

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

Item 1, Report No. 18, of the Committee of the Whole (Working Session), which was adopted without amendment by the Council of the City of Vaughan on April 11, 2005.

1 **WARD BOUNDARIES**

The Committee of the Whole (Working Session) recommends:

- 1) That the following report of the City Clerk, dated March 22, 2005, be received, and referred to a Special Committee of the Whole (Working Session) meeting on April 4, 2005;**
- 2) That the City Clerk provide the related costs of a 6 and 7 ward option in terms of an additional local councillor and two additional local councillors respectively; and**
- 3) That the written submission of Councillor Yeung Racco, dated March 22, 2005, be received.**

Recommendation

The City Clerk, in consultation with the Commissioner of Legal and Administrative Services, recommends that Council select the preferred ward option to be presented at a public meeting to be scheduled as soon as possible.

Purpose

To respond to a Council directive respecting proposals for revised wards including 5, 6 and 7 ward options based on criteria established by Council and to report on the matter of regional wards.

Background - Analysis and Options

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Over the years, numerous ward boundary reviews have been conducted by Vaughan Councils. When York Region came into existence on January 1, 1971, Vaughan Council consisted of 1 Mayor, 1 Regional and 5 Local Councillors all elected at large. In 1980 staff were directed to report on a ward system. Council ultimately selected a 6 ward proposal that was submitted to the OMB for approval in 1982. At that time and until 1996 all ward proposals required OMB approval. The Board did not approve the Council preferred 6 ward system but instead adopted a 3 ward system with one councillor for ward 1 and two councillors each for wards 2 and 3 (Attachment No. 1). This surprised both supporters and opponents of the Council recommended plan. Council appealed the decision to Cabinet but was unsuccessful and a 3 ward system was adopted which remained in place until 1994. In the intervening years, Council considered numerous ward proposals including an 8 ward system but no changes were made until 1994. However, Vaughan did gain additional regional councillors with one being added in 1988 and another in 2004 resulting in the current Council of 9, one Mayor, 3 Local and Regional Councillors and 5 Local Councillors.

In 1992 – 1993, Council considered options for a 5 and 6 ward system ultimately opting for a 5 ward system which was approved by the OMB and implemented for the 1994 election and is still in place today. Council considered a ward review in October of 2002 and decided to retain the current ward boundaries for the 2003 election but directed staff to report on a ward boundary review for implementation at the 2006 election. More recently, staff reported to a Committee of the Whole (Working Session) on November 9, 2004 and Council adopted the following resolutions:

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

Item 1, CW(WS) Report No. 18 – Page 2

- 1) That this matter be referred to a Special Committee of the Whole meeting on November 22, 2004 at 11:00 a.m.;
- 2) That staff provide a legal opinion on the regulations and statutory requirements respecting Regional Wards;
- 3) That staff provide a report on the Regional Ward system in Mississauga and Brampton; and
- 4) That the Electoral count for each of the five wards as at the 2003 election be provided.

At the Special Committee of the Whole on November 22, 2004, the matter of regional wards was considered. Staff reports addressing regulations, statutory requirements and the regional ward systems in Mississauga and Brampton were received. In addition, the following direction was given and subsequently ratified by Council:

- 1) That staff be directed to prepare revised ward maps providing for 5, 6 and 7 local wards based on the following principles, in order of importance:
 1. Population:
Equity based on expected populations as of November 2009 with variances no greater than 15% from the average populations between the wards as of that date;
 2. Respecting the concept of distinctive communities; and
 3. Acknowledgement of natural or built boundaries between communities;

And that such report be presented no later than March 31, 2005; and

- 2) That the City of Vaughan ask the Region of York if it would approve, in principle, the creation of Regional wards in the City of Vaughan for the purpose of electing regional councillors from the City of Vaughan to sit on Regional Council.

As directed in clause 2 of the resolution correspondence was forwarded to the Region to determine if Regional Council would support in principle regional wards for the City of Vaughan. Regional Council received the correspondence and took no action. (Attachment No. 2)

WARD CRITERIA

As noted above, Council has set out some criteria to be used in establishing the ward boundaries presented in this report. In addition Council may wish to be guided by criteria considered by a previous Council when the current boundaries were established:

- 1) Representation by population;
- 2) Use of natural and/or easily identifiable boundaries;
- 3) Recognition of communities of interest; and
- 4) Accommodation of future growth.

Also, the OMB, which prior to 1996, approved all ward revisions utilized this criteria:

Total electors divided by number of councillors (or wards) to find an average, and then create wards to make them equal.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

Item 1, CW(WS) Report No. 18 – Page 3

Reasons to have them less than equal:

- Preserve communities of interest
- Recognition of natural (rivers, lakes, swamps) or Man-made (highways, railways) barriers/dividers
- Recognition of areas of growth/decline
- Recognition of density (ward with a few people over a large geographic area equals ward with large population in a small geographic area)
- Accessibility/communication

Size of variance from the average is up to Council but closer to equal is always better.

On the matter of an acceptable variance from the average ward population, Council has recognized $\pm 15\%$ which is a desirable goal. There may be circumstances that justify a greater variance. Recently municipalities have been working to $\pm 25\%$. And, in fact, the Province directed that $\pm 25\%$ be used when Toronto's wards were established which was appealed to the OMB. The Board upheld the use of $\pm 25\%$. All this said, Council has directed that 15% be the deviation from the average which is certainly a figure to be strived for in equalizing the populations of the wards.

One of the challenges in equalizing ward populations is to avoid splitting communities in the process. In Vaughan's case, amongst the communities to be recognized are Woodbridge, Kleinburg, Maple, Thornhill and Concord. That is not to say that one ward councillor may not represent more than one community. Such has been the case to date with Kleinburg and Maple. Recently more and more municipalities are recognizing communities of interest when considering ward boundaries. Vaughan was one of the first councils, if not the first, to do this in creating the current ward structure back in 1993. It is worthy of noting that the OMB in its 1994 order recognized this as a "very innovative" approach. Consequently the boundaries presented in this report were drawn with this in mind. Certainly there may be a need to deviate from this to accommodate population between various wards and/or to provide for a clear recognizable boundary as recognized by the criteria previously used by the OMB. Attachment No. 3 shows the boundaries of Vaughan's ratepayers associations registered with the City in 2004.

COUNCIL SIZE

Council has directed that 5, 6 and 7 ward options be provided for consideration. The matter of the number of wards was considered at a Committee of the Whole (Working Session) on November 9, 2004 (Attachment No. 4). As noted in that report, Vaughan has a relatively small Council and high ratio of population per members of Council.

The following charts serve to illustrate the disparity between the ratios of numbers of members of Council per resident and numbers of local councillors per resident when comparing Vaughan to comparable high growth municipalities:

CHART #1

MUNICIPALITY	POPULATION*	NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS	NUMBER OF WARDS	RATIO
Vaughan	182,022	5	5	1:36,404
Richmond Hill	132,030	6	6	1:22,005
Markham	208,615	8	8	1:26,076
Brampton	325,428	10	10	1:32,542

*Taken from 2001 Census

Average Ratio 1:29,256

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

Item 1, CW(WS) Report No. 18 – Page 4

CHART #2

MUNICIPALITY	POPULATION*	COUNCIL SIZE	NUMBER OF WARDS	RATIO
Vaughan	182,022	9	5	1:20,224
Richmond Hill	132,030	9	6	1:14,670
Markham	208,615	13	8	1:16,047
Brampton	325,428	11	10	1:29,584

*Taken from 2001 Census

Average Ratio

1:20,131

The charts serve to illustrate that members of Vaughan Council represent considerably more residents per member than those of comparable municipalities. When comparing all members of Council, Vaughan councillors represent approximately the same number of residents on average. However, when comparing the number of residents per local councillor Vaughan local councillors represent approximately 7,000 more residents on average. A good case can be made for increasing the number of local councillors. Vaughan residents enjoy excellent services including the representation provided by members of Council. The quality of this representation is a function of workload and the numbers of residents each member of Council represents. Vaughan residents demand high quality representation from its Council. Whether this high level of service can be sustained by Vaughan's relatively small Council particularly in light of Vaughan's continuing high growth rate, is a question to be considered.

As noted above, Vaughan Councils have considered expanding the size of Council. As far back as 1982, Council favoured 6 wards. It is noted that Council size has increased over the years by two regional councillors to reflect Vaughan's increasing population and size relative to other York Region municipalities.

WARD PROPOSALS

As directed by Council, options have been prepared for 5, 6 and 7 wards. Three options for each of the 5, 6 and 7 ward scenarios are presented. Population projections are for 2009 as requested as well as for 2014. The current ward boundaries were considered with 10 year population projections and are now in their eleventh year. With this in mind, it seemed appropriate to provide the longer term projections in addition to those requested by Council.

The following comments are provided on the ward options attached hereto: (Attachment No. 5)

5 Ward A - This is the preferred 5 ward option

Pros

- The ±15% population variance is met in the longer term
- Clear identifiable lines
- Ratepayers association boundaries are respected
- Each ward has a rural/urban mix with the exception of ward 5

Cons

- Kleinburg included with the Woodbridge community, as opposed to the Maple community
- Current population variance exceeds ±15%

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

Item 1, CW(WS) Report No. 18 – Page 5

5 Ward B

Pros

- Reasonably good population distribution in the longer term
- Keeps the communities of Kleinburg and Maple in the same ward
- Ratepayers associations boundaries are respected
- Major arterial roads form the boundaries.

Cons

- Highway 400 divides Ward 1
- Current population variance exceeds $\pm 15\%$

5 Ward C

Pros

- Meets the $\pm 15\%$ population variance in the longer term
- Ratepayers associations boundaries are respected except for Kleinburg Area Ratepayers Association

Cons

- Current population variance exceeds $\pm 15\%$
- Splits Kleinburg Area Ratepayers Association
- Highway 400 splits Ward 1

6 Ward A - This is the preferred 6 ward option

Pros

- Good population distribution in the longer term
- Ratepayers associations boundaries are respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association
- Major community boundaries are respected for the most part.

Cons

- Current population variance exceeds $\pm 15\%$

6 Ward B

Pros

- Good population distribution in the longer term
- Ratepayers associations boundaries are respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association

Cons

- Current population variance exceeds $\pm 15\%$
- Boundary lines somewhat irregular
- Highway 400 splits Ward 1

6 Ward C

Pros

- Good population distribution in the longer term
- Ratepayers associations boundaries are respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association
- Boundaries are major arterial roads for the most part

Cons

- Current population variance exceeds $\pm 15\%$
- Highway 400 splits Ward 1

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

Item 1, CW(WS) Report No. 18 – Page 6

7 Ward A – This is the preferred 7 Ward option

Pros

- Very good population distribution in the longer term
- Community boundaries respected
- Clear identifiable lines
- Ratepayers associations boundaries respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association

Cons

- Current population variance exceeds $\pm 15\%$

7 Ward B

Pros

- Reasonably good population distribution in the longer term
- Clear identifiable lines
- Ratepayers associations boundaries respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association and Gates of Maple Ratepayers Association

Cons

- Current population variance exceeds $\pm 15\%$
- Splits the Maple community

7 Ward C

Pros

- Very good population distribution in the longer term
- Clear identifiable lines
- Ratepayers associations boundaries respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association and Gates of Maple Ratepayers Association.

Cons

- Current population variance exceeds $\pm 15\%$
- Splits the Maple community

PROCESS

Council has the authority under the Municipal Act to enact by-laws to change the size of Council by adjusting the number of local councillors. As well, Council can enact a by-law to re-align ward boundaries. In each case notice of intention to pass a by-law must be given and at least one public meeting held. It would be desirable for Council to select a ward option for presentation at a public meeting and any public consultation process deemed appropriate. By-laws would need to be enacted both to change the number of local councillors and to re-align ward boundaries. In the case of a boundary change there is a 45 day appeal period during which the Minister or any other person or agency may appeal to the OMB. Any changes and/or approvals must be completed prior to January 2, 2006.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2007

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council and the necessary resources have been allocated and approved.

Conclusion

Council has directed that a ward review be conducted. It would be in order for Council to select a preferred ward configuration for consideration at a public meeting.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

Item 1, CW(WS) Report No. 18 – Page 7

Attachments

Attachment No. 1 – Ward Map 1982

Attachment No. 2 – Letter from York Region dated October 21, 2005 re Ward Review

Attachment No. 3 – Ratepayers 2004 Map

Attachment No. 4 – Committee of the Whole (Working Session), Report No. 81, Item No. 4

Attachment No. 5 – Ward Options

Report prepared by:

John D. Leach, City Clerk

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

Please refer to Item 1, Report No. 21, Special Committee of the Whole (Working Session) for further disposition regarding this matter.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

Item 2, Report No. 18, of the Committee of the Whole (Working Session), which was adopted without amendment by the Council of the City of Vaughan on April 11, 2005.



2 NEW BUSINESS – REVISION TO THE 2005 MEETING SCHEDULE

The Committee of the Whole (Working Session) recommends that the Committee of the Whole, Committee of the Whole (Closed Session) and Committee of the Whole (Public Hearing) meetings scheduled for June 6, 2005, be moved to June 8, 2005, as some Members of Council will be attending the FCM Conference.

The foregoing matter was brought to the attention of the Committee by Mayor Di Biase.