

## Request for Decision

### Development Charges By-law

Presented To:	City Council
Presented:	Tuesday, Jun 11, 2019
Report Date	Wednesday, May 29, 2019
Type:	Referred & Deferred Matters

### Resolution

Resolution #1:

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury Development Charges Background Study dated March 28, 2019 prepared by Hemson Consulting Ltd be approved under Section 10 of the Development Charges Act, 1997;

AND THAT City of Greater Sudbury determine that no further public meeting is required, pursuant to Section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997;

AND THAT City of Greater Sudbury considered area specific development charges and approved city-wide development charges.

Resolution #2:

THAT City of Greater Sudbury approves the development charge calculated rates from the 2019 Development Charges Background Study as outlined in the report entitled "Development Charges By-law", from the General Manager of Corporate Services, presented at the City Council meeting on June 11, 2019.

Potential Amendment 1 to Resolution #2

THAT the resolution be amended to provide that the residential rates be reduced by 50% and frozen for the full five years with no annual inflation.

Potential Amendment 2 to Resolution #2

THAT the resolution be amended to provide that the industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) rates be reduced by 50%.

Potential Amendment 3 to Resolution #2

### Signed By

#### Report Prepared By

Apryl Lukezic  
Co-ordinator of Budgets  
*Digitally Signed May 29, 19*

#### Manager Review

Jim Lister  
Manager of Financial Planning and Budgeting  
*Digitally Signed May 29, 19*

#### Division Review

Ed Stankiewicz  
Executive Director of Finance, Assets and Fleet  
*Digitally Signed May 29, 19*

#### Financial Implications

Jim Lister  
Manager of Financial Planning and Budgeting  
*Digitally Signed May 29, 19*

#### Recommended by the Department

Kevin Fowke  
General Manager of Corporate Services  
*Digitally Signed May 29, 19*

#### Recommended by the C.A.O.

Ed Archer  
Chief Administrative Officer  
*Digitally Signed May 29, 19*

THAT the resolution be amended to provide that the multi-unit building (apartments/multiples only) rates be reduced by 25%.

Potential Amendment 4 to Resolution #2

THAT the resolution be amended to provide that the multi-unit building (apartments/multiples only) rates be reduced by 50%.

Potential Amendment 5 to Resolution #2

THAT the resolution be amended to provide that the development charge rates for long term care homes (both profit and non-profit) be reduced by 50%.

Potential Amendment 6 to Resolution #2

THAT the resolution be amended to provide that the development charge rates for smaller residential units (single and semi-detached dwellings) that are less than 1,000 square feet in size be the rate for multiple dwelling units.

Potential Amendment 7 to Resolution #2

THAT the resolution be amended to provide for the expansion of designated exempt areas to include nodes and corridors with 100m set back from the corridors.

Resolution #3:

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury directs staff to present a by-law in the form attached as Appendix D as may be amended by Council decisions under the report entitled "Development Charges By-law", from the General Manager of Corporate Services, presented at the City Council meeting on June 11, 2019.

Resolution #4:

THAT the City of Greater Sudbury directs staff to present a by-law repealing By-Law 2015-241 "Deferral of Payment of Development Charges for Certain Residential Development".

## **Relationship to the Strategic Plan / Health Impact Assessment**

This reports refers to operational matters.

## **Report Summary**

This report provides Council with options to finalize the 2019 Development Charges By-Law for the next five years (from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2024) based on prior information reports on this subject and the results of public consultation.

## **Financial Implications**

This report will establish the DC rates for the period of July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2024.

## 1.0 Purpose

This report provides Council with options to finalize the 2019 Development Charges By-Law for the next five years, from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2024.

## 2.0 Background

Development charges (DC) are a financing tool available to assist municipalities with minimizing costs to existing taxpayers and businesses for growth-related infrastructure costs. City Council establishes development charge rates via a DC by-law that is subject to renewal every five years and that must adhere to provincial legislative requirements.

The following chart provides a summary of staff reports previously presented to City Council, Planning or the Finance and Administration Committee:

<b>Report Date</b>	<b>City Council or Committee</b>	<b>Report Name</b>	<b>Report Summary</b>
September 26, 2016	Planning Committee	Proposed City-Wide Nodes and Corridors Strategy	Provided a recommended city-wide nodes and corridors strategy and outlined a schedule for the completion of nodes and corridors design studies over the next 9-year period.
January 8, 2018	Planning Committee	Comparative Fiscal Impact Analysis of Growth Study	Provided to understand the cost and revenue to service residential developments across the city.
April 9, 2018	Planning Committee	City of Greater Sudbury Outlook for Growth to 2046	Provided an update of the Population, Household and Employment Growth Projections 2016 to 2046 used to inform capital, service level and policy planning in the City, including the upcoming development charges background study.
April 17, 2018	Finance & Administration Committee	2019 Development Charges Background Study and By-Law	Provided an overview of development charges as well as the steps planned for the 2019 DC Background Study and related by-law to be approved by City Council before June 30, 2019.
March 26, 2019	Finance & Administration Committee	Proposed Changes to City's Development Charges By-Law and Rates	Provided a summary of the proposed changes to the development charges by-law and proposed development charge rates as calculated through the 2019 DC Background Study.
May 2, 2019	Finance & Administration Committee	Strategic Options for Development Charge Rate Reductions	Provided options for reducing DCs in response to Council's direction from the March 26, 2019 meeting.

Report Date	City Council or Committee	Report Name	Report Summary
May 2, 2019	Finance & Administration Committee	Development Charges and Planning Policies	Provided connections between DCs and land use planning policy at the City, specifically with respect to the Official Plan, community improvement plans, development cost sharing, building permit trends and the cost of growth.
May 2, 2019	Finance & Administration Committee	Economic Development Context for Development Charges Strategic Options	Provided advantages that the City has to attract new/expanded businesses along with recent economic trends affecting the community in relation to consideration of DCs and strategic alternatives.
May 7, 2019	City Council	2019 Development Charges Public Input	Provided summary of requirement for one public meeting in accordance with the DC Act and the process of the public input.

**3.0 Public Input**

The public input meeting on Development Charges was held at the City Council meeting on May 7, 2019. There were a total of 8 individuals that provided their input and opinions for and against development charges.

Appendix B includes all of the public input written submissions received through submissions to Clerks Services, through the “Over to You” engagement portal as well as general submissions for the period of March 1, 2019 to May 8, 2019.

**4.0 Bill 108: *More Homes, More Choices Act***

On May 2, 2019, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) launched the Housing Supply Action Plan which intends to increase the supply of housing, make housing more affordable, and ensure that the housing supply meets the needs of the growing population. The Action Plan is detailed in Bill 108, the *More Homes, More Choices Act*, which passed First Reading on May 2<sup>nd</sup>. The Bill contains proposed changes to the Development Charges Act (DCA), as well as changes to the *Planning Act* that will impact certain aspects of development charges. It is noted that at the time of writing, the draft regulations to accompany the DCA and the *Planning Act* have not yet been released. As such, information is limited.

Bill 108 has been released for public consultation which is open until June 1st, and it is unknown when the Bill will be passed into legislation along with an effective date for implementation of changes.

A brief summary of the announced changes relating to development charges and potential implications to the City are outlined below. Given the preliminary nature of this information and the early stage in the legislative process, it is recommended that City Council finalize a DC Bylaw prior to July 1<sup>st</sup> and amend it if necessary once Bill 108 is passed.

Proposed Change	Description	City Implications
<b>Secondary Suites</b>	Proposed that DC Act would exempt DCs for the creation of one secondary suite in new residential buildings. Restrictions are to be prescribed by the regulations.	Implications are anticipated to be minimal as the 2019 DC By-law recommends exempting DCs for the creation of a Secondary Dwelling Unit in accordance with the Zoning By-law.
<b>Soft Services</b>	Proposed new community benefits authority will be created under the <i>Planning Act</i> , which will allow municipalities to charge directly for benefits such as libraries and daycare facilities. This authority would replace density bonusing provisions, some parkland dedications, and development charges for discounted soft services (e.g. library, recreation, parks, and likely other services subject to the statutory 10% deduction). Proposed charges under the community benefits authority would be capped based on a portion of the appraised value of land. It appears that discounted services (soft services) will be removed from the DCA and covered by the new Planning Act "Community Benefits" provisions. The DCA may be restricted to the following services: Roads and Related, Water, Wastewater, Stormwater, Transit, Waste Diversion, and the protection services of Police and Fire.	<p>If these changes were put into effect, the City would see a decrease in DC revenues and would need to introduce other policy changes to realize the new revenue anticipated by applying the "Community Benefit" provisions described by the Province.</p> <p>Under the proposed DCA transitional policies, it is anticipated that the City could continue to charge DCs for soft services until the earlier of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The prescribed date, as per the accompanying regulations, or</li> <li>• The City's passage of a by-law related to "community benefits charges" under the amended <i>Planning Act</i>.</li> </ul> <p>Following this time, it is anticipated that the City's DC by-law as it relates to General Government, Library, Parks and Recreation, Ambulance, Emergency Preparedness services would no longer apply. Staff has calculated the impact of this change to the rates as follows: Single Detached Dwelling – \$2,191 decrease per unit (15.7%); Semi-Detached Dwelling - \$2,243 decrease per unit (15.7%); Apartments and Multiples - \$1,611 decrease per unit (15.7%); Industrial - \$0.29 decrease per</p>

		<p>square foot (4.9%) Non-industrial \$0.29 decrease per square foot (3.3%). The percentage reductions would occur in the future in addition to any DC rate reductions that may be included in the By-law.</p> <p>When the changes are approved and to be implemented, staff may return with a report for a plan on the related changes to the <i>Planning Act</i> and the <i>Development Charges Act</i>.</p>
<b>Proposed Change</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>City Implications</b>
<b>Administration</b>	<p>Proposed amendment to the DC Act would freeze DC rates at an earlier point in the development process (such as when an application is made for a site plan or zoning approval). DCs would continue to be paid at time of building permit issuance.</p> <p>Proposed that DCs relating to rental housing, institutional, industrial, commercial and non-profit housing would be paid in six equal annual instalments following occupancy.</p> <p>Other proposed changes include removal of the 10% statutory deduction for waste diversion capital costs, as well as exempting the conversion of communal areas to residential units in rental buildings from DCs.</p>	<p>These changes are likely to result in a reduction in DCs for most development and a reduction in the City's DC revenues, as compared with the current practice of calculating and collection DCs at the time of building permit issuance.</p> <p>These proposed changes would also result in increased administrative responsibilities for monitoring and collection of DCs.</p>

**5.0 Analysis:**

Finance & Administration Committee received several information reports at its meeting on May 2, 2019. This section of the report provides analysis and follow up information requested by the Committee as well as options for finalizing a new DC Bylaw.

**5.1 Vacancy Rebates/Units**

Information on the City's commercial and industrial vacancy rates is included in Appendix A.

**5.2 Nodes and Corridors**

On November 1st, 2016, Council endorsed a City wide Nodes and Corridors Strategy. The purpose of the strategy is to allow the City to better guide future growth and development (and intensification) by

analyzing the intensification potential of existing nodes and corridors throughout the city and creating a framework to guide investment in these areas that would result in more complete communities and a more complete integration of active transportation and transit. The strategy also helps create new and distinctive corridors and centres, all featuring mixed uses, public realm improvements and public transit.

The Nodes and Corridor Strategy prioritizes study areas to help guide investment and intensification within the community. Individual nodes and corridor studies will:

- Identify and strengthen areas of significant capital investment and reinvestment;
- Promote positive change;
- Improve urban design;
- Create complete streets;
- Recommend how appropriate land uses, densities and built form can be introduced, creating new economic opportunities;
- Recommend where public open spaces can be created and existing parks improved;
- Improve the pedestrian environment;
- Inform future capital planning;
- Optimize transit service; and,
- Inform City policy, by-laws, and guidelines

In 2017 Planning Services division began to implement the strategy by undertaking the LaSalle Boulevard Corridor Plan and Strategy and the Chelmsford Town Centre CIP, which were endorsed and approved by Council in 2018.

It is possible for Council to expand exemptions within the DC By-law to exempt desirable development within defined areas along existing and defined nodes and corridors. This option is developed further below as option 7.

### **5.3 DC Rate Options**

The options are listed below with additional implications outlined further in this report.

1. Approve calculated DC rates from the 2019 DC Background Study.
2. Reduce DC rates by 50% for residential only and freeze the rates for the full 5 years of the by-law with no annual inflation.
3. Reduce DC rates by 50% for ICI (Industrial, Commercial and Institutional) only.
4. Reduce DC rates for multi-unit buildings (apartments/multiples only).
5. Reduce DC rates by 50% for long term care (both profit and non-profit) buildings.
6. Reduce DC rates for smaller residential units (less than 1,000 square foot) - only applicable to single and semi-detached dwellings.
7. Expand designated exempt areas to include nodes and corridors.

The following table shows the DC rates for each DC category based on the options described above.

DC Category	DC Rate Options						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (c)
Single Detached Dwelling (per unit)	\$17,721	\$8,861	\$17,721	\$17,721	\$17,721	\$17,721 (b)	\$17,721
Semi-Detached Dwelling (per unit)	\$14,238	\$7,119	\$14,238	\$14,238	\$14,238	\$14,238 (b)	\$14,238
Apartments and Multiples (per unit)	\$10,227	\$5,114	\$10,227	\$5,114	\$10,227	\$10,227	\$10,227
Industrial (per sq ft)	\$5.92	\$5.92	\$2.96	\$5.92	\$5.92	\$5.92	\$5.92
Non-Industrial (per sq ft)	\$8.89	\$8.89	\$4.45	\$8.89	\$8.89 (a)	\$8.89	\$8.89

Notes:

(a) Rates for Long Term Care homes (profit and non-profit) would be 50% of the Non-Industrial rate.

(b) Rates for residential single detached and semi-detached dwelling units below 1,000 square feet would be based on the calculated rate for “apartments and multiples”.

(c) Rates for any type of development along nodes & corridors (boundary maps for exempt areas to be created and attached to the DC By-law) would be reduced by 25% or 40% of the respective rates.

During the policy discussion at the Finance and Administration Committee meeting on May 2nd, Committee members discussed the impact of DC rates and exemptions on various classes of commercial development. There are several vacant buildings within the City that can be renovated for new types of commercial development where DCs would not be applicable on renovation to existing buildings (as long as the renovation does not expand square footage). Further, when a building permit is issued within 5 years of a demolition permit on the same site, there would be redevelopment credits available that may reduce or eliminate the amount of DCs on the proposed new development where there is a change in use of the building (e.g. from residential to non-industrial).

In addition, Appendix C outlines the policy changes to the DC by-law for Council’s approval as noted in the resolution. The policy changes were extracted from the report presented to the Finance & Administration Committee on March 26, 2019.

The table below provides the benefits and drawbacks for each DC rate option that are listed above.

Note - the estimated percentage share of DC revenues listed in each option represents the total projected DC revenues based on the calculated DC rates and development forecast (as shown in first table under Section 6.0 Financial Implications). The estimated DC revenue loss (second table under Section 6.0) for each option is based on assumptions (listed under Section 7.0) and the total projected DC revenues.



Benefits	Drawbacks
<b>Option 1</b> - Approve calculated DC rates from the 2019 DC Background Study.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- utilize financing tool available to minimize costs to existing taxpayers, ratepayers and businesses for growth-related infrastructure costs;</li> <li>- receive full development charges revenue based on actual new development;</li> <li>- avoid existing taxpayers and/or ratepayers to pay a higher portion of growth-related infrastructure costs through higher property taxes or w/ww user fees, or delay/deferral of capital projects;</li> <li>-expect no impact on housing or rental prices as calculated DC rates are lower than current rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may not encourage additional development beyond the development forecast in the DC Background Study within the community;</li> <li>- will not decrease costs for individual homeowners building own home;</li> <li>- may not improve profitability of developers and businesses as decreasing cost of construction</li> </ul>
Benefits	Drawbacks
<b>Option 2</b> - Reduce DC rates by 50% for residential only and freeze the rates for the full 5 years of the by-law with no annual inflation.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may encourage development in residential sector;</li> <li>- costs currently paid by individual homeowners building their own home would instead be paid by all tax/ratepayers, reducing costs for those individuals;</li> <li>- may improve profitability of developers, since the discounted rates would decrease construction costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Residential DCs account for an estimated 78% share of total projected DC revenues</li> <li>- the resulting decreases in DC revenue for growth-related capital projects will require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a change to financing plans that rely on DCs, leading to a reduction in the number of capital projects included in an annual plan and/or</li> <li>• a change in the scope or timing of capital projects, increasing the risk of unmet service expectations;</li> </ul> </li> <li>- increases the reliance on annual property taxes and w/ww user fees for existing taxpayers and w/ww ratepayers to fund higher portion of growth related costs;</li> <li>- may not result in lower housing or rental prices as those prices are based on market demand;</li> <li>- market demand for residential housing does not appear to be impacted by DC rates (e.g. lower DC rates may not result in additional houses being built and sold if the market doesn't support it)</li> </ul>
<b>Option 3</b> - Reduce DC rates by 50% for ICI (Industrial, Commercial, Institutional) only.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may encourage development in ICI sector;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revenue from ICI DCs account for approximately 22% of total projected DC revenues</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may improve profitability of businesses in ICI sector by decreasing cost of building construction;</li> <li>- new ICI development would increase number of jobs which may translate into additional population moving to the City, which in turn may increase residential development from new population or existing population buying new homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the resulting decreases in DC revenue for growth-related capital projects will require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a change to financing plans that rely on DCs, leading to a reduction in the number of capital projects included in an annual plan and/or</li> <li>• a change in the scope or timing of capital projects, increasing the risk of unmet service expectations;</li> </ul> </li> <li>- increases the reliance on annual property taxes and w/ww user fees for existing taxpayers and w/ww ratepayers to fund higher portion of growth related costs;</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Drawbacks</b>
<b>Option 4</b> - Reduce DC rates for multi-unit buildings (apartments/multiples only).	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may encourage development in multi-residential sector;</li> <li>- may improve profitability of developers and/or landlords as decreasing cost of construction (DCs is below 5% of total construction cost);</li> <li>- may provide additional affordable housing units (if landlord/owner offers lower rent than market rent, or if supply increases to a point where market rent decreases if the rental apartment vacancy rate increases)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revenue from Multi-unit building DCs account for approximately 21% of total projected DC revenues (or 27% of the 78% total residential projected DC revenues)</li> <li>- the resulting decreases in DC revenue for growth-related capital projects will require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a change to financing plans that rely on DCs, leading to a reduction in the number of capital projects included in an annual plan and/or</li> <li>• a change in the scope or timing of capital projects, increasing the risk of unmet service expectations;</li> </ul> </li> <li>- increases the reliance on annual property taxes and w/ww user fees for existing taxpayers and w/ww ratepayers to fund higher portion of growth related costs;</li> <li>- may not result in lower rental prices as those prices are based on market demand;</li> <li>- market demand for residential housing does not appear to be impacted by DC rates (e.g. lower DC rates may not result in additional houses being built and sold if the market does not support it)</li> </ul>
<b>Option 5</b> - Reduce DC rates by 50% for long term care (both profit and non-profit) buildings.	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may encourage development in long-term care sector by providing additional beds in the community, subject to approval under the Long-Term Care Homes Act, 2007 as the Ministry provides funding for long-term care beds;</li> <li>- would increase profitability of for-profit long-term care providers by decreasing cost of building construction;</li> <li>- staff previously recommended that non-profit long term care homes be exempt from DCs if they are exempt from property taxes, so this option may be provided to the remaining non-profit and for-profit long term care homes, depending on Council's decision on staff recommended policy changes to the DC by-law</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revenue from Long Term Care DCs account is estimated at 7% of total projected DC revenues (or 33% of total ICI projected DC revenues). This is based on assumption that 267,000 square feet may be constructed at long-term care homes. Staff does not have actual or expected square footage in future development in this specific area;</li> <li>- the resulting decreases in DC revenue for growth-related capital projects will require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a change to financing plans that rely on DCs, leading to a reduction in the number of capital projects included in an annual plan and/or</li> <li>• a change in the scope or timing of capital projects, increasing the risk of unmet service expectations;</li> </ul> </li> <li>- increases the reliance on annual property taxes and w/ww user fees for existing taxpayers and w/ww ratepayers to fund higher portion of growth related costs;</li> <li>- additional beds in our community must be approved by the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care by obtaining a licence under the Long-Term Care Homes Act, 2007 (section 96 states "The Minister shall determine whether or not there should be a long-term care home in an area, and how many long-term care home beds there should be in an area...");</li> <li>- will not result in lower accommodation rates for residents living in long-term care homes as the rates are set by the Ministry</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Drawbacks</b>
<p><b>Option 6</b> - Reduce DC rates for smaller residential units (less than 1,000 square foot) - only applicable to single &amp; semi-detached dwellings.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may encourage development in residential sector with smaller homes;</li> <li>- decrease costs of individual homeowners building own home;</li> <li>- may improve profitability of developers as decreasing cost of construction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revenue from smaller residential unit DCs is estimated at 11% of total projected DC revenues (or 15% of total residential projected DC revenues) based on assumption that 20% of single and semi-detached units may be constructed below 1,000 square feet. Staff does not have actual or expected square footage in future development in this specific area;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the resulting decreases in DC revenue for growth-related capital projects will require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a change to financing plans that rely on DCs, leading to a reduction in the number of capital projects included in an annual plan and/or</li> <li>• a change in the scope or timing of capital projects, increasing the risk of unmet service expectations;</li> </ul> </li> <li>- increases the reliance on annual property taxes and w/ww user fees for existing taxpayers and w/ww ratepayers to fund higher portion of growth related costs;</li> <li>- may not result in lower housing prices as those prices are based on market demand;</li> <li>- market demand for residential housing does not appear to be impacted by DC rates (e.g. lower DC rates may not result in additional houses being built and sold if the market doesn't support it)</li> </ul>
<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Drawbacks</b>

**Option 7** - Expand designated exempt areas to include nodes and corridors.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may encourage development in residential and non-residential sectors for properties along the nodes and corridors;</li> <li>- decrease costs of individual homeowners building own home;</li> <li>- may improve profitability of developers and businesses as decreasing cost of construction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revenue from DCs in nodes and corridors areas is estimated at 21% and 34% of total projected DC revenues based on assumptions of 25% and 40% of residential and non-industrial development may occur in the nodes and corridors areas. Residential and Non-Industrial represents 85% of the total projected DC revenues. Staff does not have actual or expected square footage in future development in this specific area;</li> <li>- the resulting decreases in DC revenue for growth-related capital projects will require: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a change to financing plans that rely on DCs, leading to a reduction in the number of capital projects included in an annual plan and/or</li> <li>• a change in the scope or timing of capital projects, increasing the risk of unmet service expectations;</li> </ul> </li> <li>- increases the reliance on annual property taxes and w/ww user fees for existing taxpayers and</li> </ul>
---	--

	<p>w/ww ratepayers to fund higher portion of growth related costs;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- may not result in lower housing or rental prices as those prices are based on market demand;</li> <li>- market demand for residential housing does not appear to be impacted by DC rates (e.g. lower DC rates may not result in additional houses being built and sold if the market doesn't support it)</li> </ul>
--	---

## **6.0 Financial Implications**

Each of the DC rate options has financial implications. Options 2-7 create a level of DC revenue loss that would need to be recovered from property taxation and w/ww user fees through increases to the property tax levy and w/ww user fee rates.

The next table provides the total expected DC revenue to be collected based on the DC rates and expected development forecast from the DC background study, which shows the “non w/ww portion” and “w/ww portion” separately. It is provided for comparison from the total DC revenue per year to the DC revenue loss per year for each of the options presented.

	<b>DC Rate</b>	<b>Non W/WW Portion</b>	<b>W / WW Portion</b>	<b>Forecast 2019 – 2023</b>	<b>Revenues – Non W/WW Portion</b>	<b>Revenues – W / WW Portion</b>	<b>Total</b>
Single Detached	\$17,721	\$12,030	\$5,691	962	\$11,572,860	\$5,474,742	\$17,047,602
Semi-Detached	\$14,238	\$11,173	\$4,572	76	\$734,616	\$347,472	\$1,082,088
Apartments & Multiples	\$10,227	\$8,026	\$3,284	666	\$4,624,038	\$2,187,144	\$6,811,182
Industrial	\$5.92	\$5.18	\$2.42	804,000	\$2,814,000	\$1,945,680	\$4,759,680
Non-Industrial	\$8.89	\$8.15	\$2.42	262,390	\$1,697,663	\$634,984	\$2,332,647
<b>Total DC Revenues over 5 Years</b>					\$21,443,177	\$10,590,022	\$32,033,199
<b>Total DC Revenue per Year</b>					\$4,288,635	\$2,118,004	\$6,406,640

The following table shows the financial implications for each of the options.

#	Total DC Revenue Loss per Year	Total DC Revenue Loss per Year – Tax Levy Portion	Total DC Revenue Loss per Year – W/WW User Rates Portion	Property Tax Levy % Increase Impact	W/WW User Rates % Increase Impact	Weighted Assessment Growth Required to Offset Loss DC Revenue Tax Levy Portion – New Assessed Value (Note A)
1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	\$2,535,206	\$1,721,065	\$814,140	0.63%	1.04%	\$136,199,123
3	\$709,233	\$451,166	\$258,066	0.16%	0.33%	\$35,703,732
4A	\$340,559	\$231,194	\$109,365	0.08%	0.14%	\$18,295,892
4B	\$681,118	\$463,160	\$217,958	0.17%	0.28%	\$36,652,899
5	\$237,363	\$172,749	\$64,614	0.06%	0.08%	\$13,670,754
6	\$311,151	\$211,230	\$99,921	0.08%	0.13%	\$16,715,991
7A	\$1,363,676	\$931,459	\$432,217	0.34%	0.55%	\$73,712,410
7B	\$2,181,882	\$1,490,334	\$691,547	0.54%	0.88%	\$117,939,856

**Note A:** These assessment growth figures are in addition to the expected assessment growth described in the 2019 Background Study.

## 7.0 Assumptions

The following lists the assumptions used in calculating the financial implications for the options.

Option	Assumptions
1	Not applicable as there is no revenue loss if calculated DC rates are approved.
2	Assumed annual inflation of 2% per year for the four years of the by-law (e.g. starting July 1, 2020 to July 2, 2023) and assumed forecasted development to occur equally over the five year period.
3	Calculation based on calculated DC rates for Industrial and Non-Industrial categories with a 50% reduction.
4A & 4B	Provided two scenarios - (4A) scenario with assumed 25% DC rate reduction and (4B) scenario with assumed 50% rate reduction.
5	Assumption based on 267,000 square feet of new development relating to long term care homes.
6	Assumed based on calculated DC rates for apartments/multiples. Also, assumed that approximately 20% of single family and semi-detached dwelling units may be constructed below 1,000 square feet.
7A & 7B	Provided two scenarios - (7A) scenario with assumption that 25% of residential and non-industrial would occur on nodes and corridors and (7B) scenario with assumption that 40% of residential and non-industrial would occur on nodes and corridors.

## **8.0 Conclusion**

This report provides additional information to Council in relation to discussions at the Finance & Administration Committee meeting on May 2, 2019.

Furthermore, this report seeks Council approval of the resolutions listed for this report including the approval of the DC by-law and associated rates that will become effective on July 1, 2019.

### **Appendices:**

Appendix A – Commercial/Industrial Vacancy Rates

Appendix B – Public Input Received Since March 1, 2019

Appendix C – 2019 Development Charges By-Law Policy Decision (from March 26, 2019 DC Report)

Appendix D – Proposed 2019 Development Charges By-Law

### **References:**

Proposed City-Wide Nodes and Corridors Strategy, Planning Committee, September 26, 2016.

<https://agendasonline.greatersudbury.ca/index.cfm?pg=agenda&action=navigator&lang=en&id=992&itemid=11977>

Comparative Fiscal Impact Analysis of Growth Study, Planning Committee, January 8, 2018

<http://agendasonline.greatersudbury.ca/index.cfm?pg=feed&action=file&agenda=report&itemid=11&id=1215>

City of Greater Sudbury Outlook for Growth to 2046, Planning Committee, April 9, 2018

<http://agendasonline.greatersudbury.ca/index.cfm?pg=feed&action=file&agenda=report&itemid=16&id=1221>

2019 Development Charges Background Study and By-Law, Finance and Administration Committee meeting on April 17, 2018

<http://agendasonline.greatersudbury.ca/index.cfm?pg=feed&action=file&agenda=report&itemid=2&id=1271>

Proposed Changes to City's Development Charges By-Law and Rates, Finance and Administration Committee meeting on March 26, 2019

<http://agendasonline.greatersudbury.ca/index.cfm?pg=feed&action=file&agenda=report&itemid=2&id=1365>

Strategic Options for Development Charge Rate Reductions, Finance and Administration Committee meeting on May 2, 2019

<http://agendasonline.greatersudbury.ca/index.cfm?pg=feed&action=file&agenda=report&itemid=2&id=1420>

Development Charges and Planning Policies, Finance and Administration Committee meeting on May 2, 2019

<http://agendasonline.greatersudbury.ca/index.cfm?pg=feed&action=file&agenda=report&itemid=4&id=1420>

Economic Development Context for Development Charges Strategic Option, Finance and Administration Committee meeting on May 2, 2019

<http://agendasonline.greatersudbury.ca/index.cfm?pg=feed&action=file&agenda=report&itemid=5&id=1420>

2019 Development Charges Public Input

<http://agendasonline.greatersudbury.ca/index.cfm?pg=feed&action=file&agenda=report&itemid=18&id=1322>



## Appendix A – Commercial/Industrial Vacancy Rates Update

At their meeting of May 2, 2019, Council directed staff to provide information on the City's commercial and industrial vacancy rates. Economic Development staff have put together the following information in response to this request.

### CONSULTATION

Economic Development staff have connected with representatives from Ontario's North Economic Development Corporation (ONEDC), a consortium of the five large cities in Northern Ontario (including Greater Sudbury, North Bay, Timmins, Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay). This outreach sought to gain insight on how their municipalities are tracking their commercial and industrial vacancies, with the following responses received:

- NORTH BAY: Not tracking. Having internal discussions to determine if there's a purpose to track and how to do so.
- SAULT STE MARIE: Not tracking vacancy rate, rely on local real estate market for general information.
- THUNDER BAY: Not tracking vacancy rate.
- TIMMINS: Not tracking the data. Too difficult to collect and maintain.

Staff also contacted the following agencies to see if they are tracking the data, or have an interest in tracking it:

- CBRE: Only tracking data for large metropolitan areas. Not currently collecting data on Sudbury and do not have the resources locally to perform this work. Small market size noted as constraint.
- COLLIERS CANADA: Only tracking data for large metropolitan areas. Not tracking data for Sudbury and no immediate intentions of doing so. Small market size noted as constraint.
- SUDBURY REAL ESTATE BOARD – Reviewing Information available.
- MALLETTE-GORING SUDBURY: Previously tracked locally, no longer doing it. Interested in data but indicated it is very labour-intensive and not sure they have the capacity to compile and maintain it.
- CITY OF HAMILTON: Tracking the data annually through a summer student program (15 students), but concerns remain that the data is not entirely reliable. Previously tracked the data for the downtown core only in order to measure the success of its Downtown CIP, but recently expanded tracking to the entire city.

## **PROCESS**

Based on the feedback from industry experts and colleagues across other municipalities, we have concluded the data to calculate an accurate vacancy rate in the commercial and industrial sectors does not exist and would need to be created.

- In order to determine a reliable vacancy rate, a survey of property owners in both the commercial and industrial sectors will have to be conducted.
- The City's GIS Department has an accurate database of all commercial and industrial properties. Using MPAC data of all of the 400 (Commercial) and 500 (Industrial) series properties based in Sudbury. Staff believe that using the information from this database to determine a baseline property inventory, and then conducting a sample size survey of the property owners to request current vacancies will provide an accurate representation of the vacancy rates in both sectors.
- The approach recommended is to engage an independent polling firm to conduct a survey, based on a random sample of the property owners in the database to determine the vacancy rates.
- Staff are working with the City Clerk to determine if the Greater Sudbury database purchased from MPAC can be utilized for this purpose, based on the terms of the City's agreement with MPAC, as well as MFIPPA regulations.
- As an alternative to use of the MPAC data for this purpose, staff have confirmed that the polling agency has their own existing database they can use to conduct the survey. There will be additional implications, such as ensuring their database is categorized in the same manner as the MPAC data. The information from the MPAC data will be used as a baseline for total inventory.

## **BUDGET**

The project is estimated to cost approximately \$5,000, dependent on the availability of the internal database provided by the City. This cost will be covered by existing operational budgets, as this information aligns with Economic Development goals and mandate to attract new investment opportunities.

## **TIMELINE**

Staff estimates that the total project will be completed in approximately four weeks, including a final report providing the vacancy rates for both the commercial and industrial sectors. This information will be brought forward to Council for its consideration in the near future.

## **FUTURE**

Staff is in the process of completing this exercise and will continue to conduct this exercise on an annual basis to monitor trends in industrial and commercial vacancies as a potential indicator of economic climate and a tool to guide policy recommendations.

## **Appendix B – Public Input Received Since March 1, 2019**

- B-1 Survey Report – Over to You – DC Background Study (survey responses up to May 14, 2019)
- B-2 Survey Report – Over to You – DC Background Study (survey responses May 15, 2019 – May 28, 2019)
- B-3 Public response received on May 7, 2019
- B-4 Letter from Sudbury & District Chamber of Commerce on May 7, 2019
- B-5 Public response received on May 23, 2019

List of speakers at the Public Input meeting held during City Council meeting on May 7, 2019:

- Connie Cyr
- Les Lisk – Coniston Seniors Non Profit Housing Corporation
- Karla Colasimone – Sudbury and District Home Builders Association
- Mathieu Labonte
- Paul Kennedy
- Joel Sauve
- Tom Price
- Michel Lalonde

# Survey Report

16 January 2018 - 14 May 2019


# Development Charges Background Study

PROJECT: Development Charges Background Study

**Over To You Greater Sudbury**

engagement   
by Bong the Table

**Q1 I identify as:**




**Question options**

- A residential taxpayer
- A non-residential taxpayer
- A developer or landowner actively constructing new building(s)
- Prefer not to answer

*Optional question (32 responses, 10 skipped)*

**Q2 Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements:**



**Question options**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

*Optional question (32 responses, 10 skipped)*

**Q3 Do you feel that lower development charges will encourage investment in our community? If so, how?**

Anonymous  
4/09/2019 03:38 PM

0.9% is not lowering, it's making people go elsewhere. The fee is outrageously priced!

Anonymous  
4/09/2019 06:21 PM

Yes, growth is at a minimal. By eliminating these hefty development fees it would entice more people and businesses to invest in our community. It would allow people and businesses to put this money back into their business and offer more services this creating more employment. An increase Residential building would also allow for more job creation.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 09:06 AM

The minor changes proposed will not make a noticeable difference. The key would be to target the best ideas. Infill and intensifying residential development should be have the rates greatly reduced as these serve the best interest over the longest terms. The plowing under of agriculture lands should have the charges doubled at min as the infrastructure required for these McMansions in the middle of nowhere is crippling the budgets

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 09:16 AM

Possibly however the real issues are the lack of infrastructure and services yielded or maintained from the dollars collected

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 01:57 PM

We need to cut the rates at least in half. The fee is hurting development.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 03:32 PM

Given the historical track-record in Greater Sudbury, by-and-large, development charges are gross compared to other cities in the surrounding area. Sudbury has a multitude of untapped land which can be used to grow our city and attract new, tax-paying citizens and businesses. By making up-front costs prohibitive, it scares investors away. Additionally, permits require agreements for new spaces, particularly commercial spaces, to meet certain requirements and provide specific landscapes which add to the overall cost of the project. Our viewpoint on new buildings and developments needs to change from an "infrastructure burden" to a "longer benefit" to our city.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 05:08 PM

Yes.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 06:06 PM

When someone has to put that large amount of money before a shovel is put in the ground is sickening. Do you realize what 15000 can buy in lumber.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 09:35 PM

As a 30 something future home builder, I believe that the opportunity to save almost 20k off the top of the total cost of building a new home will be vastly beneficial for young people like myself. Building new houses and dwellings will be more affordable and I believe more people will start doing just that. The city will be able to recoup costs from the new property tax revenues and future increases in property taxes. Also potentially amalgamating more areas just outside of the city boundaries as the city grows and our services spread farther.

Anonymous

They should be reduced by atleast 50 percent.

4/10/2019 10:44 PM

Anonymous

yes

4/11/2019 10:42 AM

Anonymous

It will enable the average family to build their dream home, instead of relying on rich developers such as Dalron and Zulich to build their dream home. These high fees impede the average family from taking on this project, opting instead for cookie-cutter options in the same price range as the build would have cost them.

4/11/2019 03:33 PM

Anonymous

More affordable, people will think twice before moving to the outskirts to build where charges are nil or much cheaper

4/12/2019 02:59 PM

Anonymous

Yes It would be a deciding factor for younger couples who would like to build their own homes.

4/13/2019 03:26 AM

Anonymous

As a contractor, we recently erected a 40x60' storage building on Lorne Street for Bell Canada. The building was deemed to be an extension to the exiting building and development charges applies of approx. \$ 25,000. There are no utilities in the building expect for hydro, no water, no sewer and anything else. The project was almost halted as no one expected to pay this fee. The building didn't create additional jobs, no tie in to any city infrastructure yet was unfairly classified as a add on to exiting building ( it is over 200' away from the existing office building), it is simply a storage building to keep their quads, boats etc. I never have seen anything so unprofessional in my 30 years as a contractor, it was not an extension to the existing structure yet that is how it was classified. This is why so my business's build elsewhere other than Sudbury.

4/16/2019 07:55 AM

Anonymous

It will cost less to operate a business in the city

4/21/2019 10:33 PM

Anonymous

I believe that lower development charges will encourage investment in CGS because it will promote the building of new infrastructure and dwellings within our city, thus creating more taxation base. I also believe it would help our housing market and stimulate our economy by creating more jobs in the construction field and everything that spawns off the building of new infrastructure.

4/23/2019 11:00 AM

Anonymous

People, developers and business will be more likely to invest in building their homes, properties and businesses within our city because it will be cheaper for them to initially set up therefore making CGS more attractive to invest in

4/26/2019 05:45 PM

Anonymous

People, developers and business will be more likely to invest in building their homes, properties and businesses within our city because it will be cheaper for them to initially set up therefore making CGS more attractive to invest in

5/02/2019 01:06 PM

AN

I think that lowering charges should be strategic to ensure infilling and not encourage urban sprawl. I believe that we can better use buildings already in existence, and not have to expand and create new infrastructure. This should not be a free for all of discount development. We aren't the dollar store.

5/03/2019 07:18 PM

Anonymous

No, if there are no jobs for people and with the failing infrastructure we have it just raise taxes

5/04/2019 08:33 AM

Anonymous

5/04/2019 09:17 AM

The problem in Sudbury isn't development charges, it's Building Control. Anyone who has had any permitted work done or built either a new home or a commercial project has a horror story to tell. The attitude there is "how can we make this more difficult for you", not "how can we help". Sudbury has earned a reputation as a difficult city to get anything built and it is costing us a lot of tax dollars from companies that won't locate here because it is so difficult to get a project done without having building inspectors making your life hell.. I speak from personal experience and 20 years of financing both residential and commercial projects in Sudbury.

Anonymous

5/04/2019 09:35 AM

The problem in Sudbury isn't development charges, it's Building Control. Anyone who has had any permitted work done or built either a new home or a commercial project has a horror story to tell. The attitude there is "how can we make this more difficult for you", not "how can we help". Sudbury has earned a reputation as a difficult city to get anything built and it is costing us a lot of tax dollars from companies that won't locate here because it is so difficult to get a project done without having building inspectors making your life hell.. I speak from personal experience and 20 years of financing both residential and commercial projects in Sudbury.

Anonymous

5/05/2019 09:05 PM

Yes. Sudbury is an expensive city to build

Anonymous

5/06/2019 06:47 AM

NO IT WILL NOT. SUDBURY, LIKE OTHER NORTHERN ONTARIO MUNICIPALITIES HAS ONLY EXPERIENCED MINIMAL GROWTH OVER THE LAST 60 SOME YEARS. THE GREATER SUDBURY POPULATION DID NOT GROW AT A FASTER RATE BEFORE THE INTRODUCTION OF DEVELOPMENT CHARGES THAN AFTER. THE RATE OF MINIMAL GROWTH HAS BEEN CYCLICAL AND FAMILY COMPOSITION, SMALLER HOUSEHOLDS ARE THE MAIN REASON FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT GROWTH.

Anonymous

5/06/2019 11:00 AM

Less money to be spent in red tape allows for other money to be spent in development.

Anonymous55

5/06/2019 02:53 PM

Yes - I grew up here, and with the exception of Costco 15 years ago, and the box stores surrounding it, not much else has changed.

Anonymous

5/06/2019 08:26 PM

Development charges for business should be tied to goals of Sudbury's strategic plan. Industrial is already lower than commercial but could even be lower if industrial development takes place in brownfield environments rather than greenfield. Same with commercial, lower development charges if commercial development leads to urban intensification rather than urban sprawl.

Anonymous

5/08/2019 03:10 PM

No

Anonymous

5/10/2019 08:41 AM

Yes, Up front fees are a primary concern in deciding whether to build a new house. It factors in the overall affordability of the project.

---

**Optional question (30 responses, 12 skipped)**



**Q4 Do you believe that development charges are a significant consideration in a company's decision to locate in Greater Sudbury?**

Anonymous 4/09/2019 03:38 PM	100% agree
Anonymous 4/09/2019 06:21 PM	Yes. Sudbury is very slow growth in comparison to other cities. There is so much red tape and fees it deters companies to want to invest and locate in our community.
Anonymous 4/10/2019 09:06 AM	Not really. If they were places like Markstay who will give the land away would be booming.
Anonymous 4/10/2019 09:16 AM	Yes
Anonymous 4/10/2019 01:57 PM	yes
Anonymous 4/10/2019 03:32 PM	Yes, but perhaps indirectly. In addition to development charges, the requirements added to site plan agreements further increase costs. The City should be picking one and not both. Either development charges are high to cover all, or the Site Plan Agreement is extensive, but not both. I have had friends who have built commercial buildings pay extensive development charges only to have to undertake upgrades to adjacent and right-of-way property because they are working in the vicinity. In cases such as this, what then are the development charges put towards if the investor has to also pay for the local upgrade?
Anonymous 4/10/2019 05:08 PM	I think it's a consideration for company's and citizens alike.
Anonymous 4/10/2019 06:06 PM	No. They have deeper pockets and easier financing available.
Anonymous 4/10/2019 09:35 PM	I believe that if a company can locate their business a few km out of the city to avoid these charges, they will. Not to mention home builders
Anonymous 4/10/2019 10:44 PM	Yes
Anonymous 4/11/2019 10:42 AM	yes
Anonymous 4/11/2019 03:33 PM	Companies should be the ones paying the development fees, not the average family or homeowner. Companies are the bigger users of our water/wasterwater system, their large trucks damage our roads, therefore they should pay a bigger portion of the taxes, not receive drastic cuts.
Anonymous 4/12/2019 02:59 PM	Yes

**Development Charges Background Study : Survey Report for 16 January 2018 to 14 May 2019**

---

Anonymous 4/13/2019 08:26 AM	Yes for the company and their employees. Unless the work is direct with say vale or strata
Anonymous 4/16/2019 07:55 AM	I was 100% agree that this is a significant consideration, how can you reasonably justify a development charge on what was described as above ? I don't think there is a reasonable explanation. Just because it was a commercial development doesn't mean it automatically qualifies for a development fee charge. I know of people who erected residential garages larger than this, and no development fees were added to the cost of the permit.
Anonymous 4/23/2019 11:00 AM	I believe that a start up or company would feel a lot better about their investment in our city with significantly reduced development charges. Less of a financial risk for them.
Anonymous 4/26/2019 05:45 PM	I believe that if a company can locate their business and infrastructure 30 min outside of the city to save 15-20k then that will definitely be something they would consider doing.
Anonymous 5/02/2019 01:06 PM	I believe that if a company can locate their business and infrastructure 30 min outside of the city to save 15-20k then that will definitely be something they would consider doing.
AN 5/03/2019 07:18 PM	Yes, but I believe strong initiatives to encourage them in-filling (residential) and using existing industrial areas before creating new neighborhoods and shopping areas. I believe that we need industry here not investment in entertainment.
Anonymous 5/04/2019 08:33 AM	No they look at the long term costs and with the failing infrastructure , mismanagement at city hall, no cost projects that cost hundreds of millions and the condition of roads they know that taxes are going to skyrocket.
Anonymous 5/04/2019 09:17 AM	No, our reputation as a difficult city to build in is the obstacle.
Anonymous 5/01/2019 09:35 AM	No, our reputation as a difficult city to build in is the obstacle.
Anonymous 5/05/2019 09:05 PM	Yes. Along with other obstacles to building here
Anonymous 5/05/2019 08:47 AM	NO. IT IS NAIVE TO THINK THAT A ONE TIME DEVELOPMENT FEE IS THE DECISIVE FACTOR WHEN LOOKING AT A LONG TERM INVESTMENT FOR A COMPANY. IT IS AT THE BOTTOM OF THE LIST. WHAT WOULD BE THE MARGINAL DIFFERENCE IN INITIAL COST BETWEEN SUDBURY AND OTHER MUNICIPALITIES? THIS DIFFERENCE IN COST MUST OVERRIDE ALL OTHER LOCATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.
Anonymous 5/06/2019 11:00 AM	No
Anonymous55 5/06/2019 02:53 PM	Absolutely. Why pay a fee when our city has so little to show on what happens with our money? People want to build in a city that functions. People want to invest in a community that does something of value with their money, much UNLIKE Sudbury.

**Development Charges Background Study : Survey Report for 16 January 2018 to 14 May 2019**

---

**Anonymous**

5/06/2019 06:26 PM

From anecdotal evidence that seems to be the case but it would help if there was a group at City Hall that championed all new projects (not just "big" projects). For example, our company is currently moving to new space in Midland and the renovations from warehouse to office space require an upgraded septic system and the City planner is making sure we get our permits but don't spent money needlessly on a new septic system until they decide for sure whether or not they are putting in a new sewer line on our street in 2020. It is my understanding that North Bay assigns someone to help companies wanting to locate there through the permitting and various administrative processes. Maybe the cost of development charges are not as important as the city showing they really want the business.

**Anonymous**

5/08/2019 03:10 PM

Not significant

**Anonymous**

5/13/2019 08:41 AM

I own a waterfront lot on Whitewater lake and live in the Maritimes. My roots are in Sudbury and would like to have a summer residence on the lake. However, I was told by the Planning Dept of the upfront cost before even putting a shovel in the ground. These costs are outrageous and will discourage new construction. My lot has a private road with no services and will likely never be serviced. Therefore these fees will not be used for my benefit.

**Optional question (29 responses, 13 skipped)**

**Q5 : Do you feel that Greater Sudbury is an attractive place for businesses to invest?**

Anonymous  
4/9/2019 03:06 PM

The cost of utilities and if building ( dev fee ) mostly scares them off! Imagine we had an Amazon warehouse here but we aren't even in the runnings!

Anonymous  
4/9/2019 06:21 PM

No. We have high fees, minimal growth along with minimal well paying jobs.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 09:06 AM

No. But it has nothing to do with development charges. It has to do with the perception of graft and nepotism within the city. The crumbling roads were actually brought up as a negative at a meeting of a large call centre company who later left the city due to perceived insider actions at city hall

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 09:16 AM

No

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 01:57 PM

No

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 03:52 PM

No, I unfortunately do not. We are not welcoming to new ideas, and there is a perception of corruption. KED is a good example of this, and by and large, the issue most people have with it is the perception of corrupt decision-making at the highest levels. If someone has connections within the City staff, work can progress easily. If they have no connections, then road-block after road-block are in place.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 05:06 PM

Yes

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 05:06 PM

No

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 09:35 PM

Sudbury is the hub of the north, it has great untapped potential. We have 333 lakes within the city limits, great location from provincial parks, an almost complete 4 lane to the south. Sudbury is becoming the jewel of the north and investors see this.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 10:44 PM

Possibly

Anonymous  
4/11/2019 10:42 AM

no

Anonymous  
4/11/2019 03:33 PM

Yes, provided we play our cards right. Taxing the small guy while giving cuts to the big guys is reverse economics.

Anonymous  
4/12/2019 02:59 PM

Not with the high taxes and development charges

Anonymous  
4/13/2019 08:26 AM

Yes

**Development Charges Background Study : Survey Report for 16 January 2018 to 14 May 2019**

---

**Anonymous**

4/16/2019 07:55 AM

For the most part, I think most developers and contractors find Sudbury a suitable place for their business, however, the permit application process, the review of the drawings for the permit, etc is a very slow process, it should not take 6 to 8 weeks to get a permit for such a simple structure that can be reviewed in a matter of days. The building was built during the winter months, slow construction period for the year, so I find it hard to believe adequate resources were not available to expedite the permit in a timely fashion.

**Anonymous**

4/21/2019 10:33 PM

No

**Anonymous**

4/23/2019 11:00 AM

According to a 2016 census survey, the population of Northern Ontario is 780,140 with Greater Sudbury being the largest city. I think companies would see Sudbury as an epicenter for an untapped market of people in Northern Ontario and therefore would want to base their operations out of Greater Sudbury. I also believe that they would feel a lot better about their investment in our city with significantly reduced development charges. Less of a financial risk for them.

**Anonymous**

4/26/2019 05:45 PM

CGS is a beautiful city of pristine lakes, gorgeous countryside and tons of potential . I think that it is an extremely attractive place for potential business opportunities being the largest city in northern Ontario and the gateway to the north

**Anonymous**

5/02/2019 01:00 PM

CGS is a beautiful city of pristine lakes, gorgeous countryside and tons of potential . I think that it is an extremely attractive place for potential business opportunities being the largest city in northern Ontario and the gateway to the north

**AN**

5/03/2019 07:16 PM

Not necessarily.

**Anonymous**

5/04/2019 08:33 AM

No that is why we have very little to no business invest. Dumb question wasn't it?

**Anonymous**

5/04/2019 09:17 AM

It should be and could be but we have to have a buy in from Building Controls. Any project here runs into unnecessary expenditures because of requests for unnecessary additional engineering reports or just the slow process of having an approval moved along. It costs business owners a lot of money when they can't open on time. I have seen too many businesses try to work with the City and think that everything is going smoothly and then at the last minute something comes up and they have to spend another \$20,000 or \$50,000 or more to do something in order to get their final inspection completed. That means someone missed something in the process. Regrettably I see no improvement in this area.

**Anonymous**

5/04/2019 09:35 AM

It should be and could be but we have to have a buy in from Building Controls. Any project here runs into unnecessary expenditures because of requests for unnecessary additional engineering reports or just the slow process of having an approval moved along. It costs business owners a lot of money when they can't open on time. I have seen too many businesses try to work with the City and think that everything is going smoothly and then at the last minute something comes up and they have to spend another \$20,000

Anonymous 5/05/2019 09:05 PM	or \$50,000 or more to do something in order to get their final inspection completed. That means someone missed something in the process. Regrettably I see no improvement in this area. Yes
Anonymous 5/06/2019 06:47 AM	THE HISTORIC NO GROWTH OF NORTHERN ONTARIO LIMITS GROWTH INVESTMENTS. SUDURY IS NO DIFFERENT THAN OTHER NORTHERN ONTARIO MUNICIPALITIES. No
Anonymous 5/06/2019 11:00 AM	No, it used to be. Sudbury has literally become a laughing stock to the rest of Ontario. I travel for work, and I do not take it lightly when I say people from all over only know Sudbury as an "armpit of the north". Sudbury is deteriorating quickly, our roads, our buildings, and the priorities by our City Hall. Why do massive companies like Vale and Glencore get the privilege of destroying our roads yet contribute so little into our community in terms of tax deferrals and moving their footprint underground. Tax their use of the roadways instead of us who are already crippling in debt; or force them to go back to hauling by rail.
Anonymous55 5/06/2019 02:53 PM	The City of Sudbury should be one of the most attractive places in Canada to invest, It's at the cross roads of the two cross Canada railways along with feeder lines, highways pointing in all directions, one of the larges bilingual workforces outside of Quebec, one of the world's larges mining complexes to build an industrial base from, great hospital and post-secondary educational complexes. There seems to be a total lack of vision to take advantage of Sudbury's strengths, The city staff is distracted by trying to justify a entertainment district by a landfill site and not focussing on the mundane tasks of maintaining infrastructure (roads) that will ultimately attract business to the City.
Anonymous 5/06/2019 08:26 PM	Yes
Anonymous 5/08/2019 03:10 PM	Sudbury needs to diversify its economy. There is too much dependence on mining. Take a look at Moncton New Brunswick and the loss of CNR which was the primary industry. The City Fathers capitalized on the bilingual population and attracted Call Centres. These have provided good paying jobs. As well, Moncton being so centrally located was ideal for industrial parks with trucking and storage facilities. Sudbury must have a strong cultural scene to attract people from the larger centres such as Toronto.

Optional question (30 responses, 12 skipped)

**Q6 Not considering development charges, how do you think the City can encourage development and investments in our community?**

Anonymous  
4/9/2019 03:36 PM

Taxes are on a constant rise every year. Maybe a profit share from the casino that the tax payers will be paying for could be an incentive!

Anonymous  
4/9/2019 06:21 PM

Being more open to growth and development. Making a decision and sticking to it and moving forward and progressing towards the decision rather than having a media spectacle and meeting after meeting to discuss and review - like what has happened with the arena. Other cities would have had that arena built by now.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 09:06 AM

Be more responsible with the already existing city. The roads are what people notice when they come here and it's not a good impression. To have it be a well known secret that the city used and continues to use a contractor who does not comply with the terms of the contracts and fails to warranty the work... while having familial ties between the city management and engineers to said company is unacceptable. Adding to that the seemingly haphazard application of the master plan with the never ending list of civic projects which - while nice - are big affordable. Our city isn't appealing because we don't appear professional, open and honest. We appear to be a clique of cronies whose only goal is to enrich each other's portfolios with tax payer dollars.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 09:16 AM

Transparency and infrastructure maintenance to a sufficient level that doesn't result in an deterrent for investment or increased costs to businesses and their customers

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 01:57 PM

Cut taxes

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 03:32 PM

We need to stop imposing upgrade rules. The timing is onerous as well. It takes up to 8 months to receive acceptance of large developments to take place by the time meetings are held, any re-zoning takes place, plans are accepted and permits are issued. Large developments should be fast-tracked, and the process should be clear. If only a handful of people know how to navigate the system, that's a real problem.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 05:08 PM

By fixing our roads and investing in the downtown, transit, and bike lanes. By helping to reduce urban sprawl.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 06:06 PM

Business opportunities.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 09:35 PM

Keep the citizens engaged and listen to their positive feedback. But also their constructive criticisms as well. Be progressive when considering what future developments to invest in. Invest in infrastructure and the environment and the 2 working cohesively together.

Anonymous  
4/10/2019 10:44 PM

Clean up down town

**Development Charges Background Study : Survey Report for 16 January 2018 to 14 May 2019**

---

Anonymous 4/11/2019 10:42 AM	get rid of development charges or lower them more then 43 dollars
Anonymous 4/11/2019 03:33 PM	I think they really need to be looked at on a case-by-case basis, instead of painting all projects with the same brush. Location also needs to be a major component, not just square footage.
Anonymous 4/12/2019 02:59 PM	Less red tape for site plan, the planning department
Anonymous 4/13/2019 08:26 AM	Fix the roads
Anonymous 4/21/2019 10:33 PM	Have less red tape
Anonymous 4/23/2019 11:00 AM	I think the city can do a better job of weighing the wants/needs of our citizens with a realistic approach. Maybe change some of the by law language and red tape that citizens have to deal with daily at TDS
Anonymous 4/26/2019 05:45 PM	More public input sessions. Invest more money in our current crumbling infrastructure. Focus on urban renewal projects and offer incentives for businesses who invest in renewal projects
Anonymous 5/02/2019 01:06 PM	More public input sessions. Invest more money in our current crumbling infrastructure. Focus on urban renewal projects and offer incentives for businesses who invest in renewal projects
AN 5/03/2019 07:18 PM	By actively seeking out opportunities like hemp and cannabis production, as well as healthcare investments like pharmaceuticals. Get more private LTC homes, fight for LTC beds for REAL to unburden the ED and create hundreds of jobs.
Anonymous 5/04/2019 08:33 AM	Not without some long term planning, and councillors already have stated they care about plans.
Anonymous 5/04/2019 09:17 AM	See above. There needs to be a total change in attitude from building inspectors and their department. We can have zero development charges but until that attitude changes no one will want to re locate here.
Anonymous 5/04/2019 09:35 AM	See above. There needs to be a total change in attitude from building inspectors and their department. We can have zero development charges but until that attitude changes no one will want to re locate here.
Anonymous 5/05/2019 10:24 AM	Il faut arrêter l'étalement urbain afin de contribuer à la diminution de l'impact du changement climatique global. Ensuite, pour contrer les coupures budgétaires de M. Ford, on doit améliorer la circulation pour piétons et cyclistes en conjonction avec le système de transport en commun. Ceci nous donnerait des trottoirs et pistes en bonne condition, les traversées prioritaires aux intersections et le tout bien lié aux abris des routes d'autobus. De cette façon, on invite plus de piétons-consommateurs chez les commerçants, ce qui encouragerait l'investissement commercial au Grand Sudbury.
Anonymous. 5/05/2019 09:05 PM	Promote advertise our city. Its a great place
Anonymous	OUR ROADS ARE ABYSMAL. A POTENTIAL INVESTOR UPON A FIRST

---



**Development Charges Background Study : Survey Report for 16 January 2018 to 14 May 2019**

---

5/06/2019 06:47 AM

TIME VISIT TO SUDBURY LOOKING AT THE STATE OF OUR ROADS WOULD THEN LOOK AT THE ADMINISTRATION AND QUESTION HOW THE GOVERNANCE COULD LET THIS HAPPEN. THIS INCOMPETENCE LEADS TO A LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN THE CITY LEADERS AND QUESTIONS AS TO WHY WE SHOULD INVEST HERE OVER OTHER LOCATIONS. THE PLANNING AND BUILDING PERMIT APPROVAL SYSTEMS OVER THE YEARS SUFFERED FROM TOO MUCH RED TAPE AND UNREALISTIC COSTLY CONDITIONS TO APPROVALS.

**Anonymous**

Not sure

5/06/2019 11:00 AM

**Anonymous55**

5/06/2019 02:53 PM

Invest in ourselves first. That doesn't mean an \$11 million dollar refurbish of the outdoor pavilion at Tom Davies that is of no use to 95% of the town's population. I mean re-evaluating where our revenues from taxes are already being misappropriated.

**Anonymous**

5/06/2019 08:26 PM

Focus on the city's strength - there are many. Spend dollars maintaining infrastructure rather than chasing a promoter's vision and other pipe dreams and there may be dollars available to lower development charges.

**Anonymous**

5/08/2019 03:10 PM

By enriching the cultural attractiveness of the city. People want to live and identify with a creative, progressive, interesting community.

**Anonymous**

5/13/2019 08:41 AM

The business community must take an active part in determining the direction growth will take place. Get Rotary and the Chamber of Commerce involved in round table discussions. They know best what is required to create a vibrant business environment. Check with Moncton on how the accomplished their turn around.

**Optional question (30 responses, 12 skipped)**

**Q7 | Please add any comments on current or future development charges in the City of Greater Sudbury.**

Anonymous

8/02/2018 12:27 PM

Find the current development fees are quite expensive compared to other City's.

Anonymous

8/27/2018 10:31 AM

Perry + Perry Architects Inc. and Perry + Perry Developments Inc., long standing members of the Sudbury Business community, wish to submit the following recommendation for the upcoming review of Development charges for the Greater City of Sudbury: Affordable Housing Exemption - The current Development charge by-law offers that any/all affordable housing new starts are exempt from development charges, however, the affordable unit must remain affordable in "perpetuity"...this requirement has not to date and will not entice builders in the future to build affordable units. Our recommendation is to match the current IAH contribution agreement requirement for affordability to 20 years with units becoming available as market rent units after year 15 as vacancies arise. We trust with this approach, the rules will align with the current funding programs available and provide builders with the means and incentives necessary to construct more affordable units for our vulnerable populations. Jeff Perry President

mykul

10/24/2018 02:22 PM

Yes..... way too expensive for permit to build. Developers build the roads in a residential project, they build the side walks, hydro installation etc. In an existing residential area where one would buy a single lot those roads, sidewalks, services have already been paid for, the city does not have an expense for that. The cost of the installed sewers, like in Dowling, were passed on to homeowners who had to pay that cost associated with the lot they owned. Again, not the city. Sewer and water services is a separate bill home owners pay and the charges are for full amount of cost of water treatment so again, no cost to city. You want more construction then drop building costs.

Anonymous

11/06/2018 01:54 PM

Do not remove them and perhaps even raise them.

Jantonioni

11/13/2018 02:10 AM

Development charges are a barrier to economic growth. Get rid of them altogether. The only reason for development charges is to control the pace of overdevelopment in boom times. Obviously - it cannot be said that Sudbury is in booming development times. We need more cranes in the sky.

Anonymous

11/13/2018 08:28 AM

Make Ramsey motor free lake - rent paddle boats / kayaks / canoes - such a wasted revenue for our "city of lakes" and it's only accesible mainly by rich people. The only time in my life i've been on a boat on ramsey lake - was for a cortina ride.

bmwright08

12/08/2018 02:09 PM

Reduce DCs to attract investment. Economics 101. If you want growth, what are you waiting for? It just needs to be slightly lower than competitive cities, and investors will come.

Anonymous

3/20/2019 12:49 PM

I have a degree in Economic Policy and have been a Sudbury business person for 30 years. I have railed against the City's Economic Development

policy many times and it remains in my opinion misguided. By the City's own admission development charges exist solely to reduce the burden on residential rate payer. How is that working out? Well, we hide our tax increases in sewer and water rates while our stock of commercial and industrial buildings is deteriorating year after year because nobody will renovate or build. We now find that over the past several years the City has collected barely half of what the projected revenue from these charge was expected to be. So we continue to believe the charges are working? We continue to promote them as some panacea to give relief to the poor beleaguered individual rate payer? What nonsense. This charges are a fundamental hindrance to economic growth and activity, without which the pie simply does not grow. Here's a radical idea: Start using development charges as a tool of economic development and urban renewal rather as a revenue generator because clearly this has failed. Too many building and properties throughout our City sit vacant or are crumbling away! Owners won't touch them. The eyesores abound and every major street in the City. The urban blight in our City has become truly alarming and what are we doing about it? Dropping development fees by \$26 bucks? Let's get serious folks and save our City from ongoing decay!!! Slash these charges in half for two years and watch the money pour in as the property assessment base grows and our City undergoes a long overdue building renaissance. Or keep using them in a vain attempt to get revenue from developers who refuse to develop or builders who refuse to build or owners who refuse to renovate and see how that works out for the City in the next 5 years. I would be more than happy to continue this discussion and offer my thoughts to anybody willing to listen. Sincerely, Mark McKillop [REDACTED]

Anonymous

0/25/2019 05:12 AM

Yes we have comments, we work hard for our money and UNLIKE the crooked government policy makers and red tape bureaucrats, we only have ONE source of income? stop shafting Canadians with your [REDACTED] development policies and procedures and find YOUR own way to get your FEES and TAXES...we're sick of it already....too many years of your dictatorial [REDACTED]. If you want to grow Sudbury, use its natural RESOURCES and stop stealing from the taxpayers like in the big cities. I will NEVER, EVER pay any of your ransom fees or taxes while you dangle our city like a carrot!! if you can't do the job...LEAVE. Yes, we know you need a secure paycheck but don't try getting it from us by pretending to DEVELOP anything..We HATE development, thats why we live HERE, get it!. Our birthright is "OUR" country, not yours to pillage and plunder...so [REDACTED] and leave us alone and out of your suffocating rules, regulations, fees, taxes, licensing and permits scams. ENOUGH already, we can see right through your money grabbing habits. NO MORE "DEVELOPMENT" fees or taxes or anything else EVER.....I repeat, EVER!!!!!!

Anonymous

0/29/2019 12:00 PM

Lowering or eleminating development charages will definitely help make it affordable ot buil a home in the sudbury area, not to mention help lower the price on newly constructed homes.

Anonymous

1/09/2019 03:35 PM

Don't decrease the development fee, remove it!

Anonymous

4/9/2019 05:21 PM

Abolish them and you will see growth and people investing in the city.

Anonymous

4/10/2019 09:06 AM

The city needs, NEEDS to decide if it wants to move into the future or not . The future is intensified residential development, which allows for a better run and more utilized transit system. It allows for better use of water/sewer infrastructure by concentrating the usage and allowing better return on investment. Sprawl needs to be curtailed, but not by prohibition edict. Simply refusing to issue severance for lands is a mean policy. Instead the development charges for 4+ story residential should be halved or even less and the charges for single detached on former rural should be tripled. Someone who is planning to build a \$700,000house won't refuse to build a \$750,000 house with \$50k in charges. There are ways to make this city amazing and functional. None of those ways involve piecemeal half-assed cony driven policies. The time has come for bold action. Step up or get out of the way.

Anonymous

4/10/2019 01:57 PM

Sault Ste Marie and Northbay doesn't have development charges.

Anonymous

4/10/2019 03:08 PM

Dev. Charges for new construction in outlying areas of the City of Greater Sudbury where there is no water, or waste water service should be abolished. New developments should have lower development fees.

Anonymous

4/10/2019 06:06 PM

Companies that are developing new areas that need infracture should pay for the cost. Those that make income from large rental areas

Anonymous

4/10/2019 10:44 PM

Land owners wanting to build however cost of development fees are ridiculous

Anonymous

4/11/2019 10:42 AM

Please get rid of the development charges, I cant even keep track of the amount of people I know in my demographic that wont even consider building because of the development fees. You talk about growth pays for growth, this doesn't even make sense when someone is building a home in a rural area with no access to sewer and water and has to pay to have their own hydro and gas brought to the new build. When a new home is being built it creates a new tax revenue of 6,000 dollars + per year, that alone should offset the "growth pays for growth" scam you keep referring to. You should be encouraging young families to invest in their own city. There shouldn't be these types of barriers in place to prevent them from realising their dreams.

Anonymous

4/11/2019 03:33 PM

Charging the same Development Fees to both rural and urban builds is a flawed approach, especially when these folks are not tied into the city's water and wastewater systems (having to use wells and septic systems), having [poor snow removal...etc... basically not accessing the same level of city services and infrastructure as someone building in New Sudbury, for example, despite paying taxes to the Greater City of Sudbury. This needs to be reevaluated to consider how many families would prefer to build in farm country and raise their family away from the town core.

Anonymous

As a carpenter I know many people I frame for expecially privates that wont

**Development Charges Background Study : Survey Report for 16 January 2018 to 14 May 2019**

---

4/12/2019 03:59 PM

Anonymous

build here because of development charges. They call me once they purchase property outside sudbury like eden township, estaire so on. They should be rated on all services required. Much lower in rural areas were you supply all your own services and have no sidewalks etc.

4/13/2019 08:26 AM

Anonymous

Development charges should be reviewed on a case by case basis, and there should be an option to appeal the decision or have a reasonable explanation provided as to why development charges apply to projects.

4/15/2019 07:55 AM

Anonymous

I think it would be in the city's best interest to run a trial period of no development charges or significantly reduced charges to see if the housing construction market bounces back. Weigh out the tax revenue that is gained from new builds and see if it can help offset the loss of the DCs

4/23/2019 11:00 AM

Anonymous

Sudbury has a severe sprawl problem. We could try to curb that in part by reducing dev charges close to core areas.

5/03/2019 03:17 PM

AN

Residential tax payers cannot afford any more. Please breathe some life into the city without gouging us anymore.

5/03/2019 07:18 PM

Anonymous

Just what we need more no cost to taxpayers projects that cost million. But check the mayor election donations to see how the vote is going to go.

5/04/2019 08:33 AM

Anonymous

We can fiddle with development charges all we want , it won't change a thing until there is a change in attitude. I feel like I am repeating myself but in over 20 years of working with businesses to renovate or build there has been no change in how difficult Building Controls makes life for people. A lot of money is wasted on unnecessary engineering reports or redos. I love this City but it is very discouraging to see growth opportunities missed because of the reputation we have here.

5/04/2019 09:17 AM

Anonymous

We can fiddle with development charges all we want , it won't change a thing until there is a change in attitude. I feel like I am repeating myself but in over 20 years of working with businesses to renovate or build there has been no change in how difficult Building Controls makes life for people. A lot of money is wasted on unnecessary engineering reports or redos. I love this City but it is very discouraging to see growth opportunities missed because of the reputation we have here.

5/04/2019 09:35 AM

Anonymous

Les jeux d'argent (KED!) et l'alcool sont des problèmes sociaux. L'éducation et les services en santé sont des responsabilités sociales. Les coupures en éducation et santé de M. Ford, et son appui pour l'extraction sans conséquences (le cercle de feu de l'Ontario) et l'alcool (a buck a beer!) démontrent que les francophones paieront plus pour moins!

5/05/2019 10:24 AM

Anonymous

USER PAY PRINCIPLE. OUR TAXES SINCE THE 1950'S UNTIL THE INTRODUCTION OF DEVELOPMENT CHARGES PAID FOR ALL THE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS OF THE NEW DEVELOPMENTS, WHO GOT A FREE RIDE. THE EXISTING TAX BASE CANNOT REVERT TO THE OLD DAYS OF SUBSIDIZING THE DEVELOPERS. THEY MUST PAY THEIR FAIR SHARE. OUR HIGH TAXES ARE A DETERRENT WHICH COULD GO HIGHER WITHOUT DEVELOPMENT CHARGES.

5/06/2019 08:47 AM

Anonymous

Lowering/freezing residential taxes would allow for citizens to be able to afford homes and allow for citizens to stay to fill the jobs of these developers

5/06/2019 11:00 AM

Anonymous55

5/08/2019 02:53 PM

Sudbury, I am a vacant land owner. I am also a home owner and Landlord. I am a full-time employed young professional. I am educated. I am aged under 40 and have much of my future ahead of me. I'm just getting started. But Sudbury, you are failing me. You are failing people like me. The harder we work, the harder it is to be proud of investing in this community. The harder it is to see OUR futures in this community. I grew up here, proud to be from the 'Nickle City' and wore that pride with an open vision to growing here, in this community. I moved away and I came back because I so loved this city. I saw potential here and not just because I work in our largest (and historical) sector in mining. But I saw myself raising a family here, investing my future and my finances here. Me, like so many other young adults struggle now to see that. Like so many businesses, we no longer see Sudbury with a viable, sustainable, or rewarding future. I know that I am not alone. Three years ago I purchased my second property here in Sudbury. I worked hard for this, I took every minute of overtime work possible to earn this, I saved for this. I was so proud to own two properties before I reached 30 years old. A feat not many can say they've achieved. I thought I could build a home to raise a family and continue my future, my investment, in this community. But these fees hit me with such force it stopped all hope of a future in Sudbury dead in it's tracks. I pay taxes on both properties, and the city will collect these taxes for each year, increasing them annually - forever. The development fee though? Sure, it's just a one time fee. A one time, astronomical fee that costs more than the windows alone for the home and in addition to the permit! This land I hoped to build on, it has ZERO municipal services. No water, no waste-water, no road maintenance (private road) no garbage pick up, no recycling, no school busses but it's within city limits. Yes, I chose this. Yes I could have picked an existing home and not had to deal with any of this - but shouldn't I be able to create my own future in this city? Haven't I worked hard enough to do so? Three years ago when I applied for the building permit and inquired on this fee no-one could tell me where this money would go. "Back into financial services" was the only response. Since that day, I have not been able to do anything with my property. Why is there no application for building permits / development fees based on circumstance. Not every application is the same. Why does a landowner looking to build one home have to pay the same fee a developer pays for an entire subdivision, with absolutely no municipal servicing? It makes no sense, Sudbury you are failing us. It's so hard to see where our money goes in this city. You see the crumbling roads, the buildings in such a deteriorated state and the focus of our City Hall on projects that only scream added dollar signs. It's hard to see where these development fees hold any value, let alone where our taxes go. Frankly, I'm set to sell and move out of this city. Sincerely, My Future No Longer Belongs in Sudbury.

Anonymous

5/15/2019 09:41 AM

The City must be invest in infrastructure such as industrial parks and have the staff necessary to sell the projects. If the serviced land is available then they will come. I wish Sudbury all the best and hope to some day return.

---

Optional question (33 responses, 9 skipped)

# Survey Report


15 May 2019 - 28 May 2019

# Development Charges Background Study

PROJECT: Development Charges Background Study  
**Over To You Greater Sudbury**

engagement   
by Bang the Table

**Q1** | I identify as:




**Question options**

- A residential taxpayer
- A developer or landowner actively constructing new building(s)

*Optional question (13 responses, 1 skipped)*



**Q2 Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements:**



**Question options**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

*Optional question (14 responses, 0 skipped)*

**Q3 | Do you feel that lower development charges will encourage investment in our community? If so, how?**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Anonymous<br>5/15/2019 09:21 AM            | no.   |
| wayne<br>5/16/2019 09:15 PM                | With the way Sudbury abuses tax payers money no one in there wright mind would invest here  |
| Communications Proxy<br>5/18/2019 09:28 AM | More houses that get built, more new property taxes get added to the pot. Development charges at \$1700000.00 makes it impossible financially for average home owners. I would consider building a new home if this charges would be lowered.   |
| Communications Proxy<br>5/18/2019 09:35 AM | I agree that densification will encourage a lowering of development costs and of greenhouse gases (i.e. a denser community uses less gas for transportation). Let's do what we can to encourage denser community by the way of higher costs to those who want to develop where infrastructure does not exist. Actually, I would be in favor of a bylaw prohibiting new development in unserviced areas until we get our ghg emissions in line with IPCC 1.5C targets for 2030 and 2050. |
| Communications Proxy<br>5/18/2019 09:37 AM | More infrastructure means more maintenance No new areas should be developed and developers should pay present and future costs of infrastructure  |
| Anonymous<br>5/21/2019 09:58 PM            | Absolutely.. lowering the DC substantially would allow homeowners to build .. we personally along with our neighbors own lots without water,sewer,garbage pick up and we also plow our own road. constantly complain about poor road maintenance .. paying a high DC won't change anything for us .. we don't see a dime  |
| Anonymous<br>5/22/2019 07:45 AM            | NO  |
| Anonymous<br>5/22/2019 07:47 AM            | NO  |
| Anonymous<br>5/22/2019 08:32 PM            | Yes because residents will move to where it is cheaper. More residents mean more taxes. Slight decrease in prices will encourage more and new builds which in turn generate more money for the city.  |
| Anonymous<br>5/23/2019 12:35 PM            | It will not.  |
| Anonymous<br>5/23/2019 02:11 PM            | it's an enormous cost with nothing to show for  |
| Anonymous<br>5/28/2019 03:55 PM            | encouraging young people to build within the city encourages that investment. It is expensive to build a home, and the fees make it so building a simple home is not affordable within Sudbury.   |

**Optional question** (12 responses, 2 skipped)

---

**Q4 | Do you believe that development charges are a significant consideration in a company's decision to locate in Greater Sudbury?**

Rdbazinet

5/15/2019 07:55 AM

Yes.

Anonymous

5/15/2019 09:21 AM

Price difference of 3-4% for a new home will not have an effect on investors thinking of investing in Sudbury, and that's the difference in price with or without the DC. For new large industrial projects it could, because a 10k sq ft structure will cost what \$80k in DC fees and that might have an effect on decision.

Communications Proxy

5/18/2019 09:28 AM

I would think so. But Sudbury has one of the highest development charges and property taxes in province!

Communications Proxy

5/18/2019 09:35 AM

Yes

Communications Proxy

5/18/2019 09:37 AM

No

Anonymous

5/21/2019 09:58 PM

Absolutely

Anonymous

5/22/2019 07:45 AM

NO

Anonymous

5/22/2019 07:47 AM

NO

Anonymous

5/22/2019 08:32 PM

Absolutely. I've spoken to many business owners who have opened business in nearby cities with cheaper development charges rather than build in Sudbury. Cheaper fees mean more business. More business mean more jobs and more jobs mean more citizens which is more tax payers.

Anonymous

5/23/2019 12:35 PM

No.

Anonymous

5/23/2019 02:11 PM

As well as our yearly tax increases and hydro rates!

**Optional question** (11 responses, 3 skipped)

**Q5 | Do you feel that Greater Sudbury is an attractive place for businesses to invest?**

Rdbazinet

5/15/2019 07:55 AM

Yes.

Anonymous

5/15/2019 09:21 AM

no - potholes, price of gas gouging, cultural thinking of managers who think a new arena attached to a Casino is morally correct. Why not have a [REDACTED] next to it also! Sudbury could be, but our positives are negated by our negatives.

wayne

5/16/2019 09:15 PM

Guaranteed not attractive to invest here

Communications Proxy

5/18/2019 09:28 AM

No! My hole family moved away for this reason. When looking to maybe come back looking into fees and property taxes they moved elsewhere.

Communications Proxy

5/18/2019 09:35 AM

Possibly more so than other northern towns bec. of our social fabric & being educational & health centre. But no, not more than southern neighbours in Ontario bec of remoteness.

Communications Proxy

5/18/2019 09:37 AM

Yes

Anonymous

5/21/2019 09:58 PM

NO

Anonymous

5/22/2019 07:45 AM

Yes, but at the expense of our present taxpayers

Anonymous

5/22/2019 07:47 AM

Yes, but at the expense of our present taxpayers

Anonymous

5/22/2019 08:32 PM

Not as of now with the development charges. We need new building to brighten the city up. More jobs, cheaper living.

Anonymous

5/23/2019 12:35 PM

No. We have allowed our infrastructure debt to increase to an undesirable level for home ownership and business investment.

Anonymous

5/23/2019 02:11 PM

Cost of living is getting the better of most of us

Anonymous

5/28/2019 03:55 PM

I beleive there has been much growth for businesses especially small local businesses which is great for the community as well as the environment.

**Optional question** (13 responses, 1 skipped)

**Q6 | Not considering development charges, how do you think the City can encourage development and investments in our community?**

Anonymous

5/15/2019 09:21 AM

read above for what not to do. The City could fund experimental developments to the tune of \$1MM / year for things such as developing paving machines that can economically rejuvenate our roads even the roads only last 10 years, so long as it cost 25% less than rebuilding the roadway. Buy the old hospital and turn it into a senior centre... knock off the top floors and keep 2. On an individual basis, entice investors looking at Sudbury with incentives. I heard enticing professional to Sudbury is dependent upon the professional's wife decision. What does Sudbury offer culturally, beside a new arena next to a dump, attached to a Casino!!! Place des Arts is a good start but it's an island being built in an area without vision or proper future planning. Build it right the first time!

Communications Proxy

5/18/2019 09:28 AM

Not making the application process so difficult and so long. It should not take so long to be approved. Also allowing to pay the application fee up front so you are guaranteed your approval in less then 10 weeks. I feel they do allow you to because it take them longer and don't want to be charged late fees. Follow the rules Greater Sudbury

Communications Proxy

5/18/2019 09:35 AM

We can make it safer for new businesses/new development by ensuring that we have a plan to ensure resiliency as the number of droughts, downpours/floods, wildfires increases due to climate change. If it's not safe here it's not appealing. Let's increase our appeal with a strong Climate Adaptation Plan & vigorous long term goals reflecting IPCC 1.5 C targets  
Less difficulty finding out what's required

Communications Proxy

5/18/2019 09:37 AM

Anonymous

5/21/2019 09:58 PM

Get rid of red tape

Anonymous

5/22/2019 07:45 AM

by fixing our abysmal roads and sewers

Anonymous

5/22/2019 07:47 AM

by fixing our abysmal roads and sewers

Anonymous

5/22/2019 08:32 PM

Tax breaks for new builds, tax breaks for using local businesses for builds.

Anonymous

5/23/2019 12:35 PM

We to project an image of a financially sound community. One which takes pride in what we have and provides a great first impression. A clean and healthy environment that cares more about community health and well being vs engaging in competition with other Northern Ontario communities to provide the best low cost option for large corporations that may actually do more harm than good.

Anonymous

5/23/2019 02:11 PM

Show thit actually is affordable to build here

**Optional question** (10 responses, 4 skipped)

**Q7 | Please add any comments on current or future development charges in the City of Greater Sudbury.**

Anonymous

5/15/2019 09:21 AM

Do you honestly believe removing DC will drop the price of homes? If you do, you don't belong in the position you're in. :-) Hazel McCallum? built a whole City for dozens of years with DCharges, and no tax increases! Why is it that every time developers / builders cry broke, this City runs to their help?

wayne

5/16/2019 09:15 PM

I do not understand the development charges as the individual or contractor that is building the subdivision foots 100 of the bill as far as roads lighting services etc so why should the city have a development charge that goes towards infrastructure

Communications Proxy

5/18/2019 09:35 AM

Remember: extra costs are digestible when they are seen as an investment into a more stable world in the long run. Merci

Anonymous

5/21/2019 09:58 PM

A DC should be spent in the area being developed BUT when paying that fee and we get NO SERVICES... where's that money going and what's the point of the fee

Anonymous

5/22/2019 07:45 AM

consider present taxpayers and charge all infrastructure costs including maintenance of infrastructure to be developers' responsibilities

Anonymous

5/22/2019 07:47 AM

consider present taxpayers and charge all infrastructure costs including maintenance of infrastructure to be developers' responsibilities

Anonymous

5/22/2019 08:32 PM

The fees should be lower. I have actually considered moving for cheaper development fees. Lower it and keep tax payers in Sudbury

Anonymous

5/23/2019 12:35 PM

Once we can project an image of a caring, well functioning and financially sound community, we will be able to pick and choose the development best suited for our lifestyle. All wise business investors are seeking communities that will provide the best returns on their investments with low tax rates and a sound infrastructure and clean environment.

Anonymous

5/23/2019 02:11 PM

Profit share new casino complex with the ones paying for it ( tax payer last )

Communications Proxy

5/28/2019 04:20 PM

We can't even get anything for the property tax we pay and then you charge development fees. What infrastructure are you talking about? We don't have any out here in the bush. If the money was spent on our road it wouldn't be so bad; however, it goes to the [REDACTED] parking meters on Elm street. We get ABSOLUTELY nothing for the fees you collect out here. We have neighbours from Owen Sound that claim that the area boomed when they got rid of them. I know people that have moved or refuse to build because of the fees. Get rid of them OR spend it where it is collected.

**Optional question** (10 responses, 4 skipped)

## Appendix B-3

**[REDACTED] - Request to speak to council re development fee changes**

---

**From:** Evie Moores [REDACTED]  
**To:** "clerks@greatersudbury.ca" <clerks@greatersudbury.ca>  
**Date:** 5/7/2019 7:10 PM  
**Subject:** Request to speak to council re development fee changes

---

Dear Council

My name is Evie Moores . I live on the edge of greater Sudbury west. I'm looking to build a modest dwelling this summer. A one floor 450 square foot tiny house. From what I discerned off the greater Sudbury website, I will have to pay the same amount of development fees as someone building a mansion. This formula seems discouraging to those with modest income or those concerned with their carbon footprint. Could you please consider a square footage type formula for development fees for dwellings similar to industrial development

Evie Moores  
123 regional road 4  
Whitefish, on P0M 3E0  
[REDACTED]



## Appendix B-4

May 7, 2019

Mayor Brian Bigger and City Council  
City of Greater Sudbury  
Tom Davies Square  
P. O. Box 5000  
Sudbury, ON P3A 5P3

### **RE: Development Charges By-law**

Dear Mayor Bigger and City Council,

I am writing to you today regarding the city's review of the development charges by-law. The Greater Sudbury Chamber of Commerce represents over 750 businesses and serves as the *voice of business* in Greater Sudbury.

The chamber's Municipal Advocacy Committee had the opportunity to hear from Kris Longston, the city's Manager of Community and Strategic Planning, regarding city staff's work on the development charges review. We applaud the efforts of city staff for taking on a difficult undertaking and for producing such a thorough report.

The Greater Sudbury Chamber of Commerce supports the city staff's recommendations for moderate changes in residential and non-residential development charges. The chamber supports the idea that growth should pay for growth, and the cost of development should not fall on existing taxpayers. Despite projections of limited population growth, investments in critical infrastructure for new developments will be necessary in the next five-year period, and it is sound policy to impose development charges on those investments. Council has deliberated the idea of eliminating these charges altogether and we cannot support such an approach. If the city was to eliminate development charges for the coming five-year period, there would be no opportunity to collect revenue from new developments which will require essential infrastructure. The solution would either be to not invest in critical infrastructure or to place the burden on taxpayers – both undesirable options.

We would also suggest that investments such as the Wanapitei Lake Water Treatment Plant and other city-funded investments in critical infrastructure expansion should be subject to development charges, if they are not already. Additionally, it is important that the city, keeping with recent progress on this front, implement a sound communications strategy to explain council's decision to the community.

The chamber commends the work of city staff in their review of the development charges by-law, and supports the recommendations put forth for limited changes to the existing development charges rates and we urge you to follow their recommendations. Given the research that has been conducted, it is evident that development charges are a necessary investment for the future of our community.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Debbi Nicholson." The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Debbi M. Nicholson  
PRESIDENT & CEO

cc Ed Archer, CAO, City of Greater Sudbury  
Kris Longston, Manager of Community and Strategic Planning, City of Greater Sudbury

## Appendix B-5

**Apryl Lukezic - Fwd: Developmental Charges Comments**

---

**From:** Lisa Locken  
**To:** Lukezic, Apryl  
**Date:** 5/23/2019 3:13 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Developmental Charges Comments

---

>>> Liz Collin 5/23/2019 1:20 PM >>>

Hi Lisa,

I received a call from City resident Gloria Monkhouse today (approx 1:15 p.m.) who would like her comments included in the public meeting. She stated the fees are too high and it discourages developers to build. She did not leave a call back number nor her address.

Liz Collin  
Records Processing Clerk  
Building Services  
City of Greater Sudbury  
[705-674-4455 ext 4296](tel:705-674-4455)  
Fax [705-675-1075](tel:705-675-1075)  
[liz.collin@greatersudbury.ca](mailto:liz.collin@greatersudbury.ca)

---

**Appendix C - 2019 Development Charges By-Law Policy Decisions**  
(from March 26, 2019 DC Report)

**9. 2019 Development Charges By-Law Policy Decisions**

The following are options for Council consideration for the amended by-law and reflect comparisons with other municipalities and Council reports during the past five years and input from the DC Working Group and the general public.

**9.1 DC Exempt Areas**

There are currently nine (9) geographic areas in the City that are exempt from DCs. These areas correspond to Downtown, Town Centre and/or Mixed Use Commercial designations in the City's Official Plan and represent the historic commercial areas of the former City of Sudbury and the former municipalities. The rationale for exempting these areas is to stimulate commercial and residential intensification in these strategic core areas. The areas that are exempt in the current DC by-law are:

- Downtown Sudbury
- Capreol Town Centre
- Chelmsford Town Centre
- Dowling Town Centre
- Garson Town Centre
- Hanmer Mixed Use Commercial Area
- Val Caron Mixed Use Commercial Area
- Walden Town Centre
- Flour Mill BIA

There is the opportunity through the DC background study to modify or remove the exempt areas from the by-law. The advantage to removing areas would be to eliminate any loss of DC revenue. The disadvantage to removing areas would be the loss of incentives to intensify fully serviced mixed use areas in the City. At this time, staff recommends that these areas remain the same.

There have been two requests received to date to expand the DC exempt areas, one in Walden and one in downtown Sudbury. The effect of these requests would be to exempt proposed multi-residential buildings from DCs. The areas lie outside of the Town Centre designation in Walden and outside of the Downtown designation in Sudbury and to allow the requests would be inconsistent with the rationale for why the exemption areas were originally established. Staff does not recommend that these areas be expanded.

## **Appendix C - 2019 Development Charges By-Law Policy Decisions** (from March 26, 2019 DC Report)

### **9.2 Affordable Housing**

As part of developing the existing DC by-law in 2014, a clause was added that exempted affordable housing units from development charges, provided that the units remained affordable in perpetuity.

Through the creation of an affordable housing strategy per Council's Corporate Strategic Plan, Community Services Committee passed resolution CS2017-17 which directed staff to investigate changes to the Development Charges By-law to ensure that affordable housing criteria align with any Federal or Provincial Funding programs as part of the scheduled review in 2018-2019.

In July 2018, Council adopted the Affordable Housing Community Improvement Plan, which provides a framework and the ability for Council to provide financial incentives for the creation of affordable housing. The Affordable Housing CIP includes the ability to stack any Federal and/or Provincial incentives with Municipal Incentives, as a result the development charges by-law should permit the flexibility to align the requirements for DC exemptions with the Affordable Housing CIP. Therefore, staff recommends that DC by-law be revised to provide exemptions for affordable housing units subject to the proponents entering into an Affordable Housing Agreement with the City. This agreement would stipulate the terms and conditions for maintaining the affordability of the units.

### **9.3 Secondary Units (including Garden Suites)**

In 2016, the City passed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments to permit a second unit in all single, semi detached and street townhouses subject to applicable zoning regulations. The amendments also permitted the second unit to be located in an accessory structure. Part of resolution PL2016-114 directed staff to bring forward a report on second units and development charges.

The issue with respect to DCs and second units is that there is a discrepancy between certain types of second units and the application of DCs. Essentially, there are three types of second units; 1) those that are created within an existing dwelling, 2) those that are created when a new home is built and 3) those that are created in an accessory building. The Development Charges Act provides statutory exemptions for second units created within an existing dwelling, provided that the gross floor area of the additional dwelling is less than or equal to the gross floor area of

## **Appendix C - 2019 Development Charges By-Law Policy Decisions**

(from March 26, 2019 DC Report)

the dwelling unit already in the building. Currently there are no exemptions for second units in new builds or in accessory buildings, even though the impact on service levels is no different than second units in existing buildings.

The purpose of allowing second units within the City was to facilitate residential intensification and increase the diversity of affordable housing options. Now that the zoning framework is in place, staff recommend that the DC by-law be revised to exempt all second units from DCs in order to facilitate their creation.

### **9.4 Hospice and Non-Profit Long Term Care Homes**

A hospice would be defined as “a facility providing end of life care for persons who are terminally ill and may include provision of palliative care”. A hospice would be exempt from DCs if it is exempt from property taxation determined in accordance with the Assessment Act (Section 23.1 of the Ontario Regulation 282/98 made under the Assessment Act).

Non-Profit Long Term Care Homes would be exempt from DCs if regulated under the Long Term Care Homes Act and exempt from property taxes in accordance with the Municipal Act (Section 3 Subsection 7.2).

### **9.5 Temporary Buildings**

The existing DC by-law has an exemption for temporary buildings which have been constructed and demolished within a continuous period not exceeding eight months. The DCs would be payable when the temporary building is not demolished within the eight month period.

Staff is recommending a change in the by-law that DCs would be payable at the building permit stage which is consistent in process for all other types of buildings. If the landowner demolishes the building, they would receive a refund of DCs paid when the Chief Building Official is satisfied that the building has been demolished in accordance with the demolition permit that would be on or before eight months from the issuance date of the building permit.

**Appendix C - 2019 Development Charges By-Law Policy Decisions**  
(from March 26, 2019 DC Report)

**9.6 Residential DC Deferral Program (up to 6 months)**

City Council approved a deferred development charges program for residential development in late 2015. This program is available where a building permit is issued for single detached dwellings, a semi detached dwelling, and multi-residential building which has not more than four units. This largely parallels the division in the City's Site Plan Control Areas By-law (By-Law 2010-220) between developments which require a site plan agreement and those that do not. The DCs are to be paid on the date which is the earliest of: a) six months from date of issuance of building permit; b) the issuance of the occupancy permit; or c) the sale or transfer of the property.

This deferral program does result in additional costs for the applicants to pay for the Restriction on Transfer to be registered on title of the property to ensure that the City collects the development charges if the property is sold or transferred before the 6 month period.

The Restriction on Transfer is one of the requirements along with other eligibility criteria in order to minimize risk of loss to the City before issuance of the building permit. Also, if the restriction requirement is removed, it would result in additional administrative staff time and costs to collect outstanding DC's and collection would not be guaranteed.

Since its implementation, a total of three applications have been received and approved for a total of five residential properties. Therefore, staff recommends that this deferral program be eliminated due to the low usage of this deferral program over the past three years.

**9.7 Greenhouses and Buildings Relating to Cannabis Production**

Further to the reports presented to City Council on "Municipal Implementation of Cannabis Act" in late 2018 and early 2019, recreational cannabis was legalized on October 17, 2018 by the federal government. The federal Cannabis Act provides the regulatory framework to legalize, regulate, and restrict access to cannabis. The provincial government passed legislation to regulate usage, licensing, retail sales and distribution of cannabis and cannabis related products in Ontario. As a result, there may be an increase in building permit applications relating to cannabis production. Greenhouses or any type of buildings relating to cannabis are not exempt from DCs as it does not meet the definition of farming. One of the requirements for a building to be considered a farm building is to be located on land designated for farming and must have a farm registration number.

## **Appendix C - 2019 Development Charges By-Law Policy Decisions**

(from March 26, 2019 DC Report)

This item has been included in this report for clarification purposes with the recent legalization of cannabis in late 2018. Staff recommends that buildings relating to cannabis production do not meet the definition of a farm building in accordance with the Building Code Act and would not be exempt from development charges.

### **9.8 Annual Indexing Date and Effective Date**

Existing by-law annual indexing date is July 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. Staff recommends the annual indexing rate to continue to be July 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. The index used is the most recent 12-month change in the Non-Residential Building Cost Price Index (NRBCPI) as released by Statistics Canada for the Ottawa region.

### **9.9 Payment of DCs**

The City's by-law continues to require payment of the Development Charge before the issuance of the building permit. There is no recommendation for deferral or payment plan based on review of other cities as most require development charges to be paid before the building permit is issued and in accordance with the DC Act.



## Appendix D - Proposed 2019 Development Charges By-Law

### By-law 2019-\*

#### A By-law of the City of Greater Sudbury With Respect to Development Charges

**Whereas** section 2(1) of the *Development Charges Act, 1997* (hereinafter called “the Act”) enables Council of a municipality to pass by-laws for the imposition of development charges against land within the municipality for increased capital costs required because of the need for municipal services arising from development in the area to which the by-law applies;

**And Whereas** Council of the City of Greater Sudbury, at its meeting of \*\*\* approved a report dated \*\*\* titled Development Charges Background Study, City of Greater Sudbury, prepared by Hemson Consulting Ltd. in accordance with the directive of Council;

**And Whereas** Council has given Notice in accordance with Section 12 of the Act of its development charges proposal and held a public meeting on \*\*\* ;

**And Whereas** Council has heard all persons who applied to be heard in objection to, or in support of, the development charges proposal at such public meeting, and provided for written communications to be made;

**And Whereas** Council has given said communications due consideration, has made any necessary revisions to the City of Greater Sudbury Development Charges Background Study as a result of those communications, and has determined that no further public meetings are required in respect of the background study;

**And Whereas** Council in approving the said report directed that development charges be imposed on land under development or redevelopment within the geographical limits of the City as hereinafter provided;

**Now therefore Council of the City of Greater Sudbury hereby enacts as follows:**

#### Definitions

1. In this By-Law:

“Act” means the *Development Charges Act, 1997*, S.O. 1997, c.27, and regulations thereunder, as amended or replaced from time to time;

“Accessory” means a use, separate Building or Structure, which is usually incidental, subordinate, exclusively devoted to and located on the same lot as the principal use, Building or

Structure and, in the case of a Building or Structure, may or may not be attached to the main building on the same lot;

“Affordable Housing Project” means a housing project which targets low income households by providing affordable rent levels, provided:

- (a) the initial and on-going annual affordable project rents, have been set and/or approved by the City’s Housing Services department, where affordable rent must be demonstrated by showing the initial rent setting is consistent with any one of the following:
  - (i) the definition of affordable rental as provided in the Provincial Policy Statement; OR
  - (ii) 80% of the Average Market Rent as determined by CMHC in its latest survey of the local market; or
  - (iii) rent levels set in accordance with an affordable housing program recognized by the City’s Housing Services department, such as the Canada / Ontario Affordable Housing Program; and
- (b) occupant maximum income by unit type has been set and/or approved by the City’s Housing Services department; and
- (c) a housing agreement between the City and the property Owner has been entered into to ensure that the affordability terms established by the City remain in effect for the term of the agreement and providing that in exchange for the Development Charge exemption, the City will specify rental rates and occupant income by unit type for the term of the agreement and providing for penalties and remedies on default;

“Benefitting Area” means an area defined by a map, plan or legal description in a Front-Ending Agreement as an area that will receive a benefit from the construction of one or more Services;

“Board of Education” means a board as defined in the *Education Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.2, as amended or replaced from time to time;

“Building or Structure” means a structure occupying an area greater than 10 square metres consisting of a wall, roof and floor or any of them or a structural system serving the function thereof, but does not include a Farm Building, or include an exterior storage tank;

“Building Code Act” means the *Building Code Act 1992*, S.O. 1992, c.23, as amended or replaced from time to time and includes regulations thereunder;

“Business Improvement Area” means a geographic area in the City governed by a board of management to provide certain business promotion and improvement functions within that area;

“Capital Cost” means costs incurred or proposed to be incurred by the City or a Local Board directly or by others on behalf of, and as authorized by, the City or a Local Board:

- (a) to acquire land or an interest in land including a leasehold interest;
- (b) to improve land;
- (c) to acquire, lease, construct or improve buildings and structures provided that only the capital component of costs to lease anything or to acquire a leasehold interest is included;
- (d) to acquire, lease, construct or improve facilities including,
  - (i) rolling stock with an estimated future life of seven years or more;
  - (ii) furniture and equipment, other than computer equipment, and
  - (iii) materials acquired for circulation, reference or information purposes by a library board as defined in the *Public Libraries Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.44;
- (e) to undertake studies in connection with any matter under the Act and any of the matters in clauses (a) to (d);
- (f) for the development charge background study under s.10 of the Act; or
- (g) for interest on money borrowed to pay for costs in (a) to (d);

“Chief Building Official” means the person appointed as the City’s Chief Building Official pursuant to the *Building Code Act*, and includes his or her authorized designate;

“City” means the municipal corporation of the City of Greater Sudbury or the geographic area, as the context requires;

“Council” means the Council of the City of Greater Sudbury;

“Designated Exempt Area” includes each area shown in Schedules E-1 to E-9 of this By-law and includes any Business Improvement Area approved by Council after the effective date of this By-law;

“Development” means the construction, erection or placing of one or more Buildings or Structures on land or the making of an addition or alteration to a Building or Structure that has the effect of increasing the size or usability thereof, and includes Redevelopment;

“Development Charge” means a charge imposed against land in the City under this By-Law;

“Dwelling Unit” means any part of a Residential or Mixed-Use Building or Structure with one or more habitable rooms designed or intended to be used as a domestic establishment in which one or more persons may sleep and in which sanitary facilities and a separate kitchen are provided for the exclusive use of such person or persons;

“Farm Building” means all or any part of a building:

- (a) that does not contain a Dwelling Unit; and
- (b) is accessory to an “agricultural use” as that term is used in the Zoning By-law and for which the owner of the land maintains at all times an active Farm Business Registration Number and provides evidence of same to the Treasurer upon request from time to time;

“Front-End Payment” means a payment made by an Owner pursuant to a Front-Ending Agreement to cover the net Capital Costs of the Services designated in the agreement that are required to enable the land to be developed;

“Front-Ending Agreement” means an agreement made under Section 44 of the Act between the City and any or all Owners within a Benefitting Area providing for Front-End Payments by an Owner or Owners or for the installation of Services by an Owner or Owners or any combination thereof;

“Garden Suite” means a one-unit detached residential structure, containing bathroom and kitchen facilities that is ancillary to an existing residential structure and that is designed to be portable;

“Gross Floor Area” means the total floor area, measured between the outside of exterior walls or between the outside of exterior walls and the centre line of party walls dividing the building from another building, of all floors above the average level of finished ground adjoining the building at its exterior walls;

“Growth Related Net Capital Cost” means the portion of the net capital cost of Services that is reasonably attributable to the need for such net capital cost that results or will result from Development in all or a defined part of the City;

“Hospice” is a facility providing end of life care for persons who are terminally ill and may include provision of palliative care;

“Industrial” means lands, Buildings or Structures used or designed or intended for use for or in connection with:

- (a) manufacturing, producing, processing, storing or distributing something;
- (b) research or development in connection with manufacturing, producing or processing something;
- (c) retail sales by a manufacturer, producer or processor of something they manufactured, produced or processed, if the retail sales are at the site where the manufacturing, production or processing takes place; or
- (d) office or administrative purposes, if they are:
  - (i) carried out with respect to manufacturing, producing, processing, storage or distributing of something; and
  - (ii) in or attached to the Building or Structure used for that manufacturing, producing, processing, storage or distribution;

“Local Board” means a school board, municipal service board, transportation commission, public library board, board of health, police services board, planning board, or any other board, commission, committee, board or local authority established or exercising any power or authority under any general or special Act with respect to any of the affairs or purposes, including school purposes of a municipality or of two or more municipalities or parts thereof, but does not include a school district school board or a school authority as those terms are used in the *Education Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.2;

“Local Services” means those services, facilities or things which are under the jurisdiction of the City and are within the boundaries of, abut or are necessary to connect lands to services and an application has been made in respect of the lands under Sections 41, 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, as amended or replaced from time to time;

“Mixed-Use” means lands, Buildings or Structures used, designed or intended to be used for both Residential and Non-Residential Uses;

“Municipal” refers to something owned by the City;

“Multiple Dwelling” means a Residential Building or the Residential portion of a Mixed-Use Building containing one or more Dwelling Units, but does not include a Single Detached Dwelling or a Semi-Detached Dwelling;

“Non-Residential Use” means land, Buildings or Structures or portions thereof used, or designed or intended to be used for a use other than for a Residential Use;

“Non-Industrial Use” means land, Buildings or Structures or portions thereof used, or designed or intended to be used for a use other than for a Residential Use or an Industrial Use;

“Official Plan” means the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and any amendments thereto together with any subsequent related Plan or Plans enacted;

“Owner” means the registered owner of the property and includes the authorized agent in lawful control of the property;

“Planning Act” means the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, as amended and includes regulations thereunder;

“Redevelopment” means the construction, erection or placing of one or more Buildings or Structures on land where all or part of a Building or Structure has previously been demolished on such land, or changing the use of a Building or Structure, or part thereof, from Residential to Non-Residential or from Non-Residential to Residential or from Industrial to Non-Industrial or Non-Industrial to Industrial;

“Residential Use” means the land, Buildings or Structures or portions thereof used, designed or intended to be used as living accommodation for one or more individuals and “Residential” has a similar meaning;

“Secondary Dwelling Unit” has the meaning in the Zoning By-law;

“Semi-Detached Dwelling” means one of a freestanding pair of Dwelling Units attached together horizontally in whole or in part above grade and divided vertically from each other by a common wall extending at least one story above finished grade;

“Service Areas” in the City of Greater Sudbury include:

- (a) “Water Service Area” means, within the City of Greater Sudbury;
  - (i) properties that are connected to the Municipal water services but are not located within 500 feet (152.5 m) of the Municipal wastewater services as they may exist from time to time;

- (ii) properties that abut streets, easements, or rights-of-way upon which Municipal water services have been placed or are placed from time to time but are not located within 500 feet (152.5 m) of the Municipal wastewater services as they may exist from time to time; and
  - (iii) properties that are located within 500 feet (152.5 m) of Municipal water services as they may exist from time to time but are not located within 500 feet (152.5 m) of Municipal wastewater services as they may exist from time to time;
- (b) “Water and Wastewater Service Area” means, within the City of Greater Sudbury:
- (i) properties that are connected to the Municipal wastewater and water services;
  - (ii) properties that abut on streets, easements or rights-of way upon which Municipal wastewater and water service have been placed or are placed from time to time; and
  - (iii) properties that are located within 500 feet (152.5 m) of Municipal wastewater and water services as they may exist from time to time, and
- (c) “Wastewater Service Area” means, within the City of Greater Sudbury:
- (i) properties that are connected to the Municipal wastewater services but are not located within 500 feet (152.5 m) of the Municipal water services as they may exist from time to time;
  - (ii) properties that abut streets, easements, or rights-of-way upon which Municipal wastewater services have been placed or are placed from time to time but are not located within 500 feet (152.5 m) of the Municipal water services as they may exist from time to time; and
  - (iii) properties that are located within 500 feet (152.5 m) of Municipal wastewater services as they may exist from time to time but are not located within 500 feet (152.5 m) of Municipal water services as they may exist from time to time;

“Service Standards” means the prescribed level of services on which the Schedule of Charges in Schedules B-1, B-2, B-3, C, and D are based;

“Services” (or “Service”) means those Services designated in Schedule A to this By-Law or specified in an agreement made under Section 44 of the Act;

“Servicing Agreement” means an agreement between a land Owner and the City relating to the provision of Municipal services to specified lands within the City;

“Single Detached Dwelling” means a separate Building or Structure containing only one Dwelling Unit;

“Temporary Building or Structure” means a Building or Structure constructed or erected or placed on land for a continuous period not exceeding eight months, or an addition or alteration to a Building or Structure that has the effect of increasing the total floor area thereof for a continuous period not exceeding eight months;

“Total Floor Area” means in relation to Non-Residential Building or Structure the sum total of the total areas of all floors in a Building or Structure, whether at, above, or below grade, measured between the exterior faces of the exterior walls of the Building or Structure or from the centre line of a common wall separating two uses, or from the outside edge of a floor where the outside edge of the floor does not meet an exterior or common wall, and includes the floor area of a mezzanine, atrium or air-supported structure, and the space occupied by interior wall partitions, as defined in the Building Code Act; and, where a Building or Structure does not have any walls, the Total Floor Area of the Building or Structure shall be the total of the area of all floors, including the ground floor, that are directly beneath the roof of the Building or Structure;

“Treasurer” means the person appointed by Council to the position of City Treasurer in accordance with the *Municipal Act, 2001*, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended, and includes his or her authorized designate; and

“Zoning By-law” means the Zoning by-law or by-laws passed under Section 34 of the *Planning Act* and in force and effect in the City.

### **Schedule of Development Charges**

2.-(1) Subject to the provisions of this by-law, Development Charges against land shall be calculated and collected in accordance with the rates set out in Schedules B-1, B-2, B-3, C, and D which relate to the Services set out in Schedule A.

(2) The Development Charge with respect to the use of any land, Buildings or Structures shall be calculated as follows:

- (a) in the case of (i) Residential Development, or (ii) the Residential portion of a Mixed-Use Development, based upon the number and type of Dwelling Units and calculated at the applicable rate set out in Schedule B-1 in the case of a Single Detached Dwelling, Schedule B-2 in the case of a Semi-Detached Dwelling and Schedule B-3 in the case of a Multiple Dwelling;



- (b) in the case of (i) Industrial Development or (ii) the Development of the Industrial portion of a Mixed-Use Development, based upon the Total Floor Area of such Development and calculated at the applicable rate set out in Schedule C; and
- (c) in the case of (i) Non-Industrial Development, or (ii) the Non-Industrial portion of a Mixed-Use Development, based upon the Total Floor Area of such Development and calculated at the applicable rate set out in Schedule D.

(3) Council hereby determines that the Development of land, Buildings or Structures for Residential Use, Industrial Use and Non-Industrial Use have required or will require the provision, enlargement, expansion or improvement of the Services referenced in Schedule A.

### **Applicable Lands/ Compliance with Section 6**

3.-(1) Subject to subsections 3(2) and 3(3), this by-law applies to all lands in the City, whether or not the land or use is exempt from taxation under Section 3 of the *Assessment Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c.A.31.

- (2) This by-law applies to all lands in the City subject to the following:
  - (a) pursuant to the Service Area definitions in this by-law, Development Charges for Municipal wastewater services, as identified on Schedules B-1, B-2, B-3, C and D of this by-law, will not be levied against Development of land that will not receive wastewater services from the City at the time of Development; and
  - (b) pursuant to the Service Area definitions in this by-law, Development Charges for Municipal water services, as identified on Schedules B-1, B-2, B-3, C and D of this by-law, will not be levied against Development of land that will not receive water services from the City at the time of Development.
- (3) For the purpose of complying with Section 6 of the Act;
  - (a) the area to which this by-law applies shall be the area described in subsection 3(1) above;
  - (b) the rules developed under paragraph 9 of subsection 5(1) of the Act for determining if a Development Charge is payable in a particular case and for determining the amount of the charge shall be as set forth in sections 2 through 19 of this by-law;
  - (c) the rules for exemptions and partial exemptions shall be as set forth in subsection 3(2) and sections 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9; of this by-law;

- (d) the rules respecting Redevelopment of land shall be as set forth in section 9 of this by-law;
- (e) the rules respecting indexing of Development Charges shall be as set out in section 23 of this by-law; and
- (f) Development Charges imposed by this By-law shall be phased in as detailed in Schedules B-1, B-2, B-3, C and D.

### **Designation of Services**

4.-(1) It is hereby declared by Council that all Development of land within the area to which this by-law applies will increase the need for Services.

(2) Development Charges shall be imposed and reserve funds established or continued for the categories of Services designated on Schedule A of this by-law to pay for the increased Capital Costs required because of increased needs for Services arising from Development.

### **Exemptions and Partial Exemption**

5.-(1) This by-law shall not apply to land that is owned by and used for the purposes of:

- (a) a Board of Education;
- (b) any municipality or Local Board thereof;
- (c) a consent (boundary line adjustment) under Section 53 of the *Planning Act* where no new building lot is created;
- (d) any college created pursuant to the *Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology Act, 2002*, S.O. 2002, c. 8, Sched. F.; or
- (e) a Garden Suite, provided that the Garden Suite is removed within ten years or such longer period as authorized by by-law pursuant to section 39 of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended or replaced.

(2) This by-law shall not apply to:

- (a) land, Buildings or Structures that are owned by a university and used for the university's academic or research purposes;
- (b) land, Buildings or Structures used for the purpose of an Affordable Housing Project, where the exemption from the payment of Development Charges is specifically authorized by resolution of Council.

(3) Where land, Buildings or Structures are owned by a university and used for purposes other than the university's academic or research purposes, a 50% exemption from Development Charges otherwise payable under this by-law shall be applied.

(4) This by-law shall not apply to permitted uses within Designated Exempt Areas.

(5) No Development Charges under section 4 are payable where the Development is:

- (a) a Hospice occupying land for which there is an exemption from taxation determined in accordance with section 23.1 of Ontario Regulation 282/98 made under the *Assessment Act*; or
- (b) a long term care home regulated under the *Long Term Care Homes Act, 2007*, S.O. 2007, c.8, as amended or replaced and exempt from property taxes pursuant to section 3, subsection 7.2 of the *Municipal Act, 2001*.

### **Temporary Building – Refund**

6. Development Charges actually paid with respect to a Temporary Building or Structure may be refunded by the Treasurer to the person who paid the Development Charges upon application in writing and upon evidence satisfactory to the Treasurer that the Building or Structure has been demolished to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official, in accordance with a demolition permit, on or before a date which is 8 months after the date on which the building permit for that Temporary Building or Structure was issued.

### **Rules With Respect to Exemptions for Intensification of Existing Housing**

7.-(1) This by-law shall not apply to that category of exempt Development described in subsection 2(3) of the Act, and Section 2 of O. Reg. 82/98, namely:

- (a) the enlargement of an existing Dwelling Unit;
- (b) the creation of one or two additional Dwelling Units in an existing Single Detached Dwelling where the total Residential Gross Floor Area of the Dwelling Unit or Units created does not exceed the Residential Gross Floor Area of the Dwelling Unit already in the Building; or
- (c) the creation of one additional Dwelling Unit in an existing Semi-Detached Dwelling where the total Residential Gross Floor Area of the additional Dwelling Unit created does not exceed the Residential Gross Floor Area of the Dwelling Unit already in the Building; or
- (d) the creation of one additional Dwelling Unit in any other existing Residential building other than a Single Detached Dwelling or a Semi-Detached Dwelling

provided the Residential Gross Floor Area of the additional Dwelling Unit does not exceed the Residential Gross Floor Area of the smallest existing Dwelling Unit already in the building

(2) Notwithstanding subsection 7(1)(b), Development Charges shall be calculated and collected in accordance with Schedule B-1 where the total Residential Gross Floor Area of the additional one or two Dwelling Units is greater than the Gross Floor Area of the existing Dwelling Unit in the Single Detached Dwelling.

(3) Notwithstanding subsection 7(1)(c), Development Charges shall be calculated and collected in accordance with Schedule B-2 where the additional Dwelling Unit in the Semi-Detached Dwelling has a Residential Gross Floor Area greater than the Gross Floor Area of the Dwelling Unit already in the Semi-Detached Dwelling.

(4) Notwithstanding subsection 7(1)(d), Development Charges shall be calculated and collected in accordance with Schedule B-3 where the additional Dwelling Unit in the Residential building other than a Single Detached Dwelling or a Semi-Detached Dwelling has a Residential Gross Floor Area greater than the Gross Floor Area of the smallest Dwelling Unit already in that Residential building.

#### **Additional Rules With Respect to Exemptions for Residential Intensification**

8. This by-law shall not apply to the creation of a Secondary Dwelling Unit in accordance with the Zoning By-law.

#### **Rules With Respect to an Industrial Expansion Exemption**

9.-(1) For the purposes of calculating Development Charges pursuant to section 2, if a Development includes the enlargement of the Gross Floor Area of an existing Industrial building, the amount of the Development Charge that is payable is the following:

- (a) if the Gross Floor Area is enlarged by 50 per cent or less, the amount of the Development Charge in respect of the enlargement is zero; or
- (b) if the Gross Floor Area is enlarged by more than 50 per cent, Development Charges are payable on the amount by which the enlargement exceeds 50 per cent of the Gross Floor Area before the enlargement.

(2) In this section, for greater certainty in applying the exemption herein:

- (a) the Gross Floor Area of an existing Industrial building is enlarged where there is a bona fide physical and functional increase in the size of the existing Industrial building;
- (b) for the purpose of determining any enlargement, the existing Industrial building will be its Gross Floor Area as of the effective date of this by-law (in this section “Original Gross Floor Area”);
- (c) the maximum exemption permitted during the term of this by-law will be 50% of the Original Gross Floor Area irrespective of the number of enlargements or expansion of the Gross Floor Area that take place over the course of the term of this by-law so that any enlargement beyond 50% of the Original Gross Floor Area during the term of this By-Law will be subject to the Development Charge herein.
- (d) an expansion must be attached to and a bona fide extension of the existing building, and “attached” shall not mean or include a tunnel, bridge, passageway, shared below grade connection (whether by footing, foundation, passageway, or otherwise), breezeway, shared roof connection or shared parking facility.

#### **Rules With Respect to the Redevelopment of Land**

**10.-(1)** Where, as a result of the Redevelopment of land, a Building or Structure has been demolished, in whole or in part, or converted from one principal use to another principal use on the same land, in order to facilitate the Redevelopment, the Development Charges otherwise payable with respect to such Redevelopment shall be reduced by the following amounts:

- (a) in the case of a Residential Building or Structure or the Residential portion of a Mixed-Use Building or Structure, an amount calculated by multiplying the applicable Development Charge under section 2 of this by-law by the number, according to type of Dwelling Unit that have been demolished or converted to another principal use;
- (b) In the case of an Industrial Building or Structure or the Industrial portion of a Mixed-Use Building or Structure, an amount calculated by multiplying the applicable Development Charge under section 2 of this by-law by the Industrial Gross Floor Area that has been demolished or converted to another principal use; and
- (c) in the case of a Non-Industrial Building or Structure or the Non-Industrial portion of a Mixed-Use Building or Structure, an amount calculated by multiplying the applicable Development Charges under section 2 of this by-law by the Non-

Industrial Gross Floor Area that has been demolished or converted to another principal use.

(2) The amounts of any reduction under subsection 10(1) shall not exceed in total, the amount of the Development Charges otherwise payable with respect to the Redevelopment.

(3) Despite subsection 10(1), no reduction in the Development Charges otherwise payable shall be granted in the case of the demolition of all or part of a Building or Structure unless the demolition for which the reduction is sought occurred no more than five (5) years prior to the issuance of the building permit for the Redevelopment, and a demolition permit issued to authorize the demolition.

(4) Where as part of a Redevelopment a building permit is issued for a new Building or Structure (the "New Building") to be erected on a site and the New Building is constructed prior to the demolition of an existing Building or Structure on the same site and provided that the existing Building or Structure is demolished pursuant to a demolition permit within five (5) years from the issuance of the building permit for that New Building, the Owner may apply to the Chief Building Official in writing for a refund (excluding interest) of all or part of the Development Charges actually paid on the issuance of the building permit for the New Building. The amount of the refund shall be calculated at the rates paid for the Development Charges on the issuance of the building permit for the New Building, for the number and type of Residential Dwelling Units demolished or the Total Floor Area of the Non-Residential portion of the Building or Structure or part thereof demolished.

(5) The reduction of Development Charges otherwise authorized under subsection 10(1) shall relate only to the land, including any parcel subject to the same site plan approval for the proposed development, upon which the Building or Structure which was demolished or converted was situate and is not transferable to another parcel of land.

(6) Any reduction in the Development Charges otherwise payable, authorized under subsection 10(1) and any refund authorized under subsection 10(4) shall apply only where the use of the Building or Structure that has been demolished or converted to another use has been legally established pursuant to the City's Zoning By-law and all building statutes and regulations related to the construction of buildings.

(7) For the purposes of this section, Dwelling Units or Gross Floor Area accidentally destroyed by fire shall be deemed to have been demolished under a demolition permit issued on the date of the fire. No refund shall be paid or reduction applied to Development Charges

otherwise payable unless the Owner has obtained a Demolition Permit for the Dwelling Units or Gross Floor accidentally destroyed by fire.

### **Onus**

11. The onus is on the Owner to produce evidence to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official which establishes that the Owner is entitled to any exemption from, or reduction of, or credit against or any refund of Development Charges otherwise payable under this By-law.

### **Approval for Development**

12.-(1) Subject to subsection 12(2), Development Charges shall apply to, and shall be calculated and collected in accordance with the provisions of this by-law on land to be developed where, the Development requires any one or more of the following:

- (a) the passing of a zoning by-law or an amendment thereto under Section 34 of the *Planning Act*;
- (b) the approval of a minor variance under Section 45 of the *Planning Act*;
- (c) a conveyance of land to which a by-law passed under subsection 50(7) of the *Planning Act* applies;
- (d) the approval of a plan of subdivision under Section 51 of the *Planning Act*;
- (e) a consent under Section 53 of the *Planning Act*;
- (f) the approval of a description under Section 50 of the *Condominium Act*, 1998, S.O. 1998 c. 19; or
- (g) the issuing of a permit under the *Building Code Act* in relation to a Building or Structure.

(2) Subsection 12(1) shall not apply in respect of:

- (a) Local Services installed or paid for by the Owner within a plan of subdivision as a condition of approval under Section 51 of the *Planning Act*;
- (b) Local Services installed or paid for by the Owner within the area to which the Development relates; or
- (c) Local Services installed at the expense of the Owner as a condition of approval under Section 53 of the *Planning Act*.

### **Local Service Installation**

13. Nothing in this by-law prevents Council from requiring as a condition of any approval or agreement for Development under the *Planning Act*, including sections 41, 51 or 53 of the

*Planning Act*, that the Owner, at his or her own expense, shall install such Local Services within the area to which the Development relates, or that the Owner pay for local connections to water mains, wastewaters and/or storm drainage facilities, as Council may require.

### **Multiple Charges**

14.(1) Where two or more of the actions described in subsection 12(1) of this by-law are required before land to which a Development Charge applies can be developed, only one Development Charge shall be calculated and collected in accordance with the provisions of this by-law.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection 14(1), if two or more of the actions described in subsection 12(1) occur at different times, and if the subsequent action has the effect of increasing the need for Municipal Services as designated in Schedule A, an additional Development Charge on the additional Residential Dwelling Units and/or the additional Gross Floor Area for Industrial and Non-Industrial uses shall be calculated and collected in accordance with the provisions of this by-law.

### **Credit for Services**

15. Despite subsection 2(1) and section 17, Council may by agreement, give a credit towards a Development Charge in exchange for work that relates to Services for which a Development Charge is imposed under this By-law, in accordance with sections 38, 39, 40 and 41 of the Act. No such credit shall exceed the total Development Charges otherwise payable.

### **Front-Ending Agreements**

16. The City may enter into agreements under Section 44 of the Act as it sees fit.

### **Timing of Calculation and Payment / Section 27 Agreements**

17.-(1) Development Charges shall be calculated and payable in full in cash, certified cheque, bank draft or by provision of Services as may be agreed upon, or by credit granted by the Act, on the date that the first building permit is issued in relation to a Building or Structure on land to which a Development Charge applies.

(2) Where Development Charges apply to land in relation to which a building permit is required, the building permit shall not be issued until the Development Charges have been paid in full except as otherwise specifically provided to the contrary herein.



(3) If a Development does not require a building permit but does require one or more of the approvals described in section 12, then the Development Charge shall nonetheless be payable in respect of any increased or additional Development permitted by such approval required for the increased or additional Development being granted.

(4) Notwithstanding subsection 17(1) upon request of the Treasurer, Council may, in its sole discretion, authorize an agreement with the Owner in accordance with Section 27 of the Act to permit on such terms as Council may require, the payment of the Development Charge before or after it is otherwise payable. Without limiting the generality of the forgoing, Council may require the Owner to pay interest from the date of issuance of the building permit until payment in full of the Development Charges and to provide security for the Owner's obligations under the agreement. Where an agreement has been entered into, then despite subsection 16(2), the building permit may issue before payment of the applicable Development Charges.

#### **Changes to Building Design – Residential**

**18.** Where a Development Charge has been paid in respect of a Residential Building or Structure, and the Development is subsequently revised within the same building envelope but with a different distribution of unit types such that a revised building permit prior to completion and new calculation of Development Charges payable is required, the calculation of the amount of Development Charges payable will be made in respect of such revised building permit as follows:

- (a) Where there is an increase in the number of any type of Dwelling Unit, the Development Charges payable will be calculated by multiplying the number of such Dwelling Units so increased by the Development Charge rate then in effect according to the type of Dwelling Unit; and
- (b) Where there is a decrease in the number of any type of Dwelling Unit, the Development Charges payable will be reduced by multiplying the number of such Dwelling Units so reduced by the Development Charges rate that was in effect and collected for such unit type upon the issuance of the initial building permit for the Development.

#### **Changes to Building Design – Non-Residential**

**19.** Where a Development Charge has been paid in respect of a Non-Residential Building or Structures, and the Development is subsequently revised within the same building envelope but such that a revised building permit prior to completion and new calculation of Development

Charges payable is required, the calculation of the amount of Development Charges payable will be made in respect of such revised building permit as follows:

- (a) Where there is an increase in the amount of Non-Residential Total Floor Area, the Development Charges payable will be calculated by multiplying the amount of Total Floor Area so increased by the Development Charge rate then in effect; and
- (b) Where there is a decrease in the amount of Non-Residential Total Floor Area, the Development Charges payable will be reduced by multiplying the amount of Total Floor Area so reduced by the Development Charge rate that was in effect and collected upon issuance of the initial building permit for the Development;

provided that in no case shall any refund be provided in an amount greater than the amount of Development Charges paid upon issuance of such initial Building Permit

#### **By-law Registration**

**20.** A certified copy of this by-law may be registered in the By-law Register in the Land Registry Office (No. 53).

#### **Reserve Fund(s)**

**21.** The City of Greater Sudbury shall establish Reserve Funds as follows:

- (a) Monies received from payment of Development Charges shall be maintained in separate reserve funds for each service as detailed in Schedule A to this by-law. Funds shall be used only in accordance with the provisions of Section 35 of the Act.
- (b) The Treasurer shall, in each year, furnish to Council a statement in respect of the reserve funds established hereunder for the prior year, containing the information set out in Sections 12 and 13 of O. Reg. 82/98.
- (c) Borrowing from the reserve funds, or from one designated Municipal service fund to another, for Municipal financial purposes will be permitted as authorized from time to time by resolution or by-law of Council provided interest is paid in accordance with the Act and the regulations thereto, and in particular section 36.
- (d) Refunds may be made from the applicable reserve funds in accordance with this by-law.

## **Refunds**

**22.**-(1) Where this by-law or any Development Charge prescribed thereunder is amended or repealed either by order of the Ontario Municipal Board or by Council, the Treasurer shall calculate forthwith the amount of any overpayment to be refunded as a result of said amendment or repeal.

(2) Any refund of Development Charges shall be paid to the person who is the registered Owner of the land, Building or Structure on the date on which the refund is paid.

(3) Refunds that are required to be paid under subsection 22(1) or section 26 shall be paid with interest to be calculated as follows:

- (a) interest shall be calculated from the date on which the overpayment was collected to the date on which the refund is paid;
- (b) the refund shall include the interest owed under this section; and
- (c) interest shall be paid at the Bank of Canada (overnight lending) rate in effect on the date of enactment of this By-Law.

(4) Interest shall not be payable on any refund other than a refund required to be paid under subsection 22(1) or section 26.

(5) Where a building permit is lawfully revoked by the Chief Building Official the Owner may apply in writing to the Chief Building Official for a refund of the Development Charges actually paid pursuant to the said building permit.

(6) In the event that a building permit is lawfully revoked by the Chief Building Official a subsequent application submitted for a building permit for a Building or Structure on the same land will be subject to the Development Charge rate in effect as of the date the building permit issues under the subsequent application.

## **Development Charge Schedule Indexing**

**23.** The Development Charges referred to in Schedules B-1, B-2, B-3, C, and D shall be adjusted annually, without amendment to this By-Law, commencing on July 1st, 2020, and annually thereafter on July 1<sup>st</sup> in each year while this By-Law is in force, in accordance with the most recent twelve-month change reflected in the Statistics Canada Quarterly, Building Construction Price Indexes, non-residential (Ottawa-Gatineau) and the Treasurer shall advise Council of such adjustments.

## **By-law Administration**

**24.** This by-law shall be administered by the Treasurer and the Chief Building Official.

## **Complaints**

**25.-(1)** The Hearing Committee is appointed pursuant to Section 23.1 of the *Municipal Act, 2001* to act in the place and stead of Council to deal with complaints under Section 20 of the Act.

(2) A person required to pay a Development Charge or the person's agent may complain to the Hearing Committee that:

- (a) the amount of the Development Charge was incorrectly determined; or
- (b) whether a credit is available to be used against the Development Charge or the amount of the credit or the Service with respect to which the credit was given, was incorrectly determined; or
- (c) there was an error in the application of this by-law.

(3) A complaint may not be made under subsection 25(2) above later than 90 days after the day that the Development Charge or any part of it is payable.

(4) The complaint must be in writing and must set the complainant's name, the address where notices can be given to the complainant and the reasons for the complaint.

(5) Where the City Solicitor in consultation with the Treasurer and Chief Building Official determines that a request for a hearing as filed does not comply with the requirements of subsection 25(2) or 25(3) above or with the Act, the Clerk shall forthwith notify the complainant in writing that no hearing will be scheduled and specify the deficiency.

(6) The City Clerk shall fix a day and time for a hearing before the Hearing Committee and mail a notice of the hearing to the complainant at least 14 days before the hearing date.

(7) The Hearing Committee shall hold a hearing into a complaint made under subsection 25(2) and 25(3) above and shall give the complainant an opportunity to make representations at the hearing.

(8) After hearing the evidence and submissions of the complainant, the Hearing Committee shall as soon as practicable, make a recommendation to Council on the merits of the complaint and Council may dismiss the complaint or rectify any incorrect determination or error that was properly the subject of the complaint.

## **Request for Review**

26. Nothing herein prevents a person, prior to filing a complaint under subsection 25(1) of this By-law from making a request in writing to the Chief Building Official to review the calculation of the Development Charge for a reason under subsection 25(2). No such request shall be deemed to constitute a complaint to the Hearing Committee or relieve the person from complying with the process in section 25 should the person wish to file a complaint.

## **Conflict**

27. Where a conflict exists between the provisions of this by-law and any agreement between the City and the Owner entered into pursuant to this by-law the provisions of such agreement shall prevail to the extent of the conflict.

## **Application of the Act**

28. Any matter not otherwise provided for in this by-law shall be subject to the provisions of the Act.

## **Interpretation**

29.-(1) Whenever this by-law refers to a person or thing with reference to gender or the gender neutral, the intention is to read the by-law with the gender applicable to the circumstances.

(2) References to items in the plural include the singular, as applicable.

(3) The words "include", "including" and "includes" are not to be read as limiting the phrases or descriptions that precede them.

(4) Headings are inserted for ease of reference only and are not to be used as interpretation aids.

(5) Specific references to laws in this by-law are printed in italic font and are meant to refer to the current laws applicable with the Province of Ontario as at the time the by-law was enacted, as they are amended from time to time and include regulations thereunder.

(6) Any reference to periods of time, stated in numbers of days, shall be deemed applicable on the first business day after a Sunday or Statutory holiday if the expiration of the time period occurs on a Sunday or Statutory holiday.

(7) The obligations imposed by this by-law are in addition to obligations otherwise imposed by law or contract.

(8) Words which are not defined for the purposes of this by-law shall be read in their ordinary, everyday meanings.

(9) References to a whole include references to a part of the whole, whether or not so specified.

### **Severability**

**30.-(1)** If any section, subsection, part or parts of this by-law is declared by any court of law to be bad, illegal or ultra vires, such section, subsection, part or parts shall be deemed to be severable and all parts hereof are declared to be separate and independent and enacted as such.

(2) Nothing in this by-law relieves any person from complying with any provision of any Federal or Provincial legislation or any other by-law of the City.

### **Schedules to the By-law**

**31.** The following schedules are attached to and form an integral part of this by-Law:

Schedule A	Schedule of Municipal Services
Schedule B -1	Schedule of Residential Development Charges – Single Detached Dwelling
Schedule B-2	Schedule of Residential Development Charge – Semi-Detached Dwelling
Schedule B-3	Schedule of Residential Development Charges – Multiple Dwelling
Schedule C	Schedule of Industrial Development Charges
Schedule D	Schedule of Non-Industrial Development Charges
Schedules E-1 to E-9	Designated Exempt Areas

### **Existing Development Charge By-law Repeal**

**32.-(1)** By-Law 2014-151 and all by-laws amending the said By-law 2014-151 are repealed upon the coming into force of this by-law.

(2) The repeal of the by-law does not affect the previous operation of any by-law so repealed; or affect any right, privilege, obligation or liability acquired, accrued, accruing, or incurred under the by-law so repealed.

**Date By-law Effective and Expiry**

33.-(1) This by-law shall come into force and effect on the 1st day of July, 2019.

(2) This by-law shall continue in force and effect for a term expiring June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2024, unless it is extended by statute, regulation or by-law, or repealed at an earlier date.

**Short Title**

34. This By-Law shall be cited as the “Development Charges By-Law 2019”.

**Read and Passed in Open Council** this **\*\*\* day of \*\*\*, 2019**

\_\_\_\_\_ Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_ Clerk

DRAFT

**Schedule A**  
to By-law 2019-XXX of the City of Greater Sudbury

**Designated Municipal Services**

1. General Government
2. Library Services
3. Fire Services
4. Police Services
5. Public Safety
6. Parks and Recreation
7. Cemetery Services
8. Ambulance Services
9. Emergency Preparedness
10. Transit Services
11. Roads and Related
12. Water Services
13. Wastewater Services
14. Drains and Stormwater



**Schedule B-1**

**To By-law 2019-**

**RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CHARGES  
PER DWELLING UNIT FOR A SINGLE DETACHED DWELLING**

	<i>calculated</i>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
		<i>July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020</i>	<i>July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021</i>	<i>July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022</i>	<i>July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023</i>	<i>July 1, 2023 - June 30, 2024</i>
<b>Charge per unit</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>
			+CPS	+CPS	+CPS	+CPS
General Government	207	207	207	207	207	207
Library	458	458	458	458	458	458
Fire Services	46	46	46	46	46	46
Police Services	323	323	323	323	323	323
Public Safety	107	107	107	107	107	107
Parks and Recreation	1,665	1,665	1,665	1,665	1,665	1,665
Ambulance Services	107	107	107	107	107	107
Emergency Preparedness	354	354	354	354	354	354
Transit Services	546	546	546	546	546	546
<b>Total General Services</b>	<b>3,813</b>	<b>3,813</b>	<b>3,813</b>	<b>3,813</b>	<b>3,813</b>	<b>3,813</b>
Roads	7,372	7,372	7,372	7,372	7,372	7,372
Water Service	1,003	1,003	1,003	1,003	1,003	1,003
Wastewater Service	4,688	4,688	4,688	4,688	4,688	4,688
Drains	845	845	845	845	845	845
<b>Total Engineered Services</b>	<b>13,908</b>	<b>13,908</b>	<b>13,908</b>	<b>13,908</b>	<b>13,908</b>	<b>13,908</b>
<b>Total Development Charge all services</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>	<b>\$ 17,721</b>
<b>Excluding Water Service</b>	16,718	16,718	16,718	16,718	16,718	16,718
<b>Excluding Wastewater Service</b>	13,033	13,033	13,033	13,033	13,033	13,033
<b>Excluding Water and Wastewater Services</b>	12,030	12,030	12,030	12,030	12,030	12,030

NOTE:

CPS: The Development Charge will be adjusted annually in accordance with the most recent twelve-month change reflected in the Statistics Canada Quarterly, Building Construction Price Indexes, non-residential (Ottawa-Gatineau) in accordance with Section 23 of the By-Law.

**Schedule B-2**

**To By-law 2019-**

**RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CHARGES  
PER DWELLING UNIT FOR A SEMI-DETACHED DWELLING**

<b>Charge per unit</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>	
	<i>calculated</i>	<i>July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020</i>	<i>July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021</i>	<i>July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022</i>	<i>July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023</i>	<i>July 1, 2023 - June 30, 2024</i>
	<b>\$ 14,238</b>	<b>\$ 14,238</b>	<b>\$ 14,238</b>	<b>\$ 14,238</b>	<b>\$ 14,238</b>	<b>\$ 14,238</b>
			<b>+CPS</b>	<b>+CPS</b>	<b>+CPS</b>	<b>+CPS</b>
General Government	167	167	167	167	167	167
Library	368	368	368	368	368	368
Fire Services	37	37	37	37	37	37
Police Services	260	260	260	260	260	260
Public Safety	86	86	86	86	86	86
Parks and Recreation	1,338	1,338	1,338	1,338	1,338	1,338
Ambulance Services	86	86	86	86	86	86
Emergency Preparedness	284	284	284	284	284	284
Transit Services	439	439	439	439	439	439
<b>Total General Services</b>	<b>3,065</b>	<b>3,065</b>	<b>3,065</b>	<b>3,065</b>	<b>3,065</b>	<b>3,065</b>
Roads	5,922	5,922	5,922	5,922	5,922	5,922
Water Service	806	806	806	806	806	806
Wastewater Service	3,766	3,766	3,766	3,766	3,766	3,766
Drains	679	679	679	679	679	679
<b>Total Engineered Services</b>	<b>11,173</b>	<b>11,173</b>	<b>11,173</b>	<b>11,173</b>	<b>11,173</b>	<b>11,173</b>
<b>Total Development Charge all services</b>	<b>\$ 14,238</b>	<b>\$ 14,238</b>	<b>\$ 14,238</b>	<b>\$ 14,238</b>	<b>\$ 14,238</b>	<b>\$ 14,238</b>
<b>Excluding Water Service</b>	13,432	13,432	13,432	13,432	13,432	13,432
<b>Excluding Wastewater Service</b>	10,472	10,472	10,472	10,472	10,472	10,472
<b>Excluding Water and Wastewater Services</b>	9,666	9,666	9,666	9,666	9,666	9,666

**NOTE:**

CPS: The Development Charge will be adjusted annually in accordance with the most recent twelve-month change reflected in the Statistics Canada Quarterly, Building Construction Price Indexes, non-residential (Ottawa-Gatineau) in accordance with Section 23 of the By-Law.

**Schedule B-3**

**To By-law 2019-**

**RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CHARGES  
PER DWELLING UNIT FOR A MULTIPLE DWELLING**

	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>	
<i>Charge per unit</i>	<i>calculated</i> <b>\$ 10,227</b>	<i>July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020</i> <b>\$ 10,227</b>	<i>July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021</i> <b>\$ 10,227</b> <b>+CPS</b>	<i>July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022</i> <b>\$ 10,227</b> <b>+CPS</b>	<i>July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023</i> <b>\$ 10,227</b> <b>+CPS</b>	<i>July 1, 2023 - June 30, 2024</i> <b>\$10,227</b> <b>+CPS</b>
General Government	120	120	120	120	120	120
Library	264	264	264	264	264	264
Fire Services	26	26	26	26	26	26
Police Services	187	187	87	187	187	187
Public Safety	62	62	62	62	62	62
Parks and Recreation	961	961	961	961	961	961
Ambulance Services	62	62	62	62	62	62
Emergency Preparedness	204	204	204	204	204	204
Transit Services	315	315	315	315	315	315
<b>Total General Services</b>	<b>2,201</b>	<b>2,201</b>	<b>2,201</b>	<b>2,201</b>	<b>2,201</b>	<b>2,201</b>
Roads	4,254	4,254	4,254	4,254	4,254	4,254
Water Service	579	579	579	579	579	579
Wastewater Service	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705	2,705
Drains	488	488	488	488	488	488
<b>Total Engineered Services</b>	<b>8,026</b>	<b>8,026</b>	<b>8,026</b>	<b>8,026</b>	<b>8,026</b>	<b>8,026</b>
<b>Total Development Charge all services</b>	<b>\$ 10,227</b>	<b>\$ 10,227</b>	<b>\$ 10,227</b>	<b>\$10,227</b>	<b>\$ 10,227</b>	<b>\$10,227</b>
<b>Excluding Water Service</b>	9,648	9,648	9,648	9,648	9,648	9,648
<b>Excluding Wastewater Service</b>	7,522	7,522	7,522	7,522	7,522	7,522
<b>Excluding Water and Wastewater Services</b>	6,943	6,943	6,943	6,943	6,943	6,943

**NOTE:**

CPS: The Development Charge will be adjusted annually in accordance with the most recent twelve-month change reflected in the Statistics Canada Quarterly, Building Construction Price Indexes, non-residential (Ottawa-Gatineau) in accordance with Section 23 of the By-Law.

## Schedule C

### To By-law 2019-

#### INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CHARGES PER SQUARE FOOT

	<i>calculated</i>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
		<i>July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020</i>	<i>July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021</i>	<i>July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022</i>	<i>July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023</i>	<i>July 1, 2023 - June 30, 2024</i>
<b>Charge per square foot</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>5.92</b>
			+CPS	+CPS	+CPS	+CPS
General Government	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09
Library	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fire Services	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Police Services	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14
Public Safety	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Parks and Recreation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ambulance Services	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Emergency Preparedness	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
Transit Services	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
<b>Total General Services</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.74</b>
Roads	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40
Water Service	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43
Wastewater Service	1.99	1.99	1.99	1.99	1.99	1.99
Drains	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36
<b>Total Engineered Services</b>	<b>5.18</b>	<b>5.18</b>	<b>5.18</b>	<b>5.18</b>	<b>5.18</b>	<b>5.18</b>
<b>Total Development Charge all services</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>5.92</b>
<b>Excluding Water Service</b>	5.49	5.49	5.49	5.49	5.49	5.49
<b>Excluding Wastewater Service</b>	3.93	3.93	3.93	3.93	3.93	3.93
<b>Excluding Water and Wastewater Services</b>	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50

**NOTE:**

CPS: The Development Charge will be adjusted annually in accordance with the most recent twelve-month change reflected in the Statistics Canada Quarterly, Building Construction Price Indexes, non-residential (Ottawa-Gatineau) in accordance with Section 23 of the By-Law.

**Schedule D**

**To By-law 2019-**

**NON-INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CHARGES PER SQUARE FOOT**


	<i>calculated</i>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
		<i>July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2020</i>	<i>July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021</i>	<i>July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022</i>	<i>July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023</i>	<i>July 1, 2023 - June 30, 2024</i>
<b>Charge per square foot</b>	<b>8.89</b>	<b>8.89</b>	<b>8.89</b>	<b>8.89</b>	<b>8.89</b>	<b>8.89</b>
			+CPS	+CPS	+CPS	+CPS
General Government	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09
Library	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fire Services	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Police Services	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14
Public Safety	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Parks and Recreation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ambulance Services	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Emergency Preparedness	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15
Transit Services	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24
<b>Total General Services</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>0.74</b>
Roads	5.37	5.37	5.37	5.37	5.37	5.37
Water Service	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43
Wastewater Service	1.99	1.99	1.99	1.99	1.99	1.99
Drains	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36
<b>Total Engineered Services</b>	<b>8.15</b>	<b>8.15</b>	<b>8.15</b>	<b>8.15</b>	<b>8.15</b>	<b>8.15</b>
<b>Total Development Charge all services</b>	<b>8.89</b>	<b>8.89</b>	<b>8.89</b>	<b>8.89</b>	<b>8.89</b>	<b>8.89</b>
<b>Excluding Water Service</b>	8.46	8.46	8.46	8.46	8.46	8.46
<b>Excluding Wastewater Service</b>	6.90	6.90	6.90	6.90	6.90	6.90
<b>Excluding Water and Wastewater Services</b>	6.47	6.47	6.47	6.47	6.47	6.47

NOTE:

CPS: The Development Charge will be adjusted annually in accordance with the most recent twelve-month change reflected in the Statistics Canada Quarterly, Building Construction Price Indexes, non-residential (Ottawa-Gatineau) in accordance with Section 23 of the By-Law.




Capreol Development Charges Designated Exempt Area






Chelmsford Development Charges Designated Exempt Area






Dowling Development Charges Designated Exempt Area






Garson Development Charges Designated Exempt Area



Headquarters Lake  
Goodwill




Hanmer Development Charges Designated Exempt Area



SCHEDULE "E-6"  
to By-law 2019-XXX  
of the City of Greater Sudbury


**DRAFT**

# Sudbury Development Charges Designated Exempt Area






Val Caron Development Charges Designated Exempt Area



Walden Development Charges Designated Exempt Area





Flour Mill Development Charges Designated Exempt Area

