



April 25, 2024

Reena Bajwa
Coordinator of Financial Strategies and Business Consulting
City of Burlington
426 Brant St.
Burlington, ON
L7R 3Z6

Sent via email to reena.bajwa@burlington.ca

RE: **2024 Development Charges Review**

BILD Memorandum

4/25/2024

The Building Industry and Land Development Association has received the City of Burlington's 2024 Development Charges Background Study. We have sent this information to our membership and have reviewed the material accordingly.

Please note that BILD, in partnership with the West End Homebuilders' Association, retained the services of Daryl Keleher from Keleher Planning and Economic Consulting (KPEC) to conduct a review of this background study. Attached to this cover letter is our consultant's memorandum in response to his findings within the study. BILD and WE HBA look forward to a written response to this memo in advance of Council consideration.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this letter. If there are any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Victoria Mortelliti".

Victoria Mortelliti, MCIP, RPP.
Senior Manager, Policy & Advocacy

CC: BILD's Review Team
BILD Halton Members
Ellen Chen, City of Burlington
Michelle Diplock, WEHBA

The Building Industry and Land Development Association is an advocacy and educational group representing the building, land development and professional renovation industry in the Greater Toronto Area. BILD is the largest home builders' association in Canada, and is affiliated with the Ontario Home Builders' Association and the Canadian Home Builders' Association. It's 1,300 member companies consists not only of direct industry participants but also of supporting companies such as financial and professional service organizations, trade contractors, as well as manufacturers and suppliers of home-related products.

April 11, 2024

Memorandum to: Victoria Mortelliti
 BILD

Michelle Diplock
 WEHBA

From: Daryl Keleher, MCIP, RPP, Principal
 Keleher Planning & Economic Consulting Inc.

Re: Burlington DC Review
 Our File: P1005 / P1014

Keleher Planning & Economic Consulting Inc. was retained by BILD and WEHBA to review the City of Burlington’s 2024 DC Background Study and proposed DC by-law.

CHANGES TO DC RATES

Compared to the City’s current DC rates, expressed on a per single-detached unit basis, the City’s proposed DC rates would be 26% higher. The rate increase is driven by the Roads DC (+74% or \$8,451 per SDU), Fire (+753% or \$1,799 per SDU) and Transit (+76% or \$699 per SDU). The DC rates for Stormwater Drainage, Parks & Recreation and Library are all proposed to decrease, offsetting the DC services with proposed rate increases.

Figure 1

Current and Proposed DC Rates, City of Burlington, per Single-Detached Unit

	Current (w/ April 2024 Index)	Proposed	Change	% Change
Roads	\$ 11,387	\$ 19,864	\$ 8,477	74%
Stormwater Drainage	\$ 2,322	\$ 175	\$ (2,147)	-92%
Fire	\$ 239	\$ 2,038	\$ 1,799	753%
Transit	\$ 918	\$ 1,617	\$ 699	76%
Parks & Recreation	\$ 6,577	\$ 4,482	\$ (2,095)	-32%
Library	\$ 1,053	\$ 256	\$ (797)	-76%
Studies	\$ 43	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Total	\$ 22,539	\$ 28,432	\$ 5,893	26%

Source: City of Burlington 2024 DC Study

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Population, Household and Employment Forecasts

- 1) Schedule 4 of Appendix A has a label of “Early-2024 to Mid-2051”, but the data in the table appears to be based on an end point of Mid-2041. Can an updated table that extends the data shown to 2051 be provided?
- 2) Schedule 3 of Appendix A shows a population incline in existing units of 0.022 persons per unit, or population growth of 1,655 persons from increased occupancy of the City’s existing 74,026 units. By comparison, the City’s 2019 DC Study had forecast a population decline in existing units of 0.0558 persons per unit, or a decline of 4,113 persons over a 10-year period. To acknowledge the growth in population and associated increased needs, the City’s DC Study makes a deduction in numerous DC service categories for ‘population incline’ – can details behind the calculated deductions be provided?

Fire

- 3) Since the 2019 DC Study, the values of buildings (excluding the Training Tower) have increased by a range of 137% to 265%, as summarized in the figure below. Can background details for the estimated replacement value of existing fire stations (building and land/site works) be provided?

Change in Value of Fire Station Buildings, 2019 to 2024 DC Studies, City of Burlington

	2019 DC Study	2024 DC Study	Change	% Change
Station 1	\$ 505	\$ 1,411	\$ 906	179%
Station 1 - Training Tower	\$ 261	\$ 313	\$ 52	20%
Station 1 - Service Building	\$ 409	\$ 1,110	\$ 701	171%
Station 2	\$ 472	\$ 1,183	\$ 711	151%
Station 3	\$ 473	\$ 1,344	\$ 871	184%
Station 4	\$ 439	\$ 1,245	\$ 806	184%
Station 5	\$ 554	\$ 2,023	\$ 1,469	265%
Station 6	\$ 365	\$ 962	\$ 597	164%
Station 7	\$ 507	\$ 1,202	\$ 695	137%
Station 8	\$ 503	\$ 1,280	\$ 777	154%

Source: City of Burlington 2019 and 2024 DC Studies

- 4) For both the Aldershot MTSA and Urban Downtown Core fire station builds, how are the estimated capital costs split between land acquisition and building construction costs?

Roads

- 5) Can the City provide details about where the Mainway Grade Separation (capital cost \$25 million) would be located, and how was the BTE of 24% determined?
- 6) Many of the projects contained in the 2024 DC Study are also identified in the IMP and include a scope of “BRT Dedicated Lanes”, such as Project #59 (Plains Road from Daryl Drive to Shadeland Avenue) and Project #70 (New Street from Guelph Line to Walkers Line), etc. – can a breakdown of what is included in the estimated costs for the Active Transportation projects as contained in the 2024 DC Study be provided?

- 7) According to the IMP, the Cedar Springs Road projects (projects 141-143), are for installation of “Multi-Use Path” – can detailed cost breakdowns be provided for how the capital costs (\$6.9 million in total) were estimated, and how the BTE allocation of 10% was determined?
- 8) There are numerous “Paved Shoulder” projects, many of which are on narrow rural roads in the City’s rural area and hamlets, such as Britannia Road from Milborough Line to Bell School Line, which have a combined capital costs of \$8.0 million and a BTE of only 10%. Can the rationale for these projects were determined to be growth-related be provided, as well as how the 10% BTE was determined? The IMP refers to these projects (page 131) as being “proposed for major recreational links such as Britannia Road and Walker’s Line”, rather than being for mobility purposes.
- 9) What types of capital works are covered by the “Standalone Pedestrian Projects” category? These projects do not appear to be studied in the City’s IMP - can cost breakdowns (or project sheets) be provided for a sample of how the costs of these projects were estimated?
- 10) Can a breakdown of costs (or detailed project sheets) be provided for the three AT Overpass/Underpass projects, which have gross capital costs ranging from \$18.8 million to \$26.1 million:
 - a) Project 154 – QEW from Greenwood to Maple;
 - b) Project 155 – QEW/403 (east of Brant) from Truman to Industrial;
 - c) Project 156 – QEW/403 (east of Appleby) from Century to Sutton.
- 11) Can a cost breakdown for the \$147.6 million Cumberland Avenue Extension be provided?
- 12) What is the rationale for 0% BTE applied to the Cumberland Avenue Extension project? The IMP states that the project provides numerous advantages to the City’s transportation system, including:
 - Provides an additional multimodal crossing of the QEW, thereby unlocking employment lands that are situated between Guelph Line and Walkers Line;*
 - Offers alternative routes to the Guelph Line / QEW and Walkers Line / QEW interchanges;*
 - Provides an additional active transportation link across the QEW, which avoids the need to use the Guelph Line / QEW or Walkers Line / QEW interchanges; and*
 - Offers a new transit link across the QEW that reduces deadhead and provides more flexibility for Burlington Transit, which is located at 3332 Harvester Road;*
- 13) In discussing the rationale for the New Collector Roads #197 and #198, the IMP (page 109) finds that the works would provide an additional link across the GO corridor, and provide cyclists with a safer option – given the apparent benefit to existing users of the City’s transportation network, why is there no BTE allocation for these projects?
- 14) Can a breakdown of the 2024 value of various road types in Schedule B-2 (page B-3) be provided in a similar manner as was provided in the 2019 DC Study? In the 2019 DC Study, the value per lane km of roads in the urban area and rural area were counter to what the expected relative value would be – for example, the value per lane km for an Urban Arterial was \$3.075 million/km, but a value of was \$4.13 million/km for Rural Arterials. Assuming this relationship has been maintained in the 2024 DC Study, can the rationale for the urban/rural land values be provided?

Parks & Recreation

- 15) Can detailed information be provided for the values assigned to:
 - a) Community Centre \$2,027/sf (up from \$598/sf in 2019 DC Study or 239%)
 - b) Operations Centre \$2,313/sf (up from \$644/sf in 2019 DC Study, or 259%)
- 16) What costs are meant to be funded for the “Parkland Development - Park Provisioning (Balance of Anticipated Need to 2031), 14.35 ha”, which at a cost of \$14,0 million equates to a development cost of nearly \$1,000,000 per hectare?
- 17) What percentage of overall capital costs does the \$8.1 million for the “unfunded growth-related cost share” of the Skyway Redevelopment represent?

April 25, 2024

To: Reena Bajwa, Hons. B.Comm, MBA
Manager of Financial Strategies and Business Consulting
Finance Department
City of Burlington

West End Home Builders' Association Comments: 2024 Development Charges Bylaw

The West End Home Builders' Association (WE HBA) is the voice of the land development, new housing and professional renovation industries in Hamilton, Burlington, and Grimsby. The WE HBA represents approximately 300 member companies made up of all disciplines involved in land development and residential construction, including: builders, developers, professional renovators, trade contractors, consultants, and suppliers.

Please note that WE HBA, in partnership with the BILD, retained the services of Daryl Keleher from Keleher Planning and Economic Consulting (KPEC) to conduct a review of this background study. Attached to this cover letter is our consultant's memorandum in response to his findings within the study. BILD and WE HBA look forward to a written response to this memo in advance of Council consideration of the new Development Charges Bylaw.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this letter. If there are any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Kind regards,

Sincerely,



Michelle Diplock, M.Pl. RPP, MCIP
Manager of Planning & Government Relations
West End Home Builders' Association



April 11, 2024

Memorandum to: Victoria Mortelliti
 BILD

Michelle Diplock
 WEHBA

From: Daryl Keleher, MCIP, RPP, Principal
 Keleher Planning & Economic Consulting Inc.

Re: Burlington DC Review
 Our File: P1005 / P1014

Keleher Planning & Economic Consulting Inc. was retained by BILD and WEHBA to review the City of Burlington’s 2024 DC Background Study and proposed DC by-law.

CHANGES TO DC RATES

Compared to the City’s current DC rates, expressed on a per single-detached unit basis, the City’s proposed DC rates would be 26% higher. The rate increase is driven by the Roads DC (+74% or \$8,451 per SDU), Fire (+753% or \$1,799 per SDU) and Transit (+76% or \$699 per SDU). The DC rates for Stormwater Drainage, Parks & Recreation and Library are all proposed to decrease, offsetting the DC services with proposed rate increases.

Figure 1

Current and Proposed DC Rates, City of Burlington, per Single-Detached Unit

	Current (w/ April 2024 Index)	Proposed	Change	% Change
Roads	\$ 11,387	\$ 19,864	\$ 8,477	74%
Stormwater Drainage	\$ 2,322	\$ 175	\$ (2,147)	-92%
Fire	\$ 239	\$ 2,038	\$ 1,799	753%
Transit	\$ 918	\$ 1,617	\$ 699	76%
Parks & Recreation	\$ 6,577	\$ 4,482	\$ (2,095)	-32%
Library	\$ 1,053	\$ 256	\$ (797)	-76%
Studies	\$ 43	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Total	\$ 22,539	\$ 28,432	\$ 5,893	26%

Source: City of Burlington 2024 DC Study

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Population, Household and Employment Forecasts

- 1) Schedule 4 of Appendix A has a label of “Early-2024 to Mid-2051”, but the data in the table appears to be based on an end point of Mid-2041. Can an updated table that extends the data shown to 2051 be provided?
- 2) Schedule 3 of Appendix A shows a population incline in existing units of 0.022 persons per unit, or population growth of 1,655 persons from increased occupancy of the City’s existing 74,026 units. By comparison, the City’s 2019 DC Study had forecast a population decline in existing units of 0.0558 persons per unit, or a decline of 4,113 persons over a 10-year period. To acknowledge the growth in population and associated increased needs, the City’s DC Study makes a deduction in numerous DC service categories for ‘population incline’ – can details behind the calculated deductions be provided?

Fire

- 3) Since the 2019 DC Study, the values of buildings (excluding the Training Tower) have increased by a range of 137% to 265%, as summarized in the figure below. Can background details for the estimated replacement value of existing fire stations (building and land/site works) be provided?

Change in Value of Fire Station Buildings, 2019 to 2024 DC Studies, City of Burlington

	2019 DC Study	2024 DC Study	Change	% Change
Station 1	\$ 505	\$ 1,411	\$ 906	179%
Station 1 - Training Tower	\$ 261	\$ 313	\$ 52	20%
Station 1 - Service Building	\$ 409	\$ 1,110	\$ 701	171%
Station 2	\$ 472	\$ 1,183	\$ 711	151%
Station 3	\$ 473	\$ 1,344	\$ 871	184%
Station 4	\$ 439	\$ 1,245	\$ 806	184%
Station 5	\$ 554	\$ 2,023	\$ 1,469	265%
Station 6	\$ 365	\$ 962	\$ 597	164%
Station 7	\$ 507	\$ 1,202	\$ 695	137%
Station 8	\$ 503	\$ 1,280	\$ 777	154%

Source: City of Burlington 2019 and 2024 DC Studies

- 4) For both the Aldershot MTSA and Urban Downtown Core fire station builds, how are the estimated capital costs split between land acquisition and building construction costs?

Roads

- 5) Can the City provide details about where the Mainway Grade Separation (capital cost \$25 million) would be located, and how was the BTE of 24% determined?
- 6) Many of the projects contained in the 2024 DC Study are also identified in the IMP and include a scope of “BRT Dedicated Lanes”, such as Project #59 (Plains Road from Daryl Drive to Shadeland Avenue) and Project #70 (New Street from Guelph Line to Walkers Line), etc. – can a breakdown of what is included in the estimated costs for the Active Transportation projects as contained in the 2024 DC Study be provided?

- 7) According to the IMP, the Cedar Springs Road projects (projects 141-143), are for installation of “Multi-Use Path” – can detailed cost breakdowns be provided for how the capital costs (\$6.9 million in total) were estimated, and how the BTE allocation of 10% was determined?
- 8) There are numerous “Paved Shoulder” projects, many of which are on narrow rural roads in the City’s rural area and hamlets, such as Britannia Road from Milborough Line to Bell School Line, which have a combined capital costs of \$8.0 million and a BTE of only 10%. Can the rationale for these projects were determined to be growth-related be provided, as well as how the 10% BTE was determined? The IMP refers to these projects (page 131) as being “proposed for major recreational links such as Britannia Road and Walker’s Line”, rather than being for mobility purposes.
- 9) What types of capital works are covered by the “Standalone Pedestrian Projects” category? These projects do not appear to be studied in the City’s IMP - can cost breakdowns (or project sheets) be provided for a sample of how the costs of these projects were estimated?
- 10) Can a breakdown of costs (or detailed project sheets) be provided for the three AT Overpass/Underpass projects, which have gross capital costs ranging from \$18.8 million to \$26.1 million:
 - a) Project 154 – QEW from Greenwood to Maple;
 - b) Project 155 – QEW/403 (east of Brant) from Truman to Industrial;
 - c) Project 156 – QEW/403 (east of Appleby) from Century to Sutton.
- 11) Can a cost breakdown for the \$147.6 million Cumberland Avenue Extension be provided?
- 12) What is the rationale for 0% BTE applied to the Cumberland Avenue Extension project? The IMP states that the project provides numerous advantages to the City’s transportation system, including:
 - Provides an additional multimodal crossing of the QEW, thereby unlocking employment lands that are situated between Guelph Line and Walkers Line;*
 - Offers alternative routes to the Guelph Line / QEW and Walkers Line / QEW interchanges;*
 - Provides an additional active transportation link across the QEW, which avoids the need to use the Guelph Line / QEW or Walkers Line / QEW interchanges; and*
 - Offers a new transit link across the QEW that reduces deadhead and provides more flexibility for Burlington Transit, which is located at 3332 Harvester Road;*
- 13) In discussing the rationale for the New Collector Roads #197 and #198, the IMP (page 109) finds that the works would provide an additional link across the GO corridor, and provide cyclists with a safer option – given the apparent benefit to existing users of the City’s transportation network, why is there no BTE allocation for these projects?
- 14) Can a breakdown of the 2024 value of various road types in Schedule B-2 (page B-3) be provided in a similar manner as was provided in the 2019 DC Study? In the 2019 DC Study, the value per lane km of roads in the urban area and rural area were counter to what the expected relative value would be – for example, the value per lane km for an Urban Arterial was \$3.075 million/km, but a value of was \$4.13 million/km for Rural Arterials. Assuming this relationship has been maintained in the 2024 DC Study, can the rationale for the urban/rural land values be provided?

Parks & Recreation

- 15) Can detailed information be provided for the values assigned to:
- a) Community Centre \$2,027/sf (up from \$598/sf in 2019 DC Study or 239%)
 - b) Operations Centre \$2,313/sf (up from \$644/sf in 2019 DC Study, or 259%)
- 16) What costs are meant to be funded for the “Parkland Development - Park Provisioning (Balance of Anticipated Need to 2031), 14.35 ha”, which at a cost of \$14,0 million equates to a development cost of nearly \$1,000,000 per hectare?
- 17) What percentage of overall capital costs does the \$8.1 million for the “unfunded growth-related cost share” of the Skyway Redevelopment represent?