

The Corporation of the City of Kawartha Lakes
Amended Agenda
Development Charges Task Force Meeting

DC2025-10

Monday, July 14, 2025

Meeting to Commence at 9:00 a.m. - In-Person Only

Weldon Room

City Hall

26 Francis Street, Lindsay, Ontario K9V 5R8

Members:

Councillor Tracy Richardson

Bernard Finney

Sal Polito

Karl Repka

Jeff Solly

Mark Wilson

Accessible formats and communication supports are available upon request. The City of Kawartha Lakes is committed to accessibility for persons with disabilities. Please contact AgendaItems@kawarthalakes.ca if you have an accessible accommodation request.

1.	Call to Order	
2.	Administrative Business	
2.1	Adoption of Agenda	
	That the agenda be adopted as circulated.	
2.2	Declaration of Pecuniary Interest	
2.3	Adoption of Minutes	4 - 7
	That the Minutes of the July 7, 2025 Development Charges Task Force Meeting, be received.	
3.	Deputations/Presentations	
4.	Correspondence	
5.	New or Other Business	
5.1	DC2025-10.5.1	
	Issue Assignment Reports	
5.1.1	Local Service Policy Review - J. Solly	8 - 21
	That the correspondence from J. Solly be received.	
5.1.2	Alignment of Growth Related Capital Costs with DC Revenues Review - J. Solly	22 - 24
	That the correspondence from J. Solly be received.	
5.1.3	Draft DC Finding Issues - J. Solly	25 - 27
	That the correspondence from J. Solly be received.	
*5.1.4	Development Charge Credits for Aggregated and Phased Developments - B. Finney	28 - 32
	That the correspondence from B. Finney, be received.	
*5.1.5	Area DC Ratings - M. Wilson	33 - 33
	That the correspondence from M. Wilson, be received.	

5.2 DC2025-10-5.2

Formulation of Draft Recommendations

6. **Next Meeting**

7. **Adjournment**

That the Development Charges Task Force Meeting adjourn at ____
a.m./p.m.

The Corporation of the City of Kawartha Lakes

Minutes

Development Charges Task Force Meeting

DC2025-009
Monday, July 7, 2025
2:30 P.M.
Weldon Room
City Hall
26 Francis Street, Lindsay, Ontario K9V 5R8

Members:
Councillor Tracy Richardson
Bernard Finney
Sal Polito
Karl Repka
Jeff Solly
Mark Wilson

Accessible formats and communication supports are available upon request. The City of Kawartha Lakes is committed to accessibility for persons with disabilities. Please contact AgendaItems@kawarthalakes.ca if you have an accessible accommodation request.

1. **Call to Order**

Chair Polito called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. Councillor Richardson, B. Finney, and J. Solly were in attendance.

A. Found, L. Peimann, S. Beukeboom and S. Murchison were also in attendance.

Absent: K. Repka and M. Wilson.

2. **Administrative Business**

2.1 Adoption of Agenda

DCTF2025-034

Moved By Councillor Richardson

Seconded By B. Finney

That the agenda be adopted as circulated.

Carried

2.2 Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

There were no declarations of pecuniary interest disclosed.

2.3 Adoption of Minutes

DCTF2025-035

Moved By J. Solly

Seconded By Councillor Richardson

That the minutes of the Development Charges Task Force meeting held on June 23, 2025, be adopted as circulated.

Carried

3. **Deputations/Presentations**

There were no deputations or presentations.

4. **Correspondence**

4.1 DC2025-09.4.1

Development Charge Credits for Aggregated and Phased Developments -
Bernard Finney

DCTF2025-036**Moved By** Councillor Richardson**Seconded By** J. Solly**That** the correspondence from B. Finney, be received; and,**That** this matter be discussed under Item 5.3.**Carried**

4.2 DC2025-09.4.2

Local Service Policy Comparison Review - Jeff Solly

DCTF2025-037**Moved By** Councillor Richardson**Seconded By** J. Solly**That** the correspondence from J. Solly, be received; and,**That** this matter be discussed under Item 5.3.**Carried****5. New or Other Business**

5.1 DC2025-09.5.1

Discussion of Draft DC Study Findings

No questions or concerns were raised.

5.2 DC2025-09.5.2

Review of Issue Tracker

Consensus was reached to add to the Issue Tracker an issue concerning the need for improvements to DC-related processes (e.g. Treasurer's Statements, DC collections, etc.), a need which could be in part met through training by Watson and outsourced process mapping.

5.3 DC2025-09-5.3

Reports on Issue Assignments

Each task force member and staff person was asked to submit to A. Found a written report dealing with each issue he or she is assigned in the Issue Tracker.

The report should set out the (i) issue(s) at hand, (ii) research findings, (iii) proposed recommendations, and (iv) rationale for the proposed recommendations. Bernard's report serves as an instructive guide for report structure. the reports are needed to inform recommendation formulation by the Task Force.

5.4 DC2025-09.5.4

Formulation of Draft Recommendations

The Task Force deferred this item to the next meeting.

A. Found stressed the pressing need for the Task Force to finalize its recommendations at its July 21 meeting, in order for staff and Watson to have sufficient time to address the recommendations in the DC Study.

6. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, July 14, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. in the Weldon Room at City Hall.

7. **Adjournment**

DCTF2025-038

Moved By J. Solly

Seconded By B. Finney

That the Development Charges Task Force Meeting adjourn at 3:27 p.m.

Carried

DC Task Force Issue Tracker

Item #6 - Local Service Policy Review

Context:

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act*, impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed through either a condition of development approval or an agreement implementing a development approval. Such works within the condition or agreement are referred to as “local services”.

The idea of a “local service” is to provide a differentiation between services that benefit individual developments and services that benefits development within a larger specified area or community.

Issue:

The term “local services” is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations, as a result, there is often confusion, uncertainty and, in some cases, disputes as to what constitutes a “local service”.

For example, in the City of Kawartha Lakes, there is no local service definition for parkland development. Although, under the Planning Act, developers are required to make provisions for the dedication of parkland to the municipality at no charge, there is no clarity as to what condition the parkland should be provided to the municipality. Without such clarity, each parkland dedication becomes a matter of discussion, debate and compromise between the municipality and the developer.

Research Findings:

A comparison and review of “local service” provisions has been undertaken. The exercise reviews the City’s current Local Service provisions and compares them with other municipalities’ local service definitions within their respective DC Background Studies. A copy of that analysis is attached as Appendix 1.

As noted on the comparison, there are a wide variety of definitions between municipalities over what constitutes a local service for Roads and Related Works, Stormwater Management, Noise Abatement, Water and Wastewater and Parks. Although there are similarities throughout, there are also key differences that can add significant dollars to a developer or municipality’s budget if not appropriately accounted for.

Through Bill 17, the Province has enacted changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act. The Act adds a new section (59(2.1)) empowering the province to define Local Services by regulation — removing ambiguity about what municipalities can require developers to build.

The Province has not yet enacted the regulations. The timing to enact the regulations is not known at this point.

Proposed Recommendations:

1. In the absence of Provincial regulations defining Local Services, staff be directed to review the current Local Service provisions and update them as necessary so that they are consistent with the requirements of the City's Growth Management Plan, Water and Wastewater Servicing and Capacity Master Plan, Transportation Master Plan Update and future Parks Master Plan and implementing Official Plan updates.

In particular, staff should provide a Local Service definition for Parkland Development. Such definition should be consistent with definitions in neighbouring municipalities.

2. Staff should monitor the **Environmental Registry of Ontario (ERO)** for postings of proposed regulations. The DC Background Study should be amended accordingly once the regulations are enacted.

Local Service Policy Review - Roads and Related

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that:

"ss.59(1) a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act*, impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed in subsection (2).

(2) a condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for:

- a) local services, related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates, to be installed or paid for by the owners as a condition of approval under section 51 of the *Planning Act* ;
- b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the *Planning Act* . "

The term "local services" is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations.

As of May 13, the Province announced changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act in proposed Bill 17

City of Kawartha Lakes	Region of Durham	Whitby
DC Background Study - Appendix "E" Watson + Assoc. - October 7, 2019	DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - March 2023	DC Background Study Hemson - April 2021
<p>Arterial and Collector Roads</p> <p>1.1. Collector roads internal to development - direct developer responsibility under s.59 of the D.C.A. (as a local service).</p> <p>1.2. Roads (collector and arterial) external to development - include in D.C. calculation to the extent permitted under s.5(1) of the D.C.A. (dependent on local circumstances).</p>	<p>5.2 Under the current policy, the developer pays for Regional road improvements required to access a development and for the minimum size of Regional storm drainage works required to service a development.</p> <p>The Region's cost sharing policy for Roads consists of paying for Regional road improvements over and above the cost of those required for the development and for the oversizing of Regional storm sewers. The Region also pays for its share of any non-Regional storm drainage works that are oversized to convey or treat runoff from Regional roads.</p> <p>Historically, the Regional road improvements have primarily been focused on safe vehicular access to the lands. The "local service" definition relies on the minimum design which conforms to Regional design guidelines. Regional design guidelines are expanding to include active transportation facilities (e.g. sidewalk/MUP platforms, bike lanes, cross-rides, bike signals, etc.). As Regional design guidelines are expanded, the local services definition expands along with it, and as such more may be required from the developer to supply safe road access to sites for all modes of transportation.</p>	<p>1.0 Road Internal to Development</p> <p>1.1 All local and collector roads related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which a plan relates (including road base and surface, streetlighting, storm sewers, bridges, culverts, sidewalks, cycling facilities, noise walls, utilities, turning lanes, line painting, signage, traffic control measures etc.) – are the direct responsibility of the direct developer under s.59 of the DCA (as a local service).</p> <p>1.2 Arterial Roadways internal to a development are subject to oversizing cost recoveries for the direct developer. Oversizing costs (the costs associated with providing a roadway width greater than a 12.0m collector roadway as identified in the paragraph above) have been included in this study.</p> <p>1.3 In addition, there may be circumstances where road improvements (turning lanes, traffic signalization, pedestrian crossings, all-way stop-control, horizontal/vertical grade upgrades for applicable intersection sightlines, etc.) are required on adjacent external roadways in order to facilitate a development. These road improvements are the responsibility of the direct developer under s.59 of the DCA (as a local service) and have not been identified in this study.</p>
<p>1.3. Stream crossing and rail crossing road works, excluding underground utilities but including all other works within lands to be dedicated to the City or rail corridors - include in D.C. calculation to the extent permitted under s.5(1) of the D.C.A. (dependent on local circumstances).</p>		<p>5.2 Bridges - New bridges that are required to service future growth (as identified by the Town's Transportation Master Plan) have generally been included in the associated road Widening/New Alignment project cost.</p>
<p>Traffic Signals</p> <p>2.1. Traffic signalization within or external to development – include in D.C. calculation to the extent permitted under s.5(1) of the D.C.A.</p>		<p>2.2 Traffic signalization for development adjacent to a highway or major arterial is a direct developer responsibility under s.59 of the DCA (local services).</p> <p>6.1 New traffic signals associated with road widening/new alignment projects that are required to service future growth (as identified by the Town's Transportation Master Plan) have generally been included in the associated Road Widening/New Alignment project cost.</p> <p>6.2 Existing intersections that are currently stop-controlled, but are projected to require full signalization to service future growth, and are not associated with a road project, are included individually within this study. These projects are based on the Town's annual traffic count program and associated traffic signal warrant calculations.</p>

Local Service Policy Review - Roads and Related

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that:

“ss.59(1) a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act*, impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed in subsection (2).

(2) a condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for:

- a) local services, related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates, to be installed or paid for by the owners as a condition of approval under section 51 of the *Planning Act*;
- b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the *Planning Act*.”

The term "local services" is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations.

As of May 13, the Province announced changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act in proposed Bill 17

City of Kawartha Lakes	Region of Durham	Whitby
DC Background Study - Appendix "E" Watson + Assoc. - October 7, 2019	DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - March 2023	DC Background Study Hemson - April 2021
Intersection Improvements 3.1. Intersection improvements on arterial and collector roads external to development – include in D.C. calculation (linked to arterial and collector road funding source in item 1). 3.2. Intersections improvements within specific developments and all works necessary to connect to entrances (private and specific subdivision, including auxiliary lanes) to the roadway - direct developer responsibility under s.59 of D.C.A. (as a local service). 3.3. Intersections with provincial highways – include in D.C. calculation to the extent that they are City responsibility.		Intersections and Signals 1.3 In addition, there may be circumstances where road improvements (turning lanes, traffic signalization, pedestrian crossings, all-way stop-control, horizontal/vertical grade upgrades for applicable intersection sightlines, etc.) are required on adjacent external roadways in order to facilitate a development. These road improvements are the responsibility of the direct developer under s.59 of the DCA (as a local service) and have not been identified in this study. 6.1 New traffic signals associated with road widening/new alignment projects that are required to service future growth (as identified by the Town's Transportation Master Plan) have generally been included in the associated Road Widening/New Alignment project cost. 6.2 Existing intersections that are currently stop-controlled, but are projected to require full signalization to service future growth, and are not associated with a road project, are included individually within this study. These projects are based on the Town's annual traffic count program and associated traffic signal warrant calculations.

Local Service Policy Review - Roads and Related

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that:

“ss.59(1) a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act* , impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed in subsection (2).

(2) a condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for:

- a) local services, related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates, to be installed or paid for by the owners as a condition of approval under section 51 of the *Planning Act* ;
- b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the *Planning Act* .”

The term "local services" is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations.

As of May 13, the Province announced changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act in proposed Bill 17

Oshawa	Clarington	Peterborough
DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - April 2024	DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - November 2020	DC Background Report Hemson - September 2024
Roads Local and Collector Roads Internal to Development, inclusive of all land and associated infrastructure – direct developer responsibility under s.59 of the D.C.A. as a local service. Oversizing of Arterial Type 'C' Roads Internal to Development, in excess of an 11 m pavement width, not required for the specific development (i.e., required for future development external to a specific development or the area to which a specific development relates) - included in D.C. calculation to the extent permitted under s.5(1) of the D.C.A. Arterial Type “C” Roads External to Development, inclusive of all land and associated infrastructure – if needed to support a specific development or required to link with the area to which the plan relates, direct developer responsibility under s.59 of the D.C.A.; Arterial Type “C” Roads External to Development, inclusive of all land and associated infrastructure – if not needed to support a specific development or required to link with the area to which the plan relates, include in the D.C. calculation to the extent permitted under s.5(1) of the D.C.A.; Arterial Type “A” and Type “B” Roads: Included as part of road costing funded through D.C.A., s.5(1).	Roads: · All roads internal to a development or external to a development on an un-opened right-of-way and within the area to which the plan relates are a direct developer responsibility under s.59 of the D.C.A. as a local service up to a width of ten metres. The incremental cost for roads constructed to a greater width are included in the road oversizing portion of the D.C. calculations, excluding property costs; · Roads external to development lands on existing right-of-way are included in the D.C. calculations; · All roads internal to a development are a direct developer responsibility under s.59 of the D.C.A. as a local service built to a width up to and including ten metres. Cost for roads constructed to a greater width are included in the road oversizing portion of the D.C. calculations, excluding property costs; · All roads external to development lands but with development lot frontage are included in the D.C. calculations with a reduction for direct developer contributions of 50% for serviced frontages; and · Roads within a development or external to the development but related to the development and within developable lands - are local services and a direct developer responsibility under s.59 of the D.C.A. · All enhancements to a road internal to a subdivision over and above the current municipal standard as recommended by a completed secondary plan for the subject area are local services and are the direct responsibility of the developer.	Collector Roads Collector roads internal to a development are a direct developer responsibility as a local service under s.59 of the DCA. Collector roads external to a development are a local service if the works are within the area to which the plan relates and therefore a direct developer responsibility under s.59 of the DCA. Otherwise, the works are included in the development charges calculations to the extent permitted under s.5(1) of the DCA. Arterial Roads New arterial roads and arterial road improvements are included as part of road costing funded through development charges. Local Roads Local roads are local services and a direct developer responsibility under s.59 of the DCA
Bridges and Culverts Culverts and Bridges on local and collector roads within developments to be a developer responsibility. Oversizing of Culverts and Bridges on Arterial Type "C" roads Internal to Development, in excess of an 11 m pavement width, not required for the specific development (i.e., required for future development external to a specific development or the area to which a specific development relates) - included in D.C. calculation to the extent permitted under s.5(1) of the D.C.A. Culverts and Bridges on arterial roads external to developments - Included as part of costing funded through the D.C.A., s.5(1).		
Signals + Intersections not specifically included	Traffic Signals and Intersection Improvements: · Intersections with Regional Roads - Regional Responsibility if warrants are met; and Intersection improvements and signalization on other roads due to development and growth-related traffic increases - included in the D.C. calculation.	Subdivision/Site Entrances and Related Entrances and all related costs (including, but not limited to: signalization, turn lanes, utility conduits and extensions, etc.), no matter the class of road, are a local service and a direct developer responsibility under s.59 of the DCA.

Local Service Policy Review - Roads and Related

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that:

"ss.59(1) a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act*, impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed in subsection (2).

(2) a condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for:

- a) local services, related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates, to be installed or paid for by the owners as a condition of approval under section 51 of the *Planning Act*;
- b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the *Planning Act*."

The term "local services" is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations.

As of May 13, the Province announced changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act in proposed Bill 17

City of Kawartha Lakes	Region of Durham	Whitby
DC Background Study - Appendix "E" Watson + Assoc. - October 7, 2019	DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - March 2023	DC Background Study Hemson - April 2021
Sidewalks 5.1. Sidewalks on arterial and collector roads external to development (except where abutting development) – include in D.C. calculation (linked to arterial and collector road funding source in item 1). 5.2. Sidewalks on MTO roads – include in D.C. calculation or, in exceptional circumstances, may be local improvement or direct developer responsibility through local service provisions (s.59 of D.C.A.). 5.3. Sidewalks within developments or external to development (which are a local service within the area to which the plan relates) - direct developer responsibility as a local service provision (under s.59 of D.C.A.)	See transportation local service policy above	Sidewalks 8.3 The Town of Whitby is mandated by the Municipal Act with the responsibility of providing/maintaining sidewalks on Regional roads within the Town. The timing of these projects is based on the Region's Capital Road Program, and have been included in this study. 8.4 New sidewalk installations on existing Town collector, arterial and local roads that are required to service future growth, and are not associated with a road project, are included individually within this study.
Bike Routes/Bike Lanes/Walkways 6.1. Bike routes and bike lanes, within road allowance, external to	Bike routes not specifically included	Active Transportation 8.1 Multi-use pathways and trails including related structures, crossings and
Traffic Control Systems 8.1. Include in D.C. calculation.	Traffic signals not specifically included	6.0 Signals + Intersections 6.1 New traffic signals associated with road widening/new alignment projects that are required to service future growth (as identified by the Town's Transportation Master Plan) have generally been included in the associated Road Widening/New Alignment project cost. 6.2 Existing intersections that are currently stop-controlled, but are projected to require full signalization to service future growth, and are not associated with a road project, are included individually within this study. These projects are based on the Town's annual traffic count program and associated traffic signal warrant calculations.
Land Acquisition for Road Allowances 9.1. Land acquisition for arterial roads – Dedication under the Planning Act provisions (s.51, s.42) through development lands; in areas with limited or no development, include in D.C. calculation (to the extent eligible). 9.2. Land Acquisition for collector roads – Dedication under the Planning Act provisions (s.51, s.42) through development lands (up to 26 metre right-of-way); in areas with limited or no development, include in D.C. calculation (to the extent eligible). 9.3. Land Acquisition for grade separations (beyond normal dedication requirements) – include in the D.C. calculation (to the extent eligible).	Land acquisition not specifically included	Land acquisition not specifically included
Land Acquisition for Easements 10.1. Easement costs external to subdivisions - include in D.C. calculation or, in exceptional circumstances, may be local improvement or direct developer responsibility through local service provisions (s.59 of D.C.A.).	Easement acquisition not specifically included	Easement acquisition not specifically included
Streetslights 4.1. Streetslights on arterial and collector roads external to development – include in D.C. calculation (linked to arterial and collector road funding source in item 1). 4.2. Streetslights within specific developments – direct developer responsibility under s.59 of D.C.A. (as a local service).	Streetslights not specifically included	7.0 Street Lights New street lights associated with road widening/new alignment projects that are required to service future growth (as identified by the Town's Transportation Master Plan) have generally been included in the associated Road Widening/New Alignment project cost. The Town of Whitby's current practice is to collect Development Charges on behalf of the Region of Durham to provide streetlighting on Regional road widening/new alignment projects that are required to service future growth. The timing of these projects is based on the Region's Capital Road Program, and have been included in this study. New street light installations on existing Town collector and arterial roads that are required to service future growth, and are not associated with a road project, are included individually within this study.

Local Service Policy Review - Roads and Related

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that:

"ss.59(1) a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act*, impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed in subsection (2).

(2) a condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for:

- a) local services, related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates, to be installed or paid for by the owners as a condition of approval under section 51 of the *Planning Act*;
- b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the *Planning Act*."

The term "local services" is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations.

As of May 13, the Province announced changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act in proposed Bill 17

Oshawa	Clarington	Peterborough
DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - April 2024	DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - November 2020	DC Background Report Hemson - September 2024
Streetlights not specifically included	Streetlights and Sidewalks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streetlights and sidewalks on Regional Roads - included in the Municipal D.C. or, in exceptional circumstances, may be direct developer responsibility through local service provisions (s.59 of D.C.A.); and Streetlights and sidewalks on Municipal Roads - linked to road funding source. 	Streetlights Streetlights internal to a development or site are a direct developer responsibility through local service provisions under s.59 of the DCA. Streetlights external to a development but related to the subject lands are a direct developer responsibility through local service provisions under s.59 of the DCA.
Sidewalks Sidewalks internal to development - developer responsibility. Sidewalks external and abutting developments to be a developer responsibility including upgrades, expansion and/or realignment as required through the development agreement to the City's standard; otherwise included in the D.C. Sidewalks external and not abutting developments - Included as costing funded through D.C.A., s.5(1)., with the exception of transition sections, up to a maximum of 25m in length beyond the abutting development, to connect new sidewalks to existing sidewalks		Sidewalks Sidewalks internal to a development or site are a direct developer responsibility through local service provisions under s.59 of the DCA. Sidewalks external to a development but related to the subject lands are a direct developer responsibility through local service provisions under s.59 of the DCA.
Bike routes not specifically included		Bikeways Bike lanes within road allowance are included in development charges
Traffic signals not specifically included	Other Enhancements within the Road Right-of-Way If through the Secondary Plan Process, or other similar development approval	
Land acquisition not specifically included	Land Acquisition for Road Allowances <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land acquisition for roads - dedication under the Planning Act subdivision provisions (s.51) through development lands (up to a 26 metre right of way); in areas with limited or new development maybe include in D.C. calculation (to the extent eligible); if purchased in advance of dedication costs may be funded on an interim basis from the D.C. reserve fund with potential future reimbursement from developer contributions; and Land acquisition for grade separations (beyond normal dedication requirements) - to be included in the Municipality D.C. to the extent eligible. 	Land Acquisition Land acquisition for roads is a dedication under the Planning Act subdivision provisions (s.51) through development lands. In areas with limited or no development land, acquisition needs to be included in the City development charges to the extent eligible as identified and included in the Development Charges Background Study. Land acquisition for grade separations (beyond normal dedication requirements) is to be included in the City development charges to the extent eligible as identified and included in the Development Charges Background Study.
Easement acquisition not specifically included	Easement acquisition not specifically included	Easement acquisition not specifically included

Local Service Policy Review - Noise And Storm

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that:

"ss.59(1) a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act*, impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed in subsection (2).

(2) a condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for:

- a) local services, related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates, to be installed or paid for by the owners as a condition of approval under section 51 of the *Planning Act* ;
- b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the *Planning Act* ."

The term "local services" is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations.

As of May 13, the Province announced changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act in proposed Bill 17

City of Kawartha Lakes	Region of Durham	Whitby
DC Background Study - Appendix "E" Watson + Assoc. - October 7, 2019	DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - March 2023	DC Background Study Hemson - April 2021
Noise Abatement 7.1. External to which the plan relates - include in D.C. calculation.	Noise abatement not specifically included	Noise abatement not specifically included
Storm Water Management 11.1. Quality and quantity works - direct developer responsibility through local service provisions (s. 59 of D.C.A.). 11.2. Oversizing of stormwater management works external to developments - subject to best efforts clauses within development agreements by the City. This however does not preclude the use of D.C.'s on an area specific basis for community systems.	N/A	11.2 All minor/local storm water management facilities internal to a development (including storm sewer pipe networks, storm water management ponds, plunge pools, creek/channel stabilization measures, LID and infiltration galleries etc.) – are the responsibility of the direct developer under s.59 of the DCA (as a local service), thus have not been identified in this study. 12.4 Storm Water Rehabilitation - Depending on their design, Storm Water Management Facilities provide a flood protection, a water quantity and quality treatment, an erosion control, a base flow augmentation, an infiltration, a spill management, aesthetics, and a buffer between urbanized and/or natural areas. New Storm Water Management ponds and/or plunge pools that are required to service future growth and intensification areas have generally been included in this study.

Local Service Policy Review - Noise and Storm

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that:

“ss.59(1) a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act* , impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed in subsection (2).

(2) a condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for:

- a) local services, related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates, to be installed or paid for by the owners as a condition of approval under section 51 of the *Planning Act* ;
- b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the *Planning Act* . ”

The term "local services" is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations.

As of May 13, the Province announced changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act in proposed Bill 17

Oshawa	Clarington	Peterborough
DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - April 2024	DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - November 2020	DC Background Report Hemson - September 2024
Noise abatement not specifically included	Noise Abatement Measures · Internal to development - direct developer responsibility through local service provisions (s.59 of D.C.A.);	Noise Abatement Noise Abatement Measures internal to a development are a direct developer responsibility through local service provisions under s.59 of the DCA.
Watercourse Improvements Developers are required to pay for any erosion protection work to adjacent lands they are developing, where erosion works are necessary to protect the development. This work will be determined on a site basis and is over and above any work for which watercourse development charges are collected. Providing stormwater management ponds and other facilities required by the development including all associated features such as landscaping and fencing shall be direct developer responsibilities as a local service. Storm Sewer systems and drainage works that are required, related to, or within the area needed to support the development, either internal or external to the area to which the plan relates: Direct developer responsibility under s. 59 of the D.C.A. as a local service.	Stormwater Management (S.W.M.) Facilities The costs of S.W.M.facilities internal to a development plan and related to a development plan are considered to be a local service under the D.C.A. and the associated costs are not included in the development charges calculation. Local S.W.M. facilities would typically include: · Stormwater management facilities servicing local drainage areas; · Storm sewer oversizing associated with local drainage areas; and · Oversized storm sewer works on existing roads. S.W.M. facilities servicing more than one development plan, may be included in an area-specific D.C. by-law subject to local circumstances.	Stormwater Management Services The costs of stormwater management facilities (SWM) that are internal to a subdivision or are related to a single plan of subdivision are considered to be a local service under the DCA and the associated costs are not included in the development charges calculations. The costs of stormwater management facilities benefiting more than one subdivision are largely to be recovered through development charges to the extent eligible as identified and included in the Development Charges Background Study.

Local Service Policy Review - Water and Wastewater

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that:

“ss. 59(1) a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act*, impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development

(2) a condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for

- b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the *Planning Act*.”

The term "local services" is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations.

As of May 13, the Province announced changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act in proposed Bill 17.

City of Kawartha Lakes	Region of Durham	Whitby																	
DC Background Study - Appendix "E" Watson + Assoc. - October 7, 2019 Water 12.1. Water supply, treatment and related facilities - include in the City-Wide D.C. calculation for urban serviced area. 12.2. Watermains external to development - include in City-Wide D.C. calculations for urban service area. 12.3. Marginal costs of waterworks within development or within the area to which the plan relates, above 200 mm nominal diameter- include in City-Wide D.C. calculations for urban service area. 12.4. Pumping Stations and connections to trunk mains and pumping stations to service a specific development exclusively - direct developer responsibility though local service provisions (s.59 of D.C.A.).	DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - March 2023 5.4 Water & Wastewater The Region's share policy is proposed to remain unchanged as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Category Service</th><th colspan="2">Source of Financing</th></tr> <tr> <th>Developer</th><th>Region</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Sequential and Non-Sequential External Works required by the developer</td><td>Min. size</td><td>Oversizing</td></tr> <tr> <td>Sequential and Non-Sequential External Works not required by the developer</td><td></td><td>100% of the cost</td></tr> <tr> <td>Internal Works</td><td>Min. Size</td><td>Oversizing</td></tr> <tr> <td>Abutting Works</td><td>50% of Min. Size</td><td>Remainder</td></tr> </tbody> </table> It is further articulated in Attachment #1 and #2 of the DC Background Study	Category Service	Source of Financing		Developer	Region	Sequential and Non-Sequential External Works required by the developer	Min. size	Oversizing	Sequential and Non-Sequential External Works not required by the developer		100% of the cost	Internal Works	Min. Size	Oversizing	Abutting Works	50% of Min. Size	Remainder	DC Background Study Hemson - April 2021 Water not specifically included
Category Service	Source of Financing																		
	Developer	Region																	
Sequential and Non-Sequential External Works required by the developer	Min. size	Oversizing																	
Sequential and Non-Sequential External Works not required by the developer		100% of the cost																	
Internal Works	Min. Size	Oversizing																	
Abutting Works	50% of Min. Size	Remainder																	
Wastewater 13.1. Wastewater discharge, treatment and related facilities - include in the City-Wide D.C. calculation for the urban serviced area. 13.2. Wastewater sewers external to development - include in City-Wide D.C. calculation for the urban serviced area 13.3. Marginal costs of wastewater sewer works within development or within the area to which the plan relates, which benefits upstream developers, above 200mm nominal diameter – City-Wide D.C. calculation for the urban serviced area. 13.4. Pumping Stations and connections to trunk mains and pumping stations to service specific development exclusively - direct developer responsibility though local service provisions (s.59 of D.C.A.).	Pumping Stations + Force mains not specifically included	Wastewater not specifically included																	
Pumping Stations + Force mains not specifically included	Pumping Stations + Force mains not specifically included	Pumping Stations + Force mains not specifically included																	

Local Service Policy Review - Water and Wastewater

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that:

“ss.59(1) a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act* , impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed in subsection (2).

(2) a condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for:

- a) local services, related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates, to be installed or paid for by the owners as a condition of approval under section 51 of the *Planning Act* ;
- b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the *Planning Act* .”

The term "local services" is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations.

As of May 13, the Province announced changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act in proposed Bill 17

Oshawa	Clarington	Peterborough
DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - April 2024	DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - November 2020	DC Background Report Hemson - September 2024
Water not specifically included not specifically included	Water not specifically included Wastewater not specifically included	Underground Services <p>The costs of the following items shall be direct developer responsibilities as a local service:</p> <p>All underground services internal to the development, including storm, water and sanitary</p> <p>If underground services are required by two or more developments but they do not meet the criteria for development charge funding, the developer of the first development will be responsible for the cost of these services and may enter into cost-sharing agreements with other developers independent of the City.</p> <p>Service connections from existing services to the development.</p> <p>Providing new underground services or upgrading existing services external to the development if the services are required to service the development.</p> <p>Wastewater Collection Studies undertaken for a specific development are considered to be local benefit.</p> <p>The costs of the following shall be payable through development charges: Watermain and sewer infrastructure exceeding 300 mm for water and sanitary and 900 mm for storm.</p> <p>Oversizing of storm sewers within a development to accommodate runoff from new, widened, extended or upgraded roads that are funded as a development charge project.</p> <p>Additional sewer pipe depth to service external lands in accordance with a City-approved Master Plan.</p> <p>Underground services not identified in a City approved Master Servicing Plan but are subsequently identified by the City as being required in order to facilitate two or more developments and where the potential benefiting lands are owned by two or more unrelated parties may be eligible for Development Charges funding at the appropriate time.</p>

Pumping Stations + Forcemains not specifically included	Pumping Stations + Forcemains not specifically included	<p>Pumping Stations and Forcemains</p> <p>The costs of the following will be direct developer responsibilities as a local service:</p> <p>\$Construction of temporary or permanent water booster station or reservoir pumping stations servicing individual new developments or redevelopments.</p> <p>\$Construction of sanitary pumping stations and forcemains serving individual new developments and redevelopments.</p> <p>\$Dedication of all lands required for pumping stations, including any lands deemed necessary by the City to provide adequate buffering.</p> <p>\$Upgrades or expansions to existing pumping stations and forcemains to provide capacity for individual new developments or redevelopments.</p> <p>The costs of the following shall be payable through development charges:</p> <p>Facilities identified as being required in a City approved Master Plan to accommodate growth will be funded from development charge revenues to the extent eligible.</p> <p>Oversizing of upgrades or expansions to existing pumping stations and forcemains to service external lands.</p> <p>Facilities not identified in a City approved Master Plan but are subsequently identified by the City as being required in order to facilitate two or more developments and where the potential benefiting lands are owned by two or more unrelated parties may be eligible for development charges funding at the appropriate time.</p>
---	---	---

Local Service Policy Review - Parks

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that:

"ss.59(1) a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act* , impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed in subsection (2).

(2) a condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for:

- a) local services, related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates, to be installed or paid for by the owners as a condition of approval under section 51 of the *Planning Act* ;
- b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the *Planning Act* . "

The term "local services" is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations.

As of May 13, the Province announced changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act in proposed Bill 17

City of Kawartha Lakes	Region of Durham	Whitby
DC Background Study - Appendix "E" Watson + Assoc. - October 7, 2019	DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - March 2023	DC Background Study Hemson - April 2021
Parkland not specifically included	N/A	<p>13.1 Parkland - The following elements of Park Development are not eligible for DCs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Landscape Design Plan - A Grading and Drainage Plan - A Servicing and Storm Water Management Plan - Approvals - Park Development approvals required from all agencies/authorities. - Clearing and grubbing - Hoarding - Topsoil - Stripping and stockpiling of full depth of topsoil - Removal and disposal of contaminated organics offsite. - Excess topsoil or fill removal and disposal offsite. - Earthworks - Grading the park to the approved plans to minus 300mm of finished grade. - Storm Drainage - This equates to a minimum of one (1) catch basin/manhole (cb/mh) per catchment area and road frontage per block. - Servicing - Installation of, a sanitary sewer stub, a 50mm diameter water supply line and single-phase or three-phase electrical supply, as required,. These services are to be stubbed 1.5 metres into the park property - Surveying - Ontario Land Surveyor (O.L.S) as-built topographic condition - Temporary Works - restoration of the Park Block if rough graded in advance of its development. Restoration work may include topsoil spreading, seeding and or sodding to the satisfaction of the Town.

Local Service Policy Review - Parks

The Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997, states that:

“ss.59(1) a municipality shall not, by way of a condition or agreement under section 51 or 53 of the *Planning Act* , impose directly or indirectly a charge related to a development or a requirement to construct a service related to development except as allowed in subsection (2).

(2) a condition or agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for:

- a) local services, related to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates, to be installed or paid for by the owners as a condition of approval under section 51 of the *Planning Act* ;
- b) local services to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under section 53 of the *Planning Act* . ”

The term "local services" is not specifically defined in the DCA, 1997 or the associated regulations.

As of May 13, the Province announced changes to the Local Service provisions of the Development Charges Act in proposed Bill 17

Oshawa	Clarington	Peterborough
DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - April 2024	DC Background Study Watson + Assoc. - November 2020	DC Background Report Hemson - September 2024
Parkland Development With respect to parkland dedications, developer responsibilities include preparation of a concept plan and overall grading plan, grading, topsoil, sodding, fencing, and sub-surface drainage. Parkland Development for City Parks, Community Parks, Regional Parks, Neighbourhood Parks, Parkettes and Open Space: responsibility to provide up to base condition is a direct developer responsibility as a local service provision under s. 59 of the D.C.A. including, but not limited to, the following: · Clearing and grubbing. · Topsoil Stripping and stockpiling, (Topsoil or any fill or soils shall not be stockpiled on parkland without the approval of the City.). · Parkland shall be free of any contaminated soil or subsoil. · Servicing - Water, Hydro, Stormwater, Sanitary, Electrical, Fibre/ phone, catch basins, meter, and meter boxes to the entrance of the park as per City's requirements. · Rough grading (pre-grading) and the supply of topsoil to the required depth as per City requirements. · Parkland shall not be mined for engineering fill and replaced with fill or topsoil. · Parkland shall be conveyed free and clear of all encumbrances. · When parkland parcels cannot be developed in a timely manner, they shall be graded to ensure positive drainage and seeded to minimize erosion and dust. · Temporary fencing may also be required where there is no permanent fence to prevent illegal dumping. · Temporary Park sign advising future residents that the site is a future park. · Perimeter fencing of parkland to the City standard located on the public property side of the property line adjacent land uses (residential, industrial,	3. Parkland Development For the purpose of parkland development, local service includes preparation of a conceptual park plan, proposed grading to demonstrate that the proposed park size, configuration and topography will allow for the construction of park facilities to the satisfaction of the Municipality. In addition, the owner is required to provide the park site graded in accordance with the park concept plan including storm water servicing. The park site must be fenced and seeded with a minimum cover of 200mm of topsoil. Servicing such as hydro, sanitary sewer and water should be stubbed at the property line along the park frontage. The Municipality also requires the owner to dedicate parkland or provide cash-in-lieu, consistent with the Planning Act provisions. All of these costs are deemed a direct responsibility of the owner and have not been included in the development charge calculation. With respect to other parkland development costs, the municipal policy is to include all other components of parkland development in the D.C. calculation, including detailed design and contract administration, finished grading, sodding, park furniture electrical, water, sanitary sewer, signage, plant material, walkways, play courts, parking lots, sports fields, playground equipment, water play equipment, recreational trails, park shelters, lighting, irrigation and field houses.	Parkland Development For the purpose of parkland development, local service includes the requirement for the owner to undertake preparation of the park plan, to retain necessary consultants to prepare design and to grade plans for the park prior to development. In addition, the owner is required to provide stripping and stockpiling, leveling, topsoiling, seeding and stormwater servicing (consistent with the plan), and services to the lot line. These requirements are part of the conditions of s.51 and s.53 of the Planning Act agreements. The municipality also requires the owner to dedicate parkland or provide cash-in-lieu, consistent with the Planning Act provisions. All of these costs are deemed a direct responsibility of the developer and have not been included in the development charges calculations. With respect to other parkland development costs, the municipal policy is to include all other components of parkland development in the development charges calculations, including parking, park furniture, signage, landscaping and walkways/trails, in addition to the necessary fields, diamonds, playground equipment, lighting, irrigation and field houses.

DC Task Force Issue Tracker

Item #7 - Alignment of Growth-Related Capital Costs and Revenue

Context:

The City's Growth Management Strategy (GMS) provides for the allocation of Designated Growth Areas and staging of growth in Lindsay. The GMS sets out where and how growth will be directed to a horizon year of 2051.

The City has also completed a Water and Wastewater Servicing and Capacity Master Plan, Transportation Master Plan Update to support growth areas identified in the GMS in Lindsay.

The updated DC calculation addresses funding for the infrastructure works and funding and recommends the DC rate to generate revenue for recovery of costs.

Issue:

Figure 8-9 of the GMS has forecasted that the land area needed in Lindsay to support residential and employment growth to 2051 is 235 Ha.

The Province has approved MZO's for 565 Ha in Lindsay for residential development.

As a result of the requirement to include the MZO lands within the Designated Growth Areas in Lindsay, there is a surplus of land equating to 329 Ha.

The Water and Wastewater Servicing and Capacity Master Plan and Transportation Master Plan Update have identified works required to support the development within the Designated Growth Areas, including the surplus lands. Given that services are planned to support areas for growth beyond the 2051 horizon, and, full build-out of the Designated Growth Areas may not be needed will not be within that timeframe, and therefore expected DC revenue to support the payment of those services required for development of those lands may not be realized until after 2051:

1. Will there be a gap in DC revenue timing relative to the projected population growth and development timing outlined in the GMS,
2. If there is, how will the City support the funding of those services?
3. Is the funding of services that benefit lands beyond the 2051 horizon being unfairly apportioned to lands that are otherwise within the 2051 growth horizon?

Research Findings:

Under the Province's 2024 Provincial Planning Statement, municipalities create or update an Official Plan, they must provide land to accommodate forecasted needs over a time horizon of at least 20 years but no more than 30 years, guided by provincial projections. The City's GMS appears to conform with this requirement.

The 2024 PPS also states that planning for infrastructure, public service facilities, strategic growth areas, and employment lands may extend **beyond** this 20–30-year horizon.

The PPS also states that planning for infrastructure and services shall be coordinated and integrated with land use planning and growth management so that they:

- a) Are financially viable over their life cycle
- b) Leverage capacity of development proposals, where appropriate, and
- c) Are available to meet current and projected needs.

It is generally accepted that planning for infrastructure and services for assets that are deemed service multiple generations, such as major transit and water/wastewater systems is prudent given the level of effort required to get such facilities built. In the City's case, major water and wastewater treatment plants should be designed to suit geographic service areas, not "arbitrary" population counts

The 2024 PPS also states that public service facilities, should be planned and co-located with one another, along with parks and open space where appropriate, to promote cost effectiveness and facilitate design integration etc. In the City's case, opportunities to co-locate police, fire and EMS, headquarters should be reviewed.

The City has funded municipal works previously and utilized Section 391 of the Municipal Act to recover costs. The costs/benefit of utilizing this tool, and any other funding tools, should be explored.

Proposed Recommendations:

1. The draft DC calculations provided by Watson on June 23, 2025, loads the payment of the full cost of infrastructure and services to support the Designated Growth Areas in Lindsay for payment within a 2051 horizon. Given that the GMS identifies that a portion of the Designated Growth Areas in Lindsay is surplus beyond, staff should review if the proposed financial framework to service those lands is fair and appropriate.
2. That staff comment on the findings of the current Treasurers Statement regarding existing DC reserve funds and how current surpluses and deficits will be utilized/funded to support new capital projects.
3. Staff to report on any other financial tools and mechanisms to fund the capital costs identified in the Watson analysis as part of the public and Council's review of the upcoming DC Background Study, so that the full suite of funding sources for future capital works can be reviewed and understood. As part of that review,

staff to prepare, for Council approval, a Capital Plan that shows how the implementation of the works identified in the Capital Needs forecast will be funded. The Capital Plan should be updated on an annual basis together with the Treasurers DC Reserve Fund Report.

4. Staff and Council should review the viability of consolidating police, fire and EMS headquarters to take advantage of potential cost efficiencies in land and building design and construction.

DC Task Force Issues Tracker

New Issues - DC Background Study Draft Findings Comments

Context

Watson and Assoc have prepared a Draft Findings document providing capital needs, a calculation of service standards and preliminary DC calculations. The document is a snapshot and represents work in progress.

Issue:

1. As noted in the Draft Findings, the impact associated with the updated reconciliation of DC reserve funds needs to be provided.

Proposed Recommendation: Staff and Watson continue to reconcile and include DC reserve funds into DC charge calculation.

2. The DC calculation yields a per unit rate for Other Multiples and Two Bedroom + Apartments that seems counterintuitive. Firstly, because the numbers are so counterintuitive, it has the potential to cause doubt on the calculation. If the calculation is correct, and carried forward, this DC rate has the potential unintended consequence of disincentivizing the production of so called “family type” high density units.

Recommendation: Review calculation to confirm calculation correct. If correct, review alternative DC quantum better/fairly incentivize Two Bedroom + apartment units.

3. Under the Capital Needs assessment for Fire Services:
 - a) What has changed from the previous DC calculation to require a 536% increase in the per unit charge?
 - b) How does the DC calculated charge relate to the level of service from previous DC calculation? In determining the maximum DC eligible amount, what population beyond the 2051 horizon year is included?
 - c) What assumptions go into the determination of “benefit to existing” – especially for new HQ replacement.
 - d) Is there a Level of Service applied to the current potential D.C. recoverable cost?

Recommendation: Watson and staff report back on assumptions and inputs into DC calculations .

4. Under the Capital Needs assessment for Social Housing:

- a) 2019 DC Background Study provided for \$17.5 million for new housing. How can such a substantial increase be included in current DC calculation?
- b) Is there a service standard to be applied to Social Housing? There is no service standard calculation included in current calculation.
- c) This Background Study provides for gross capital cost of \$228 million and net capital cost of \$183 million. The benefit to existing of 147.3 million is 80%. The 2019 DC Background study assumed an 84% benefit to existing.
- d) How is final per unit # calculated?
- e) Is there a Level of Service applied to the current potential D.C. recoverable cost?

Recommendation: Watson and staff report back on assumptions and inputs into DC calculations .

5. Under the Capital Needs assessment for Solid Waste:

- a) What has changed from the previous DC calculation to require a 1752% increase in the per unit charge?
- b) How is final per unit # calculated?
- c) Is there a Level of Service applied to the current potential D.C. recoverable cost?

Recommendation: Watson and staff report back on assumptions and inputs into DC calculations .

6. Under the Capital Needs assessment for Solid Waste

- a) What has changed from the previous DC calculation to require a 1752% increase in the per unit charge?
- b) How is final per unit # calculated?
- c) Is there a Level of Service applied to the current potential D.C. recoverable cost?

Recommendation: Watson and staff report back on assumptions and inputs into DC calculations .

7. Under the Capital Needs assessment for Parks & Recreation Services

- a) A local service definition needs to be provided. This question is related to comments provided in Issue #6.
- b) In the absence of a Parks Master Plan, how was the DC recoverable cost estimate of \$22 million developed as compared to the 2019 DC eligible cost estimate of \$5.9 million?
- c) Is there a further discussion on post period benefit to be held?
- d) Is there a Level of Service applied to the current potential D.C. recoverable cost?

Recommendation: Watson and staff report back on assumptions and inputs into DC calculations .

8. Under the Capital Needs assessment for Water and Wastewater Services

- a) What works are triggered by the MZO lands beyond the 2051 DGA land requirements?
- b) A reduction in the water distribution component of the DC calculation from 2019 seems counterintuitive. Some further clarification requested.

Recommendation: Watson and staff report back on assumptions and inputs into DC calculations .

9. Post period benefit needs to be reviewed in the context of capital works being built to service lands beyond the 2051 horizon year. This question relates to comments provided within Issue #7

Recommendation: Staff and Watson review proposed financial framework to service those lands is fair and appropriate..

Development Charge Credits for Aggregated and Phased Developments

Executive Summary

The current Development Charges (DC) by-law in the City of Kawartha Lakes provides redevelopment credits if a structure is rebuilt within three years of being demolished or rendered uninhabitable. While effective for small, individual property projects, this limited timeframe unintentionally discourages long-term, large-scale urban redevelopment—especially projects involving phased property assemblies or strategic intensification.

Issue Identified:

The existing 3-year eligibility window (extendable to 10 years by Council) does not accommodate the extended timelines required for assembling multiple parcels and planning complex urban infill developments. As a result, developers undertaking multi-year revitalization projects may lose access to DC credits, creating a disincentive for transformative growth.

Proposed Solution:

A **Two-Track Redevelopment Credit System** is recommended to distinguish between:

1. **Standard Track** – For typical, short-term individual property redevelopments (maintains the 3-year limit, with potential extension to 6 years).
2. **Strategic Redevelopment Track** – Tailored for long-term, aggregated, or phased projects in designated growth areas. This track allows for DC credit eligibility up to 20–30 years, subject to continuous ownership, official planning approvals, and historical documentation.

Additional provisions include:

- **Pro-rata credits** for partial assemblies;
- **Enhanced credits** for strategic intensification where most properties qualify;
- **Documentation requirements** to ensure alignment with the Official Plan and Community Improvement Plan (CIP) objectives.

Comparative Practices:

Other municipalities like Hamilton, Guelph, Kingston, and London have adopted flexible, area-specific DC policies that recognize the longer timeframes and complexities of core area redevelopment. These include exemptions, deferrals, and CIP-linked grants.

Recommendations:

1. Amend the DC By-law to establish a **Strategic Urban Redevelopment Track**.
2. Create a **formal review process** for applications involving multi-property, long-term redevelopment.
3. **Engage Council** to define clear eligibility criteria and approval procedures to ensure transparency and fiscal responsibility.

This revised framework would better support the City's strategic intensification goals, remove unintended barriers to downtown revitalization, and align the DC policy with real-world redevelopment timelines.

Working Paper

Summary of Existing By-law

The City of Kawartha Lakes currently exempts property owners from development charges if they redevelop a property within three years of it becoming uninhabitable or demolished. The by-law allows a credit for the redevelopment of land where structures were demolished or converted to another principal use.

Excerpt from Municipal By-law:

Redevelopment Credit:

- A credit applies if a residential or non-residential structure was demolished or converted to another use.
- The credit is calculated based on the applicable development charge rate multiplied by the number of units or the gross floor area/nameplate capacity.

Restrictions:

- The building must have been occupiable within three (3) years of the development charges becoming payable.
- The credit amount cannot exceed the development charges otherwise payable.
- A Council override can extend the eligibility to ten (10) years.

Assessment of Current Framework

The current 3- and 10-year timelines for Development Charge (DC) credits may unintentionally discourage large-scale urban redevelopment, particularly property aggregation or phased redevelopment projects spanning over a decade.

While the framework functions effectively for single-property projects, it does not align well with strategic, long-term redevelopment goals in core urban areas.

Example Scenario:

A standalone 1920s residential building on a downtown street is demolished, and a new mixed-use building is constructed within three years. This type of renewal is beneficial for downtown vibrancy, enabling compact, mixed-use urban environments without municipal subsidy.

However, if a developer assembles multiple adjacent properties over 20 years with a long-term vision, the current time limits void eligibility for redevelopment credits. This penalizes strategic, large-scale projects that aim for high-impact revitalization.

Proposed Amendment: Two-Track Redevelopment Credit System

To support both short-term and long-term projects, we propose introducing two distinct tracks:

Section 3.01 – Redevelopment Credit (Modified)

a) Where a building or structure on the same land was demolished, is to be demolished, or was rendered uninhabitable or unsafe in order to facilitate redevelopment, development charges shall be reduced based on the applicable DC rate and scale of previous use, as verified by the Chief Building Official (CBO).

b) The redevelopment credit shall be granted under one of the following tracks:

(i) Standard Track – Individual Property Redevelopment:

- The prior structure must have been occupied or occupiable within **3 years** of the development charge becoming payable.
- **Override Provision:** This period may be extended to **6 years** by Council policy.

(ii) Strategic Redevelopment Track – Aggregated or Phased Redevelopment:

- Applies to multiple contiguous or strategically located properties (e.g., within Urban Growth Centres or CIP Areas).
- Credits are eligible if:
 - The applicant demonstrates continuous or phased ownership;
 - Redevelopment occurs within **20 years** of the earliest demolition;
 - A comprehensive redevelopment application is approved.
- The CBO must verify the original use, size, and condition of demolished structures.

Section 5.07(c) – Restriction (Amended)

Notwithstanding subsection 5.07(c), for phased or strategic redevelopment projects in Urban Growth Centres or designated downtown cores, the eligibility period may be extended up to **30 years**, provided:

- The redevelopment is part of an integrated urban renewal project;
 - Council or delegated authority approves the project;
 - Supporting documentation verifies historical structures and land use.
-

New Subsection 5.09 – Redevelopment Credit for Aggregated or Phased Land Assemblies

a) Where redevelopment occurs on a site comprising two or more contiguous or functionally linked properties, a proportional credit shall apply to those properties demolished within **15 years**.

b) The CBO and Director of Development Services may approve partial credits on a **pro-rata** basis.

c) If part of the land assembly exceeds 15 years but:

- The site represents strategic intensification or urban renewal;
- The majority of properties (by unit count or GFA) fall within the eligibility window;

Council may authorize a **full or enhanced redevelopment credit**.

d) The applicant must submit:

- Documentation of an assembly strategy;
 - Evidence that early demolitions were part of long-term plans;
 - A redevelopment plan aligned with the Official Plan or CIP objectives.
-

Case Studies: Other Ontario Municipalities

1. City of Hamilton

- DC exemptions for downtown and BIA areas.
- Brownfield redevelopment support with extended timelines.

2. City of Guelph

- DC deferral agreements and exemptions in intensification zones.
- Site-specific policy adjustments encouraged.

3. City of Kingston

- Community Improvement Plans (CIPs) override standard DC timelines.

- Grants equivalent to DCs in targeted zones.

4. City of London

- Full/partial DC exemptions in “Old East Village” and “Downtown” CIPs.
 - No firm 3-year cutoff – policies tied to planning goals.
-

Final Recommendations

1. **Create a Strategic Urban Redevelopment Track** within the DC By-law, especially for core areas and CIP-designated lands.
2. **Establish a Review Process** for "Aggregated Property Redevelopment Applications" that exceed typical timelines.
3. **Engage Council to Set Guidelines** for:
 - Defining project eligibility;
 - Ensuring transparency;
 - Aligning urban renewal goals with fiscal responsibility.

Hi Adam,

I won't be at today's meeting but I wanted to provide some additional follow up on my task which was to provide recommendations on area specific DC ratings. We have had a lot of good discussion about this topic at previous meetings and I believe there is opportunity for area DC ratings. The following would be my recommendation for Watson to review.

1. Calculate DC with and without the MZO lands to confirm that greenfield development within the previous existing growth boundary is not subsidizing growth in the MZO lands.
2. It still seems to me that there should be consideration for an area rating for infill development on lands within the previous urban boundary. This infill development makes use of existing infrastructure more efficient and incentivize intensification inline with PPS. I also believe that infill development can reduce demand on some services. For example, older urban areas continue to have considerable inflow from sewer cross connections. These issues would be addressed by redevelopment of existing urban lands. There may be considerable capacity added for wastewater if these issues were corrected through redevelopment.

It is my hope that careful consideration could be given to the above items.

Regards,

Mark

Mark V Wilson, P.Eng.
President