

May 23, 2024

Dear City Council,

I am writing to you with regard to the *By-Law 2017-151 to Regulate Access to Municipal Right of Ways in the City of Kawartha Lakes*, and specifically the \$2000 bond payment in order to obtain an Entrance permit.

Last year I arranged to repave my driveway with a reputable contractor who has served the Kawartha Lakes area for many years. The repaving was expected to start this month. My contractor advised me this week however that I now require an Entrance permit, as it seems that the interpretation of the By-law has recently been extended to include a simple repaving of a driveway though no modifications are being made to the length, width or positioning of the driveway relative to my residence or road, and no cut-aways would be done to the existing curb.

I do not have any issues with paying the \$208 fee for an entrance permit. I do however want to express my deep concern and outrage with the \$2000 deposit the City of Kawartha Lakes has mandated when applying for said permit.

I have read By-law 2017-151 and I am concerned about the lack of details regarding:

1. What are the service standards of when an inspector will come out to review the repaving? Is it 1-2 days after the job has been completed? One week? One month?
2. What are the turnaround times for when my \$2000 bond will be returned to me? Is it expected to take a week? A month? Will it be returned with an amount of interest earned on it commensurate with the interest I have lost?

In relation to the Entrance By-law, I have read the By-law 2018-234 Consolidation of Fees and am concerned about the transparency of when the \$2000 bond was established. It appears that this amount was set in February 2024, through By-law 2024-037 Schedule A-I amendment. The details of the Schedule A-I amendment are attached to the by-law as a pdf that cannot be opened and this information specifically does not seem to be available for general public review on the Kawartha Lakes website. Was there any public communication of Fee increases? Were contractors notified of changes?

My outrage comes from being a senior who, in addition to paying the contractor for basic driveway repaving, does not have a "spare" \$2000 available to give to the city to hold at its leisure for an undetermined period. I take pride in maintaining my home but under this current circumstance, I will not get my driveway repaved. My home will not look as nice as it could and in turn, the contractor's business will suffer the loss of income.

I don't agree that residents should have to pay this bond fee at all. If the contractor damages the road, I believe it is the contractor who should be held accountable for the repairs. The bond fee should be an amount that the contractor pays as a cost of doing business in addition to the Road

Occupancy Permit, as a guarantee of the work they'll do. If contractors have to give deposits to the city for installing new driveways to new houses, then they should also be responsible for deposit now being required for basic driveway resurfacing.

I note that many of the reputable contractors are also contractors who do work for the city. It is not likely that a reputable contractor would jeopardize their livelihood by being negligent.

This bond amount and how it is administered needs to be revisited. If the city must have a bond at all and maintains its position to hold the resident responsible, there are other ways to satisfy your requirement but not force seniors like me to be actually out of pocket and lose out on the interest my \$2000 would earn. As a suggestion:

- Eliminate the requirement for a bond completely and on the rare occasions where the inspector determines that corrective work is required, then work with the resident and the contractor for a resolution to fix the problem and recoup the money either with payment at that time or payment through installments added on to the resident's tax bill,

OR

- Request a post-dated cheque instead for the city to hold in trust and then return immediately once the inspector has approved the work done.

I hope you will consider this issue to come up with a more palatable resolution for your constituents.

Respectfully,



Eileen Arnaud



c.c.

Sarah O'Connell  
Constance Ellison  
Doug Elmslie  
Charlie McDonald