

C1

Communication

Council – January 28, 2025

CW(1) – Report No. 1 Item No. 20 & 21

From: [IRENE FORD](#)
To: Council@vaughan.ca; Clerks@vaughan.ca
Cc: [Joseph Quigley](#); [Mike Schreiner](#); [Mike Crawley](#); [Paul Calandra](#); [Paul Webster](#); [Premier of Ontario | Premier ministre de l'Ontario](#); [Francesco Sorbara](#); [Laura Smith](#); [Stephen Leccoco](#); [Peter Bethlenfalvy](#); [Jeff Gray](#); [Mike Adler](#); [Veracia Ankrah](#); [Noor Javed](#); [Emma McIntosh](#); [Erin Mahoney](#); [Robert Benzie](#); [Isaac Callan](#); [Integrity Commissioner](#); [Principle's Integrity](#); [Comments](#); [Ontario Lobbyist Registry](#); [Oico On Info](#); [Lobbyist Registry](#); [Haiqing Xu](#); [Vince Musacchio](#); [Zoran Postic](#); [Martha Greenberg](#); ltchomes.licensing@ontario.ca; kinga.surma@pc.ola.org; ltcminister@ontario.ca; [Marit Stiles-OP](#); bonnie@ontarioliberal.ca; [Joel Wittnebel](#); [Michael Tiboloco](#); [Minister](#); [Ombudsman On Info](#); [Jack Hauen](#); [John Taylor](#); [Frank Scarpitti](#); [David West](#); [Tom Mrakas](#); [Virginia Hackson](#); [Iain Lovatt](#); [Margaret Quirk](#); [Steve Pellegrini](#)
Subject: [External] Mayor Del Duca Making Significant Policy Changes W/O Consulting/Informing the Public & Acts Like York Region/Vaughan are Sitting on a Pot of Gold
Date: January-20-25 3:12:09 PM

CAUTION! This is an external email. Verify the sender's email address and carefully examine any links or attachments before clicking. If you believe this may be a phishing email, please use the Phish Alert Button.

Vaughan Council,

Please do not blindly support the Mayor's motions in the absence of further policy discussion and analysis.

Vaughan Clerks,

Please add this as a communication with regard to the Member's Motions presented by Mayor Del Duca tomorrow. I realize it is late, attachment to Council is understood.

Mayor Del Duca appears to be resorting to making huge policy shifts as well as financial decisions through the use of Member's Motions that are not informed by staff professional opinion or recommendations. There are 2 such motions on tomorrow's agenda that have no staff reports to understand if there is VFM, risks, benefits etc., nor a request for any such thing.

Member motions are at times necessary but they are becoming a staple in order to shape the decision making process. Motions are not objective nor are they unbiased. Motions are crafted to obtain the outcome that is desired by the author. They are inherently unfair as motions come forward based on who asks and has the member's ear.

At this point I am very concerned about who Mayor Del Duca is listening to and I don't think it is ratepayer groups, any public interest, not-profits or charity groups. [Support from BILD](#) is not support from residents and the Mayor should take note. BILD and the members they represent have been behind some of the most [destructive decisions to expand urban boundaries](#) and they hosted the dinner in which Ryan Amato was given the majority of information relating to the now reversed Greenbelt removals. All of this was done without any regard for the significant and severe limitations surrounding the delivery, budget and construction of infrastructure required to service the proposed growth. In the absence of infrastructure land use decisions are nothing more than an artificial means to inflate land value.

Motion 1: Taking Charge of Our Roads

[TAKING CHARGE OF OUR ROADS TO FIGHT GRIDLOCK - Committee of the Whole \(1\) - January 21, 2025](#)

This motion seeks to downgrade portions of regional roads to local roads so that massive infrastructure projects can be delivered.

- The Langstaff Bridge over the CN rail yard and one over federal land. CN to date has not been supportive of a giant bridge.
- The expansion of Teston, from Keele to Dufferin will be on top of an old landfill.
- Highway 7 from Pine Valley to Martin Grove Rd will have to cross the Humber and widen the existing CP rail line underpass.

Why the Mayor believes this is a good idea is beyond my comprehension, in fact I find it reckless and irresponsible given the magnitude of the projects both in scope, constructability and budget. Some general comments on the Where Clauses in the Motion.

- I asked for the analysis from Ernest & Yonge referenced in the third Whereas Clause on pg. 2. The Clerk informed me that it was presented in confidential session, therefore not available for public consumption. This report was used to inform Vaughan's submission to the Ontario government on regional governance, mostly supportive of downloading regional governance. If it's so good for Vaughan why can't we get a copy?
- There is no logical reason to think that Vaughan would deliver these projects with improved VFM, transparency or faster. In fact I wonder if the opposite could be true. For eg. the management of the Kirby Rd extension thus far has: [overpayment of funds surrounding the EA](#), procurement was [awarded to the parent company](#) associated with the Vaughan City Hall saga (KAPP Infrastructure Inc. is an entity of [HBNG Holburn Group of Companies](#) as is Maystar who was the constructor for Vaughan City Hall and linked to the [2015 Integrity Commissioner Report](#) that led to [charges under the municipal act against former Mayor Di Biase](#)) and now the landowner is fighting expropriation costs at the [OLT](#) for an exorbitant amount. The landowners argue that the [\\$14.6M paid by Vaughan for expropriation should be \\$99M](#) more to add on to the Rizmi land saga.
- The fourth Whereas Clause references provincial legislation that is not yet in effect and is only at first reading! Legislation that if passed applies only to Peel Region NOT York Region. [Peel Transition Implementation Act, 2024](#). Is the Mayor aware of future changes to the Peel Implementation Act, 2024 that would expand the proposed act to apply to York Region, or is he the advocate for other actors who are trying to trigger such provincial legislative changes?

Motion 2: VAUGHAN AND ONTARIO PARTNERING TO BUILD A NEW NOT-FOR-PROFIT LONG-TERM CARE FACILITY

[VAUGHAN AND ONTARIO PARTNERING TO BUILD A NEW NOT-FOR-PROFIT LONG-TERM CARE FACILITY - Committee of the Whole \(1\) - January 21, 2025](#)

The information provided in this motion is not consistent and conflicts with public information available. The Mayor seeks to remove \$4.3M in development fees and suggest that the LTCH will be run "by Mariann Home, a non-profit founded in the 1970s in Richmond Hill by The Missionary Sisters of the Precious Blood". The 256 bed LTCH was approved by MZO in 2020 on provincial land that I thought was sold to a for-profit LTC provider (Arch Corporation) and the bed license was awarded to another entity affiliated with the for-profit company who is part of a partnership (Arch Venture Holdings Ltd.).

Toronto Star Article: https://www.thestar.com/news/investigations/an-attractive-investment-as-private-equity-scoops-up-ontario-nursing-homes-there-are-concerns-about/article_c9dcfafb-bf1b-5e7e-8b16-a992450fdaf8.html#tncms-source=login

Bed License Award: [Ontario's long-term care licensing public consultation registry](#)

Infrastructure Ontario Bid Document: [Publish Online](#)

Many things are unclear to me about where the Mayor is getting his information from as well as why he is proceeding to ask for the development charges to be deferred (indefinitely?) given that Infrastructure Ontario (IO) has been leading this project. If IO wanted the development fees waived then they should have formally submitted a communication to that effect and as far as I can tell they have not. If the Province or the Minister of Finance wanted the development fees waived so it could be included in the 2025 Ontario Budget as suggested in the Whereas Clauses then again there should be a formal communication from the Minister of LTC and/or Finance requesting this - NOT A MEMBER'S MOTION suggesting such. **Perhaps the Minister of Finance, LTC or IO would like to comment as they have been cc'd?**

This is not about the delivery of LTC it is about land banking. The requirement for LTC is 30 years, what do you think the land will be worth in 30 years and what will the development potential actually be? Further there is also suggestion of ancillary facilities - would we be waiving development fees for structures that are not the LTCH?

When did this project become named the Mariann Home and how did [Mariann Home](#) get involved, who is affiliated with [Universal Care](#) (at the center of controversy surrounding the 'fake teacher ads', preferential treatment from the Ford government as well as lawsuits related to standards of care during COVID)?

If there is no development application (none on PlanIt or otherwise that I am aware of) how could the Mayor estimate the development fees as being \$4.3M? Where did this number come from? Why would we grant an indefinite deferral of development fees, do we have any sense of the infrastructure that is or will be required at this point in time?

The Mayor must explain why he has suggested that the home will be a non-profit to justify the waving of development fees when all other indicators suggest that a for-profit entity is behind the scenes ([Arch Corporation](#))?

Did [IO contract with](#) another entity, did the Vaughan land transaction fail apart?

York Region Council - Ambush by Mayor Del Duca to Lower Development Fees - Where is the Pot of Gold?

[York Region council clashes over reducing charges for developers](#)

This is relevant because there is a staff report requesting to authorization a staff report to enter into a development agreement to finance and build a portion of Shipwell St ahead of the normal planning process. Refer to the Block 34E reference below. If developers have so much money that they can prepay and absorb costs above development fees then why are they complaining about development fees?

At York Region Council last week the Mayor brought forward a motion that was successfully voted upon seeking a staff report to return at the end of the first quarter to reduce development charges in efforts to make housing more affordable. I view this as an ambush on the new Chair of York Region. My concern from the beginning with the Chair was not nepotism, or that he had a law enforcement background. It was the significant growth planned and delivery/funding of infrastructure projects that need to be paid over the next decades and how they will be funded in light of Bill 23, changes by the provincial government to find a Lake Ontario based solution to pump drinking water and treat sanitary at distances greater than 50km, plus the fast tracking of municipal infrastructure by 10 years in order to satisfy the government housing pledges. The Chair is on a steep learning curve with regards to municipal infrastructure and associated capital/operating budget. Del Duca's actions to bring such a motion/action forward at his first meeting was opportunistic and/or inconsiderate.

Del Duca's action demonstrates disrespect for smaller York Region municipalities as well as the intent and purpose of regional government; to pool resources in order to provide more efficient services and larger infrastructure projects in ways that do not penalize smaller municipalities who have access to less financial and staff resources. This form of government should help to relieve pressure to develop sensitive landscapes (Greenbelt/ORM/farmland) in smaller rural municipalities. Vaughan is blessed with an abundance of employment land which is what has enabled us to keep our property taxes rate as one of the lowest in Ontario. Del Duca blindly failed to recognize the inequality that exists across the Region and how regional governance serves to offset that to some extent. While not perfect, I recognize.

If the Mayor of Vaughan truly cared about affordable housing, emergency housing then he would be supporting York Region's efforts to delivery on it's Housing Strategy not providing gifts to the development community in the form of blind reductions of development charges that assume housing will become more affordable in the absence of any formal agreement or conditions. It is like the Mayor is unaware that

developers have so much money they are willing to pay above and beyond development fees to prioritize and advance infrastructure. Some examples.

Block 34E Prepaying to Build Shipwell Rd, Case Study No. 5 of the [Auditor General's Report on MZO](#)

<https://pub-vaughan.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=191306>

- The Owner of the Subject Lands where the extension of Shipwill Street is proposed has committed to fund the full cost of and construct the requisite infrastructure. A development agreement will secure for the land and works.

Block 27 Prepaid Development Charges Agreement

<https://yorkpublishing.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=18245>

Block 34E, Block 41 are both benefiting blocks and subject to MZO's. Basically the developer prepaid \$156.4M, knowing that \$4M would not be recoverable through development fees.

If the exceptions to the policy, based on the principles set out below, are approved by Council, the Block 27 Developer Group would advance only the cost of Phase 1 of the project, plus the cost of certain transportation preconstruction works. Phase 2 of the project would proceed as a Regional project, as contemplated in the Region's capital plan, and may be adjusted during the annual budget process. The total amount the Developer Group would be required to advance is currently estimated at \$156.4 million with \$152.4 million or 97% recoverable, subject to the Regional debt service coverage provisions in the Prepaid Development Charge Credit policy.

Markham Flato MZO's

<https://yorkpublishing.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=44831>

Flato agreed to pay \$3.9M to fund an EA to service an approved MZO's that were not in York Region's W/W Master Plans. This may not be recoverable.

However, as the four-kilometre extension of the McCowan Sewer is not included in the Region's Capital Plan and Development Charges Bylaw, the Landowners are not eligible to recover their costs through development charges credits. At a later point, when/if the project is included in the Region's Development Charge Bylaw, it may be eligible for development charges credits. The Landowners have been made aware of this and have agreed to proceed with funding EA at their risk.

The Mayor should explain where he thinks the pot of gold is sitting that will be used to fund and pay for infrastructure in the City of Vaughan as well as York Region? Especially before removing existing funding sources.

Regards,
Irene Ford,
Ward 3, Vaughan, York Region