TORONTO

# STAFF REPORT
# ACTION REQUIRED

# Development Charges By-law Review – Results of Additional Consultation

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date:** | September 13, 2013 |
| **To:** | Executive Committee |
| **From:** | Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer |
| **Wards:** | All |
| **Reference Number:** | P:\2013\Internal Services\Cf\Ec13017cf (AFS #18072) |

## SUMMARY


At the statutory public meeting held on July 3, 2013, Executive Committee deferred consideration of a report titled "Development Charges By-law Review" to its September 24, 2013 meeting, and requested that staff review the submissions and deputations made at the public meeting, conduct additional stakeholder consultations, and report on certain other matters.

This report presents the results of additional consultation, which includes adjustments to the calculated development charges rates and refinements to development charges policies compared to the rates and policies previously presented at the public meeting.

Technical revisions to the background study calculations, arising primarily through further discussions with consultants retained on behalf of the Building Industry and Land Development (BILD) in conjunction with a review by the City's own consultants, have resulted in a reduction (8% for residential and 6% for non-residential uses) to the calculated development charges rates. These rates do not incorporate an arbitrary reduction or subsidy. In addition, a number of policy changes are discussed in this report in regard to the transitional strategies, treatment of stacked and back-to-back townhomes, redevelopment credits and revision permits.

On behalf of the land development industry, BILD has indicated that with the amendments to the rate calculation and the recommended transition provisions, discussed in the report, it is satisfied that the new by-law is reasonable. Accordingly BILD will not appeal the by-law nor support actions of its independent members to appeal.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer recommends that:**

1. Council enact the development charges by-law attached to this report as Appendix 1.

2. For the purposes of complying with the Development Charges Act, 1997, Council adopt the Development Charges Background Study, dated June 17, 2013, as amended by the Addendum dated September 13, 2013, including the development charges capital program contained within.

3. Council determine that, pursuant to section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, no further public meeting is required.

4. Council express its intent that the development-related cost of post-2022 capacity identified in the Background Study, as amended, be carried forward into future development charges by-law reviews for potential cost recovery from future development charges or other similar charges.

5. Council authorize the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer, to make such housekeeping, technical and minor amendments to the by-law as necessary to give effect to the recommendations contained herein.

### Financial Impact

Municipal investments in capital infrastructure are required in order to maintain service levels as population and employment increase over time. The development charges background study, as amended, identifies approximately $3.2 billion in net growth-related costs attributed to development within the 10-year study planning period. Development charges are an important source of funding for growth related capital works. Development charges are the means to systematically obtain funding to offset a portion of these costs, in proportion to the increased service demand attributable to new land development.

Under the existing development charges by-law, the City collected about $100 million per year on average, including approximately $150 million in 2012 alone. The proposed new by-law would increase development charge rates by about 71% for a typical residential development (based on a two-bedroom apartment unit) and 25% for eligible ground level commercial (typically retail) development. These new rates are expected to increase development charge revenues to approximately $170 to $250 million annually over the five-year term of the by-law. Actual revenues may differ from those forecast depending on the amount, type and timing of land development occurring in the City.

The recommended transition provisions would implement the rate increases over a two year period, beginning February 1, 2014, and ending February 1, 2016, with 55% of the increase coming into effect by August 1, 2014, less than a year from the anticipated adoption of the new by-law. The proposed phase-in strategy will result in foregone revenue to the City. However this foregone revenue has to be compared to the potential loss of revenue arising from a successful appeal of the by-law if a shortened or no phase-in period is provided. It is noted that an appeal that succeeds in reducing the rates would apply for the life of the by-law. Staff believe that the proposed phase-in strategy strikes the appropriate balance of revenue optimization and due consideration of the potential impact on the land development industry and construction activity.

## DECISION HISTORY

Executive Committee, on July 3, 2013, deferred consideration of the report from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer, dated June 18, 2013 and titled "Development Charges By-law Review", to its meeting on September 24, 2013. The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer was directed to undertake further consultation with stakeholders, to review submissions received at the public meeting and to report on any recommended changes to the proposed by-law along with certain other matters.

- EX33.1: "Development Charges By-law Review" http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2013.EX33.1.

## ISSUE BACKGROUND

A statutory public meeting was held on July 3, 2013 to allow the public the opportunity to provide input into the proposed development charges by-law and development charges background study. The development charges background study and proposed by-law were published in advance of the public meeting, as required by the *Development Charges Act.*

## COMMENTS

## Introduction

This report provides the results of additional stakeholder consultation and Committee direction, including proposed changes to development charges rates. Those aspects of the by-law that remain unchanged are not discussed in detail in this report. Reference should be made to the June 18, 2013 staff report, a link to which can be found in the decision history section of this report.

This report is organized as follows:

1. Stakeholder Consultation
2. Revised Development Charges Rates
3. Proposed Policy Changes

4. Other Matters

## 1. Stakeholder Consultation

The City's development charges by-law review process included an extensive public consultation process that commenced in January 2013 with the release of draft development charge background study calculations. The process also included ongoing meetings and correspondence with key stakeholders, as well as two consultation meetings with the general public and a statutory public meeting.

A. Statutory Public Meeting

The background study findings and proposed by-law were considered at a statutory public meeting, as contained in EX 33.1. A total of 43 written submissions were received at the public meeting representing a balance between development industry stakeholders, the general public and other perspectives. The main themes arising from submissions related to:

a. Development industry / landowners

- Request for longer transition provisions, including extended phase-in, delayed implementation and grandparenting provisions
- Concerns regarding the impact on the pace of development and housing affordability
- Questions regarding the background study calculations
- Comments respecting a number of development charges policies

b. General public / ratepayer groups

- Support for development charges increases to maintain service levels

c. Other

- Support for continuation of industrial exemptions
- Consideration of other incentives and policies, such as purpose-built rental housing

B. Additional Consultation Activity

Staff and the City's development charges consultant, Hemson Consulting Ltd. ("Hemson"), continued to meet with stakeholders in July, August and September to discuss both technical and policy aspects of the development charges by-law and background study calculations. A summary of meetings held since the statutory public meeting is provided below.

Table 1: Additional Consultation Activity

| | Date | Group | Topic |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | July 22, 2013 | BILD | Technical and development charges policy |
| 2. | July 25, 2013 | Port Lands Landowners | General and technical |
| 3. | August 14, 2013 | BILD | Technical review |
| 4. | August 28, 2013 | BILD | Development charges policy |
| 5. | September 6, 2013 | Greater Toronto Apartment Association | Purpose-built rental |
| 6. | September 10, 2013 | BILD | Development charges policy |

Proposed changes to development charges policies and rates resulting from input received through the submissions and through further stakeholder consultations are discussed below.

BILD represents the land development industry, home building and professional renovation industry in the Greater Toronto Area with more than 1,400 member companies. On behalf of the land development industry, BILD indicated that with the amendments to the rate calculation, and the recommended transition and policy provisions, discussed below, it is satisfied that the new by-law is reasonable. Accordingly BILD will not appeal the by-law nor support actions of its independent members to appeal. The letter from BILD, dated September 10, 2013, setting out the above is attached to this report as Appendix 4.

## 2. Revised Development Charges Rates

The additional technical review has resulted in amendments to the previously calculated development charges rates, as well as a proposed differentiation of the multiple dwelling unit rates, for reasons discussed further in the report. The calculated rates have decreased by approximately 8% and 6%, for residential and non-residential uses respectively, from the rates released at the public meeting, as summarized below. It is important to note that the revised development charges still represent a reasonable maximum level permitted under the *Development Charges Act* and do not incorporate an arbitrary subsidy or reduction.

Table 2: Development Charges Rates

| Development Type | Current Rates | 2013 DC Study Rates** | Proposed Rates Sept 2013 | % Change over Current Rates |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Residential ($ per unit) | | | | |
| Singles & Semis | 19,412 | 37,457 | 34,482 | 78% |
| Multiples | 15,695 | 30,648 | | |
| Multiples 2+ Bedrooms | | | 29,041 | n/a |
| Multiples 1 Bed. and Bach. | | | 20,744 | n/a |
| Apts 2+ Bedrooms | 12,412 | 23,036 | 21,203 | 71% |
| Apts 1 Bed and Bach. | 8,356 | 16,027 | 14,749 | 77% |
| Dwelling Room | 5,212 | 10,018 | 9,219 | 77% |
| Non-residential ($ per sq. m.) | | | | |
| Industrial/Non-ground Floor* | 0.00 | 186.27 | 175.78 | n/a |
| Ground Floor | 141.16 | 186.27 | 175.78 | 25% |

*Exempted from development charges
** Tabled at the July 3, 2013 statutory public meeting

The proposed rates represent an increase over current rates of approximately 75% for residential (average) and 25% for non-residential development, respectively. While the City's rates are increasing, Toronto's rates are competitive with the surrounding regions and remain well below the average charges imposed in the Greater Toronto Area.

The technical adjustments to the development charges calculations include:

i) Growth Forecast: Amended the population in new units value so that it is based on a mid-year number consistent with historic data.
ii) Spadina Subway: Adjusted the financing costs used in the calculation to be net of inflation and increased the benefit to existing share from 35% to 40%.
iii) Parks and Recreation: Reduced the value used to assess the parkland development replacement costs in the level of service analysis of the range in City parks.
iv) Stormwater Management: Increased the benefit to existing allocation for end of pipe and similar stormwater management projects and made adjustments to eligible projects.
v) Roads: Increased the benefit to existing development allocation for certain road improvements identified in the Roads development charges capital program.
vi) Water: Increased the post-period benefit allocation (post 2031) to water plant projects based on growth projections and servicing capacities.
vii) The multiple dwelling unit rate has been split between one-bedroom and bachelor units and two-bedroom and larger units similar to the treatment of apartments.

These changes resulted from further discussions moderated by staff between the City's consultant and the technical representatives of the development industry about the reasonableness of certain assumptions within the original study. For example, the increase in the benefit to existing allocation for some stormwater management and roads projects recognizes that these projects will serve the existing community to a greater degree than originally assumed.

The changes made to the background study calculations described above are detailed in an Addendum to the Background Study, dated September 13, 2013, ("Addendum") which is attached to this report as Appendix 3. As noted in the June 2013 staff report, the background study, as amended, calculates the maximum charges, or "cost recovery charges", that Council can implement pursuant to the *Development Charges Act*. These revised rates continue to be the maximum cost recovery charges. For various policy reasons, Council may discount the rates that are imposed.

## 3. Proposed Development Charges Policy Changes

In addition to the above technical changes to the background study calculations, a number of policy refinements are proposed, as discussed below. The proposed policy and definitional changes, as well as some minor technical revisions, are reflected in recommended development charges by-law attached to this report as Appendix 1.

### A. Transition Provisions

Transition provisions implement the changes in the rates over a period of time in order to mitigate the impact of the new rates on land development projects that are well along in the development approval process and to allow for an orderly implementation of the new by-law. The provisions are provided in recognition that some of the projects imminently proceeding to the development approvals stage may have difficultly absorbing notable rate increases. Each option for transition assistance has a theoretical associated cost when compared to immediate implementation. Transition policies seek to strike a balance between mitigating the impact of the new rates on new development and, at the same time, minimizing the financial cost to the City of such transition assistance.

a. Development Industry Request

Development industry stakeholders have requested a variety of transition measures, including further delayed implementation of the new bylaw, longer phase-in provisions, grandparenting of existing site plan or building permit applications, as well as prepayment options.

b. Proposed Transition Provision

After further discussions with the BILD, as well as a review of submissions received at the public meeting, staff propose that the phase-in be extended.

The recommended transition provision would implement the rate increases over a two-year period, beginning February 1, 2014, with 55% of the increase in effect by August 1, 2014 (less than a year from the date of planned by-law adoption), and full implementation by February 1, 2016. The proposed phase-in of the increase in the rates is shown below, subject to adjustments for indexing. The start date for implementing the new development charges rates (i.e. February 1, 2014) coincides with the next indexation and last phase-in installment under the City's existing (2009) development charges by-law. The proposed phase-in period has been extended from July 2014 to February 2016.

Table 3: Proposed Phase-in

| | | | Proposed Phase-in* | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Development Type | Nov 1/13 | Feb 1/14 | Aug 1/14 | Feb 1/15 | Aug 1/15 | Feb 1/16 |
| *% increase phased-in* | *0%* | *32%* | *23%* | *15%* | *15%* | *15%* |
| Residential ($ per unit) | | | | | | |
| Singles & Semis | 19,412 | 24,234 | 27,701 | 29,961 | 32,222 | 34,482 |
| Multiples 2+ Bedrooms | 15,695 | 19,966 | 23,035 | 25,037 | 27,039 | 29,041 |
| Multiples 1 Bed and Bach | 8,356 | 12,320 | 15,169 | 17,028 | 18,886 | 20,744 |
| Apts 2+ Bedrooms | 12,412 | 15,225 | 17,247 | 18,566 | 19,884 | 21,203 |
| Apts 1 Bed and Bach. | 8,356 | 10,402 | 11,872 | 12,831 | 13,790 | 14,749 |
| Dwelling Room | 5,212 | 6,494 | 7,416 | 8,017 | 8,618 | 9,219 |
| Non-residential ($ per sq. m.) | | | | | | |
| Ground Floor | 141.16 | 152.24 | 160.20 | 165.39 | 170.59 | 175.78 |
| All Non-Ground & Industrial | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

* As a result of the change in the small multiple policy discussed further in the staff report, for the purposes of the phase-in, the November 1, 2013 multiple dwelling unit rates for 2 bedroom & larger and 1 bedroom & bachelor units will be $15,695 and $8,356, respectively.

City staff and Hemson believe that the calculated development charges are fair, reasonable and defensible at the Ontario Municipal Board and meets the requirements under the *Development Charges Act.* The revenue impact of the proposed transition provisions must be weighed against the risk-adjusted revenue expectation from full, immediate implementation (i.e. no phase-in) but subject to potential appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board. Any appeal that succeeds in reducing the rates would apply for the life of the by-law. Staff believe that the additional phase-in strikes the appropriate balance of revenue optimization and due consideration of the potential impact on the development industry.

The other potential transition provisions requested by development industry stakeholders were also considered, including delayed implementation to expiry of the current by-law, prepayment options, grandparenting of existing applications with site plan or building permit applications submitted. These additional transition provisions are not recommended in light of the extended phase-in provisions being proposed.

B. Stacked Townhouses and Back-to-back Townhouses

Executive Committee directed staff to consider the development industry request to treat stacked townhouses and back-to-back townhouses as apartment units for the purposes of calculating the development charges payable. The rationale advanced by the industry was that these types of units can achieve the same density and occupancy rates as many apartment style developments.

Municipal development charges by-laws vary across Ontario in their treatment of stacked and back-to-back townhouses. However, Statistics Canada Census data, which was relied on for the growth forecast and the occupancy figures in the background study calculations, generally includes stacked townhouses in the apartment category, and backed to back townhouses as row houses (multiple dwelling units). Staff agree that setting unit category definitions consistent with Statistics Canada enumeration of these types of units would improve the by-law, and accordingly have proposed redefining apartments to include stacked townhouses, but to continue to consider back-to-back townhouses as multiple dwelling units. It was also determined that the City's current small multiple policy ought to be revised to reflect the appropriate occupancy in these types of units and to differentiate the units between one-bedroom and two-bedroom units, similar to the treatment for apartment units.

C. Redevelopment Credit Policy

The redevelopment credit policy previously proposed at the public meeting was unchanged from the policy in the City’s current (2009) by-law, as amended. The City's current policy is designed to preserve employment lands, particularly industrial uses, by not offering financial incentives, in the form of redevelopment credits, to redevelop these lands for residential purposes. The retention of employment lands is deemed necessary to support the City's planning and economic development policy objectives, as well as the employment targets under the Growth Plan.

Development industry representatives have questioned some aspects of the City's proposed policy, in particular that no reduction is provided where a non-residential use is demolished or converted to a residential use. It was suggested that the redevelopment of land theoretically utilizes existing servicing capacity and should therefore be entitled to a credit based on the floor area demolished or converted.

A review of general municipal practice suggests that there is precedent for determining redevelopment credits based on the prevailing development charges rates in effect at the time of the redevelopment. Some municipalities, like the City of Hamilton and Regional Municipality of Halton, go further and explicitly state that redevelopment credits are not provided to the demolition or conversion of exempt uses. Furthermore, the *Development Charges Act, 1997* is clearer in mandating that a redevelopment policy be in place.

Giving consideration to the above, and consistent with municipal practice, it is proposed that, for the redevelopment of land from a non-residential for residential use, a credit be given based on the prevailing rates at the time of the redevelopment. Under this approach, no credit would be provided for the demolition or conversion of exempted uses (e.g. industrial uses) but a credit would apply for the demolition or conversion of retail uses based on the chargeable floor area (i.e. currently ground floor only.) The current and revised policies are summarized in the table below.

Table 4: Redevelopment Credit Policy

| Redevelopment from | To | Policy proposed at public meeting | Revised policy |
|---|---|---|---|
| Residential uses | Residential or non-residential uses | Demolitions or conversions: The credit is equal to the units demolished or converted multiplied by the development charges rates applicable to those units | No change |
| Non-residential uses | Non-residential uses | Demolitions: The credit is equal to the floor area demolished multiplied by the development charges rates applicable to that floor area<br><br>Conversions: The development charges are calculated based on the net increase in total non-residential floor area located on the ground floor | No change. |
| Non-residential uses | Residential uses | No credit is provided | Demolitions or conversions: The credit is equal to the floor area demolished or converted multiplied by the development charges rates applicable to that floor area |

D. Revision Credit Policy

Staff had previously proposed that revisions to building permit applications (i.e. where a building permit has been issued but where there are subsequent revisions to the plans that change the number or type of units without adding additional floor area or massing to a building) be treated in the same manner as demolitions. Credits would be provided based on current rates but subject to no cash reimbursement. Some deputants objected to the second aspect of the policy as it could be unfair in some situations.

Staff agreed and now recommend that credits be provided based on the rates originally paid, by unit type, where there is a reduction in that type of unit, and the current rates would apply where there is an increase by unit type. Refunds would be issued where warranted based on the above recalculation.

## 4. Other Matters

A. Market Rental Apartments

Executive Committee directed staff to review the possibility of payment by installments or other staged deferral payment of development charges to encourage the development of market rental apartments. The City's Official Plan sets out the importance to the City of purpose-built rental housing, including stimulating the production of the new private sector rental housing supply, as follows:

> "3.2.1.3. Investment in new rental housing, particularly affordable rental housing, will be encouraged by a co-ordinated effort from all levels of government through implementation of a range of strategies, including effective taxation, regulatory, administrative policies and incentives."

Current City incentives for rental housing include: a full development charges exemption and other fee exemptions for affordable rental housing; a special property tax class and preferential tax rate (equal to the single family residential rate) for new purpose built rental; and the Official Plan by-law protecting built rental from conversion and demolition.

Staff met with the representatives of apartment developers to discuss potential arrangements for deferring development charges collection for market rental housing (affordable rental housing is exempted from development charges). Deferring the payment of development charges through the construction period was identified as a potential indication of City support for purpose built rental and, depending on how it is structured, could increase financial flexibility and marginally improve the business cases for new purpose-built market rental development.

Staff recommend that further consideration be given to examining the merits of a deferred development collection option, but that any deferral should be considered in the broader context of other possible mechanisms to encourage the creation of new market rental housing and should include an analysis of the potential effectiveness of any recommended incentive programs. A policy change to address this issue should consider the City requirements for provision of appropriate security to ensure payment in full, an appropriate rate of interest on outstanding balances and the possibly limiting incentives to certain segments of the market, such as moderate rental housing. It is noted that under the proposed by-law, Council can enter into agreements for the earlier or later collection of development charges but Finance staff deem it premature to recommend the deferral of the development charges for market rental housing at this time, until further analysis is undertaken.

B. Local Services Policy

Following comments received by stakeholders, the roads and related capital program was reviewed in the context of future growth expected in the Downsview area of the City. The City is proposing that future development charges eligible road works related to

Downsview that have yet to be identified be considered for development charges funding through the unallocated provision of the capital program. Additionally, change to the City's local services guidelines is being proposed to ensure that arterial roads internal to a development are also eligible for potential development charges credits or funding. It is noted that the amount of any development charges credit available to a particular development is determined by taking into account the local services policy, funds available, the specifics of the development, as well as surrounding development, and the nature, type and timing of works required.

C. Subsidized Housing

Staff and Hemson reviewed the subsidized housing calculation at the request of Committee. As discussed in the Addendum, the City is recovering more revenue for subsidized housing under this Study compared to the previous (2008) Study ($84 million versus $57 million net development-related costs, respectively) if growth occurs at the rate forecasted in the Study. The review identified no recommended changes to the development charges calculations for subsidized housing.

D. Mid-rise Development Along the Avenues

The Official Plan identifies the Avenues as important corridors along identified major streets where re-urbanization and intensification is directed and encouraged to develop. To help facilitate development along these important corridors, in 2010, City Council adopted Performance Standards for Mid-Rise Buildings (http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2010.PG39.9) and provided City Planning with directions to encourage the realization of the Avenues development vision. The Mid-Rise report contained reference to the November 2, 2009 recommendation from Executive Committee "on the possibility of reducing development charges for smaller scale Avenue intensification projects". In addition, nineteen Avenue Studies have been completed and another two Avenue studies are currently underway including Eglinton Avenue and a portion of Dufferin Street.

The Avenues are currently experiencing healthy development activity. Between July 2010 and July 2012, the City received 36 proposals for mid-rise buildings on the Avenues. While the majority of this development is located close to the Downtown and along the Sheppard Corridor, until the monitoring report is completed it is premature to determine if an Avenue development charge reduction, or other financial incentives or programs, should be considered.

Furthermore, if the City was to pursue this course of action, a number of implementation issues must be addressed including the delineation of the precise boundaries of such areas. The Official Plan, Map 2 does not show the precise boundaries for the Avenues. In addition, not all areas shown as Avenues are intended to be intensified. The underlying land use designations provide for a variety of land use designations, not all of which are intended to result in intensification i.e. parks and open space designated areas. It is through the Avenues Study and resulting zoning implementation that the precise boundaries for the Avenues are determined. As the Avenue Study results can be disputed at the Ontario Municipal Board, it is not until the zoning is actually in place and the precise boundaries delineated that an area subject to the development charge relief ought to be considered, if at all.

City Planning staff are currently monitoring development occurring along the Avenues to help measure the effectiveness of the Performance Standards and will report to Planning and Growth Management Committee in the future. Given the healthy amount of mid-rise growth along the Avenues and in light of the implementation questions to be considered, staff consider it premature to consider a reduction of development charges for the land development projects occurring along the Avenues. Furthermore, any development charges relief, if warranted, ought to be considered in the broader context of other possible City programs and incentives to encourage development along the Avenues, if needed and appropriate.

E. Growth Since 1999 by Former Municipality

Executive Committee requested that staff report on where growth has occurred in Toronto since 1999, listed by pre-amalgamation municipal boundaries. This information is presented in the tables contained in Appendix 2.

Population and household growth is shown between the Census years, 1996 and 2011. Most of the growth was in the three largest former municipalities of North York, Scarborough and the former City of Toronto. Housing unit completions over the five years from 2007 to 2011 were also the largest in the former North York, Scarborough and Toronto. Non-residential growth follows similar patterns to residential growth, with about half of the new floorspace in the former City of Toronto, and just under 20% in each of North York and Scarborough.

## CONCLUSION

Additional technical review and stakeholder consultation has resulted in adjustments to the development charges rates and refinements to development charges policies, from those rates and policies previously tabled at the public meeting.

The proposed development charges by-law attempts to balance the City's overall capital financing needs, its broader economic development and long-term financial planning objectives and the trade off that an increase in the rates may have on the rate of development in the City. That balance is achieved by phasing-in the change in the rates over a period of time, as well as by providing targeted relief to certain types of land development in the form of exemptions, incentives and other development charges policies.

As the key organization representing the land development industry, BILD has indicated that with the amendments to the rate calculation and the recommended transition provisions it is satisfied that the new by-law is reasonable.  Accordingly BILD will not appeal the by-law nor support actions of its independent members to appeal

## CONTACT

Joe Farag, Director Corporate Finance
Tel: 416-392-8108
Fax: 416-397-4555
Email: jfarag@toronto.ca

Robert Hatton, Director Strategic Initiatives and Intergovernmental Finance, Corporate Finance
Tel: 416-392-9149
Fax: 416-397-4555
Email: rhatton@toronto.ca

## SIGNATURE

_______________________________
Roberto Rossini, Deputy City Manager
and Chief Financial Officer

## ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1: Development Charges By-law
Appendix 2: Growth in Toronto Since 1999, by Former Municipal Boundary
Appendix 3: Development Charges Background Study Addendum
Appendix 4: Letter from BILD dated September 10, 2013

## Appendix 1: Development Charges By-law

*(provided under separate cover)*

# Appendix 2: Growth in Toronto since 1999, by former municipal boundaries

### 1. Population Growth

| Former Municipality | 1996 | 2011 | Change | Percent change | % of Total Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| East York | 107,820 | 115,365 | 7,545 | 7.0 | 3.3 |
| Etobicoke | 328,720 | 347,948 | 19,228 | 5.8 | 8.4 |
| North York | 589,655 | 651,083 | 61,428 | 10.4 | 26.8 |
| Scarborough | 558,960 | 625,926 | 66,966 | 12.0 | 29.2 |
| Toronto | 653,735 | 730,656 | 76,921 | 11.8 | 33.5 |
| York | 146,535 | 144,082 | -2,453 | -1.7 | -1.1 |
| **Total** | 2,385,425 | 2,615,060 | 229,635 | 9.6 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada

### 2. Household Growth

| Former Municipality | 1996 | 2011 | Change | Percent Change | % of Total Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| East York | 45,180 | 46,827 | 1,647 | 3.6 | 1.2 |
| Etobicoke | 120,180 | 129,649 | 9,469 | 7.9 | 6.7 |
| North York | 210,080 | 244,951 | 34,871 | 16.6 | 24.8 |
| Scarborough | 184,205 | 211,722 | 27,517 | 14.9 | 19.6 |
| Toronto | 286,295 | 352,378 | 66,083 | 23.1 | 47.0 |
| York | 57,650 | 58,785 | 1,135 | 2.0 | 0.8 |
| **Total** | 903,590 | 1,044,312 | 140,722 | 15.6 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Census of Canada

### 3. Housing Completions, 2006 to 2011

| Former Municipality | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| East York | 55 | 92 | 95 | 38 | 237 | 123 |
| Etobicoke | 1,667 | 800 | 2,323 | 1,156 | 256 | 1,245 |
| North York | 2,791 | 1,570 | 2,252 | 3,265 | 2,277 | 5,948 |
| Scarborough | 2,384 | 779 | 1,291 | 899 | 645 | 3,536 |
| Toronto | 5,280 | 3,308 | 7,138 | 7,038 | 9,516 | 9,146 |
| York | 243 | 237 | 351 | 77 | 157 | 78 |
| **Total** | 12,420 | 6,786 | 13,450 | 12,473 | 13,088 | 20,076 |

Source: Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, custom tabulation, 2012.

### 4. Non-residential Development in Planning Applications, 2001-2011*

| | All Applications | | Work started or completed | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Former Municipalities** | GFA (sq.m.) | Percent of Total | GFA (sq.m.) | Percent of Total |
| East York | 92,086 | 1.1 | 27,677 | 0.6 |
| Etobicoke | 1,261,632 | 14.8 | 382,304 | 8.6 |
| North York | 1,556,745 | 18.3 | 816,741 | 18.4 |
| Scarborough | 1,545,962 | 18.2 | 861,616 | 19.4 |
| Toronto | 3,716,915 | 43.7 | 2,240,116 | 50.5 |
| York | 323,477 | 3.8 | 103,324 | 2.3 |
| **Total** | 8,496,818 | 100.0 | 4,431,778 | 100.0 |

Source: Toronto City Planning Division, Land Use Information System II
* All planning applications received between July 1 2001 and June 30 2011.

## Appendix 3: Development Charges Background Study Addendum

*(provided under separate cover)*

## Appendix 4: Letter from the Building Industry and Land Development Association

*(provided under separate cover)*