

Magnifico, Rose

Subject: Committee of the Whole - April 14th 2015 - ITEM 17 - North Vaughan Transportation Master Plan AWARD

c: <u>23</u>
Communication
cw: <u>Apr 14/15</u>
Item: <u>17</u>

From: Antony Niro [<mailto:antony.niro@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2015 10:35 AM

To: Shefman, Alan; Rosati, Gino; Iafrate, Marilyn; Ferri, Mario; Bevilacqua, Maurizio; Di Biase, Michael; DeFrancesca, Rosanna; Racco, Sandra; Carella, Tony

Cc: Adam Martin-Robbins; Kim Champion; Steven Del Duca; gila.martowco@pc.ola.org; Clerks@vaughan.ca

Subject: Committee of the Whole - April 14th 2015 - ITEM 17 - North Vaughan Transportation Master Plan AWARD

Dear Members of Vaughan Council,

The extension of Kirby Rd through to Bathurst, upgrading of Kirby to 4 lanes from Bathurst to Hwy 27, and an interconnect at Hwy 400 is in my opinion the single most important transportation improvement Vaughan could embark on to alleviate not only the increasing east-west traffic problems in the north but the choking east-west traffic problem throughout Vaughan.

Its good we're finally progressing on the North Vaughan Transportation Master Plan, an important step in providing much needed transportation East-West corridor relief for Vaughan.

BACKGROUND: The North Vaughan Transportation Master Plan is a resident initiated project, as the result of myself (Antony Niro P.Eng.) settling an OMB appeal of the DC By-law with the City of Vaughan. Past council fully supported the current DC By-Law that OBLITERATED the majority of funding for the planned upgrade and expansion of Kirby Road between Bathurst and Hwy 27. The City of Vaughan agreed to conduct a study and produce a **North Vaughan Transportation Master Plan** validate the claims being made in the appeal of the DC By-Law.

Removing funding for a Kirby Road upgrade would push any East-West corridor transportation relief to **2031**. Might I remind current council, and in particular the re-elected Local Councillor of Ward 1 whom supported the delay in funding Kirby, that any talk of a Go-Station on Kirby without the support of a Kirby upgrade is preposterous and irresponsible to the current and +10,000 future residents living in close proximity of Kirby Road.

I look forward to attending the settlement agreed mandatory public working sessions prior to the release of any reports. I hope the residents of North Vaughan have the support of the four local councillors and the mayor in a plan that effectively identifies east-west transportation upgrades for north Vaughan in a timely manner.

The current residents want to see transportation upgrades completed "before" any development of blocks 27 and 41, including a Go-Station. To make my point clear and simple for the current local councillor of Ward 1, we expect Kirby widened before you build a Go-Station on Kirby, if you build a Go-Station, people will drive in "cars" that use "roads" like Kirby to get to the Go-Station.

Supporting a Go-Station but not any upgrades to roads in it's vicinity sounds to me like a POLITICAL position, not a practical position. Let's keep the politics out of our planning and make good, practical, decisions to improve our standard of living.

Please feel free to contact me at any time during the development of this plan for comment and background information.

http://www.vaughan.ca/council/minutes_agendas/AgendaItems/CW0414_15_17.pdf

-Antony.

Antony Niro, P.Eng.

416-846-6476



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Antony Niro P.Eng.** <antony.niro@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, May 14, 2013 at 8:21 AM

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

To: Maurizio Bevilacqua Vaughan Mayor <maurizio.bevilacqua@vaughan.ca>, Deb Schulte <deb.schulte@vaughan.ca>, Rosanna DeFrancesca <rosanna.defrancesca@vaughan.ca>, Gino Risati <gino.rosati@vaughan.ca>, Alan Shefman <alan.shefman@vaughan.ca>, Sandra Racco <sandra.racco@vaughan.ca>, Michael Di Biase <michael.dibiase@vaughan.ca>, Angela Palermo <angela.palermo@vaughan.ca>, Tony Carella <tony.carella@vaughan.ca>, Marilyn Iafrate <marilyn.iafrate@vaughan.ca>, Vaughan Jeffrey Abrams Clerk <clerks@vaughan.ca>

Cc: Tim Kelly <tkelly@yrmg.com>

Dear Members of Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

-Antony.

Antony Niro P.Eng.

416-846-6476

Resident of the Vaughan Countryside