

# Development Fee Model General Committee Meeting

March 5, 2007



# Background

- Town has authority to collect development fees through the Building Act, Municipal Act and the Planning Act
- Historically, Development Services fees (Planning/Design, Engineering and Building) did not reflect actual costs of activities and were largely collected at the end of the development process (Building stage)
- New Building Code Statute Law Legislation (Bill 124) came into effect on July 1, 2005 requiring building fees to not exceed the anticipated costs of providing the related service
- A redistribution of revenue sources was implemented to reflect the true cost of providing the service when incurred
- Planning/Design and Engineering fees were increased while Building fees were decreased (Markham was the only municipality to decrease its Building Permit Fees across GTA)



# Principles Established for Fee Model

■ Principles of establishing Building permit fees in Bill 124 were similarly used for Planning and Engineering fees:

- Activities must be authorized by legislation
- The fee payer must be a direct beneficiary of the program
- Fees can include all reasonably anticipated costs
  - Direct costs (salaries, benefits, rent, etc.)
  - Indirect costs (IT equipment, other departments costs provided to support department, etc.)
- Fees may include a reserve to stabilize revenues
- Bill 124 requires Building Department to provide a minimum mandatory level of service (e.g. permit approval time frame) which may require additional resources to meet



# General Methodology for setting up Fee Model

- Cost based on current year budgets plus adjustments (i.e. estimated salary increases, predicted budget implications)
- Allocate costs to revenue sources (e.g. Development fees, taxes, DC, etc.)
- Determine total costs to be recovered through fees (direct and indirect costs plus reserve component)
- Calculate fees based on 5 year average activity by development application type
- Incorporate outcomes into next years budget

# Illustration of Methodology

<b>Direct Cost</b>	\$ 15,000
<b>Indirect Cost</b>	\$ 5,000
<b>Total Department Cost</b>	<u>\$ 20,000</u>

## Allocation of Cost to Revenue Source

	<b>Development Fee</b>	<b>Development Charge</b>	<b>Tax</b>
<b>% of Cost *</b>	50%	40%	10%
<b>Cost Allocated</b>	\$ 10,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 2,000

\* Allocated based on staff time spent on each type of activity



# Illustration of Methodology (2)

<b>Development Fee</b>	\$	10,000
<b>Reserve</b>	\$	1,000
<hr/>		
<b>Total Cost to be recovered from Development Fees</b>	\$	11,000 (a)
<hr/>		

## Calculation of Application Fees

	b	c = a x b	d	e = c / d
<b>Activity</b>	<b>% of Cost *</b>	<b>Cost Allocated</b>	<b>5-yr Avg # of Applications</b>	<b>Application Fee</b>
A	40%	\$ 4,400	10	\$ 440
B	50%	\$ 5,500	5	\$ 1,100
C	10%	\$ 1,100	20	\$ 55
Total	100%	\$ 11,000		

\* Allocated based on staff time spent on each activity



# Reserve Impact

- The Building and The Planning & Engineering Development Fee reserves' purpose is to stabilize development fees
- In years where Revenue is greater than total Costs, there will be a transfer **to** reserves for the surplus amount
- In years where Revenue is less than total Costs, there will be a transfer **from** reserves for the deficit amount
- Departments may need to borrow from the Corporate Rate Stabilization Reserve in years where the reserve balance is not sufficient to cover the deficit amount



## Building, Planning/Design and Engineering Reserve Balances

### Building (In \$000)

	2005	2006 Prelim Actuals	2007 Prelim Budget
Revenues		6,390	8,045
Less:			
Direct Costs		4,867	5,444
Indirect Costs		1,932	2,044
Transfer to/(from) Reserves		(409)	557
Building Fee Reserve Balance	2,627	2,218	2,775

### Planning, Design and Engineering (In \$000)

	2005	2006 Prelim Actuals	2007 Prelim Budget
Revenues		9,245	10,581
Less:			
Direct Costs		8,020	8,407
Indirect Costs		971	1,777
Transfer to/(from) Reserves		255	397
Development Fee Reserve Balance	-	255	652