

TOWN OF OAKVILLE RESPONSES
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Altus Group Economic Consulting – Soft Services – January 10, 2018

Library

- 1. Is the Sixteen Mile Creek branch library project shown to be located on lands the Town already owns (as purchased in 1991 and funded by developer contributions)? Prior plans showed a Phase 2 community centre and library on lands east of the now-built recreation centre, closer to the site's Neyagawa frontage. If so, the land costs included (at a cost of \$1.7 million on page 5-14) should be excluded from the DC calculations?**

Response

The land costs for the acquisition of land for the Sixteen Mile Library branch represent the fair market value of the lands from a third party and not the costs paid when the lands were originally acquired.

General Response on Land Values

It should also be noted that as part of the current DC Background Study the town undertook an update the land valuations and it has been noted that the value of land associated with the capital projects has increased significantly since 2012 which has had a resulting impact on the cost of projects. The assessment of the increase in overall project costs and rates must be considered within the context of this general statement of significantly increased land values adding to the costs. Please see attached Appendix 1.

- 2. The costs for land for the Palermo library branch has increased significantly from \$509,000 to \$4,005,000. We are unable to find the proposed land purchase in the Town's 2017-2026 capital budget, despite it being shown as planned for purchase in 2020 in the DC Study?**

Response

The document referred to in the question is 1 year old. The land purchase is included in the 2018 to 2027 capital forecast which will be available February 7, 2018.

- 3. We would like to understand the nature of the “Palermo Temporary Branch Library”, scheduled for 2019 at a cost of \$3,000,000, particularly given that it only appears to be proposed one year ahead of the scheduled land purchase for the “permanent” Palermo branch library, and seven years ahead of construction of the permanent branch library?**

Response

The temporary library branch is an interim solution until a permanent branch can be built. There is a need to secure land for the permanent branch early to ensure an appropriate location.

- 4. The 2017-2026 capital budget forecast only shows \$911,300 in expenditures related to the new Sixteen Mile Branch library in 2026, while the DC Study shows a total of \$11,464,100 in costs up to 2026. What is the reasoning behind the project moving forward 1-2 years compared to the 2017 capital budget?**

Response

The need for the library was confirmed in the update to the Parks, Recreation and Library Master Plan. Timing has been matched to the construction of the future community centre.

Parks and Recreation

- 5. The North Operations Depot, Phase 2 is to be located on lands that the Town already owns (as purchased in 1991 via parkland reserve funds and lot levies). Therefore, land costs included (at a cost of \$4.1 million on page 5-8) should be excluded from the DC calculations?**

Response

Please refer to the answer provided to Question No. 1.

6. The costs for the North Operations Depot Phase 2 are split between the “Services Related to a Highway” category and the “Parks and Recreation” DC, for a total of \$20.6 million in costs. This is significantly higher than what is shown in the Town’s 2017 capital budget forecast, where only \$14.8 million in costs are included. What is the difference between the capital budget estimate and the DC Study cost estimate?

Response

The town budgets on a cash flow basis, therefore budgets are spread over several years based on expected timing of spending. Sometimes in later years the budget only reflects a portion of the total budget with the remaining falling outside the 10 year forecast window.

The 2017-2026 capital forecast budget included a total of \$14,818,100 which represents land, phase 1 completion and a portion of Phase 2 construction as one project.

The following is a breakdown of the components:

North Operations Depot - 2017-2026 CAPITAL FORECAST	
Land	2,562,600
Phase 1 completion	4,120,000
Phase 2 Construction	8,135,500
	14,818,100
Phase 2 Construction outside forecast	1,897,000
Total Project Budget	16,715,100

The estimates are based on updated costs estimates for both land and construction. Therefore, in comparison to the 2017 DC Study, land has increased by \$8,690,484 and construction (Phase 1 and Phase 2) has decreased by \$1,063,500.

7. Can the Town share plans for the North Operations Depot Phase 2 (square footage of building areas, acres of land, etc.)?

Response

- Acreage of land is 6.69 acres
- Renovation of fire portion of existing building
- New Administration Building - 7,815 square feet
- New Pole Barns - 22,695 square feet
- Allowance for site work - majority of work was completed under Phase One

8. **The Sixteen Mile Creek Recreation Centre project shown appears to be located on lands the Town already owns. Prior plans showed a Phase 2 community centre and library on lands east of the now-built recreation centre, closer to the site's Neyagawa frontage. The land costs included (at a cost of \$6.9 million on page 5-10) should be excluded from the DC calculations, as there will be no such expenditure required by the Town (and what was spent was funded by developer contributions).**

Response

Please refer to the answer provided to Question No. 1.

9. **The Town's 2017-2016 capital budget forecast includes just \$3.3 million in funding over the 10-year period for the Sixteen Mile Creek Community Centre and Branch Library, compared to \$51 million in the 2017 DC Study. What is the basis for seemingly advancing the project forward 1-2 years compared to the timing from the 2017 capital budget forecast?**

Response

The need for the Sixteen Mile Community Centre was confirmed in the update to the Parks, Recreation and Library Master Plan which indicated the recommended timing in 2026. The Library's recommended timing is to be matched to the construction of the future community centre.

The town budgets on a cash flow basis, therefore budgets are spread over several years based on expected timing of spending. Sometimes in later years the budget only reflects a portion of the total budget with the remaining falling outside the 10 year forecast window. The 2017-2026 Capital Forecast only represented a portion of the total budget for the Sixteen Mile CC and Library.

10. **The Level of Service inventory for Parks and Recreation includes the full cost of building and land for the Quad Pad and Joshua's Creek Arena facilities, despite the capital program including the remaining debt for both facilities. The proportion to which the remaining debt relates to the total costs of those works should be deducted from the gross floor area in the level of service inventory tables for Parks and Recreation.**

Response

Response to be provided.

11. On page 5-11, the debt interest for the Quad Pad Arena and Joshua's Creek Arena projects have been discounted, however, it does not appear that the same discounting has been applied to the principal portions of costs. Discounting the principal payments is appropriate to offset future indexing of DC rates. As total payments towards debentures are constant from year-to-year, both the principal and interest portions need to be discounted to ensure that the DCs collected towards total payment amounts are held constant over the life of the DC by-law.

Response

The discounted debt interest is calculated by discounting the future annual principal and interest payments by the assumed annual indexing for the bylaw. The discounted amounts then represent the original principal plus the discounted interest. An example of this calculation is provided below based on \$1 million in principal issued:

Annual Debt Schedule

Annual Interest Rate	5.00%
Discounting Rate	2.00%
Years	5
Payments per Year	1
Principal	1,000,000
Year	2017

Payment Number	Year of Payment	Payment	Principal	Interest	Balance	Discounted Payment
1	2017	\$230,974.80	\$180,974.80	\$50,000.00	\$819,025.20	\$230,974.80
2	2018	\$230,974.80	\$190,023.54	\$40,951.26	\$629,001.66	\$226,445.88
3	2019	\$230,974.80	\$199,524.71	\$31,450.08	\$429,476.95	\$222,005.77
4	2020	\$230,974.80	\$209,500.95	\$21,473.85	\$219,976.00	\$217,652.71
5	2021	\$230,974.80	\$219,976.00	\$10,998.80	\$0.00	\$213,385.01
Total		\$1,154,873.99	\$1,000,000.00	\$154,873.99		\$1,110,464.17
		[a]	[b]	[c]		[d]

[d]	Total Discounted Payments:	\$1,110,464.17
[b]	Total Principal:	\$1,000,000.00
[d]-[b]	Total Discounted Interest:	\$110,464.17

The repayment schedule above provides for 5 years repayment of a loan (i.e. debt). The five years principal and interest payments are provided in total in column A with the breakdown of the annual amounts of principal and interest shown in columns A and B respectively. The discount is calculated on the annual payments in column A and is shown in column D. This results in the total 5 years payments of \$1,154,873 being discounted to \$1,110,464. The discounted interest amount is shown in the lower table where the Total Principal amount (column B) is subtracted from the Discounted payment total (column D). This provides the discounted interest of \$110,464 (Column D minus Column B).

- 12. The costs for the South East Recreation Centre include land costs of \$8.6 million. According to a Town staff report dated February 28, 2013, which discussed publicly-owned lands in the southern part of the Town:**

All of the study sites are owned by the Town of Oakville, except for the Oakville Trafalgar Memorial Hospital (OTMH) site, which the town will acquire from Halton Healthcare Services for \$1 when construction of the new hospital at Third Line and Dundas Street is complete.

Response

The former OTMH lands were acquired by the Town of Oakville as part of a commitment from the town to contribute towards the funding and construction of the new hospital site of \$130 Million. As part of the total contribution by the town, the former OTMH lands were transferred to the town. The lands were valued at approximately \$24.9 Million at the time of the transfer and land transfer taxes and HST was paid in accordance with that valuation that has been identified in the town's capital assets. The OTMH lands have been properly valued at \$24.9 Million and represent the value of those lands and the amounts paid by the town to acquire same. The lands are now proposed to be used for a DC capital project based on fair market value of the lands from a third party and as such recovery of those amounts are permitted under the Act. If the lands were not used by the town for this purpose, the town would still be required to purchase other lands at the same valuation, if not higher, for the South East Recreation Centre.

- 13. The "Tableland Woodlot" areas have each been assigned a 2017 "value" for parkland development of \$87,700 per hectare – as the cost of land cannot be included in the DC level of service inventory, can you specify what improvements have been made to these areas to justify this 'parkland improvement' value? The level of service inventory includes a fairly comprehensive list of amenities (gateways, information kiosks, stairs, bridges) that it is unclear what could be left over to give any value to remaining development items for woodlots.**

Response

The \$87,000 per hectare cost reflects the development cost without amenities. The \$87,000 consists of site preparation, site servicing, pathways, site furnishings, soft landscaping, and a portion of fees, mobilization, testing and contingency.

- 14. Similar to the above question for Undeveloped Parkland – we'd like to understand the 'improvements' that have been made to the land to reach a \$13,400 per hectare value – especially if "parkland trails" are accounted for separately.**

Response

The costs associated with "Undeveloped Parkland" at \$13,400 per hectare represents fencing and gates for the perimeter of the parkland. These costs include costs of ensuring the land is safe for public use .

Fire

- 15. Based on the map provided in the 2016 Fire Master Plan executive summary, it appears that Fire Station No. 9 will be located within the North Park lands. The capital program on page 5-22 shows a land purchase of \$2.7 million. Prior plans showed a fire station on lands that the Town already owns. Therefore, the land costs included should be excluded from the DC calculations.**

Response

The temporary fire station 9 is located on the North Park lands. The permanent station will be located in the Sixth Line/Burnhamthorpe area and will require the purchase of land.

- 16. Can the Town provide details about expansion to Fire Station No. 4 – the existing site for this station is small, which would appear to make a potential expansion relatively limited – are there plans for how this expansion will be implemented, and how large the building will be?**

Response

The existing Fire Station 4 was built in 1975. The facility is 4,525 square feet and is significantly undersized limiting its future use. In addition, the existing building is at the end of its life cycle due to poor construction and cannot be repurposed. The existing fire station will be demolished and a new Fire Station 4 will be built on the same property. The new Fire Station will be 12,810 square feet and 2 storeys.

17. Compared to the Town’s 2017-2026 capital budget forecast, the costs for the Station #4 Expansion and Fire Station #9 have increased (fairly significantly in the case of Station #9). What is the rationale for the cost increases over the estimates provided by the Town earlier in 2017?

Response

For Station #4

The difference in cost of \$509,000 between 2017 and 2018 estimate is due to:

- Inflation
- Additional fire vehicular access point for efficient operations
- Allow for temporary facilities for existing fire fighters as the station must remain operational throughout construction.
- Increased cost for demolition due to designated substance remediation

For Station #9

Cost for 2018 of \$11,584,900 includes \$2,710,400 million for land purchase based on current value. If you remove the cost of land, there is a difference in cost of \$2,598,500 for the added scope of Fire Prevention offices on 2nd floor of the new facility. Relocation of the Fire Prevention space to the new facility has been attributed to an increased benefit to existing.

18. For Fire Station No. 9, how have the costs incurred for the temporary fire station 9A (as recovered for through the 2013 DC Study) been accounted for in the DC Study?

Response

A benefit to existing has been included in the construction of the permanent Fire Station No. 9. The benefit to existing allocated to this project includes both the temporary fire station 9A as well as a benefit to existing for the relocation of Fire Prevention space to the new facility.

Administration (Studies)

19. Why have studies such as Fire Master Plan, Transit Service Plan, Parking Demand Study, Recreation Master Plan, etc. been included within “Administration” and not within the particular service categories?

Response

Generally, studies which relate to an individual project (e.g. Design, Site Works, etc.) remains with the service’s capital works. Studies of a broader planning nature are included in the Administration category.

Local Service Guidelines

20. The local service guidelines state that:

Local and Collector Roads

All Roads, other than those designated as Arterial Roads within the Town's Official Plan ... direct developer responsibility

The guidelines should clarify how the road classifications in the North Oakville secondary plans fit into the guidelines, as there are “Avenue/Transit Corridor” and “Connector/Transit Corridor” classifications, which fall into neither of the “local”, “collector” or “arterial” classifications referred to in the local service guidelines.

Response

The description heading for Policy Section A1 – “Local and Collector Roads (including land)” was not intended to set out any policy for local or collector roads. In order to clarify the confusion, we propose to remove the descriptor heading for A1 and A2 and combine the content of these two sections under a new section description entitled A1 – Roads (including land). Subsequent sections 3 through 7 will then be re-numbered 2 through 6. This revision will effectively remove the use of any road classifications other than Arterial Roads – which is the only road classification which may have its planned improvements included in the Development Charges study. Planned or necessary construction of, or improvements to, roads classifications other than Arterial roads shall be a direct developer responsibility under section s. 59 of the D.C.A as a local service. This includes but is not limited to roads classified as local, collector, avenue/transit corridor, connector/transit corridor, etc.

21. The guidelines go on to state that:

Where roadway improvements are required on Arterial roadways to support a specific development or required to link the development area with the existing community, and where these Arterial roadway improvements have not been identified within the current D.C. study, these road improvements shall be a direct developer responsibility under s.59 of the DCA as a local service.

This provision is concerning for a few reasons:

- a. **The purpose of arterial roads is to serve Town-wide traffic, so the implication that there could be arterial improvements required to support specific developments, or link a development area with the existing community would hopefully be a rare case, particularly if the existing road being improved is already classified as arterial**

Response

The Town agrees that specific projects requiring a specific direct development improvement to an Arterial road are rare, however they are identified from time to time. An example would be a new commercial development access onto an Arterial roadway that requires the installation of a new traffic signal and dedicated turn lane to accommodate and control the movement of traffic in/out of this new access connection. The improvement provides little to no benefit to the overall movement of people and goods throughout the community. The needed improvement is predominately driven by the need to safely control and accommodate the ingress/egress of movements into/out of the new development.

- b. **The provision that Arterial road improvements are ineligible for recovery through DCs “where these Arterial roadway improvements have not be identified within the current DC study” is problematic in that sometimes the need for a project can arise during the planning/development process, which may require a landowner to front-end costs and receive DC credits for their works. If the need for this work could not have been anticipated, so long as it is meets the requirements regarding road classification, it should not matter that the work was or was not specified in the most recent DC study. Therefore, we would recommend that the wording “where these Arterial roadway improvements have not been identified within the current DC study” be removed.**

Response

The identification of needs and projects is fundamental to the development and computation of the DC charge. Every effort should be made to determine the needs brought on by development so that the charge may be appropriately set. The Town has identified three projects (30, 33, 34) within the DC charge that consider the need for intersection improvements and signals at unspecified locations. We have come to learn that improvements such as these do come about through the cumulative increase in people and goods movement brought on by growth. The Town actively monitors its intersections and roadway system and actuates these projects when required. These projects are driven by the cumulative impacts of growth and are not associated with one or two specific developments. There may be instances where an intersection and/or signal

project is triggered by the ‘additional’ introduction of traffic into an area being monitored for cumulative traffic growth. In such a case, the Town may agree to such intersection and/or signal works completed as a condition of the active development proposal. The active development may be eligible for reimbursement for these works or for DC credits as may be elected by the Town.

The Town also recognizes that (as set out in a. above) that intersection and/or signal works may be required solely for the benefit of a development proposal. In these instances, the intersection and/or signal works are a local development responsibility.

22. We also have questions regarding the classification and treatment of old Burnhamthorpe – assuming that the Town will be assuming this road from Halton Region, where it is designated as Major Arterial in the Regional Official Plan, we would assume it would at least be classified as Minor Arterial by the Town, but would want clarification regarding how it will be classified and handled, as it is currently shown as Avenue/Transit Corridor within the North Oakville East Secondary Plan (Figure NOE 4 – Transportation Plan).

Response

As a result of the requests by industry representatives to reconsider the classification of Burnhamthorpe Road under the current development charge background study, the town has undertaken a further review of the intended function and design of Burnhamthorpe Road and agrees that the form of function of the road is such that the construction of same is intended to serve growth beyond that of a local road which otherwise would be considered under the Local Services Policy and as such it is appropriate to add Burnhamthorpe Road as a development charges eligible program and to recover the costs of same pursuant to the development charges by-law. The addition of this program has resulted in an additional cost recovery of \$25.1M to the development charges capital program. If however, it is ultimately determined that Burnhamthorpe Road should not be included in the development charge capital program, whether by way of Council decision or a decision on an appeal, the provision and construction of this road will be dealt with in accordance with the town’s Local Services Policy.

Burnhamthorpe Road is currently a Regional Road but will become a Town of Oakville Road once William Halton Parkway is completed.

The North Oakville East Secondary Plan designates Burnhamthorpe Road as a “Character Road”. The “Burnhamthorpe Road Character Study and Municipal Class Environmental Assessment” (Character Road Study) was completed in December 2014. The Character Road Study sets out the required configuration of the portions of Burnhamthorpe Road that will be transferred to the town, including number of lanes, bicycle lanes, sidewalks and on-street parking.

As outlined in the Character Road Study, Burnhamthorpe Road will have sections with a 22m right-of-way and a section with a 24m right-of-way. Burnhamthorpe Road will support multiple modes of transportation including cars, transit, bicycles and pedestrians, and will provide on-street parking opportunities. It will serve a greater transportation function than a local road (as defined in the North Oakville East Secondary Plan) by accommodating and supporting local, neighbourhood and intra-district travel, and connecting Urban Centres and Cores.

While Burnhamthorpe Road exists today, the road must be essentially rebuilt to support the planned development along the corridor and to achieve the cross-sections and functions identified in the Character Road Study and the North Oakville East Secondary Plan. As a result, the benefits of this new road are primarily attributable to growth.

By-Law Definitions

23. We have concerns with the inclusion of stacked townhouses within the multiple unit category in the proposed DC by-law. Statistics Canada includes stacked townhouses within the apartments category, typically within the “apartment, building that has fewer than five storeys”. While Statistics Canada does not provide data on average household sizes for stacked townhouses separately from traditional apartments within this defined category, the PPU for stacked townhouses are likely far more similar to those of apartments than a townhouse unit. According to the 2016 Census, the average household sizes for selected dwelling types in the Town are as follows:

- a. Row house – 2.68 persons per unit;**
- b. Apartment in building with less than five storeys – 1.81 persons per unit;**
- c. Apartment in building with more than five storeys – 1.71 persons per unit.**

According to Altus Data Solutions information, recent stacked townhouse units sold within the Town have ranged from as small as 745 square feet, and no larger than 1,799 square feet. Traditional townhouse units being marketed in the Town have ranged from 1,600 square feet at the low end to over 2,400 square feet.

The inflated charges on relatively small unit types will act as a disincentive to provide units that can help meet the need for affordable ground-oriented ownership housing. In its DC by-law, the Region of Halton includes stacked houses within the apartment category. If the rates are adopted as proposed, the cumulative Regional and Town-imposed development charges for a one-bedroom stacked townhouse unit in the greenfield area would amount to

\$37,585 (or \$47 per square foot for an 800 square foot unit). Currently, a three-bedroom townhouse in the built-boundary area of the Town would pay a combined DC of \$38,859 (or \$16 per square foot for a 2,400 square foot unit).

Response

Please refer to Appendix 2.

Population, Household and Employment Forecasts

24. The population and employment forecast for 2031 in the 2017 DC Study is consistent with the Best Planning Estimates and the Halton Region Official Plan. However, the household forecasts a total of 89,090 housing units by 2031, which is well below the 93,549 by 2031 forecasted in the Best Planning Estimates and set out in the Regional Official Plan. The forecasts used in the DC Study should be consistent with those forecasts enshrined in Official Plans. It should be noted that Page 3-1 of the DC Study says that the Regional OP was “consulted” to assess residential development potential in the Town, but the household forecast in the ROP was seemingly not followed.

Response

Please refer to Appendix 2.

25. An influence behind the reduced number of housing units in the DC Study’s housing forecast are the higher PPU’s, which, based on a fixed population forecast for 2031, results in fewer units being required to generate the forecasted population. The PPU estimates in the DC Study are based on adjusted data from the 2011 Census, with the adjustment made to transform the 2011 data into something akin to what the 2016 data is assumed to show, if it were used. Rather than evaluating the reasonableness of the ‘adjustment’ made to 2011 data, we would like to see how the PPU’s would have been calculated if based on 2016 Census data. Although there may have been some unforeseen trends in average household sizes in Oakville over the 2011-2016 period, we would expect that the long-term forecasts in the 2011 BPE, as now contained in the Regional Official Plan, would be accurate over the long-term out to 2031, and should therefore be continued to be used as the basis for the Town’s DC Study, regardless of intra-period fluctuations in PPU factors that may well revert to long-term expectations in coming years.

Response

Please refer to Appendix 2.

26. Schedule 3 of Appendix A estimates the amount of population that new units over the mid-2016 to mid-2017 period would have generated. It is based on PPU's of 3.68 for singles/semis, 2.61 for multiples and 1.44 for apartments. This is different than the PPU's used for Schedules 4b and 4c (3.61 for singles/semis, 2.63 for multiples, 1.59 for apartments). The tables in both schedules showing the PPU's have a related footnote saying that "Persons per unit based on adjusted Statistics Canada Custom 2011 Census database". We would like to understand why a different set of PPU's were used for Schedule 3.

Response

Please refer to Appendix 2.

Altus Group Economic Consulting – Roads & Transit – January 11, 2018**Roads**

1. **The DC Study, on page 5-25, refers to a “2018 Transportation Background Study” as being the source for added roads in the 2018 DC Study, but we are unable to locate this document. Can you please provide us with a copy of this study?**

Response

The TMP will be made available online, on or about January 22nd, 2018. The TMP can be accessed from the town’s website by following the below noted link:

<https://www.oakville.ca/townhall/switching-gears-tmp.html>

2. **There are numerous roads projects with significant cost increases over what was shown for the same projects in the Town’s 2013 DC Study. It is our understanding that costs for projects in the 2013 DC Study were indexed by roughly 9% to account for construction cost inflation, which is reasonable.**

The 19 projects listed in Figure 1 have a combined cost of \$338.4 million, compared to only \$176.9 million in costs for the same projects in 2013, an average increase of 91%.

- a. **We would like to understand the reason for the significant cost increases seen for each of the projects listed below over and above the construction cost index?**

Response

Project 10 – AT Cycle Lanes – The town’s Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) was updated in 2017 and includes updated costs and new projects that were identified through the study process.

The \$26.741M included in Project 10 - AT Cycle Lanes, Routes and Pathways includes active transportation infrastructure to 2031 that has been identified in the ATMP but that is not included as part of other road works (widening, urbanization, etc.).

Project 39 – Palermo Terminal - The Palermo Terminal budget was updated based on the Palermo Transit Terminal Location Study by the IBI Group as well as current land values and construction costs. The Palermo Transit Terminal Location Study by the IBI Group is provided as part of question 4.

Project 9 – Active Transportation Initiatives – The ATMP was updated in 2017 and identified additional initiatives to support active transportation and a shift in

travel to more sustainable modes. The increase in the value of Project 9 – Active Transportation Initiatives reflects the costs to implement these works. The Active Transportation Initiatives are included in Appendix G of the 2017 Active Transportation Master Plan.

Project 54 – Speers Road Widening (Third Line to Fourth Line)

The costing for two Speers Road projects (Third Line to Fourth Line, and Dorval Drive to Kerr Street) in the 2012 DC Study were incorrectly listed and should have been switched:

Project	Reported 2017 Cost	Reported 2012 Cost
54 - Speers Road (3 rd to 4 th Line)	\$18,947 million	\$6,157 million
56 – Speers Road (Dorval to Kerr)	\$ 6,942 million	\$17,476 million

Projects 12, 13, 14 and 15 - Lakeshore Road

Phasing limits for these projects have changed. In comparing costs of all four project phases, the net cost increase is 17.3%, based on the following costs:

Total 2012 cost \$26,923 million

Total 2017 cost \$31,596 million

Project 18 - Cornwall Road (Chartwell to Morrison Road)

This project is now at 90% detail design. During the design phase, additional drainage and site condition requirements were identified.

Major cost increases from 2012 include:

- Replacement and upsizing of existing cross culverts based on Conservation Authority requirement in development of the detail design. Additional \$600k
- Pipeline protection \$200k
- Storm drainage retention through underground storage methods. Additional \$550k
- General unit pricing increases

Project 49 - Speers Road (W of Third Line to Fourth Line)

The length of this project has increased from 2,100m to 2,800m.

Project 16 - Lower Base Line (excl. valley section) Bronte Road to 4th Line

Land costs for this project increased from \$870k to \$1.6 million.

Project 7 - New Burnhamthorpe Road (Tremaine Road to Bronte Road)

This project includes a land component that was previously not included, which resulted in a \$2.5 million increase.

General unit pricing increases also contributed to the change in costs.

b. We would also like to request detailed project sheets for road works (for both those listed in Figure 1, but all other road improvement works listed in the DC Study), with unit cost breakdowns.

Response

Detailed project sheets can be accessed via the below link:

<https://oakville.box.com/s/srwzrpxcsyzq3iaexp9o9qtgefb5zwi>

- 3. There are 18 projects identified as “Added Projects” that are new or substantially changed since the 2013 DC Study. Many of these projects relate to the Midtown Oakville area (Cross Avenue, Royal Windsor Drive, Iroquois Shore Road, N/S BRT, etc.), and have a combined cost of \$188.4 million.**

Based on discussions at the January 8th, 2018 stakeholder meeting, it is my understanding that the construction costs for these projects were based on recently constructed works in the Town, as well as several similar projects in surrounding municipalities (Brampton, Mississauga). Has the Town applied a contingency and engineering factor to the unit costs discerned from real world examples elsewhere in the region? If so, we would question this approach, as it would be assumed that the “real-world” examples would contain the costs associated with unforeseen events during design and/or construction, as well as any engineering fees. Please provide us with detailed cost information for each of the “Added Projects”, as well as the “real-world” information construction costs have been based on from projects in Oakville, Mississauga, Brampton, etc.

Response

Project costs were developed from unit pricing of Oakville tenders in the last 3 years. For items where there was no recent unit pricing from contracts the unit pricing from the 2012 DC study were indexed to 2017 costs.

Costs from analyzed tenders are only unit price costs only (excavation, asphalt, etc.) not overall contract price.

- 4. The 2018-2027 capital budget forecast indicated that the cost for the Palermo Terminal included the purchase of land and construction of a bus terminal, as based on the June 2010 Palermo Transit Terminal Location Study, performed by IBI Group. Can you provide us with a copy of this study?**

Response

Please refer to Appendix No. 5.

5. We have several questions related to the Kerr Street Grade Separation project (Project #5):

a. What is the nature of the \$31.3 million in “other contributions”?

b. Similarly, what is the source of the \$8.8 million in “Other Deductions”?

c. What is the rationale for a 20% BTE (based on net cost after above noted deductions)? The Class EA Study for the improvement stated that “the findings of the traffic analysis indicate and confirm that the existing Exposure Index warrant a grade separation at the Kerr Street crossing of the CNR and a widening to four lanes north of the CNR is required to accommodate the forecast 2021 peak hour traffic.” Much of the growth identified in the Class EA Study (growth to 2021) that the improvement was assumed to require the widening of the road has been accommodated in the Town?

Response

The \$31.3M in other contributions is Metrolinx’s contribution based on an agreement in principle of a 50-50 cost share.

The \$8.8M in other deductions represents capital works in progress.

The identified BTE is what we have used in previous development charges studies – we have carried this forward accordingly - see also page 9 of Cole Development Charge Background Study from February 2013

6. What is the nature of the “N/S BRT” projects included on page 5-28 as projects 73 & 74? Is this a widening of Trafalgar Road between Cross Ave. and White Oaks Blvd., or is this the new north-south road proposed to run parallel to the east of Trafalgar? If it is the former, are the costs being shared with Halton Region (who has responsibility for Trafalgar Road north of Cross Avenue)?

Response

The N/S BRT projects refer to the net north-south road running parallel to Trafalgar Road from White Oaks Boulevard southerly to the new Station Road. These projects have been shown as 50% town costs and 50% coming from others Metrolinx.

- 7. What is the rationale for the Iroquois Shore Road improvement (project #61) from Eighth Line to Trafalgar Road? Given the existing congestion issues in the area, we have questions regarding the sufficiency of a 15% BTE allocation.**

Response

The improvements to Iroquois Shore Road were identified in the Midtown Class EA, to support the growth in population and employment in the Midtown area. The benefit to existing (15%) follows our past practice of assigning benefit of existing to widening projects. Please refer to page 9 of the 2012 Development Charge Background Study Transportation Technical Report by Cole Engineering (February 2013).

- 8. Similarly, the improvements being made to Speers Road, from Cross to Kerr (Project #47), and from Dorval to Kerr (#51), among other segments as well, would appear to be alleviating existing congestion issues in the area relating to GO commuters. We therefore have questions regarding the sufficiency of the 15% BTE allocation being made.**

Response

Please refer to page 9 of the 2012 Development Charge Background Study Transportation Technical Report by Cole Engineering (February 2013) for the explanation on the determination of benefit to existing for roads projects.

- 9. For project #16 – Lower Base Line (excluding valley section), from Bronte to Fourth Line:**

a. As the road forms the northern border of the Town, does the \$4.4 million in “other contributions” reflect 50/50 cost sharing with the Town of Milton?

b. Will the project be adding lanes, or only bringing the road up from the current rural standard to an urbanized 2-lane standard?

Response

The \$4.4 million in “other contributions” reflects 50/50 cost sharing with the Town of Milton.

The project will not be adding lanes, it will be bringing the road to an urbanized 2-lane standard

- 10. Project #7 is “New Burnhamthorpe Road” from Tremaine to Bronte Road. The remainder of the length of the New Burnhamthorpe Road otherwise built east of Bronte, most of which is south of Highway 407 and is to be the Region’s responsibility – is the segment included in the Town’s DC Study part of that Regional project, and if so, will this segment be the Region’s responsibility as well?**

Response

The \$4.4 million in “other contributions” reflects 50/50 cost sharing with the Town of Milton. The project will not be adding lanes, it will be bringing the road to an urbanized 2-lane standard

- 11. Projects 71 and 72 in the DC Study are for a realignment of the Trafalgar/QEW westbound ramp, as well as a new Trafalgar/QEW westbound ramp:**

a. Are these the same project – wouldn’t a “new ramp” allow for a realignment of the ramp / wouldn’t a realignment be a “new ramp”?

b. Why have these works been included in the Town’s DC, when it involves the intersection of a Regional road with a Provincial highway?

Response

Projects 71 and 72 are separate projects. The Midtown Class EA Study identified a need to maintain the existing ramp terminal (71) including some realignment work so that traffic could still access Trafalgar Road north/south. The study also recommended the need to build a new eastbound off-ramp (72) from the QEW that will go under Trafalgar Road to provide more direct access to the Midtown area east of Trafalgar Road.

- 12. Table 5 on page 54 of the ATMP shows that 50.6 km of sidewalks are proposed to be constructed within the short-term period of 0-10 years. These sidewalks are included in the \$28.8 million included within short- and long-term AT routes/facilities shown on Table 12 (page 88) of the ATMP, meaning that these costs are likely included within the costs of \$41.492 million for AT Cycle Lanes, Routes and Pathways included in the DC (project #10 on page 5-27). Please confirm that none of the planned sidewalks are also included within the road reconstruction/widening projects included elsewhere in the DC study’s roads capital program.**

Response

The AT Cycle Lanes, Routes and Pathways project (Project 10) includes sidewalks, in boulevard trails, bike lanes and bike routes that are not included in other road projects. A list of the sidewalk projects is attached. Please also refer to the response to question 2.

- 13. Page B-3 of the 2017 DC Study sets out the inventory of roadways in the Town. The “unit measure” for the table is shown as “km of roadways”, but the inputs in the table are the dollar value of each type of road in a given year, meaning the number of km of each road type are not shown, and the average value per km is also not apparent.**

The “per capita standard”, which would be the total value of road divided by population in a given year remains constant for each of the 10-year historical period, suggesting that the information in the table is a mathematical formula based on population, and not an accurate reflection of the actual quantity of road works in the Town in each given year. We would like to request that the information contained in the table on Page B-3 be revised to clearly depict the quantity of each item for each year, as well as the value of each item.

Response

Response to follow.

- 14. The Dillon report assumes that transit mode share for residents in North Oakville will be 9.9%, compared to 4.1% in the rest of the Town. Currently, the Town-wide transit mode share is 1.4%. The Dillon report provides no background data for how the 9.9% transit mode share in North Oakville was reached. As this assumption is a key input into how both BTE and PPB are calculated, can the background data, assumptions and rationale for this assumption be clarified in some detail?**

Response

The transit mode shares in this study are incorporated based on policies defined by Halton Region and Town of Oakville. Halton Region transportation model was used as the starting point in this process. This model was developed to incorporate Halton Region Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Policy Mode Shares. It assumes that future mode splits will increase as key transit network enhancements are implemented in the future. The policy mode share targets were defined by the Halton Region TMP. The policy mode shares were implemented within the Halton TMP model through the development of transit mode share matrices. The matrices define a mode share target on an origin-to-destination basis; with higher mode assigned to traffic zones where transit improvements/higher order transit services are being planned for the future. For

example, the overall policy mode share for North Oakville was considered to be approximately 26% in the Halton TMP (trips with at least one end in North Oakville).

The second step was to implement Oakville Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Policy Mode Shares. The Halton Policy Mode Splits were used as the starting point; then the Halton mode split matrices were updated to take into account the Oakville TMP mode splits targets. The preferred scenario is the Oakville TMP considers a 12% overall mode share target for Town of Oakville (3% internal and 9% external trips). The Halton mode split matrices were proportionally adjusted to incorporate Oakville Policy targets.

The third step was to use the trip generation data developed through the Town of Oakville Transportation Master Plan to assess mode share by traffic zone. The model data included a forecasted 2031 origin-destination matrix by mode which identifies both transit trips between each traffic zone, and total trips between each zone. These were grouped into four quadrants (North Oakville, West Oakville, East Oakville, South Oakville). North Oakville will represent the majority of growth over the next ten years, and was assumed to be representative of future mode share targets.

Transit trips by quadrant in the 2031 Origin-destination matrix were used to understand the propensity to use transit in different areas of Oakville.

Using this methodology, the Technical Appendix noted that by 2031, the propensity to use transit as identified is 2.41 times greater in North Oakville than in the rest of Oakville (9.9% transit mode share in North Oakville versus 4.1% transit mode share in the rest of Oakville).

Updated information has recently been received from the Transportation Master Plan modelling team on the mode share by traffic zone. The result of this new data will change the 2031 transit mode share in both North Oakville and the rest of Oakville and will be reflected in an update to the Oakville Transit Development Charges Background Report. Based on new data received, the propensity to use transit is 1.41 times greater in North Oakville than in the rest of Oakville (14.6% transit mode share in North Oakville versus 10.4% transit mode share in the rest of Oakville). While this new information does not change the peak bus expansion requirements, it will result in the reduction in the in-period benefit to growth than originally reported.

Based on the new 2031 transit mode shares noted above, an exponential relationship was used to interpolate the 2026 transit mode share by quadrant of Oakville (assuming a 1.4% transit mode share as a base). Using the same formula provided in the Technical Appendix, it is estimated that in 2026 the transit mode share of growth population and employment is 1.25 times the average transit mode share of existing population and employment. Therefore, the calculation of transit ridership for 2026 assumed that the transit mode share in new growth areas is 3.23% compared to 2.59% in existing areas (Town-wide mode share is 2.7%). This was used to apportion benefit to growth and existing for the 2026 DC period.

Therefore, the benefit to existing and growth for conventional vehicles is as follows:

- **82% benefit to existing;** and
- **18% benefit to growth.**

The above noted change will also result in a slight modification to the in-period and post-period benefit using the methodology outlined in the Technical Appendix. Using the above noted revision, the in-period and post-period benefit for conventional transit vehicles is as follows:

- **94% in-period benefit;** and
- **6% post-period benefit.**

The in-period and post-period benefits were applied to the benefits to existing and growth for conventional transit vehicles, resulting in the following modification:

- **77% in-period benefit to existing;**
- **17% in-period benefit to growth;** and
- **6% post-period benefit.**

The updated information will be amended in a revision to the Oakville Development Charges Background Study.

Letters from BILD, January 12th, 2018 and Delta Urban, January 22nd. 2018

BILD and Delta Urban on behalf of the North Oakville Community Builders Inc. (NOCBI) has requested that the town consider transition policies to address those situations where building permits have been submitted in advance of the adoption of the proposed development charges by-law. The letters recognize that DC revenues are required to meet the increased need for services arising from growth and the concern of the town that any revenue shortfalls arising from any transition policies would need to be made up from revenue sources other than development charges (i.e. general tax revenue). The letters go on further to suggest that any shortfall that would arise from any transition policy could be made up from a future Development Charge program, i.e. that any shortfall in the period from this by-law would be made up by having growth in a future period pay for the transition provided.

The town does not agree with that statement and further does not believe the legislation would permit such a shortfall to be made up from future development charge revenues as suggested. The shortfall would not arise from a post-period benefit or other similar approach that could be carried forward to another development period but would rather arise from a policy decision of the town not to impose the full rates that have been calculated as required to be collected during the current growth period. As such any suggestion that the shortfall from any transition policies would be recoverable against future development is not agreed to and would subject the current taxpayers with an additional burden arising from growth that is not recommended.

With regards to those applications for building permits that may be submitted in advance of the adoption of the new development charges by-law, town staff will work to ensure that all legislative requirements for processing complete application are met during this period. As such the town will be working to ensure that all complete applications for building permits that are submitted at least 10 full business days before the adoption of the new by-law, and for which no resubmission or additional information is requested by the town, will be processed in accordance with the legislative requirements and as such it is expected that in those cases the current in force rates will apply. Given the anticipated volume that the town expects it will receive in advance of the adoption of the by-law, all parties are advised that any delays in the submission of complete applications or any requirement for a resubmission in relation to any application may result in delays in the processing of these applications and may result in the permit being issued at a time when the new rates will be applicable.

IBI Group – Preliminary Comments/Questions on 2017 Oakville Development Charges Background Study – January 15, 2018

Growth Forecast

1. **Please explain why the Oakville 2017 DCBS assumes housing forecasts that deviate from the Halton 2011 BPE.**

Response

Please refer to Appendix No. 3.

2. **Please explain the difference in PPU assumptions between the Oakville 2017 DCBS and the Halton 2011 BPE for Oakville.**

Response

Please refer to Appendix No. 3.

Level of Service Calculations

3. **Please provide construction cost per sm, land values and other appraisal materials to understand the significant increase in service level calculations for the following Indoor Recreation Facilities. Please provide the breakdown by component (Land [\$/ha], Site Works [cost/ha], building (cost/sm) and other inputs used) for each of the facilities.**

Response

The cost increase in the level of service calculations are based on the indexed values from the Suncorp valuations used in the 2013 D.C. study as well as the increased land values identified by the 2017 Robson Land Appraisal report. Please refer to Appendix No. 4.

4. **Similar to the value increase for indoor recreation facilities in the above, please provide construction cost per sm, land values and other appraisal materials to understand the significant increase in service level calculations for the following Library Facilities. Please provide the breakdown by component (Land [\$/ha], Site Works [cost/ha], building (cost/sm) and other inputs used) for each of the facilities.**

Response

The cost increase in the level of service calculations are based on the indexed values from the Suncorp valuations used in the 2013 D.C. study as well as the increased land values identified by the 2017 Robson Land Appraisal report. Please refer to Appendix No. 4.

5. **Please provide construction cost per sm, land values and other appraisal materials to understand the significant increase in service level calculations for the following Fire Facilities. Please provide the breakdown by component (Land [\$/ha], Site Works [cost/ha], building (cost/sm) and other inputs used) for each of the facilities.**

Response

The cost increase in the level of service calculations are based on the indexed values from the Suncorp valuations used in the 2013 D.C. study as well as the increased land values identified by the 2017 Robson Land Appraisal report. Please refer to Appendix No. 4.

6. **The level of service calculations in the Oakville 2017 DCBS includes Undeveloped Parkland in the Parks and Recreation category.**

Under the DCA O. Reg. 82/98, the acquisition of land for parks is ineligible for development charges. In the service level calculations, replacement value should only relate to parkland development costs, not land costs.

Please clarify what is included in replacement values for Undeveloped Parkland.

Response

The costs associated with “Undeveloped Parkland” at \$13,400 per hectare represents fencing and gates for the perimeter of the parkland. These costs include costs of ensuring the land is safe for public use .

7. **The level of service calculations in the Oakville 2017 DCBS includes Roads in the Services Related to a Highway category.**

Please explain the approach and assumptions used to estimate the calculation of the replacement value of roads. IBI Group has not seen this approach used in its extensive experience in development charge reviews either historically or in the current DC review cycle.

Response

Response to follow.

Capital Program

8. **Schedule 2 of the Oakville 2017 DCBS estimated a population increase of approximately 25,000 in North Oakville over the 2017 – 2027 period. The existing population in North Oakville is 6,430 as of 2016, and the Town of Oakville Official Plan set out the build-out population of 55,000 in North Oakville.**

Please provide the rationale for determining the BTE and PPB assumptions related to projects that would be located in North Oakville but available to all residents, including, but not limited to:

- **Park Buildings – North Operations Depot**
- **Indoor Recreation Facilities – Sixteen Mile Creek Recreation Centre and Quad Pad Arena at North Park (Debt)**
- **Fire Facilities – Fire Station No. 9.**

Response

Debt is net of BTE and PPB and therefore require no further deductions.

9. **The municipal parking capital program does not include any BTE allocation.**

Please explain the BTE assumption and confirm that there is currently no excess capacity in the municipal parking service.

Response

The parking capital identified are all new parking lots that are adding capacity to the existing parking system. The growth percentages are carryovers from the previous D.C. studies which identified 100% growth for all the projects.

10. **While the DC capital program stated the timing for Sixteen Mile Creek Recreation Centre between 2022 and 2026, the Town's 10-year capital forecast in the 2017 budget indicated the project initiation year of 2026 and the completion year of 2028. Please clarify the timing for Sixteen Mile Creek Recreation Centre**

Response

The Sixteen Mile Creek Recreation Centre is included in the 2018 to 2027 capital forecast with the funds budgeted in 2022 to 2026 to be in accordance with the

updated Parks, Recreation and Library Master Plan. The updated forecast will be publicly available February 7, 2018.

11. Parks and Recreation – Details on Debts for Indoor Recreation Facilities

Please provide further details on the following debt items with regards to payment schedule, funding source(s), etc.

- **Quad Pad Arena at North Park**
- **Joshua's Creek Arena**

Response

Please refer to By-law 37-11 attached as Appendix No. 6.

12. Parks and Recreation – Land Costs for South East Recreation Centre

It is our understanding that South East Recreation Centre is planned for the former hospital site.

It appears that the land costs involved in the Recreation Centre project is minimal. According to the Town of Oakville Staff Report, “South Central Public Lands Study - Final Recommendations and Next Steps”, February 28, 2013:

All of the study sites are owned by the Town of Oakville, except for the Oakville Trafalgar Memorial Hospital (OTMH) site, which the town will acquire from Halton Healthcare Services for \$1 when construction of the new hospital at Third Line and Dundas Street is complete. (page 4)

Please provide details on the land component of the South East Recreation Centre project.

Response

The former OTMH lands were acquired by the Town of Oakville as part of a commitment from the town to contribute towards the funding and construction of the new hospital site of \$130 Million. As part of the total contribution by the town, the former OTMH lands were transferred to the town. The lands were valued at approximately \$24.9 Million at the time of the transfer and land transfer taxes and HST was paid in accordance with that valuation that has been identified in the town’s capital assets. The OTMH lands have been properly valued at \$24.9 Million and represent the value of those lands and the amounts paid by the town to acquire same. The lands are now proposed to be used for a DC capital project and as such recovery of those amounts are permitted under the Act. If the lands were not used

by the town for this purpose, the town would still be required to purchase other lands at the same valuation, if not higher, for the South East Recreation Centre.

13. Parks Administration Studies – BTE Allocation

The 46 studies identified in the capital program have no BTE allocation, except for the Town Wide Parking Strategy.

Please explain why it was assumed that most studies only relate to growth.

Response

Same approach used as in previous study. The BTE allocations for the Transit Service Plan will be corrected to match the 2013 D.C. study which identified a 40% BTE. All other studies are correct to have a 0% BTE allocation.

14. Administration Studies – Fire Master Plan

The Administration Studies service has a 10-year horizon for DC purposes. Fire Master Plan (2030) and Fire Master Plan (2035) are not within the 10-year horizon and should not be included in the DC Recoverable Cost.

Please explain why Fire Master Plan (2030) and Fire Master Plan (2035) are included in the DC Recoverable Cost.

Response

These should have had Post period benefit applied. These will be corrected in the addendum.

15. Services Related to a Highway – 2018 Transportation Background Study

The Oakville 2017 DCBS refers to the Town's 2018 Transportation Background Study for added capital projects in the Services Related to a Highway program. It is our understanding that the document is not publicly available.

Please provide the 2018 Transportation Background Study or relevant parts of the Study that were used to prepare the Oakville 2017 DCBS.

Response

To be provided.

16. Services Related to a Highway – BTE and PPB Allocation for Active Transportation Projects

The Town of Oakville’s Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP), November 2017, shows recommended facilities and network that span both existing and new communities.

For the following Active Transportation projects in the DC capital program, 10% BTE were attributed:

- **Active Transportation Initiatives (total cost estimate: \$4,535,000)**
- **AT Cycle Lanes, Routes and Pathways (total cost estimate: \$41,492,000)**
- **AT Studies (total cost estimate: \$1,000,000)**

Based on a high-level review of the ATMP, it appears that recommended the facilities and network would have significant benefits to existing communities.

In addition, the ATMP indicates a timeline of two phases: short term (1 – 10 years) and long term (11 – 20+ years). PPB allocations would be appropriate for long term ATMP projects.

Please provide further details on the above projects and explain how BTE and PPB assumptions were developed.

Response

Project 10 – AT Cycle Lanes – The town’s Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) was updated in 2017 and includes updated costs and new projects that were identified through the study process.

The \$26.741M included in Project 10 - AT Cycle Lanes, Routes and Pathways includes active transportation infrastructure to 2031 that has been identified in the ATMP but that is not included as part of other road works (widening, urbanization, etc.). A list of the sidewalk projects is attached.

The amount for Grants, Subsidies and Other Contributions Attributable to New Development for Project 10 was originally \$400,000 which represented grant funding from the PTIF program. Since that time, the town has been notified that it will receive \$645,376 from the Ontario Municipal Commuter Cycling Program. The amount has been added to the Grants, Subsidies and Other Contributions for this project.

Project 9 – Active Transportation Initiatives – The ATMP was updated in 2017 and identified additional initiatives to support active transportation and a shift in travel to more sustainable modes. The increase in the value of Project 9 – Active Transportation Initiatives reflects the costs to implement these works. The Active Transportation Initiatives are included in Appendix G of the 2017 Active Transportation Master Plan.

17. Services Related to a Highway – BTE Allocation for Roads & Works Equipment

The Roads and Works equipment projects in the capital program have no BTE assigned.

Please explain how the projects only relate to growth.

Response

Vehicles and Equipment are provided to service the Services Related to a Highway. As additional subdivisions are constructed and major roads are expanded, additional equipment is needed to address the added infrastructure. The equipment is part of a broader system used to meet operational servicing targets for the department.

Details on Reserve Fund Balance

18. The capital programs in the Oakville 2017 DCBS includes a significant amount of negative development charges reserve fund balances, including the negative balance of \$33.9 million for Parks and Recreation.

Please provide historical reserve fund statements which identify project details and indicate how each expenditure item relates to the Town's previous DC by-laws.

Response

Please refer to Appendix No. 7.

Cash Flow Calculations

19. The Oakville 2017 DCBS does not appear to include cash flow-adjusted charges by service.

Please explain how cash flow assumptions were taken into account for the determination of the proposed development charges.

Response

The 2017 D.C. study has maintained the same method used to calculate the 2013 D.C.s which does not include the use of a cash flow method

GHD – Town of Oakville DC Review – January 12, 2018

The following is a summary of our concerns and observations based on the limited information contained within the Watson and Associates Town of Oakville Development Charge Background Study, December 22 2017

1. It is stated in the report that the Town's forecasted road program is an extension from the previous D.C. study as well as added components identified through the Town's 2018 Transportation Background Study which includes projects for areas such as Midtown and other active transportation initiatives throughout the town. Please provide a copy of the updated study so that a proper detailed review of the need and justification of the proposed capital program can be undertaken.

Response

Report to be provided.

2. Additional technical support is required to understand the methodology used to calculate BTE for some of the road projects.

Response

Please refer to page 9 of the 2012 Development Charge Background Study Transportation Technical Report by Cole Engineering (February 2013) for the explanation on the determination of benefit to existing roads projects. The same approach has been adopted for the current background study.

3. More detail is required as to the proposed capital road projects, are they resurfacing, widening, etc. in order to review the gross capital cost estimates. I assume this info may be contained within the 2018 transportation Background Study.

Response

Details sheets to be provided.

4. **Many of the capital projects attributed to future growth will provide needed capacity to accommodate planned growth, without having detained information on the need/justification for these projects it is not clear if the additional capacity provided by these projects will be fully used up with the planned growth. If additional road capacity remains after 2031 it should be applied to post period benefit.**

Response

TMP Review Report and modeling work provides justification for the inclusion of all the road projects in this DC Bylaw.

The presentation to the Development Charges Steering Committee on October 18, 2017 shows that even with the inclusion of all the road improvements that have previously been identified through other studies and a higher transit mode split, there will be screenlines and road segments that are at or above capacity.

5. **A copy of the Town's 2018 Transportation Background Study is also needed to review the Transit calculations and projections with the DC study. Detailed analysis will also help confirm if the projected timing of the projects are reasonable with respect to the outlined cash flow and project scheduling, additional information regarding the assignment of traffic for interim years is required to better understand the impact to cash flow projections.**

Response

Please refer to Appendix A of the TMP Review Report.

**David Faye & Associates – Oakville 2017 Development Charge Background Study
– January 16, 2018**

On behalf of our client, Star Oak Developments Limited, we have reviewed Section 5.3.2 Services Related to a Highway in the Town of Oakville Draft Development Charge Background Study dated December 22, 2017.

We note that the section of Burnhamthorpe Road extending from Ninth Line to a future intersection with proposed William Halton Parkway west of Sixth Line is not included in the list of roads identified for widening and reconstruction under the Development Charges Act.

Burnhamthorpe Road is currently a Region of Halton road classified as a Major Arterial. We understand that Burnhamthorpe Road is intended to come under the jurisdiction of the Town of Oakville upon the construction of William Halton Parkway, a new Region of Halton Major Arterial road.

Figure NOE 4 Transportation Plan of OPA 172 shows the section of Burnhamthorpe Road in question as an Avenue/Transit Corridor. This section of Burnhamthorpe Road is unique in that it is the only Avenue/Transit Corridor in North Oakville East which existed at the time of approval of OPA 172.

We have the following questions regarding the subject section of Burnhamthorpe Road:

1. During review of the Town's 2013 Transportation Master Plan undertaken to provide input to the December 22, 2017 Development Charges Background Study, did the Town review the intended function of the subject section of Burnhamthorpe Road postconstruction of William Halton Parkway?

Response

Please see response to question 3.

2. Did the analysis suggest any reconsideration of the Avenue/Transit Corridor category?

Response

Please see response to question 3.

3. Given that the subject section of Burnhamthorpe Road is an existing road with multiple land ownerships from Ninth Line to the future William Halton Parkway intersection and cannot be constructed in the same efficient manner as other new Avenue/Transit Corridors in Greenfield situations and that the local service policy approach will likely lead to a protracted multi-year reconstruction process, did the Town consider including the subject section of Burnhamthorpe Road as a development charge eligible road to facilitate the future widening and reconstruction?

Response

As a result of the requests by industry representatives to reconsider the classification of Burnhamthorpe Road under the current development charge background study, the town has undertaken a further review of the intended function and design of Burnhamthorpe Road and agrees that the form of function of the road is such that the construction of same is intended to serve growth beyond that of a local road which otherwise would be considered under the Local Services Policy and as such it is appropriate to add Burnhamthorpe Road as a development charges eligible program and to recover the costs of same pursuant to the development charges by-law. The addition of this program has resulted in an additional cost recovery of \$25.1M to the development charges capital program. If however, it is ultimately determined that Burnhamthorpe Road should not be included in the development charge capital program, whether by way of Council decision or a decision on an appeal, the provision and construction of this road will be dealt with in accordance with the town's Local Services Policy.

Burnhamthorpe Road is currently a Regional Road but will become a Town of Oakville Road once William Halton Parkway is completed.

The North Oakville East Secondary Plan designates Burnhamthorpe Road as a "Character Road". The "Burnhamthorpe Road Character Study and Municipal Class Environmental Assessment" (Character Road Study) was completed in December 2014. The Character Road Study sets out the required configuration of the portions of Burnhamthorpe Road that will be transferred to the town, including number of lanes, bicycle lanes, sidewalks and on-street parking.

As outlined in the Character Road Study, Burnhamthorpe Road will have sections with a 22m right-of-way and a section with a 24m right-of-way. Burnhamthorpe Road will support multiple modes of transportation including cars, transit, bicycles and pedestrians, and will provide on-street parking opportunities. It will serve a greater transportation function than a local road (as defined in the North Oakville East Secondary Plan) by accommodating and supporting local, neighbourhood and intra-district travel, and connecting Urban Centres and Cores.

While Burnhamthorpe Road exists today, the road must be essentially rebuilt to support the planned development along the corridor and to achieve the cross-sections and functions identified in the Character Road Study and the North Oakville East Secondary Plan. As a result, the benefits of this new road are primarily attributable to growth.