

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 5. 2014 Development Charges

- Jim Kennedy, President, London Development Institute – reiterating the points made in the two communications included on the Added Agenda, in particular the position that water supply charges should not be included in development charges, but rather should be included in the utility rate; requesting final approval of the Development Charge By-law and background study be postponed to the Strategic Priorities and Policy Committee meeting to be held on June 23, 2014 to allow time for revisions based upon input from the public participation meeting held on May 5, 2014 and for further discussions with staff; noting that the London Development Institute does not represent the entire development community; indicating he would like more time to talk to staff about the policy for private, permanent stormwater systems affecting medium and high density residential, industrial, commercial and institutional as the way the proposed DC By-law is worded, they haven't made reductions in the amount to reflect that developers will have to provide quality and quantity control on site, which will have a cumulative effect; noting they still need a bit more time to speak with staff since the engineering component background studies were only discussed with staff last week and the studies need to be taken back to the consultant for review and revision and we should be able to see those revisions before they come forward; commending staff for their work and collaboration to date; and indicating support for postponing final approval until June 23, 2014 to allow the additional time for final discussions with staff.
- Phil Masschelein, Sifton Properties Limited – advising of one of Sifton's proposed developments called "The Village at Riverbend", which will be approximately 70 acres in size, will have approximately 2,000 residential units, .5 million sq. ft. of commercial, will have a total value of \$500 million once built out, will be leading edge in terms of architecture and design, green building/smart community; noting that the applications for the aforementioned development will be submitted to staff within the next month and will attract provincial and national recognition; noting that the development industry requires "tools" to help them move forward with smart communities, because they ultimately save communities money; noting they have submitted two letters to the City—one to Planning and one to Finance—to discuss implementing a Community Improvement Plan (CIP) designation for the area; and seeking flexibility in the language of the DC By-law for CIP programs for this and other future developments.
- Sandy Levin, Urban League of London – thanking the City for involving the Urban League in the review of the DC By-law and expressing the hope that this continue into the future, providing the attached presentation; indicating concern with delaying final approval to June 23, 2014 when June 24, 2014 is the "drop dead" date for approval; expressing the opinion that water supply should be included in the DC By-law as DC's are one-time charges whereas water rates continue; noting there are two elements to DC's: forecast of demand and forecast of costs; indicating that traditionally the DC study estimates are higher than actuals so the DC rates are too low, resulting in an increase in debt issuance; stating that existing and new residences and businesses are affected by road widenings and consideration of higher construction costs are generally ignored; noting that the private sector knows THAT when infrastructure programs are available, costs for works go up because there is always a limited timeframe for those programs; pointing out that DCs in different municipalities are not always apples to apples as a municipality such as London has roads to widen whereas a smaller municipality does not; reiterating support for water supply to be included in DCs and cautioning to be careful what you wish for.
- Peter Sergautis, President, Extra Realty Ltd. – providing the attached letter and reiterating the position expressed therein.
- Nadio DiPardo – indicating it would be a win-win situation for both the City and also small builders and private citizens to be able to construct in older, completely established neighbourhoods and areas of the City without the substantial development charges imposed; noting this would greatly encourage the development of any empty lots, severing of very large properties into smaller lots, and in turn, "filling up" neighborhoods and areas, which would help reduce sprawl; noting that in order to develop and build a single family home, duplex, triplex or fourplex, etc. all fees and costs attached to the development are paid for by the owner, at no cost to the City; stating that the City would not have to

expand roads, sidewalks, enlarge or enhance services and other requirements for a handful of homes built on any given street, but it would benefit greatly by the additional property taxes generated; indicating that development charges imposed make building in established areas very difficult to justify and seem unfair and must be subsidizing other bigger projects; stating that he is encouraged and hoping that there is Council support for in-fill projects to increase and suggesting that this would happen more quickly if development charges would be exempt for in-fill projects, which would in turn benefit the City through an increase in the tax base and a slow down of urban sprawl.

- Mike Inglis, 147 West Rivertrace Walk – indicating that he and his wife own and operate Gymworld Gymnastics, which has been operating for the last 12 years; stating that the proposed 2014 DC By-law references conversion provisions and he feels that when you locate a commercial use in an industrial area there should not be an expectation of the payment of full commercial development charges as the uses are temporary, but the building is permanent; noting that the full value of paying full commercial development charges can't every be fully realized because of retail uses; expressing the view that a lot of effort has been put into limiting non-industrial uses in industrial areas this past year by both staff and City Council and citing a situation at Wonderland and Southdale Roads that would suggest that the rates don't make sense; also pointing out that some Councillors have suggested that a certain area for small businesses be exempt, but a business such as his, which is still a small business, requires a large area, so that exemption does not assist his situation to any great extent; noting he is trying to build a world class facility, a process which started 5 years ago when he purchased property in the Hyde Park industrial area, behind his current location; stating he has been waiting for services to arrive that are presently being installed and this summer he was successful in working with the Planning staff to rezone the property to allow commercial recreation uses in the light industrial zone; indicating he has been following development charges for years and have been watching them rise over the years to the point where his project would be \$282,000 at the commercial rate; stating that he has been searching for policies that could help reduce that charge, but not only has that search been unsuccessful, they are now faced with charges increasing to \$433,000 which is almost an entire year's gross revenue and 30% of the cost of building the facility; expressing his strong belief that a commercial recreation facility is not the same as a commercial enterprise and noting his business does not generate enough revenue to support these kinds of fees; and summarizing that he and his spouse are not the kind of people that like to ask for things, but in this case they are asking as they need some assistance in order to be able to build this legacy project for the community...a project that is long overdue.