



TO: GENERAL COMMITTEE


SUBJECT: FEES BY-LAW AMENDMENTS

WARD: ALL

PREPARED BY AND KEY CONTACT: GORD ALLISON, P.ENG., CBCO
DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND BY-LAW SERVICES 4323 

SUBMITTED BY: G. ALLISON, P.ENG., CBCO
DIRECTOR OF BUILDING AND BY-LAW SERVICES 

GENERAL MANAGER APPROVAL: PATRICIA ELLIOTT-SPENCER, MBA, CPA, CMA
GENERAL MANAGER OF COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE SERVICES

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER APPROVAL: C. LADD, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER 

RECOMMENDED MOTION

1. That Schedule B of Fees By-law 2016-011 be amended as follows:
 - a) Amend line #1.11.9 to read "1.11.9.(a) Except for backflow devices, all plumbing alterations or extensions to existing distribution and drainage systems (per fixture) \$15.00";
 - b) Add line #1.11.9.(b) to read "Backflow devices \$300 for first five devices being installed at one time, plus \$30 per additional device being installed at the same time"; and
 - c) Add line #1.11.17 to read "Decks, deck extensions \$281".

PURPOSE & BACKGROUND

Report Overview

2. Permit fees are reviewed and set each year in conjunction with the City's Business Plan. The fees provide compensation for the total cost, including corporate overheads, of delivering permit-related services.
3. When reviewing the 2016 permit fees approved in By-law 2016-011 staff realized there were some fees inadvertently omitted.
4. This report seeks approval to add two fees into the Fees By-law.

ANALYSIS

5. Under the Clean Water Act, the municipality has undertaken to identify conditions within existing industrial, commercial, institutional (ICI) and major residential buildings where the potable water system could be at risk of contamination by non-potable sources being in direct contact with the potable water. Where the risk exists, the building owner is being required to install one or more backflow devices.
6. To date, permits have been issued to install several hundred backflow devices. The current fee that applies is \$15.00 per device, with a minimum fee of \$215.

7. It is estimated there will be another thousand or more of these devices to be installed in the next 12 months.
8. Staff's experience to date consumes, on average, about 0.5 hours of permit intake and processing, and about 1.0 hour on the job site to locate and gain access to the locked service room and to inspect the installed device, at an estimated cost of \$255.
9. Where additional devices are required in the same building, they are often located in a different service room, requiring on average another 10 minutes of inspection time at an estimated cost of \$30.
10. It is therefore recommended that a new fee be added to provide full cost recovery for this specialized and recurring type of permit.
11. Residential decks are primarily installed by homeowners, except where they are installed as part of the original house construction by the house builder. Owner-built decks consume a considerable amount of time at both the permit review process and the inspection processes. Homeowners in general are not well versed in the Building Code requirements and many questions are asked of our staff, and at the inspections.
12. On average, decks built subsequent to the house construction requires about 1.5 hours of permit processing time and 2.0 hours of on-site inspection time at a cost of \$525 to the corporation.
13. Recognizing a permit fee of \$525 might be onerous for many homeowners, who might be inclined to simply avoid the cost by not getting a permit, a flat fee of \$261.80 had been charged in 2015 for each deck or deck extension.
14. When preparing the proposed 2016 permit fees, this line was inadvertently deleted. The minimum fee of \$155 for a residential accessory structure is the default fee that can be applied until a new deck fee can be reinstated.
15. It is proposed the fee be reinstated and a new flat fee rate of \$281. When combined with the Zoning review fee of \$69, the total fee for a typical deck would be \$350.

ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

16. There are no environmental matters related to the recommendation.

ALTERNATIVES

17. The following alternatives are available for consideration by General Committee:

Alternative #1 General Committee could maintain the existing fee schedule in Fees By-law 2016-011.

This alternative is not recommended as it would result in services being delivered that are not fully recovered by the appropriate permit fee.

Alternative #2 General Committee could alter the proposed recommendation by adjusting the recommended permit fees to a different amount.

Although this alternative is available, the municipality should try to establish permit fees that are reasonable and defensible with respect to cost recovery for a prescribed service level. Whereas the issuance of permits and the conducting of inspections are both mandatory requirements under the Building Code Act, the user of those services should be paying for the costs of those services.

FINANCIAL

18. There are no financial implications for the Corporation resulting from the proposed recommendation.

LINKAGE TO 2014-2018 STRATEGIC PLAN

19. The recommendation(s) included in this Staff Report are not directly associated with the goals identified in the 2014-2018 Strategic Plan.

