
RESTRICTED CAPACITY - YDSS - SOUTHEAST COLLECTOR MIPPROVEIRENTS (OL - 2014) Restriction Restrict	RESTRUCTED CAPACITY - YDSS - SOUTHEAST COLLECTOR MIPPROVEINENTS (Col 2014) Motion (Denvice Motion (Denvice Defon (Owner (Denvice Amma Bateri Sec. 75% Feed Feed Defon (Owner (Denvice Amma Bateri Sec. 75% Feed Feed Feed Defon (Owner (Denvice Amma Bateri Sec. 75% Feed Tobe Sec. 75% Feed					0			Unresticted Capacity SUB - TOTAL
Observation Administ Adminis Administ Administ	Control Dention Control De	лан алан алан алан алан алан алан алан		CAPACITY - YDSS - SOUTHEAS	T COLLECTOR	MPROVEMEN	TS (04 - 1	11)	
Markenselier Ceere / Ingrit Tree Accol	Marketilen Ceere / Ingrit Treezer / Ingrit Treezer Accol		Owner (Devidence)			aunts Fair Ann		, and the second se	Riverso) and drawing by box
Projecter/Tragent Project 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 2,200 1,200 <td>Projecter/Income 1,000</td> <td>VMC/10</td> <td>VERTONATO</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>34</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Southeast Columns Sever Works</td>	Projecter/Income 1,000	VMC/10	VERTONATO			34			Southeast Columns Sever Works
Observenture OP: Zewen end SNA Negated Leg <	Observents Nr. Or. Zeven ed SA Nagrated 422 423 424 774 774 774 774 1 Answin Plaus Ic. SPA Negared SPA Negared 1 311 325 311 325 Answin Plaus Ic. SPA Negared SPA Negared 1 4 311 325 Answin Plaus Ic. Diversities SPA Negared 0 0 14 5(717) 5(79) 131 Answin Plaus Undest Relation SPA Negared 0 0 14 5(79) 131 Answin Plant Icentione Undest Relation SPA Negared Receiverstures relation Receiverstures relation 14 14 14 Anstrum Lastree Level State of the State of	1660	York Reserved Druggers			11			Southeast Collector Server Works
Conserversion Conserve	Otherements Lie, (Pricediticy) Op/Ansignation Op/Ansignation Int Trial Tria	industrue of the	Libery Developments Inc. (Thermite)	OP, Zoom and SPA Peorined		*			Consiss Histofee - Within 38 Month Resultation
Arthenelles Sex.Nequered 11 245 Arthenelles 0 14 6.731 13 UNRESTRUCTED Ownerstructed Native structure Native structure 14 Ownerstructed Sas Native structure 14 0 14 Ontext University Ontext Structure 0 14 17 Ownersity 0 14 0 14 Operation 0 14 0 14	Attrant/Insale. Stylepters St		(Jerry Developments Inc. (Woodwidys)	OP. Zoning and SPA Regimed	- Control				Constitut High that - Within 36 Month Restriction
UNRESTRUCTED CAPACITY N.E.INBURG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KMPCP UNRESTRUCTED CAPACITY N.E.INBURG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KMPCP Match / Demin / Reference Revolves0ularity Revolves0ularity Revolves0ularity Revolves0ularity <td>Mindestration March Strate Constraint Co</td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td>SPARegared</td> <td></td> <td>to a c</td> <td></td> <td>AU POLICIAN DOMESTIC</td> <td>Contract Horney - WWAN 38 North RESPECTION</td>	Mindestration March Strate Constraint Co	_		SPARegared		to a c		AU POLICIAN DOMESTIC	Contract Horney - WWAN 38 North RESPECTION
UNRESTRUCTED CAPACITY KLEINBURG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KNPCP UNRESTRUCTED CAPACITY KLEINBURG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KNPCP Addita I Dennie (Reneare Addita I Dennie (Reneare Addita I Dennie (Reneare I T OTAL Addita I Dennie (Reneare I T OTAL Addita I Dennie (Reneare I T OTAL	UNRESTRUCTED CAPACITY KLEINBURG - MASHVILLE APPLICATIONS TRIBUTARY TO KNPCP Contraction of the second	ланаралсии салана славовата у кото салан станици в манерал. Контаралсии слава славовата у И.У. Зала М. салан Химиникими				¥	7 6.791		Restricted Capacity SUB - TOTAL
Molecularity Reconstruction Reconstru	Model / Demark Reveals Reconserutions Reconserutions <th< td=""><td>and the second se</td><td>UNRESTRICTED</td><td>CAPACITY KLEINBURG - MASH</td><td>WILLE APPLICA</td><td>TIONS TRIBU</td><td>TARY TO</td><td>WPCP</td><td></td></th<>	and the second se	UNRESTRICTED	CAPACITY KLEINBURG - MASH	WILLE APPLICA	TIONS TRIBU	TARY TO	WPCP	
Consistence See Demicration (Consistence) AT AS	Construction See Dem/Construction CI		Decolution IC			47.34	Tour I	Pesetiteiso	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
47 0 9 45 82 10 1 1 1 1 11 10 1 1 1 11 10 1 1 1 11 10 1 1 1 11 10 1 1 1 11 10 1 1 1 11 10 1 1 1	47 0 9 45 82 101 101 1 1 1 1 11 101 1 1 1 1 1 1 11 10 1 <			Sta Pan Azorved IN ONE	5	A QUANTIA ANY INC.			тельно таких и на нали и от 2000 година, по водина и от 2000 година до на колологи и селото и полното и по от такиет в на на типе и по боли и по боли и по во таке раке од докалосто по до колосто у челот По полосто у че от на полното на типе и по боли и по боли и по во таке раке од докалосто по до колосто у челот По полосто у че от к
IOTAL (2 of 2) 6,840 GRAND TOTAL 8,230 1 1 1	IDDE IDDE IDDE ISOMAL ISOMAL <thisomal< th=""></thisomal<>							264	Unrestricted Capacity SUB - TOTAL
GRAND FOTAL & 2.30 (1 of 2 + 2 of 2) 1	Image: Second Se Second Second Seco				TOTA	L (2 of 2)	6,940		
		And the Andrew	nie de Annuel VII Webert IV met de Anterne (1990) en general en angemen par an anterne (1990) en anterne (1990) Proposition (1990) en anterne (1990) en general en anterne (1990) (1990) en anterne (1990) en anterne (1990) en	n m = 1 () > >> () >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>	GRA	ID TOTAL	8,230	5 F	
1. 24. refer to Sar Plan Agrowit. 2. Colviende to Ond Plan Accord. 1. Or refers to Onder Plan. 5. Out inder to Doneb Worther Buket.	 Star refer to Scar Plan Agronk. Call Heart to Carl Fash Agronk. Star refer to Scar Star Aground. Star refer to Scar Star Lan refer to Scar Star Star refer to Scar Star Star refer to Scar Star Star Star Star Star Star Star Star Star Star Star Star Star Star Star Star Star <li< td=""><td>koten:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>(7 10 7 17</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></li<>	koten:				(7 10 7 17			
 Creders & Oricel Par. Zan release 12 a Dev. Zan release 12 co-MN Marget Barat 	 Consider to Oricel Pari. Caloring and Decomposition of Constraints (Constraints) (Constr	1. SPA mint to Sta Plan. 2. CPA mint to Drift Plan.	carrow. Acaronal	y James dana yang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang	NAME AND ADDRESS OF DESIGNATION OF DESIGNATION OF		and a second	ann durch della starato	
 Otol risks to Dearly Marcey Based 	 Child Heller ID Checkel Bound. A Properties of Marceler Biology, and I. Rumin (B.2.4) (Co. Section 2012) (S.2.10). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and I. Rumin (B.2.4) (Co. Section 2012) (S.2.10). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and I. Rumin (B.2.4) (S. 2.10). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and I. Rumin (B.2.4) (S. 2.10). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and I. Rumin (B.2.4) (S. 2.10). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and I. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and I. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and I. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A. Rumin (B.2.4). A Properties of Marceler Biology, and A.	1. D? refers to Official Part 4. Zen refers to Zedra	на на на прила при при прила при						
	 Arrystic for the first other at shows: since it turns if all other attractions in a statement of the statement o	A. OUS MAY IS ONIA'S	teropel Boued.	a yanan ya waana ayoo ayoo garaa dadamaanaa waxaa madaa ahaa ahaa ahaa ahaa ahaa ahaa a	1004 VIEW COMPANY CONTRACTOR OF COMPANY	ALCONTRACTOR OF COMPACT VALUES OF COMPACT. VALUES OF COMPACT VALUES OF COMPACTA	Promision water and a start	STORE AND INCOME.	У ПРИМАТИСЬ И И ЛИКИ И И И И И И И И И И И И И И И

2102 MPC

Reservation Schedule

Allers's event the A

ATTACHMENT No. 6 ACCLONMENT COLEDILE	ASSIGNMENI SCHEDULE	RESTRICTED CAPACITY - YDSS + SOUTHEAST COLLECTOR IMPROVEMENTS (QA - 2014)	PROPOŠED UMTS Troin	BLK File No. Description / Owner / Developer Approval Status 3ing Sensi Town Aprix Units Population Required infrastructure / Comments	BLOCK 4047 Block 40 / 47 Developers Group for, Phase 11 Block Plan Approval Pending 1 (1350 1 1350	Trustee (holudes 660 units from 2011 Assignment)			1.750 0 0 0 1.750 5.950 Restricted Capacity SUB - TOTAL			GRAND TOTAL [1,750] 5,950	MOTES:	. SPA refers to SNe Plan Approval.	2. DPA refers to Draß Plan Approval.	OP raties to Official Plan.	. Zon refers to Zoning.	2				Persons per unit (ppu) aquivalent as follows; sholles, semis & towns f	No. 6 HEDULE FOURTRIPEOVEMENTS (CA - 2014) TOWNTS TOWN ADDR UNITS TOWN ADDR UN	MENT NT SCI Sing Sami 1,750 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	ATTACH ASSIGNMEN ED CAPACITY - YDSS-SOUTHE Boot Plan Approvel Pending Boot Plan Approvel Rects. Zording & Dratt Plan Approvel Rects.	iption / Owmer / Developer 40 / 47 Developers Group Inc. 9 / Includes 600 units from 20 orst Investments Limited	File No. Fil	BLK BLK 40.147 12 1. SPA refers 3. OPA refers 5. OMB refers 6. Persons pr
---	---------------------	---	------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---------------------------	--------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	---	--	--

,

Aun 2017

30.19

ATTACHMENT NO. 7

Key Infrastructure Capacity Triggers **YDSS Serviced Area****



Slide 1

Area Municipal CAOs - February 24, 2012

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE - MAY 10, 2011

SERVICING CAPACITY ALLOCATION STRATEGY - ANNUAL UPDATE CITY-WIDE

Recommendations

The Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works and the Commissioner of Planning, in consultation with the City Manager, recommend:

- 1. THAT the revised 'Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol' and 'Allocation Capacity / Development Approvals Timeline' included as Attachments No. 1 and No. 2 respectively, be adopted by Council;
- That Council pass the following resolutions with respect to the ALLOCATION of servicing capacity to specific development applications in accordance with the Allocation Schedule included as Attachment No. 3:

"IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT development applications described by file numbers 19T-05V10, 19T-06V04, 19T-06V07, 19T-07V04, 19T-07V06, 19T-06V14, DA.08.024, DA.10.067 and consent applications B005/10, B016/10, B020-022/10, B039/10, B059/10 and B011/11 are allocated servicing capacity from the York Sewage Servicing / Water Supply System for a total of 2,781 persons equivalent (as detailed on the Allocation Schedule included as Attachment No. 3)"; and

- 3. That Council pass the following resolutions with respect to the RESERVATION of servicing capacity to specific development applications in accordance with the Reservation Schedules included as Attachments No. 4 and No. 5:
 - I) "IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT the development applications described by file numbers 19T-06V10, 19T-08V01, DA.09.089, DA.10.112, Z.06.035, Z.07.047, Z.07.050, Z.08.045, Z.08.048, Z.09.014, Z.09.040, OP.00.043 and Z.09.043 are reserved servicing capacity from the York Sewage Servicing / Water Supply System for a total of 3,421 persons equivalent (as detailed on the Reservation Schedule included as Attachment No. 4). This reservation shall automatically be revoked after a period of 12 months in the event that a Draft Plan of Subdivision has not proceeded to registration, or in the case of a Site Development Application, that a Letter of Undertaking (or Site Plan Agreement, whichever is in effect) has not been executed"; and
 - ii) "IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT the Block 61 Developers' Group Inc. (Block 61) Trustee is reserved servicing capacity from the York Sewage Servicing / Water Supply System for a total of 1,969 persons equivalent (as detailed on the Reservation Schedule included as Attachment No. 4). The distribution of this capacity is associated with the Inflow and Infiltration Reduction Pilot Project currently underway by Block 61; and
 - iii) "IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED THAT the development applications described by file numbers 19T-84076, 19T-03V02, 19T-08V04, 19T-08V05, and Z.07.031 are reserved servicing capacity from the Kleinburg-Nashville Sewage Servicing / Water Supply System for a total of 675 persons equivalent (as detailed on the Reservation Schedule included as Attachment No. 5). This reservation shall automatically be revoked after a period of 12 months in the event that a Draft Plan of Subdivision has not proceeded to registration, or in the case of a Site Development Application, that a Letter of Undertaking (or Site Plan Agreement, whichever is in effect) has not been executed".

- That servicing capacity for 1,020 persons equivalent be RESERVED from the York Sewage Servicing / Water Supply System for distribution to development applications at Council's discretion;
- 5. That servicing capacity be RESERVED in accordance with the Reservation Schedule included as Attachment No. 4 as follows;
 - i) 6,000 persons equivalent (3,000 apartment units) for specific Vaughan Metropolitan Centre and/or Transit Oriented Development applications; and
 - ii) 4,000 persons equivalent (2,000 apartment units) for LEEDs development applications; and
 - iii) 2,771 persons equivalent for distribution to development applications within the Kleinburg-Nashville service area as required to facilitate intensification in the core and completion of OPA 601 approved development areas; and
 - iv) 2,937 persons equivalent for future distribution to active development applications in conjunction with the City's next annual update report.
- 6. That servicing capacity for 2,040 persons equivalent (600 residential units) be ASSIGNED in accordance with the Assignment Schedule included as Attachment No. 6 to the Trustee for Block 40 / 47.
- 7. That an annual review of the City's available servicing capacity, and related development process and distribution protocol, be undertaken by staff and brought forward to a future Committee of the Whole meeting; and
- 8. That the City Clerk forward a copy of this report to the Region of York.

Contribution to Sustainability

The yearly distribution of servicing capacity to active development applications contributes to orderly and sustainable development.

The availability of future servicing capacity is linked to the City's active participation in the joint Regional and Local Municipal Inflow and Infiltration Reduction and Long Term Water Conservation Task Force. These efforts are consistent with the objectives of the City's Community Sustainability and Environmental Master Plan (Green Directions Vaughan, April 2009). The policies, decision making framework and implementation strategies related to the reduction of inflow and infiltration, water conservation, and the procurement of long-term servicing capacity will assist in the pursuit of:

- Sustainable growth and development;
- Minimizing energy consumption;
- The conservation and protection of our long term water supply;
- The creation of a City with sustainable built form; and
- Sharing sustainable best practices and ideas between and among municipal staff and the community.

Economic Impact

There are no immediate budgetary impacts resulting from the adoption of this report.

Communications Plan

This report will serve to inform and update the development industry with respect to the City's current position and priorities relating to development approvals and the distribution of servicing capacity.

Purpose ·

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an update on the status of available servicing capacity and to obtain Council direction with respect to the Allocation, Reservation and Assignment of the City's available servicing capacity.

Background - Analysis and Options

City Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol

On November 14, 2005, Council adopted the City's Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol as a means to distribute available servicing capacity to development applications in an effective and strategic manner.

The Protocol has provided staff and Council with an efficient tool for prioritizing the allocation of the City's existing and future servicing capacity. Implementation of the protocol has proven itself successful in ensuring:

- Efficient allocation of Regional servicing capacity supply;
- The prioritization of development applications based on specific qualifying criteria;
- Fairness and equity amongst all development interests throughout the City;
- That adequate local and regional infrastructure has been constructed; and,
- Consistency and cooperation with Regional initiatives.

To ensure infrastructure capacity is available at occupancy and to limit the premature sales of residential units, imposed restrictions on pre-sales and on final plan registration continue to be 12 months and 6 months respectively. This approach is reflected in the City's Protocol and continues to work well for low density residential developments (singles, semis and townhouses).

In order to accommodate longer construction periods for high density type developments and more complex hi-rise developments (greater than 200 units and with multiple levels of underground parking), Regional Council has endorsed the City's ability to release building permits for these types of developments up to 18 months (for high density) and 36 months (for complex high-rise) prior to the completion of specific infrastructure triggers.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the City's amended 'Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol' and 'Allocation Capacity / Development Approvals Timeline' included as Attachments No. 1 and No. 2 respectively, be adopted by Council. The amendments will align the City's protocol with current Regional initiatives and will assist in promoting higher density intensification forms of development.

Reconcillation of Available Servicing Capacity

The City's last annual update report on available servicing capacity was approved by Council on June 8, 2010. A detailed reconciliation of available servicing capacity has been conducted by staff which accounts for the development activity over the last year. The results of this review are outlined below.

Council's Discretionary Reserve

For a number of years, staff has recommended that a Council servicing capacity reserve be set aside for allocation to priority development applications that are identified during the year. Typically, Council's discretionary reserve contains capacity for approximately 300 residential units (1,020 persons equivalent). Over the last year, Council's total reserve remains un-changed from the 2010 reserve. Thus, the total of 300 units (1,020 persons equivalent) will be carried over to the proposed 2011 Council reserve, as outlined in Item 1 of Table 1 below. This capacity is unrestricted and available for allocation by Council in conjunction with the approval of applicable development applications.

Remaining Capacity for LEEDs Buildings and TOD

On June 8, 2010, Council reserved servicing capacity for development applications that qualify for York Region's Sustainable Development through LEEDs program, transit-oriented development (TOD) and consent/severance applications. Over the last year, these available capacity figures remained unchanged. As a result, the total number of available residential units remains unchanged from 2010 and have been carried over to 2011 as outlined in Item 2 of Table 1 below. This capacity remains unrestricted and available for allocation by Council in conjunction with the approval of applicable development applications.

2010 Reservation of Capacity

On June 8, 2010, Council reserved capacity to active development applications that were expected to proceed within one year. Three (3) of these applications did not proceed to site plan / draft plan approval. Based on a recent review by staff, it is anticipated that these applications will proceed to draft plan or site plan approval within the next twelve (12) months. Accordingly, the applications will be re-reserved capacity for an additional year. This capacity remains unrestricted and available for allocation by Council in conjunction with the approval of applicable development applications. Refer to Item 2 of Table 1 below.

Consent / Severance Applications

On June 8, 2010, Council assigned 15 units of capacity for severance applications. Over the past year, 8 new residential building lots have been created by way of Consent/Severance. Accordingly, it is recommended that the applicable development applications associated with these eight (8) units be allocated servicing capacity from the capacity that was set aside by Council specifically to facilitate Consent/Severance applications.

These development applications and associated unit counts are summarized in the Allocation Schedule included as Attachment No. 3 of this report. The available capacity for Consent / Severance applications is also identified in Item 2 of Table 1 below.

Uncommitted Capacity 2010

On June 8, 2010, Council assigned 2,338 persons equivalent (linked to the Duffin Creek Water Pollution Control Plant expansion works) to be held by the City for consideration and future distribution to active development applications in conjunction with the next City-wide annual update report. The expansion work to the Duffin Creek Water Pollution Control Plant is now complete. Accordingly, this capacity is now unrestricted and remains available for allocation by Council as identified in Item 3 of Table 1 below.

2011 Unrestricted Capacity - YDSS

Based on the above noted reconciliation, the City's current available unrestricted total capacity to the York Durham Sewage System (YDSS) is 11,791 persons equivalent (Refer to Items 1, 2 and 3 of Table 1 below). All Regional infrastructure triggers have been met for this capacity and it is available for distribution to active development applications.

TABLE 1 2011 AVAILABLE SERVICING CAPACITY - YDSS

Item / Description	Servicing Capacity (Persons Equivalent)
1. Council Reserve Capacity (300 units)- 2010 Update	1,020
2. Committed / Unused Capacity - 2010 Update	
1,180 Units - LEED Applications	2,360
2,800 Units - Transit Oriented Development Applications	5,600
Consent / Severance (15 units)	51
Reserved in 2010 Not Allocated	422
3. Uncommitted Capacity – 2010 Update	2,338
UNRESTRICTED TOTAL:	11,791 people
4. 2013 Restricted Servicing Capacity: RESTRICTED TOTAL: (Southeast Collector, In-Service Q4 2014)	12,377 people

2013 Regional Commitment - Southeast Collector Trunk Sewer

On February 18, 2010, Regional Council endorsed a 2013 commitment of servicing capacity to the local municipalities. Vaughan's portion of the 2013 capacity assignment was established at 12,377 persons equivalent (Refer to Item 4 of Table 1 above). This capacity is linked to the anticipated in-service date for the new sanitary trunk sewer which will serve as a twin to the existing Southeast Collector Regional Trunk Sewer. The Individual Environmental Assessment (IEA) for the Southeast Collector Sewer twinning was approved by the Ministry of the Environment on March 11, 2010.

The Southeast Collector Sewer Twinning project is a joint infrastructure initiative between York and Durham Regions. The approved IEA Study was the culmination of more than five years of study. The new trunk sewer is expected to be in-service by the fourth quarter of 2014 and cost approximately \$546 million.

The sewer is necessary to meet the projected growth in both York and Durham Regions for the next 25 years and will provide needed backup support for rehabilitation of the existing Southeast Collector Trunk sewer. The approved sewer route is approximately 15 kilometres in length spanning large sections of both Markham and Pickering in York and Durham Regions. The majority of the sewer will be constructed using four Earth Pressure Balance Tunnel Machines

(EPBM) which are able to tunnel with minimal construction and groundwater related impacts.

MOE's approval for the Southeast Collector Sewer IEA is based on specific sustainability targets related to Inflow and Infiltration Reduction and Water Conservation. Accordingly, all 2013 capacity assignments to local area municipalities are conditional upon successfully achieving these targets.

Since April of 2010, staff has participated in a joint Task Force in order to establish a strategy by which the MOE sustainability targets can be achieved. Final strategy documents and detailed implementation plans were submitted to the MOE on March 31, 2011.

On March 21, 2011, staff provided a report to the Priorities and Key Initiatives Committee on the Inflow and Infiltration Reduction / Water Conservation Strategies that have been developed in collaboration with the area municipalities as endorsed by Regional Council on February 17, 2011.

Inflow and Infiltration Reduction Pilot Project

On March 21, 2011, staff provided a report to the Priorities and Key Initiatives Committee on the Inflow and Infiltration Reduction Pilot Project as proposed by the Huntington Landowners Trustee Inc. (Block 61 Developers' Group). In general, the developer is proposing to fund and undertake works that will identify inflow and infiltration within the City's sewer system, and will undertake remediation works as required in return for servicing capacity.

The development in Block 61 will require approximately 3,000 units of servicing capacity to provide for the full build out of the block. Based on a 2:1 ratio, the pilot project must identify a total of 6,000 units of capacity to reach this target.

In addition, staff have requested that the pilot project realize a further flow reduction equivalent to 800 units. It is anticipated that this additional 800 units will be provided to the City and may be allocated to active development applications within the City, regardless of catchment area, in accordance with the current Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol as approved by Council.

Given that development in Block 61 will be in a position to proceed with Phase 1 development before the pilot project has been completed, it is necessary to reserve servicing capacity for an initial phase of development in Block 61. The reservation of this capacity is expected to be returned to the City after the pilot project is completed. As such, it is recommended that the Block 61 Trustee be reserved Phase 1 capacity for a total of 579 residential units. Refer to Attachment No. 4.

Any capacity realized through the Block 61 Inflow and Infiltration Reduction Pilot Project is in addition to the City's current Regional assignment of 2013 capacity.

YDSS Capacity Beyond 2013

In 2010, Regional Council assigned capacity to local municipalities to permit a total serviced population up to 1,078,328 within the York Durham Sewage System and Peel diversion service areas. The distribution of this capacity is intended to facilitate growth to the end of 2013. Further, the capacity assignment is subject to construction completion of specific Regional infrastructure projects or triggers. The triggers associated with Vaughan's current and future capacity assignment are identified in Attachment No. 7.

Attachment No. 7 provides a summary of key Regional priority projects (or triggers) applicable to Vaughan, the anticipated in-service dates for these works and resulting serviceable population at a Regional scale. This information is based on current Regional forecasts to a planning horizon year of 2031. Staff will continue to work closely with the Region to ensure the availability of capacity remains in step with development planning projections over the long term.

Kleinburg-Nashville Servicing Capacity

York Region has advised that the anticipated in-service date for expansion works currently underway at the Kleinburg-Nashville Water Pollution Control Plant (KWPCP) and the construction of the new Regional trunk watermain along Huntington Road (Rutherford Road to Nashville Road), and along Islington Avenue (Sunset Ridge to Bindertwine Boulevard), and the water booster station have been delayed. The new estimated completion date for these works is the second quarter of 2012. Accordingly, it is expected that the pre-sale of units associated with servicing allocation capacity in Kleinburg-Nashville may not occur prior to the second quarter of 2011 with registration beginning six (6) later (or six (6) months prior to the in-service date of the proposed infrastructure). Refer to Attachment No. 2. It is expected that the City will be notified in writing by York Region once these trigger dates have been achieved.

Based on the preferred wastewater servicing alternative for the City's on-going Kleinburg-Nashville Servicing Strategy Master Plan Class Environmental Assessment Study, servicing capacity previously allocated to Lake Rivers Inc. (File 19T-05V10) and Molise Kleinburg Estates Inc. (File 19T-06V14) totaling 818 persons (221 residential units @ 3.7 persons per unit) from the KWPCP can now be re-allocated from the York / Durham Sewage System (YDSS). Accordingly, 818 persons can be assigned to active development applications tributary to the Kleinburg-Nashville Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP). These lands are now anticipated to be serviced by the York-Durham Sewage System via the Huntington Road sanitary sewer. Given that the draft plan of subdivision applications were previously allocated to the Kleinburg-Nashville WPCP an equivalent number of units / population equivalent will be replaced with allocation from the YDSS as Identified in the Allocation Schedule (Attachment No. 3).

Five (5) applications are included in the Reservation Schedule (Attachment No. 5) based on their approval status and anticipated timing of draft plan / site plan approval. A total of 675 persons equivalent is proposed for reservation from the KWPCP. Table 2 below provides a summary of the available capacity to the Kleinburg-Nashville WPCP and its proposed distribution.

TABLE 2 2011 AVAILABLE SERVICING CAPACITY – KLEINBURG-NASHVILLE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PLANT (WPCP)

Item	/ Description	Servicing Capacity (Persons Equivalent)
1.	Remaining 2010 Capacity	2,461
2.	Regained Capacity Previously Allocated To WPCP Application File No. 197-05V10 – Lake Rivers Inc. (145 units) Application File No. 197-06V14 – Molise Kleinburg Estates Inc. (76 units)	537 281
	Remaining 2010 Reservation Application File No. 197-84076 – Berkley Developments Inc. (45 units)	167
	2011 TOTAL RESTRICTED: (Q2 2012)	3,446 people
3.	Proposed 2011 Reservation Schedule:	(675)
	2011 RESTRICTED BALANCE: (Q2 2012)	2,771 people

After considering the proposed reservation of capacity to the KWPCP, a balance of 2,771 persons equivalent remains available for distribution. Accordingly, it is recommended that this capacity be reserved for distribution to development applications within the Kleinburg-Nashville service area as required to facilitate intensification in the core and completion of OPA 601 approved development areas.

Proposed Allocation, Reservation and Assignment Schedules

On a move forward basis, and in consideration of the 'Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol' (as amended), City Development Engineering and Development Planning staff has completed a detailed status assessment of all active development applications City-wide such that new Allocation, Reservation and Assignment Schedules may be established to effectively distribute the City's current servicing capacity.

From a planning approval status perspective, immediate consideration was given to those applications having Draft Plan of Subdivision or Site Development approvals in place. In sequential order of priority, consideration was also given to those applications that have the appropriate zoning in place for the intended use, followed by those that are Official Plan approved. Consideration was also given to those applications that represent infill development or completion of partially built communities.

Table 3 below provides a summary of the proposed 2011 distribution of capacity from the YDSS.

ltem	/ Description	Servicing Capacity (Persons Equivalent)
1.	Unrestricted Capacity	11,791
2.	Proposed 2011 Allocation Schedule: (Attachment No. 3)	(2,781)
3,	Proposed 2011 Reservation Schedule: (Attachments No. 4 & 5)	(9,010)
	Unrestricted Balance:	0 people
4.	2013 Restricted Capacity	12,377
5.	Proposed 2011 Reservation Schedule: (Attachments No. 4 & 5)	(7,400)
6.	Proposed 2011 Assignment Schedule: (Attachment No. 6)	(2,040)
	2013 Restricted Capacity Balance:	2,937 people

TABLE 3 2011 DISTRIBUTION OF AVAILABLE SERVICING CAPACITY - YDSS

Based on the proposed allocation, reservation and assignment schedules, 2,937 persons equivalent of restricted 2013 capacity remains available for future distribution.

In keeping with the City's protocol and in order to maximize the efficient distribution of available capacity to high density and complex high-rise development applications, the proposed 2011 assignment schedule recommends that a total of 10,000 persons equivalent be reserved for specific high density development initiatives. These include high density applications qualifying for the Region's Sustainable Development through LEEDs program and for transit oriented development particularly within the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre. Refer to Attachment No. 5.

In addition, it is recommended that 600 low density residential units be assigned to the Block 40/47 Trustee to allow for Phase 1 development within this block. A revised Master Environmental / Servicing Plan has recently been submitted in support of the Block Plan application. Block Plan approval is expected this fall with draft plan of subdivision applications following shortly thereafter.

Accordingly, it is recommended that applications identified on the Allocation, Reservation and Assignment Schedules included as Attachment Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6 be committed servicing capacity in accordance with the City's protocol.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

In consideration of the strategic priorities related to Vaughan Vision 2020, the recommendations of this report will assist in:

- The pursuit of excellence in service delivery;
- · Planning and managing growth and economic vitality; and,
- The demonstration of leadership and promotion of effective governance.

Specific Strategic Plan Initiatives applicable to the recommendations made in this report include Vaughan's corporate priorities to:

- Establish city-wide master phasing and servicing allocation plans;
- Provide annual update reports to Council; and
- Support and plan high capacity transit at strategic locations throughout the City.

This report is therefore consistent with the priorities previously set by Council and the necessary resources have been allocated and approved.

Regional Implications

The proposed amendments to the City's 'Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol' will ensure consistency with current Regional practices.

Identification of the City's servicing capacity priority schedules as included in Attachment Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6 will ensure the timely release of Regional draft plan approval conditions. Accordingly, it is recommended that a copy of this report be forwarded to the Region of York.

Conclusion

Given the ongoing Regional limitations imposed on servicing capacity to all local area municipalities, the allocation, reservation and assignment of available capacity to development applications throughout the City must be carried out in an effective and strategic manner. The recommendations of this report will serve to implement the City's 'Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol' and to allow the orderly progression of development within established urban boundaries.

Staff will continue to work closely with the Region of York to ensure the City's future servicing capacity requirements will be met in a timely manner. It is anticipated that a yearly update report will be brought forward to the Committee of the Whole to reconcile the City's available and anticipated future servicing capacity.

The City's 2013 allocation capacity as assigned by York Region (12,377 persons equivalent), is dependent upon the anticipated in-service date for the Southeast Collector Sewer twinning project (currently estimated to be the fourth quarter of 2014).

Attachments

- 1. Servicing Capacity Distribution Protocol, May 10, 2011 Revision
- 2. Allocation Capacity / Development Approvals Timeline
- 3. Allocation Schedule
- 4. Reservation Schedule (Page 1 of 2)
- 5. Reservation Schedule (Page 2 of 2)
- 6. Assignment Schedule
- 7. Key Regional Infrastructure Capacity Triggers YDSS Service Area

Report prepared by:

Tony Artuso, Senior Engineering Assistant, Ext. 8396 Jennifer Cappola-Logulio, Water / Wastewater Engineer, Ext. 8433 Michael Frieri, Manager of Engineering Planning & Studies, Ext. 8729 Mauro Peverini, Manager of Development Planning, Ext. 8407

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Robinson, P. Eng. Commissioner of Engineering and Public Works John Zipay Acting Commissioner of Planning

Andrew Pearce, C.E.T. Director of Development / Transportation Engineering Grant Uyeyama Director of Development Planning

SERVICING CAPACITY DISTRIBUTION PROTOCOL

(Revised May 10, 2011)

In this policy, Servicing Capacity means water supply and wastewater treatment capacity within the York Sewage Servicing System, York Water Supply System or the Kleinburg/Nashville Sewage Servicing System as distributed by the Region of York and allocated by the City of Vaughan. Council will be solely responsible for the allocation of water and wastewater servicing capacity to specific developments as defined by the Region of York. The approval of all development applications shall be subject to the availability of adequate municipal services, including transportation related infrastructure at both the local and regional level.

Allocation, reservation or assignment of servicing capacity by Council resolution, is specific to a proposed development application. In the event that a development application is closed, withdrawn, or significantly revised (thereby requiring a site specific Official Plan Amendment), any previous commitment of servicing capacity shall become null and void and shall not be transferable to the subject lands or to a subsequent application for the subject lands.

Development Approvals

Where the availability of servicing capacity is not dependent on the construction of specific regional or local infrastructure improvements, development applications shall be allocated capacity by Council resolution in conjunction with development approval.

Where the availability of servicing capacity is dependent on the construction of specific regional or local infrastructure improvements, Council may consider granting development approval approximately 18 months prior to the anticipated operational/in-service date for the related infrastructure, subject to the implementation of a Holding Symbol on the implementing Zoning Bylaw and a No-Sale Agreement. Development applications which generally meet this timeframe shall be reserved servicing capacity.

Allocation of Servicing Capacity Linked to Infrastructure Improvements

Where the availability of servicing capacity is dependent on the construction of specific regional or local infrastructure improvements, development applications shall be allocated servicing capacity by Council resolution in conjunction with the removal of the Holding Symbol and enactment of the applicable Zoning By-law for the subject lands. This may occur no sooner than 6 months prior to the anticipated operational/in-service date for the related infrastructure improvements, thereby allowing a previously approved development application to proceed to registration.

Allocation Priority Categories

Residential development applications shall be placed in a cue for allocation of servicing capacity based on the following priority categories, Reservation and Assignment.

The reservation and assignment of available and/or future servicing capacity to an active development application shall be prioritized with consideration for; status of planning approvals, anticipated timing of development, location and density of built form, environmental sustainability, and the availability of adequate local and regional infrastructure including transportation.



RESERVATION of SERVICING CAPACITY

A development application shall qualify for reservation of servicing capacity where:

- It is demonstrated with reasonable certainty that the Draft Plan of Subdivision will proceed to registration, or in the case of a Site Development Application, that a Letter of Undertaking (or Site Plan Agreement, whichever is in effect) will be executed, within the next 12 months; and
- 2. The City is satisfied that adequate municipal services and transportation related infrastructure, both at the local and regional level will be available to service the development upon occupancy; and
- 3. A minimum of two of the following conditions apply;
 - a. Official Plan Approved, or
 - b. Zoning Approved with or without a Holding Symbol, or
 - c. Represents infill development or completion of a partially built community.

Development applications shall be reserved servicing capacity by Council resolution for a period of 12 months. The reservation shall automatically be revoked after a period of 12 months in the event that the Draft Plan of Subdivision has not proceeded to registration, or in the case of a Site Development Application, that a Letter of Undertaking (or Site Plan Agreement, whichever is in effect) has not been executed.

Servicing capacity may be reserved by Council resolution regardless of its dependency on specific regional or local infrastructure improvements.

ASSIGNMENT OF SERVICING CAPACITY

A development application shall classify for assignment of servicing capacity where:

- It is demonstrated with reasonable certainty that the Draft Plan of Subdivision will proceed to registration, or in the case of a Site Development Application, that a Letter of Undertaking (or Site Plan Agreement, whichever is In effect) will be executed, within the next 12 to 24 months; and
- The City is satisfied that adequate municipal services and transportation related infrastructure, both at the local and regional level will be available to service the development upon occupancy; and
- 3. A minimum of two of the following conditions apply;
 - a. Official Plan Approved, or
 - b. Zoning Approved with or without a Holding Symbol, or
 - c. Represents infill development or completion of a partially built community, or
 - d. Geographically located within an area where the City strategically chooses to provide for deliberate growth.



ATTACHMENT No. 1

Servicing capacity may be assigned by Council resolution regardless of its dependency on specific regional or local infrastructure improvements. The assignment of capacity to specific developments may be amended at any time.

High Density / Complex High-Rise Developments

The timing for release of building permits for high-density and complex high-rise developments may be advanced as noted below, in order to implement these larger complex intensification projects and to accommodate a longer construction period.

- 1. For High-Density Developments Building Permits may be released up to 18 months prior to the completion of required Regional infrastructure; and
- 2. For Complex High-Rise Developments (consisting of over 200 units and multiple levels of underground parking) Building Permits may be released up to 36 months prior to the completion of required Regional Infrastructure.

Accordingly, the timing for allocation of servicing capacity to such development applications may occur in conjunction with Site Plan Approval and consistent with the release of building permits.

Sustainable Development Through LEEDTM Program

If a development application meets all eligibility criteria required to participate in York Region's Sustainable Development Through LEEDTM Program, and formal confirmation has been issued by the Region of York identifying the allocation credit applicable to the specific application; the application may be reserved or allocated servicing capacity from the City's LEEDTM Reserve, thereby allowing the development to proceed with pre-sales and / or registration (final approval / building permit release) in a timely manner.



Africation Schedule

Attachment Na. 1

that you

R. (AS) File Na. Description (Current / Developmenter) BLN File Na. Description (Ormer / Developmenter) CITY COLONCIL CN of Vaughtan - Counted Assamination BLN File Na. Description (Ormer / Developmenter) BLN File Na. Description (Ormer / Developmental in: 200 00.003 00 00 100 NMIMER Acadimental in: 200 00.003 00 100 NMIMER Acadimental in: 200 00.003 00 100 NMIMER Acadimenter in: 200 00.003 00 NMIMER Acadimenter in: 200 00.003 00 NMIMER Acadimenter in: 200 00.003 00 NMIMER Acadimenter in: 200	ATTACHMENT No. 4	RESERVATION SCHEDULE (1 of 2)	UNRESTRICTED REGIONAL CAPACITY	Detertioned Detertioned Determined and the second states of the second s	City of Vaughan - Counct Reserve	300- 0 0 300 1. 1.020 Linestricted Capacity SUB-TOTAL	UNRESTRICTED REGIONAL CAPACITY	and the second	SAA Repaired 3 1 5 5	Converting CPA & SPA Revolved 1 31 131 131	CP, Zonng and SPA Recutation 109, Zonng and SPA Recutation 109, Zonno and SPA Recutation 100, Zonno and SPA Recutation	55A Revites	11 71 71 71 71 71 71 71 71 71 71 71 71 7	SPA Routred 5 9 3 5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Z.7411Uarestricted Capacity - SL	KLENBURG+ MASHVILLE-WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS (02 - 2013)	W. Cestigation Conver (Developer Cestigation Converting Cestigation Converting Cestigation Ces	(8) WHH BLOCK OF OPPEOSES GROUP ING. (Truskes) BODOK Plan Approved Parofing 579 579 1.849 (I Random Plan Parofin	573 0 573 1 569 Unrestricted Capacity SUB-TOTAL	TOTAL (1 of 2) 1.739 5.729	1 Part Approvel. 1 Part Approvel.		and Municipal Georg
					COLVICIE				CX 09.083 1173	1 200.043 [Cut	OP.07.008.2.07.047	OP.05 003 209 014 157	Z 10.032, DA.10.112 Wr	CP.05.013.2.03.030 No.				Book 61 West Block			1. SPA resers to Sele Pren Approval. 2. DPA refer to Craft Pran Approval.	ters to Zoning.	fors to Ontario Municipal Board

Reservation Schedule

C TANKARA

NAX PA

SERV SERVICE STATUS STATUS STATUS STATUS STATUS SERVICE STATUS STATUS STATUS STATUS STATUS SERVICE STATUS S				1 1 1 2	of 2)	ĺ	
15	SERVICING CAPACITY LINK	CITY LINKED TO PINE VALLEY NORTH PUMPING-STATION AND WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	MPING STATION A	ND WATER	SYSTEM II	APROVEM	EXTS
197-08V10 197-08V01		Service States	A Sun Sun Ten	2246 1 1		Population	Polycodation Revoluted Infrastructure / Comments
100,60,761	Mosex Priever Iso.	Craft Plan Approval Prequired	145	200 - 1 11 12 12 14	143	48	Absi Pres Vatley North Purpelog Station & Witner System (mp.
~~~	Mitmood Vester eves Inc.	Orath Plan Approval Required		50 and 1717 <b>1</b> 7 4	\$1	191	Pine Vitley Morth Purping Station & White System Into.
			500 500	0, , 0,	- 500	630	000 Unresticted Capacity - SUB - TOTAL
	SERVICIA	SERVICING CAPACITY LINKED SOUTHEAST COLL ECTOR SEWER (04-2014)	ASTCOLLECTOR SI	EWER (04	2014)		
	A Contraction of Cont	Accorded States	Bird Scale Land				statististististististististististististist
VMC/TCD Vaughe	Verghan Metropolisan Centre & Transc-Oriented Development			2,000	2,000	- 100,7	Southert Constar Sever Works
Vaugh	Vaughan Marropolitan Canter & Transh-Ofsmed Development			1 200	80	2.000	Un-restricted capacity
LEEDs Yark Re	York Report Program			1,700	1.700		Southeast Colinetar Sewer Works
17xt R	Tott Regional Program			8	8	8	Unvestmend carectly
			<u>।</u> । ।	0 5.000	ar 5,000	10,000	10.000 SUB -TOTAL
SERV	SERVICING CAPACITY LINKED TO RUENBURG W	NBURG WPCP EXPANSION AND WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM MPREOVEMENTS (ANTICIPATED IN SERVICE DATE Q2 2012)	UPPLYSYSTEM IMI	PREOVENE	TTS (ANT	CIPA TED	N-SERVICE DATE C2: 2012)
Land and the second s	States (1994) St	And	Sing Send Town	Jundy J. State		Instanded	argente internet and construction of the second
		Oraf Plan Approval Recured Oraf Flan Acoroval Recured	505 245		272 272	<u>1</u> 200	CA MPCP Exp. Water System Ing. Ex. Sen. Purneing Sin, Ing. CA WPCP Exp. Water System Ing. Fr. San. Purneing Sin, Ing.
101-03105 2 07.031 1 21-340/3	(Kleinni Eikana Inc. 110000 leinyoon Avenue & Jose and Fabio Aviani 12kvisey Devecoment inc.	Dark Plan Approved By OMB Sits Plan Approved by OMB Dark Flan Approved by OMB	в 45	45	e 2 2	885	(RAVACAS D.A., Name System med., 24, 5av. Purrjed, Sc. Inne. K.M. WECP D.D. Water System Inc., 24, 5av. Purrjed, Sci. Inc. K.M. WECP D.D., Water System Inc., 24, 5av. Purrjed, Sci. Inc.
			158 0	0 - 72	203	6751	675 Univestificted Capacity - SUB - TOTAL
			TOTAL (2 of	of 2)	5,403	11,355	
			GRAND TOTAL	DTAL	7,142	17,084	
			(1 of 2 + 2	2 of 2)			
refers to Site Plan Approval. Refers to Draft Plan Approval.	<ol> <li>SPA refers to Sile Flan Approvel</li> <li>DPA refers to Start Pain Approvel</li> </ol>						
र्मका 10 (130 को Puin. जोवन 10 टिलांग्रे,							
refers to Orderio Munchel Board. yns pie unit (aou) equiratent as fatt	र्यसम्बद्धाः स्टब्स्याय क्रम्याय की दि संटल्प, जन्मदियन्त्र हि 3.0	annata 🛱 2.19924					
<u>burg - Kastwite persons per unit (</u>	XLCE & SLADY & SALES SAFERS LACED IS LOWARD & (1994)	al starmark @ 3 open					

Reservation Schoole

Algebrand sig. ?

Huy 2011

ATTACHMENT NO. 6 ASSIGNMENT SCHEDULE	SERVICING CAPACITY LINKED SOUTHEAST COLLECTOR SEWER (Q4 - 2014)	al K. Pla No. Description (Devince) Devinces State	ELOCK 4047 Block 40/47 Block 40/47 Developers Group Inc. (Phase 1) Block Flan. Approvel Pending Block 40/47	600 0 0 600 2,040 SUB-TOTAL	GRAND TOTAL 600 2,040	SPA relies to Sile Pan Approval. DPA miles to Charl Plan Approval.	Zon refers to uncare her. Zon refers to Oriento Heart MB melars to Oriento Nuncipet Beend Percents per unit (poul eculoremin at follows: sentia fi a 3.45pu, sentiments & 2.05pu.
			40147		NOTES:		A. Zon, refers to 5. OMB rotors to 8. Parcons par

**ATTACHMENT NO. 7** 



.

.

. .

ଷ୍ଟ .

.

°u .



















с_	15
ltem #	19
Report # _	9

### COUNCIL MEETING - MARCH 19, 2013

### COUNCIL - March 19, 2013

### PETITION RE: WARD BOUNDARIES

### **Recommendation**

The City Clerk recommends:

- 1) That the communication from Mr. Antony Niro submitting the report by Dr. Ronald G. Landes entitled 'Public Ward Boundary Review' be received;
- 2) That the petition submitted to the Committee of the Whole meeting of February 26, 2013 be formally received by Council; and
- 3) That the options in this report be submitted to the Committee of the Whole (Working Session) for consideration and public input.

### Contribution to Sustainability

A balanced ward system that provides effective representation is a key component of a sustainable governance structure.

### Economic Impact

If Council does not pass a by-law in accordance with the petition within 90 days of its receipt, any of the electors who have signed the petition may apply to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) to have the municipality divided or re-divided into wards or the existing wards dissolved. Additional expenditures would likely be incurred to represent the City's interests at the Ontario Municipal Board.

If Council commences a ward boundary review, consultant's fees for facilitation and planning projects are estimated at \$40,000 to \$200,000, depending on the level of involvement and time frame. In addition, if after adoption of a ward boundary by-law the by-law is appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board additional expenditures will be incurred.

Funding would be from the election reserve but would need to be replenished to ensure the proper administration of the election.

### Communications Plan

A public consultation plan will be a key component of any changes to the ward boundaries.

### <u>Purpose</u>

The purpose of this report is to outline the options for responding to the petition filed pursuant to S. 223 of the *Municipal Act*, S.O. 2001, c. 25 requesting that Council pass a by-law dividing or redividing the municipality into six (6) wards.

### Background – Analysis and Options

### Legislative Framework

Under Section 223 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, electors may present a petition to Council requesting that Council pass a by-law dividing, re-dividing or dissolving wards. The petition requires signatures of 1% of the total number of electors in the municipality or 500

electors, whichever is less, but with a minimum of 50 signatures. Five hundred (500) electors would have to sign a petition in the case of a population the size of the City of Vaughan.

If Council does not pass a by-law in accordance with a petition within 90 days after receiving it, any of the electors who signed the petition may apply to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) to have the municipality divided or re-divided or have the existing wards dissolved. The OMB will hear the application and may make an order dividing, re-dividing or dissolving wards.

### Ward Boundary Petition

At the Committee of the Whole meeting of February 26, 2013, a petition pursuant to S. 223 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, c. 25 was submitted by Mr. Antony Niro asking Council to pass a bylaw re-dividing the municipality into six wards. Committee received the petition and directed that the City Clerk report to the March 19, 2013 Council meeting on the petition and any other necessary action. The City Clerk's Office has reviewed the petition submitted for statutory compliance and found that it has met the threshold number of 500 electors.

On March 7, 2013, Mr. Niro submitted an additional report to the Office of the City Clerk entitled 'Public Ward Boundary Review' prepared by Dr. Ronald G. Landes. A copy of this report is included as a communication with the March 19, 2013 Council Agenda.

### Recent Council Consideration of Ward Boundary Review

The City Clerk provided a Ward Boundary Review summary report to Committee of the Whole (Working Session) at its meeting of November 22, 2011 [Report No. 53, Item 2]. The report summarized information from the 2009 ward boundary review and provided additional background information to enable Council to decide whether a further ward boundary review should be conducted. Council adopted a recommendation that staff provide a follow up report outlining the next steps and options for a ward boundary review.

In the follow up report to the February 14, 2012 Committee of the Whole (Working Session) [Report No. 7, Item 2], the City Clerk outlined three options for a ward boundary review:

Option 1 - Conduct the Review Option 2 - Defer Consideration Option 3 - Do not conduct a Ward Boundary Review

In presenting the options, the City Clerk noted that a key consideration in determining whether a ward boundary review should take place is the question of whether the citizens of Vaughan are receiving (and will receive, for the elections contemplated by the review) effective representation from their Council. Effective representation, as noted in previous reports on this matter, is not simply a mathematical concept. Amidst the array of factors and considerations that are taken into account in assessing models for 'effective representation', the primary goal is to establish relative parity of voting power.

In his report, the City Clerk also noted that Council is not compelled to conduct a ward boundary review at this time. The OMB decision in the appeal of the last review concluded that the current boundaries respect the *Carter* principles at the point in time the Order was made. Though the OMB raised an expectation that the boundaries would be revisited, the City Clerk noted that it is for Council to determine whether the current model provides for effective representation for the purpose of the next election.

The City Clerk also outlined the steps necessary to undertake a ward boundary review, set out as follows:



### New Wards Instituted

Section 222(1) of the Act provides for an approval process for Ward boundary changes and a municipal by-law to alter ward boundaries must be finalized by January 1, 2014 to become effective for the 2014 municipal elections After taking these matters into consideration, Council, at its February 21, 2012 meeting, recommended that a Ward Boundary Review not be conducted before the 2014 general municipal elections.

### Ward Boundary Petition and Background Study

The petition received on February 26, 2013 requests the addition of one new ward along with boundary adjustments to most of the other wards, increasing the number of wards from five to six. The petition states that population growth in Vaughan during recent decades has not been matched by an increase in the level of representation on City Council. In addition, the petition states that, "the additional ward will allow for the growth in size of the urban wards to be moderated, while creating a new Ward to better represent the Countryside Communities areas of Vaughan."

The report entitled 'Public Ward Boundary Review', received by the City Clerk's Office on March 7, 2013, outlines the review process and analysis used to prepare the request outlined in the ward boundary petition.

### Ward Boundary Petition - Options for Council

As a result of receiving a petition pursuant to S. 223 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, c. 25, requesting a re-division into six (6) wards, Council has the following options:

Option 1 – Pass a By-Law to Re-divide the Wards in Accordance with the Petition

The petition was presented as an addendum item at the February 26, 2013 Committee of the Whole meeting and the supporting documentation was submitted to the City Clerk's Office on March 7, 2013. The petition represents less than 0.5% of the population of Vaughan and there has not been an opportunity for broader public input or discussion on the proposal.

If Council wishes to consider this option, staff would need to undertake an analysis of the proposal and provide Council with that analysis at a future Committee of the Whole (Working Session). The public would also have an opportunity to provide input at that meeting.

### Option 2 - Conduct Our Own Ward Boundary Review

A Ward Boundary Review is an extremely important and lengthy task. Based on the experience of many municipalities, including Vaughan, and the outcome of previous OMB Ward Boundary hearings, there are a number of guiding principles for a Council to consider in conducting a ward boundary review. This includes ensuring a strong and effective public consultation process.

Ward Boundary Reviews are to follow the principles set out by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Re: Provincial Electoral Boundaries (Sask.)*, the 'Carter' case. The purpose of a review is to achieve 'effective representation'.

In describing the concept, the OMB in its order on the 2008/2009 Vaughan ward boundary review quoted extensively from the Carter decision:

"In Carter, Madame Justice McLachlin (as she then was) stated:

To what extent, if at all, does the right to vote enshrined in the Charter permit deviation from the "one person – one vote" rule?... The purpose of the right to vote enshrined in s. 3 of the Charter is not equality of voting power per se, but the right to "effective representation"....

What are the conditions of effective representation? The first is relative parity of voting power. A system which dilutes one citizen's vote unduly as compared with another citizen's vote runs the risk of providing inadequate representation.... The result will be uneven and unfair representation.

But parity of voting power, though of prime importance, is not the only factor... in ensuring effective representation....

Notwithstanding the fact that the value of a citizen's vote should not be unduly diluted, it is a practical fact that effective representation often cannot be achieved without taking into account countervailing factors. First, absolute parity is impossible. It is impossible to draw boundary lines which guarantee exactly the same number of voters in each district....

Secondly, such relative parity as may be possible of achievement may prove undesirable because it has the effect of detracting from the primary goal of effective representation. Factors like geography, community history, community interests and minority representation may need to be taken into account to ensure that our legislative assemblies effectively represent the diversity of our social mosaic. These are but examples of considerations which may justify departure from absolute voter parity in the pursuit of more effective representation; the list is not closed.

It emerges therefore that the deviations from absolute voter parity may be justified on the grounds of practical impossibility or the provision of more effective representation. Beyond this, dilution of one citizen's vote as compared with another's should not be countenanced. I adhere to the proposition asserted in Dixon, that "only those deviations should be admitted which can be justified on the ground that they contribute to better government of the populace as a whole, giving due weight to regional issues within the populace and geographic factors within the territory governed".

... The process (in this case), viewed as a whole, was fair. The original division between urban and rural ridings was the work of an unimpeded commission; the subsequent adjustment largely reflected population changes, and gave due weight to the principle of voter parity. The fact that the Legislature was involved in the readjustment does not in itself render the process arbitrary or unfair...

... It may be useful to mention some of the factors other than equality of voting power which figure in the analysis. One of the most important is the fact that it is more difficult to represent rural ridings than urban.... Thus the goal of effective representation may justify somewhat lower voter populations in rural areas. Another factor... is geographic boundaries... Yet another factor is growth projections. Given that the boundaries will govern for a number of years,...projected population changes within that period may justify a deviation from strict equality at the time the boundaries are drawn."

A preliminary budget estimate for a thorough Ward Boundary Review, based on information obtained from other municipalities, is approximately \$40,000 to \$200,000. This would include:

- Consulting Fees
- Public meetings/public consultation
- Internal staff time and resources
- Legal proceedings before the OMB (including external legal counsel)

Costs would depend on the level of involvement of staff and consultants and could be affected by a compressed time frame. An example of an estimated timeline to conduct a Ward Boundary Review is 19 to 32 weeks.

In accordance with the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, c. 25, the process needs to be completed by January 1, 2014 in order for boundaries to come into effect for the 2014 general municipal elections.

Based on the timeline information, a ward boundary review would not be completed before the expiry of the 90 day period after the filing of the petition. If a petitioner did apply to the Ontario Municipal Board after 90 days, there is no certainty as to when the OMB hearing would be held. The matter could still be at the Board for scheduling while the ward boundary review is underway.

Option 3 – Do Not Pass a By-Law

If Council chooses not to pass a by-law within 90 days of receiving the petition, any elector who signed the petition may apply to the Ontario Municipal Board to have the municipality divided or re-divided into wards or to have the existing wards dissolved. The City would be able to present evidence in support of Council's position, but the decision would be left to the Ontario Municipal Board and the Board can make any decision on boundaries including no change to wholesale changes. Additional costs in consultant and legal fees would be incurred to represent the City's interests at the Board similar to what would be required in conducting a Ward Boundary Review.

### Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council as set out in Vaughan Vision 2020, particularly:

MANAGEMENT EXCELLENCE – Demonstrate Leadership and Promote Effective Governance

### Regional Implications

n/a

### Conclusion

With the filing of a petition under S. 223 of the *Municipal Act*, S.O. 2001, c. 25, Council has 3 options to consider:

Option 1 – Pass a By-Law to Re-Divide the Wards in Accordance with the Petition Option 2 – Conduct a Ward Boundary Review Option 3 – Do Not Pass a By-Law

Any decision to change ward boundaries should include consideration of public input. Staff also requires time to undertake further analysis of the Public Ward Boundary Review proposal submitted by the petitioners. It is therefore recommended that consideration of these options be referred to a future Committee of the Whole (Working Session) where the public will have an opportunity to provide input and staff can provide further information.

### **Attachments**

Refer to Communication C5 - Public Ward Boundary Review, Vaughan, Ontario, 2012 – 2013, Report prepared by Dr. Ronald G. Landes submitted by Mr. Antony Niro on March 7, 2013

### Report prepared by:

Donna Winborn, Elections Coordinator, Ext. 8241

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara-A. McEwan Manager of Administrative Services and Deputy City Clerk

### Bonsignore, Connie



From:	Antony Niro P.Eng. <antony.niro@gmail.com></antony.niro@gmail.com>
Sent:	Tuesday, March 19, 2013 12:09 PM
То:	Clerks@vaughan.ca; Bevilacqua, Maurizio; Schulte, Deb; DeFrancesca, Rosanna; Rosati,
	Gino; Shefman, Alan; Racco, Sandra; Di Biase, Michael; Palermo, Angela; Carella, Tony;
	Iafrate, Marilyn
Cc:	Abrams, Jeffrey; Tim Kelly; Ron Landes
Subject:	Council Meeting - March 19, 2013 - Item 1 Report No. 9 of the Committee of the Whole
	- Item 19 Petition Re: Ward Boundaries

Mayor and Members of Vaughan Council.

I have read the Clerks department report, communication C15 on "Petition Re: Ward Boundaries", and agree with the recommendation that consideration of the options be referred to a future Committee of the Whole (Working Session).

As stated in the report, the Clerk's department requires further time to review Dr. Ron Landes report "Public Ward Boundary Review, Vaughan, Ontario 2012-2013". As stated on deputation, Dr. Landes and myself are available to the Clerk's department and members of Council to discuss and provide clarification either by conference call or in person when necessary.

Let me bring attention to a point not covered in the Clerks report. The report submitted written by Dr. Landes brings forward a very important issue. The current structure of the Regional Councillors being "elected-at-large" is open to a potential constitutional challenge in relation to the Canadian Charter of Rights and the Carter Case. It is recommended in the report to elect Regional Councillors on a Ward basis, a 6 Ward system provides for regional councillors to be elected on a two-ward constituency structure. This would provide three advantages, first, regional councillors could help ward councillors with the workload, second, to focus regional councillors on more local concerns, third, would help offset the preponderance of the larger populated areas of Vaughan selecting the regional councillors.

In conclusion, the public's reception at the door for the petition to increase representation of the countryside community has been exceptional. The overwhelming majority of residents appreciate the opportunity to speak to someone about their concerns of representation at the city. For that reason, I am continuing to petition communities in the proposed Ward 6 and a joining communities and will continue to communicate to council and the Clerk's department on my progress.

-Antony.

Antony Niro P.Eng. 416-846-6476



### Communication C7 COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FEBRUARY 26, 2013 <u>REPORT 9, ADDENDUM_ITEM NO. 19</u>

The City Clerk's Office has received a petition from Mr. Antony Niro regarding Ward Boundaries pursuant to S.223 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, c. 25. with the summary wording below.

The total number of signatures on the petition are: 1047 (unverified by the City Clerk's Office of the City of Vaughan at the time of the Committee of the Whole meeting).

"In accordance with the Municipal Act, the Undersigned hereby request Vaughan Council to pass a by-law re-dividing the municipality into wards in accordance with the attached map on the reverse side of the Petition"

A copy of the entire petition document containing a total of 128 pages is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Attachment: Map submitted with Petition

Antony Niro P.Eng. 333 Laurentian Blvd Maple, ON L6A 2V3

# <u>Completed Petition Forms can</u> <u>be Mailed to:</u>

<u>Contact:</u> Antony Niro P.Eng. antony.niro@gmail.com 416-846-6476 www.vaughancountryside.com



### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE FEBRUARY 26, 2013

### PETITION RE: WARD BOUNDARIES

### **Recommendation**

The City Clerk recommends:

- 1) That the petition filed by Mr. Antony Niro regarding ward boundaries pursuant to S. 223 of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, c. 25 be received; and
- 2) That the City Clerk be directed to report to the March 19, 2013 Council meeting on the petition and any other necessary action.

### **Contribution to Sustainability**

n/a

### Economic Impact

Not applicable at this time.

### **Communications Plan**

Not applicable at this time.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to outline the process for responding to the petition filed pursuant to S. 223 of the *Municipal Act*, S.O. 2001, c. 25 requesting that Council pass a by-law dividing or redividing the municipality into wards

### **Background - Analysis and Options**

Under Section 223 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, electors may present a petition to Council requesting that Council pass a by-law dividing, re-dividing or dissolving wards. The petition requires signatures of 1% of the total number of electors in the municipality or 500 electors, whichever is less, but with a minimum of 50 signatures. Five hundred (500) electors would have to sign a petition in the case of a population the size of the City of Vaughan.

If Council does not pass a by-law in accordance with a petition within 90 days after receiving it, any of the electors may apply to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) to have the municipality divided or re-divided or have the existing wards dissolved. The OMB will hear the application and may make an order dividing, re-dividing or dissolving wards.

A petition pursuant to S. 223 of the *Municipal Act*, S.O. 2001, c. 25 was submitted to the City Clerk's Office by Mr. Antony Niro on February 26, 2013. The City Clerk has not had time to review the petition for statutory compliance and to ensure that the threshold number of signatures is met. It is proposed that the City Clerk report to the March 19, 2013 Council meeting on the petition and to outline any necessary next steps in the process.

### Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council as set out in Vaughan Vision 2020, particularly:

MANAGEMENT EXCELLENCE – Demonstrate Leadership and Promote Effective Governance

### **Regional Implications**

n/a

### **Conclusion**

Staff recommends that the City Clerk be directed to report to the March 19, 2013 Council meeting on the petition filed pursuant to S. 223 of the *Municipal Act*, S.O. 2001, c. 25 and any necessary action.

### **Attachments**

none

### Report prepared by:

Barbara A. McEwan, Manager of Administrative Services, Deputy City Clerk Ext. 8628

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey A. Abrams City Clerk