

7890To: The Council of the Whole (working session) dated June 6, 2018

Good afternoon Honourable Mayor Bevilacqua, Members of Council, and City Staff. My name Renzo Ranalli and I am here today representing the South Maple RPA - this RPA was only formed a week ago in response to notices that the Sport Village Municipal Capital Facility (MCF) was going to be redeveloped as early as this October!

I live at [REDACTED] and our family home backs onto the junior diamond of the Sports Village which is in use (weather permitting) every day, in the morning by students and in the evening by local junior ball teams.

I would like to focus our concerns with this proposal on:

1. The success of the current facility;
2. The loss of Parklands in Maple to development contrary to the Active Together Master Plan (ATMP); and
3. The Risks in moving to a multi-use Privately run Elite School and Entertainment Centre contrary to the ATMP;

First off, I have heard on numerous occasions about the success of the current MCF attracting 2.4 mill visitors p.a. and a hub for activity amongst the old and the young. The facility is utilized by numerous community sports teams, senior citizens and the local community and promotes being Active Together both formally and informally. It is also home to two private schooling programs - arrangement of which are unknown to us as it relates to the MCF. These were not part of the original agreement and at this time we are not privy to the arrangement in place with these enterprises and how much they cost or contribute to the MCF - but we will find out. Nevertheless this private enterprise operates in unison with the local community in being Active Together.

Items that were part of the original agreement but that have been allowed to deteriorate include the figure eight skating rink (gone), outdoor ice rink (gone), parking lot and garbage control. Why were these not kept up to a state of general repair? At this point we don't know, but we will find out. I would submit that these items are important to the local community in being Active Together but that they were sacrificed as they could not be made economically viable.

The Hill Academy has been bright spot for the Sports Village. Its success has been apparent and the facilities of the Sports Village have been instrumental in creating this success. Facilities which are operated under an MCF and therefore I must believe that they have been integrated into an Active Together Plan that the Sports Village represents. The point is what level of approval is required in order to alter an existing MCF agreement to expand on the private enterprise portion and destroy existing parklands contrary to the ATMP. At this point we don't know where the MCF ends and the Private Enterprise starts - but we will find out. We know that the community interest comes first and private enterprise co-exists within that. We are

not in favour of flipping this relationship and putting Private interests first – nor do we think it contributes to the City's ATMP.

Development of these parklands were not contemplated when the City entered the MCF agreement using development charges and citizen tax monies and they should not contemplate betraying this trust into any sort of development because these parklands cannot be replaced in Maple.

I commend the Mentana proposal for its emotional attraction and the perception that it will help fill all the City's gaps in meeting its ATMP, Vaughan Vision, tourism, diversity, financial self sustainability and facility services (ie ice time). A wise person once told me when an offer appears too good to be true, it usually is.

I would like the Council to consider about the risk of 'build it and they will come' approach. Sure, Elite hockey academies are popular at this time – there are currently some 126 Hockey Canada licensed and unlicensed academies in Canada. None to my knowledge have enrolments over 100-200 students. Mentana is proposing the middle ground, offering more than just hockey and sports to get enrolment up to 700+ – but think about the strength that has got them where they are. It was hockey and the facilities of the Sports Village. It is another thing entirely to create a technology and innovation centre, 21st Century Learning environments that attract symphonies and high end speaking engagements. Mentana's proposal is trying to expand into disciplines they have no experience with and leverage that into being Active Together – but their proposal is anything but Acting Together. Remember our skating rink/figure eight, take a look at the parking lot - if we build it and they don't come, who will maintain this facility in the future and at what cost? Where will the City be with Financial Sustainability then?

Now allow me to get personal. How many of you could honestly say they would want a complex of the nature presented right in their backyard or their community? Apart from concerns with the loss of our beautiful parklands and the ecology of the ravine, we have concerns around safety, noise, garbage, flood lighting, parking, traffic and our general quality of life.

Understand that we are just getting off the ground, but we have a strong group and we oppose this complex – we will run each one of these concerns to the ground before any of this moves forward. We request complete openness of voting and request that closed door sessions like the one held in Dec, 2015 be discontinued. We further request deferral of any decision on this proposal be stayed to provide the citizens most impacted time to review and properly comment.

Generally we feel there is a good opportunity to expand on the school concept but that can be accomplished by investing in the existing facilities and strength in harmony with the existing parklands and community and contribute to the ATMP. Thank you.

Renzo Ranalli [REDACTED]