



May 9, 2019

Chairman and Members of the Committee of the Whole
City of Burlington
426 Brant St.
Burlington, ON L7R 3Z6

RE: 2019 Development Charges Background Study

This submission is being made on behalf of Penta Properties Inc, the owner of a number of properties in the City of Burlington. The submission is intended to address concerns with the proposed Development Charges Bylaw -2019. The concerns include a number of issues as summarized in the following paragraphs.

In section 4.3 of the Background Report "Increasing Need for Service", the City of Burlington background report states "While the need could conceivably be expressed generally in terms of units of capacity, s.s.5 (1)3, which requires that municipal council indicate that it intends to ensure that such an increase in need will be met, suggests that a project specific expression of need would be most appropriate". In reviewing the list of projects in chapter 5 of the background study it is my opinion that the expression of need is not specific enough and is too general. I suggest an analysis be undertaken of the City of Burlington actual experience in the last few years in the terms of number and amount of money spent on these types of projects. Otherwise the expenditure of funds are too ill-defined and are akin to a slush fund.

In section 5.2.1, "Transportation Services", on page 5-2 of the Background Study there is a table with improvement types and percentage of allocation to benefit to existing. In my view, the determination of

CORPORATE HEAD OFFICE
P.O. Box 128
2 MAIN STREET EAST
GRIMSBY, ON L3M 4G3
CELL. 289-983-1629
FAX. 905.637.3268
Email: cdonnensen@metrocon.ca

the benefit to existing is somewhat arbitrary. I would like review how these percentages were arrived at and how the City justifies these percentages.

In section 5.2.2, "Storm Drainage Services", there is a statement on page 5-5 in the last sentence of the third paragraph that indicates "the cost allocated to future development is set equal to the percentage of the undeveloped lands within the respective watersheds". It is my opinion that this is not appropriate as many of the watersheds will never be developed. The cost of work within the watershed in those areas should not be borne by development. Erosion is a natural occurring process and remedial work may be required and the cost thereof should be borne by existing development.

Appendix A-1, page A-15, I note that no development is forecast for North Aldershot nor are there any projects forecast for this area. As you are aware my client has an approved plan of subdivision, draft approved by the Ontario Municipal Board sometime ago, The plan has undergone some changes at the request of the various agencies including the way stormwater management is treated and with respect to land use in one of the major institutional blocks that is no longer required by a public agency. The revisions to the draft plan together with supporting studies are now in circulation to the various agencies.

Unfortunately I am unable to attend the Committee of the Whole meeting on Monday. I trust that this letter will be reviewed by the Committee and hopefully discussions can be held with staff prior to any passage of the by-law.

Yours truly,



Karl Gonnissen, P. Eng, RPP, MCIP
President