1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

3. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS
   (a) June 25, 2014
   (b) July 2, 2014

5. PRESENTATIONS
   (a) Mississauga North Major Bantam (15U) Boys Baseball team
       Councillor Saito will congratulate the Mississauga North Major Bantam (15U) Boys Baseball team on winning the National Championship in a Gold Medal game played against Team New Brunswick.
   (b) Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing Long Service Award – 25 Years
       Mayor McCallion will present the Long Service Awards to Councillors Frank Dale and Nando Iannicca.
   (c) Exceptional Accessible Customer Service Award
       Rabia Khedr, Chairperson, Mississauga Accessibility Advisory Committee will present the Exceptional Accessible Customer Service Award to Linda Norris, Homebound Service Coordinator, City of Mississauga Library Services.
   (d) Government Finance Officers’ Association Award
       Gary Kent, Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer will provide an overview of the Government Finance Officers’ Associations Award and Mayor McCallion will present the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award to staff.

   Information Item I-8
(e) **Canadian Institute of Planners Award for Excellence in Social Planning**

Angela Dietrich, Acting Director, Citywide Planning will present the Canadian Institute of Planners Award for Excellence in Social Planning. Mayor McCallion will present the Canadian Institute of Planners Award for Excellence in Social Planning to staff.

(f) **Phil Green Recognition Award**

Jeff Wachman, Chair of Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee will present the Phil Green Recognition Award to Frank Toth. The Award honours a citizen who demonstrates exemplary efforts of promoting or furthering cycling or other forms of sustainable transportation in the City of Mississauga. Mayor McCallion will present the award to Frank Toth.

6. **DEPUTATIONS**

(a) **Tax Adjustments**

There may be persons in attendance who wish to address Council re: Tax Adjustments pursuant to Sections 357 and 358 of the *Municipal Act* and Apportionment of Taxes.

Corporate Report R-1
Corporate Report R-2

(b) **Tour de Mississauga**

Jeff Wachman, Chair and members of the Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee will speak to the Tour de Mississauga event that will take place on September 21, 2014.

(c) **Westray’s Bill C-45**

Sylvia Boyce, D6 Health and Safety Coordinator will speak to Westray’s Bill C-45 and ask that the City of Mississauga Council pass their motion to enforce Westray’s Bill C-45.

Information I-1
(d) **Art of Living Foundation**

Soody Thayaparan and Mitesh Sharma, Teachers and Volunteers at the Art of Living Foundation will provide an introduction of the Art of Living Foundation, the work that has been going on since 2008 and the Foundation's commitment going forward.

(e) **World Mental Health Day October 10, 2014 Light Up the World Purple 2014**

Helena Stahls, Volunteer for Light Up the World Purple 2014 will speak to World Mental Health Day and ask City of Mississauga Council to light up Mississauga Celebration Square Purple on October 10, 2014.

(f) **Peel Police Community Safety Model - Youth and Mentors Film Program**

Deputy Chief Chris McCord will provide an introduction of the Youth and Mentors Film Program which is in partnership with Safe City Mississauga and the City of Mississauga.

7. **PUBLIC QUESTION PERIOD – 15 Minute Limit**

(In accordance with Section 43 of the City of Mississauga Procedure By-law 0139-2013, as amended, Council may grant permission to a person who is present at Council and wishes to address Council on a matter on the Agenda. Persons addressing Council with a question should limit preamble to a maximum of two statements sufficient to establish the context for the question. Leave must be granted by Council to deal with any matter not on the Agenda.)

8. **INTRODUCTION AND CONSIDERATION OF CORPORATE REPORTS**

R-1 A report dated August 20, 2014, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer re: **Tax Adjustments Pursuant to Sections 357 and 358**.

**Recommendation**

That the tax adjustments outlined in Appendix 1 attached to the report dated August 20, 2014, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer for applications for cancellation or refund of taxes pursuant to Sections 357 and 358 of the Municipal Act, be adopted.

**Motion**
R-2  A report dated August 21, 2014, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer re: **Apportionment of Taxes.**

**Recommendation**

That the recommended apportionment of taxes and payments set out in Appendix 1 of the report dated August 21, 2014, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer, be approved.

**Motion**

R-3  A report dated August 26, 2014, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer re: **Appointment of Screening Officers for Administrative Penalties System.**

**Recommendation**

That a by-law be enacted to repeal By-laws 0286-2013 and 0103-2014, and to appoint Screening Officers for the Administrative Penalties System, as outlined in the report from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer, dated August 26, 2014.

**Motion**

R-4  A report dated August 28, 2014, from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works re: **Assumption of Municipal Works (Ward 4)**

**Recommendation**

That the City of Mississauga assume the municipal works as constructed by the developer under the terms of the Servicing Agreement for 43M-1693, Shelltown Construction Ltd. (lands located north of Highway 403, south of Eglinton Avenue West, east of Mavis Road and east and west of Confederation Parkway, in Z-29, known as Madill Residential Subdivision – Phase 1, T-86088) and that the Letter of Credit in the amount of $323,332.75 be returned to the developer and that a by-law be enacted to assume the road allowances within the Registered Plan as public highway and part of the municipal system of the City of Mississauga, 43M-1693 (Ward 4).
9. **PRESENTATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Motion

(b) Transportation Committee Report 7-2014 dated September 3, 2014.
Motion

(c) Audit Committee Report 3-2014 dated September 8, 2014.

Please Note: Audit Committee Report 3-2014 will be distributed prior to the meeting.

Motion

(d) Planning and Development Committee Report 9-2014 dated September 8, 2014.
Motion

Please Note: Planning and Development Committee Report 3-2014 will be distributed prior to the meeting.

Motion

Please Note: Heritage Advisory Committee Report 3-2014 will be distributed prior to the meeting.

10. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**


Recommendation

That the proposed 2014 Traffic Signal Installation Program for Ward 9, as outlined in the report dated August 12, 2014, from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works, be approved.

Motion
11. **PETITIONS** - Nil

12. **CORRESPONDENCE**

   (a) Information Items: I-1-1-14

   (b) Direction Item: D1-D-2

   D-1 A letter dated July 4, 2014, from the Region of Peel requesting that the City of Mississauga Council endorse the Peel Urban Forestry Strategy.

   **Motion**

   D-2 A letter dated July 11, 2014, from Halton Region requesting that the City of Mississauga Council consider supporting the Protection of Public Participation Act, 2014 and request that Bill 83 be re-introduced forthwith in the Legislature.

   **Motion**

13. **NOTICE OF MOTION** - Nil

14. **MOTIONS**

   (a) To approve recommendations from the following Committee Reports:


   (iii) Recommendations inclusive contained in the Audit Committee Report 3-2014 dated September 8, 2014.

   **Please Note:** Audit Committee Report 3-2014 will be distributed prior to the meeting.


   **Please Note:** Planning and Development Committee Report 3-2014 will be distributed prior to the meeting.

Please Note: Heritage Advisory Committee Report 3-2014 will be distributed prior to the meeting.

(b) To close to the public a portion of the Council meeting to be held on September 10, 2014, to deal with various matters. (See Item 18 Closed Session).

(c) To adopt the tax adjustments outlined in Appendix 1 attached to the report dated August 20, 2014, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer for applications for cancellation or refund of taxes pursuant to Sections 357 and 358 of the Municipal Act.

Corporate Report R-1

(d) To approve the recommended apportionment of taxes and payments set out in Appendix 1 of the report dated August 21, 2014, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer.

Corporate Report R-2

(e) To enacted and repeal By-laws 0286-2013 and 0103-2014, and to appoint Screening Officers for the Administrative Penalties System, as outlined in the report from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer, dated August 26, 2014.

Corporate Report R-3

(f) To assume the road allowances within the Registered Plan as public highway and part of the municipal system of the City of Mississauga, 43M-1693 (Ward 4).

Corporate Report R-4

(g) To express sincere condolences to the family of Howard Hardt who passed away.
(h) To support the campaign on educating, training and directing Crown attorneys, police to apply the Westray Amendments regarding workplace fatalities.

Deputation (b)
Information Item I-1

(i) To support World Mental Health Day on October 10, 2014 and Light Up the World Purple 2014 at Mississauga Celebration Square.

Deputation (d)

(j) To support the nomination of the Holcim Waterfront Estate to the 2014 Lieutenant Governor’s Ontario Heritage Award for Excellence in Conservation.

GC-0376-2014/September 3, 2014

(k) To amend the Municipal Capital Facility, as such term is defined in the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, located at the property known as 4141 Living Arts Drive in Mississauga, Ontario being the Living Arts Centre is used for cultural, recreational and tourist purposes and is for the purpose of the municipality and for public use.

GC-0389-2014/September 3, 2014

15. INTRODUCTION AND CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS

B-1 A by-law to assume certain roads dedicated through Registered Plan 43M-1844 (in the vicinity of Terry Fox Way and Bristol Road West) (Ward 6).

GC-0341-2014/June 25, 2014

B-2 A by-law to establish certain lands as part of the municipal highway system Register Plan 43R-30659 (in the vicinity of Queensway West and Glengarry Road) (Ward 7).

B-3 A by-law to establish certain lands as part of the municipal highway system Register Plan 43R-36071 (in the vicinity of Burnhamthorpe Road West and Kariya Drive) (Ward 7).
B-4 A by-law to establish certain lands as part of the municipal highway system Register Plan 43R-34499 (in the vicinity of Tenth Line West and Argentia Road) (Ward 9).

B-5 A by-law to establish certain lands as part of the municipal highway system Register Plan 43R-25453 (in the vicinity of Eglinton Avenue West and Churchill Meadows Boulevard) (Ward 10).

B-6 A by-law to repeal By-laws 0286-2013 and 0103-2014 and to Appoint Screening Officers.

Corporate Report R-3

B-7 A by-law to amend Schedule A, Streetsville Business Improvement Area 2014 Final Tax Rates and Levy, of By-law 0115-2014 to include properties in the expanded business improvement area adopted by By-law 0281-2013, being a by-law to expand the boundaries of the Streetsville Business Improvement Area (Ward 11) (housekeeping)

GC-0194-2014/May 7, 2014

B-8 A by-law to amend the Road Occupancy, Lot Grading and Municipal Services Protection Deposit By-law 251-12.

TC-0108-2014/June 18, 2014

B-9 A by-law to amend the Highway Obstruction By-law 357-10.

TC-0108-2014/June 18, 2014

B-10 A by-law to authorize the execution of a Maintenance and Operation Agreement with GO Transit (a Division of Metrolinx) for the Mississauga Transitway.

TC-0108-2014/June 18, 2014
B-11  A by-law to amend By-law 51-06, as amended, being the Special Events Temporary Road Closure By-law.

TC-0108-2014/June 18, 2014

B-12  A by-law to establish certain lands as part of the municipal highway systems Registered Plan 43R-19857 (in the vicinity of Eastgate Parkway and Fieldgate Drive and Eastgate Parkway and Tomken Road) (Ward 3).

TC-0109-2014/June 18, 2014

B-13  A by-law to assume certain roads dedicated through Registered Plan 43M-1693 (in the vicinity of Eglinton Avenue West and Confederation Parkway) (Ward 4).

Corporate Report R-4

B-14  A by-law to amend By-law No. 555-2000, as amended, being the Traffic By-law deleting Schedule 10 through highways on Huntington Ridge Drive, adding Schedule 10 through highways on Huntington Ridge Drive, adding Schedule 11 stop signs on Huntington Ridge Drive & Guildwood Way & Trail Blazer Way (Ward 4).

TC-0095-2014/May 28, 2014

B-15  A by-law to amend By-law No. 555-2000, as amended, being the Traffic By-law deleting Schedule 10 through highways on Sidmouth Street, adding Schedule 10 through highways on Sidmouth Street, adding Schedule 11 stop signs on Sidmouth Street & Pickwick Drive (Ward 6).

TC-0156-2014/September 3, 2014

B-16  A by-law to amend By-law No. 555-2000, as amended, being the Traffic By-law deleting Schedule 10 through highways on Black Walnut Trail, adding Schedule 10 through highways on Black Walnut Trail, adding Schedule 11 stop signs at Black Walnut Trail & Smoke Tree Road, and Black Walnut Trail & Scotch Pine Gate (Ward 10).

TC-0157-2014/September 3, 2014
B-17  A by-law to amend By-law No. 555-2000, as amended, being the Traffic By-law deleting Schedule 10 through highways on Russian Olive Close, adding Schedule 10 through highways on Russian Olive Close, adding Schedule 11 stop signs Russian Olive Close & Passway Road (Ward 10).

TC-0158-2014/September 3, 2014

B-18  A by-law to amend By-law No. 555-2000, as amended, being the Traffic By-law adding Schedule 3 no parking on Summersky Court, adding Schedule 19 prohibited u-turns on Kennedy Road at Pebblebrook Court, adding Schedule 31 driveway boulevard parking-curb to sidewalk on Birchmeadow Crescent, Huron Heights Drive, Warbler Lane (Wards 3, 4, 5, 10 & 11).

B-19  A by-law to appoint a Fire Chief of Mississauga, Fire and Emergency Services, Community Services Department for The Corporation of the City of Mississauga and to repeal By-law Number 0127-2009.

GC-0375-2014/September 3, 2014

B-20  A by-law to transfer funds from the 2009 Special Project Capital Reserve Fund (Account 35574) to the Capital Reserve Fund (Account 33121).

GC-0379-2014/September 3, 2014

B-21  A by-law to transfer funds between various Reserve Funds and certain capital projects approved in prior Capital Budgets.

GC-0379-2014/September 3, 2014

B-22  A by-law to exempt the property known as 4141 Living Arts Drive in Mississauga, Ontario from taxation for municipal and school purposes.

GC-0389-2014/September 3, 2014

B-23  A by-law to adopt Mississauga Official Plan Amendment No. 23 CD-02.MIS. (Citywide).

PDC-0034-2014/May 14, 2014
B-24 A by-law to authorize the execution of a Development Agreement between 2356860 Ontario Ltd. and The Corporation of the City of Mississauga, southeast corner of Bancroft Drive and Ivandale Drive, Owner: 2356860 Ontario Ltd., Applicant: Weston Consulting (OZ 11/002) (Ward 1).

Resolution 0141-2014/July 2, 2014

B-25 A by-law to amend By-law 0225-2007, as amended being the Zoning By-law adding the Exception Table 6.2.4.63 (Exception C3-63, Map # 44W), change “C1-2” to C3-63” zoning shall only apply to the lands which are shown in Schedule “A” Owner: 2356860 Ontario Ltd., Applicant: Weston Consulting (OZ 11/002) (Ward 1).

Resolution 0141-2014/July 2, 2014

B-26 A by-law to adopt Mississauga Official Plan Amendment No. 12 (OZ 12/010) (Ward 2).

PDC-0014-2014/March 5, 2014

B-27 A by-law to amend By-law Number 0225-2007, as amended being the Zoning By-law by replacing the Exception Table 4.15.3.46 (Exception RA2-46, Map #10) (Exception C4-45, Map #10) Owner: 2286974 Ontario Inc., Applicant: Bousfields Inc. (OZ 12/010) (Ward 2).

PDC-0014-2014/March 5, 2014

B-28 A by-law to amend By-law 0051-2009, amended by By-law 0290-2011 being By-law to Exempt certain lands from Part-Lot Control Owner/Applicant: Orlando Corporation (Ward 9).

B-29 A by-law to amend By-law Number 0225-2007, as amended Zoning By-law adding Exception Table 4.2.38 (Exception R5-38, Map #56), changing from “R1” to R5-38 and “B” zoning shall apply to all the lands which are shown on the attached Schedule “A” Owner: Argo Trail Corporation, Applicant: Weston Consulting (OZ13/014(T-13004)) (Ward 10).

PDC-0008-2014/January 22, 2014
B-30  A by-law to amend the Animal Care and Control By-law 98-04, as amended for various amendments.

GC-0368-2014/September 3, 2014

B-31  A by-law to amend By-law 250-13, being the Transportation and Works Fees and Charges By-law.

GC-0368-2014/September 3, 2014

16. INQUIRIES

17. OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

18. CLOSED SESSION

(a) Pursuant to the Municipal Act, Section 239 (2)

(i) Litigation or potential, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board re: Tomken Road Paramedic Reporting Facility and Fire Station 116-Claim Against Thomas Brown Architects Inc. (Ward 5).


(iii) Litigation or potential, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board re: Proposed Settlement of Ontario Municipal Board Appeal – Rezoning and Consent and Minor Variance Applications for 2167 Gordon Drive – Proposed Settlement with Raffi Konialian (Ward 7).

(iv) Labour Relations re: – Elected Officials’ Office Staffing.
19. **CONFIRMATORY BILL**

A by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Council of The Corporation of the City of Mississauga at its meeting held on September 10, 2014.

20. **ADJOURNMENT**
DATE: August 20, 2014

TO: Mayor and Members of Council
Meeting Date: September 10, 2014

FROM: Gary Kent
Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: Tax Adjustments Pursuant to Sections 357 and 358

RECOMMENDATION: That the tax adjustments outlined in Appendix 1 attached to the report dated August 20, 2014 from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer for applications for cancellation or refund of taxes pursuant to Sections 357 and 358 of the Municipal Act, be adopted.

BACKGROUND: Sections 357 and 358 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25 allow a property owner or the Treasurer to make application for the cancellation, reduction or refund of taxes for a number of specific reasons. Taxes may be adjusted when a building has been demolished or razed by fire or if a property has become exempt, changed class or has been overcharged by reason of gross or manifest error.

COMMENTS: A total of 59 applications for tax adjustments have been prepared for Council's consideration on Wednesday, September 10, 2014.
The total cancellation or refund of taxes as recommended is $249,124.90. Appendix 1 outlines the tax cancellations being recommended by property and summarizes by appeal reason the number of applications and tax dollars recommended for reduction.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: The City’s portion of the cancellations resulting from the Section 357 and 358 tax adjustments is $54,312.50.


[Signature]
Gary Kent
Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer

Prepared By: Connie Mesih, Manager, Revenue and Taxation
## Tax Appeals Pursuant to the Municipal Act

**For Hearing On September 10, 2014**

### Corporate Services

### Section 357 : 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal No</th>
<th>Roll No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reason for Appeal</th>
<th>Tax Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8819</td>
<td>05-01-0-018-01300-0000</td>
<td>1546 DOUGLAS DR</td>
<td>Demolished/razed-fire</td>
<td>-550.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8890</td>
<td>05-01-0-068-00900-0000</td>
<td>140 CAMILLA PL</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-1,429.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8719</td>
<td>05-02-0-025-02800-0000</td>
<td>595 WINSTON CHURCHILL BLVD</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-142.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8857</td>
<td>05-02-0-025-03500-0000</td>
<td>2620 ROYAL WINDSOR DR</td>
<td>Demolished/razed-fire</td>
<td>-35,724.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8708</td>
<td>05-02-0-031-05600-0000</td>
<td>1559 LORNE WOOD RD</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-1,821.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8580</td>
<td>05-04-0-096-19192-0000</td>
<td>0 BLACKHEATH RIDGE REAR</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-260.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8754</td>
<td>05-04-0-098-09800-0000</td>
<td>1595 EGLINTON AVE W</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8827</td>
<td>05-04-0-099-10600-0000</td>
<td>5100 ERIN MILLS PKY</td>
<td>Unusable minimum 3 months</td>
<td>-20,576.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8577</td>
<td>05-04-0-117-06800-0000</td>
<td>155 BRITANNIA RD E</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8790</td>
<td>05-04-0-117-24770-0000</td>
<td>6970 KENDERRY GATE</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-10,316.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8850</td>
<td>05-04-0-144-00600-0000</td>
<td>3125 WOLFEDALE RD</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-11,682.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8832</td>
<td>05-04-0-144-00610-0000</td>
<td>3440 WOLFEDALE RD</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-37.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8769</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-16229-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8770</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-16233-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-1,820.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8771</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-16250-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8772</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-16318-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>-1,360.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8725</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-16324-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>-4,150.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8773</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-16329-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-431.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8781</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-16333-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8774</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-60005-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8780</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-60006-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8775</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-60023-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8776</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-60026-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8777</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-60033-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8778</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-60103-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8779</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-60104-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8729</td>
<td>05-05-0-113-60106-0000</td>
<td>0 AIRPORT RD</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>-4,733.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8799</td>
<td>05-05-0-116-49596-0000</td>
<td>6830 COLUMBUS RD</td>
<td>Class change</td>
<td>-3,282.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tax Appeals Pursuant to the Municipal Act

**For Hearing On September 10, 2014**

#### Corporate Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal No</th>
<th>Roll No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reason for Appeal</th>
<th>Tax Adjustment Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8599</td>
<td>05-06-0-125-00900-0000</td>
<td>2564 CONFEDERATION PKY</td>
<td>Class change</td>
<td>-3,686.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8640</td>
<td>05-06-0-131-01200-0000</td>
<td>2225 ERIN MILLS PKY</td>
<td>Unusable minimum 3 months</td>
<td>-21,814.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8826</td>
<td>05-06-0-141-17100-0000</td>
<td>1151 DUNDAS ST W</td>
<td>Unusable minimum 3 months</td>
<td>-27,573.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8607</td>
<td>05-06-0-155-04210-0000</td>
<td>2550 DUNWIN DR</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>-2,860.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8764</td>
<td>05-09-0-004-16800-0000</td>
<td>7 STAVEBANK RD</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-134.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8588</td>
<td>05-11-0-002-09700-0000</td>
<td>2055 BRITANNIA RD W</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>-6,162.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8782</td>
<td>05-12-0-004-06500-0000</td>
<td>275 QUEEN ST S</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-249.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8797</td>
<td>05-12-0-006-09210-0000</td>
<td>60 TANNERY ST</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>-236.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8715</td>
<td>05-15-0-070-20538-0000</td>
<td>3250 BENTLEY DR 60</td>
<td>Demolished/razed-fire</td>
<td>-408.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8623</td>
<td>05-15-0-082-51001-0000</td>
<td>3931 BEACHAM ST</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>-4,707.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Section 357 : 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeal No</th>
<th>Roll No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reason for Appeal</th>
<th>Tax Adjustment Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8894</td>
<td>05-01-0-011-03200-0000</td>
<td>125 ANGELENE ST</td>
<td>Demolished/razed-fire</td>
<td>-637.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8730</td>
<td>05-01-0-065-02700-0000</td>
<td>2165 CORSAIR RD</td>
<td>Demolished/razed-unused</td>
<td>-1,627.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8603</td>
<td>05-04-0-098-20300-0000</td>
<td>0 DERRY RD W</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-127.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8851</td>
<td>05-04-0-144-06600-0000</td>
<td>3125 WOLFEDALE RD</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-15,523.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8736</td>
<td>05-05-0-107-46529-0000</td>
<td>7299 SIGSBEE DR</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-897.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8762</td>
<td>05-05-0-118-08500-0000</td>
<td>6405 NORTHAM DR</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-21,687.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8870</td>
<td>05-06-0-125-00900-0000</td>
<td>2564 CONFEDERATION PKY</td>
<td>Demolished/razed-fire</td>
<td>-2,001.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8808</td>
<td>05-06-0-155-04210-0000</td>
<td>2550 DUNWIN DR</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-21,902.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8916</td>
<td>05-09-0-001-15500-0000</td>
<td>94 CUMBERLAND DR</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8914</td>
<td>05-15-0-083-34100-0000</td>
<td>3697 ST LAURENT CRT</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-233.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8748</td>
<td>05-15-0-083-88200-0000</td>
<td>3468 INGRAM RD</td>
<td>Demolished/razed-fire</td>
<td>-1,063.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                           **-65,702.16**

**Section Total**                                    **-231,858.43**

---
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Corporate Services

Section 358 : 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8662</td>
<td>05-04-0-096-19192-0000</td>
<td>0 BLACKHEATH RIDGE REAR</td>
<td>-215.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: -215.39

Section 358 : 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8689</td>
<td>05-01-0-068-00900-0000</td>
<td>140 CAMILLA PL</td>
<td>-1,340.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8717</td>
<td>05-02-0-025-02600-0000</td>
<td>595 WINSTON CHURCHILL BLVD</td>
<td>-18.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8681</td>
<td>05-04-0-096-19192-0000</td>
<td>0 BLACKHEATH RIDGE REAR</td>
<td>-250.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8901</td>
<td>05-04-0-098-20300-0000</td>
<td>0 DERRY RD W</td>
<td>-125.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8763</td>
<td>05-09-0-004-16800-0000</td>
<td>7 STAVEBANK RD</td>
<td>-132.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: -1,866.66

Section 358 : 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8845</td>
<td>05-01-0-060-08601-0000</td>
<td>565 ORWELL ST</td>
<td>-4,714.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8902</td>
<td>05-04-0-098-20300-0000</td>
<td>0 DERRY RD W</td>
<td>-126.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8887</td>
<td>05-05-0-116-02600-0000</td>
<td>1905 SHAWSON DR</td>
<td>-5,924.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8830</td>
<td>05-06-0-141-16906-0000</td>
<td>1063 DUNDAS ST W</td>
<td>-4,418.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: -15,184.42

Section Total: -17,266.47
### Tax Adjustments Pursuant to the Municipal Act

For Hearing On September 10, 2014

Corporate Services

#### Tax Adjustment Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 357</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-166,156.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-65,702.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 358</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-215.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-1,866.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-15,184.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>-249,124.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tax Appeals Pursuant to the Municipal Act
For Hearing On September 10, 2014

Corporate Services

Summary of Tax Adjustment by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Became exempt</td>
<td>-24,212.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>gross/manifest error</td>
<td>-105,964.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Demolished/razed-fire</td>
<td>-40,385.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demolished/razed-unusable</td>
<td>-1,627.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Class change</td>
<td>-6,969.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unusable minimum 3 months</td>
<td>-69,965.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: -249,124.90
DATE: August 21, 2014

TO: Mayor and Members of Council
Meeting Date: September 10, 2014

FROM: Gary Kent
Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: Apportionment of Taxes

RECOMMENDATION: That the recommended apportionment of taxes and payments set out in Appendix 1 of the report dated August 21, 2014 from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer be approved.

BACKGROUND: Section 356 of the Municipal Act allows a local municipality to apportion taxes if land which was assessed in one block at the return of the assessment roll is subsequently divided into two or more parcels and to direct what proportion of any payment of taxes is to be applied to each of the parcels.

COMMENTS: The Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) has advised of a number of properties that have been divided into parcels subsequent to the return of the assessment roll. Section 356 of the Municipal Act provides for taxes levied on the land to be apportioned to the newly created parcels. In addition, the municipality is to direct what proportion of any payment of taxes is to be applied to each of the parcels.

In accordance with section 356(1) of the Municipal Act, taxes levied on the land for the year in which the property is divided and any
unpaid taxes for years prior to that year have been proportionately apportioned to the newly created parcels based on the relative assessed value of the parcels as determined by MPAC. Supplementary taxes levied for the year in which the property was divided have been allocated to the parcel to which they pertain.

All payments applied to the property tax account being apportioned, from the year of the land division to date, must be allocated to the appropriate parcels. Payments have been allocated based on the parcel that payment was intended for or distributed proportionately among the parcels if the payment was intended for the entire block.

A Summary of Apportionment of Taxes listing newly created parcels and the recommended apportionment of taxes and payments is provided as Appendix 1.

Owners of the apportioned lands have been sent notification. Property owners have the right to appeal the decision of Council to the Assessment Review Board.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: Not applicable.

CONCLUSION: There are a number of properties that were assessed in one block at the return of the assessment roll and subsequently divided into parcels. The Municipal Act requires Council to approve the apportionment of taxes and allocation of payments subsequent to the division of property.

ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1: Summary of Apportionment of Taxes under the Municipal Act for hearing on September 10, 2014.

Prepared By: Connie Mesih, Manager, Revenue and Taxation

Gary Kent
Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer
# Summary of Apportionment of Taxes under the Municipal Act

For Hearing on September 10, 2014

Rosanna Angellini  
(905)615-3200

Corporate Services Revenue  
August 21, 2014 12:28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apportionment No</th>
<th>Roll No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Legal Descr</th>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Recommended Apportionment of Taxes</th>
<th>Recommended Apportionment of Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8539</td>
<td>05-07-0-053-13021-0000</td>
<td>921 QUEENSWAY E</td>
<td>TORONTO CON 1 SDS PT LOT 9 PLAN G14 PT LOT 29 RP 43R 7841 PARTS 2 &amp; 3 PT PARTS 1 &amp; 4 RP 43R8233 PART 2 RP 43R10151 PARTS 9 &amp; 10 PT PARTS 8 11</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5,466,918</td>
<td>124,245.86</td>
<td>- 124,245.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8540</td>
<td>05-07-0-053-13021-0000</td>
<td>921 QUEENSWAY E</td>
<td>TORONTO CON 1 SDS PT LOT 9 PLAN G14 PT LOT 29 RP 43R 7841 PARTS 2 &amp; 3 PT PARTS 1 &amp; 4 RP 43R8233 PART 2 RP 43R10151 PARTS 9 &amp; 10 PT PARTS 8 11</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5,797,332</td>
<td>126,560.25</td>
<td>- 301,063.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8542</td>
<td>05-07-0-159-22825-0000</td>
<td>1213 HAIG BLVD</td>
<td>TORONTO CON 2 SDS PT LOT 7 RP 43R34788 PART 1</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>496,011</td>
<td>4,596.27</td>
<td>- 1,793.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-07-0-159-22850-0000</td>
<td>0 HAIG BLVD</td>
<td>TORONTO CON 2 SDS PT LOT 7 RP 43R34788 PART 2</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>450,989</td>
<td>4,179.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8543</td>
<td>05-15-0-085-04224-0000</td>
<td>0 MARGARITA CRES</td>
<td>PLAN M1437 PT BLK 455 RP 43R27262 PART 34</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>70,852</td>
<td>1,596.49</td>
<td>- 1,184.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-15-0-085-04223-0000</td>
<td>0 MARGARITA CRES</td>
<td>PLAN M1437 PT BLK 455 RP 43R27262 PART 35</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>74,148</td>
<td>1,672.86</td>
<td>- 1,239.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8544</td>
<td>05-15-0-085-04224-0000</td>
<td>0 MARGARITA CRES</td>
<td>PLAN M1437 PT BLK 455 RP 43R27262 PART 34</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>74,639</td>
<td>693.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-15-0-085-04223-0000</td>
<td>0 MARGARITA CRES</td>
<td>PLAN M1437 PT BLK 455 RP 43R27262 PART 35</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>78,111</td>
<td>725.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8546</td>
<td>05-01-0-014-07505-0000</td>
<td>0 SOUTH SERVICE RD</td>
<td>PLAN 372</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>181,655</td>
<td>3,976.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-01-0-014-07510-0000</td>
<td>0 SOUTH SERVICE RD</td>
<td>PLAN 372 PT BLK A</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>121,345</td>
<td>2,656.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8548</td>
<td>05-05-0-115-09522-0000</td>
<td>2792 SLOUGH ST</td>
<td>PLAN 737 BLK B RP 43R34314 PARTS 18 TO 21</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,630,507</td>
<td>34,270.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Apportionment of Taxes under the Municipal Act

**For Hearing on September 10, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apportionment No</th>
<th>Roll No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Legal Dscr</th>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Recommended Apportionment of Taxes</th>
<th>Recommended Apportionment of Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8548</td>
<td>05-05-0-115-09524-0000</td>
<td>2790 SLOUGH ST</td>
<td>PLAN 737 BLK B RP 43R34314 PARTS 13 TO 17</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,539,433</td>
<td>37,566.05</td>
<td>- 46,684.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-05-0-115-09526-0000</td>
<td>2788 SLOUGH ST</td>
<td>PLAN 737 PT BLK B RP 43R34314 PARTS 6 TO 12</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,128,810</td>
<td>24,011.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8549</td>
<td>05-01-0-014-07505-0000</td>
<td>0 SOUTH SERVICE RD</td>
<td>PLAN 372</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>178,658</td>
<td>1,657.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-01-0-014-07510-0000</td>
<td>0 SOUTH SERVICE RD</td>
<td>PLAN 372 PT BLK A</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>119,342</td>
<td>1,107.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8550</td>
<td>05-05-0-115-16300-0000</td>
<td>7600 TORBRAM RD</td>
<td>TORONTO CON 5 EHS PT LOT 14 AND RP 43R1708 PARTS 1 AND 2 PT PARTS 3 AND 4 RP 43R33542 PARTS 1 TO 3 AND 5</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7,905,203</td>
<td>155,888.46</td>
<td>- 155,888.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8551</td>
<td>05-02-0-023-03400-0000</td>
<td>948 CLARKSON RD S</td>
<td>MISSISSAUGA CON 3SDS PT LOT 29 RP 43R35322 PART 1</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>633,475</td>
<td>5,942.85</td>
<td>- 5,942.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8552</td>
<td>05-02-0-023-03400-0000</td>
<td>948 CLARKSON RD S</td>
<td>MISSISSAUGA CON 3SDS PT LOT 29 RP 43R35322 PART 1</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>669,983</td>
<td>6,085.03</td>
<td>- 4,046.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8553</td>
<td>05-05-0-115-16300-0000</td>
<td>7600 TORBRAM RD</td>
<td>TORONTO CON 5 EHS PT LOT 14 AND RP 43R1708 PARTS 1 AND 2 PT PARTS 3 AND 4 RP 43R33542 PARTS 1 TO 3 AND 5</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8,082,802</td>
<td>154,845.87</td>
<td>- 155,466.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8554</td>
<td>05-01-0-003-07901-0000</td>
<td>1224 CAWTHRA RD</td>
<td>PLAN B19 PTLOTS 144 TO 148 AND RP 43R17872 PART 2 RP 43R21974 PART 2 RP 43R12940 PART 1</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,092,250</td>
<td>19,387.81</td>
<td>- 19,439.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8556</td>
<td>05-07-0-159-21905-0000</td>
<td>1169 HAIG BLVD</td>
<td>TORONTO CON 2 SDS PT LOT 7 RP 43R35141 PART 2</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>751,000</td>
<td>6,992.12</td>
<td>- 8,170.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-07-0-159-22101-0000</td>
<td>1173 HAIG BLVD</td>
<td>TORONTO CON 2 SDS PT LOT 7 RP 43R9940 PART 1 RP 43R35141 PART 1</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,342,500</td>
<td>12,443.25</td>
<td>- 19,957.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Apportionment of Taxes under the Municipal Act

**For Hearing on September 18, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apportionment No</th>
<th>Roll No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Legal Descr</th>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Recommended Apportionment of Taxes</th>
<th>Recommended Apportionment of Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8557</td>
<td>05-04-0-154-01303-0000</td>
<td>0 PARKSIDE VILLAGE DR</td>
<td>TORONTO CON 2 NDS PT LOT 19</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15,412,159</td>
<td>228,593.43</td>
<td>-228,593.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-04-0-154-01313-0000</td>
<td>4050 PARKSIDE VILLAGE DR PLAN 43M1925 BLK 1</td>
<td>RP 43R30808 PART 2 PT PART 1</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,626,280</td>
<td>24,121.01</td>
<td>-24,121.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-04-0-154-01323-0000</td>
<td>4010 PARKSIDE VILLAGE DR PLAN 43M1925 BLK 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,353,393</td>
<td>20,073.55</td>
<td>-20,073.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-04-0-154-01333-0000</td>
<td>0 PARKSIDE VILLAGE DR PLAN 43M1925 BLK 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,124,321</td>
<td>46,340.00</td>
<td>-46,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-04-0-154-01343-0000</td>
<td>415 BURNHAMTHORPE RD V PLAN 43M1925 BLK 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,002,141</td>
<td>44,527.82</td>
<td>-44,527.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-04-0-154-01353-0000</td>
<td>0 PARKSIDE VILLAGE DR PLAN 43M1925 BLK 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,351,227</td>
<td>49,705.47</td>
<td>-49,705.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-04-0-154-01363-0000</td>
<td>0 BRICKSTONE MEWS</td>
<td>PLAN 43M1925 BLK 6</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>-10.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M050</td>
<td>05-05-0-100-03451-0000</td>
<td>0 GOREWAY DR</td>
<td>MISSISSAUGA CON 8 SD PT LTS 7, 8 RP43R11337 PTS 2 TO 10 PT PT 1</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>793,280</td>
<td>5,669.16</td>
<td>-469.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-05-0-100-03460-0000</td>
<td>0 GOREWAY DR</td>
<td>MISSISSAUGA CON 8 SD PT LT 8 RP43R33793 PTS 1 TO 4</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>428,220</td>
<td>3,060.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M051</td>
<td>05-05-0-100-03231-0000</td>
<td>0 ZAHAVY WAY</td>
<td>MISSISSAUGA CON 8 CON SD PT LTS 7, 8 RP 43R9989 PTS 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23 TO 28, 28 AND 29 PT PTS 15, 16, 19, 22 AND 27</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>745,812</td>
<td>11,606.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-05-0-100-03240-0000</td>
<td>0 ZAHAVY WAY</td>
<td>MISSISSAUGA CON 8 SD PT LTS 7, 8 RP43R33793 PTS 5 TO 8</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>143,388</td>
<td>1,036.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M052</td>
<td>05-05-0-100-03240-0000</td>
<td>0 ZAHAVY WAY</td>
<td>MISSISSAUGA CON 8 SD PT LTS 7, 8 RP43R33793 PTS 5 TO 8</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>349,839</td>
<td>2,500.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05-05-0-100-03231-0000</td>
<td>0 ZAHAVY WAY</td>
<td>MISSISSAUGA CON 8 CON SD PT LTS 7, 8 RP 43R9989 PTS 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23 TO 28, 28 AND 29 PT PTS 15, 16, 19, 22 AND 27</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,819,161</td>
<td>13,000.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,181,348.86</td>
<td>-1,258,965.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: August 26, 2014

TO: Mayor and Members of Council
    Meeting Date: September 10, 2014

FROM: Gary Kent
      Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: Appointment of Screening Officers for Administrative Penalties System

RECOMMENDATION: That a by-law be enacted to repeal By-laws 0286-2013 and 0103-2014, and to appoint Screening Officers for the Administrative Penalties System, as outlined in the report from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer, dated August 26, 2014.

BACKGROUND: The Municipal Act, 2001, authorizes municipalities to implement an Administrative Penalties System (APS) for non-compliance with any by-laws respecting licensing and parking. Ontario Regulation 333/07, under the Municipal Act, 2001 allows municipalities to establish an APS for administering, disputing and resolving most minor parking offences as an alternative to the current system of parking tickets being processed.

At its meeting of July 3, 2013 Council approved a recommendation to proceed with the implementation of an APS for the enforcement of licensing and parking by-law in the City of Mississauga. On November 20, 2013, Council approved a recommendation to establish the position of screening officer and on December 11, 2013, By-law 0286-2013 was enacted, which appointed staff to the position of Screening Officer for the purpose of adjudicating reviews of administrative penalties.
On May 14, 2014, Council adopted By-law 0103-2014, which appointed the Manager of Court Administration, the Supervisor of Court Administration and one additional staff person as Screening Officers, to ensure that resources exist to respond to public requests for review of an administrative penalty. Since the enactment of By-law 0103-2014 one additional Supervisor of Court Administration has been appointed. In addition, as a result of staffing changes one additional staff person has been recruited to perform the duties of Screening Officer. The By-law must be revised to reflect the changes in the appointment of personnel authorized to respond to public requests for review of an administrative penalty, and the following additional staff appointed as Screening Officers:

Carmela Carleton
Mangaljit Raja Dabb

**COMMENTS:**

As a result, By-law 0286-2013 and 0103-2014 must be repealed and a new By-law enacted to reflect changes in the appointment of personnel authorized to respond to public requests for review of an administrative penalty.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

Not applicable.

**CONCLUSION:**

That a By-law be enacted to amend By-law 0-2014, to reflect changes in the personnel authorized to respond to public requests for review of an administrative penalty.

Gary Kent
Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer

*Prepared By: Crystal Greer, Director of Legislative Services and City Clerk*
DATE: August 28, 2014

TO: Mayor and Members of Council
   Meeting Date: September 10, 2014

FROM: Martin Powell, P.Eng.
      Commissioner of Transportation and Works

SUBJECT: Assumption of Municipal Works (Ward 4)

RECOMMENDATION: That the City of Mississauga assume the municipal works as constructed by the developer under the terms of the Servicing Agreement for 43M-1693, Shelltown Construction Ltd. (lands located north of Highway 403, south of Eglinton Avenue West, east of Mavis Road and east and west of Confederation Parkway, in Z-29, known as Madill Residential Subdivision – Phase 1, T-86088) and that the Letter of Credit in the amount of $323,332.75 be returned to the developer and that a by-law be enacted to assume the road allowances within the Registered Plan as public highway and part of the municipal system of the City of Mississauga.

   43M-1693 (Ward 4)

BACKGROUND: The developer identified on the attached Table of Assumptions (Appendix 1) has complied with all the requirements of the Servicing Agreement.
FINANCIAL IMPACT: With the assumption of Madill Residential Subdivision – Phase 1, T-86088 (43M-1693), the City will now be required to provide maintenance for 2,205 metres (7,234 feet) of the newly constructed storm sewer and 2.30 lane kilometres (7,546 feet) of roadway.

CONCLUSION: It is in order for the City to assume the municipal works within the sites identified on the attached Table of Assumptions (Appendix 1).

ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1: Table of Assumptions

Appendix 2: Approximate location of Madill Residential Subdivision – Phase 1, T-86088, 43M-1693

Martin Powell, P. Eng.
Commissioner of Transportation and Works

Prepared by: Silvio Cesario, P.Eng.,
Acting Manager, Development Construction
## TABLE OF ASSUMPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN/FILE REFERENCE #</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DEVELOPER ADDRESS</th>
<th>SERVICING AGREEMENT DATE</th>
<th>SECURITIES TO BE RELEASED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43M-1693</td>
<td>North of Highway 403, south of Eglinton Avenue West, east of Mavis Road and west of Confederation Parkway (Z-29)</td>
<td>Shelltown Construction Ltd. 80 Tiverton Court, Suite 300 Markham, ON L3R 0G4 Attn: Mr. Al Brown</td>
<td>December 14, 2005</td>
<td>$323,332.75 Cancel Insurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT 11 - 2014

TO: THE MAYOR & MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

General Committee of Council presents its eleventh Report of 2014 and recommends:

GC-0368-2014

1. That a by-law be enacted to amend the Animal Care and Control By-law 0098-04, as amended, to provide for greater standards of care for animals and dogs as outlined in the report from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works, dated August 20, 2014 and entitled “Animal Standards of Care”.

2. That the Animal Care and Control By-law 0098-04, as amended, be amended to provide Animal Services officers with the authorization to enter on lands, as provided for under the Municipal Act, to carry out an inspection to determine whether the by-law has been complied with including the provisions relating to standards of care.

3. That a by-law be enacted to amend the Fees and Charges Transportation and Works By-law 250-13, as amended, to incorporate an application fee to process exemptions to the pen and tethering time limitations as outlined in the report from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works, dated August 20, 2014 and entitled “Animal Standards of Care”.

4. That information outreach, using existing communication channels, be updated to inform pet owners about responsible pet care related to tethering, pens and doghouses, animal standards of care, extreme weather, pets in vehicles and barking dogs; and, commence with a 2014 winter campaign, as well as a media release upon approval of the by-law changes by Council.

5. That staff report to General Committee in the fall of 2015 on the impact of the changes to the Animal Care and Control By-law 0098-04, as amended, for greater standards of care for animals and dogs, including a summary of the enforcement activity, identification of any issues and further amendments to the by-law, if required.

GC-0369-2014

That the following information items regarding animal standards of care be received for information:

a) Letter dated August 29, 2014 from Roman Hapek, resident.
b) Letter dated August 29, 2014 from Chris Johnson.
c) Letter dated August 29, 2014 from Vanessa Lycos.
d) Letter dated August 30, 2014 from Sonja Didyk.
f) Letter dated August 30, 2014 from Isabel Martins.
g) Letter dated September 2, 2014 from Wanda.
h) Letter dated September 2, 2014 from Ashley Rhodes, PETA.

GC-0370-2014
1. That the City undertake the necessary procedure to rename Dupont Meadow Place from its current name to Crossroads Place.
2. That the standard City of Mississauga public street name signs indicating the name of the street be erected at the appropriate locations by City forces.
3. That the street be double signed by the Transportation and Works Department, indicating the old and new names for a period of 12 months after renaming occurs.
(Ward 9)

GC-0371-2014
That Southland Technicore Mole J. V. be granted an exemption from Noise Control By-law No. 360-79, as amended, to allow for extended tunnelling construction work of the Hanlan Feedermain in the southwest corner of Eastgate Parkway at Tomken Road, commencing at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 1, 2014 and ending at 7:00 a.m. on Friday, February 3, 2017.
(Ward 3)

GC-0372-2014
That the Corporate Report dated August 12, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services with respect to rooftop solar applications under the Provincial Small Feed-in Tariff (FIT) 4.0 Program, be received for information.

GC-0373-2014

GC-0374-2014
1. That the Commissioner of Community Services and the City Clerk on behalf of the City of Mississauga be authorized to enter into a Licence Agreement with Bell Mobility Inc. (Bell) and a subsequent renewal thereof for the installation of signal enhancing equipment at City Hall, Hershey Centre, Hershey Community Rinks and Hershey Sportzone, and the purchase of advertising, in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor.
2. That all necessary by-laws be enacted.
GC-0375-2014
That a by-law be enacted to appoint Timothy Beckett as Fire Chief of the City of Mississauga Fire and Emergency Services, and that By-law 0127-2009, as amended, be repealed.

GC-0376-2014
That Council pass a resolution supporting the nomination of the Holcim Waterfront Estate to the Lieutenant Governor’s Ontario Heritage Award for Excellence in Conservation as outlined in this Corporate Report titled “Council Resolution in support of Holcim Waterfront Estate nomination to the Ontario Heritage Awards” dated August 21, 2014 from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer.

GC-0377-2014
That the Corporate Report titled “Procurement of Electricity and Natural Gas 2013-2014” dated August 18, 2014 from the Commissioner, Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer be received for information.

GC-0378-2014
1. That the City of Mississauga’s 2013 Treasurer’s Statement as required under the Development Charges Act, 1997, be received.

2. That the City of Mississauga’s 2013 Treasurer’s Statement be sent to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing within 60 days of Council receipt, as per the legislation.

GC-0379-2014
1. That the “Financial Report as at June 30, 2014” report dated August 14, 2014, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer, including appendices 1-1 to 3-1, be approved.

2. That the Treasurer be authorized to fund and close the capital projects as identified in this report.

3. That the necessary by-laws be enacted.

GC-0380-2014
That the report dated August 13, 2014 from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer entitled Delegation of Authority – Acquisition, Disposal, Administration and Lease of Land and Property – January 1, 2014 to June 30, 2014 be received for information.
GC-0381-2014

1. That a portion of City owned property containing a site area of approximately 3 square metres (32.29 square feet), municipally known as 6375 Airport Road and legally described as Part 5 on Reference Plan 43R-35890, City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, in Ward 5, be declared surplus to the City’s requirements for the purpose of a proposed gratuitous dedication to the Regional Municipality of Peel (Peel Region) to establish a 0.3 metre reserve.

2. That the Commissioner of Community Services and the City Clerk be authorized to execute on behalf of the City, all closing documentation that may be required in connection with the transfer of a portion of City owned property at 6375 Airport Road, described as Part 5 on Reference Plan 43R-35890, to Peel Region.

3. That all steps necessary to comply with the requirements of Section 2.(1) of City Notice By-law 215-08 be taken, including giving notice to the public by posting a notice on the City of Mississauga’s website for a two week period, where the expiry of the two week period will be at least one week prior to the transfer of the subject lands.

4. That following Council approval of the surplus declaration, easements be granted to protect the existing services and utilities within Part 5 on Reference Plan 43R-35890.

(Ward 5)

GC-0382-2014

1. That a portion of City owned lands containing an area of approximately 560 square metres (6,028 square feet), located on the north side of Beverley Street and municipally known as 29 Beverley Street, being Land Titles Act PIN 13273-0461LT and described as Parts 11, 12, 13 and 14 on Reference Plan 43R-32465, in the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, in Ward 5, be declared surplus to the City’s requirements.

2. That following the subject lands being declared surplus the Realty Services Section of the Corporate Services Department be authorized to dispose of the subject lands at fair market value in accordance with Corporate Policy 05-04-01, Acquisition and Disposal of Real Property.

3. That following the subject lands being declared surplus, easements be granted to protect existing services and utilities within the subject lands prior to disposal.
4. That all steps necessary to comply with the requirements of Section 2. (1) of the City Notice by-law 215-08 be taken, including giving notice of the proposed sale on the City of Mississauga’s website for a two week period, where the expiry of the two week period will be at least one week before the execution of the agreement for the sale of the subject lands.

(Ward 5)

GC-0383-2014

1. That the following City owned lands be declared surplus to the City’s requirements for the purpose of transfer to Metrolinx, at market value:

   i) Located on the north side of Eglinton Avenue West, between Commerce Boulevard and Renforth Drive, containing a site area of approximately 1,382 square metres (14,875.7 square feet) and legally described under the Land Titles Act as part of PIN 07424-0215 (LT) and designated as Parts 1 and 2 on the draft reference plan prepared by Cunningham McConnell Limited (O.L.S. File No. 12-100-3N), in the City of Toronto;

   ii) Located at the southeast corner of Eglinton Avenue West and Renforth Drive, containing a site area of approximately 416 square metres (4,477.8 square feet) and legally described under the Land Titles Act as part of PIN 07441-0216 (LT) and designated as Parts 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21 and 32 on the draft reference plan prepared by Cunningham McConnell Limited (O.L.S. File No. 12-100-3N), in the City of Toronto;

   iii) Located on the north side of Eglinton Avenue West, west of Renforth Drive, containing a site area of approximately 1,110 square metres (11,949.9 square feet) and legally described under the Land Titles Act as part of PIN 13297-0295 (LT) and designated as Part 13 on the draft reference plan prepared by Cunningham McConnell Limited (O.L.S. File No. 12-100-5H), in the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel (Ward 5).

2. That all steps necessary to comply with the requirements of Section 2. (1) of the City Notice by-law 215-08 be taken, including giving notice of the proposed sale on the City of Mississauga’s website for a two week period, where the expiry of the two week period will be at least one week before the execution of the agreement for the sale of the subject lands.

3. That following Council approval of the surplus declaration, easements be granted to protect any existing services and utilities within these properties.
4. That a by-law be enacted authorizing the Commissioner of Transportation and Works and the City Clerk to execute and affix the Corporate Seal to an Agreement, in a form and content satisfactory to the City Solicitor, to authorize the transfer of land to Metrolinx, as may be required in connection with the eastern leg of the Mississauga Transitway.

(Ward 5)

GC-0384-2014

1. That a portion of City owned lands located on the south side of Burnhamthorpe Road West, municipally known as 134 Burnhamthorpe West, being part of Land Titles Act PIN 13144-0249 LT and described as Part 8 on the draft reference plan prepared by Young & Young surveying Inc. (Project 14-B6662-2, containing a site area of approximately 669.3 square metres (.165 acres), in the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, in Ward 7, be declared surplus to the City’s requirements.

2. That, once the subject lands are declared surplus, the Realty Services Section of the Corporate Services Department be authorized to enter into negotiations for a Land Exchange Agreement, at fair market value, between The Corporation of the City of Mississauga (“City”) and Enersource Corporation (“Enersource”), including all documents ancillary thereto, and, any amending agreements as may be required to exchange title to their respective lands.

3. That all steps necessary to comply with the requirements of Section 2. (1) of the City Notice by-law 215-08 be taken, including giving notice of the proposed sale on the City of Mississauga’s website for a two week period, where the expiry of the two week period will be at least one week before the execution of the agreement for the sale of the subject lands.

(Ward 7)

GC-0385-2014

1. That a portion of City owned lands located on the south side of Mill Street, forming part of Streetsville Memorial Park (P-114), municipally known as 41 Mill Street (Timothy Street House), containing an area of approximately 0.23 ha. (0.57 ac.) and legally described under the Land Titles Act as PIN number 13196-0632 (LT), City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, in Ward 11, be declared surplus to the City’s requirements.

2. That Realty Services staff be authorized to proceed to dispose of the subject lands at fair market value, on the open market, once they are declared surplus.
3. That all steps necessary to comply with the requirements of Section 2.(1) of the City Notice by-law 215-08 be taken, including giving notice of the proposed sale on the City of Mississauga’s website for a two week period, where the expiry of the two week period will be at least one week before the execution of the agreement for the sale of the subject lands.

(Ward 11)

GC-0386-2014

1. That a by-law be enacted authorizing the closure of part of the road allowance on the east side of Second Line West comprised of 861.90 square metres (9,277.40 square feet) of land and legally described as Part of Lot 12, Concession 2 W.H.S., Geographic Township of Toronto, County of Peel, designated as public highway by The Corporation of the Town of Mississauga By-law 9995, registered as Instrument VS219870, designated as Parts 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14 on Plan 43R-35891, in the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, in Ward 11.

2. That Parts 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 14 on Reference Plan 43R-35891 (the “Lands”), comprising a total area of 861.90 square metres (9,277.40 square feet) be declared surplus to the City’s requirements for the purpose of transferring to the adjacent owner.

3. That all steps necessary to comply with the requirements of Section 2.(1) of City Notice By-law 215-08 be taken, including giving notice to the public by posting notice on the City of Mississauga’s website for a two week period, where the expiry of the two week period will be at least one week before the execution of the agreement for the sale of the Lands.

4. That following Council approval of the road closure and prior to the sale of the Lands, easements be granted to protect existing services and utilities within the Lands.

(Ward 11)
GC-0387-2014
1. That the Commissioner of Community Services and the City Clerk be authorized to execute and affix the Corporate Seal to a Ground Lease Agreement and all documents ancillary thereto, including any future amending agreements as may be required, between The Corporation of the City of Mississauga ("City") as Landlord and 8159203 Canada Limited ("AM960") as Tenant, for a portion of 3280 Mavis Road, legally described as Part of Lot 21, Concession 1, NDS, Toronto Township, now in the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel in Ward 6, for a twenty (20) year term for the purpose of building and operating a radio tower for CKNT AM960, at an annual rent of $27,500.00 plus HST for the first 10 years, to be increased each year thereafter by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for Toronto, all in form and content satisfactory to the City Solicitor.

2. That the Commissioner of Community Services and the City Clerk be authorized to execute and affix the Corporate Seal to any agreement, as deemed necessary by City Solicitor, to amend the Memorandum of Agreement, dated April 30, 2012, between The City and 2325224 Ontario Inc. to reflect the agreement of both parties to enter into a lease agreement to construct and operate a radio tower on a portion of the City lands located at 3280 Mavis Road.

3. That all necessary By-laws be enacted.
   (Ward 6)

GC-0388-2014
1. That the report entitled, “Citizen Appointment Committee Review”, dated August 22, 2014, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer, be received for information.

2. That the City Clerk be directed to implement the recommended approach to Citizen Appointment for the 2014-2018 term of Council and that Corporate Policy 02-01-01, Citizen Appointments to Committees, Boards and Authorities be revised accordingly.

GC-0389-2014
1. That a bylaw be enacted to declare the Living Arts Centre, located on 4141 Living Arts Drive in Mississauga, Ontario, as a “municipal capital facility”, as such term is defined in the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, and exempt it from taxation for municipal and school purposes until the expiry or earlier termination of the Master Relationship Agreement between The Corporation of the City of Mississauga and the Living Arts Centre in Mississauga.
2. That a resolution be passed as required by O. Reg. 603/06 declaring that the Living Arts Centre is for the purpose of the municipality and for public use.

3. That the City Clerk be directed to notify the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation, the Regional Municipality of Peel, the Minister of Education and the school boards of the contents of the bylaw and resolutions so enacted and passed by Council.

(Ward 4)

GC-0390-2014
(a) That the Memorandum dated July 2, 2014 from Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator, entitled "Alterations to 271 Queen Street South", be received.
(b) That Committee Members and Heritage Staff meet with Mr. Steve Hamelin, Steve Hamelin Architecture Design and Build, at 271 Queen Street South, to review the proposed alterations. (Ward 11)

(HAC-0042-2014)

GC-0391-2014
That the property owner’s request to alter the property located at 1092 Old Derry Road (Ward 11), which is Designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District, be recommended for approval, as described in the Corporate Report dated June 23, 2014, from the Commissioner of Community Services.

(HAC-0043-2014)

GC-0392-2014
That the property owner’s request to alter the property located at 7015 Pond Street (Ward 11), which is Designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District, be recommended for approval, as described in the Corporate Report dated June 23, 2014, from the Commissioner of Community Services.

(HAC-0044-2014)

GC-0393-2014
That the property at 75 Inglewood Drive (Ward 1), which is listed on the City’s Heritage Register as part of the Mineola West Neighbourhood Cultural Landscape, is not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner’s request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect hereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated June 25, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services.

(HAC-0045-2014)
GC-0394-2014
1. That the properties at 24, 26, 28 and 32 Dundas Street East (Ward 7), which are individually listed on the City's Heritage Register, are not worthy of heritage designation, and consequently, that the owner's request to demolish the structure be approved and that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect hereto, as described in the Corporate Report dated June 26, 2014 from the Commissioner of Community Services;
2. That Heritage Staff be directed to convey the Committee's suggestions to the Owner with respect to the three (3) unit structure to consider treating the middle unit's façade differently or by incorporating landscaping or benches to animate the front streetscape.

(HAC-0046-2014)

GC-0395-2014
That the Memorandum dated July 2, 2014 from Laura Waldie, Heritage Coordinator, providing a monthly update from Heritage Coordinators, be received for information.

(HAC-0047-2014)

GC-0396-2014
That the letter dated June 27, 2014 from the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) acknowledging receipt of a Notice of Appeal from Neil O'Conner, Owner of a Designated Part V Structure, Meadowvale Village Heritage Conservation District (Ward 11) located at 1050 Old Derry Road, be received for information.

(HAC-0048-2014)

GC-0397-2014
That Realty Services be authorized to enter into negotiations for the potential acquisition of the property located at 2278 Lakeshore Road West for park purposes.

(Ward 2)

GC-0398-2014
That a by-law be enacted authorizing the Commissioner of Transportation and Works and the City Clerk to execute a Final Settlement Agreement, and all documents ancillary thereto, between Simcoe Fox Developments Limited ("Simcoe Fox") and The Corporation of the City of Mississauga ("City"), in the total amount of $40,275.00, representing full and final payment by the City of all compensation payable under the Expropriations Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter E.26 to Simcoe Fox for the 1998 expropriation of part of the property at 2579 Hurontario Street, being Part 1 on Expropriation Plan D46, which lands were required for the widening of Hurontario Street.

(Ward 7)
Transportation Committee of Council presents its seventh Report of 2014 and recommends:

TC-0151-2014
That the deputation by Ryan Cureatz, Manager, Marketing and Mary-Lou Johnston, Manager, Business Development with respect to the Marketing Communications and Outreach Plan for the Mississauga Transitway Phase 1 Opening be received for information.

TC-0152-2014
That the report entitled “Marketing Communications and Outreach Plan for the Mississauga Transitway Phase 1 Opening” dated August 22, 2014 from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works be received for information.

TC-0153-2014
That a by-law be enacted to amend The Traffic By-law 555-00, as amended, to implement lower driveway boulevard parking between the curb and sidewalk, at anytime, on both sides of Birchmeadow Crescent.

TC-0154-2014
That a by-law be enacted to amend The Traffic By-law 555-00, as amended, to implement lower driveway boulevard parking between the curb and sidewalk, at anytime, on the west side of Huron Heights Drive between Elia Avenue and James Austin Drive (south intersection).

TC-0155-2014
That a by-law be enacted to amend The Traffic By-law 555-00, as amended, to implement an all-way stop control at the intersection of Sidmouth Street and Pickwick Drive.
TC-0157-2014
That a by-law be enacted to amend The Traffic By-law 555-00, as amended, to implement an all-way stop control at the intersection of Black Walnut Trail at Scotch Pine Gate and Black Walnut Trail at Smoke Tree Road.

TC-0158-2014
That a by-law be enacted to amend The Traffic By-law 555-00, as amended, to implement an all-way stop control at the intersection of Passway Road and Russian Olive Close.

TC-0159-2014
That a by-law be enacted to amend The Traffic By-law No. 555-00, as amended, to implement a parking prohibition from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on both sides of Summersky Court.

TC-0160-2014
That a by-law be enacted to amend The Traffic By-law 555-00, as amended, to implement a U-turn prohibition for northbound motorists on Kennedy Road at Pebblebrook Court.

TC-0161-2014
1. That the proposed 2014 Traffic Signal Installation Program, as outlined in the report dated August 12, 2014, from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works, be approved for Wards 5 and 6.


TC-0162-2014
1. That the maximum cost of the multi-year funding Torbram Grade Separations (P.N. 06-104) be approved at $90,000,000 gross costs with recoveries of $34,000,000 for a net cost of $56,000,000.

2. That Torbram Road Grade Separation Projects (P.N. 06-104) net funding be increased by $6,755,000 funded from Development Charges Act – City Wide Engineering Reserve Fund (Acct # 31335) and be incorporated into the 2015 Budget from a cash flow perspective.

3. That the Purchasing Agent be authorized to award the Torbram Road Grade Separations project P.N. 06-104 to Dufferin Construction Company, a division of Holcim (Canada) Inc., 690 Dorval Road, Suite 200, Oakville ON L6K 3W7, in the
estimated amount of $66,756,213 (excluding tax), subject to approval by Brampton Council of their portion of the recoveries in the estimated amount of $19.3M.

4. That the Purchasing Agent be authorized to revise the existing Purchase Order 4500330675 to AECOM Canada Ltd., 5080 Commerce Boulevard, Mississauga ON L4W 4P2 for engineering consulting services for detail design and construction administration for the Torbram Road Grade Separations from $2,476,875 to $4,500,000 (excluding tax).

TC-0163-2014
That Transportation and Works staff be directed to setup a meeting with City of Brampton staff with respect to the status of the Goreway Bridge.

TC-0164-2014
That the deputation by Farhad Shahla, Project Manager with respect to the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for Second Line West Pedestrian and Cyclist Crossing of Highway 401 be received and referred to the Communications and Promotions Subcommittee.
(MCAC-0028-2014)

TC-0165-2014
That the memorandum dated June 30, 2014 from Jacquelyn Hayward Gulati, Manager, Active Transportation regarding the 2nd quarterly update on the proposed 2014 Cycling Network Program be received.
(MCAC-0029-2014)

TC-0166-2014
That the memorandum dated June 30, 2014 from Jacquelyn Hayward Gulati, Manager, Active Transportation regarding the MCAC input into the business planning and budgeting process be received and referred to Irwin Nayer for consideration in achieving a Silver designation as part of the Bicycle Friendly Community award.
(MCAC-0030-2014)

TC-0167-2014
That the 2014 Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee Calendar of Events be received as amended.
(MCAC-0031-2014)

TC-0168-2014
That the Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee action list be received as amended.
(MCAC-0032-2014)
TC-0169-2014
That the following information items be received for information:

a) Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee (MCAC) reviewed the Public Notice regarding the Hurontario-Main Light Rail Transit Project – Environmental Project Report.

b) Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee (MCAC) reviewed the Corporate Report dated June 4, 2014 regarding the Cycling Plan 2013 Progress Report.

c) Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee (MCAC) reviewed the Corporate Report dated April 30, 2014 regarding the 2014 Sidewalk and Multi-Use Trail Construction Programs (Wards 3, 4, 5, 6)

(MCAC-0033-2014)

TC-0170-2014
That the deputation by Michael Gusche, Project Manager with respect to Park 302 Draft Master Plan be received and referred to the Network and Technical Subcommittee.

(MCAC-0034-2014)

TC-0171-2014
That the document dated August 2014 from the Network and Technical Subcommittee regarding the review of cycling infrastructures priorities be approved as amended and forwarded to the Active Transportation Office.

(MCAC-0035-2014)

TC-0172-2014
That the memorandum dated August 6, 2014 from Bob Levesque, Manager, Works Maintenance and Operations entitled FOLLOW UP: April 1st Start Date for Street Sweeping Program be received.

(MCAC-0036-2014)

TC-0173-2014
That the 2014 Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee Calendar of Events be received as amended.

(MCAC-0037-2014)

TC-0174-2014
That the Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee action list be received as amended.

(MCAC-0038-2014)
TC-0175-2014
That the following information items be received for information:
Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee (MCAC) reviewed the e-mail dated July 16, 2014 regarding the School Trip Planning Map LIVE.
(MCAC-0039-2014)
DATE: August 12, 2014

TO: Chair and Members of Transportation Committee
Meeting Date: September 3, 2014

FROM: Martin Powell, P. Eng.
Commissioner of Transportation and Works

SUBJECT: 2014 Traffic Signal Installation Program
(Wards 5, 6 and 9)

RECOMMENDATION: That the proposed 2014 Traffic Signal Installation Program, as outlined in the report dated August 12, 2014, from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works, be approved.

BACKGROUND: The Capital Budget provides for the supply and installation of traffic control signals throughout the City. Typically, intersections are signalized upon realization of technical warrants, or in response to anticipated development.

COMMENTS: The need for the installation of a new traffic signal is indicated when the signal warrant criteria are satisfied, when traffic conditions have changed significantly rendering the existing form of traffic control inefficient, and/or when imminent adjacent development indicates that signalization will be required.

The recommended traffic signal installation locations for 2014 under these criteria are listed below and illustrated on the attached appendices:
Transportation Committee

- Goreway Drive at Nashua Drive/Private Access – S. Int. (Ward 5)
- Matheson Boulevard West at Heatherleigh Avenue (Ward 6)
- Argentia Road at Century Avenue – S. Int. (Ward 9)

FINANCIAL IMPACT: The proposed three signal locations will be funded from the 2014 Traffic Signals (PN14-198) budget.

CONCLUSION: Each significant intersection is estimated to cost approximately $140,000. Sufficient funding is available in the approved 2014 Traffic Signal Capital Program.

ATTACHMENTS: Appendix 1: Location Map: Goreway Drive at Nashua Drive/Private Access – S. Int. (Ward 5)
Appendix 2: Location Map: Matheson Boulevard West at Heatherleigh Avenue (Ward 6)
Appendix 3: Location Map: Argentia Road at Century Avenue – S. Int. (Ward 9)

Martin Powell, P.Eng.
Commissioner of Transportation and Works

Prepared By: Zvonimir Miller, Traffic Signal Technologist
Dear Mayor and Councillors:

In 2004, the House of Commons came together in historic fashion to unanimously pass the Westray Act. The legislation came in response to the horrific Westray Coal mine explosion in Nova Scotia that killed 26 miners on May 9th, 1992, and after a strong lobby campaign by the United Steelworkers to demand “No more Westrays.”

The legislation was intended to hold corporate executives, directors and managers criminally responsible for workplace deaths. Ten years later, approximately 10,000 Canadians have been killed on the job, yet not one corporate executive has faced a single day in jail.

In response to this shameful record, our union has launched a campaign to “Stop The Killing and Enforce The Law”, which asks provincial, territorial and federal governments to work together to ensure that workplace deaths are taken seriously and that, where warranted, the Westray Law is enforced.

As part of this campaign, we are asking city councils to pass resolutions expressing their support for Proactive action to protect workers. Though not an area of municipal responsibility, we recognize you as community leaders and this is a community issue. There is no place in Canada that has not been touched by workplace deaths, and your voices are needed to encourage senior levels of government to take steps to enforce the Westray Law.


I respectfully request that your council consider adding its voice by passing this resolution, and sending it to your provincial municipal association for endorsement. In doing so, you will be sending a message to senior levels of government that it is time to work together to stop the killing, and enforce the law.

We would be pleased to have a representative from our union to make a presentation to your council to provide additional information should you require this to pass this resolution.
Please contact me at 416-544-5971 or 905-741-9830 and sboyce@usw.ca to schedule.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Boyce
District 6 Health, Safety and Environment Coordinator, Ontario and Atlantic Canada.

Encl.

SB/ss
cope 343

cc: Marty Warren, USW District 6 Director for Ontario and Atlantic Canada
Enforce the Westray Amendments to Canada's Criminal Code

WHEREAS it has been more than two decades since the Westray mine disaster in Nova Scotia and a decade since amendments were made to the Criminal Code of Canada to hold corporations, their directors and executives criminally accountable for the health and safety of workers; and

WHEREAS police and prosecutors are not utilizing the Westray amendments, and not investigating workplace fatalities through the lens of criminal accountability; and

WHEREAS more than 1,000 workers a year are killed at work

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Council support a campaign to urge our provincial/territorial government, specifically the Attorney-General and Labour Minister, to ensure that:

- Crown attorneys are educated, trained and directed to apply the Westray amendments;
- Dedicated prosecutors are given the responsibility for health and safety fatalities;
- Police are educated, trained and directed to apply the Westray amendments;
- There is greater coordination among regulators, police and Crowns so that health and safety regulators are trained to reach out to police when there is a possibility that Westray amendment charges are warranted.
Corporate Criminal Liability 2004-2013
By Robert Champagne, Legal Counsel

United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union

October 16, 2013
Summary

Amendments passed in 2004 to the Criminal Code of Canada to make it easier to impose criminal liability on corporations for serious workplace injuries and fatalities are being woefully underutilized. There have been only three successful prosecutions under the Westray amendments to date. Sentences issued in these prosecutions have been paltry. Serious workplace injuries and fatalities continue to occur at alarming rates. Governments can take concrete steps to better enforce the Westray amendments in order to hold corporations liable for their criminally negligent actions.

The Westray Mine Disaster

In 1992, 26 miners died at the Westray mine in Pictou County, Nova Scotia as a result of an explosion caused by a build-up of methane gas and coal dust. Only 15 miners’ bodies were ever recovered.

The Government of Nova Scotia called a Public Inquiry to investigate the causes of the disaster. Justice Peter Richard presided over the Public Inquiry, which heard 76 days of testimony.

Justice Richard’s concluded that the explosions and the workers’ deaths resulted from a combination of corporate neglect and mismanagement, as well as government bungling and indifference. His key findings were:

- the mine’s Internal Responsibility System for health and safety had failed
- mine managers blatantly disregarded health and safety regulations
- mine managers intimidated and coerced miners with threats and firings
- mine management emphasized production at the expense of safety
- government inspectors and officials failed to carry out their oversight responsibilities

Justice Richard made more than 70 recommendations to improve workers’ health and safety, including a recommendation that the Government of Canada amend the Criminal Code to ensure that corporations and corporate executives be held accountable for workplace safety.

The Westray Amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada

No individual or corporation was ever successfully prosecuted for the workers’ deaths at the Westray mine. At the time, Canada’s Criminal Code made it difficult to hold corporate executives and corporations criminally liable for serious workplace injuries and fatalities.

For over a decade, Westray family survivors and the labour movement, particularly the United Steelworkers, lobbied the federal government and Members of Parliament to amend the Criminal Code to make it easier hold corporate executives and corporations criminally liable for serious workplace injuries and fatalities.
In 2004, Parliament unanimously adopted the Westray amendments to the Criminal Code. The Westray amendments are primarily focussed on the offence of criminal negligence.

The Westray amendments make it easier to hold corporations liable for criminal negligence by:

- creating a new legal duty (s.217.1) that all persons directing work, or having the authority to direct work, must take reasonable steps to prevent bodily harm arising from work, and

- creating rules (s. 22.1) for attributing liability to organizations for the acts of their representatives which are criminally negligent.

In brief, if a person with the duty to take all reasonable steps to prevent bodily harm to a worker fails to do so, and in failing to do so acts with wanton or reckless disregard for the life and safety of the worker, then that person is guilty of criminal negligence (s. 219).

If one or more representatives of a corporation commit criminal negligence and a senior officer (or officers) of the corporation departs markedly from the standard of care that could be reasonably expected to prevent the representative from committing criminal negligence, then a corporation can be convicted of criminal negligence (s.22.1).

Penalties for a conviction for the indictable offence of criminal negligence under the Westray amendments are:

**Individuals**
- Injury - 10 years in prison
- Death - life in prison
- Unlimited fine and 15% victim surcharge

**Corporations**
- Criminal record
- Probation
- Unlimited fine and 15% victim surcharge

**Application of the Westray Amendments**

Between 2004 and 2013, the Westray amendments to the Criminal Code have been utilized in only 10 cases to bring criminal negligence charges in cases of serious worker injury and death. In those 10 cases, criminal negligence charges were brought against five corporations and twelve individuals.

As of mid-2013, there have been only three successful prosecutions under the Westray amendments - two in Quebec and one in Ontario. Those prosecutions resulted in the conviction of two corporations and one individual. Sentences have been relatively minor.

- R v. Transpave – employee of concrete product manufacturer crushed to death; disabled guarding system, no inspection system, inadequate safety training
Sentence: $100,000 fine, plus $10,000 victim surcharge

- R v. Scrocca – employee of landscape contractor crushed to death by backhoe; failure to maintain multiple braking systems
  Sentence: 2 years, less a day, to be served in the community, subject to conditions including a curfew

- R v. Metron – 4 employees killed, one seriously injured, after collapse of faulty swing stage scaffold; employees not wearing safety lifelines
  Original sentence at trial: $200,000 fine, plus $30,000 victim surcharge
  Sentence on appeal: $750,000 fine, plus $112,500 victim surcharge

Charges have been withdrawn in four cases; acquittals followed trials in two cases; charges in two cases were stayed by the Crown, including one charge laid as a result of a private prosecution brought by the United Steelworkers; one charge against an individual is pending.

Workplace Fatalities in Canada Continue at Alarming Rate

Between 900 and 1000 workers die in workplace deaths in Canada every year.

- 1993 – 2011: 17,062 workplace deaths (average of 898 workers deaths per year)

* Source: Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety

Reasons Why the Westray Amendments Are Not Being Utilized More

Key reasons for the under-utilization of the Westray amendments:

- The consequences and criminal significance of serious workplace injuries and fatalities have not penetrated the consciousness of police, Crown attorneys, and provincial health and safety regulators. There is a prevalent belief that serious workplace injuries and deaths are matters for provincial regulatory response and not criminal sanction. The evolution of thinking on the need to prosecute impaired driving offences and domestic violence demonstrates an important parallel.

- Police and Crown attorneys face a lack of knowledge, education, training and resources in utilizing the Westray amendments.

- There is a lack of cooperation and coordination amongst health and safety regulators, police and Crown attorneys in the investigations of serious workplace injuries and fatalities.

- Governments and employers continue to push an agenda of deregulation which undercuts the desire and means to hold corporations liable for their criminally negligent actions which result in serious workplace injuries and deaths.
What is Needed for Better Enforcement of the Westray Amendments?

- Health and safety regulators, police and Crown attorneys need education and training about the Westray amendments and their application.

- Attorneys General need to curtail Crown attorney discretion to not prosecute for criminal negligence in cases of serious workplace injuries and fatalities.

- Dedicated Crown prosecutors are needed to criminally prosecute cases involving serious workplace injuries and fatalities.

- Police investigations should be mandatory in all cases involving a serious workplace injury or fatality.

- Police need education and training in carrying out workplace accident investigations.

- Health and safety regulators must be directed to reach out to police when Westray amendment charges may be in order.

- A written protocol is needed to coordinate the efforts of health and safety regulators, police, and the Crown in dealing with cases of serious workplace injuries and fatalities.

- Dedicated and coordinated teams of health and safety regulators, police and Crown Attorneys should work on the application of the Westray amendments.

- Greater financial resources need to be provided to police and Crown attorneys to help ensure proper application of the Westray amendments.
Beyond Westray
Stop the Killing
Enforce the Law
"The Westray story is a complex mosaic of actions, omissions, mistakes, incompetence, apathy, cynicism, stupidity and neglect."

*The Westray Story: A Predictable Path to Disaster*

In March 2004, to great acclaim and with the support of a unanimous House of Commons and Senate, the Governor General signed into law amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada. Widely known as the Westray Bill, these amendments were so named after the killing of 26 workers in the explosion of the Westray coal mine on May 9, 1992. Designed to hold criminally accountable those corporations that fail to protect the health of their employees or the public, the amendments marked a significant shift in the liabilities of organizations for the failure of their senior officers to act.

"Mr. Speaker, the passage of Bill C-45 represents the final step in the House in making significant reforms to the criminal law as it applies to all organizations. The bill has its origins in the terrible tragedy of the Westray mine explosion. All parties in the House co-operated in ensuring that the bill received high priority."

Paul Macklin, then Liberal MP and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, October 27, 2003.

Failure to Enforce the Law

In the years since the passage of these Criminal Code amendments, only a few charges have been laid, with minimal consequences for employers. Yet the killing continues.

Every year across Canada almost 1,000 people are killed at work. Canada has one of the worst safety records of the developed world. Since the passing of the Westray amendments there has actually been an increase in workplace fatalities.

What Canada needs is a societal change in how we look at death, illness and injury caused by work. The 2004 Criminal Code amendments must be enforced.

Justice Has Not Yet Been Served

The public inquiry following the 1992 Westray disaster delivered a damning report of management greed and government incompetence. In all, Justice Peter Richard made 74 recommendations. Most notable is recommendation #73:

"The Government of Canada, through the Department of Justice, should institute a study of the accountability of corporate executives and directors for the wrongful or negligent acts of the corporation and should introduce in the Parliament of Canada such amendments to legislation as are necessary to ensure that corporate executives and directors are held properly accountable for workplace safety."

Mr. Speaker, the passage of Bill C-45 represents the final step in the House in making significant reforms to the criminal law as it applies to all organizations. The bill has its origins in the terrible tragedy of the Westray mine explosion. All parties in the House co-operated in ensuring that the bill received high priority.

Paul Macklin, then Liberal MP and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, October 27, 2003.
The United Steelworkers, the union representing workers in mines, mills, and thousands of other kinds of employment across North America, took up the cause and with the Westray Families lobbied Parliament for a decade.

The Westray amendments do not address all of the goals of preventing fatal injuries in the workplace, but they acknowledge management responsibility and the need for criminal liability for the failure to exercise it.

The Westray Bill will not bring back the 26 miners who died, nor the thousands who have died because of work since then.

However, careful and judicious use of the Westray amendments by provincial authorities, to address corporate leadership failure to exercise their responsibility for health and safety of employees and contractors, will prevent future fatalities from happening.

"The fundamental and basic responsibility for the safe operation of an undertaking, rests clearly with management... Management failed in this primary responsibility and the significance of that failure cannot be mitigated or diluted simply because others were derelict in their responsibilities."

Justice K. Peter Richard

Cruel Irony

The Westray mine received an award for safety just a week before the mine exploded in 1992. One of the workers, sent by the company to receive the JT Ryan Safety Award, was killed in the explosion. Despite the overwhelming evidence that came to light, the award was not taken away from Westray until years afterwards, after the Richard report was released, and then only after a letter writing campaign from disgusted miners and their union.

Westray’s corporate leaders were never penalized.

"There was a time, especially after the charges were dropped, that I could have broken some laws myself. I thought about it seriously. I thought about punishing those who did this to me and my family, and the only thing that stopped me was that I knew that I would be held accountable, and I couldn’t stand the thought of being taken away from my family, losing everything I worked for, future plans. I still can’t understand why that fear is not present with corporations and companies."

Allen Martin, brother of killed Westray miner and leader of the Westray Families.
Why Did Parliament Unanimously Support the Westray Bill?

In October 2003 when the Westray Bill was debated for the last time, the House of Commons was made up of 172 Liberals, 66 Reform Alliance, 38 Bloc Quebecois, 13 NDP, and 12 Conservatives. Members were able to come together in one common cause in both the Commons and the Senate.

Westray becomes law: USW National Director Lawrence McBrearty in Ottawa with Prime Minister Jean Chrétien in 2003 for Royal Assent of the Westray amendments.
“This Bill is the outcome of the efforts of ordinary members of this House and not an initiative of the Government. Members worked hard to ensure that tragedies such as the one at the Westray mine would never occur again or, if they did, that very harsh penalties could be incurred,” said BQ MP Richard Marceau at the time.

No one spoke against the Westray Bill. Some wanted it to be stronger. In the end, it was accepted by everyone because something had to be done.

**Liability Before and After the Westray Amendments**

Prior to the Westray amendments, corporations could only be held criminally liable if the CEO had personal knowledge of and involvement in the problem. This ignored management’s role in the design, planning, and supervision of work. Safety and health is a part of the process and not just an afterthought. Often workers are confronted with the reality that production and profit take precedence over safety and health.

Before the Westray Bill, organizations and individuals in charge could claim they were unaware of the potential risks or harm and escape responsibility. The Westray amendments create a legal duty to take reasonable steps to avoid bodily harm.

It is no defence for an individual or organization to say they didn’t know there was a problem.

Such a claim could be an admission of guilt. If an individual did not even know of a problem, then they may not have taken reasonable steps to avoid bodily harm to other persons and failure to inquire could support a charge of criminal negligence.

**Enforce the Law**

In Canada, enforcement of the Criminal Code is a provincial responsibility, led by the provincial Attorneys General. The performance across Canada of the provincial authorities responsible for protecting workers’ lives is poor.

*Clockwise from top:* The Kill a Worker, Go to Jail campaign demands that employers be held criminally liable for the deaths of workers. Bill C-45 signed by Prime Minister Jean Chrétien. Run of Muck: press conference at Queen’s Park in 2012 releasing the results of USW Local 6500’s investigation into the 2011 deaths of two workers at Vale’s Stobie Mine in Sudbury. A sawdust explosion killed 2 workers and injured 19 others at a sawmill in Burns Lake, B.C. in 2012. USW members perform a mock rescue exercise.
Despite on-going reductions in the number of claims by injured workers for lost time, the number of fatalities at work has steadily increased, profoundly contradicting claims that work is safer.

Almost a thousand people now die annually because of a traumatic event at work. One in 10 severe injuries among Canadians occurs while working.

Since the Westray amendments were proclaimed into law, only a handful of charges have been attributed to it. That has to change.

**Direction From the Top Down**

Attorneys General must give policy direction to Crown attorneys in order for change to occur. Workplace fatalities are no different than drunk driving, domestic assault or gun violence – they are all the same in that there is a point when the cause is criminal.

The Criminal Code represents the outside boundary of acceptable behaviour. Governments today continue to pursue policies of deregulation. Today, policing or fire fighting are not the most dangerous jobs. There is greater risk of being killed at work as a security guard, a logger, or truck driver. And if your job is contracted out, that risk increases further.

In 2005, there were 43 deaths and 115 serious injuries in the BC forest industry, the highest numbers since the 1970s when loggers were still on bonus and not salary.

"Employers blame the workers and claim that there is a 'culture of risk-taking' causing this," says the United Steelworkers Western Canada Director Steve Hunt.

"Today there are more contractors in the forest industry than ever before, and workers are being forced by economic blackmail to work longer hours with fewer resources to protect their safety.

"Industry, by its reckless, single-minded and selfish pursuit of corporate profits above all else, has created a 'culture of desperation' in which workers are pushed to their physical and mental limits."

**The Story of Lyle Hewer**

In November 2004, sawmill worker Lyle Hewer worked at Weyerhaeuser's New Westminster sawmill. A supervisor asked Hewer to clean out a hopper that funneled waste material into a hog, a high-speed grinder that reduces wood waste. Workers regularly climbed inside to manually remove waste-wood products and clear out any jams, even though the hopper constitutes a "confined space" as defined in BC's workers' compensation laws. Hewer climbed into the hopper, became trapped and was asphyxiated.

Investigators from WorkSafe BC and the New Westminster police found that Weyerhaeuser management was aware that the hopper was a safety hazard but had resisted repeated requests to fix it. After Hewer died, Weyerhaeuser repaired the hopper at a cost of about $30,000.

Following its investigation, WorkSafe BC fined Weyerhaeuser $297,000, the largest such penalty in BC.
history. The New Westminster police recommended charges under the Westray amendments to the Criminal Code.

Yet, in spite of the glaring nature of the case and the urging of WorkSafe and police, the BC prosecution service declined to launch a prosecution. Asked in the Legislature, then-attorney general Wally Oppal indicated there was no need to explain the Crown’s reasons. His office (incorrectly) said that the matter was under federal jurisdiction.

The United Steelworkers decided that wasn’t good enough. So it sought leave from the courts to launch a private prosecution. Vancouver lawyer Glen Orris began a year of legal work to show that there are reasonable grounds for a prosecution.

The private prosecution was launched in March 2010 in New Westminster Provincial Court. Over three days of hearings in October and November 2010, Orris called 16 witnesses, presenting the Steelworkers’ case that there was sufficient evidence for Weyerhaeuser to be tried under the Westray amendments. In March 2011, provincial court judge Therese Alexander ordered a process hearing, allowing the prosecution to proceed. Orris indicated that he was prepared to proceed as prosecutor on behalf of USW.

However, the policy of the BC Crown is to handle all privately-initiated prosecutions itself. Rather than proceed with the prosecution, in August 2011, the Criminal Justice Branch stayed the proceedings.

against Weyerhaeuser, saying in a statement that, “There is no evidence that management at Weyerhaeuser was aware that workers were entering the hog in these circumstances.”

A Deep Disconnect

The Hewer case is just one of many workplace fatalities that should have been investigated through the lens of the Westray amendments. Other recent fatalities that ought to be prosecuted include the deaths of John Wilson at the Craigmont mine in BC; Sam Fitzpatrick at Kiewit’s Toba-Montrose hydroelectric project, also in BC; Jason Chenier and Jordan Fram at Vale’s Stobie mine in Sudbury, ON. There are many more that have escaped justice.

Until there is clear direction from all of our provincial and territorial attorneys-general, there will continue to be a clear and deep disconnect between the intent of the Westray amendments and their application. All parties in Parliament at the time of the passage of the Westray Bill indicated that the new law would better protect workers and hold companies to account by making it easier to obtain prosecutions.

“It is painfully obvious that the provinces do not know how to proceed in criminal prosecutions that involve workplace health and safety,” says the USW’s National Director, Ken Neumann.

It’s the Law – Make it Work

The United Steelworkers, the grown-up sons and daughters of the 26 Westray miners, the families of so many workers killed at work – all support the campaign to enforce the Westray amendments.

Specifically, we are seeking support and political will – just as we did in the aftermath of Westray – for these specific actions to ensure enforcement:

- Educate, train and direct Crown attorneys to apply the Westray amendments;
- Give responsibility for health and safety fatalities to dedicated prosecutors;
- Educate, train and direct police to apply the Westray amendments;
- Ensure greater coordination among regulators, police and Crowns so that health and safety regulators are trained to reach out to police when there is a possibility that Westray amendment charges are warranted.

STOP THE KILLING
ENFORCE THE LAW
IT’S NOT TOO LATE
Deregulation of railway transport is partly to blame for disasters such as the 2013 train derailment and explosion that killed 47 people in Lac-Mégantic, Que.

Photo: Service de protection contre l'incendie de la Ville de Québec.
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June 26, 2014

Ms. Crystal Greer, City Clerk
City of Mississauga
Civic Centre, 300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga, ON L5B 3C1

Re: City of Brampton - Development Charges (DC) By-laws

Dear Ms. Greer:

Please consider this as notice that, effective August 1, 2014, the Council for the City of Brampton has passed By-laws 167-2014, 168-2014, 169-2014, 170-2014, 171-2014, 172-2014 and 173-2014 which impose City-wide development charges rates.

For your reference, the following documents are enclosed:

- City of Brampton 2014 Development Charges Information Pamphlet
- Notice of Passing of DC By-laws, as published in the Brampton Guardian on Thursday, June 26, 2014.

The following documents are available on the city’s website: www.brampton.ca – search “Development Charges Review 2014”:

- The seven DC By-laws that were passed by Council on June 18, 2014, to come into force and effect on August 1, 2014
- City of Brampton Development Charges Background Study
- Other information such as staff reports to Council.

The website address is http://www.brampton.ca/EN/Business/planning-development/development-charges/Pages/Development-Charges-Review.aspx

Please contact John Spencer, Project Manager, Development Charges, Corporate Services Department, (905) 874-3954, if you require more information.

Yours truly,

Earl Evans, Deputy Clerk
City Clerk’s Office
Tel: 905-874-2115 / Fax: 905-874-2119
earl.evans@brampton.ca

Encl.
Purpose of Development Charges

Development Charges assist in financing capital projects required to meet the need for services resulting from growth and development. Development charges may only be used for the purpose for which they are collected.

City of Brampton Development Charge By-laws

The City of Brampton has seven (7) development charge by-laws that govern the entire geographic area of the City of Brampton, pursuant to Section 2(1) of the Development Charges Act, 1997. The seven by-laws were all passed by City Council on June 18, 2014 and came into effect, August 1, 2014.

Development Charge Rates

The following are the residential rates in effect as of August 1, 2014, subject to further indexing*, the first day of February and August of each year, in accordance with section 15 of By-laws 167-2014 to 173-2014 (inclusive):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Family, Semi-Detached</th>
<th>$26,935</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>$21,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Dwellings greater than 750 square feet</td>
<td>$15,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Dwellings equal to or less than 750 square feet</td>
<td>$9,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are the non-residential rates in effect as of August 1, 2014 subject to further indexing* the first day of February and August of each year, in accordance with section 15 of By-laws 167-2014 to 173-2014 (inclusive):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Industrial Non-Office</th>
<th>$96.70 per square metre of Total Gross Floor Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and Office</td>
<td>$45.31 per square metre of Total Gross Floor Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The City of Brampton development charge rates are adjusted in accordance with the Statistics Canada Quarterly, Construction Price Statistics (catalogue no. 62-007). Payment of the current indexed rate will be required prior to issuance of a building permit. Schedules of current rates are available on request or consult the City’s website: http://www.brampton.ca/EN/Business/planning-development/development-charges/Pages/welcome.aspx
Calculation and Payment

Development Charges are imposed using the current prescribed rates as of the date of building permit issuance and are based on the following criteria:

- In the case of residential development, or the residential portion of a mixed-use development, based upon the number and type of dwelling units.

- In the case of non-residential development, or the non-residential portion of a mixed-use development, based upon the total floor area* of such development, and

- In the case of non-residential developments containing industrial and/or office and/or other non-residential components or the non-residential portion of a non-residential mixed use development containing industrial and/or office and/or other non-residential components, based upon the total floor area* of the industrial component and based upon the total floor area* of the office component, and based on the total floor area* of all the other non-residential components, respectively.

*For the definition of total floor area, please refer to the City of Brampton Development Charges By-laws 167-2014 to 173-2014 on the City’s website.

- Building permits will not be issued until all applicable Development Charge payments have been received.

- In accordance with the approved by-laws, the payment of development charges shall be payable by cash or certified funds.

Exemptions

The by-laws and Development Charges Act, 1997 provide for credits, exemptions and special provisions for residential and non-residential development, applicable in some cases. Institutional exemptions include land, building or structures intended for hospital, government, education, colleges, universities or religious purposes.

Contact the Financial Planning and Budgets Division in the Corporate Services Department staff for further information on eligibility for development charge credits or exemption.

Treasurer’s Annual Statement

Section 43 of Development Charges Act, 1997 requires that the Treasurer of each municipality provide annually to Council a financial statement relating to the development charge reserve funds further described in O. Reg. 82/98 Section 12 and 13, including description of services funded under the municipality’s development charge by-law; opening and closing balances; disclosure of all development charge credits issued that may affect reserve balances; and a list of projects that have been financed from development charge reserves.

The Treasurer’s Statement may be viewed at 2 Wellington Street West, 2nd Floor, Brampton, during normal office hours. Contact Treasury Services, by phone (905) 874-3820 or by fax (905) 874-2296.

Region of Peel Development Charges and Educational Development Charges

The City of Brampton also collects development charges on behalf of the Region of Peel, Peel District School Board and Dufferin-Peel Catholic School Board.

For information on their Development Charges policies please contact the following:

Region of Peel and GO Transit:

Financial Support Analyst, Finance Department Region of Peel
Phone: (905) 791-7800 ext. 4439
Fax: (905) 791-2497
www.region.peel.on.ca

Peel District School Board and Dufferin Peel Catholic District School Board:

Project Officer, Planning Department
Dufferin Peel Catholic District School Board
Phone: (905) 890-0708 ext. 24462
Fax: (905) 890-1557
www.dpcdsb.org

The City of Brampton web site: (http://www.brampton.ca/EV/Business/planning_development/development_charges/Pages/welco me.aspx) also contains current rates for the above-noted agencies.
NOTICE OF PASSING OF DEPARTMENT CHARGES BY-LAWS BY THE CITY OF BRAMPTON

DEVELOPMENT CHARGES ACT, 1997, S.O. 1997, c.27


The charges in these by-laws will apply to all new residential and non-residential development, subject to certain terms, conditions and limited exemptions as identified therein.

Development charges are levied against new development to pay for the increased capital costs related to the provision of such municipal services as library, fire, recreation, public works: buildings and fleet, parking, transit, roads services, and general government. Schedule 1 below sets out the development charge rates applicable throughout the City.

Both the residential and non-residential development charge rates will be in effect as of August 1, 2014. Copies of the by-laws may be viewed and downloaded at the City of Brampton’s website at www.brampton.ca. The complete development charges by-laws may also be examined at the City Clerk’s Office from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm, Monday through Friday at the address shown below.

Any person or organization may appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board in respect to the by-laws by filing with the Clerk of The Corporation of the City of Brampton, not later than Monday, July 28, 2014, a notice of appeal setting out the objection to the by-law or by-laws and the reasons in support of the objection.

A key map has not been included in this notice as the City-wide development charges applies to all lands located within the boundaries of the City of Brampton.

For further information, please contact the Clerk’s Office at 905-874-2000.

DATED at The Corporation of the City of Brampton this 26th day of June, 2014.

Peter Fay, City Clerk
Corporation of the City of Brampton
2 Wellington Street West,
Brampton, Ontario L6Y 4R2

#### Residential Charge By Unit Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Apartments</th>
<th>&gt; 750 sq.ft</th>
<th>≤ 750 sq.ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$216</td>
<td>$174</td>
<td>$122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$661</td>
<td>$533</td>
<td>$374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>$631</td>
<td>$509</td>
<td>$357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$9,131</td>
<td>$7,365</td>
<td>$5,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>$637</td>
<td>$514</td>
<td>$360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$1,533</td>
<td>$1,237</td>
<td>$867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal General Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,809</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,332</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,241</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads - Excluding Bramwest/NSTC</td>
<td>$13,572</td>
<td>$10,947</td>
<td>$7,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads - Bramwest/NSTC</td>
<td>$554</td>
<td>$447</td>
<td>$313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CHARGE PER UNIT</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,935</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,225</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-Residential Charges per Square Metre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Industrial/Office</th>
<th>Non-Industrial/Non-Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$0.68</td>
<td>$0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>$1.97</td>
<td>$1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>$1.99</td>
<td>$1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$4.79</td>
<td>$4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal General Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9.43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads - Excluding Bramwest/NSTC</td>
<td>$34.46</td>
<td>$83.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads - Bramwest/NSTC</td>
<td>$1.42</td>
<td>$3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CHARGE PER SQ.M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>$96.70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 4, 2014

Crystal Greer, Clerk
City of Mississauga
300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga, ON L5B 3C1

Dear Ms. Greer,

Subject: New Development Charges Background Study

I am writing to advise that Peel Regional Council approved the following resolution at its meeting held on June 26, 2014:

Resolution 2014-593:

Whereas, the Region of Peel continues to review the planning and financial challenges related to managing the significant growth that it faces;

And whereas, broader discussion with members of the Growth Management Committee, our area municipal partners, and impacted stakeholders on the costs/benefits of growth including risk sharing, impacts to major infrastructure and financing options to accommodate forecasted growth needs to occur now;

And whereas, at the Growth Management Committee meeting on May 15, 2014, it was suggested that an analysis be completed to determine the full costs/benefits of growth, including costs of transportation, to accommodate forecasted growth;

And whereas, a recommendation to host a workshop in February/March 2015 with stakeholders, including senior-level Provincial staff and Members of Regional Council, to consider sharing financial risks associated with growth and determine possible options for sustainable financing of growth, was adopted by the Growth Management Committee on May 15, 2014;

Therefore be it resolved, that the Chief Administrative Officer be authorized to retain expert services and direct Regional staff to work together with the area municipal partners to gather and analyze the information needed to understand the full costs/benefits of growth, including the costs of both the Regional and area municipal road and transit systems, when planning for forecasted growth;

And further, that Regional staff work with Metrolinx and Ministry of Transportation (MTO) to advance transit and highway investments in Peel;

And further, that the Region initiate a new Development Charges (DCs) background study to ensure that the growth capital program is sustainable;
And further, that a Growth Management workshop be held on Friday, September 5, 2014, with area municipal partners, impacted stakeholders and members of the development industry, to discuss a sustainable path going forward to accommodate forecasted growth.

And further, that this resolution be communicated to the area municipalities, with a request that area municipal staff be authorized and directed to collaboratively facilitate its implementation.

Yours truly,

Helena West
Legislative Specialist

HW:js

c: Peter Fay, Clerk, City of Brampton
Carey de Gorter, Clerk, Town of Caledon
Arvin Prasad, Director, Integrated Planning Division, Region of Peel
Stephen VanOfwegen, Chief Financial Officer, Region of Peel
Patrick O'Connor, Acting Commissioner of Corporate Services, Region of Peel
From: Hon. Bob Chiarelli [mailto:write2us@ontario.ca]
Sent: 2014/07/04 2:49 PM
To: Hazel McCallion
Subject: Letter from the Hon. Bob Chiarelli, Minister of Energy

MEMORANDUM TO: Ontario Municipal Leaders
MEMORANDUM FROM: The Honourable Bob Chiarelli
RE:

Ontario’s updated Long-Term Energy Plan, Achieving Balance, is committed to putting conservation first. Putting conservation first means ensuring conservation is the first resource considered before building new generation and transmission facilities, wherever cost-effective. Conservation is the cleanest and cheapest energy resource and it offers consumers a way to reduce their energy bills.

To continue our efforts to put conservation first, our government is supporting local energy planning and engaging municipalities through the Municipal Energy Plan (MEP) program.

I am pleased to announce that as of today, Ontario will begin accepting MEP applications on an ongoing basis for two funding streams:

- Funding Stream to Develop a New Municipal Energy Plan: Successful applicants to this stream will receive 50 per cent of eligible costs, up to a maximum of $90,000.
- New Funding Stream to Enhance an Existing Energy Plan: Successful applicants to this stream will receive 50 per cent of eligible costs, up to a maximum of $25,000.

Launched in 2013, the MEP program supports municipalities’ efforts to better understand their local energy needs, develop plans to meet their goals, and identify opportunities for energy efficiency and clean energy. MEPs will help municipalities:

- assess the community’s energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions;
- identify opportunities to conserve, improve energy efficiency and reduce GHG emissions;
• consider impact of future growth and options for local clean energy generation; and
• support local economic development.

The MEP program takes an integrated approach to energy planning by aligning energy, growth, infrastructure, and land use planning. Supporting local energy planning is part of the government’s economic plan that is creating jobs for today and tomorrow. The comprehensive plan and its six priorities focus on Ontario’s greatest strengths - its people and strategic partnerships.

Your staff can review the program guidelines and complete the application form at http://www.energy.gov.on.ca/en/municipal-energy/. If staff have any questions about the MEP program, they can email MEP@ontario.ca.

Sincerely,

Bob Chiarelli
Minister
July 7, 2014

Kathryn Lockyer  
Regional Clerk and Director of Clerk's  
Region of Peel  
Fax: (905) 791-1693

Peter Fay  
City Clerk & Director of Council & Administrative Services  
City of Brampton  
Fax: (905) 874-2119

Crystal Greer  
Director of Legislative Services and City Clerk  
City of Mississauga  
Fax: (905) 615-4181

Carey deGorter  
Director of Administration/Town Clerk  
Town of Caledon  
Fax: (905) 584-4325

RE: DUFFERIN-PEEL CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD  
NOTICE OF PASSING OF AN EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT CHARGES BY-LAW - REGION OF PEEL

As per my email of June 20, 2014, the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board held a Public Meeting to consider the passage of an Education Development Charge By-law. The by-law has been passed and a notice of such is enclosed for your information. The by-law came into force on July 1, 2014.

Yours truly,

Stephanie Cox  
Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board  
Phone: (905)890-0708x24163  
Fax: (905) 890-1557  
E-mail: stephanie.cox@dpcdsb.org
NOTICE OF THE PASSING OF AN EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT CHARGES BY-LAW BY DUFFERIN-PEEL CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

TAKE NOTICE that the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board passed an Education Development Charges By-law on the 17th day of June, 2014, under Section 257.54 of the Education Act. The By-law is Education Development Charges By-law, 2014 (Region of Peel).

AND TAKE NOTICE that any person or organization may appeal the By-law to the Ontario Municipal Board under Section 257.65 of the Act by filing with the Secretary of the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board on or before the 28th day of July, 2014, a notice of appeal setting out the objection to the By-law and the reasons supporting the objection.

The By-law comes into force on July 1, 2014. The education development charges imposed by the By-law are as follows:

- $1,343.00 per dwelling unit in regard to residential development
- $0.56 per square foot of gross floor area in regard to non-residential development.

The education development charges are imposed on all development of lands in the Region of Peel. Accordingly, a key map showing the location of the lands subject to the By-law is not provided as part of this notice.

A copy of the complete By-law is available for examination in the offices of the Board located at 40 Matheson Boulevard West, Catholic Education Centre, Mississauga, Ontario, L5R 1C5, during regular office hours or on the Board’s website at www.dpcdsb.org.

Notice of a proposed by-law amending the education development charges by-law or the passage of such an amending by-law is not required to be given to any person or organization, other than to certain clerks of municipalities or secretaries of school boards, unless the person or organization gives the secretary of the Board a written request for notice of any amendments to the education development charges by-law and has provided a return address.

Dated at the City of Mississauga this 18th day of June, 2014.

John B. Kostoff
Director of Education and Secretary to the Board
Dear Mr. Minister:


In your letter you state that the City of Mississauga did not participate in the consultations and I would like to address your statement and provide clarification.

The City's Planning and Building staff are part of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) Antenna Tower Working Group, which was established by FCM in June 2012, and consists of municipal staff from across Canada. When Industry Canada launched their public consultation in February 2014, the working group convened to discuss the matter. During this time, our Planning and Building staff provided input and comments. Many of the comments from the working group members were also similar. As such, FCM co-ordinated the comments and submitted them directly to Industry Canada on behalf of the working group. Therefore, the City did participate in Industry Canada's consultation via FCM.

Thank you again for your letter and we look forward to seeing the new policy and consultation requirements.

Sincerely,

HAZEL MCCALLION, C.M., LL.D.
MAYOR
Dear Madam Mayor:

Thank you for your letter of May 22, 2014, regarding ham radio tower installations. I appreciate your taking the time to share your views.

We recognize that local governments and community members deserve the opportunity to provide meaningful input into the antenna siting process.

It is important that local governments play a central role in identifying potential locations for new antenna towers in their communities by working with proponents on their respective proposals. Canadians told us they wanted real input into the antenna siting process.

That is why, on February 5, 2014, I announced improvements to Canada's antenna tower consultation process to give communities a better say in the placement of new cell towers. As you know, Industry Canada launched public consultation, following my announcement, to ensure that stakeholders and most importantly, municipalities had the opportunity to present their perspective and concerns on the protocol that would govern new antenna siting procedures.

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) endorsed our approach to give communities a meaningful say in this important process. For information on the FCM's response to our government's move to seek input from municipalities I would refer you to www.fcm.ca/home/media/news-releases/2014.htm.

Unfortunately, the City of Mississauga did not participate in the consultations.

All input received from local communities and stakeholders during the comment period has been reviewed and considered. The new policy and consultation requirements will be

Please accept my best wishes.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

The Honourable James Moore, P.C., M.P.
May 22, 2014

The Honourable James Moore
Minister of Industry
C.D. Howe Building
235 Queen Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H5

Dear Mr. Minister:

Re: Radio Communication Antenna Towers (Ham Radio Towers)

The Council of the Corporation of the City of Mississauga at its meeting on May 14, 2014 adopted the enclosed Resolution 0080-2014 with respect to implementing new rules that require amateur radio operators to consult with municipalities and the public for the installation of ham radio tower installations.

Council is requesting that Industry Canada implement new rules that require amateur radio operators to consult with municipalities and the public prior to the installation of new ham radio tower installations, regardless of height. The planned changes do not include a requirement for amateur radio operators to consult with municipalities or the public for ham radio towers that are less than 15 metres (49.2 feet) in height.

On behalf of the Members of Council, I would urge you to work with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to implement the changes.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

HAZEL McCALLION, C.M., LL.D.
MAYOR

cc: Mississauga MPs
Members of Council
Federation of Canadian Municipalities

Enc.
RESOLUTION 0080-2014
adopted by the Council of
The Corporation of the City of Mississauga
at its meeting on May 14, 2014

0080-2014 Moved by: Pat Mullin Seconded by: Katie Mahoney

WHEREAS the approval of radiocommunication antenna towers ("ham radio towers") for amateur radio operators is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government through Industry Canada;

AND WHEREAS ham radio tower installations in urban residential areas have raised serious concerns amongst residents, including the visual impact of these towers to the surrounding residential neighbourhood;

AND WHEREAS amateur radio operators can place a ham radio tower less than 15 metres (49.2 feet) in height anywhere on their residential property, including the front yard, and are exempted from municipal and public consultation by Industry Canada;

AND WHEREAS local planning authorities cannot regulate ham radio towers, which are under federal jurisdiction, and therefore, cannot be regulated or controlled through Zoning By-laws or other planning instruments;

AND WHEREAS the City of Mississauga Telecommunication Tower/Antenna Facilities Protocol has procedures and design criteria for ham radio towers in residential areas, ham radio towers less than 15 metres (49.2 feet) in height are exempted from municipal consultation by Industry Canada, and therefore, the City is not provided the opportunity to review, influence or comment on ham radio towers in accordance with the City's protocol;

AND WHEREAS Industry Canada is currently reviewing their Antenna Tower Siting Policy and planning to change their policy to require companies to consult with municipalities and the public for commercial tower installations, regardless of height, however, the planned changes do not include a requirement for amateur radio operators to consult with municipalities or the public for ham radio towers that are less than 15 metres (49.2 feet) in height;
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Mississauga requests that Industry Canada implement new rules that require amateur radio operators to consult with municipalities and the public for ham radio tower installations, regardless of height. This will ensure that municipalities contribute local knowledge that facilitates and influences the location and design of ham radio towers, and ensures residents' concerns are heard regarding the placement of towers in their communities;

AND FURTHER that the City of Mississauga requests that the Federation of Canadian Municipalities encourage and work with Industry Canada to implement the changes noted above;

AND FURTHER that the City of Mississauga requests that the local Members of Parliament support this request and work with Industry Canada to implement the changes noted above.

Carried
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Minister
9th Floor, Hearst Block
900 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M7A 2E1
Tel: (416) 326-9326
Fax: (416) 326-9338

Ministère du Tourisme,
de la Culture et du Sport
Ministre
9e étage, Édifice Hearst
900, rue Bay
Toronto, ON M7A 2E1
Tél.: (416) 326-9326
Téléc.: (416) 326-9338

JUL 09 2014

HER Worship Hazel McCallion
Mayor of Mississauga
Civic Centre
300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga, ON L5B 3C1

Re: Ontario Sport and Recreation Communities Fund 2014-2015
Local/Regional Stream
Grants Ontario Case # 2014-01-1-22489374

Dear Mayor McCallion:

On behalf of the Government of Ontario, thank you for supporting and promoting community sport, recreation and physical activity in our province. The Ontario government is committed to helping people of all ages and abilities get active, stay fit and live healthier.

I am pleased to inform you that the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport has approved your Play in the Park initiative in the amount of $154,769.

Through the Ontario Sport and Recreation Communities Fund, we are supporting increased opportunities for participation, building physical literacy as the foundation for lifelong activity and strengthening the capacity of the sport and recreation sector.

MTCS recognizes that providing Ontarians with opportunities to engage in community sport, recreation and physical activity is critical to improving quality of life. Research demonstrates that sustained physical activity contributes to long lasting benefits such as physical, mental, emotional and social well-being, thereby strengthening personal development and the diverse communities in which we live.
A Ministry staff person will contact you shortly to provide information regarding payment details and project reporting requirements.

Together we are laying an important foundation for active living through all stages of life; I wish you much success in your project activities.

Sincerely,

Michael Coteau
Minister

c: Dipika Damerla, MPP Mississauga East-Cooksville

c: Mrs. Teresa Burgess-Ogilvie, Grants Funding Coordinator
July 21, 2014

The Honorable Hazel McCallion
Mayor
City of Mississauga
300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga, ON L5B 3C1

Dear Mayor McCallion:

I am pleased to notify you that City of Mississauga, Ontario has received the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award for the current budget from the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA). This award is the highest form of recognition in governmental budgeting and represents a significant achievement by your organization.

When a Distinguished Budget Presentation Award is granted to an entity, a Certificate of Recognition for Budget Presentation is also presented to the individual or department designated as being primarily responsible for its having achieved the award. This has been presented to:

Finance Division, Corporate Services Department

We hope you will arrange for a formal public presentation of the award, and that appropriate publicity will be given to this notable achievement. A press release is enclosed for your use.

We appreciate your participation in GFOA's Budget Awards Program. Through your example, we hope that other entities will be encouraged to achieve excellence in budgeting.

Sincerely,

Stephen J. Gauthier, Director
Technical Services Center

Enclosure
QUARTERLY
COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

[To be filed by every Member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the Council of the City of Mississauga,

I, ______________________, Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge information and belief, no family member of mine nor a member of my staff (all as defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: __________________ Signature of Councillor:

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City's Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery, as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Councillor Declaration filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
QUARTERLY COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

[To be filed by every Member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the Council of the City of Mississauga,

I. ________________________, Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge information and belief, no family member of mine nor a member of my staff (all as defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: ______________ Signature of Councillor: _______________________

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City’s Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery, as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Councillor Declaration filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
QUARTERLY COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

[To be filed by every Member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the Council of the City of Mississauga,]

I, Patricia Molin, Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge information and belief, no family member of mine nor a member of my staff (all as defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: Aug 1st Signature of Councillor: Patricia Molin

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City's Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery, as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Councillor Declaration filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
QUARTERLY
COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
Under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

To be filed by every member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the council of the city of Mississauga,

I, CHRIS FONSECA, Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value of $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge information and belief, no family member of mine nor a member of my staff (all defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: July 24, 2014  Signature of Councillor: Chris Fonseca

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City’s Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: Robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Declaration a filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
QUARTERLY COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

[To be filed by every Member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st, and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the Council of the City of Mississauga,]

I, ____________________________, Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge information and belief, no family member of mine nor a member of my staff (all as defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: ____________________________

Signature of Councillor: ____________________________

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City’s Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery, as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Councillor Declaration filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
QUARTERLY
COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

[To be filed by every Member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the Council of the City of Mississauga,]

I, __________________, Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge information and belief, no family member of mine nor a member of my staff (all as defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: __________________ Signature of Councillor: __________________

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City’s Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery, as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Councillor Declaration filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
QUARTERLY COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

[To be filed by every Member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the Council of the City of Mississauga.

I, Ron Stark, Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, no family member of mine or a member of my staff (all as defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: Aug 1/14
Signature of Councillor:

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City's Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery, as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Councillor Declaration filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
QUARTERLY COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

[To be filed by every Member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the Council of the City of Mississauga,

I, Nando Iannicca, Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge information and belief, no family member of mine nor a member of my staff (all as defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: Aug 1, 2017

Signature of Councillor:

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City’s Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery, as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Councillor Declaration filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
QUARTERLY COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

[To be filed by every Member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the Council of the City of Mississauga,

I, Katie Hannon, Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge information and belief, no family member of mine nor a member of my staff (all as defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: July 16/14
Signature of Councillor: [Signature]

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City’s Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery, as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Councillor Declaration filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
QUARTERLY
COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

[To be filed by every Member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the Council of the City of Mississauga,]

I, [Signature], Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge information and belief, no family member of mine nor a member of my staff (all as defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: [Signature]

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City’s Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery, as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Councillor Declaration filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
QUARTERLY COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

[To be filed by every Member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the Council of the City of Mississauga,

I, ________________________________, Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge information and belief, no family member of mine nor a member of my staff (all as defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: __________ Signature of Councillor: __________________________

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City’s Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery, as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Councillor Declaration filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
QUARTERLY COUNCILLOR DECLARATION
under the City of Mississauga Council Code of Conduct

[To be filed by every Member of Council on or by February 1st, May 1st, August 1st and November 1st in each year during the term of office of the Council of the City of Mississauga,

I, __________________________, Member of the Council of the City of Mississauga, HEREBY DECLARE as follows:

I have received no fee, advance, cash, gift, gift certificate, personal benefit, price reduction or other consideration in the past quarter year, connected directly or indirectly with the performance of my duties of office as a member of Council which exceeds in value the sum of $500 or in the case of multiple gifts from the same source in this calendar year, exceeds in value $500 in the aggregate, and to the best of my knowledge information and belief, no family member of mine nor a member of my staff (all as defined in the Code of Conduct) has received any such gift in the past quarter year, except as I may have disclosed in a Councillor Information Statement filed by me with the Integrity Commissioner within 30 days of receipt of any such gift.

Date: ______________________ Signature of Councillor: ______________________

This Quarterly Councillor Declaration shall be filed with the City's Integrity Commissioner, Robert J. Swayze, by mail, fax, e-mail or delivery, as follows:

Robert J. Swayze
Integrity Commissioner for the City of Mississauga
20736 Mississauga Road
Caledon, Ontario L7K 1M7

Phone: 519-942-0070
Fax: 519-942-1233
E-mail: robert.swayze@sympatico.ca

Every Quarterly Councillor Declaration filed with the Integrity Commissioner will become a matter of public record.
Dear Ms Greer,

Further to Steve's note - could you please also provide me with the additional information required to move this amendment forward at council?

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Beena Masellis

On Monday, August 11, 2014 10:22:05 AM, Stephen Gallagher <

Ms. Greer,

Per Councillor Tovey's email below, could you please provide me with copies of the "clearly defined rules on Bylaw 49-03".

Also, I would ask that the email chain below be included in the Council Agenda under Information Items along with any other relevant emails you may receive prior to the meeting on the 10th of September.
Hi Steve,

Thank you for the email. At the Council meeting in September, I will be directing staff to review the criteria, definition and procedure for determining what is a "nuisance fire". Thank you for supporting the reexamination of the Bylaw. It would be helpful if you and any other concerned residents could send an email to the City Clerk with the request for clearly defined rules on Bylaw 49-03. Ask the Clerk to include your emails in the Council Agenda under Information Items. Please cc my office. This will permit me to speak to the information item and will help facilitate the process. The Council meeting is on September 10th. Information items should be filed with the Clerks Office one week prior to the meeting. The email address is Crystal.Greer@mississauga.ca.

My cell # is below if you would like to discuss this or any other issue in greater detail.

Regards,

Councillor Jim Tovey, Ward 1
City of Mississauga
Telephone:
Email: Jim.tovey@mississauga.ca

On Aug 7, 2014, at 11:10 AM, "Stephen Gallagher" <...> wrote:

Councillor Tovey,

I'm not sure if you recall, but we spoke on the phone about this matter a month or so ago. My wife (Andree Noel) and I just wanted to add our support to Mrs. Masellis comments on this matter. This is clearly a matter that needs to be resolved as it's a nuisance for everyone, most especially for the fire department, as I'm sure they have much better things to do than respond to frivolous and vexatious complaints that are related to private disputes as stated by Mrs. Masellis.

We are happy to provide and help or assistance that may be helpful to get this matter resolved once and for all.

Also, we have no objection whatsoever in being identified as party to this complaint.
Hello Councillor Tovey,

Thank you for your time on the phone (Friday Aug 1) following up with my concern regarding the current By-Law Number 49-03 (A by-law to regulate the setting of open air fires and to repeal By-law 60-96).

In follow up to our telephone conversation on Friday - could you please put a motion forward to amend the open air bylaw to amend section 10(e) the fire does not create a Nuisance as is determined upon inspection by the Firefighter or enforcement officer. (1)

In addition, the application of the vexatious complainer bylaw should also apply to a resident who continually calls the fire department to come out and investigate these controlled fires and wastes tax dollars on open air fires that are compliant to section 10. Those complainers cost the city when it is "really a private dispute with the neighbour" (2) and those complainers should be the party fined for repeated calls. The fire responders told us that if they are called to a property multiple times, it is the party having the fire that is fined- not the complainer. Can you raise this as well - so the vexatious complainer is fined and this deters vexatious complainers?

May I please ask you one other question pertaining to this issue- the fire department has not been releasing the name of the neighbour that has been complaining - is there a way to ascertain this information?

I have cc'd another neighbour who would also support this amendment.

Please keep me updated on the status of this, I really appreciate your time and help.

Sincerely,
Beena Masellis
16-08-14

 references:
(1) http://www.mississauga.ca/file/COM/Open_Air_Burning.PDF
(2) http://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2014/06/19/mississauga_moves_to_cut_off_vexatious_complainers.html
Ms. Greer,

Per Councillor Tovey's email below, could you please provide me with copies of the "clearly defined rules on Bylaw 49-03".

Also, I would ask that the email chain below be included in the Council Agenda under Information Items along with any other relevant emails you may receive prior to the meeting on the 10th of September.

Please feel free to contact me if you require any additional information.

Regards,

Steve Gallagher
Hi Steve,

Thank you for the email. At the Council meeting in September, I will be directing staff to review the criteria, definition and procedure for determining what is a "nuisance fire". Thank you for supporting the reexamination of the Bylaw. It would be helpful if you and any other concerned residents could send an emails to the City Clerk with the request for clearly defined rules on Bylaw 49-03. Ask the Clerk to include your emails in the Council Agenda under Information Items. Please cc my office. This will permit me to speak to the information item and will help facilitate the process.

The Council meeting is on September 10th. Information items should be filed with the Clerks Office one week prior to the meeting. The email address is Crystal.Greer@mississauga.ca. My cell # is below if you would like to discuss this or any other issue in greater detail.

Regards,
Councillor Jim Tovey, Ward 1
City of Mississauga
Telephone: 
Email: Jim.tovey@mississauga.ca


Councillor Tovey,

I'm not sure if you recall, but we spoke on the phone about this matter a month or so ago. My wife (Andree Noel) and I just wanted to add our support to Mrs. Masellis comments on this matter. This is clearly a matter that needs to be resolved as it's a nuisance for everyone, most especially for the fire department, as I'm sure they have much better things to do then respond to frivolous and vexatious complaints that are related to private disputes as stated by Mrs. Masellis.

We are happy to provide and help or assistance that may be helpful to get this matter resolved once and for all.

Also, we have no objection whatsoever in being identified as party to this complaint.

Regards,
Steve Gallagher

From: Beena Masellis
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2014 10:28 PM
To: Jim.Tovey@mississauga.ca
Hello Councillor Tovey,

Thank you for your time on the phone (Friday Aug 1) following up with my concern regarding the current By-Law Number 49-03 (A by-law to regulate the setting of open air fires and to repeal By-law 50-96).

In follow up to our telephone conversation on Friday - could you please put a motion forward to amend the open air bylaw to amend section 10(e) the fire does not create a Nuisance as is determined upon inspection by the Firefighter or enforcement officer. (1)

In addition, the application of the vexatious complainer bylaw should also apply to a resident who continually calls the fire department to come out and investigate these controlled fires and wastes tax dollars on open air fires that are compliant to section 10. Those complainers cost the city when it is "really a private dispute with the neighbour" (2) and those complainers should be the party fined for repeated calls. The fire responders told us that if they are called to a property multiple times, it is the party having the fire that is fined- not the complainer. Can you raise this as well - so the vexatious complainer is fined and this deters vexatious complainers?

May I please ask you one other question pertaining to this issue- the fire department has not been releasing the name of the neighbour that has been complaining - is there a way to ascertain this information?

I have cc'd another neighbour who would also support this amendment.

Please keep me updated on the status of this, I really appreciate your time and help.

Sincerely,
Beena Maselli

references:

(1) http://www.mississauga.ca/file/COM/Open_Air_Burning.PDF
(2) http://www.thestar.com/news/qta/2014/06/19/mississauga_moves_to_cut_off_vexatious_complainers.html
URGENT MESSAGE FROM COUNCILLOR NANDO IANNICCA
"2532 Glengarry Road OMB Affair"

Dear Ratepayers and Residents,

We have hand-delivered this letter to you in the dead of summer because it is time sensitive and by far the most serious matter that I have ever dealt with in 26 years of service as your Councillor at City Hall.

I will apologize in advance for the very harsh language and examples that I draw but if my letter expresses the gravity of the situation properly then you should conclude the message and language were totally warranted.

In a matter before the provincially created and mandated Ontario Municipal Board on June 27, 2014, member M. A. Sills overruled two separate Committee of Adjustment refusals for a lot severance at 2532 Glengarry Road and has now decreed that this 30.44 metres (100 feet) single detached lot and residential home can now be demolished to allow for the creation of two 15.24 metre (50 foot lots) and two new homes. This so called ‘minor variance’ creating 50 foot lots amongst and adjacent to 100 foot lots is in complete contravention of the zoning, secondary plan, Official Plan, and provincially approved intensification corridors of the City.

Upon learning of this startling and unprecedented decision I immediately convened a meeting of the appropriate senior staff at the City and for the first time in my career asked and explained to them why we should be appealing this Ontario Municipal Board decision. From the excellent discussion that ensued I am pleased to advise you that it was agreed that this unprecedented appeal was warranted and it was duly filed on July 25, 2014 with the Executive Chair of the Ontario Municipal Board.

If the decision is allowed to stand, the specific zoning on your home may be irrelevant, and the municipal planning process, several historic fundamental institutions, and democratic due process will be rendered useless. The decision is autocratic and tyrannical and creates a state of chaos and anarchy. I say this with the assistance of the Oxford Dictionary that defines an autocrat as “an absolute, irresponsible governor.” Tyranny is the “arbitrary or oppressed exercise of power; severe use of one’s authority; harsh, lawless action “...administered by one” who exercises his power in an oppressive, unjust manner.” Chaos is “a state of utter confusion and disorder “...that creates anarchy defined as “absence of government; a state of lawlessness due to the absence or inefficiency of the supreme power; political disorder; non-recognition of authority in any sphere.”
Pretty harsh but I trust I now have your attention so you can judge accordingly. I believe it applies and our Members of Provincial Government who created the Ontario Municipal Board and hired, appointment and pay their OMB Adjudicator must ensure the decision is overturned and order restored.

Simply put, the decision spits in the face of our democratic institutions, historical policies and procedures, our faith and expectation of moral and natural justice, and the principle of “peace, order and good government” upon which our country and municipalities were founded. And it does so to the most fundamental building block of any City – the ability to determine land use and zoning.

I go back almost 40 or 50 years long before I was elected and your communities engaged in the most basic fundamental democratic institution of electing Councillors and Mayors. In dealing with land use planning matters those elected individuals conducted Public Meetings in communities such as Huron Park/Glen Sharon, the Erindale Village and the Gordon Woods to arrive at a community consensus on the residential form these communities would take. This democratic will and community consensus then had to be vetted through the appropriate professional government bureaucracy such as the Planning and Civil Engineering Department to ensure proper planning and science was respected. And because we do not live in an autocracy under the single rule of one tyrant, this collective political and professional position now had to pass muster with a larger body known as the Planning Committee where more individuals on behalf of the City had to determine if this local vision was appropriate. A formal Public Meeting is called, official notices are sent, and the matter is debated and discussed. A democratic vote is then taken, and if passed it now must face an additional level scrutiny from an even larger democratically elected group which is the local Council. This is a city-wide body of democratically elected individuals who have to ensure that landowner and community intentions are in keeping with the long term best interests of the entire town. These are the institutions such as elections, public consultations, professional planning and civil engineering, legal Counsel, and a final democratic vote that establish the zoning, secondary plans, special site policies, and the Official Plan under which we have collectively chosen to live. And if after all this anyone believes they were unfairly dealt with, they have a right to appeal to the Courts and the Ontario Municipal Board. Finally, additional institutions exist like a local Committee of Adjustment where non-partisan appointed citizen members can sit in judgement of an application brought by any applicant should they wish to propose “minor variance” from the By-laws that were created by the process noted above. This system of checks and balances that includes virtually all those who wish to participate is the fundamental basis of our democracy. Nowhere does one single person get a Veto.

It is for all these reasons that I am disgusted and appalled that on June 27, 2014 OMB member M.A. Sills spit in the face of all these historic fundamental institutions; told us that they and we were all wrong; and unilaterally reversed half a century of history. In so doing this individual overruled the Councillor; the area residents and community that engaged in a public planning processes; the professional municipal planners and civil engineers who found favour with this community consensus; the planning lawyers at the municipality who ensured all proper laws
were followed; the planning committee that approved this professional opinion and consensus; the elected Mayor and Members of Council who made this decision official, and the site specific zoning, secondary plan, special zoning policies, and Official Plan that are created and apply. But there’s more. In the specific instance of the Glengarry Road affair the applicant took all of this history to the Committee of Adjustment not once but twice and in both instances was rejected by the independent citizen committee. So how dare any one provincial government appointee have the audacity to tell us we are all wrong!

To demonstrate just how appalling the decision was let me specifically reference the law, our opposing arguments, and what some of the “dominos” exercising their professional duty had to say on the matter.

A minor variance is described by the Province of Ontario as having to meet “four tests set out in the Planning Act of the Province.” The OMB member had to determine that a) the variance was truly minor b) it was desirable for the appropriate development or use of the lands c) maintained the general purpose and intent of the zoning by-law and d) maintained the general intended purpose of the Official Plan. It should have failed on all four tests.

All abutting lots to 2532 Glengarry Road are 100 foot frontage properties. On what planet is a 50% deviation or doubling the density considered minor? In evidence given by municipal professional and legal staff on the two separate occasions before the Committee of Adjustments staff stated, “The Erindale neighbourhood is an established and stable residential neighbourhood. To satisfy compatibility concerns, any proposed development is required to recognize and enhance the scale and character of the existing residential areas by having regard to lot frontages and area, among other matters. Mississauga Official Plan encourages development in neighbourhoods to be context sensitive and respect the existing or planned character and scale of the development... The requested severance does not recognize or enhance the scale or character of the existing residential area or streetscape with respect to lot frontage or area, and therefore, does not satisfy compatibility concerns as outlined in the Mississauga Official Plan...the intent of the applicable zoning regulations in this instance is to maintain the established character of the streetscape, which on the west side of Glengarry Road and to the rear of Sharon Crescent, consists predominantly of lots with significant frontages of 30.48 metres (100 feet)... We advise that this department has serious concerns with the requested consent as approval would set an undesirable precedent for lots that are not in keeping with the established character of the streetscape.” In addition to this very powerful and precise testimony before the two separate Committee of Adjustment hearings and the OMB reversal, it will not come as a surprise that I and dozens of other area residents wrote strongly worded letters in opposition. Not one single area resident submitted comments of support.

Specific comments noted in the minutes of the Ontario Municipal Board ruling are also very troubling. At my direction and as approved by Council we sent professional planning and legal staff to defend our position before the Board. In evidence given before the OMB appeal noted in the minutes it was stated quite explicitly by the City’s professional planner that “the property is not within the intensification corridor.” Our expert went on to acknowledge that
“Intensification within neighbourhoods may be considered where the proposed development is compatible in built form and scale to surrounding development, enhances the existing and planned development and is consistent with the policies of the plan...while meeting the housing needs and preferences of Mississauga residents.” How could the member have ignored these facts. Of even greater concern is that the City of Mississauga has gone through the provincially mandated growth policies and had the planning documents approved by the Province. What this means is that the Province of Ontario has decreed our communities in the Greater Toronto Hamilton Area (GTHA) to grow by 100,000 people a year over the next 30 years. You and I were given no opinion on the matter and they simply mandated the growth. What they did allow us to do is to establish the intensification corridors where it could be accommodated. Put differently, they allowed us to “pick” the locations to place our “poison” – we complied as evidenced by our emerging Downtown Core and the designation of Cooksville and Hurontario and Dundas Streets as intensification corridors. In accommodating the Provincial growth order, all members of your City Council paid for and earned the right to preserve the character of our residential communities such as the Gordon Woods and the Erindale Village. What this single member has just done in reversing this decision is to renege on the deal your City had with the Province of Ontario. What is worse, the adjudicator clearly did so deliberately. The minutes prove this to be the case. Section 41 of the decision states that “the planning department has serious concerns with the requested consensus as approval would set an undesirable precedent for lots that are not in keeping with the established character of the streetscape.” In section 49 of their decision the member stated that “notwithstanding that each individual planning application is to be assessed on its own merits, if the approval of the current application were to set a precedent, the Board cannot agree that it could be considered an ‘undesirable precedent.’” This is an abomination and the main reason why I am so angered and truly livid. Not only did this one person unilaterally rezone your land, when it was specifically brought to their attention that this could create an undesirable precedent the Board member in their ruling specifically went out of their way to make everyone aware that it most assuredly was not “an undesirable precedent” that could be applied outside mandated, approved intensification corridors.

This one individual just tore up the Official Plan of the City of Mississauga, and more specifically the provincially approved intensification policies therein. The specific zoning on your property and the 50 year history that made it so no longer applies. From this point on if you were to ask any of the institutional and democratic dominos noted above what the specific zoning is for your land we have to refer you to your Member of Provincial Parliament, their Ontario Municipal Board, and the individual they appointed and employ to render these final decisions.

Let me conclude by trying to express the magnitude of this atrocity at the simplest possible level referencing one single residence and one real family. The property immediately adjacent to the severance allowed is owned by a lovely couple who before purchasing that lot contacted me as their area Councillor to go over matters of zoning and permitted uses. They had done their homework and so I merely confirmed what they had learned from the historic dominos noted above. They purchased this 100 foot single detached lot upon which they built a large bungalow. This meant they did two very specific things. They honoured the history of all those
previous dominos, and they made an enormous investment presuming those dominos would
continue to be honoured. In the 50 years of history and all of the decisions leading up to the
appeal before the Board by all the dominos involved that commitment was honoured and
upheld. On June 27, 2014 one single tyrant and autocrat overruled all of the above creating
chaos and anarchy. They did so deliberately and went so far as to suggest it should not be seen
as an “undesirable” precedent. Kiss your community goodbye. This is the Wild West and the
shooting has already started.

In the aftermath it should come as no surprise that the ‘development vultures’ are already
circling. The decision has already attracted those trying to make a fast buck by inquiring about
or purchasing what was always thought to be and legally zoned as a single lot but may now in
fact be two. It has also reawakened land developers revisiting previous favourable decisions
that preserve our neighbourhoods made by the Committee of Adjustment seeking reversal on
appeal to the OMB. When I am now asked the direct question of just what the specific zoning is
for their property what am I supposed to say? I had told the couple who built the bungalow on
Glengarry adjacent to the site that their lot was in a very special community with very specific
zoning and policies that ensured they had to maintain the character of 100 foot lots. This was
true based upon 50 years of history and process I have detailed. We all now know that the
Province of Ontario, our Members of Provincial Parliament, their Ontario Municipal Board, and
their appointees/employees have turned that statement into a lie. The truth is, with this
decision I can no longer give any taxpayer any assurance of what is permitted on their
lot. From this point on we can only refer those inquiries to your Members of Provincial Parliament and the
whims of their appointees.

It gets worse. One of the ‘development vultures’ who has a very good understanding and
experience regarding these matters in these areas contacted me shortly after the decision and
referenced some properties in our ward that now may represent a very desirable “lottery
ticket.” I made it explicitly clear that notwithstanding this decision I would continue to
vigorously defend and uphold the existing zoning and oppose intensification in these cherished
communities. He responded that was exactly what he wanted me to do but hoped that my
stern opposition before the community and Committee of Adjustment could be done hastily so
that he can get before the Ontario Municipal Board with this new precedent setting decision on
a similar adjacent property as quickly as possible. Can you imagine. Imploring elected officials
and democratic institutions to do you the enormous favour of voting against you as quickly as
possible because they have a friend waiting to give them what they want. As it relates to
municipal government, land use planning, and zoning, this is our world gone insane. We simply
can’t stand for it.

My closing thought is what is by far the most perplexing piece of this entire debacle. In doing a
great deal of homework on this file I have spoken to several individuals with intimate
knowledge of these affairs that come from various perspectives. Their top-of-mind thought,
totally unprompted by me, was why this member would have even touched this decision with a
ten foot pole. It is the role of the OMB to correct an injustice such as those that do arise when
politicians play to the crowd or NIMBYism rears its head. Against the weight of all the evidence
and history I have provided it is clear that far from correcting an injustice the member created one.

Please contact your Member of Provincial Parliament with the contact details I have provided below referencing O.M.B. Case No. PL 130483. They too will have been copied on this letter. I have gone to so much time and effort in detailing all of the above so that you won’t have to. All you have to do is insist they bring every effort to bear to ensure another one of their employees who alone has the right to overturn this decision by another one of their employees does so.

Kindest personal regards,

Nando

Nando Iannicca
Councillor, Ward 7

Harinder Takhar – MPP Mississauga-Erindale
Tel: 905-897-8815 e-mail: htakhar.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org
Area: North of Queensway West and west of Mavis Rd.

Charles Sousa – MPP Mississauga South
Tel: 905-274-8228 e-mail: csousa.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org
Area: South of Queensway West

cc Mayor & Members of Council
Senior Management Team (SMT)
Ward 7 Ratepayers
Miranet
Mississauga MPPs
August 15, 2014

Her Worship Hazel McCallion
Mayor
City of Mississauga
300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga, ON
L5B 3C1

Dear Mayor McCallion:

Thank you for your letter regarding Private Member’s Bill 69, Prompt Payment Act, 2013, which was forwarded to the Attorney General for response. I am responding on behalf of the Attorney General.

Bill 69 was introduced during the previous session of the Legislative Assembly. The Bill died on the Order Paper when the Legislative Assembly was dissolved on May 2, 2014 for the general election.

The Government is committed to modernizing the Construction Lien Act to reflect the reality of today’s construction industry and to address payment risk within the sector. The objective is to ensure that companies are paid in a timely way for work they have done.

On April 30, 2014, officials from the Ministry of the Attorney General and the Ministry of Economic Development, Employment and Infrastructure held a meeting with a diverse group of construction industry stakeholders, including your organization, to discuss the process for reviewing the Act. I am enclosing a copy of some notes taken at this session.

The Ministry is currently considering the feedback from stakeholders in determining the appropriate process for the review, the selection of a Chair to lead the review and expert panel, and the size and composition of the panel.
Construction Lien Act Review
Stakeholder Meeting Summary

April 30, 2014 (3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.)
700 Bay Street, 24th Floor

Purpose of Meeting

The Ministry of the Attorney General and the Ministry of Infrastructure called this stakeholder meeting to discuss the announced process for reviewing the Construction Lien Act, with particular emphasis on prompt payment. This meeting was called prior to the date that the provincial election was called.

In advance of this meeting, all participants were provided with some draft terms of reference jointly developed by the two ministries. The terms of reference outline four issues:

1. The substantive content of the review.
2. The process for undertaking the review.
3. The composition of the advisory panel.
4. The individual who should lead the panel.

The ministries sought stakeholder feedback with respect to the last two issues in particular.

Organizations Represented

National Trade Contractors Coalition of Canada (NTCCC)
Carpenters District Council of Ontario
Residential Construction Council of Ontario (RESCON)
Electrical Contractors Association of Ontario
Ontario Construction Secretariat
Building Industry and Land Development Association
Trisan
Consulting Engineers of Ontario
Council of Ontario Construction Associations
Ontario General Contractors Association
Aecon Group Inc.
Toronto Transit Commission and the City of Toronto
Crown Law Office Civil
MAG – Justice Policy and Development Branch
McMillan LLP
Ellis Don Construction
Construction Law Section – Ontario Bar Association
MAG - Minister’s Office
Ontario Association of Architects
Region of Durham
Ontario Sewer and Watermain Construction Association
Ontario Construction Finishing Industries Alliance
Ministry of Infrastructure
Infrastructure Ontario
Ministry of Transportation
Ontario Home Builders’ Association (OHBA)
Robins Appleby LLP (OHBA)
Torkin Manes LLP
Infrastructure Ontario
Ontario Road Builders Association
Colleges Ontario
Surety Association of Canada
Manion Wilkins & Associates Ltd.
Interior Systems Contractors Association
Ontario Hospitals Association
Ontario Association of School Business Officials

Summary of Discussions

General comments

Several stakeholders emphasized the importance of ensuring that the focus for the proposed panel is on prompt payments and identifying the associated issues. Prompt payment is, however, understood to be directly linked to the issue of construction liens; if you solve the first, the second is unlikely/less likely to arise. There is general agreement across the industry on the principles underlying prompt payment.

The proposed review process

There was considerable support for the proposed review process, which would proceed in two phases. The first phase contemplates an investigation into the issues and/or gaps in existing legislation. A report would be developed and provided to the ministers outlining the results of these efforts. Assuming that some measure of concurrence was achieved, the second phase would require that the panel develop a legislative proposal for statutory amendments. Generally speaking, the stakeholder groups found this proposed process to be fair and appropriate.

There was some suggestion of pursuing a staged process with prompt payment addressed first, and the Construction Lien Act second. Little feedback was provided for this idea. However, most groups preferred the process as laid out in the proposed terms of reference.
Panel composition

In terms of qualifications, attendees proposed that both ministries establish the parameters used to identify the appropriate representation. It was also suggested that the people on the panel have a background in, and knowledge of, contracts, tendering and construction law. This could mean lawyers or people with experience in the field.

In terms of composition, it was generally agreed that the panel needs to reflect and balance the various stakeholder interests. A number of suggestions were put forward, including the following:

1. The panel should have representatives for different classes of participants (i.e. contractors, trades, consulting professions). Each class could have its own caucus to develop the positions that would secure the buy in of its group.

2. The panel should be composed of different groups responsible for securing stakeholder buy in. Some of the groups proposed were:
   - Owners (which should include public and private)
   - General contractors
   - Subcontractors and trades
   - Material suppliers
   - Trade unions
   - Bonding industry
   - Financing industry (i.e. banks)
   - Professionals
   - The Ontario Bar Association Construction Lien Working Group.

3. Lawyers should represent the various stakeholder interests, perhaps at a separate committee.

There was a lot of discussion relating to the size of the panel. Some groups suggested that it be on a smaller scale (i.e. four to five members), while others preferred a larger panel (i.e. eight to ten members). No consensus was reached on this point. The ministries were entrusted with determining the requisite number.

The Panel Chair

Ministry officials suggested several attributes that would be important for a panel chair: technical expertise, legal training, neutral/impartial perspective, and a good consensus builder. While generally agreed upon, some participants expressed concerns relating to the chair being a practicing lawyer. That was the case because some might be affiliated with particular groups.
Stakeholders provided names of individuals who they believed to possess the above-mentioned traits, and who are highly respected in the field.

1. Harvey Kirsch.
2. Master David Sandler (retired).
4. Bruce Reynolds.
5. Mathew Alter.

The idea of co-chairs was also proposed, which received some positive feedback and support.

Next Steps

Ministry officials agreed to circulate a summary of the key points raised at the meeting with attendees. There was discussion that the next steps to be taken on this file would depend on whether or not an election was called.
March 18, 2014

Her Worship Hazel McCallion
Mayor
City of Mississauga
300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga, Ontario
L5B 3C1

Dear Mayor McCallion:

Thank you for writing to me regarding Bill 69, Prompt Payment Act. I appreciate hearing your views on this Private Member’s Bill, and value the input of our municipal partners. I also appreciate the time you took to share the City of Mississauga’s corporate report and resolution.

As this issue falls under the area of responsibility of my colleague the Honourable John Gerretsen, Attorney General I have forwarded a copy of your correspondence to his office. I trust that he will also give your views his consideration.

Mayor McCallion, thank you again for writing. Please accept my best wishes.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Wynne
Premier

c: The Honourable John Gerretsen
February 11, 2014

The Honourable Kathleen Wynne
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building – Room 281
Queen’s Park
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1A1

Dear Madam Premier:

At the Large Urban Mayors’ Caucus of Ontario (LUMCO) meeting on Friday, January 7, 2014, we discussed the difficulty that municipalities will face if the Private Member’s Bill, Bill 69 – An Act representing payments made under contracts and subcontracts in the construction industry, was to be passed. There are many reasons for our concern but what is critical is that the Bill will affect municipalities’ ability to exercise due diligence over public funds and limit our contractual freedom to negotiate with contractors and suppliers. If the Bill passes into law, there could potentially be a significant financial impact on owners, such as the City of Mississauga.

Please find enclosed the corporate report and resolution of the City of Mississauga on this important issue. There has been little, if no, consultation with municipalities on this pending legislation, which is unacceptable. Bill 69 should not be passed into law.

Sincerely,

HAZEL MCCALLION, C.M., LL.D.
MAYOR

cc: Tim Hudak, Leader of the Official Opposition
Andrea Horwath, Leader of the New Democratic Party of Ontario
The Honourable Linda Jeffrey, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Mississauga MPPs
Steven Del Duca, MPP, Vaughan
Pat Vanini, Executive Director, AMO
LUMCO Members
Members of Council

Enc.
Please be informed of a proposed development in your neighbourhood

This is to inform you that the landowners at 1294 - 1318 Alexandra Avenue, east of Cawthra Road and north of Atwater Avenue have revised their application to the City to permit eight (8) detached dwellings and the extension of Seventh Street as a public road, and to recognize the existing frontages and the proposed retained lot areas on Alexandra Avenue. Below is a short description of the applications. The City will be processing the applications as required by the Provincial Planning Act and we would welcome any comments you may have.

Revised Proposal:

- The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Mississauga Official Plan policies for the Lakeview Local Area Plan from "Residential Low Density II" to "Residential Low Density II-Special Site";
- In addition, a change in zoning is being requested for the subject lands from "RM1" (Semi-Detached Dwellings) to "RS-Exception" (Detached Dwellings-Typical Lots);
- Approval of a proposed Plan of Subdivision is also required comprised of 8 detached dwelling lots on a public road.

The original notification for this development proposal was sent out on November 22, 2013. The proposal originally consisted of 8 standard condominium detached dwellings on a private road with access off Seventh Street. Through consultation with City Departments, the applicant has revised the proposal to 8 detached dwellings and the extension of Seventh Street as a public road. As a result of these changes a Subdivision Application (T-M14001 W1) has been submitted.

The following studies/information were submitted in support of the applications:

- Survey, Context Map, Concept Plan, Draft Plan of Subdivision
- Typical Elevation
- Planning Justification Report
- Phase I Environmental Evaluation
- Functional Servicing Report
- Tree Inventory/Preservation Plan & Arborist Report
- Parcel Registry Documents
- Draft Official Plan Amendment
- Draft Zoning By-law Amendment

Planning Act Requirements:

The Planning Act requires that all complete applications be processed.

The above-noted applications are now being circulated to City Departments and Agencies for technical review.

Once this has been completed, a report summarizing the development and the comments received will be prepared by Planning staff and presented at a Public Meeting.

Notice of the Public Meeting will be given in accordance with the Planning Act requirements.

A recommendation on the applications will not be presented until after the Public Meeting and all technical comments have been received.

Lesley Pavan, Director
Development and Design Division
Planning and Building Department

Please contact the Planning and Building Department in writing by mail at 200 City Centre Drive, Mississauga ON L5B 3C1 or by fax at 905-896-5553 or by email at application.info@mississauga.ca if:

- You would like to forward your views on the proposed development. Written submissions will become part of the public record; or
- You wish to be notified of any upcoming meetings.

More Information:

Contact the Planner responsible for the file (noted above) for further details on the actual proposal.

Planning documents and background material are available for inspection at the Planning and Building Department, Planning Services Centre, 3rd floor, Mississauga Civic Centre between 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. Please contact the Planner noted above prior to your visit.

For residential applications, information regarding education and school accommodation is available from the Peel District School Board at 905-890-1089 or the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board at 905-890-1221.
July 4, 2014

Crystal Greer
300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga L5B 3C1

Dear Ms. Greer:

Subject: Peel Urban Forest Strategy

I am writing to advise that Peel Regional Council approved the following resolution at its meeting held on June 26, 2014:

**Resolution 2014-576:**

Whereas the urban and rural forests require a proactive approach:

And whereas, there is a need to maintain, preserve and expand the forest in both rural and urban areas;

Therefore be it resolved, that Regional staff work with the Conservation Authorities and the Cities of Brampton and Mississauga and the Town of Caledon to further implement the Peel Urban Forest Strategy and to develop a partnership approach and identify a matrix of roles and responsibilities and report back to a future Conservation Authority Advisory Committee meeting with proposed plans for the maintenance, preservation and expansion of the rural and urban forest including nurseries and the use of existing public lands owned by the municipalities and Conservation Authorities;

And further, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Cities of Brampton and Mississauga, the Town of Caledon and the Conservation Authorities for endorsement.

Yours truly,

Helena West
Legislative Specialist

HW:js

C: Crystal Greer, Clerk, City of Mississauga
   Peter Fey, Clerk, City of Brampton
   Karen Landry, Clerk, Town of Caledon
   Brian Denney, Chief Administrative Officer, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
   Deborah Martin-Downs, Chief Administrative Officer, Credit Valley Conservation Authority
   Arvin Prasad, Director, Integrated Planning Division, Region of Peel

---

**Corporate Services**
10 Peel Centre Dr., Brampton, ON L6T 4B9
Tel: 905-791-7800 www.peelregion.ca
VIA EMAIL

July 11, 2014

The Honourable Michael Chong, MP, Wellington-Halton Hills
The Honourable Lisa Raitt, MP Halton
Mike Wallace, MP, Burlington
Terence Young, MP, Oakville
Eleanor McMahon, MPP, Burlington
Indira Naidoo-Harris, MPP, Halton
The Honourable Kevin Flynn, MPP, Oakville
Ted Arnott, MPP, Wellington-Halton Hills
Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), Pat Vanini
All Ontario Municipalities

Please be advised that at its meeting held, Wednesday, July 09, 2014 the Council of the Regional Municipality of Halton adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION: Protection of Public Participation Act, 2014 (Bill 83)

WHEREAS Bill 83, Protection of Public Participation Act, 2014, being "An Statutory Powers of Procedure Act in order to protect expression on matters of public interest" (hereinafter "Bill 83"), was introduced into the Provincial Legislature in June 2013;

WHEREAS Bill 83 was introduced by the government out of concern that Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation (SLAPP), being lawsuits brought before the court by one party against another party or individual as a tactic for silencing or intimidating the other party, are having a chilling effect on public participation on contentious matters of public interest in Ontario;

WHEREAS Bill 83 is intended to protect persons from being subjected to legal proceedings that would stifle their ability to speak out on public issues or promote, in the public interest, action by the public or any level of government;

WHEREAS the ability to engage in public participation forums is the foundation of a democratic society;

WHEREAS there exist a number of high profile environmental issues in the Regional Municipality of Halton that are of public interest and that have generated a great deal of debate in the community;

WHEREAS Regional Council is of the opinion that public participation in matters of public interest ought to be encouraged and not discouraged through tactics such as strategic lawsuits against public participation;

The Regional Municipality of Halton
HEAD OFFICE 1151 Bronte Road, Oakville, Ontario L6M 3L1 • Tel: 905-825-6000 • Toll free: 1-866-442-5866 • TTY: 905-827-9833 • www.halton.ca
WHEREAS provision is made in Bill 83 to amend the Courts of Justice Act for such SLAPP legal proceedings to be dismissed at an early stage and for defendants subjected to such proceedings to be indemnified for incurred costs in such proceedings with the potential for additional damages to be awarded in appropriate circumstances;

WHEREAS provision is made in Bill 83 to amend the Libel and Slander Act to state that any qualified privilege that applies in respect of an oral or written communication on a matter of public interest between two or more persons who have a direct interest in the matter applies regardless of whether the communication is witnessed or reported on by media representatives or other persons;

WHEREAS provision is made in Bill 83 to amend the Statutory Powers Procedure Act to provide that submissions for a costs order in a proceeding must be made in writing, unless the tribunal determines that to do so is likely to cause a party to the proceeding significant prejudice;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of The Regional Municipality of Halton advise the newly elected Premier of the Province of Ontario, the Honorable Kathleen Wynne, Halton MP’s and MPP’s, party leaders and all Ontario municipalities of its support for the Protection of Public Participation Act, 2014 and request that Bill 83 be re-introduced forthwith in the Legislature;

THAT the Regional Chair be requested to meet with Halton’s newly elected Members of Provincial Parliament to encourage the Province to reintroduce the anti-SLAPP legislation; and

THAT the Association of Municipalities of Ontario be requested to support this resolution.

As per the above resolution, please accept this correspondence for your information and consideration.

If you have any questions please contact Ms. Karyn Bennett, Regional Clerk & Director of Council Services.

Sincerely,

Kathy Kielt
Deputy Clerk and Supervisor of Council & Committee Services

c. Karyn Bennett, Regional Clerk & Director of Council Services
WHEREAS the Holcim Waterfront Estate, including the Harding House and Coach House completed in 1938, was designated by the City of Mississauga in 2009 under the Ontario Heritage Act for its physical design, historical and contextual value.

AND WHEREAS the redevelopment of this property in 2013 included the successful restoration of the existing buildings and adjacent parkland and the re-use of this property as a Wedding and Banquet Venue.

AND WHEREAS the Prime Consultants for this project owned by the City of Mississauga are ATA Architects Inc.

AND WHEREAS the Holcim Waterfront Estate was the winner of the Cultural Heritage Property Award presented by Heritage Mississauga and the Award for Excellence for Adaptive Re-use of Heritage Property presented by the Heritage Advisory Committee in 2013.

AND WHEREAS The Lieutenant Governor’s Ontario Heritage Awards, administered by the Ontario Heritage Trust, are prestigious awards that recognize exceptional contributions to heritage conservation, environmental sustainability and biodiversity, and cultural and natural heritage.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council supports the nomination of the Holcim Waterfront Estate to the 2014 Lieutenant Governor’s Ontario Heritage Award for Excellence in Conservation.
WHEREAS section 110(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended provides that council of a municipality may enter into agreements for the provision of municipal capital facilities with any person;

AND WHEREAS, section 6 of O. Reg 603/06 requires that in order for such an agreement to be entered into, council for the municipality must declare by resolution that a municipal capital facility used for cultural, recreational or tourist purposes is for the purpose of the municipality and for public use;

AND WHEREAS The Corporation of the City of Mississauga (“City”) is the registered owner of the lands municipally known as 4141 Living Arts Drive, and owns the building known as the “Living Arts Centre” located on these lands;

AND WHEREAS the Living Arts Centre is a multifaceted arts and entertainment facility that, among its objectives, include the fostering, promotion and production of the performing arts, visual and other arts and cultural and entertainment events for the benefit of the municipality, the artistic community and the members of the public;

AND WHEREAS City Council wishes to lease the Living Arts Centre to The Living Arts Centre in Mississauga and to contract with the latter to operate and manage the Centre on the City’s behalf;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Municipal Capital Facility, as such term is defined in the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended, located at the property known as 4141 Living Arts Drive in Mississauga, Ontario, being the Living Arts Centre, is used for cultural, recreational and tourist purposes and is for the purpose of the municipality and for public use.