

From: Doug Glass

Sent: November 11, 2025 9:25 AM

To: chair <chair@durham.ca>; Clerks <Clerks@durham.ca>; Sterling Lee

Subject: Durham Committee of the Whole - Nov 13, 2025

Good day. Here are some of the questions and concerns I have prior to the meeting that I hope can get addressed at the meeting. Clerk, please ensure this goes into the public record. Can you also tell me how I can confirm that this happens? Where do I see it? (minutes, etc)

Item 7.1

The updated Community Safety and Well-Being Plan sets out a thoughtful and well-intentioned framework to tackle complex issues like homelessness, substance use, mental health, racism, and gender-based violence through coordination rather than silos. Its focus on prevention, data, and collaboration is commendable. But the structure has grown heavy, dozens of committees, sub-committees, and inter-municipal tables involving many of the same senior staff and agencies. While coordination has value, this scale risks becoming symbolic and bureaucratic, consuming time and payroll that could be reaching people directly. The plan itself notes it doesn't fund services or build housing, so the return on administrative effort must be clearly measured. (how will the Region measure success?)

Going forward, I believe Durham would be better served by streamlining governance, publishing annual performance indicators, and redirecting more resources toward proven front-line programs that stabilize lives. The region's strength lies not in how many meetings, but in how many residents see real change because of them. Something that I recently asked Durham Social Services to provide updated data on in a meeting with them.

Item 7.2

As a resident of North Ajax, I'm increasingly concerned by the growing pressure to urbanize the Northeast Pickering lands, an area of sensitive greenspace, forests, and headwaters directly tied to the Duffins Creek watershed. This report makes clear that the push to accelerate servicing has not come from the public, but from the Northeast Pickering Landowners Group and the development industry. Yet, taxpayers are being asked to fund early consulting and legal work while residents, conservation authorities, and environmental experts have been completely left out of the process. That raises real questions about transparency and who this exercise is meant to serve.

Before any decisions are made, Council should clearly state:

1. Who initiated and benefits from this review — was it developer-driven or a Regional growth priority?
2. What environmental protections will be in place to safeguard the Duffins Creek watershed, woodlots, and remaining Greenbelt buffers?
3. What financial exposure do taxpayers face, especially given thousands of unbuilt units already serviced in Seaton?

4. Why residents and environmental groups are not included in the stakeholder consultation phase?

Council should not advance this process, or spend public money on it until those questions are publicly answered and residents have a formal seat at the table. The future of our greenspace and the fiscal stability of this Region deserve nothing less.

Item 7.3

Similar to the above, I'm increasingly alarmed that these policies seem built around meeting provincial development targets, not sustaining livability or affordability for the people already here. This report admits that deferring development charges to occupancy could drain reserves and delay infrastructure, yet there's no commitment that taxpayers won't be left covering the shortfall. It supports new service classes, Local Service Policies, and standardized provincial forecasts that further erode local control—all while Ajax faces density levels already beyond what infrastructure and roads can handle. Now the targets being proposed border on unrealistic and risk turning Ajax into a high-rise corridor without the services or affordability to match.

So I have a few simple questions: How will you ensure these new deferral rules and planning changes don't translate into higher property taxes, utility rates, or service cuts for residents? Why endorse a system that weakens "growth pays for growth" when your own report warns of reserve depletion? And will Council finally re-examine its population and density targets—based on actual infrastructure and cost capacity—rather than provincial pressure and developer expectations?

Residents like me are very troubled with the path being taken and we need to act on our behalf.

Item 8.1

I shared comments in October but the sponsor did not attend. So I am re-submitting them.

This motion may sound helpful on paper, but it risks creating another tax loophole that shifts costs onto regular homeowners and small businesses. The proposed "Affordable Rental Housing Subclass" could reduce property taxes for certain landlords by up to 35%, yet there's no guarantee those savings will ever reach tenants. The Region would lose that revenue, and someone else, ordinary taxpayers would end up footing the bill. Once adopted, it becomes a permanent structural change, with MPAC reclassifying properties and the Region absorbing the loss year after year. This isn't affordability; it's a subsidy for property owners under a label that sounds good politically.

Before council studies or endorses this, members should ask: how will the Region ensure savings actually lower rents? What's the total revenue loss and who makes up the shortfall? Why are landlords being given new tax breaks while homeowners struggling with inflation get none? How will eligibility be verified or clawed back if rents rise anyway? And what prevents this from being quietly expanded to near-market

“affordable” units that benefit developers more than renters? Until those questions are clearly answered at the meeting and real affordability outcomes are guaranteed, Council should vote **no**, even on studying this.

There seems to be a theme here around development.