20 YEAR SERVICING PLAN AND FINANCING STRATEGY - 2006 UPDATE

PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER INPUT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

CITY OF KELOWNA
20 YEAR SERVICING PLAN AND FINANCING STRATEGY
PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER INPUT

This document is a record of the public and stakeholder submissions regarding the "Draft" 2006 update to the 20 Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy (2020 Plan). Comments were requested through newspaper advertisements and at the public presentations on November 9th and November 15th, 2006.

The 2020 Plan was prepared using 2002/03 costs with an update done in 2004. This update was prepared using the 2004 costs as the base and reflects current costs for the provision of water, wastewater, arterial roads and parkland acquisition The recommended 2006 update to the 2020 Servicing Plan reflects changes in land and construction costs, updated completed projects, some scope and funding source changes and more detailed engineering on a number of projects. The proposed infrastructure works are largely the same except for the following key changes:

(a) TRANSPORTATION – The updated plan largely includes the same roads as the current plan with the following exceptions - Highway 33 (2), Highway 33 (3) and Highway 33 (4) have been combined into Highway 33 (McKenzie – Gallagher Rd.) and University Roads 1, 2, 2B & 3 have been combined into one, UBCO Flyover. Key changes include - Hollywood 7 developer contribution of $1.2 M. which has been removed (for land purchased in advance of development), funding of the UBCO Flyover changed from 50/50 Province/City sharing to equally shared amongst the Province/UBCO/City.

(b) WATER – The current 2020 Plan calls for $36.2 Million in expenditures on pipes and pumping systems to support growth while the 2020 update identifies $46.5 Million of expenditures. This reflects increases in material supply costs, installation costs and road restoration costs as well as the additional costs of ultraviolet equipment at the Cedar Creek pump station (funded from the Utility). The design capacity of the Cedar Creek facility has been increased significantly to include future supply to the Central Mission area. To meet Health Canada turbidity guidelines it is anticipated that the Eldorado intake will ultimately be decommissioned due to raw water quality parameters. Once the Eldorado intake is decommissioned the corresponding supply would be provided from the Cedar Creek facility.

(c) WASTEWATER – The updated plan reflects an increase in Trunk costs of 17% and Treatment costs of 61%. This is based on increases in general construction costs, granular material costs, costs of hauling gravel, costs of PVC pipe and a more detailed design for the Treatment facility. Treatment plant costs have increased from $33.7 M. in the current plan to $62.0 M. now.

(d) PARKS – The updated plan retains the current standard of 2.2 hectares of park per 1,000 population. The cost of the updated 2020 program is $103.6 Million, an increase of 18.7%. Updated costs are based on the 2006 Assessment Review of land acquisition costs and specific site detail costs. A change was made to the Parks taxation assist, reducing the assist from 10% to 8%.

The total costs of providing this infrastructure in the 2020 Plan update is $753.4 Million as compared to $607.2 Million for the current 2020 program. This 24.0 % increase is a result of the changes outlined above. The impact on the funding areas is:

	(Millions $'s)		
	Current Program	**Update**	**Change $'s**
Funding Sources			
Taxation	120.4	132.3	11.9
DCC's	363.7	463.2	99.5
Developer	73.9	84.8	10.9
Province	27.9	32.7	4.8
Utility	21.3	40.4	19.1
Total	$607.2	$753.4	$146.2

Council, at their Regular Meeting of Monday, November 6, 2006, considered the staff report of October 30, 2006 (attached) and adopted the following resolution:

THAT Council receive the draft 20-Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy (2006 update) for information;

AND THAT Council authorize staff to seek stakeholder input into the draft plan and report back following that feedback.

Council also instructed staff to provide information, when they report back with the public feedback, on what the assist factors are and what the DCC's are in other communities within the interior of B.C.

Submissions Process

Staff consolidated all submissions into this document that were provided through:

- Questions posed at the November 9th and 15th presentations
- Written submissions by groups and individuals

All submissions were carefully considered and responses prepared reflecting the City's position on each issue. No changes have been made to the draft Plan.

The recommended DCC Bylaw effective date will be April 1, 2007 or the date of final bylaw reading, whichever is the later.

City of Kelowna

MEMORANDUM

DATE:	Oct. 30, 2006
FILE:	6430-01
TO:	City Manager
FROM:	Director of Works and Utilities Director of Financial Services Director of Parks and Leisure Services
RE:	**20-Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy (2006 Update)**

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Council receive the draft 20-Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy (2006 update) for information;

AND THAT Council authorize staff to seek stakeholder input into the draft plan and report back following that feedback.

BACKGROUND:

The current 20-Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy was presented to Council in July, 2005 and became effective in January, 2006.

The recommended 2006 update to the 2020 Servicing Plan reflects changes in land and construction costs, updated completed projects, some scope and funding source changes and more detailed engineering on a number of projects. The proposed infrastructure works are largely the same except for the following key changes:

(a) TRANSPORTATION – The updated plan largely includes the same roads as the current plan with the following exceptions - Highway 33 (2), Highway 33 (3) and Highway 33 (4) have been combined into Highway 33 (McKenzie – Gallagher Rd.) and University Roads 1, 2, 2B & 3 have been combined into one, UBCO Flyover. Key changes include - Hollywood 7 developer contribution of $1.2 M. has been removed (for land purchase in advance of development), funding of the UBCO Flyover changed from Province/City sharing 50/50 to equally shared amongst the Province/UBCO/City.

(b) WATER – The current 2020 Plan calls for $36.2 Million in expenditures on pipes and pumping systems to support growth while the 2020 update identifies $46.5 Million of expenditures. This reflects increases in material supply costs, installation costs and road restoration costs as well as the additional costs of Ultraviolet equipment at the Cedar Creek pump station (funded from the Utility). The design capacity of the Cedar Creek facility has been increased significantly to include future supply to the Central Mission area. To meet Health Canada turbidity guidelines it is anticipated that the Eldorado intake will ultimately be decommissioned due to raw water quality parameters. Once the Eldorado intake is decommissioned the corresponding supply would be provided from the Cedar Creek facility.

(c) WASTEWATER – The updated plan reflects an increase in Trunk costs of 17% and Treatment costs of 61%. This is based on increases in general construction costs, granular material costs, costs of hauling gravel, costs of PVC pipe and a more detailed design for the Treatment facility. Treatment plant costs have increased from $33.7 M. in the current plan to $62.0 M. now.

(d) PARKS – The updated plan retains the current standard of 2.2 hectares of park per 1,000 population. The cost of the updated 2020 program is $103.6 Million, an increase of 18.7 %. Updated costs are based on the 2006 Assessment Review of land acquisition costs and specific site detail costs.

The total costs of providing this infrastructure in the 2020 Plan update is $753.0 Million as compared to $607.2 Million for the current 2020 program. This 24.0 % increase is a result of the changes outlined above. The impact on the funding areas is:

Millions $'s)

Funding Sources	Current Program	Update	Change $'s
Taxation	120.4	158.5	38.1
DCC's	363.7	436.7	73.0
Developer	73.9	84.8	10.9
Province	27.9	32.7	4.8
Utility	21.3	40.4	19.1
Total	$607.2	$753.1	$145.9

The impact on the DCC rates can be seen in attachment Schedule 1

As part of the update exercise a scenario was developed wherein some funding changes have been applied to the updated Roads and Parks programs. This provides a more equitable allocation of DCC and taxation funding. Under the current Roads program there is $24.0 M. in taxation funding allocated to COB 2 and COB 3 that was previously anticipated from the Provincial Government but then changed to taxation. As this road segment is required due to growth it is recommended that it be treated like any other road in the program. The effect of this is an $898 increase (14%) in the Sector I DCC Residential 1 rate from $6,326 to $7,224. This translates to a 9.0% increase in Roads total DCC's from $228.8 M. to $249.0 M. offset by a decrease of $19.9 M. (14%) in Roads taxation.

As well, the extra 1" asphalt taxation amenity ($7.8 M.) has been changed from taxation funding and it is now charged to new growth. The result is an increase of $165 (2.7%) in Sector I roads rates and between $172 (2%) and $408 (4%) in non Sector I rates. This increases DCC funding by $6.4 M. with a corresponding decrease in taxation funding.

Combining the 2 changes above results in an increase to the Sector I rate of $1,062 (17%) over the updated program or $2,182 (42%) over the current program.

A further change is recommended to reduce the Parkland assist to 8% from 10% which increases the DCC rate by $78. The effect on funding was a decrease in taxation of $2.0 M. with a corresponding increase in the DCC total.

The impacts on the funding areas are:

(Millions $'s)

Funding Sources	Current Program	Update w COB/Asph /Parks Changes	Change
Taxation	120.4	132.3	11.9
DCC's	363.7	463.2	99.5
Developer	73.9	84.8	10.9
Province	27.9	32.7	4.8
Utility	21.3	40.4	19.1
Total	$607.2	$753.4 *	$146.2

(* $300,000 difference is due to the 1% admin charge)

The impact on the DCC rates can be seen in attachment Schedule 2.

Additional information on the programs is provided in the attached schedules 1-4.

Staff intends to hold 2 open houses, one on November 9th from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the Ramada Lodge and the other on November 15th from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Council Chambers, with presentations to stakeholders and the general public at 5 p.m. At this session staff will be available to answer questions on the various plans and the financing strategy. Surveys will be provided to attendees to seek feedback. As well, staff will work with key stakeholders such as the Urban Development Institute and interested neighbourhood organizations to provide additional information and clarification. Once their feedback is received staff will report with an amended servicing plan and financing strategy. The following is a schedule of events:

Presentation to City Council – November 6
Public Consultation Meetings – November 9 and November 15
Acceptance of Input – by December 5
Report back to Council – January 8/07
New rates effective – April 1/07

John Vos   Paul Macklem   David Graham

Attachments

CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE – KELOWNA CHAPTER
212 1884 Spall Road
Kelowna BC V1Y 4R1 Canada
T. 250.717.3588 F. 250.861.3950
udikelowna@shaw.ca
www.udi.bc.ca

December 11, 2006

City of Kelowna
1435 Water Street
Kelowna, B.C.
V1Y 1J4

Attention: Paul Macklem

Dear Mr. Macklem,

This fall, UDI has reviewed the increases to the DCC structure while at the same time providing input on a number of committees and panels all related to local Civic issues. As we are a volunteer organization, finding the resources to fully investigate all of these DCC items remains a challenge and we appreciate the City's cooperation in maintaining a standardized format from year to year so that we can more easily track changes and additions to the program.

The simple application of DCC's, local assist factors, and distribution of these fees within geographic sectors and market are always items of discussion amongst our group. While there is recognition that this has been a better time in the development industry we caution that overall affordability in every sector will be the single biggest barrier to maintaining a healthy development industry which will provide for the most affordable (for all) housing to the community. There are still many studies that show, as a percentage, that provincial, federal and municipal taxes, fees and requirements continue to outpace rising construction and labour costs in eroding overall affordability.

In our review, the single largest issue regarding this proposed DCC Bylaw is the addition of the Central Okanagan By-pass as a DCC Road. We do not believe this project should be included. The Ministry's 'DCC Best Practice Guide' publication (CH 6 , pg 82) outlines sharing the cost of improvements between all benefiting parties. With respect to COB, the cost should be shared, based on the ratio of benefit to new development vs. the existing community (measured in terms of projected traffic volumes). We do not believe a sufficient burden ratio can be proved on this particular road to justify its inclusion in this DCC bylaw.

The majority of the cost should be borne by the general taxpayer. Council may wish to look at funding options such as a regional (Central Okanagan) gas tax, or an increase in property taxes to pay for funding approved either under a referendum or an alternate approval process. A Public Private Partnership may also be a viable alternative, giving an option where the financing owner can lease the road back to the city. A smaller payment, over a number of years would be less of a burden to the city and would allow an opportunity for an owner/contractor to generate a profit for their risk and efforts in the project.

There were a number of small dollar anomalies within the remainder of the report that seemed to balance themselves out and it would not be cost or time effective to debate them. Four items that should be addressed though include:

1) The additional 1" of asphalt to achieve a final 100m lift was originally to be paid for through general taxation. This should be reverted back so it is not transferred to a DCC.

2) Some costs associated with the KLO project that have been projected forward should be rationalized downward as a portion of the overrun had to be attributable to the Telus strike.

3) Value of Benefits to the Existing Community
We don't think an accurate value of the benefit to the existing community (taxpayers) is being considered for many of the DCC projects. For example, an older 2-lane rural road currently functions at a low Level of Service and needs to be replaced with a 4-lane urban road because of new development. In this case almost the entire cost of the replacement would come from DCC's without considering the benefits to the existing community. In most cases and for many years, the majority of traffic enjoying the benefits of this new road originates from the existing community and not new development. Benefits to the existing community would include:

- improved safety (better alignment, lighting, curbs, bike lanes, sidewalks, removal of ditches and utility poles, etc.)
- quicker and more reliable travel
- savings resulting from lower maintenance and eliminating the need to reconstruct the old 2-lane road in the near future at the taxpayers expense
- aesthetics

This same argument can be used for all the DCC components (roads, water distribution, wastewater trunks & treatment, parkland acquisition) to some degree. The DCC Best Practices Guide clearly states that the value of these benefits should be considered and further gives direction on how these values could be calculated.

4) Increases Due to Construction Inflation

As an example, the Arterial Roads Program went from 405.9 M to 490.4 M (+21%) with the majority, as we understand, a result of construction costs increases. When the funding sources are looked at however, the DCC's were increased by 32% (183.3 M to 242.4 M) while Taxation was increase by only 9% (110.7 M to 120.8 M) to cover this increase. We understand that there are other factors influencing this however in general, the cost of construction inflation should be shared equitably (as a %) amongst all the funding sources.

We recognize the difficulty of managing any cost fluctuations and ensuring they are maintained in a reasonable and incremental fashion. We caution though that this evaluation has been done at what would appear to be peak pricing in the construction cycle and has now been calculated 20 years forward. Should prices pull back we would look for another evaluation to ensure there is a moderating of these DCC increases.

In closing we would ask that you please factor the overall affordability of development and the long-term benefit of home ownership into your balanced review and keep DCC increases to the minimum.

Yours truly,

Urban Development – Kelowna Chapter

Rick Miller, President

URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE – KELOWNA CHAPTER
212 1884 Spall Road
Kelowna BC V1Y 4R1 Canada
T. 250.717.3588 F. 250.861.3950
udikelowna@shaw.ca
www.udi.bc.ca

City of Kelowna
1435 Water Street,
Kelowna, B.C. V1Y 1J4
Attention: Paul Macklem

December 11, 2006

Dear Mr. Macklem

Subject: Charging DCCs for multi family residential on a per square foot basis

Introduction

Earlier this fall, CMHC reported that Kelowna had been given the title of second most expensive place to live in Canada, next to Vancouver. While this news is good for current owners who benefit from the increase in house prices, it is shocking to first time homebuyers and new residents moving to Kelowna.

The cost of real estate means that purchasers have to adjust their housing expectations. Where five years ago, a young couple could have purchased a single-family home, today their first purchase would be a condominium. The City of Kelowna needs to adopt polices to encourage the supply of smaller housing types to ensure that the city continues to grow in a balanced manner with a variety of housing sizes and types.

Section 934.4d of the Local Government Act, which grants the city the authority to charge Development Cost Charges (DCC), states that DCCs are not to impede the provision of reasonably priced housing. In today's economic climate, charging DCCs on a per unit basis impedes developers from creating smaller more affordable homes.

The City of Kelowna charges DCCs on a tiered system with 4 residential classifications based on units per hectare. The request to have the DCCs charged on a sq.ft. basis is only for the highest density classification called "Residential 4", because this is where the method of charging DCCs most greatly impacts unit sizes and affordability.

Amending the DCC policy is a very simple way in which the City of Kelowna could encourage affordable housing with no additional expense to any stakeholders or loss of revenue to the city.

Reasons for charging DCCs on a per square foot basis.

1) Encourages the construction of more affordable homes as developers will not be financially penalized for creating smaller housing units.
2) Ensures a variety of unit sizes are created because supply would be based on market demand. Important for the growth of a balanced community.
3) Follows the recommendation of the DCC Best Practices Guide which states, "DCCs based on floorspace basis for residential development are encouraged by the development industry."
4) Since DCCs are collected at the building permit stage when the buildable area has already been determined, city staff will be able to easily calculate the DCCs on a square foot basis.
5) Charging DCCs on the floor area ensures that small units are not subsidizing larger units, as is the case with the per unit DCC fee.

How can the method of charging DCCs affect the supply of affordable housing?

Currently, DCCs are charged on a per unit basis, which encourages developers to create large units in order to minimize the amount of DCCs paid. This works against the City of Kelowna's objective of creating affordability in the market.

The following examples will look at the classification "Residential 4", which is applicable for any development where the density is greater than 85 units/hectare. This classification equates to an average size condominium of 1,398.80 sq.ft.

Calculations
1 hectare = 10,000 m2
Max FAR in RM5 = 1.3
Total Buildable Area = 13,000 m2
Building Efficiency = 85%
Saleable Area = 11,050m2
11,050 m2 = 118,898 sq.ft.
Average Unit Size
For 85 Units = 1,398.80 sq.ft.

There is no incentive for developers to produce suites smaller than 1,398 sq.ft. as they will have to pay additional DCCs for each suite created, even though the total saleable square footage remains unchanged.

Example 1
Hypothetically, we will look at a one-acre parcel in Central Kelowna, zoned RM5. The total buildable area would be 56,628 sq.ft. based on a FAR of 1.3. In Table 1, Options A, B and C illustrate varying unit size and the result unit size has on total DCC's payable for

a common buildable area. In Option B, the choice to build smaller units at 600 sq.ft. per unit results in $350,190 more DCC's payable than Option 1.

Table 1- DCCs paid on a per units basis

	Option A	Option B	Option C
Number of Suites	34 (85 units/ha)	80 (196 units/ha)	48 (118 units/ha)
Average Suite Size	1,400 sq.ft.	600 sq.ft.	1,000 sq.ft.
DCCs /unit	$7,613	$7,613	$7,613
Total DCCs Payable	$258,842	$609,040	$365,424

Example 2

Another viewpoint, is to look at the DCC rate per sq.ft. (DCCs are $7,613/unit and assuming the average size of condos built in Kelowna is 1,000 sq.ft., the DCC rate per buildable sq.ft. would be $6.47.) By charging the DCCs on a square foot basis, the DCCs payable on a 600 sq.ft. unit would be $3,882 compared to the unit rate of $7,613. On the other hand, the DCCs payable on a 1,400 sq.ft. unit would be $9,058. This method ensures that all units are paying equitable costs and the smaller units are not subsidizing the larger units. Furthermore, the larger units are paying more, which they can afford to do because they are more expensive homes.

It is important to remember that charging DCCs on a floor area basis is not meant to decrease the total DCCs collected. Rather, this method encourages developers to provide a wide variety of housing sizes. Using the example of the one-acre parcel in Central Kelowna, we have illustrated how a number of different unit sizes result in the similar amount of DCCs payable. Referring back to Table 1, it is important to note that the DCCs payable in Option A and C are less or the same as in Table 2, again reiterating the fact that charging DCCs based on floor area will not reduce the city's revenue.

Table 2- DCCs payable per square foot on a number of different unit sizes

	Option A	Option B	Option C
Number of Suites	34	80	48
Average Suite Size	1,400 sq.ft.	600 sq.ft.	1,000 sq.ft.
DCC/ Buildable Sq.Ft.	$6.47	$6.47	$6.47
Total Buildable Area	56,628	56,628	56,628
Total DCCs Payable	$366,383	$366,383	$366,383

How the city staff can convert from the unit per hectare method to the per square foot method for multi family developments?

Although there are probably several ways to convert the DCC per unit rate to a DCC per sq.ft. rate, we offer two suggestions:

1) Highest and best use for the land according to the OCP
2) Review past building permit data to look at the history of building areas and unit counts

Option 1 requires the city staff to review the OCP map in order to predict the amount of square footage that could be built in each zone when looking at the properties' highest and best use. Currently staff is already doing this when they submit their planning predictions to the finance department at each DCC review, but they are only analyzing the data in terms of the number of suites. By doing this, staff are actually making predictions on the size of the suites which may differ from what is actually built. It may be even more accurate to just review maximum buildable square footage for the under- and undeveloped land. Once the buildable square footage is determined, staff would then take the total DCCs required and divide it by the total predicted buildable square footage.

Option 2 is to review all of the building permit applications for the last two years to see what the building areas and unit counts were. This information will help the planning staff predict the amount of buildable area which could be built in the future. This method is probably more accurate and it might be easier to gather the information. Again, once the buildable square footage and unit counts are determined, staff would then take the total DCCs paid and divide it by the total buildable square footage to determine the rate per sq.ft.

Multi family must pay its fair share.

It is important to note that the request to change the method of charging DCCs for multi-family developments is not an attempt to off load costs to single family or commercial developments. If the city agrees to this request, at the next DCC review, the amount of actual revenue collected from the multi family projects should be compared against the estimated multi family revenues to ensure that the sq.ft. rate was accurately determined. If there is a discrepancy, (not related to a market down turn), only the sq.ft. rate for multi family should be adjusted to make up of the difference and the rates for the commercial and single family should remain unchanged. We are confident that the DCCs collected based on the sq.ft. method will equal the DCCs collected on a per unit method (all other conditions remaining the same) and would not object if the staff updated the DCC sq.ft. rate if they deemed it was necessary.

Who else is doing this?

Charging DCCs per square foot is not a new concept and other large, sophisticated, urban areas such as the District of North Vancouver, City of Vancouver, City of Surrey, City of Richmond have adopted this method, just to name a few. Being the largest city in the Interior of BC, it is time Kelowna adopted similar methods of charging DCCs. Both the City of Vancouver and the Urban Development Institute have completed extensive research on this topic. We encourage you to review their documents attached.

The time to act is now.

We encourage staff and Council to seriously consider the method of charging DCCs on a per square foot basis for multi family developments. By making the decision this DCC review, the development community would be immediately encouraged to start planning for small units. By postponing this decision, however, Council would be working contradictory to their objective of encouraging affordable housing.

Yours truly,

Urban Development – Kelowna Chapter

Rick Miller, President

Enclosed:

Urban Development Institute Research Department, “A new Way to Levy Development Cost Charges to Increase Housing Affordability and Choice in the District of Maple Ridge, BC” May 1995

City of Vancouver, “Financing Growth Review – Information Sheet – Methods of Charging Residential DCLs: Unit vs. Floorspace, October, 2002

Sources:

Urban Development Institute Research Department, “A new Way to Levy Development Cost Charges to Increase Housing Affordability and Choice in the District of Maple Ridge, BC” May 1995

City of Vancouver, “Financing Growth Review – Information Sheet – Methods of Charging Residential DCLs: Unit vs. Floorspace, October, 2002

Province of BC, “Development Cost Charges – Best Practice Guide”, 2nd Edition, 2000

CC: Ron Mattiussi
Mary Pynenburg
Jim Wunderlich
Mayor Shepherd & Kelowna City Council

CITY OF KELOWNA
Response to Correspondence Received
From Urban Development Institute and Other Stakeholders

Issue – The single largest issue regarding this proposed DCC Bylaw is the addition of the Central Okanagan Bypass as a DCC Road. With respect to COB, the cost should be shared, based on the ratio of benefit to new development vs. the existing community (measured in terms of projected traffic volumes).

Response:
In the 2004 Plan 50% of the cost of the COB was allocated to the Province as it was anticipated they would provide some level of support and to keep DCC rates lower. In the 2005 update this was changed to recognize that the Province was not going to participate and their share was reallocated to existing benefit (taxation). For the 2006 update both COB 2 and COB 3 have been treated like any other road that is required due to growth. This roadway is required due to new growth that has taken place over the last five years and into the future, as without new growth existing roads would have sufficed for existing users.

There is recognition that this road will benefit existing home owners but that is why the assist factor is at 15% for the total roads program. The assist factor must be the same for every project. Using projected traffic volumes (new development vs. existing community) does not consider the impact on other non-DCC roads by new development.

Issue:
The additional 1" of asphalt to achieve a final 100m lift was originally to be paid for through general taxation. This should be reverted back so it is not transferred to a DCC.

Response:
The was initially by taxation due to the change in standards. As it is now the standard, new growth should be required to build roads to the City's standard.
Also due to growth, increased transit is required and is becoming a more prevalent mode of transportation. Because of the weight of the buses the extra 1" of asphalt is required in order to maintain the road life, therefore the decision to include the asphalt under DCC's. Also worth mentioning is that in order for buses to reach the new growth areas they must travel the existing roadways, leading to increased wear and tear on those non-DCC roads which are paid for by taxation.

Issue:
Some costs associated with the KLO project that have been projected forward should be rationalized downward as a portion of the overrun had to be attributable to the Telus strike.

Response:
None of the stakeholders, including the City were responsible for the additional costs as they were beyond anyone's control, therefore they are cost shared as per the 20 Year Servicing Plan and not allocated to just one party.

Issue:
Value of benefits to the existing community:

Response:
Not all of the cost is borne by new development, there is a portion paid by taxation for specific amenities and in some instances through the existing benefit. Furthermore, the assist rate is set at 15% (versus a much lower rate in many other Municipalities) in order for taxation to capture those types of benefits.

Roads projects that involve replacing existing structure, such as road rehabilitation projects, have a greater benefit to existing users than projects that provide increased capacity, such as new roads, adding lanes, new traffic signals and left turn bays. In an earlier DCC update, several roads that could be considered more as rehabilitation projects were removed from the DCC program.

The DCC Best Practices guide suggests a “rule of thumb” that city staff have always considered when allocating benefit for new or improved infrastructures; “If construction of the proposed works would not proceed at all if there was no new development, then it is fair to say that 0% should be paid by existing users.”

Issue:
Funding source increases (DCC’s vs. taxation) relative to increases due to construction inflation:

Response:
The cost of construction inflation has been shared equitably amongst all the funding sources. The larger increase for DCC’s is due to the changes discussed earlier. The total increase in the roads DCC portion is $59.1 M. or 32%. This breaks down as follows: cost increases - $32.6 M., 1” asphalt reallocated from taxation to DCC - $6.4 M. , COB 2 & COB 3 existing benefit reallocated from taxation to DCC - $20.1 M. The 1” asphalt and COB reallocations offset the increase to taxation which is at 9% for the Roads program.

Issue:
Charging DCC’s for multi family residential on a per square foot basis.

Response:
The current allocation of DCC charges recognizes the reduced demand on infrastructure from increasing the density of development. To take this further and look at charges based on the size of the unit may help in the development of smaller residential units. There are additional items to be considered in moving to this approach, such as determining the average footage to be developed, the number of residential units to be developed at the various sizes and then the appropriate rate to be charged by the square foot. There will also be a consultation process required and there was not sufficient time to complete a thorough review at this time. However, staff is committed to reviewing this issue and will have information available for the next DCC update.

GENERAL SUBMISSIONS

Dec 5

City of Kelowna

OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT

20 YEAR SERVICING PLAN AND FINANCING STRATEGY - 2020 PLAN

The City of Kelowna would like your comments relative to the 20 Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy update. The following comment guidelines are proposed for your convenience:

1. Servicing Plan - Major Services

1.1 Arterial Roads ______

1.2 Water Distribution/Pumping ______

1.3 Wastewater Trunks ______

1.4 Wastewater Treatment ______

1.5 Parkland Acquisition See attached

1.6 Other ______

2. Financing Strategy - Who Pays?

2.1 Development Cost Charges See attached

2.2 General Taxation

2.3 User Pays

2.4 Other

3. Other Comments

Please complete the following information to make sure your opinion counts!

Name: Ken Campbell

Address: 118 Bagpart Court

V1V 1G4 Telephone No.: 862 8247

Personal information is being collected under the authority of the BC *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and will be used for the purposes of responding to your comments or concerns as provided on this form. For questions regarding the collection, use and disclosure of the personal information, contact Jim Wunderlich at 469-8545

20-year Servicing Plan and Financing strategy

1.5 Parkland acqusition

Presumably, the 103.6 million for parkland acquisition is spread over the 20 year life of the plan.

But much of our potential parkland has been lost to development and more is being lost on a daily basis. In a very short time, there will be nothing left to acquire and preserve.

Therefore, it is imperative that funding be available at the front end of the plan period while suitable lands are still available.

Funding for acquisition of natural open space and natural features should also come largely from new development. (See below)

2.1 DCC's

I'm very supportive of reducing the assist factor for parks to 8 %. It probably should be reduced even more, given the increased pressure that growing population exerts on existing parks.

I feel strongly that an additional DCC should be imposed for acquisition of natural open space parks. This would automatically be resisted by the developers' lobby (UDI), but it would be an appropriate charge on new development. Almost all developers make use of Kelowna's natural environment and natural features in their marketing. So these attributes obviously have a value to the developers. Ironically, these very developments are destroying the very features they are using to sell their properties.

These areas need to be preserved now and the cost of doing so should rest primarily on new development.

Kim Campbell

OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT

20 YEAR SERVICING PLAN AND FINANCING STRATEGY - 2020 PLAN

The City of Kelowna would like your comments relative to the 20 Year Servicing Plan and Financing Strategy update. The following comment guidelines are proposed for your convenience:

1. Servicing Plan - Major Services

1.1 Arterial Roads

1.2 Water Distribution/Pumping

1.3 Wastewater Trunks

1.4 Wastewater Treatment

See next page

1.5 Parkland Acquisition

1.6 Other

2. Financing Strategy - Who Pays?

2.1 Development Cost Charges If sharing the costs of improvements needs to be between all benefitting parties, this means that the cost of COB needs to be shared based on the ratio of benefit to new development vs. benefit to the entire community. This can be measured in terms of projected traffic volumes.

2.2 General Taxation

2.3 User Pays

2.4 Other

3. Other Comments

Please complete the following information to make sure your opinion counts!

Name: GAIL TEMPLE

Address: #200 3275 Lakeshore Rd
Kelowna. **Telephone No.:** 763-4444

2. Financing Strategy - Who Pays?

2.1 Development Cost Charges (see below)

2.2 General Taxation

2.3 User Pays

2.4 Other

3. Other Comments

DCC's should be increased to the legal maximum (1% assist) across the board A.S.A.P.

Please complete the following information to make sure your opinion counts!

Name: JOHN ZEGER
Address: 408-1421 SUTHERLAND AVE.
KELOWNA V1Y 8G1 Telephone No.: 868-0786

Jim Wunderlich

From:	Keith Grayston
Sent:	Tuesday, November 28, 2006 11:45 AM
To:	'Mike Jacobs'
Cc:	Greg Asling; Grant Maddock; Paul Macklem; Jim Wunderlich
Subject:	RE: Status of DCC review

Hi Mike,

The process is that we will receive comments/feedback from concerned stakeholders until December 5th. The comments will be consolidated and any changes made in a recommendation back to Council along with bylaw changes on January 8th. So we are hoping that UDI will have their comments by next week so that we can review for presentation to Council.

Your comments below will be included in the feedback received.

Keith

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Jacobs [mailto:mfjacobs@eac.bc.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2006 10:54 AM
To: Paul Macklem; Keith Grayston
Cc: Greg Asling; Grant Maddock
Subject: Status of DCC review

Paul, Keith:

Where is the DCC review at? When does it go to Council with comments from UDI and the public?

Concerns that I raised at the Open House that I would like raised are:

Central OK Bypass This road has been on the books since I arrived in Kelowna 20 years ago. It was needed then and should not be paid entirely by DCC's.

Extra 1" of asphalt should still be covered by taxation not transferred to DCC.

Project overruns on KLO must be rationalized as some of the overrun was due to the Telus strike.

General Comment: Please factor overall affordability of development and the long-term benefit of home ownership into your balanced review and keep DCC increases to the minimum.

Regards

Mike

Michael Jacobs, P. Eng
President
Emil Anderson Construction

Jim Wunderlich

From: Paul Macklem
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 3:15 PM
To: Keith Grayston; Jim Wunderlich
Subject: FW: Multi-family DCC's

Keith & Jim: For your information. Considering there will be a written submission, I see no need to include this in the submission to Council, but is merely a heads up. It does go back to the question of how we may approach this issue.

Paul

-----Original Message-----
From: Ron Mattiussi
Sent: November 17, 2006 3:10 PM
To: Paul Macklem
Subject: FW: Multi-family DCC's

-----Original Message-----
From: Randall Shier [mailto:rshier@themissiongroup.ca]
Sent: November 17, 2006 9:17 AM
To: Ron Mattiussi
Subject: Multi-family DCC's

Ron,

I enjoyed our UDI Liaison meeting last Wednesday and wanted to follow up on one item. That is, the applying of DCC's on a per square foot basis. In the coming weeks, through UDI we will submit a more formal request with rationale as to why the Per Sq. Ft. method is much better policy for the City of Kelowna and a preferred method for the development industry.

In the meantime, I wanted to bring up one point that you made at the meeting. You mentioned that the current DCC method somewhat addressed the concern, by having stepped rates. The current method divides residential into 4 sectors and applies DCC's on a "unit per hectare" basis. This doesn't really work, because most RM3 and all RM5 and higher zoned multi-family land falls under the "Residential 4 - 85 Units per hectare" method for calculating DCC's. So there is absolutely no recognition of a DCC difference between an expensive 2,000 SF high rise condo and a 600 SF "affordable" wood frame condo.

This is just a friendly note, to let you know about one of the things to expect from UDI in the weeks ahead as it relates to multi-family DCC's.

Randy Shier
The Mission Group
T. 250.448.8810
C. 250.317.7780
www.themissiongroup.ca

RATE COMPARISON - REVISED & EXISTING

1. Residential 1 - Single Family Development - by growth area - by service type

Comparison to current rates

	Sector / Rate									
GROWTH AREA		**Roads**		**Water**		**Sewer Trunks**		**Treatment**	**Parks**	**Total**
City Centre (Updated)	I	7,388	A	1,646	A	1,143	A	2,542	3,610	**16,329**
Current	*I*	*5,206*	*A*	*1,507*	*A*	*972*	*A*	*1,689*	*2,957*	***12,331***
Clifton/Glen. Hghld (Updated)	I	7,388	D	2,943	A	1,143	A	2,542	3,610	**17,626**
Current	*I*	*5,206*	*D*	*2,670*	*A*	*972*	*A*	*1,689*	*2,957*	***13,494***
Glenmore Valley (Updated)	I	7,388		GEID	A	1,143	A	2,542	3,610	**14,683**
Current	*I*	*5,206*		*GEID*	*A*	*972*	*A*	*1,689*	*2,957*	***10,824***
Rutland (Updated)	I	7,388		RWW	A	1,143	A	2,542	3,610	**14,683**
Current	*I*	*5,206*		*RWW*	*A*	*972*	*A*	*1,689*	*2,957*	***10,824***
North East Rutland (Updated)	C	10,900		BMID	A	1,143	A	2,542	3,610	**18,195**
Current	*C*	*8,532*		*BMID*	*A*	*972*	*A*	*1,689*	*2,957*	***14,150***
Hwy 33 - North East (Updated)	D	14,765		BMID	A	1,143	A	2,542	3,610	**22,060**
Current	*D*	*10,102*		*BMID*	*A*	*972*	*A*	*1,689*	*2,957*	***15,720***
Hwy 33 - South West (Updated	F	12,222		BMID	A	1,143	A	2,542	3,610	**19,517**
Current	*F*	*7,675*		*BMID*	*A*	*972*	*A*	*1,689*	*2,957*	***13,293***
University / Airport (Updated)	E	12,391		GEID	A	1,143	A	2,542	3,610	**19,686**
Current	*E*	*9,677*		*GEID*	*A*	*972*	*A*	*1,689*	*2,957*	***15,295***
McKinley (Updated)	E	12,391		GEID		N/A		N/A	3,610	**16,001**
Current	*E*	*9,677*		*GEID*		*N/A*		*N/A*	*2,957*	***12,634***
Hall Road (Updated)	I	7,388		SEKID	A	1,143	A	2,542	3,610	**14,683**
Current	*I*	*5,206*		*SEKID*	*A*	*972*	*A*	*1,689*	*2,957*	***10,824***
Southeast Kelowna (Updated)	A	17,941		SEKID		N/A		N/A	3,610	**21,551**
Current	*A*	*12,302*		*SEKID*		*N/A*		*N/A*	*2,957*	***15,259***
S.W. Mission (Updated)	B	19,794	B	1,292	B	1,533	A	2,542	3,610	**28,771**
Current	*B*	*16,904*	*B*	*1,176*	*K*	*1,422*	*A*	*1,689*	*2,957*	***24,148***

BMID Serviced by Black Mountain Irrigation District

SEKID Serviced by South East Kelowna Irrigation District

RWW Serviced by Rutland Water Works

GEID Serviced by Glenmore Ellison Irrigation District

N/A Not Applicable as Sewer will not be in that area within the 20 Year period

4. Residential 4 - Single Family Development - by growth area - by service type
Comparison to current rates

	Sector / Rate									
GROWTH AREA		**Roads**		**Water**		**Sewer Trunks**		**Treatment**	**Parks**	**Total**
City Centre (Updated)	I	3,842	A	560	A	617	A	1,373	3,610	**10,002**
Current	*I*	*2,707*	*A*	*512*	*A*	*525*	*A*	*912*	2,957	**7,613**
Clifton/Glen. Hghld (Updated)	I	3,842	D	1,001	A	617	A	1,373	3,610	**10,443**
Current	*I*	*2,707*	*D*	*908*	*A*	*525*	*A*	*912*	2,957	**8,009**
Glenmore Valley (Updated)	I	3,842		GEID	A	617	A	1,373	3,610	**9,442**
Current	*I*	*2,707*		*GEID*	*A*	*525*	*A*	*912*	2,957	**7,101**
Rutland (Updated)	I	3,842		RWW	A	617	A	1,373	3,610	**9,442**
Current	*I*	*2,707*		*RWW*	*A*	*525*	*A*	*912*	2,957	**7,101**
North East Rutland (Updated)	C	5,668		BMID	A	617	A	1,373	3,610	**11,268**
Current	*C*	*4,437*		*BMID*	*A*	*525*	*A*	*912*	2,957	**8,831**
Hwy 33 - North East (Updated)	D	7,678		BMID	A	617	A	1,373	3,610	**13,278**
Current	*D*	*5,253*		*BMID*	*A*	*525*	*A*	*912*	2,957	**9,647**
Hwy 33 - South West (Updated)	F	6,356		BMID	A	617	A	1,373	3,610	**11,956**
Current	*F*	*3,991*		*BMID*	*A*	*525*	*A*	*912*	2,957	**8,385**
University / Airport (Updated)	E	6,443		GEID	A	617	A	1,373	3,610	**12,043**
Current	*E*	*5,032*		*GEID*	*A*	*525*	*A*	*912*	2,957	**9,426**
McKinley (Updated)	E	6,443		GEID		N/A		N/A	3,610	**10,053**
Current	*E*	*5,032*		*GEID*		*N/A*		*N/A*	2,957	**7,989**
Hall Road (Updated)	I	3,842		SEKID	A	617	A	1,373	3,610	**9,442**
Current	*I*	*2,707*		*SEKID*	*A*	*525*	*A*	*912*	2,957	**7,101**
Southeast Kelowna (Updated)	A	9,329		SEKID		N/A		N/A	3,610	**12,939**
Current	*A*	*6,397*		*SEKID*		*N/A*		*N/A*	2,957	**9,354**
S.W. Mission (Updated)	B	10,293	B	439	B	828	A	1,373	3,610	**16,543**
Current	*B*	*8,790*	*B*	*400*	*K*	*768*	*A*	*912*	2,957	**13,827**

BMID Serviced by Black Mountain Irrigation District
SEKID Serviced by South East Kelowna Irrigation District
RWW Serviced by Rutland Water Works
GEID Serviced by Glenmore Ellison Irrigation District
N/A Not Applicable as Sewer will not be in that area within the 20 Year period

3. Commercial - rate per 1,000 Sq.Ft. - by growth area - by service type

Comparison to current rates

GROWTH AREA	Sector / Rate									
		Roads		Water		Sewer Trunks		Treatment	Parks	Total
City Centre (Updated)	I	2,273	A	633	A	440	A	978	N/A	**4,324**
Current	*I*	*1,602*	*A*	*580*	*A*	*374*	*A*	*650*	*N/A*	**3,206**
Clifton/Glen. Hghld (Updated)	I	2,273	D	1,132	A	440	A	978	N/A	**4,823**
Current	*I*	*1,602*	*D*	*1,027*	*A*	*374*	*A*	*650*	*N/A*	**3,653**
Glenmore Valley (Updated)	I	2,273		GEID	A	440	A	978	N/A	**3,691**
Current	*I*	*1,602*		*GEID*	*A*	*374*	*A*	*650*	*N/A*	**2,626**
Rutland (Updated)	I	2,273		RWW	A	440	A	978	N/A	**3,691**
Current	*I*	*1,602*		*RWW*	*A*	*374*	*A*	*650*	*N/A*	**2,626**
North East Rutland (Updated)	C	3,354		BMID	A	440	A	978	N/A	**4,772**
Current	*C*	*2,625*		*BMID*	*A*	*374*	*A*	*650*	*N/A*	**3,649**
Hwy 33 - North East (Updated)	D	4,543		BMID	A	440	A	978	N/A	**5,961**
Current	*D*	*3,108*		*BMID*	*A*	*374*	*A*	*650*	*N/A*	**4,132**
Hwy 33 - South West (Updated	F	3,761		BMID	A	440	A	978	N/A	**5,179**
Current	*F*	*2,362*		*BMID*	*A*	*374*	*A*	*650*	*N/A*	**3,386**
University / Airport (Updated)	E	3,813		GEID	A	440	A	978	N/A	**5,231**
Current	*E*	*2,978*		*GEID*	*A*	*374*	*A*	*650*	*N/A*	**4,002**
McKinley (Updated)	E	3,813		GEID		N/A		N/A	N/A	**3,813**
Current	*E*	*2,978*		*GEID*		*N/A*		*N/A*	*N/A*	**2,978**
Hall Road (Updated)	I	2,273		SEKID	A	440	A	978	N/A	**3,691**
Current	*I*	*1,602*		*SEKID*	*A*	*374*	*A*	*650*	*N/A*	**2,626**
Southeast Kelowna (Updated)	A	5,520		SEKID		N/A		N/A	N/A	**5,520**
Current	*A*	*3,785*		*SEKID*		*N/A*		*N/A*	*N/A*	**3,785**
S.W. Mission (Updated)	B	6,090	B	497	B	590	A	978	N/A	**8,155**
Current	*B*	*5,201*	*B*	*452*	*K*	*547*	*A*	*650*	*N/A*	**6,850**

BMID Serviced by Black Mountain Irrigation District
RWW Serviced by Rutland Water Works
SEKID Serviced by South East Kelowna Irrigation District
GEID Serviced by Glenmore Ellison Irrigation District
N/A Not Applicable as Sewer will not be in that area within the 20 Year period

NOTE: Institutional rate is the same as commercial except the existing drainage charge is $70 less and Schools to grade 12 and College Residences are not charged Roads DCC.

4. Industrial - rate per acre - by growth area - by service type

Comparison to current rates

GROWTH AREA	Sector / Rate									
		Roads		Water		Sewer Trunks		Treatment	Parks	Total
City Centre (Updated)	I	7,388	A	4,609	A	3,200	A	7,117	N/A	**22,314**
Current	*I*	*5,206*	*A*	*4,220*	*A*	2,720	*A*	*4,730*	*N/A*	**16,876**
Clifton/Glen. Hghld (Updated)	I	7,388	D	8,240	A	3,200	A	7,117	N/A	**25,945**
Current	*I*	*5,206*	*D*	*7,475*	*A*	2,720	*A*	*4,730*	*N/A*	**20,131**
Glenmore Valley (Updated)	I	7,388		GEID	A	3,200	A	7,117	N/A	**17,705**
Current	*I*	*5,206*		*GEID*	*A*	2,720	*A*	*4,730*	*N/A*	**12,656**
Rutland (Updated)	I	7,388		RWW	A	3,200	A	7,117	N/A	**17,705**
Current	*I*	*5,206*		*RWW*	*A*	2,720	*A*	*4,730*	*N/A*	**12,656**
North East Rutland (Updated)	C	10,900		BMID	A	3,200	A	7,117	N/A	**21,217**
Current	*C*	*8,532*		*BMID*	*A*	2,720	*A*	*4,730*	*N/A*	**15,982**
Hwy 33 - North East (Updated)	D	14,765		BMID	A	3,200	A	7,117	N/A	**25,082**
Current	*D*	*10,102*		*BMID*	*A*	2,720	*A*	*4,730*	*N/A*	**17,552**
Hwy 33 - South West (Updated)	F	12,222		BMID	A	3,200	A	7,117	N/A	**22,539**
Current	*F*	*7,675*		*BMID*	*A*	2,720	*A*	*4,730*	*N/A*	**15,125**
University / Airport (Updated)	E	12,391		GEID	A	3,200	A	7,117	N/A	**22,708**
Current	*E*	*9,677*		*GEID*	*A*	2,720	*A*	*4,730*	*N/A*	**17,127**
McKinley (Updated)	E	12,391		GEID		N/A		N/A	N/A	**12,391**
Current	*E*	*9,677*		*GEID*		*N/A*		*N/A*	*N/A*	**9,677**
Hall Road (Updated)	I	7,388		SEKID	A	3,200	A	7,117	N/A	**17,705**
Current	*I*	*5,206*		*SEKID*	*A*	2,720	*A*	*4,730*	*N/A*	**12,656**
Southeast Kelowna (Updated)	A	17,941		SEKID		N/A		N/A	N/A	**17,941**
Current	*A*	*12,302*		*SEKID*		*N/A*		*N/A*	*N/A*	**12,302**
S.W. Mission (Updated)	B	19,794	B	3,618	B	4,293	A	7,117	N/A	**34,822**
Current	*B*	*16,904*	*B*	*3,291*	*K*	*3,981*	*A*	*4,730*	*N/A*	**28,906**

BMID Serviced by Black Mountain Irrigation District
RWW Serviced by Rutland Water Works
SEKID Serviced by South East Kelowna Irrigation District
GEID Serviced by Glenmore Ellison Irrigation District
N/A Not Applicable as Sewer will not be in that area within the 20 Year period

5. Updated Development Cost Charge Rates

ARTERIAL ROADS

Development Cost Charges Applicable to Development Within the Municipality

Development Type	Sector A SE Kelowna	Sector B South Mission	Sector C NE of Inner City	Sector D N of Hwy 33	Sector F S of Hwy 33	Sector E N of Inner City	Sector I Inner City
Residential 1	17,941	19,794	10,900	14,765	12,222	12,391	7,388
Residential 2	14,353	15,835	8,720	11,812	9,778	9,913	5,911
Residential 3	9,867	10,887	5,995	8,121	6,722	6,815	4,064
Residential 4	9,329	10,293	5,668	7,678	6,356	6,443	3,842
Commercial - Per 1,000 sq ft	5,520	6,090	3,354	4,543	3,761	3,813	2,273
Institutional A - Per 1,000 sq ft	5,520	6,090	3,354	4,543	3,761	3,813	2,273
Institutional B - Per 1,000 sq ft	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Industrial/Campground Per Acre	17,941	19,794	10,900	14,765	12,222	12,391	7,388
Current Single Family Res. Rate	12,302	16,904	8,532	10,102	7,675	9,677	5,206

WATER

Development Cost Charges Applicable to Development Within the Municipality

Development Type	Sector A Inner City	Sector B South Mission	Sector D Glenmore/ Clifton
Residential 1	1,646	1,292	2,943
Residential 2	1,103	866	1,972
Residential 3	790	620	1,413
Residential 4	560	439	1,001
Commercial - Per 1,000 sq ft	633	497	1,132
Institutional A - Per 1,000 sq ft	633	497	1,132
Institutional B - Per 1,000 sq ft	633	497	1,132
Industrial/Campground Per Acre	4,609	3,618	8,240
Current Single Family Res. Rate	1,507	1,176	2,670

WASTEWATER TRUNK MAINS

Development Cost Charges Applicable to Development Within the Municipality

Development Type	Sector A Inner City	Sector B South Mission
Residential 1	**1,143**	**1,533**
Residential 2	**949**	**1,273**
Residential 3	**640**	**859**
Residential 4	**617**	**828**
Commercial - Per 1,000 sq ft	**440**	**590**
Institutional A - Per 1,000 sq ft	**440**	**590**
Institutional B - Per 1,000 sq ft	**440**	**590**
Industrial/Campground Per Acre	**3,200**	**4,293**

Current Single Family Res. Rate	**972**	**1,422**

WASTEWATER TREATMENT

Development Cost Charges Applicable to Development Within the Municipality

Development Type	Sector A All City
Residential 1	**2,542**
Residential 2	**2,110**
Residential 3	**1,423**
Residential 4	**1,373**
Commercial - Per 1,000 sq ft	**978**
Institutional A - Per 1,000 sq ft	**978**
Institutional B - Per 1,000 sq ft	**978**
Industrial/Campground Per Acre	**7,117**

Current Single Family Res. Rate	**1,689**

PARKLAND - PUBLIC OPEN SPACE
Development Cost Charges Applicable to Development Within the Municipality

Development Type	Sector A All City
Residential 1	**3,610**
Residential 2	**3,610**
Residential 3	**3,610**
Residential 4	**3,610**
Commercial - Per 1,000 sq ft	-
Institutional A - Per 1,000 sq ft	-
Institutional B - Per 1,000 sq ft	-
Industrial/Campground Per Acre	-

Current Single Family Res. Rate	**2,957**