



NORTH HALTON'S ONLY TRULY INDEPENDENT DAILY MULTIMEDIA NEWSGROUP

Reclaiming our community, one story at a time.

[HERALD ARCHIVES](#)

[COMMUNITY CALENDAR](#)

[LINKS](#)

[SEARCH](#)

Acton's Honeyfield resident wants to know; 'Who is running this Town'?

Posted on Saturday, July 15 @ 13:59:19 EDT by [editor](#)



March 7th, 2006.

Halton Hills- Civic Centre: Town [records](#) indicate, on February 6th, 2006, Mrs. Baru, who lives in the Honeyfield subdivision next to the Acton Arena, addressed council to raise safety issues over complaints and outstanding development deficiencies residents had with the developer who named many of its streets after Acton's council members in his Acton subdivision.

Mrs. Baru and her husband moved to Acton on April 13th 2005 from Kitchener and initially were very pleased with Acton's small town atmosphere. She told council; she went through and is still going through the headaches that a new home owner has when they go buy a new house, the cracks in the walls and uncompleted items in the house, bad workmanship, etc. which lead to them quickly becoming discouraged with their builder. But she added, they still loved their home and loved Acton, noting people really seemed to care.

Her disillusionment regarding Acton's concern regarding its small population and small town service came to a screeching halt at the end of 2005. Mrs. Baru went on to explain; her developer contracted a company, which, interesting enough, is his brother's company, to do the deficiency work in the Honeyfield subdivision.

Mrs. Baru went on to explain in some detail; she and neighbours came home from work one day to find manhole covers raised, exposing residents to dangers, which was left for days. She went on to say it was inevitable that an accident would occur, and it did. Unfortunately, it involved her car and an exposed manhole.

Mrs. Baru went on to explain, a town representative assured her the 'City' would take care of the repairs to her car and she should proceed with the repairs and the 'city' would take care of it. She added: I'm am disappointed to say, they didn't. Instead they passed it on to the developer to resolve, who passed it on to the contractor company, who told us they wouldn't pay anything. Mrs. Baru went on to explain; it wasn't until her and her husband got a lawyer involved that the she was forced to accept a settlement that amounted to an amount less than the damages incurred. "To say we are disappointed with the contractor is an understatement, what really bothered us was with the way the 'city' treated this matter.

Mrs. Baru was informed by the Town that they accept no responsibility or liability in subdivision's constructed that still have 'unassumed roads'. Mrs. Baru wanted to know; "what does unassumed mean? To us that means that the safety of Honeyfeild citizens and their property are not a concern for the 'city'. She went on to explain how residents had to call the town several times to shovel the snow, so residents could see the raised manhole covers. Residents had to call the town several times to ensure cars left parked on the street weren't forcing residents to drive into the manhole covers. It took several weeks for the no parking and speed limit signs to be posted. She went on to say residents were amazed the 'city' would allow the unsafe road to remain the way it was without even requiring the developer to put up barriers around the dangerous manhole covers.

Mr's Baru asked council: "Who is running the 'city'? It was this non-commitment to get involved that forced me to take a deeper look, and what I found, really amazed me". After reviewing the developer's contract between the developer and the 'city', she noted several violations of the contract. She went on to ask, what is the 'city' doing to ensure the safety of the community? Noting only some of the violations, she added; "the hazard of the manhole covers and the general disrepair of the streets in the subdivision. In the subdivision contract it stipulates several things that should have prompted the 'city's' representatives to get involved". She went on to explain; "Under indemnification it says, the owner shall take all precautions necessary to protect the public against injury on the land". Which in Mrs. Baru's opinion, the contractor hasn't even done the bare minimum.

She added, contrary to the developer's contract with the Town, some of the light standards in the new subdivision don't even have lights on them, which, according the contract agreement, are to be brought up to the standards and satisfaction of the Director of Engineering and public works, and Halton Hills Hydro. She said; "I don't understand how a street light without a light on it could have passed inspection". She added; "Furthermore, the contract says, street lights should be installed and operational prior to issuing

occupancy permits being issued by the Town. Well, unless our neighbours are living in homes without occupancy permits, I'm not really sure how occupancy permits could have been issued with defective street lights".

Mrs. Baru informed council that several calls from concerned neighbours to the 'city' and developer have yielded no results. The (developers) contract stipulates that the owner must provide street cleaning every Friday to ensure the roads are kept cleaned, this has not happened. She added that the contract stipulates, the roads must be kept cleared from equipment and construction debris, which Mrs. Baru stated was never enforced, in fact, most of the time navigating down tanners was often difficult due to debris, construction garbage and construction vehicles.

"Under completion of public services", Mrs. Baru added; "the owner (developer) shall complete the work within two years of the date of executing this agreement by Town", which she added; "the contract, by-the-way, was signed December 4th, 2003". Mrs. Baru added; "according to the agreement, the Director of Engineering and Public Works may, upon giving seven days notice to the owner (developer), enter the lands, and proceed to supply all materials and perform the necessary labour in order to complete the work, including the repair or reconstruction of faulty work. We would have loved the city to come in and complete the work". She added; "how long will the 'city' let this go on without any action"?

Mrs. Baru closed off stating; "Perhaps the worst news we heard was the approval by the 'city' to the developer, to build seventeen more new homes on Tanners Drive, behind the arena. The impact of the news was salt in the wounds of several home owners who have been patiently waiting for their subdivision to be approved, so that they could receiver their five hundred dollar deposit back from the developer and drive down the street in relative safety". Mrs. Baru added, she and neighbours are quite amazed with the amount of complaints she and her neighbours have logged with Town, that the developer hasn't been made to complete and close his overdue project before being allowed to start a new one.

Mrs. Baru noted in her closing delegation, where the mailboxes are planned to go at the bend in Tanners Road will only make the park more dangerous for kids to play in, with the added traffic and parking that will follow to the park's location after the boxes have been permanently relocated from where they are currently temporary located, by the arena.

Mayor Bonnette asked Council if any councillors would ask staff to report on the issues raised, and Councillor Somerville put up his hand and Councillor O'Leary seconded it. The Mayor explained they were asking for a staff report because there were about thirty issues that were raised and I don't think it's fair for the engineer to try to answer everyone of them tonight.

Councillor Lewis made a point for clarification; "some of the issues are straight forward, they (the developer) has to clean the roads on Friday's. I don't think we need a staff report on that, just tell them to do it. And rather than go through this , a process, and you said thirty issues, so I'll except thirty, but some of the stuff is straight forward. I think the message should be sent to the developer tomorrow, that he must conform to the rules and regulations that are already in place. We don't need a report to tell us stuff he's not doing. We've been through this before. We've been through the manhole cover issues previously, and I think we should tell him the stuff that should be done immediately and than if we need a staff report on the balance of items, than I'm prepared to accept that. So just to say, we need a staff report, I think we can do better than that when serving the public. Unfortunately, this would probably create a hardship on the resident, but maybe we should say to the developer; we are not going to give you any occupancy permits until it's done properly, than we wouldn't have to keep going over the same issues, as Councillor Chatten indicated, time and time again. Than maybe its to say we aren't doing something right in the first place", said Councillor Lewis.

Bonnette conceded, maybe there wasn't as many issues as he had previously indicated (30) and directed staff to make a report on the issues they felt they needed to report on, stating; "we don't need to babysit them on that". The mayor motioned staff to consider the "numerous" complaints made upon the developer and report back to council.

A review of the audio transcript revealed the delegate had only raised 6 issues during the entire course of her delegation.