
To: Eshesh, Shahinaz
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL]Comments: City-Wide Policy Review for detached Additional Residential Units (ARUs)

From: Roger Cawthorn <roger.cawthorn@gmail.com>
Sent: 2021/05/31 9:52 PM
To: Eshesh, Shahinaz <Shahinaz.Eshesh@brampton.ca>
Subject: [EXTERNAL]Comments: City-Wide Policy Review for detached Additional Residential Units (ARUs)

Comments Re: City-Wide Policy Review for detached Additional Residential Units (ARUs)
Commentor: Roger Cawthorn, Ward 3 resident
Note: Consent to include this email (including email address) as part of the public meeting record - Roger Cawthorn

Comments:

Expanding demand beyond planned, existing, and entrenched infrastructure capabilities through renovation or upgrade is, at best, costly and difficult. Often a complete demolition, redesign, and rebuild may be the only viable solution.

Just imagine infrastructure upgrades and/or complete rebuild costs at the neighbourhood level (assuming physical space is even available), should an unplanned surge in infrastructure demand occur due to a provincial legislation change. Consider the potential to overload existing electrical, water, sewage, transportation/road, parking, waste, telecom, emergency services, schools, health services, recreation and green spaces/parks frameworks within each neighbourhood. Please notice that the above existing infrastructure for the most part are working as designed and as per agreement of **all** residences and businesses who have chosen to make a given neighbour their home.

The City of Brampton's ARU implementation policy must either ensure population density per neighbourhood not be allowed to damage existing infrastructure capabilities or alternatively ensure the cost of upgrading and/or replacing existing functional infrastructure is incurred by those directly benefiting from that increased population density.

The City of Brampton should not indulge in wishful thinking with comments such as: "*Additional residential units help support a modest increase in housing units while respecting the overall low-density community form. ARUs are a form of gentle densification supporting the efficiency of existing City infrastructure (such as sewers, roads, and recreation facilities).*" The City will be unable to prevent or control even more ARUs being established in neighbourhoods that may very well experience excessive ARU growth. Furthermore, as currently the issue with legal and illegal second units, the City can not enter individual ARUs to assess the number of occupants. ARUs only exacerbate current (GTA specific) capacity issues over which the city is legally powerless to remediate through regulatory actions.

Beyond infrastructure impacts, it is unfortunate that the City of Brampton ARU implementation policy can not ensure that those benefiting from Provincial legislation (*Bill 108 More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019*) also incur the cost to neighbouring residences and business of property value degradation as a result of some of their neighbour's actions. This includes lost city tax revenue resulting from MPAC property value appeals. Hence, the City of Brampton does not need to encourage Provincial Bill 108. Instead the City of Brampton's ARU implementation policy should make every effort to place the cost and burden on those property owners actually benefiting from ARUs. As a first step, a realistic artist ARU renditions should replace the City's existing overly optimistic glossy representation. Why not illustrate un-maintained rental units with maximized tenants and automobiles plus existing accessory building (sheds) alongside neighbouring properties? With a realistic

visual representation in mind, then pursue ARU implementation policy that minimizes Bill 108 impact to existing infrastructure and property owners.

Retroactive actions envisioned by Bill 108 are, by definition, un-planned actions. Un-planned actions are a recipe for failure and should not be encouraged by a City policy. The City's policy should only do the minimum to comply with Provincial Bill 108. Instead, the City of Brampton should encourage and focus on NEW neighbourhoods where "*more homes, more choice*" can be effectively and efficiently implemented in a **planned** manner to actually address population growth demands.

Thank you for your consideration,
Roger Cawthorn