



IBI GROUP
7th Floor – 55 St. Clair Avenue West
Toronto ON M4V 2Y7 Canada
tel 416 596 1930 fax 416 596 0644
ibigroup.com

May 13, 2019

Ms. Wendy Cooke
City Clerk & Director of Legislative & Court Services
City of Barrie
70 Collier Street
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 4T5

Dear Ms. Cooke:

CITY OF BARRIE DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CHARGES BACKGROUND STUDY

The City of Barrie released its draft Development Charges Background Study (DCBS) on April 17th 2019. A number of master plans, which underpin the DCBS, were also released in April.

IBI Group was retained by the Hewitt Landowners Group to review the DCBS, the various assumptions and calculations associated with the determination of the new charge overall, and the area specific implication. This letter is intended to provide an overview of the IBI Group's initial comments and questions regarding the draft DCBS.

We have had little time and opportunity to absorb the substantial material released and formulate an informed opinion. Further, we have had little opportunity to engage in discussion with the City and their consultants to review our concerns and/or issues and to better understand some of the details of the updated DCBS.

Overview

IBI Group, in its review of the draft DCBS, notes that overall, the DC has increased \$19,263 or 40% for a Single Family Dwelling. Of this total increase, \$14,649 is attributable to the municipal wide DC and the remaining \$4,614 is attributed to the area specific DC focused on the wastewater collection and water distribution infrastructure for Hewitt.

The service categories with the largest increases include:

- Roads/Services Related to a Highway,
- Protection,
- Parks & Recreation,
- Wastewater Services Facilities as well as the
- ASDC for wastewater and water.

New service categories in this DC update include: Airport, Long Term Care and Waste Diversion.

It is important to note the changing policy and legislative framework which impacts growth management and development charges across the City. Proposed changes to the Development Charges Act will limit the service categories which can be considered for eligible for

Ms. Wendy Cooke – May 13, 2019

development charges. A Community Benefits Charge under the Planning Act is proposed to replace a number of the current charges considered in the draft DCBS.

Preliminary Review

IBI Group has completed a preliminary review of the service categories included in the draft DCBS, and we note the following concerns, and questions for clarification.

Roads

- a) The approach to Benefit to Existing (BTE) and Post Period Benefit (PPB) is not articulated in the DCBS. Please provide the rationale used for BTE and PPB.
- b) For Active Transportation there is generally a small BTE attribution. Given that there is little 'active transportation infrastructure' in place today, intuitively it suggests that there will be a higher benefit to existing. In order to ascertain, the City should provide mapping to identify where the projects included in the DC will be located. In other jurisdictions where Watson has done the DCBS, the BTE is based on the relative proportion of existing and future population.
- c) On p 5-39 the last row before the total row identifies a lump sum \$70 million is deducted noting 'Post Period Benefit Deduction'. What is the rationale for this lump sum amount and the manner in which it is considered in the DCBS?
- d) Mapping showing all the road projects would be helpful in reviewing the benefit attributions. Please provide.
- e) The overall level of service has increased by 90%. Given that the quantity and quality standards have increased 20% and 60% respectively, how is it that the standard overall, relative to 2014, can increase 90%. Please explain.

Wastewater Facilities

- f) IBI Group is working with Hewitt's engineering consultant to understand the projects and ensure the costs as well as the benefit attribution are reasonable. There has been insufficient time since the release of the draft DCBS to undertake this in a comprehensive manner.

Protection

- g) Please provide details regarding the First Responders Campus facility at a cost of \$46.8 million in terms of GFA, site and other assumptions. How was the BTE determined?
- h) Please explain why the 35 Sperling Police Station is fully included in the LOS without adjusting for the o/s principal included in the capital program?

Parks & Recreation

- i) Please explain the increase in the inventory of parkland development from 162 line items in 2014 compared to 243 line items in 2019.
- j) Please explain the change in the classification of parks relative to the 2014 DCBS.
- k) Please explain the inclusion of 'Environmentally Protected Open Space and NHS with Trails'. Please also explain the value per hectare assumptions (\$30,300, \$11,100) and what this includes.

Ms. Wendy Cooke – May 13, 2019

- l) There are 37.3 ha (92 ac) associated with Hewitt's Creek Environmentally Protected Open Space and Natural Heritage System with Trails. This is new to the inventory. We require more time to better understand any implications to the DCBS and/or our client group.
- m) Please provide the details on the determination of the debt principal and interest for the Holly Recreation Centre.
- n) Why is the Holly Recreation Centre fully included in the LOS as well as in the capital program? The LOS should be prorated to reflect this.

Wastewater and Water Facilities Related Debt

- o) What are the discount and interest rates assumed in the determination of debt?

Parking

- p) Why is a GO Platform included in the capital program for parking?

Local Service Policy

- q) The local service policy, found in Appendix E, comprises 21 pages; this compares to the 2014 DC local service policy which included 2 pages. Further, the local service policy indicates a particular service would be a developer responsibility 'unless it is included in the DC study'. It is difficult, if not impossible, to review the various service categories in the local service policy and compare to the DCBS capital program in order to ascertain what may be a developer responsibility. Some categories are relatively straight forward (eg. pipe sizes are identified for water and wastewater), but others require significantly more review. As noted, additional time is required to better understand responsibilities and any potential concerns.

* * * * *

We look forward to the opportunity to meet with City staff and their consultant to engage in meaningful review and discussion to ensure the DC is fair and equitable to the various stakeholders involved in this process.

Yours truly,

IBI GROUP



Audrey Jacob MCIP RPP PLE
Deputy Regional Director, Canada East