




**RESIDENTIAL INFILL DEVELOPMENT  
SERVICE DELIVERY REVIEW  
FINAL REPORT  
JANUARY 26, 2023**

Presented By: Tammy Carruthers, Project Lead  
John Skorobohacz, Consultant  
Angela Gravelle, Consultant  
Sarah Hobbs, Finance/Project Coordinator



# OVERVIEW



PROJECT APPROACH



RESIDENTIAL INFILL SERVICE PROFILE



SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS



RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

# Service Delivery Review Objectives and Deliverables

## Residential Infill Service Delivery Review Objectives

- Assess opportunities for improved service delivery model.
- Review all policies, processes and procedures for relevancy in the current state
- Assess customer service relationship management systems and abilities to meet customer demands
- Consult and survey key stakeholders
- Assess resource and technology utilization.
- Benchmark against other municipalities.
- Assess and map current residential infill development processes with view to assess best practices and implications for expansion utilizing LEAN Six Sigma methodologies.

## Deliverables

1. With the expansion of Administrative Monetary Penalties (AMPs), identify opportunities for alternative enforcement tools.
2. Develop fully integrated residential infill service delivery model and strategy with residential infill cost/benefit analysis, technological solutions and policies.
3. Provide recommended future state business process maps that are LEAN/best approach with the associated staffing requirements and Responsibility (RACI) matrix.
4. Provide recommendations and implementation roadmap with short-, medium- and long-term plan that encompasses resource, policy, processes and training requirements.




**Recommendations**



<p><b>Improved Services and Outcomes - Customer focused services &amp; delivery</b>          Outcome: Improved Customer Satisfaction, Reduced Costs</p>	<p><b>Improve Service Delivery Mechanisms through Greater operational integration</b>          Outcome: “Better decision Making and management”</p>	<p><b>Reduced Cost - Greater Economy, Alternative Service Delivery Models</b>          Outcome: “Reduced Costs and Improved Services”</p>
<p><b>Improved Processes, efficiency and productivity</b>          Outcome: Reduced Waste and Improved controls = Good Management</p>	<p><b>Meet New or Increased Demand from Customers</b>          Outcome: Economic Development, Immigration, Growth</p>	<p><b>Increased Revenues</b>          Outcome: Fiscal Sustainability, Flexibility and reduced vulnerability</p>

Service Delivery Reviews – Keys to Success

# OUR APPROACH



MAY 2022

MAY - JULY 2022

SEPTEMBER-NOVEMBER 2022

DECEMBER 2022

JANUARY 2023

# PROVINCIAL BILL 23 –IMPACTED OUR RECOMMENDATIONS ROYAL ASSENT NOV. 28

---


- Desire to see approval and construction of more housing in a timelier fashion by reducing the cost for various municipal processes and fees.
- Impacts several pieces of legislation (i.e.. Planning Act; ONT. Heritage Act; Development Charges Act; ONT Land Tribunal Act and Ontario Municipal Act)
- OP and Zoning as of right permits up to three units per lot where municipal services are available
- Site plan is exempt on developments of under 10 residential units
- Impact to Development Charges By-laws and some financial benefits for rental construction
- Loss of appeal rights for third parties to LPAT – potential order to pay costs to successful party



# SERVICE PROFILE



# Ward Boundaries






# BILL 23 IMPACT

Discussed throughout presentation.




# Issued Building Permits 2009-2019

- Additions Building Permits
- Custom Home Building Permits



# Infill Development Volumes # By Ward and %age of total Residential Permits


Infill Home Issued Permits  
2014-2022 (Source: Building Standards)






# Development Permits - # By Ward by Year

## Source: Building Standards



# About the City's Infill Development Complaint Volumes

Infill Complaints by Year - Open, Closed and Average Duration to Close  
Source: Contact Centre




Note: Contact Centre started tracking Infill separately in 2018




# About the City's Infill Development Complaint Volumes

Infill Complaints by Ward - Source: Building Standards | Total = 40






# Infill Development Complaints – Dates from Submission to Update – Building Standards Only



# ORDERS & INVESTIGATIONS

## About Infill Development Services



½ of all Building Violation's issued for infill are for:

- i) build without permit
- ii) not built in accordance
- iii) unsafe buildings

● Annual permits result in investigation   ● Result in issuance of orders/infractions   ● Building violations



## INSPECTIONS

Proactive monthly inspections throughout construction life of infill development to occupancy

**2**

Years from permit issuance to occupancy

## VOLUMES

Over 10 YEARS



**600 PERMITS ISSUED**

**\$561K**

Fees based on \$19.26/sqm  
Annual Revenues



# RESIDENTIAL INFILL PUBLIC SURVEY RESULTS

## PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

### Infill Issues



**20%**

said that they had infill issues in their neighbourhood

### Ward



**30%**

Live in Ward 4

### Response



**77%**

found that their biggest mistake was not enough testing of the product.

## JUDGING BY THE RESULTS

### Building Permits Online



**28%**

accessed the building permit search online

### Online Awareness



**46%**

said that they were aware of basic search availability online

### Construction Investigation



**9%**


started a business with the motivation of being their own boss.

**Note: Combined survey with Bylaw Enforcement - 1530 respondents in total (0.5% of the population)  
207 Respondents for the Infill section (0.06% of the population)**

**Survey Monkey - Administered online from September 22, 2022 to November 9, 2022**

# Infill Development Complaints – Top 10 from Survey

Top 10 Comment/Complaints by Category




**Note: Combined survey with Bylaw Enforcement - 1530 respondents in total (0.5% of the population)  
207 Respondents for the Infill section (0.06% of the population)**

**Survey Monkey - Administered online from September 22, 2022 to November 9, 2022**

# Infill Development Complaints – Construction Complaints by Category from Survey

Top Construction Complaints  
38 Comments





# External Stakeholders

## What we heard and observed

### Community & the Current Environment

- Older parts of community disproportionately impacted
- Change is difficult
- Value of real estate is driving people to consider teardowns
- Infill adds to intensification with multigenerational families
- Construction Delays - impacting life for long period
- Time of work - often after hours
- Noise
- Dirt, Dust
- Construction supplies on roads/allowance
- Road quality impacted

### Home Owners & Builders


- Zoning Preliminary Review – not application for permit (multiple pieces of legislation cause confusion)
- Public unfamiliar with process and timelines
- Customer Service CRM challenges – Who does what?
- Customer expectations and deliverables not aligned
- All processes 'take too long'
- Multiple plan reviews – 3 to 4 actual plan submissions
- Small scale builds – attempts to avoid/reduce costs - cutting corners – increases demand for higher level inspection oversight





# RESIDENTIAL INFILL RESEARCH

Population & Households




Responded to Survey and Interviewed

Municipality	Population % (2016-2021) Change	Land area	Population density Km <sup>2</sup> )
Toronto	2.3%	630.2	4,334.45
Newmarket	4.4%	38.45	2,190.48
Richmond Hill	3.6%	101.11	1,928.81
Kitchener	10.1%	136.77	1,705.21
<b>Markham</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>212.35</b>	<b>1,549.17</b>
Oakville	10.3%	138.89	1,395.58
St. Catharines	2.8%	96.13	1,384.72
Oshawa	10.0%	145.64	1,094.88
Vaughan	5.5%	273.56	1,119.44
Burlington	2.0%	185.66	987.36
London	10.0%	420.35	913.10
Milton	20.7%	363.22	303.20
Kingston	7.0%	451.19	274.38
Halton Hills	2.9%	276.27	221.38

Mix of smaller and large municipalities to assess possible best practices/opportunities

# What Others Are Doing? Our Research



## ● APPLICATION TIMELINE

Typical timeline from plan submission to issuance of building permits typically range between 1 month up to 6 months and in some cases subject to the number of resubmissions the process can exceed 6 months.

## ● RESUBMISSIONS

The typical number of building permit resubmissions range between 2 and 4 for infill projects.

## ● SIGNAGE STANDARDS

Most municipalities have adopted site signage standards for the infill project identifying the nature of the project and the principal contact details

## ● TOP INFILL PUBLIC CONCERNS

The leading public infill project concerns are: Density (footprint); Building height; neighbourhood compatibility; tree removal; construction issues (noise, dust, timeframes, vibration), storm water runoff, road debris (dirt and construction materials). Neighbourhood guides have been developed to assist in communications.

## ● COMPLIANCE CHALLENGES

Compliance respecting infill projects continues to present a challenge for most municipalities.


## ● SMALL SCALE BUILDERS

The single biggest challenge with infill "builders" is they are not typically large scale builders, often smaller projects and more susceptible to market variables (supply chain, labour issues) and lack the infrastructure which greenfield developers have access to.

## ● CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION TIMELINE


Given the nature of small scale builders, and external factors, the length of time to complete projects can take up to 2 years which leads to neighbourhood frustrations.

# Municipal Practices






# What the City has done to address Infill issues.



# 2021/2022 INFILL UPGRADES – INSPECTIONS



**What the City has done to address Infill issues.**



# 1. Service Delivery & Customer Service



## Findings

- ❖ Complaints regarding the process, enforcement of existing by-laws and lack of information once a complaint is filed.
- ❖ Challenges regarding customer identification of the core issues and the manner of disposition of those complaints (Customer Service Centre).
- ❖ Little to no follow-up regarding complaint status - Not standardized/No Closing the Loop
- ❖ Limited public information respecting Infill resulting in a lack of Public education and awareness Call Center - Challenges/Prioritization/Accuracy
- ❖ Complaints Tracking
- ❖ No 'one stop shop' – Expectation customers 'know' what to do and where to go



## Recommendations

- 1.1. Develop communications and community outreach strategy aligned with the city's strategic plan.**
- 1.2 Website refresh required with a view to customer needs and self-service options in mind – fully integrated portal.**
- 1.3. Enhance communication tools to be more transparent and proactive in information sharing – including site signage enhancements.**
- 1.4. Review CRM system options to consider potential improved complaints portal that provides status updates for complainants.**

# 2. Organization

## Findings

- ❖ Lack of real ownership of the Infill Development Process, multiple handoffs
- ❖ Departments working in silos despite best efforts of frontline staff to cooperate when requested
- ❖ Staff single minded focus rather than viewing big picture and dealing with other infractions
- ❖ City losing the opportunity to recover revenue on the delivery of certain services



## Recommendations

- 2.1. Establish a cross departmental team for infill development unit with a 'project' manager to oversee the team and manage projects from beginning to end – coordinate all efforts including policy and administrative monetary penalties – reporting to the Chief Building Official.**
- 2.2. Develop formal department & personalized training plans for infill and AMPS.**
- 2.3. Engage council in bi-annual training workshops to explore emerging trends.**
- 2.4 Undertake financial study to examine the true costs for delivering infill services including the cost of the Project Manager.**

## Findings

- ❖ Not all information in one place = duplication
- ❖ Access between departments not available – cannot see process
- ❖ Use of E-PLAN – at times upwards of 4 submissions required before approval of building permit – partly due to process and documentation/understanding by applicants
- ❖ AMANDA software used by certain areas to address complaints related to infill
- ❖ Only few have mobile technology
- ❖ Limited access to plans onsite
- ❖ Utilization of City – web site for enhanced site-specific projects would be helpful to the public



## Recommendations

**3.1 Standardize the use of data capture through AMANDA and E-plan.**

**3.2 Provide access to entire infill process to the new teams through mobile solutions to improve onsite review and see status of all processes.**

**3.3 Develop technology training program to support new processes.**

**3.4 Explore technology advancements to improve mobile connectivity and information capture. Work with IT to create the online ‘investigations’ map.**

**3.5. Develop document and inspection requirements in E-plan and AMANDA to ensure consistency and support move to AMPS.**

## Findings

- ❖ Delayed updating of Comprehensive Zoning By-law has resulted in the need to push most infill developments through Committee of Adjustment
- ❖ Limited Architectural controls (only heritage district)
- ❖ Lack of public information in advance of projects causes neighbourhood concerns
- ❖ Information seems guarded rather than publicly shared
- ❖ Enforcement is split – Administrative Monetary Penalties should allow for a coordinated approach



## Recommendations

- 4.1 Develop/update the Infill Strategy – integrate the actions to date and communicate team based approach with responsibilities by department.**
- 4.2 Hosted on-site preconstruction meeting to establish and build awareness of city requirements – entire team to be present.**
- 4.3 Following pre-construction meeting, require ongoing updates – published on website by all team members.**
- 4.4 Posting of enhanced public signage needs to also be included in the Infill Bylaw.**
- 4.5 Migrate enforcement mechanism into AMPS – AMPS Unit to lead.**

## Findings

- ❖ Delay in updating Comprehensive Zoning By-law is adding more time and costs to the Infill development process
- ❖ Perception that Committee of Adjustment is a money grab
- ❖ Concerns that City's By-laws are out of date and lack teeth necessary for effective enforcement
- ❖ Nuisance issues often arise outside of typical enforcement timelines – weekends and after hours
- ❖ Site Plan Control used in other communities to aid in compliance and posting of securities
- ❖ Concerns that infill footprints including hardscaping are adding to climate change challenges
- ❖ Infill Development fits with Provincial desire for intensification and maximization of existing infrastructure



## Recommendations

- 5.1. Focus on completion of comprehensive zoning by-law or alternatively carve out the provisions of the Infill development as a top priority.
- 5.2. Ensure existing by-laws are reviewed and updated in preparation for amps implementation (infill bylaw needs to be updated).
- 5.3. Creation of a good neighbour guide/videos and other educational tools to identify Infill development issues and actions to resolve.

- ✓ Willingness to change but acknowledge challenges
- ✓ Lack of cohesiveness and inconsistency across the organization
- ✓ Need for clear and transparent communications
- ✓ Need to develop – A “One Team” and Process Ownership Approach
- ✓ Organization needs to commit to resourcing, staff training, and technology to support successful change

# CHANGE READINESS





# Change Management – Steps for Success

## Top contributors to success:





# RESIDENTIAL INFILL DEVELOPMENT SDR RECOMMENDATIONS




## 1. Service Delivery & Customer Service

**1.1. Develop communications and community outreach strategy aligned with the city's strategic plan.**

**1.2 Website refresh required with a view to customer needs and self-service options in mind – fully integrated portal.**

**1.3. Enhance communication tools to be more transparent and proactive in information sharing – including site signage enhancements.**

**1.4. Review CRM system options to consider potential improved complaints portal that provides status updates for complainants.**



## 2. Organization

**2.1. Establish a cross departmental team for infill development unit with a 'project' manager to oversee the team and manage projects from beginning to end – coordinate all efforts including policy and administrative monetary penalties – reporting to the Chief Building Official.**

**2.2. Develop formal department & personalized training plans for infill and AMPS.**

**2.3. Engage council in bi-annual training workshops to explore emerging trends.**

**2.4 Undertake financial study to examine the true costs for delivering infill services including cost of Project Manager.**



## 3. Technology

**3.1 Standardize the use of data capture through AMANDA and E-plan.**

**3.2 Provide access to entire infill process to the new teams through mobile solutions to improve onsite review and see status of all processes.**

**3.3 Develop technology training program to support new processes.**

**3.4 Explore technology advancements to improve mobile connectivity and information capture. Work with IT to create the online 'investigations' map.**

**3.5. Develop document and inspection requirements in E-plan and AMANDA to ensure consistency and support move to AMPS.**



## 4. Process

**4.1 Develop/update the Infill Strategy – integrate the actions to date and communicate team based approach with responsibilities by department.**

**4.2 Hosted on-site preconstruction meeting to establish and build awareness of city requirements – entire team to be present.**

**4.3 Following pre-construction meeting, require ongoing updates – published on website by all team members.**

**4.4 Posting of enhanced public signage needs to also be included in the Infill Bylaw.**

**4.5 Migrate enforcement mechanism into AMPS – AMPS Unit to lead.**



## 5. Policy, Planning & Performance


**5.1. Focus on completion of comprehensive zoning by-law or alternatively carve out the provisions of the Infill development as a top priority.**

**5.2. Ensure existing by-laws are reviewed and updated in preparation for amps implementation (infill bylaw needs to be updated).**

**5.3. Creation of a good neighbour guide/videos and other educational tools to identify Infill development issues and actions to resolve.**

Year

# Residential Infill Recommendations Implementation Plan



Note: Costs are primarily internal with the exception of the Project Manager ~ \$125k annually – to be cost recoverable <sup>35</sup>



# WSCS Consulting

**Think Beyond**

**Tammy Carruthers**

*Principal & CEO*

*BA CPA, CGA CFE CICA PMP CLSSBB CCA MCITP CISA CCP*

---

(T) 613-267-7521

(F) 613-267-7826

(C) 613-812-0776

RR3

Perth, ON

K7H 3C5

---

[wscsconsulting.com](http://wscsconsulting.com)