

Explaining is in order

Further to Dan O'Reilly's Aug. 4 letter (Region's position a 'disgrace'), I agree that there are some very serious questions raised by this vote.

For example, why would a governing body put a residential section in the middle of an existing and already built industrial/commercial area, and adjacent to a major transportation corridor, likely to be a 400-series highway?

How can an elected body or official be critical of the (real or perceived) present or future truck traffic on Coleraine Drive, then vote to have an entire neighbourhood right on the curb of that very road?

How could that same elected body(ies) be critical of and oppose a proposed hydrogen generation facility, then vote to put a residential development right beside it?

How can the industrial/commercial tax base be grown (keeping residential taxes down) when the industrial/commercial land is being used for residential?

Has there been any analysis of what revenue would come in with industrial/commercial versus residential on the same lands? The same for costs of maintaining services?

I feel that Regional council and Ward 5 Regional Councillor Annette Groves have much explaining to do.

K. Yates,

Bolton