

**From:** Lakewood Beach Community Council  
**To:** [Paparella, Stephanie](#)  
**Cc:** [DL - Council Only](#)  
**Subject:** Assessment Growth - Area Rating - Supplemental Taxes  
**Date:** February 27, 2019 11:45:06 AM

---

*Hi Stephanie, please add to this the appropriate meeting Agenda however you see fit.*

Dear Honourable Mayor and Council,

***Should we be changing the process to be equitable and making year-end adjustments?***

We wanted to bring to your attention how we *think* tax revenue collected via Supplementary Tax bills is allocated (based on the Assessment Growth report going to GIC tomorrow) and some concerns the equal distribution of those funds has historically posed to those of us in different area-rated boundaries.

While we appreciate that growth changes from year to year, we're going to use 2018 Assessment Growths, Transit Levies, and Stoney Creek as an example (the same applies however to Fire urban/rural areas, Special Infrastructure Levies, etc in all wards.)

At the beginning of 2018, it was determined \$3.2M was required to cover the operating costs of SC Transit. Hence, the levy rate was established to project we would collect \$3.2M. However, during the year supplemental tax bills are issued and additional properties are added in. Those tax bills generally represent 1.5 years to 2 years worth of transit levies. In 2018, Ward 9 Stoney Creek saw the highest growth; as well lower Stoney Creek commercial was substantial. It appears, that not only do we not allocate "supplemental transit levies" to transit, it appears that we also do not make year-end credit (or debit) adjustments to the balance of the properties within that boundary, before we establish what the net levies should be for the following year. In other words, area-rated property taxes go into the 'general pot'. (same applies to additional Special Infrastructure taxes collected in old wards 1 to 8, rural Fire taxes collected in Winona/Binbrook/Ancaster/Waterdown high growth areas, and so on).

Recently too, we did find out that year-end adjustments are made for Fire rural/urban when a 'rural' location requires 'urban' fire responders. The cost of the urban service is charged at year end to the rural ratepayers and those costs are recouped the following year resulting in less operating levies charged to urban property taxpayers.

We don't know whether year-end adjustments for all our area-rated services is cost-prohibitive, but we do know that it can be done. We also do not know the breakdown of how much tax revenue in the 2018 Assessment Growth report is Supplemental versus Re-assessments, but perhaps both apply here.

It also might not appear to be significant dollars on an annual basis, but when we give thought to how much tax revenue was collected over the last 10 years from 'growth' for specific services for specific areas, the cumulative effect we're sure has resulted in some areas being inequitably taxed.

We're also of the opinion, that if a property taxpayer is billed x amount of dollars for y service, those funds should actually go towards that specific service. We're sure that's what the public believes when they pay that Supplemental Billing.

Respectfully, we are requesting that you consider a more equitable and transparent process be evaluated in light of our Area Rated Services.

**Viv / Anna / Nancy**  
**Lakewood Beach Community Council**