

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

**REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT CHARGE (RDC)  
POLICY REPORT**

---

(Tabled at CSEDC on 6 Apr 99)

- Joint Finance Commissioner and Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's updated report dated 01 Jun 99 (French translation of report available upon request)
- Committee Co-ordinator's report dated 04 Jun 99
- Budget Sub-Committee, Committee Co-ordinator's memorandum dated 10 Jun 99 and Budget Sub-Committee Minutes
- Region of Ottawa-Carleton Background Study, May 99, previously issued
- Written submission package 17 May 99 previously issued
- Written submission package No. 2, 10 Jun 99, issued separately
- Additional written submissions issued at the meeting
- Public Delegations

Note: A draft minute extract for 15 Apr 99, staff presentation and public delegations, will be issued separate from the Report to Council, but prior to Council deliberations on 23 Jun 99.

The second day of the meeting commenced at 8:45 a.m. in the Champlain Room.

Councillor Meilleur requested Committee to permit Mr. Pierre Dufresne, Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders' Association (OCHBA), to address the Committee on a point of clarification on their delegation the prior day.

Mr. Dufresne confirmed that at the beginning of the review process, which commenced in 1997, the OCHBA were contacted by staff. As a result, the Association met with staff to review the process and determine what information the OCHBA would want to have input. Mr. Dufresne stated numerous meetings were held over the following two years which involved both the Association and the construction industry. In closing, the speaker confirmed staff were very attentive to the consultation process, and the views of the OCHBA. As well, he stated that the process was very open, effective and highly recommended it for other significant policy issues.

In response to a question from Councillor Hill, Mr. Dufresne explained the end result of the consultation was an agreement between the Association and staff to disagree with regard to the methodology used in the Background Study. Mr. Dufresne stated the purpose of the letter from Ms. L. Townsend, Solicitor for the OCHBA, dated 27 May, was to reinforce the OCHBA's position that they believed the methodology was flawed, without the expectation of further consultation.

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

Councillor van den Ham moved a Motion as later outlined. The Councillor explained the Motion addressed the RDC issue as a package issue, including a strategy regarding the lack of senior level funding and responsibility. Councillor van den Ham pointed out the Motion would put in place affordable and competitive development charges. He reviewed each component of the Motion.

Councillor Meilleur requested clarification regarding (f) of the van den Ham Motion. Councillor van den Ham explained the charges would remain in force for two years, and if no funding came forward from other levels of government, there would be a need to re-examine the entire funding problem and issue.

With respect to (g) of the van den Ham Motion, Councillor Meilleur inquired how much would be collected through the \$200 non-RDC payment. P. Sweet, Director, Policy and Infrastructure Planning Division, reported under the current environment of 3000-4000 new building permits, it would create a fund of approximately \$600,000 per year.

Chair Chiarelli reported that during a recent Budget Sub-Committee meeting, and in light of the fact that even by charging the maximum development charge, it was discovered there would be a \$5 billion shortfall in the capital requirements. He explained the industry came forward offering to work with the Region, other municipalities and organizations to address this problem. Chair Chiarelli explained the proposal involved co-operative, professional work such as research, government relations and representation to attempt to restore senior levels of funding. He stated this strategy was necessary to attack the \$5 billion shortfall.

Councillor Meilleur requested further information on (i) of the van den Ham Motion. T. Marc, Manager, Planning and Environment Law, directed the Councillor to the report and the exemptions outlined in the current By-law. He confirmed the centre core exemption was not an exemption contained in By-law 210 of 1991.

Councillor Loney moved a Motion to adopt the staff recommendations and the increases be phased in over a four year period in equal installments. Councillor Loney explained he did not agree with the notion the industry would stop building homes as a result of the charges recommended in the staff report. The Councillor pointed out that, in the 1970's, the City of Nepean experienced a boom in the industry notwithstanding the fact that they had the highest development charge in Ontario at that time.

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

Councillor Loney stated housing prices differed immensely in each ward. He acknowledged statements that supply prices had increased, however, questioned why all costs were allowed to increase and be acknowledged through the price of a house, except the development charge required to pay for municipal infrastructure. Councillor Loney reminded Committee they were elected to serve and protect the taxpayer, adding money not collected from new development was money required to be found elsewhere.

Speaking to the non-RDC payment of \$200, Councillor Loney wondered about its legality and the power of the Region to collect it. The Councillor pointed out it was possible to later lower the charges with little difficulty, however, it was much more difficult to later increase the charges. As a result, Councillor Loney believed it was more appropriate to set the charges at the levels recommended by staff, through a phase in process. He suggested if the efforts to address the funding shortfall were successful, the rates could be revisited. In closing, Councillor Loney referenced the \$5 billion shortfall in the capital program and believed the building industry were unrealistic to expect a lower charge. He commented if Committee agreed to collect less than required, the Official Plan and capital program would require review.

Councillor Hill inquired about the definition of “developers” as stated in (g) of the van den Ham Motion. She wondered if it was inclusive for all applying for a building permit. Councillor van den Ham explained it was his intention to include all building permit applicants, however, acknowledged staff was required to review the proposal. Mr. Marc reported the authority used by the Region to impose the fee would be that used to impose processing fees for planning applications under the *Planning Act*. He added a planning application would have to be with the Region in order to impose the fee. Mr. Marc pointed out the fees were subject to appeal, and someone could challenge them before the Ontario Municipal Board.

Councillor Meilleur moved four Motions, as outlined below. The first Motion requested the exemption of the central area and centretown. The Councillor referenced the additional expenses to develop in this area. In addition, she reviewed the many benefits of the exemption to centretown, such as quality of life, economic development and safety. In closing, Councillor Meilleur pointed out the exemption of the centre core would assist in achieving the objectives of the Official Plan.

On the second Motion to exempt contaminated sites, Councillor Meilleur stated this would also assist in achieving the Official Plan objectives. She referenced a six acre site which had great potential for residential development, however, was contaminated. Councillor Meilleur believed the site would remain vacant for many years as it would cost

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

approximately \$4 million to decontaminate it; she emphasized relief was required in cases such as this.

Councillor Meilleur reviewed her third and fourth Motions, with regard to an exemption for certain health care facilities and the collection of a RDC for growth related community health needs.

Councillor Stewart noted the staff report indicated the issue of contaminated sites would be reviewed at a later date. Ms. Sweet confirmed staff were completing a report entitled the Historical Land Use Survey, which would identify areas of potential contamination. She stated the report would include policies on how to encourage or prohibit development, and would include a review of a possible exemption. Ms. Sweet explained staff did not presently have a clear picture of the extent of this issue. However, the report should come forward within the next two years and the option of an exemption could be considered during the next development charge review.

Councillor Stewart inquired how the non-RDC payment fund would be administered and where the spending authority would lie. J. LeBelle, Finance Commissioner, recommended the revenue be placed in a reserve fund where spending would be subject to reports to Committee and Council.

In response to a question from Councillor Hume regarding the van den Ham Motion of a \$7500 urban residential charge, Mr. Kirkpatrick confirmed this changed the staff recommendation of \$9562. Councillor Hume wondered, if rates were not going to be raised and taxes were not going to be increased, how Council would reduce the capital program to fit the budget. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated Council did that exercise annually in consideration of the ten year capital budget forecast. Mr. Kirkpatrick noted that in the event that tax and development rates could not be increased, and alternative sources of revenue were not achieved to fund capital requirements, Council may face revisiting the affordability of the Official Plan. The Deputy Treasurer indicated Council would be re-addressing the Official Plan in four years and all issues would be taken into context at that time. Ms. Sweet stated an earlier than the four year review of the Plan would place Council in similar dilemmas experienced during the last Review, however, they would be more difficult in light of further eliminations. Ms. Sweet stated she was adverse to an early review of the Plan as she did not feel there had been enough time to evaluate the effect of the current Plan and its impact.

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

Chair Chiarelli pointed out the charges proposed in the van den Ham Motion were for a two year period; and were premised on the success of obtaining other sources of revenue and working to restore federal and provincial support for growth related infrastructure. The Chair inquired what the two year period at the reduced rate represented. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated the van den Ham Motion regarding proposed charges for a two year period would represent a loss of approximately \$20 million in revenue. Mr. Kirkpatrick pointed out Council and staff would have to be successful in obtaining alternative sources of funding for the capital fund regardless what charges were set; the lower rate set the more exacerbated the problem. Ms. Sweet pointed out under the Official Plan there were two priorities set for capital spending. She stated Council may have to further delay some capital spending in certain projects, resulting in possible phasing or restriction of development through the approval process if infrastructure was not in place.

Councillor van den Ham stated even if the staff recommended charges were implemented, the goals of the Official Plan would not be meant. The Councillor reminded Committee that staff presented what Council requested as a result of the Official Plan through recommending the maximum theoretical. He stated the Official Plan was not affordable under the current scenario of taxation and elimination of support from upper levels of government. Councillor van den Ham explained his Motion offered a strategy to attempt to resolve the problem of lost revenue and represented an interim charge for a two year period, with further examination. The Councillor did not agree with the notion taxes would have to be raised to fulfill the capital program, as he believed there were items that should not be done, such as the \$150 million for the east-west CNR rail corridor. Councillor van den Ham reminded members that Council was guilty of the large capital program. In closing, he stated the two year proposal was competitive, affordable and did not punish the industry.

Speaking to the Motion for an exemption to centretown, Councillor van den Ham stated he could not support a blanket exemption, however, may support the exemption if there were guidelines and criteria in place which supported the Official Plan and increased densities. Councillor Meilleur stated her Motion was to include an exemption as per By-law 31 of 1995.

Councillor Munter referenced the van den Ham Motion. The Councillor noted the public delegations did not express concern with the rural residential rate, however, the Motion reduced that rate. Councillor van den Ham provided clarification to the concern.

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

Councillor Munter referenced the Meilleur Motion regarding health development charges. The Councillor reviewed the major health related infrastructure the Region would require to fund due to growth, such as ambulances and homes for the aged. Councillor Munter urged the Committee to adopt the Meilleur Motions.

Councillor Munter suggested the issue came down to a choice between user pay on one hand or taxes and debt on the other. He stated if adequate revenue was not collected from the industry to cover new infrastructure, the Region would face tax increases of 25 - 30 % over the period of the Official Plan, in addition to water rate increases. Councillor Munter referenced the significance of the issue, debate and decisions to be made. With respect to the delegations, the Councillor referenced the requests to build the infrastructure that represented going into debt which would be against the community desires. In closing, Councillor Munter expressed dismay in that Committee may not collect fees for development, however, would consider collecting fees for political lobbying. He welcomed the participation of the OCHBA to convince the senior government regarding alternative funding sources. However, he concurred with Councillor Loney in that for it to be effective, Committee should set the charge at what was required to pay for the projects the industry requested. Should other funding sources come through, then the charges may be reduced.

Councillor Holmes did not support the van den Ham Motion, noting the large capital shortfall. The Councillor stated the Motion would represent a subsidization of those inside the greenbelt for those outside the greenbelt. Councillor Holmes commended staff for attempting to move forward on how to develop in the future and fulfill the Official Plan objectives. Councillor Holmes referenced environmental issues and suggested the van den Ham Motion sustained and subsidized urban sprawl on more costly lands. Councillor Holmes urged Committee to support the centretown exemption and reviewed the benefits resulting from By-law 31 of 1995 and the necessity to maintain the exemption.

Councillor Doucet believed there was a need to discontinue the current subsidization and place real costs on development. The Councillor stated the van den Ham Motion ignored this fundamental responsibility to manage the tax base in the interest of the taxpayer. Councillor Doucet concurred with the need to populate and intensify the downtown area. He reviewed recent projects that were significant to rejuvenating the core.

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen referenced the community visioning exercise during the Official Plan consultation, and suggested it was that exercise which resulted in the unaffordability of the current Official Plan. She stated the standards that have been established must be revisited.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen expressed her support for the van den Ham Motion as it provided Committee with immediate response to the need to have a charge, yet provided flexibility in the future should the need arise to increase the fee should other funding not be secured. In closing, Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen respected the centretown situation, however, pointed out people also chose to reside outside that area, reviewing the benefits of each to the other.

Councillor Legendre agreed with the comments regarding a potential tax problem. The Councillor stated the main problem was that the urban form was currently inefficient, representing a direct link which could not be corrected after the fact. Councillor Legendre concurred senior level funding would be useful, agreeing with the partnership with the industry. However, he stated this did not solve the problem of an inefficient urban form and the van den Ham Motion would only solve it in the short term.

Councillor van den Ham emphasized he was being financially responsible on this issue. The Councillor referenced the difficult annual budget exercises and did not want to direct the Region toward a more difficult financial position. Councillor van den Ham acknowledged there may be projects in the capital program he supported, however, noted there were others he did not support but were still included. With respect to subsidization, he pointed out that of \$2 billion in transportation projects, none were in the rural area. The Councillor explained the Motion represented a balancing act and strategy for an interim period while other sources of funding were explored. He noted he was not proposing exemptions.

Councillor Munter pointed out the vote of Council on the Official Plan was unanimous and he did not recall a single dissent recorded.

Councillor Cantin referenced the Motions regarding health care facilities. In response to a question, Mr. LeBelle confirmed Council did not have any legislated responsibility for funding hospitals or health care facilities. However, Mr. LeBelle noted it did not restrict Council from funding them as done in the past. Councillor Cantin referenced the \$5 billion shortfall and questioned why Councillors would want to include an area such as health care funding that was not within their legislated mandate, noting it represented another subsidy to the Province. With respect to the centretown exemption, Councillor

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

Cantin questioned what the centre core had done to encourage suburban employment which was required. The Councillor expressed his support for the van den Ham Motion.

Councillor Hunter noted the Official Plan objective stated the priority of development inside the greenbelt, however, that it did not necessarily restrict it to the downtown core. The Councillor stated the proposed RDC by-law was not contrary to the Official Plan, the Transportation Master Plan or the Water and Wastewater Master Plan. The Councillor believed it was a fallacy to assume that those that live downtown also worked in the core area. He referenced a number of the conversions in the downtown area were taking job opportunities out of the core and spreading them to the suburbs, indicating the major traffic problems associated with movement out of the core during peak periods; thereby placing pressure on the transportation and water and wastewater infrastructure.

Councillor Meilleur stated her concern for the citizens of Ottawa-Carleton and referenced her Motions regarding health care facilities. The Councillor expressed her support for the Loney Motion. Councillor Meilleur expressed concern with the self serving focus of Councillors and their interest in their own areas, rather than on the Region in general. The Councillor acknowledged the different industries in Ottawa-Carleton and believed people choose to reside or do business in the Region due to its entire quality of life. Councillor Meilleur stated staff understood Council wished to fulfill the objectives of the Official Plan and brought forward recommendation in that regard. She stated this would not be achieved through the van den Ham Motion.

Councillor Stewart concurred with previous comments regarding members self serving interests and not looking at the issue and Region in the larger picture and in an attempt to be fair. Councillor Stewart stated she would support the van den Ham Motion as it was the fairest with respect to balance.

Speaking to the issue raised by the OCHBA regarding the challenge of the methodology, Councillor Stewart stated to support the staff recommendations would not recognize this concern and may be contrary to the *Development Charges Act*. Councillor Stewart believed Council could only go so far in driving the market forces, but also referenced the need to react as well, serve the public and ensure the required range of homes were available as noted in the Regional Development Strategy. With respect to the argument that high development charges would not affect the industry, Councillor Stewart disagreed. She suggested the charge did have a significant impact and referenced the recommendations for exemptions for conversions and land in the vicinity of the transitway. In closing, Councillor Stewart expressed her support for the Meilleur Motions regarding health care facilities, as Region-wide, it was an important high priority.

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

Councillor Loney noted the van den Ham Motion represented a loss in revenue of approximately \$20,000 over the two year period. Upon request, Mr. Kirkpatrick reviewed the rates should Committee support the Loney Motion regarding phasing in over four years.

Councillor Loney agreed there were affects from development charges, including relief from the property taxpayer. However, he did not believe development would stop as a result of a higher charge, stating the decision on where to live was important and people would pay for what they want in any regard. In closing, Councillor Loney referenced the shortfall that will exist in the capital program, noting the fact Committee had not proposed eliminating some projects to assist with the problem.

Speaking to the lobbying efforts regarding a gasoline tax and transfer of revenue, Councillor Loney pointed out there was tremendous amount of resistance from the senior levels of government; he urged Committee to recognize the difficulties around the lobbying proposal. Councillor Loney reminded Committee of the difficulty to increase the charges at a later date compared to less difficulty to decrease the charges.

Councillor Hume concurred with comments from Councillor Legendre regarding moving to the unfavorable position of “building a wall”. Councillor Hume stated the debate clearly identified that the Official Plan was unaffordable and required review. He stated the RDC issue was an affordability test which failed. The Councillor appreciated the fact the industry did not wish to pay more, however, stated taxpayers could not be expected to cover the shortfall. Councillor Hume reinforcing the need to have a Region-wide view, protect the taxpayer and realize the Official Plan was not affordable. Councillor Hume moved a Motion, as outlined below, for a review of the Official Plan to eliminate the capital funding shortfall.

Councillor Hill concurred with the van den Ham Motion as it appeared to be the fairest way to go at this time. The Councillor reiterated comments regarding the unaffordability of the Official Plan, stating it was a wish list that was unrealistic. She concurred with Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen’s comments that the Region’s standards must be reviewed and adapted accordingly. Councillor Hill acknowledging staff were correct to develop the RDC report by including all programs Council requested during the Official Plan review. However, she expressed the necessity to become more efficient, affordable and realistic. In closing, Councillor Hill referenced the years of subsidization from the rural areas for the urban and centre core areas.

Subject to an earlier comment regarding the approval of the Official Plan, Councillor Hunter acknowledged it may have carried unanimously. However, he pointed out that did

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

not indicate everyone supported every component, but represented a compromised document. Councillor Hunter suggested the van den Ham Motion was a similar attempt to compromise all issues.

Councillor Hunter stated the rate at what time the infrastructure improvements would be required was yet to be determined, suggesting the improvements would not precede development, with the exception of the water and wastewater system. He agreed the van den Ham Motion would support development both inside and outside the greenbelt, in addition to not impeding the industry.

Chair Chiarelli agreed the issue held significant importance to the entire Region and each member of Council. The Chair expressed his appreciation to the public delegations for their input, including written submissions and consultation with staff, and Councillors for their professional and respectful debate. He complemented staff for their difficult challenge and outreach to the community.

Chair Chiarelli acknowledged the need for Councillors to represent their wards on certain issues. However, he noted it was his role as Regional Chair to try to bring consensus and agreement among the areas, acknowledging the justification of each position and request.

Chair Chiarelli did not agree with the suggestion the development issue was a user pay issue. He pointed out the \$5 billion shortfall regardless of which charges were approved. He stated justified issues were that of equity and balance, and referenced the requirement of subsidization in the appropriate areas.

With respect to the commercial sector and rate, Chair Chiarelli referenced Ottawa Economic Development Corporation's efforts around the attraction of a chip fabrication plant in the Region. He stated with the existing rates, the charge involved would be approximately \$700,000, however, with the staff recommendation of \$2.70, the charge would be \$2 million. The Chair reminded Committee the RDC issue was one of jobs and quality of life, not one of residential development alone.

Speaking to the proposed \$200 non-RDC fee, Chair Chiarelli emphasized the need to address the real problem of the \$5 billion shortfall in the capital program. The Chair reported that since 1995, the Region had lost \$700,000 million in support revenue in the 10 year capital program, during which time the industry was voiceless. Chair Chiarelli emphasized the obligation of the various industries to partner and address these concerns with the senior levels of government.

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

With respect to the downtown core exemption, Chair Chiarelli supported the Motion, in addition to the van den Ham conversion Motion. He stated the necessity to address the justified concerns in this area and reviewed the consequences of not supporting and building the city core.

Chair Chiarelli pointed out the van den Ham Motion stated if additional sources of revenue were not secured in two years, the rates would have to be revisited. However, he stated the senior levels of government must be held accountable, not the industry, community or Council. Chair Chiarelli did not believe it was in the best interest of the community to implement charges at the highest rate in the Province and referenced the obligation to provide affordable housing.

In closing, the Chair urged Committee to support the van den Ham Motion and Meilleur Motion on the centretown exemption.

The Committee then considered the Motions as follows:

Moved by R. van den Ham

**WHEREAS the current forecasted capital funding requirement of the 10 - 20 year time planning horizon of the Official Plan is greater than current capital budgets can sustain;**

**WHEREAS the application of the maximum theoretical RDC would contribute only a small portion of this capital funding requirement;**

**WHEREAS an application of the theoretical rate would not be competitive with RDCs in other municipalities (as described in the staff report Annex B1 Table 1);**

**WHEREAS in consultations with the OCHBA and BOMA the willingness to form a coalition to seek renewed provincial and federal commitment to growth related infrastructure became apparent;**

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee recommend Council to approve the following:**

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

- a) **That the Region of Ottawa-Carleton Development Charge Background Study dated May 1999, issued separately, be approved and the theoretical rates calculated in the background study be included in the RDC By-law;**

Mr. Marc explained Council must endorse the Background Study. He explained by not endorsing it, staff were placed in an untenable position in front of the Ontario Municipal Board. Mr. Marc reported the absence of Council's endorsement represented a charge, however, Council did not support the basis of that charge. After lengthy discussion, it was decided (a) would proceed to Council without a Committee decision or vote, at which time it would be finalized upon the conclusion of Council's debate.

Moved by P. Hume

**That (a) above be REFERRED to Council with no Committee decision or vote.**

CARRIED as amended

- b) **That the residential RDC in the urban area be set at a uniform rate of \$7500 per full services single detached unit within the urban area;**

CARRIED

- c) **That the residential RDC in the rural area be set at a uniform rate of \$1488 per unserviced single detached unit in the rural area;**

CARRIED

- d) **That the residential RDC in the rural area be set at a uniform rate of \$2334 per serviced single detached unit in the rural area;**

CARRIED

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

- e) **That the non-residential RDC be established on a uniform region-wide basis at \$1.90 per square foot for all commercial and institutional development and the RDC for all industrial development in the Region be set at 50% of the full commercial/institutional charge, for all services, with proportionate reductions outside the various service areas;**

CARRIED

- f) **That the RDC described in b) c) and d) remain in force for a two-year period while the Region and builders work together to redress the funding shortfall created by the withdrawal of capital funding by the provincial government;**

CARRIED

- g) **That developers be required to make non-RDC payment of \$200 single detached unit region-wide to join other municipalities in efforts to restore federal and provincial support for growth related infrastructure, to be implemented on January 1, 2000;**

CARRIED

- h) **That at the end of the two-year interim period the effectiveness of efforts to restore federal and provincial infrastructure capital funding be evaluated and the application of the theoretical RDC described in the By-law;**

CARRIED

- i) **That the exemption policies contained in By-law 210 of 1991 be continued in the successor RDC By-law;**

CARRIED

YEAS:           B. Hill, G. Hunter, M. Meilleur, W. Stewart, R. van den Ham  
                  R. Chiarelli ... 6

NAYS:           R. Cantin, P. Hume, A. Loney ... 3

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

- j) **That in addition to i) all non-profit housing corporations be exempted from RDCs;**

CARRIED

YEAS: B. Hill, P. Hume, G. Hunter, A. Loney, M. Meilleur, W. Stewart  
R. van den Ham, R. Chiarelli .... 8  
NAYS: R. Cantin .... 1

- k) **That all conversions of Commercial/industrial properties to residential use be exempt from RDCs;**

CARRIED

- l) **That RDCs be reduced in accordance with Table 6 for development in the vicinity of Transitway and/or light rail stations;**

CARRIED

- m) **That RDCs be indexed on an annual basis, commencing on November 1, 2000 at the maximum rate provided by DCA;**

CARRIED

- n) **That the current RDC By-law No. 210 of 1991 (as amended) be repealed and the successor By-law, the form and content of which is included in the Background Study and as amended by the recommendations of Committee, dated May 1999, be enacted.**

CARRIED as amended

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

Moved by R. van den Ham

**That the Regional Development Charges Background Study be amended as follows:**

- (a) **Appendix C- Regional Roads - That all road and structure components currently attributed 100% to growth be revised to 80% growth and 20% benefit to existing development.**
- (b) **Remove from Transit Sector, the East-West CNR Rail corridor at \$150 Million.**

LOST

YEAS: R. Cantin, G. Hunter, W. Stewart, R. van den Ham....4

NAYS: B. Hill, P. Hume, A. Loney, M. Meilleur, B. Chiarelli ... 5

Moved by A. Loney

That the Committee recommend Council adopt the staff recommendations and that the increase in fees be phased in over four years in equal increments.

MOTION NOT  
CONSIDERED AS  
VAN DEN HAM MOTION  
WAS SUCCESSFUL

Moved by M. Meilleur

**That the Regional Development Charge By-law include an exemption for the Central Area and Centretown as per By-law No. 31 of 1995.**

CARRIED

YEAS: B. Hill, M. Meilleur, W. Stewart, R. van den Ham, R. Chiarelli....5

NAYS: R. Cantin, P. Hume, G. Hunter, A. Loney....4

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

Moved by R. van den Ham

**That the above Meilleur Motion re Centretown exemption be amended by the following:**

**That an exemption for the Central Area include guidelines and criteria to be developed by staff which support our Regional Official Plan and increased densities.**

CARRIED

YEAS: R. Cantin, B. Hill, P. Hume, M. Meilleur, W. Stewart, R. van den Ham  
R. Chiarelli .... 7  
NAYS: G. Hunter, A. Loney ... 2

Moved by M. Meilleur

**That the RMOC incorporate a policy that would exempt development charges for contaminated sites up to the amount of the remedial costs, with this general policy being subject to a staff report to Committee and Council.**

CARRIED  
(R. van den Ham, G. Hunter  
and A. Loney dissented)

Moved by M. Meilleur

**That the RDC By-law be amended to exempt community health centres, long term care centres and other non-profit health facilities from paying RDC's.**

Moved by A. Loney

**That the above Meilleur Motion be REFERRED to Council with no Committee decision or vote, and staff prepare a report on this Motion for the 23 Jun Council consideration of the RDC issue.**

CARRIED

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

Moved by M. Meilleur

**Given that health facilities are as integral to the infrastructure of our Region as roads, sewers and water pipes.**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** Committee recommend Council endorse the principle of collecting an RDC to pay for growth related community health needs (such as ambulance, long term care for seniors, community centres, etc.) and direct regional staff to prepare a background study of what those needs are and draft and amendment to the RDC to implement a community health RDC.

LOST

YEAS: P. Hume, A. Loney, M. Meilleur, W. Stewart....4

NAYS: R. Cantin, B. Hill, G. Hunter, R. van den Ham, B. Chiarelli....5

Moved by P. Hume

**That the funding shortfall in the Region's capital requirement as identified in the Region's Official Plan be addressed by an immediate review of the Region's Official Plan to adjust the capital program to eliminate the capital funding shortfall.**

LOST

YEAS: B. Hill, P. Hume, M. Meilleur...3

NAYS: R. Cantin, G. Hunter, A. Loney, W. Stewart, R. van den Ham, B. Chiarelli...6

Moved by B. Hill

**That item (d) exemption policies contained in By-law No. 210 of 1991 - clause 8(g) of exemption in present and proposed development charge by-law be amended to delete the word "farm".**

CARRIED

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

Motion Tabled from Regional Health Task Report

**That the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee consider the following for recommendation to Council:**

**That in accordance with provincial legislation banning the use of development charges for public hospitals, the remaining balance of \$3.8 million in the Hospital Regional Development Charges Reserve Fund be earmarked for non-hospital health community health services with a priority to those projects that will reduce use of the acute care hospital sector.**

CARRIED  
(G. Hunter and  
A. Loney dissented)

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AS AMENDED**

**1. WHEREAS the current forecasted capital funding requirement of the 10 - 20 year time planning horizon of the Official Plan is greater than current capital budgets can sustain;**

**WHEREAS the application of the maximum theoretical RDC would contribute only a small portion of this capital funding requirement;**

**WHEREAS an application of the theoretical rate would not be competitive with RDCs in other municipalities (as described in the staff report Annex B1 Table 1);**

**WHEREAS in consultations with the OCHBA and BOMA the willingness to form a coalition to seek renewed provincial and federal commitment to growth related infrastructure became apparent;**

**That Council approve the following:**

**a) That the residential RDC in the urban area be set at a uniform rate of \$7500 per full services single detached unit within the urban area;**

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

- b) That the residential RDC in the rural area be set at a uniform rate of \$1488 per unserviced single detached unit in the rural area;
- c) That the residential RDC in the rural area be set at a uniform rate of \$2334 per serviced single detached unit in the rural area;
- d) That the non-residential RDC be established on a uniform region-wide basis at \$1.90 per square foot for all commercial and institutional development and the RDC for all industrial development in the Region be set at 50% of the full commercial/institutional charge, for all services, with proportionate reductions outside the various service areas;
- e) That the RDC described in b) c) and d) remain in force for a two-year period while the Region and builders work together to redress the funding shortfall created by the withdrawal of capital funding by the provincial government;
- f) That developers be required to make non-RDC payment of \$200 single detached unit region-wide to join other municipalities in efforts to restore federal and provincial support for growth related infrastructure, to be implemented on January 1, 2000;
- g) That at the end of the two-year interim period the effectiveness of efforts to restore federal and provincial infrastructure capital funding be evaluated and the application of the theoretical RDC described in the By-law;
- h) That the exemption policies contained in By-law 210 of 1991 be continued in the successor RDC By-law;
- i) That in addition to i) all non-profit housing corporations be exempted from RDCs;
- j) That all conversions of Commercial/industrial properties to residential use be exempt from RDCs;
- k) That RDCs be reduced in accordance with Table 6 for development in the vicinity of transitway and/or light rail stations;

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

- l) That RDCs be indexed on an annual basis, commencing on November 1, 2000 at the maximum rate provided by DCA;
  - m) That the current RDC By-law No. 210 of 1991 (as amended) be repealed and the successor By-law, the form and content of which is included in the Background Study and as amended by the recommendations of Committee, dated May 1999, be enacted.
- 
2. That the Regional Development Charge By-law include an exemption for the Central Area and Centretown as per By-law No. 31 of 1995 and that this exemption include guidelines and criteria to be developed by staff which support our Regional Official Plan and increased densities.
  3. That the RMOC incorporate a policy that would exempt development charges for contaminated sites up to the amount of the remedial costs, with this general policy being subject to a staff report to Committee and Council.
  4. That item (d) exemption policies contained in By-law No. 210 of 1991 - clause 8(g) of exemption in present and proposed development charge by-law be amended to delete the word "farm".
  5. That in accordance with provincial legislation banning the use of development charges for public hospitals, the remaining balance of \$3.8 million in the Hospital Regional Development Charges Reserve Fund be earmarked for non-hospital health community health services with a priority to those projects that will reduce use of the acute care hospital sector.

CARRIED as amended  
(G. Hunter, A. Loney  
dissented)

Extract of Draft Minute  
Corporate Services and  
Economic Development Committee  
Regional Development Charge Policy Review  
16 June 1999 (Day Two - Debate and Motions)

**REFERRAL MOTIONS TO COUNCIL**  
**WITH NO COMMITTEE DECISION OR VOTE**

1. That the following Motion be REFERRED to Council with no Committee decision or vote, and staff prepare a report on this Motion for the 23 Jun Council consideration of the RDC issue:

That the RDC By-law be amended to exempt community health centres, long term care centres and other non-profit health facilities from paying RDC's.

2. That the Region of Ottawa-Carleton Development Charge Background Study dated May 1999, issued separately, be approved and the theoretical rates calculated in the background study be included in the RDC By-law;