



**Agenda
Council Meeting
Tuesday, March 4, 2024
Council Chambers 1:00 PM**

- 6.1. Sean-Michael Stephen, Managing Partner, Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. 27 - 236
Re: Development Charge Background Study

[Development Charge Background Study Presentation](#)
[Development Charge Background Study](#)

• This meeting is a mandatory requirement under the Development Charges Act (D.C.A.) • Prior to Council's consideration of a development charges (D.C.) by-law, a background study must be prepared and available to the public a minimum of 2 weeks prior to a public meeting and provided on the municipality's website 60 days prior to by-law passage • This public meeting is to provide a review the D.C. proposal and to receive public input on the proposed policies and charges

Purpose of D.C.s are to recover the capital costs associated with residential and non-residential development within a municipality

• The capital costs are in addition to what costs would normally be constructed as part of a subdivision (i.e., internal roads, watermains, sidewalks, streetlights, etc.)

Increase in Need for Service • 10-Year (2024-2033) • Services Related to a Highway • Fire Protection Services • Parks and Recreation Services • Library Services

D.C. By-Law Policies • D.C.s are calculated and collected at building permit issuance • D.C.s for developments proceeding through Site Plan or Zoning By-law Amendment will be determined based on the charges in effect on the day of the application • Charges to be frozen for a maximum period of 2 years after planning application approval • Payment in installments • Rental housing and institutional developments would pay D.C.s in 6 equal annual payments, commencing from the date of occupancy • Interest can be imposed on D.C.s determined at Site Plan or Zoning-By-law Amendment application and on installment payments

Much more information on the Municipal website

Deputy Mayor Armstrong –Are all the planned investments such as Open Space, Fire building development included in the capital costs that have been contemplated in this report? Answer Yes

-Two categories of residential dwellings based on size – where did that go?

When we are looking at what is driving the increase of need in service it is not size of dwelling but on population growth. You could change that to number of bedrooms but there is not the historical data available.

-Armstrong – I am not satisfied with that response. You would think there is enough data in the last few years.

- can you explain the large increase (missed this question)

Aggregates have higher charge. This proposal does not do that.

Historically, in 2019 what we could not do is assess aggregates having a higher demand. It was just through policy that this was given to aggregate development.

Compared to other municipalities. When were each of the development charges in each of those municipalities with which we were compared reviewed? All of the charges are current. The underlying increase is cost of service. The indexing doesn't always keep pace with cost of service which is why by-laws often go up when updated.

-Separate by-law for each specific area. – Areas are Highway, fire, library, parks, recreation

Franzen – If the municipalities that are on our border are not charged is that fair? Answer – if development charges are what influences where a business establishes itself I would say yes. I do not know if that is necessarily so.

Franzen – I believe in the ability to pay, I find it unconscionable that someone is paying the same amount for an 1800' that is building a monster home. I don't think that the number of bedrooms solves the problem. In the modest home there may be more bedrooms to satisfy the family needs.

It is based on demands for services just because one home is larger doesn't make a change in the demand of services

Cadigan - based on geographic neighbours - They have benefit on farms and not the large tracts of crown lands that we have. We may have also been looking at municipalities with no development charges. (did not hear all the question)

Braybrook - Why wasn't North Kawartha included in the charts for comparisons? We were looking at others that do have development charges

Lambhead – Development charges at local and County level. It is very difficult to get started. It can stymie development as well.

Audience member – disagrees with development fee. This is just another way to slow things down.

- 7.1. Sean-Michael Stephen, Managing Partner, Watson & Associates Economists Ltd.
Re: Development Charge Background Study

[Development Charges Background Study Presentation](#)

Armstrong would suggest that the consultants and staff do further exploration of two categories of residential dwellings and a proposal on aggregates on which there is wear and tear on our roads.

Second = Cadigan

Motion carried.

- 8.1. Barbara Waldron, Director of Building and Planning/CBO
Re: Proposed Building Permit Fees - Sewage Systems Fees and Administrative Penalties

[Proposed Building Permit Fees - Sewage System Fees and Administrative Penalties](#)

Recommendation: That Council receive the report from the Director of Building and Planning/Chief Building Official on Proposed Building Permit Fees- “Sewage System Permit Fees” for information; and further That Council direct staff to bring forward a by-law to the next regular Council meeting to amend the Fees and Charges By-law with the additional Septic Permit fees. Financial Implications: Recovered septic fees through issuance of permit will provide for recovering the costs to enforce Part 8 of the Ontario Building Code.

1. Amendment to septic permit - Permit required to be amended after permit has been issued. Once a permit has been issued specific to a project, often while on site, changes have been made that affect the septic permit. These include (but are not limited to), the addition of a bathroom group, a washroom group being roughed into the basement where the original plan did not indicate this, a shower with more than one shower head, and the addition of bedrooms.
2. Increase of Two Fees Two fees have been increased from the current PPH fee schedule: 1. Addition, renovations, or Inground / Above ground swimming pool installations (review of existing septic system permit)-
3. 2. Permit for Class 4 sewage System Tank Replacement Only- Fee has been increased from \$400 to \$500 to represent 50% of a new class 4 septic permit

Peterborough Public Health raised fees related to the sewage program on January 1, 2023, due to operating losses in the previous years, to provide the required services to the municipalities. Chart associated with PPH online on website

Summary - In preparation of the implementation date of April 1st, 2024, to begin enforcing Part 8 of the Ontario Building Code, staff have been preparing applications and information documents, document updates and fee structures. The proposed Septic Fee Schedule has been advertised through the Lakefield Herald and the Municipal website where the proposed fees have been posted as per the requirements of Division C, Part 1, Section 1.9, Sentence 1.9.1.2 of the OBC.

Report received.

Armstrong - Council receive the report from the Director of Building and Planning/Chief Building Official on Proposed Building Permit Fees- "Sewage System Permit Fees" for information; and further That Council direct staff to bring forward a by-law to the next regular Council meeting to amend the Fees and Charges By-law with the additional Septic Permit fees.

Braybrook seconds

Motion carried

12.1.1. Matt Wintjes, Supervisor of Waste/Public Works Coordinator
Re: 2023 Waste and Recycling Summary

[2023 Waste and Recycling Summary](#)

Data Comparison of Recycling/Diversion Materials and Garbage Trent Lakes has a very comprehensive waste management system, offering a range of waste diversion programs as well as events. The recycling and diversion programs/events significantly reduce the amount of material going into the Peterborough County/City owned Bensfort Landfill. This is the annual data comparison for 2022 and 2023 of the recycling and waste diversion materials, as well as the garbage collected at the Transfer Station Sites:

Wintjes -Believes that the transfer staff is terrific! Has made his job here easier

Cadigan -Matt do you see another source of revenue with alcohol containers?

Wintjes – I think how we do it is great.

Armstrong motion to receive. Cadigan seconds.

Comments – 521 Food cyclers is very impressive number. That is almost one in every household.

Motion carried.

Chart representing above is on website

2.1.2. Matt Wintjes, Supervisor of Waste/Public Works Coordinator
Re: Bulky Plastics Collection Program

Bulky Plastics Collection Program

Recommendation: That Council receive the report from the Supervisor of Waste/Public Works Coordinator regarding the seasonal Bulky Plastics Collection Program; and further That Council approve Option 2 to provide a seasonal Bulky Plastics Program at the Buckhorn and Bobcaygeon Transfer Stations from May to October 2024; and further That Council approve that the costs associated with the Bulky Plastics Collection Program continue to be drawn from service delivery funds. Financial Implications: Total estimated cost ranges from \$0 to \$19,750.00 depending on the selected option

Background: The Trent Lakes Bulky Plastic Collection Program allows residents to dispose of large items made of hard plastics that are then collected and recycled by an outside contractor. Each year, the program diverts around 8 tonnes of plastic from the municipal waste stream. Furthermore, the plastic accepted in this program is generally lightweight and bulky and requires more lifts per tonne than other waste products, costing the Municipality more in processing fees. All four transfer station sites were able to fill at least one 40-yard roll-off bin. However, only the Buckhorn and Bobcaygeon sites were able to fill a second. This resulted in the Municipality paying full collection fees for bins that were only partially full for two sites – Cavendish and Crystal Lake.

Option 2 The Bulky Plastics Collection Program is only offered at the two most frequented transfer station sites, Buckhorn and Bobcaygeon. This will allow for an immediate cost saving of \$4500 that would normally cover the monthly bin rental costs. It will also reduce the number of partially filled bins that are processed at the end of the season. This option would require some residents to travel further in order to access the collection points.

Armstrong favors Option1. I think we need to satisfy our residents not take away. The extra money \$54500 is coming from a reserve fund. Measure it and sees what happens next year.

Cadigan – can we just get one dumpster to fill.

Wintjes Once it is full it is full.

Cadigan – there should be notification at the Crystal Lake and the other landfill if there is no bin available.

Motion - That Council receive the report from the Supervisor of Waste/Public Works Coordinator regarding the seasonal Bulky Plastics Collection Program; and further That Council approve Option 2 to provide a seasonal Bulky Plastics Program at the Buckhorn and Bobcaygeon Transfer Stations from May

At October 2024; and further That Council approve that the costs associated with the Bulky Plastics Collection Program continue to be drawn from service delivery funds.

Armstrong – receive report and direct staff to keep bins at all four landfills.

Cadigan seconds

Motion carried.

2.1.3. Evan Grieger, Director of Public Works Re: Private Road Grant Policy Comments

[Private Road Grant Policy Comments](#)

Recommendation: That Council receive the report from the Director of Public Works regarding Private Road Grant Policy Comments for their information; and further, That Council approves the updated Private Road Grant Policy to allow acceptance of applications beginning in September of 2024 for 2025 Budget planning, as attached; and further, That Council direct the Director of Public Works to provide an update during the First Draft Meeting of the 2025 Budget on how the first intake period progressed.

Financial Implications: Up to \$30,000 to be included in the 2025 Budget.

Franzen – how did we get the feedback?

Grieger – all the feedback came through the website

Braybrook – received many correspondences that were not in favor of program. Comments against were more insightful than those in favor. I can't support this.

Franzen – I do support this program. It is something that we can do to support basically seasonal residents.

Armstrong – Initially supported. I have to admit that having read some of the comments it created doubt. I am not sure any longer. I am on the fence.

Franzen – as an example – why should we create an amphitheatre that council is in favor of when I will never use it. or improve Galway Hall? Same type of comment as the road policy. No one uses everything.

Cadigan – feedback which I received has all been positive.

Lamshead – This is open to everyone. It is a very small amount of money.

Franzen – requested recorded vote.

Braybrook – I would support improving roads for increased fire and medical service. I am not totally against. I am reflecting comments received.

Franzen Motion - That Council receives the report and approves the updated Private Road Grant Policy to allow acceptance of applications beginning in September of 2024 for 2025 Budget planning, and review program for 2025.

Cadigan seconds

Motion carried.