NORTH VANCOUVER
DISTRICT

DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER

DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES BYLAW REVIEW AND UPDATE

BACKGROUND REPORT

JANUARY 2013

Additional References:

http://www.cscd.gov.bc.ca/lgd/intergov_relations/library/DCC_Elected_Officials_Guide_2005.pdf
http://www.cscd.gov.bc.ca/lgd/intergov_relations/library/DCC_Best_Practice_Guide_2005.pdf
http://www.cscd.gov.bc.ca/lgd/intergov_relations/library/development_finances_choices00_guide.pdf
http://www.cscd.gov.bc.ca/lgd/finance/development_cost_charges.htm
http://www.dnv.org/upload/documents/bylaws/7135-2.pdf
http://www.dnv.org/upload/pcdocsdocuments/1tbb501_.pdf
http://www.dnv.org/upload/documents/bylaws/6945.pdf
http://www.dnv.org/article.asp?a=254&c=603
http://www.dnv.org/upload/documents/finance/dcc-bylaw.htm
http://www.dnv.org/upload/documents/Bylaws/7958.PDF
http://www.dnv.org/upload/documents/bylaws/7652.pdf
http://www.dnv.org/article.asp?c=1096 <-- parks and open space strategic plan
http://persquaremile.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/parkland-per-person-us.png

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CAVEAT: This report (comprised of comments in red interspersed throughout the document) only partially covers the full compensation package of charges extracted from developers. The two main others being the CAC (Community Amenity Contribution) and the provision for parkland by way of the 5% dedication/cash-in-lieu provision of the Local Government Act.

It is my understanding that currently the district has an existing amenity contribution policy for any rezoning **outside** of the 4 town centres. However, as far as I know, for development of sites **inside** the four town centres, the district has not yet adopted an amenity contribution policy.

In any case it is difficult to objectively assess this report without full knowledge of the other two components. CJK

CONTEXT: The striving for a fair compensation package for development should follow the following process:

a) Assess the project design to determine the increase in density AND the desired built form

b) calculate the increase in land value that the rezoning would produce (so called "lift") and the CAC share of that increase - and finally

c) determine the public amenity and benefit priorities and how much of the CAC would go to each.

It is fundamental that the urban design and land use impacts (traffic, massing, shadowing, view impacts, etc.) of a rezoning proposal be assessed first, before any discussion of the lift or CAC took place(Ref). One should not start from wanting so much money to pay for specific amenities that all you'll get is confrontation when it becomes obvious it's all too much.

Ref: http://www.sfu.ca/content/dam/sfu/continuing-studies/forms-docs/city/community-amenity-contributions-cameron-gray.pdf

Policy: Growth should not burden (lessen the quality of life) of existing taxpayers. Growth should "pay for itself" (CJK) Readers should recall the automatic 5% parkland dedication provisions that have existing in the past.

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of Development Cost Charges (DCCs)

Development Cost Charges are charges that are levied on new development to finance the cost of upgrading or providing infrastructure services needed to support new development. Examples of services financed through DCCs include:

- Widening and upgrading of arterial and collector roads to meet the needs of growth in vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic;
- Upgrading of water, sewer and drainage works to provide capacity for new growth;
- Parkland development and acquisition of new parkland.

Infrastructure services necessitated by development but **not eligible** to be included in a DCC program are facilities such as:

- Off-street parking (e.g. public parking lots)
- Recreation centres
- Libraries
- Schools
- Facilities for police and fire fighting forces
- Certain parkland improvements such as parking lots, park area lighting, baseball diamonds, basketball courts, bleachers, and park furniture.

Increasingly, all governments are facing significant constraints in the use of general purpose taxation and have placed greater emphasis on the "user pay" or "benefiter pay" principle. In response to these pressures, DCCs have been utilized by local governments as a cost recovery mechanism for apportioning infrastructure costs amongst developers of land.

DCCs allow monies to be pooled from many developers so that funds can be raised to construct the necessary services in an equitable manner. Simply stated, the municipality is considered to be the co-ordinator of the capital program and administrator of the funds collected.

1.2 Background

In December 1993, District Council ratified bylaws 6570 and 6571 which provided for the collection of DCCs in Northlands Development Area Sector 1. Developments in this specified area were assessed DCCs in accordance with those two bylaws. A number of projects identified in the Northlands DCC bylaw proceeded, however in July 1997, Council adopted bylaws 6955, 6956 and 6957 amending the Mountain and Cove Forest areas from urban reserve to parks recreational and wilderness, and development of the subject lands ceased. As of October 31, 2012, the combined Northlands DCC reserve accounts have a balance with interest income, less appropriations, transfers and adjustments of $2,952,906. The Northlands DCC reserve accounts have since remained dormant and grown only from interest accrued on the outstanding balances.

Prior to 1993, District wide DCCs were not assessed or collected. In September 1998, Council passed DCC Bylaw 6945, which excluded the Northlands area and Native Reserve lands from the DCC calculations. In February 2000, Bylaw 6945 was amended by Bylaw 7135 to introduce several new definitions including an amendment to "gross floor area" to avoid penalizing builders wishing to expand the thickness of exterior walls in an attempt to address moisture and rainwater penetration. Other revisions clarified how the charges for varying types of development are to be calculated.

The provincial legislature amended the *Local Government Act* in the fall of 2004 to permit municipalities with DCC bylaws to impose them on multi-family development with fewer than four dwelling units. To allow collections for duplex and triplex developments, the District wide bylaw was amended accordingly in February 2005 (Bylaw 7526).

Lacks clarity. I believe, for example, that the increased capital costs of sewer and water lines should be allowed for; that park component of DCC should be substantially increased due to increased land values (else our existing heritage is undermined)

1.3 Reason for Bylaw Review and Update

The purpose of this DCC bylaw review and update can be summarized as follows:

- Both construction and land costs have risen since the DCC bylaw was first introduced and the current charges do not allow for the increases in capital costs;
- In June 2011, Council adopted a new Official Community Plan with the objective of adding 10,000 new housing units over the next 20 years;
- Given a significant increase in anticipated capital expenditure programs for transportation, sanitary sewers, waterworks, drainage/flood protection and parks infrastructure upgrades, the charges need to be recalculated using the estimated future residential and non-residential growth projections;
- Concurrently, the 20 Year Financial Plan is in the process of being amended to reflect the increase in future capital works expenditures;
- To simplify the administration process, the preference is to consolidate the collection of DCCs through a single District wide bylaw with regular updates of projects and costs;
- To obtain approval from the Ministry of Community, Sport and Cultural Development (Local Government Finance) to repeal the Northlands DCC bylaw and transfer the Northlands funds to the District wide reserve accounts;
- To establish procedures for making minor amendments to the bylaw on either an annual or bi-annual basis, and for major amendments similar to this review and update, at least once every five years.

1.4 Best Practices Guide

The proposed amendments to the District's DCC bylaw incorporate the principles identified in the Ministry's Best Practices Guide. The Guide has two primary objectives:

1. To encourage local governments to standardize the establishment and administration of DCC programs; and
2. To provide some flexibility to accommodate a municipality's specific circumstances.

The Guide was developed in partnership between the province, local government and the development community. Local governments who choose to follow the recommended best practices can expect an expedited process for provincial approval of their DCC bylaws.

Note: The ~ 20,000 people that could move into DNV by 2030 will mostly go into residential units which provide little or no backyard play spaces (ie. unlike the single family homes). Thus these **new residents need local/neighbourhood parks more than the average existing residents.**

2. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 Legislative and Regulatory Background

DCCs are established within a layered governance structure. At the most direct level, DCCs are subject to the policy and technical bulletins issued by the Ministry whose responsibility it is to review and approve the bylaws submitted by local government. This level lies under the legislative framework described by sections 932 to 937 of the *Local Government Act* related to DCCs. When amending a DCC Bylaw, District Council must consider whether the charges

- are excessive in relation to the capital cost of prevailing standards of service;
- will deter development; or
- will discourage the construction of reasonably priced housing, or the provision of reasonably priced serviced land; or
- will discourage development designed to result in low environmental impact.

DCCs must be used to acquire or construct the works for which they were collected and cannot be used for any other purpose (section 935). Therefore, the District must carefully consider broad policy matters and technical issues prior to amending the DCC bylaw. Relevant policy and technical issues include:

http://www.cscd.gov.bc.ca/lgd/intergov_relations/library/DCC_Best_Practice_Guide_2005.pdf
http://www.cscd.gov.bc.ca/lgd/intergov_relations/library/DCC_Elected_Officials_Guide_2005.pdf
http://www.cscd.gov.bc.ca/lgd/intergov_relations/library/Parkland_Acquisition_BPG.pdf

- level of service desired or required;
- impact on housing affordability;
- equity between existing taxpayers and developers;
- the municipal assist factor;
- the projected types and amount of new development; and,
- the utility services required to support those projected developments.

2.2 Public Participation Process

The authority to adopt a DCC bylaw rests with Council. There are no mandatory public consultation activities in the DCC legislation, such as public hearing requirements for a rezoning application. However, the Inspector of Municipalities may refuse approval of a DCC bylaw under section 937(3)(b) of the *Local Government Act* if the DCCs are excessive, deter development or discourage construction of reasonably priced housing. The recommended best practices regarding a public participation strategy associated with DCCs involves the following minimum activities:

- stakeholder input during the development or amendment of the DCC bylaw before first reading;
- additional input before second and third reading, if required.

2.3 Bylaw Exemptions

Section 933(4) of the *Local Government Act* describes the following circumstances when development is exempt from DCCs:

See bullet 2 of "WHO PAYS DCCs?" of BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- where a building permit authorizes the construction, alteration, or extension of a building, or part of a building which is solely used for public worship, such as a church;
- where the value of the work covered by the building permit does not exceed $50,000.

In 2004, these exemptions were amended to provide more flexibility. Local governments now have the authority to amend their DCC bylaws to charge DCCs on developments of fewer than four dwelling units that are exclusively for residential use, and local governments can increase the $50,000

exemption threshold. This acknowledges the variances in construction costs around the province by maintaining the current $50,000 threshold for charging DCCs, while providing flexibility for local governments to increase the threshold where appropriate.

2.4 Bill 27

In May 2008 the Provincial Government enacted new legislation pertaining to DCCs. The legislative changes include the option for municipalities to exempt or waive DCCs for the following classes of "eligible development":

- not-for-profit rental housing, including supportive living housing (similar provisions were in the previous legislation, but did not require a bylaw to waive or reduce DCCs for not-for-profit rental housing);
- for-profit affordable rental housing;
- subdivisions of small lots designed to result in low greenhouse gas emissions; and
- developments designed to result in low environmental impact.

This seems arbitrary since "affordable" is undefined, and thus open to abuse and bypass of public participation.

Where are these?

The District must adopt a DCC bylaw that establishes definitions for each class of "eligible development", corresponding rates of reduction, and requirements that must be met in order to obtain a waiver or reduction. Council, however, is not obligated to adopt any of these new provisions.

2.5 Municipal-Wide versus Area-Specific Charges

The current District DCC bylaw is District wide (excluding Northlands), meaning that the same DCC rate structure is applied for a particular type of land use deemed to generate a similar or same capital cost burden throughout the municipality, regardless of the location of any specific development. In contrast, an area-specific DCC bylaw divides the municipality into areas according to geography or any other distinctive quality for the purpose of determining DCCs.

The Guide offers advice on the decision to establish District wide charges versus area-specific charges for different areas within the community. For every category of infrastructure, the advice is to establish charges on a municipal-wide basis, unless a significant disparity exists between those who pay the DCCs and the benefiting users.

The reasons staff has a preference for District wide charges are:

- avoiding the creation of a large number of small, specialized funds that accumulate slowly and allow no flexibility in allocating or pooling funds to various infrastructure projects;
- minimizing the complexity of the system and the amount of administrative work needed to calculate costs, set rates and monitor funds, and;
- to encourage and support growth in the four designated growth centres rather than outlying areas where development is not being promoted.

That's why we have computers...

Then the 4 areas should have distinct DCC policies/rates!

Staff therefore recommends that the District adopt a municipal wide approach to administering the DCC program.

Notwithstanding the 2 comments above, I believe a single District-wide is preferred to avoid inequities and a "race to the bottom".

2.6 In-Stream Applications

In-stream, complete and valid subdivision and building permit applications, submitted prior to the date of final adoption of the amended bylaw, will be exempt from an increase in new DCC rates for a period of one year from the date of final adoption of the bylaw. Section 943 of the *Local Government Act* provides in-stream protection of one year from the proposed DCC rates for subdivision applications, provided that the application is complete and that subdivision application fees have been paid.

2.7 Grace Periods

A "grace period" is a period of time between the approval of the DCC bylaw and the bylaw's effective date of application. If the rates in the bylaw are significantly higher than those that were previously charged, the District may wish to grant a grace period to allow developers to expedite projects for which financing has already been arranged. A grace period of 6 months is recommended.

instead of "for which financing has already been arranged" I suggest something more concrete and verifiable - such as "for which council approval has been given - following a public hearing"

2.8 Collection of Charges

Section 933(5) of the *Local Government Act* states that DCCs are payable at the time of approval of subdivision or the issuance of a building permit, as the case may be. In practice, DCCs are commonly collected (1) at the subdivision approval stage for single family DCCs, and (2) upon issuance of a building permit for multi-family, commercial, industrial and institutional DCCs.

DCCs payable may be paid by installments, with one-third of the total amount payable at time of subdivision or development, another one-third at the date of the 1st anniversary of the subdivision approval or building permit issuance; and the remaining one-third at the date of the 2nd anniversary of the subdivision approval or building permit issuance.

DCCs must be paid in cash or by certified cheque. Should DCCs be paid by installments, the two-thirds balance unpaid at the time of subdivision or building permit must be secured in full by an irrevocable letter of credit, in a form and from a financial institution acceptable to the Director of Financial Services.

2.9 Credits

Credits for existing lots, units, buildings or development areas are calculated at the time of DCC payment based on incremental new impact defined in terms of the corresponding additional units of measurement, for the purposes of DCC assessment, for each type of development, as follows:

- For single family residential subdivisions, a credit is granted for each existing developed lot forming part of a subdivision at the time of application;
- For multi-family residential developments, a credit is granted for each existing dwelling unit forming part of the development at time of application;
- For non-residential developments, DCCs are assessed based on the additional "gross floor area" as defined in the bylaw.

Not obvious to me !

2.10 Benefit to Existing Users

Capital costs for DCC calculations must be net costs. It is recognized that most improvements within the District provide a significant benefit to the existing residents and users. All capital projects identified for DCC funding have been reviewed by staff, and the percentage benefit to existing users has been estimated. The cost of each project applicable to existing users is then deducted from the total expenditure to calculate the allowable DCC recoverable portion of the project. The percentage allocations are given in each of the DCC recoverable tables found in Appendix 'A', Tables 12 to 16 inclusive of this report.

If the required "project" was purely the result of growth then how can the cost be applicable to existing users?

2.11 Municipal Assist Factor

The municipal assist factor reflects a municipality's desire to encourage development within the community and is largely a political decision. The Best Practices Guide recommends that the municipal assist factor be a discretionary vehicle which reflects the community's financial support towards the financing of services for development. A local government must make allowances in the DCC calculations of at least a minimum 1% municipal assist factor, which is the value that was used in producing the original bylaw. Because most of the projects identified in the amended DCC program will

Were not additional parkland requirements also gutted for some Town Centres?

benefit existing users and be largely funded by the District (except for certain major town centre(s) road improvements and parkland acquisition), the recommendation is to continue with the 1% assist factor.

2.12 Financial Assistance from Government Grants

Government grants, including Federal/Provincial infrastructure funding programs and Provincial revenue sharing programs, can no longer be relied upon to provide sufficient funding for capital projects. Grants are sporadically available for projects, particularly those that contribute towards major road improvements (Translink's Major Road Network Program), cycling (Bicycle Infrastructure Capital Cost Sharing Program and others) and road safety programs (ICBC).

Seven (7) of 17 road projects have been identified to potentially receive grants from regional and provincial government agencies. It has been assumed that grants will not be forthcoming in the future for water, sewer, drainage and parks projects, and the DCC calculations reflect that assumption.

2.13 DCC Reserve Funds

The reserve funds are the total amounts, less appropriations, transfers and adjustments, that have been collected from developers, and not yet spent on DCC projects. In preparing the DCC calculations, the outstanding balances in each of the Roads, Sewer, Water, Drainage and Parks accounts, for both the current District wide and the Northlands DCC accounts, have been subtracted from the total DCCs recoverable to arrive at the net recoverable amounts. It has been assumed that the Ministry will approve the cancellation of the Northlands DCC bylaw and allow the transfer of the Northlands DCC reserve funds to the District wide accounts.

Where is Calculation for Parks done in this section?

2.14 DCC Calculations

DCCs have been calculated in accordance with the Best Practices Guide using a common unit basis for each infrastructure component. Roads project costs are distributed according to estimated traffic generation as defined by the number of average vehicle trip ends on weekdays during the afternoon peak period, for each given land use. Sanitary sewers and waterworks costs are calculated using equivalent population demand, which is based on average population densities per single family, townhouse and apartment dwelling. With respect to storm drainage, costs are distributed on the basis of impervious area for each category. For non-residential land uses, equivalent population densities have also been derived based on persons per square metre of gross floor area occupying a new non-residential building and related facilities.

2.15 Cost Estimates

Cost estimates have been prepared in accordance with provincial guidelines. The estimates are a Class 'D' level of accuracy, meaning that they are based upon staff's design and construction experience, current market conditions and unit costs for the supply of materials, labour and equipment. The estimates are sufficient for making correct investment decisions and obtaining preliminary project approval and funding. By comparison, a Class 'A' estimate is based on complete engineering drawings and specifications prepared prior to calling competitive tenders. Costs are based on estimated 2013 construction costs.

There is no allowance for future inflation, as this is not allowed under the *Local Government Act*. Construction cost increases should be regularly assessed as projects and time proceeds. Project cost estimates should be reviewed on an annual basis and the DCC rate structure amended accordingly.

Annual adjustments of DCC rate structure is highly desirable!

2.16 Interim Financing

The capital costs contained in this report do not include any allowances for interim financing.

2.17 Allocation of Project Costs

For each proposed infrastructure project, costs are allocated between existing development and new growth. To determine the proper allocation for each project, individual projects can be divided into two broad categories:

1. Projects that upgrade the level of service or resolve existing deficiencies; and
2. Projects that are required solely to accommodate new growth.

Projects in the first category provide some benefit to existing development, but they also benefit new growth. In order to allocate the degree of benefit equitably between the existing population and the new growth, the new growth is expressed as a percentage factor (amount of new growth divided by total future population or equivalents). This percentage factor is then applied to the estimated cost of the project in order to determine how much benefit would be attributed to new growth. For projects located within the designated town and village centres (Lynn Valley, Lower Lynn, Lower Capilano and Maplewood), the benefit to growth is deemed to be 100% since significant growth in these areas has triggered the demand for new services and upgrades.

For projects located outside the growth centres or benefiting the entire municipality, the percentage is calculated as the ratio of the estimated 20 year growth in population divided by the estimated total future 2032 population. BC Stats estimate of the District's current population is 88,678; therefore the ratio is:
20,000/88,678 + 20,000 = 0.184 (18.4%).

2.18 DCCs Levied by Other Authorities

In addition to the DCCs levied by the District, developers are often also required to pay regional DCCs. In North Vancouver, the District is required to collect regional DCCs on behalf of Metro Vancouver (Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District) as itemized in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1
METRO VANCOUVER SEWERAGE DCCs

Land Use	Rate
Single Detached Residential Use (per unit)	$1,291
Townhouse Residential Use (per unit)	$1,129
Apartment Residential Use (per unit)	$807
Non-Residential Use (per 1000 sq. ft. of building)	$605

Notes:			DNV Yearly Water Charge
DNV Single Fam Sewerage DCC:	$2525	Metro: $1291	$521
DNV Apartment Sewerage DCC:	$1514	Metro: $809	$423
Ratios:	1.67	1.60	1.23

3. DEVELOPMENT GROWTH PROJECTIONS

3.1 The Planning Process – "*Identity DNV 2030*"

In June 2011, and following a two-year community engagement initiative called *Identity DNV 2030*, the District of North Vancouver adopted its Official Community Plan (OCP). The OCP was developed to provide a comprehensive policy framework that aligns social, environmental, and economic planning to ensure a bright and sustainable future for the District. Over a 20 year timeframe, the OCP identifies capacity for approximately 10,000 net new housing units, corresponding to a population increase of around 20,000 people and 10,000 new jobs. These figures are estimates only. They are provided to help guide planning and are not targets. This growth may or may not occur over the designated planning horizon and will depend on market and other forces, including the capacity of the District's infrastructure.

As outlined in Table 2, approximately 90% of growth will be focused in four key centres and 10% in the remainder of the District.

TABLE 2
DWELLING UNIT COUNT AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Growth Centre	Estimated New Dwelling Units	Estimated Increase in Population
Lynn Valley Town Centre	2,500	5,000
Lower Lynn Town Centre	3,000	6,000
Lower Capilano-Marine Drive Village Centre	2,000	4,000
Maplewood Village Centre	1,500	3,000
Remainder of District	1,000	2,000
Totals	**10,000**	**20,000**

3.2 Single Family Residential

Under the 2011 OCP, new single family units are anticipated to come through the subdivision of existing large single family lots. Subdivision in the recent past has typically occurred at a rate of approximately 10 net new units per year and this trend is not expected to change. Existing adopted Small Lot Infill Areas (SLIAs) have capacity for approximately 40 net new units, with potential SLIAs identified in 1983 having an additional capacity of approximately 85 net new units. There is also subdivision potential in other large lots not contained within previously identified SLIAs.

Summary single family: Projected annual increase: 10 units
2032 20-year projected overall increase: 200 units

In the current DCC bylaw, the single family residential rate structure is divided into four classes (Types 1 to 4) based on homes on larger lots having more persons per dwelling and correspondingly more demand for infrastructure services. Recent census data refutes that assumption. Larger lots or homes do not necessarily have greater population densities per household. For this update, the DCC calculations make use of an average of 3.0 persons per single family dwelling. Since the proposed growth projections call for a total of 10 subdivided lots per year (200 over 20 years), it is recommended that the amended DCC rate structure for single family be reduced from four categories down to one

The aspect of potential secondary suites and/or additional/separate dwelling units - especially on street corner sites, (all parts under a single ownership) would be appropriate to discuss here.

charge for all single family subdivision applications. This proposed revision will also simplify the DCC administration process for the District.

3.3 Multi-Family Residential

The OCP provides significant opportunity for multi-family development in the form of apartments and ground-oriented townhouse or duplex-type units. Of the potential 10,000 net new units, around 9,800 can be anticipated to be multifamily (with 200 net new single family lots as described above). While the implied annual increase of this projection (9,800/20 years = 490) exceeds development activity in the District over the last 10 years (averaging between 100 and 150 net new units per year), the projected growth rate is consistent with growth rates over the last 20 and 30 year horizons. Furthermore, the new OCP provides a more directional approach to growth management and designates sites with higher density than typically contemplated in the past. Growth will occur overwhelmingly within four designated centres (75-90% of all units) and will consist primarily of apartment units (approx. 75% of units).

Summary ground-oriented: Projected annual increase: 120 units
2032 20-year projected overall increase: 2,400 units

Summary apartment: Projected annual increase: 370 units
2032 20-year projected overall increase: 7,400 units

3.4 Household and Unit Size for New Residential Units

Previous DCC work in 1997 set single family units at an average of 3.2 persons per household, with townhouse residential set at 2.7 persons and apartment at 1.6. The 2011 census counted an average of 3.0 persons per single family house, 2.7 persons per townhouse, and 1.8 persons per apartment (blended mid and low-rise). Unit sizes of 116.1 square metres (1250 square feet) for townhouses and 74.3 square metres (800 square feet) are also being maintained as per the 1997 bylaw review, but these figures should be considered placeholders and can be tested against ongoing applications for reasonableness.

missed saying this is for apartments

3.5 Commercial Floor Space

Net new commercial floor space is anticipated to occur primarily within the network of centres. Together, Lynn Valley, Lower Lynn, Lower Capilano, and Maplewood are expected to see an additional 45,522 m^2 of commercial development. Redevelopment of commercial sites outside the network of centres is not anticipated to provide a net increase in floor space, as existing older commercial sites are typically developed to around 0.3 - 0.4 FSR which may redevelop to mixed use buildings whose commercial component is again typically around 0.3 - 0.4 FSR. This is notably the case for the Marine Drive corridor which, while redeveloping substantially, is unlikely to see a notable net increase in commercial floor space. The redevelopment of existing light industrial areas to more business park type uses, however, is anticipated to provide some new commercial floor space. Between 1998 and 2007, commercial floor space growth trended much higher than anticipated at 2,193 m^2 a year, with that trend advancing in recent years (around 2,555 m^2 annually between end 2008 and end 2010). Going forward, overall growth is expected to net 2,500 m^2 annually, for a total of 50,000 m^2 over 20 years, and about 45,000 m^2 of which is within centres.

Summary commercial: Projected annual increase: 2,500 m^2
2032 20-year projected overall increase: 50,000 m2

3.6 Industrial Floor Space

The OCP provides policy direction to intensify and diversify uses in employment land which, together with recent changes to industrial zoning, should facilitate development of industrial floor space.

However, the majority of vacant business park type lands have now been absorbed and any redevelopment of light industrial areas in proximity to the network of centres is likely to increase commercial as much as industrial floor space. The District has less direct influence on development in the heavy industrial, waterfront areas and predicting economic cycles in these sectors is challenging. Individual projects may account for large increases in floor space at intermittent intervals. Between 1998 and 2007, industrial floor space growth trended much lower than anticipated at 6,721 m^2 a year, with a considerable further slowing in recent years (around 3,518 m^2 per year between end 2008 and end 2010). Going forward, a mid-range of recent trend growth of 3,500 m^2 annually can be anticipated.

Summary industrial: Projected annual increase: 3,500 m2
2032 20-year projected overall increase: 70,000 m2

3.7 Institutional Floor Space

The OCP anticipates institutional development to accompany residential growth to ensure the effective provision of community amenities and facilities for an expanded population. Within the four growth centres, a total of 10,219 m^2 of net new institutional floor space is envisioned. Outside the four centres, significant institutional expansion in District assets is not anticipated (the potential Griffin/Delbrook Community Centre consolidation, for example, would not be expected to lead to a net increase in floor space). However, projections regarding other major institutional users such as Capilano University, School District 44, or private hospice/health providers, are hard to make and will only be indirectly influenced by OCP policy. Institutional development between 1998 and 2007 far exceeded expectations at 6,232 m^2 per year, although that trend has since slowed considerably to around 2,521 m^2 annually between end 2008 and end 2010. A further slowing to 2,000 m^2 per year is anticipated going forward.

Summary institutional: Projected annual increase: 2,000 m2
2032 20-year projected overall increase: 40,000 m2

Fig: 1 **Usual DCC Calculation Procedure:**

TOTAL CAPITAL COSTS FOR EACH SERVICE CATEGORY

minus
OTHER REVENUE SOUCES
(anticipated senior governments grants and developer contributions)

minus
BENEFIT TO EXISTING DEVELOPMENT

minus
MUNICIPAL ASSIST FACTOR

minus
CURRENT DCC RESERVE FUNDS

equal
DCC's RECOVERABLE FOR EACH SERVICE CATEGORY

Ref: Figure 1.0 from www.salmonarm.ca/DocumentCenter/View/213

4. ROADS DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES

4.1 Roads DCC Program

Roads DCCs will be collected to assist the District in providing and expanding roads (corridor), cycling, pedestrian and multi-use pathway facilities to serve new developments. The improvements will also benefit existing users. Table 3 summarizes the estimated construction costs for the projects being proposed over the 20 year timeframe, potential grants, DCCs recoverable, and the District's share of the costs.

Table 17 shows only "net" DCC of $28.8m. $4.2m of existing DCC reserves are used. Correction needed?

TABLE 3
ROADS DCC PROGRAM COSTS (in Millions $)

Roads Component	Total Estimated Cost	Anticipated Grants	DCCs Recoverable	District Responsibility
Streets (Corridors)	37.6	4.0	24.9	8.7
Safety/Other	11.9	1.7	8.1	2.1
Total	**49.5**	**5.7**	**33.0**	**10.8**

Tables 12, Appendix 'A" itemizes each of the transportation projects (17 in total) and their respective costs, and DCCs recoverable after apportionment to new development. The estimates include construction, engineering, project administration and a contingency allowance. Table 17, Appendix 'A', outlines the calculations used to derive the proposed Transportation DCC rate structure

DCC Recoverable should be $28.8m (as per Fig 1)

4.2 Traffic Generation and Calculation of Road Impact

The trip generation rates used to calculate the Roads DCCs contained in Table 17, were determined based on the information provided in the Trip Generation Manual, 6th Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The trip generation statistics listed in the Manual were interpreted and aggregated as needed to more accurately reflect the land use categories outlined in the previous section on growth projections. In all cases, the trip generation rates were determined for the afternoon peak hour period. The average trip end (AVTE) rate for single family residential land use is 1.02 trips per dwelling unit. For the townhouse residential land use, a rate of 0.66 trips per dwelling unit was applied. For apartment residential, a rate of 0.50 trips per dwelling unit is used.

The rates provided in the Trip Generation Manual for various commercial, industrial, and institutional uses were reviewed to determine the rates or combinations of rates that best reflect the land uses in the District. The commercial rate represents a planned distribution of 60% retail usage and 40% office usage, resulting in a combined rate of 0.008 trips per square metre of gross floor area. Industrial rates reflect the industrial park and light industrial uses, which have rates of 0.005 trips per square metre of gross floor area. Given the wide range in rates for institutional uses, a blended rate was used covering recent development of institutional land uses in the municipality. The blended rate is 0.004 vehicles per square metre of gross floor area.

Note that much of the I&I project would not be contemplated if no new growth were forecast. Hence ~100% of the benefit and cost of the I&I project should be allocated to new growth.

Also, a program to reduce I&I - akin to maintenance of santitary sewers - is likely not a a legal DCC charge, while replacement by larger sewer pipes is.

5. SANITARY SEWERS DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES

5.1 Sanitary Sewers DCC Program

Sanitary sewer DCCs are based on the premise that upgrading of the existing sanitary sewer system is demanded by population growth. For the District, the program consists of the annual sewer system and sewage lift station upgrading programs, as well as programs to reduce extraneous inflow and infiltration into the sewers. The total future expenditure in 2013 dollars for the program is estimated to be approximately $62.9 Million, with a DCC recoverable amount of $18.3 Million, and the District responsible for $44.6 Million. Table 4 summarizes the Sanitary Sewer DCC program costs, recoverable and the District's share.

TABLE 4
SANITARY SEWER DCC PROGRAM COSTS (in Millions $)

Sewer Component	Total Estimated Cost	Grants	DCCs Recoverable	District Responsibility
Sewer System Upgrading	41.2	Nil	14.3	26.9
Lift Station Upgrading	4.1	Nil	0.8	3.3
Inflow/Infiltration Reduction	17.6	Nil	3.2	14.4
Total	**62.9**	**Nil**	**18.3**	**44.6**

As to the rationale for including the Inflow/Infiltration Reduction (I&I) Program as a DCC recoverable, the original design of the existing sanitary sewer system's required capacity included an allowance for inflow/infiltration (clean groundwater and rainwater that can enter sanitary sewers through small leaks, and improper or undetected direct connections to private storm drainage systems) as well as a capacity allowance for future growth. With many District sanitary sewers, it is being observed that the actual inflow/infiltration (I&I) volumes are exceeding the capacity built into the sewer for handling I&I, and these excess I&I volumes are taking up some or all of the extra capacity originally built into the sewer to handle future growth. This results in little or no capacity for the growth that has and will occur. Instead of replacing existing sewers with larger sewers to accommodate growth, a much more cost effective approach is to restore capacity for growth in the existing sewers by reducing I&I through the I&I Reduction Program. This approach is a more cost effective means of providing the additional sewer capacity needed to accommodate growth in various areas of the municipality.

Say Wedge=inflow Then fixing inflow provides capacity for growth only!

For whom?

S3 of Table 13 ($17.5m) is paid by all. But alternate of expanding capacity would be paid only by DCC's. Note that increased capacity is used exclusively by newcomers. This seems unfair.

5.2 DCC Calculations for Sanitary Sewers

Sanitary sewer DCC calculations reflect estimated sewage flows based on projected growth. Sewage flows generated by non-residential land uses are expressed as a population equivalent. The same process is used to determine waterworks DCCs. Sanitary sewer DCCs have been prepared for three residential and three non-residential categories. The charges are based on the relative impact according to equivalent population demand.

Say Pipe at capacity due to added I&I

Average dwelling densities of 3.0 persons per dwelling unit for single family, 2.7 for townhouse and 1.8 for apartment were used for the residential component to arrive at the overall 20,000 future population figure. A value of 90 persons per hectare (0.009 persons per square metre) was used for commercial and 80 persons per hectare (0.008 persons/sq. m.) for industrial land uses, and 60 persons per hectare (0.004 persons/sq. m.) for institutional land uses.

Dividing the net DCCs recoverable amount by the total equivalent service population results in a DCC per capita. The sanitary sewer DCC for each land use is then established by multiplying the DCC per capita by the average population densities for the respective development units. Tables 13 and 18, Appendix 'A', summarize the list of projects and calculations used to arrive at the proposed sanitary sewers DCCs for the six specified land use categories.

6. WATERWORKS DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES

6.1 Water DCC Program

Impact on the water distribution system arises from both domestic (peak day and peak hour) demand and the requirement to provide adequate flows for fire protection. Dwelling unit population densities which place a demand on the District's water system have been applied in a similar manner to those used for the sanitary sewer system calculations.

Table 5 itemizes the proposed waterworks upgrading programs and their anticipated cost in 2013 dollars over the course of the 20 year program. The total estimated cost in current dollars is $104.0 million. The net DCCs recoverable is anticipated to be approximately $18.9 million with the District responsible for $85.1 Million. Tables 14 and 19, Appendix 'A', summarize the projects and calculations used to arrive at the proposed waterworks DCCs for each of the specified classes of land use.

TABLE 5
WATERWORKS DCC PROGRAM COSTS (in Millions $)

Waterworks Component	Total Estimated Cost	Grants	DCCs Recoverable	District Responsibility
Watermain Upgrading	99.2	Nil	18.1	81.1
Regulating & Pumping Station Upgrades	4.2	Nil	0.7	3.5
Water Reservoir Upgrades	0.6	Nil	0.1	0.5
Total	**104.0**	**Nil**	**18.9**	**85.1**

Of the $104m what fraction is due to growth? (i.e. if there were no growth what would be the "Total Estimated Cost"?)

7. DRAINAGE & FLOOD CONTROL DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES

7.1 Drainage DCC Program

In the District, Drainage DCCs need to be collected to assist with the cost of correcting drainage culvert deficiencies, to upsize storm sewers which don't meet the current engineering design criteria, and to pay for engineering studies needed to complete integrated storm water management plans for various municipal watersheds. Table 6 summarizes the program costs. Total expenditures are estimated at $73.1 million. DCCs recoverable amount to approximately $13.3 Million and the District's share is $59.8 Million.

TABLE 6 DRAINAGE DCC PROGRAM COSTS (in Millions)				
Drainage / Flood Protection Project Component	**Total Estimated Cost**	**Grants**	**DCCs Recoverable**	**District Responsibility**
Short Term Projects (5 Yr Program)	13.9	Nil	2.5	11.4
MediumTerm Projects (6 to 10 Yr Program)	17.1	Nil	3.1	14.0
Long Term Projects (11 to 18 Yr Program)	42.1	Nil	7.7	34.4
Total	**73.1**	**Nil**	**13.3**	**59.8**

7.2 Imperviousness and Calculations of Equivalent Drainage Units

The need for storm drainage works is directly related to the potential runoff generated by developments in different land use zones (and not population). Therefore, drainage DCCs are based on the relative runoff potential for various land uses. The most significant factor that influences the amount of runoff produced is the imperviousness of the development site, and for all intents and purposes, the runoff coefficient is equal to the percentage of impervious area.

Values for the runoff coefficient for various land uses are found in Schedule 'D', Design Criteria Manual, of the District's Development Servicing Bylaw No. 7388. The bylaw can be viewed on the District's website at www.dnv.org/upload/documents/Council_Reports/773013.pdf.

7.3 DCC Calculations for Drainage

Using the runoff coefficients contained in the District's Development Servicing Bylaw, the total amount of impervious surface area for each land use can be calculated. Equivalent Drainage Units (EDUs) are subsequently derived. Dividing the net amount recoverable from DCCs by the total EDUs results in a DCC per EDU. The drainage DCC for each land use is calculated by multiplying the DCC per EDU by the equivalence factor. Tables 15 and 20, Appendix 'A', summarize the proposed short, medium and long term drainage and flood protection improvement programs and the calculations used to derive the Drainage DCCs.

The intent should be to ensure that increase in park requirements due to growth are collected. This will ensure sustainability and allow equitable distribution of parkland across the district.

8. PARKLAND DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES

8.1 Open Space Acquisition Criteria and Evaluation

The intent of the criteria is to ensure that the District acquires properties and open space to augment parks in areas where new development will increase the demand on our facilities. The following criteria will be addressed when reviewing potential parkland acquisition in the four designated growth communities, namely, (1) Capilano-Marine Village Centre, (2) Lynn Valley Town Centre, (3) Lower Lynn Town Centre and (4) Maplewood Village Centre.

Flawed. Leads to race to minimal standard. Monies can be used to supplement areas with park deficiences.

1. **Neighbourhood/Community Growth Areas** - Purchase properties within DNV growth areas where population density is increasing, and there is an existing park deficiency in relation to DNV Parks standards. For example, a site that is in close proximity to future higher density residential areas (i.e. multi-family housing as opposed to single family residential) would

A policy which rates DCC parks charges on unit size rather than anticipated use (eg number of occupants, expected occupant use based on demographics etc) needs justification.

provide more convenient access to a larger number of park users. Preferably, the neighbourhood parks would be in a service area of 1/8 to 1/2 mile (200m to 400m) from the growth nodes to more directly meet the recreational needs of the adjacent neighbourhood.

2. **Proximity to Existing Parks and Open Spaces** - Purchase properties in growth areas adjacent to existing public parks and open space where the purchase of properties would provide added recreational value to the existing parkland area.
3. **Connectivity and Linear Trail Access** - Purchase properties that may improve connectivity and trail linkages, within the context of a larger recreational open space and trail system. These sites should be accessible by a wide range of users by foot, bike, and wheelchair.
4. **Neighbourhood Park Potential** - Purchase properties that possess site conditions that would provide ideal options for "active" neighbourhood recreational needs such as tot lots, playgrounds, seating areas for relaxation, etc. Given that the acquisition strategy falls within developed areas, any purchase of properties would be addressing the growth of "infill" neighbourhoods, and as such, it is anticipated that the size of future neighbourhood parks, in these infill areas, would generally be less than 1/2 an acre (0.2 hectares) in size.
5. **Ecosystem Integrity** - Purchase properties that may be important in terms of preserving the integrity of an ecosystem (i.e. creek area)
6. **Property Cost and Availability** - With finite financial resources, purchase properties that are for sale at relatively attractive prices, and within current market norms where there is a willingness of the property owner to negotiate. Include in the evaluation future maintenance and operational costs for the park.
7. **Park and Open Space Strategic Plan** - Purchase properties that are clearly identified as desirable within the context of the February 2012 draft Parks and Open Space Strategic Plan.

Based on recent analysis carried out by the District's Parks Planning staff, the following is an estimate of the anticipated neighbourhood parkland needs for the four major growth areas of the community:

NOTE:
Allocating "surplus" parkland freely to accommodate new residents is a policy that needs to be discussed with the public.

Table 7
PARKLAND ACQUISITION – MAJOR GROWTH CENTRES

Major Growth Centre	Parkland Requirement	
	hectares	acres
Lynn Valley Town Centre	Nil	Nil
Lower Capilano – Marine	0.16	0.4
Lower Lynn Town Centre	0.40	1.0
Maplewood Village Centre	Nil	Nil
Total	**0.56**	**1.4**

This Table contrasts sharply with my estimated **40** additional hectares (100 acres) required by the extra 20,000 residents over the next 20 yrs!

The estimated cost in 2013 dollars to acquire 1.4 acres of developed properties using a unit cost of $6.5 Million per acre is $9.1 Million.

8.2 Parkland Improvements

Including property acquisition, the total estimated cost of the program in current dollars is expected to amount to $30.2 million. DCCs recoverable are estimated to be approximately $21.2 million with the District responsible for $9.0 Million. Table 8 summarizes the Parkland Improvement and Acquisition DCC program costs.

TABLE 8 PARKLAND IMPROVEMENT & ACQUISITION DCC PROGRAM COSTS (in Millions $)				
Drainage Project Component	**Total Estimated Cost**	**Grants**	**DCCs Recoverable**	**District Responsibility**
Parkland Improvements	21.1	Nil	12.2	8.9
Parkland Acquisition	9.1	Nil	9.0	0.1
Total	**30.2**	**Nil**	**21.2**	**9.0**

estimated at
$650m - not $9m !!

8.3 Calculation of Equivalent Population

Since people generate the need for park and open space, DCCs are based on the relative impact of each land use according to the same equivalent population factors that were used to derive sanitary sewer and waterworks DCCs. The process followed to arrive at the DCC rate structure for parks is as follows:

- divide the net DCCs recoverable amount by the total increase in population to obtain a per capita DCC; and
- multiply the DCC per capita by the population density for the respective development unit.

Tables 16 and 21, Appendix 'A', contain the list of parkland improvement capital projects for the proposed 20 year period and the calculations carried out to derive the charges.

It has been assumed that employees of commercial, industrial and institutional zones use parkland some of the time for leisure and recreational purposes. For commercial and institutional, the assumption made is that 15% of the growth in employee population will occasionally make use of our parks; and for industrial land uses, a value of 10% of the projected employee growth population has been used to allocate the charges.

9. SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT COSTS AND PROPOSED CHARGES

9.1 General

Table 9 summarizes the overall anticipated 20 year capital expenditure program, potential grants, DCCs recoverable, and the District's estimated share of the costs of the infrastructure program.

TABLE 9
SUMMARY OF CAPITAL PROGRAM & DCC RECOVERY (in Millions $)

Program Component	Total Estimated Cost	Grants	DCCs Recoverable	District Responsibility
Roads	49.5	(5.7)	33.0	10.8
Sanitary Sewers	62.9	Nil	18.3	44.6
Waterworks	104.0	Nil	18.9	85.1
Drainage / Flood Control	73.1	Nil	13.3	59.8
Parks	30.2	Nil	21.2	9.0
Total	**319.7**	**(5.7)**	**104.7**	**209.3**

Table 10 outlines the amended District wide 2012 DCC rate structure for each of the designated classes of land use. The rates are considered preliminary and subject to review and approval by Council and the Ministry (Local Government Finance Division).

TABLE 10
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AREA WIDE DCC's

1998 DCC rates

Class of Land Use	Roads	Sewers	Water	Drainage	Parks	Total
Single Family Residential (per dwelling unit)	SF >9000sq-ft lot: $3,559 / $4,596.47 SF <9000sq-ft lot: $3,381	$120 / 2,534.64 $105	$1,401 / $2,462.12 $1,226	$508 / $4,209.91 $339	$12,914 / 2,210.34 $11,300	$18,502 / **$16,003.50** $16,351
Residential Multi-Family Ground Oriented (per square metre of gross floor area)	$25.61	$19.57	$19.08	$14.28	$17.13	**$95.67**
Residential Multi-Family Apartment (per square metre of gross floor area)	$15.75 / $30.30	$0.52 / $20.37	$6.00 / $19.87	$0.79 / $12.87	$55.27 / $17.84	$78.32 / **$101.25**
Commercial (per square metre of gross floor area)	$36.05	$0.94 / $7.57	$7.39	$7.65	$8.08 / $0.99	**$59.66**
Industrial (per square metre of gross floor area)	$22.53	$0.32 / $6.73	$6.57	$7.65	$0.52	**$44.00**
Institutional (per square metre of gross floor area)	$18.03	$0.49 / $5.05	$4.92	$8.75	$4.18 / $0.55	**$37.30**

Table 10 shows little change in overall DCC rates since 1998. This is unexpected. Take for example, the change in DCC rates for City of Langley (http://www.city.langley.bc.ca/index.php/business/development-costs) which for single family homes (2005-->2013) went from $11,163 to $20,494.

Table 11 outlines the current DCC rates (excluding the Northlands Specified Area) which were adopted by Council on September 28, 1998.

Table 11
Current District of North Vancouver DCC Rate Structure (DCC Bylaws 6945 & 7135)
(Effective September 28, 1998)

Class of Land Use	Roads	Sanitary Sewers	Water Works	Drainage	Parks	Total DCC's Recoverable
RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY TYPE 1 (per dwelling unit - lot area greater than or equal to 9000 sq. ft)	$3,559	$120	$1,401	$508	$12,914	**$18,502**
RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY TYPE 2 (per dwelling unit -lot area 7000 to 9000 s.f.)	$3,381	$105	$1,226	$339	$11,300	**$16,351**
RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY TYPE 3 (per dwelling unit - lot area 5000 s.f. to 7000 s.f.)	$3,292	$96	$1,121	$305	$10,331	**$15,145**
RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY TYPE 4 (per dwelling unit -lot area less than or equal to 5,000 s.f.)	$3,203	$90	$1,051	$271	$9,685	**$14,300**
RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE FAMILY per square metre of gross floor area	$15.75	$0.52	$6.00	$0.79	$55.27	**$78.32**
COMMERCIAL per square metre of gross floor area	$15.32	$0.94	$10.93	$2.37	$8.08	**$37.64**
INDUSTRIAL per square metre of gross floor area	$7.17	$0.32	$3.77	$1.10	$1.39	**$13.75**
INSTITUTIONAL per square metre of gross floor area	$15.32	$0.49	$5.65	$1.46	$4.18	**$27.10**

9.4 Content of Appendices

Appendix 'A' includes Tables 12 through 29 inclusive (DNV Document No. 1976468) covering each of the roads, sanitary sewers, waterworks, drainage/flood protection, and parkland improvements and acquisition capital programs, the DCC calculations spreadsheets, and a comparison of the District's current and proposed rates with those currently being charged by several other lower mainland municipalities.

Appendix 'B' contains a draft of the proposed amending DCC District-wide bylaw.

APPENDIX 'A'

TABLES (Refer to Document No. 1976468)

CAPITAL PROJECTS

Table 12 – Roads DCC Projects and Allocations
Table 13 – Sanitary Sewers DCC Projects and Allocations
Table 14 – Waterworks DCC Projects and Allocations
Table 15 – Drainage & Flood Protection DCC Projects and Allocations
Table 16 – Parkland Improvements and Acquisition DCC Projects and Allocations

DCC CALCULATIONS

Table 17 – Roads DCC Calculations
Table 18 – Sanitary Sewers DCC Calculations
Table 19 – Waterworks DCC Calculations
Table 20 – Drainage & Flood Protection DCC Calculations
Table 21 – Parkland Improvements and Acquisition DCC Calculations
Table 22 – Summary of Proposed Area Wide DCCs (repeat of Table 10)
Table 23 – Current DNV DCCs (September 1998 – repeat of Table 11)

COMPARISON OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED DCCs WITH OTHER LOWER MAINLAND MUNICIPALITIES

Table 24 – Comparison of Single Family Residential DCCs
Table 25 – Comparison of Townhouse Residential DCCs
Table 26 – Comparison of Apartment Residential DCCs
Table 27 – Comparison of Commercial DCCs
Table 28 – Comparison of Industrial DCCs
Table 29 – Comparison of Institutional DCCs

TABLE 12
THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
ANTICIPATED CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PROGRAM (2013 - 2032)
ROADS PROJECTS
DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES ALLOCATION

	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	EST. EXPEND. (2013 $)	COST APPORTIONMENT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT				DCC ALLOCATION		
			GRANTS	EXPEND. AFTER GRANTS	%COST (Note 2)	COST	CDNV ($) 1% AF Note (1)	TOTAL DCCs RECOVERABLE	TOTAL DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITY
ROADS									
R1	East Keith Road Extension - Mountain Hwy to Fern St (Corridor)	$2,845,000	$0	$2,845,000	100.0	$2,845,000	$28,450	$2,816,550	$28,450
R2	Mountain Highway Improvements - Main St to Fern St (Corridor)	$4,338,000	$0	$4,338,000	100.0	$4,338,000	$43,380	$4,294,620	$43,380
R3	Mountain Hwy - Ross Road to Crayford Close (Corridor)	$5,087,000	$0	$5,087,000	100.0	$5,087,000	$50,870	$5,036,130	$50,870
R4	East 27th St - Lynn Valley Rd to Mountain Hwy (Corridor)	$1,195,000	$0	$1,195,000	100.0	$1,195,000	$11,950	$1,183,050	$11,950
R5	Capilano Rd - Marine Dr to Fullerton Ave (Corridor)	$2,332,000	$0	$2,332,000	100.0	$2,332,000	$23,320	$2,308,680	$23,320
R6	Lynn Valley Rd - Mountain Hwy to Highway #1 (Safety / Other)	$4,140,000	$1,035,000	$3,105,000	100.0	$3,105,000	$31,050	$3,073,950	$31,050
R7	Main Street Improvements - Lynn Creek to Mountain Hwy (Corridor)	$619,000	$309,500	$309,500	100.0	$309,500	$3,095	$306,405	$3,095
R8	Mountain Highway - Lynn Valley Rd to Harold Road (Corridor)	$300,000	$0	$300,000	100.0	$300,000	$3,000	$297,000	$3,000
R9	Marine Drive Transportation Improvements (Safety / Other)	$4,500,000	$0	$4,500,000	100.0	$4,500,000	$45,000	$4,455,000	$45,000
R10	East 27th St - Mountain Highway to 55m east (Corridor)	$83,000	$0	$83,000	100.0	$83,000	$830	$82,170	$830
R11	Riverside Drive - Old Dollarton Rd to Mt. Seymour Pkwy (Corridor)	$3,300,000	$1,650,000	$1,650,000	100.0	$1,650,000	$16,500	$1,633,500	$16,500
R12	East Keith Road - Mountain Hwy to east of Lynn Creek Bridge (Corridor & Bridge)	$13,464,000	$0	$13,464,000	50.0	$6,732,000	$67,320	$6,664,680	$6,799,320
R13	Marine Drive - Capilano Rd to Mackay Ave (Corridor)	$4,080,000	$2,040,000	$2,040,000	18.4	$375,360	$3,754	$371,606	$1,668,394
R14	Pemberton Ave - West 1st St to Marine Dr (Safety / Other)	$216,000	$0	$216,000	18.4	$39,744	$397	$39,347	$176,653
R15	Mountain Highway - Keith Rd to Lynn Valley Rd (Safety / Other)	$1,815,000	$453,800	$1,361,200	18.4	$250,461	$2,505	$247,956	$1,113,244
R16	East 29th Street - Lonsdale Ave to Lynn Valley Rd (Safety / Other)	$635,000	$63,500	$571,500	18.4	$105,156	$1,052	$104,104	$467,396
R17	Dollarton Hwy - Dollarton Bridge to Mt Seymour Pkwy (Safety / Other)	$574,000	$143,500	$430,500	18.4	$79,212	$792	$78,420	$352,080
TOTAL - ROADS		**$49,523,000**	**$5,695,300**	**$43,827,700**		**$33,326,433**	**$333,264**	**$32,993,168**	**$10,834,532**

Footnotes:

1 Based on a 1.0% Municipal Assist Factor (AF).

2 Unless otherwise shown, cost apportionment to new development is calculated by using the following ratio:
Estimated increase in population between 2013 and 2030 = 20,000 / 88,678 + 20,000 = 18.4%

3 Capital expenditures are in current (2013) dollars and subject to annual review.

4 All estimated expenditures include allowances for engineering design, contingencies and project management services.

TABLE 14
THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
ANTICIPATED CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PROGRAM (2013 - 2032)
WATERWORKS PROJECTS
DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES ALLOCATION

	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE (2013 $)	COST APPORTIONMENT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT		DCC ALLOCATION		
			% COST APPORTIONMENT (Note 2)	APPORTIONMENT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT ($)	CDNV ($) 1% AF Note (1)	DCC RECOVERABLE	TOTAL DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITY
WATERWORKS							
W1	Watermain Upgrading Program	$99,203,000	18.4	$18,253,352	$182,534	$18,070,818	$81,132,182
W2	Pressure Regulating Valve Stations Upgrading Program	$2,273,000	18.4	$418,232	$4,182	$414,050	$1,858,950
W3	Water Pumping Stations Upgrading Program	$1,961,000	18.4	$360,824	$3,608	$357,216	$1,603,784
W4	Water Reservoirs	$603,000	18.4	$110,952	$1,110	$109,842	$493,158
TOTAL - WATERWORKS		**$104,040,000**		**$19,143,360**	**$191,434**	**$18,951,926**	**$85,088,074**

Footnotes:

1 Based on a 1.0% Municipal Assist Factor (AF).

2 Unless otherwise shown, cost apportionment to new development is calculated by using the following ratio:
Estimated increase in population between 2013 and 2030 = 20,000 / 88,678 + 20,000 = 18.4%

3 Capital expenditures are in current (2013) dollars and subject to annual review.

4 All estimated expenditures include allowances for engineering design, contingencies and project management services.

TABLE 13
THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
ANTICIPATED CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PROGRAM (2013 - 2032)
SANITARY SEWERS PROJECTS
DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES ALLOCATION

	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE (2013 $)	COST APPORTIONMENT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT		DCC ALLOCATION		
			% COST APPORTIONMENT (Note 2)	APPORTIONMENT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT ($)	CDNV ($) 1% AF Note (1)	DCC RECOVERABLE	TOTAL DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITY
SANITARY SEWERS							
S1	Lift Station Upgrading Program	$4,108,000	18.4	$755,872	$7,559	$748,313	$3,359,687
S2	Sanitary Sewer Upgrading Program	$32,742,000	18.4	$6,024,528	$60,245	$5,964,283	$26,777,717
S3	Inflow / Infiltration Reduction Program	$17,594,000	18.4	$3,237,296	$32,373	$3,204,923	$14,389,077
S4	Town Centres - Sewer Upgrades	$8,418,000	100.0	$8,418,000	$84,180	$8,333,820	$84,180
TOTAL - SANITARY SEWERS		**$62,862,000**		**$18,435,696**	**$184,357**	**$18,251,339**	**$44,610,661**

Footnotes:

1 Based on a 1.0% Municipal Assist Factor (AF).

2 Unless otherwise shown, cost apportionment to new development is calculated by using the following ratio:
Estimated increase in population between 2013 and 2030 = 20,000 / 88,678 + 20,000 = 18.4%

3 Capital expenditures are in current (2013) dollars and subject to annual review.

4 All estimated expenditures include allowances for engineering design, contingencies and project management services.

TABLE 15
THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
ANTICIPATED CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PROGRAM (2013 - 2032)
DRAINAGE AND FLOOD PROTECTION WORKS PROJECTS
DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES ALLOCATION

	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE (2013 $)	COST APPORTIONMENT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT		DCC ALLOCATION		
			% COST APPORTIONMENT (Note 2)	APPORTIONMENT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT ($)	CDNV ($) 1% AF Note (1)	DCC RECOVERABLE	TOTAL DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITY
DRAINAGE, FLOOD PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL							
D1	Short Term 5 Year Program	$13,934,000	18.40	$2,563,856	$25,639	$2,538,217	$11,395,783
D2	Medium Term 6 to 10 Year Program	$17,076,000	18.40	$3,141,984	$31,420	$3,110,564	$13,965,436
D3	Long Term 11 to 20 Year Program	$42,104,000	18.40	$7,747,136	$77,471	$7,669,665	$34,434,335
TOTAL - DRAINAGE AND FLOOD PROTECTION WORKS		**$73,114,000**		**$13,452,976**	**$134,530**	**$13,318,446**	**$59,795,554**

Footnotes:

1 Based on a 1.0% Municipal Assist Factor (AF).

2 Unless otherwise shown, cost apportionment to new development is calculated by using the following ratio:
Estimated increase in population between 2013 and 2030 = 20,000 / 88,678 + 20,000 = 18.4%

3 Capital expenditures are in current (2013) dollars and subject to annual review.

4 All estimated expenditures include allowances for engineering design, contingencies and project management services.

TABLE 16
THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
ANTICIPATED CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PROGRAM (2013 - 2032)
PARKLAND IMPROVEMENTS & ACQUISITION PROJECTS
DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES ALLOCATION

	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE (2013 $)	COST APPORTIONMENT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT		DCC ALLOCATION		
			% COST APPORTIONMENT (Note 2)	APPORTIONMENT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT ($)	CDNV ($) 1% AF Note (1)	DCC RECOVERABLE	TOTAL DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITY
PARKS CAPITAL PROJECTS							
	Parkland Improvements						
P1	Lynn Valley Town Centre Park	$3,000,000	100.0	$3,000,000	$30,000	$2,970,000	$30,000
P2	Lower Lynn Town Centre Park	$2,750,000	100.0	$2,750,000	$27,500	$2,722,500	$27,500
P3	Lower Capilano Town Centre Park	$2,500,000	100.0	$2,500,000	$25,000	$2,475,000	$25,000
P4	Maplewood Village Centre	$1,750,000	100.0	$1,750,000	$17,500	$1,732,500	$17,500
P5	Cates Park / Wey-ah-wichen Washrooms and Changerooms	$500,000	18.4	$92,000	$920	$91,080	$408,920
P6	Cates Park Washroom at Boat Launch	$100,000	18.4	$18,400	$184	$18,216	$81,784
P7	Inter-River Tournament Washroom with Changerooms	$500,000	18.4	$92,000	$920	$91,080	$408,920
P8	William Griffin ATF Washroom	$300,000	18.4	$55,200	$552	$54,648	$245,352
P9	Norgate Park Washroom and Changeroom	$500,000	18.4	$92,000	$920	$91,080	$408,920
P10	Turf Field (drainage, fencing, and landscaping)	$855,000	50.0	$427,500	$4,275	$423,225	$431,775
P11	Sportsfield Program	$1,500,000	18.4	$276,000	$2,760	$273,240	$1,226,760
P12	Barrier Free Play Grounds	$1,000,000	18.4	$184,000	$1,840	$182,160	$817,840
P13	Waterfront Trails	$1,000,000	18.4	$184,000	$1,840	$182,160	$817,840
P14	Alpine Trails	$1,000,000	18.4	$184,000	$1,840	$182,160	$817,840
P15	Urban Trails (Trails and Structures)	$2,500,000	18.4	$460,000	$4,600	$455,400	$2,044,600
P16	Cates Park / Wey-ah-wichen Site Improvements - landscape/fence/trails/drainage/playground	$300,000	18.4	$55,200	$552	$54,648	$245,352
P17	Lillooet Park Neighbourhood Park- landscape/fence/drainage/trails/playground	$250,000	18.4	$46,000	$460	$45,540	$204,460
P18	Maplewood Farm Improvements - Washroom	$320,000	18.4	$58,880	$589	$58,291	$261,709
P19	Inter-River Trails (DNV Boundary to Lynn Canyon Park)	$480,000	18.4	$88,320	$883	$87,437	$392,563
	Parkland Acquisition						
P20	Parkland Acquisition Program	$9,100,000	100.0	$9,100,000	$91,000	$9,009,000	$91,000
TOTAL - PARKS CAPITAL PROJECTS		**$30,205,000**		**$21,413,500**	**$214,135**	**$21,199,365**	**$9,005,635**

Footnotes:
1 Based on a 1.0% Municipal Assist Factor (AF).
2 Unless otherwise shown, cost apportionment to new development is calculated by using the following ratio:
Estimated increase in population between 2013 and 2030 = 20,000 / 88,678 + 20,000 = 18.4%
3 Capital expenditures are in current (2013) dollars and subject to annual review.
4 All estimated expenditures include allowances for engineering design, contingencies and project management services

This figures seems to be far too low? (amounting to only $910 per new residential unit) Needs justification by staff.

TABLE 17
Roads DCC Calculations

Land Use	Col. (1) Est New Developmnt (2013 - 2030)	Units	Col. (2) Wt. Trip Rate (AVTE, pm Pk Hr per unit)	Col. (3)= (1) x (2) Total Trip Ends
A: Traffic Generation Calculations				
Single Family Residential	200	dwelling units	1.020	204
Townhouse Residential	2,400	dwelling units	0.660	1,584
Apartment Residential	7,400	dwelling units	0.500	3,700
Commercial	50,000	per m^2 gross floor area	0.008	400
Industrial	70,000	per m^2 gross floor area	0.005	350
Institutional	40,000	per m^2 gross floor area	0.004	160
			Total Trip Ends	**6,398**
B: Unit Road DCC Calculations				
Net Road DCC Program Recoverable				$32,993,168
Less Existing Road DCC Reserve Monies (Combined By-laws)				($4,161,562)
Net Amount to be Paid by DCCs				$28,831,606
DCC per Trip End				$4,506
C: Total DCCs Recoverable				
Single Family Residential	200	dwelling units	1.020	$919,295
Townhouse Residential	2,400	dwelling units	0.660	$7,138,053
Apartment Residential	7,400	dwelling units	0.500	$16,673,483
Commercial	50,000	per m^2 gross floor area	0.008	$1,802,539
Industrial	70,000	per m^2 gross floor area	0.005	$1,577,221
Institutional	40,000	per m^2 gross floor area	0.004	$721,015
			Total	$28,831,606
D. Resulting Road DCCs				
Single Family Residential	$ 4,596.47	per dwelling unit		
Townhouse Residential	$ 25.61	per m^2 gross floor area		
Apartment Residential	$ 30.30	per m^2 gross floor area		
Commercial	$ 36.05	per m^2 gross floor area		
Industrial	$ 22.53	per m^2 gross floor area		
Institutional	$ 18.03	per m^2 gross floor area		

NOTES:

1. Townhouse residential (including duplex and triplex developments) DCCs recoverable per square metre of gross floor area are based on an average unit size of 116.13 sq.m. or 1,250 sq. ft.
2. Apartment residential DCCs recoverable per square metre of gross floor area are based on an average unit size of 74.35 sq.m. or 800 sq. ft.

TABLE 18
Sanitary Sewer DCC Calculations

	Col. (1)		Col. (2)		Col. (3) =(1)x(2)
Land Use	**Estimated New Developmt**	**Units**	**Density or Equivalent Population Factor**		**Equivalent Population**
A: Equivalent Population Calculation					
Single Family Residential	200	dwelling units	3.000	persons per dwelling unit	600
Townhouse Residential	2,400	dwelling units	2.700	persons per dwelling unit	6,480
Apartment Residential	7,400	dwelling units	1.800	persons per dwelling unit	13,320
Commercial	50,000	m^2 gross floor area	0.009	persons per m^2 gross floor area	450
Industrial	70,000	m^2 gross floor area	0.008	persons per m^2 gross floor area	560
Institutional	40,000	m^2 gross floor area	0.006	persons per m^2 gross floor area	240
				Total Equivalent Population	21,650 (a)
B: Unit DCC Calculation					
Net Sanitary DCC Program Recoverable			$18,251,339.04	(b)	
Less Sanitary DCC Reserve Monies (Combined DCC Bylaws)			($31,832.00)	(c1)	
Net Amount to be paid by DCC's			$18,219,507.04	(d) = (b) - (c1+c2)	
DCC per Equivalent Person			$841.55	(e) = (d) / (a)	
C: Resulting Sanitary Sewer DCCs					
Single Family Residential	$ 2,524.64	per dwelling unit	(e) x Col. (2)		
Townhouse Residential	$ 19.57	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Apartment Residential	$ 20.37	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Commercial	$ 7.57	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Industrial	$ 6.73	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Institutional	$ 5.05	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		

NOTES:

TABLE 19
Waterworks DCC Calculations

	Col. (1)		Col. (2)		Col. (3) =(1)x(2)
Land Use	**Estimated New Developmt (2013-2030)**	**Units**	**Density or Equivalent Population Factor**		**Equivalent Population**
A: Equivalent Population Calculation					
Single Family Residential	200	dwelling units	3.000	persons per dwelling unit	600
Townhouse Residential	2,400	dwelling units	2.700	persons per dwelling unit	6,480
Apartment Residential	7,400	dwelling units	1.800	persons per dwelling unit	13,320
Commercial	50,000	m^2 gross floor area	0.009	persons per m^2 gross floor area	450
Industrial	70,000	m^2 gross floor area	0.008	persons per m^2 gross floor area	560
Institutional	40,000	m^2 gross floor area	0.006	persons per m^2 gross floor area	240
				Total Equivalent Population	21,650 (a)
B: Unit DCC Calculation					
Net Water DCC Program Recoverable			$ 18,951,926.40	(b)	
Less Water DCC Reserve Monies (Combined Bylaws)			($1,183,609.00)	(c1)	
Add DCC Water Reserve Funds Allocated to the 2012 Budget				(c3)	
Net Amount to be paid by DCC's			$ 17,768,317.40	(d) = (b) - (c1+c2) +(c3)	
DCC per Equivalent Person			$ 820.71	(e) = (d) / (a)	
C: Resulting Waterworks DCCs					
Single Family Residential	$ 2,462.12	per dwelling unit	(e) x Col. (2)		
Townhouse Residential	$ 19.08	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Apartment Residential	$ 19.87	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Commercial	$ 7.39	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Industrial	$ 6.57	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Institutional	$ 4.92	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		

NOTES:

TABLE 20
Drainage & Flood Protection Works DCC Calculations

	Col. (1)	Col. (2)	Col. (3)	Col. (4) =[(1) / (2)] x (3)	Col. (5)	Col. (6)	Col. (7) = (5) x (6)
Land Use	**Unit of Dev.**	**Density / FSR / Site Coverage**	**Runoff Coefficient**	**Impervious Area per Unit Dev. (m^2)**	**Equivalence factor**	**Est. New Developmt. (2013-2030)**	**Equivalent Drainage Units**
A: Drainage Impact Calculation							
Single Family Residential	1	10 lots per gross ha	0.55	550.00 (a)	1.0000 (a) / (a)	200	200
Townhouse Residential	1	30 units per gross ha	0.65	216.67 (b)	0.3939 (b) / (a)	2,400	945
Apartment Residential	1	60 units per gross ha	0.75	125.00 (c)	0.2273 (c) / (a)	7,400	1,682
Commercial	1	85% site coverage	0.85	1.00 (d)	0.0018 (d) / (a)	50,000	91
Industrial	1	85% site coverage	0.85	1.00 (e)	0.0018 (e) / (a)	70,000	127
Institutional	1	70% site coverage	0.80	1.14 (f)	0.0021 (f) / (a)	40,000	83
						Total EDU's	**3,129** (h)

B: Unit DCC Calculation		
Net Storm Drainage DCC Program recoverable	$ 13,318,446.24	(i)
Less Drainage DCC Reserve Monies (Combined Bylaws)	($147,429.00)	(j)
Net Amount to be paid by DCC's	$ 13,171,017.24	(k) = (i) - (j)
DCC per Equivalent Drainage Unit	$ 4,209.91	(l) = (k) / (h)

C: Resulting Storm Drainage DCCs			
Single Family Residential	$ 4,209.91	per dwelling unit	(l) x col (5)
Townhouse Residential	$ 14.28	per m^2 gross floor area	(l) x col (5)
Apartment Residential	$ 12.87	per m^2 gross floor area	(l) x col (5)
Commercial	$ 7.65	per m^2 gross floor area	(l) x col (5)
Industrial	$ 7.65	per m^2 gross floor area	(l) x col (5)
Institutional	$ 8.75	per m^2 gross floor area	(l) x col (5)

NOTES:

TABLE 21
Parkland Improvements & Acquisition DCC Calculations

Land Use	Col. (1) Estimated New Developmnt (2013-2030)	Units	Col. (2) Density or Equivalent Population Factor		Col. (3) = (1)x(2) Equivalent Population
A: Equivalent Population Calculation					
Single Family Residential	200	dwelling units	3.000	persons per dwelling unit	600
Townhouse Residential	2,400	dwelling units	2.700	persons per dwelling unit	6,480
Apartment Residential	7,400	dwelling units	1.800	persons per dwelling unit	13,320
Commercial	50,000	m^2 gross floor area	0.001	persons per m^2 gross floor ar	68
Industrial	70,000	m^2 gross floor area	0.001	persons per m^2 gross floor ar	49
Institutional	40,000	m^2 gross floor area	0.001	persons per m^2 gross floor ar	30
				Total Equivalent Population	20,517 (a)
B: Unit DCC Calculation					
Net Parkland DCC Program Recoverable			$ 21,199,365.00	(b)	
Less existing Parkland DCC Reserve Monies (Combined Bylaws)			($6,083,207.00)	(c1)	
Net Amount to be paid by DCC's			$ 15,116,158.00	(d) = (b) - (c1) +(c2) + (c3)	
DCC per Equivalent Person			$736.78	(e) = (d) / (a)	
C: Resulting Parks DCCs					
Single Family Residential	$ 2,210.34	per dwelling unit	(e) x Col. (2)		
Townhouse Residential	$ 17.13	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Apartment Residential	$ 17.84	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Commercial	$ 0.99	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Industrial	$ 0.52	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		
Institutional	$ 0.55	per m^2 gross floor area	(e) x Col. (2)		

NOTES:

TABLE 22
Summary of Proposed DNV Area Wide DCC's

Class of Land Use	Roads	Sanitary Sewers	Water Works	Drainage	Parks	Total DCC's Recoverable
SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL per dwelling unit	$ 4,596.47	$ 2,524.64	$ 2,462.12	$ 4,209.91	$ 2,210.34	**$ 16,003.50**
TOWNHOUSE RESIDENTIAL per square metre of gross floor area	$ 25.61	$ 19.57	$ 19.08	$ 14.28	$ 17.13	**$ 95.67**
APARTMENT RESIDENTIAL per square metre of gross floor area	$ 30.30	$ 20.37	$ 19.87	$ 12.87	$ 17.84	**$ 101.25**
COMMERCIAL per square metre of gross floor area	$ 36.05	$ 7.57	$ 7.39	$ 7.65	$ 0.99	**$ 59.66**
INDUSTRIAL per square metre of gross floor area	$ 22.53	$ 6.73	$ 6.57	$ 7.65	$ 0.52	**$ 44.00**
INSTITUTIONAL per square metre of gross floor area	$ 18.03	$ 5.05	$ 4.92	$ 8.75	$ 0.55	**$ 37.30**

My "Simple" Calculations on DCC for Parks

1) Expect 20,000 people in 20yrs

2) This means about 10,000 residential units (mostly mult-family)

3) Parkland DCC/unit = cost to supply added parks / 10,000

4) Park requirement for 20,000 additional residents according to OCP would be ~ 40 hectares (100 acres) . Estimated cost to purchase ~ $650,000,000 (based on page 15 estimates)

5) DCC (**parks only**) = $650,000,000 / 10,000 units =**$65,000/unit**

The staff report proposes to charge about 30 times less. Why?

Extract from City of New Westminster 2008 report:
http://www.newwestcity.ca/council_minutes/0908_08/CW/Reports/CW%202.pdf

*Based on the proposed **target ratio of 2.22 ha/1000 population**, a total of approximately 40 ha of new parks space is desired. The DCC program focuses only on the park and open space needs of the anticipated future populations and does not address the current parkland inventory standard shortfall...* (page 5)

*In order to meet the parks space ratio target, 40 ha of new parks space needs to be acquired and developed. Given the highly urbanized nature of New Westminster, this approach will likely require the acquisition of existing single family parcels on the Mainland and Queensborough coupled with strategic acquisitions on the Mainland waterfront area. The estimated cost for property acquisition and parks development is approximately $230M which was found to be unrealistic as it would make the DCC rates in New Westminster the most expensive in the Lower Mainland (e.g. Single family DCC for Queensborough would be **$86,000** per unit versus the next highest for Surrey (large lot) which is at $23,000 per unit). Ostensibly, this DCC rate would stop development in the City and likely would not be approved by the Province.* (page 5)

Proposed Soln:Subsidize Growth

2. Use of existing City lands coupled with strategic acquisition of private lands to meet partial park needs
In order to establish a more reasonable Parks DCC program, a modified approach to the DCC Parks program has been developed whereby a lower target ratio of parkland to population would be provided and some currently owned City lands would be developed for Parks use. Several underlying principles/assumptions have been used to guide decisions related to park land acquisition and development:

1) A recommended overall park area to population ratio target of between 1.3-2.2ha/1000 population be applied. This target range will be achieved through a combination of lands identified through the DCC program coupled with additional acquisition opportunities.

2) Wherever possible, existing City owned lands (including rights-of-way and streets), will be considered for possible conversion/adaptation for park use.

3) Industrial lands will not be considered for conversion to park use. Where feasible, waterfront trails along industrial lands will be encouraged.

4) Where land purchase is not possible or practical, easements or rights-of way over private lands will be considered to secure the use of land for park purposes.

This approach reduces the amount of private lands to be acquired and establishes a more reasonable DCC. It provides approximately 23.5 ha of park lands having an estimated property value of roughly $30M of which $8M is the value of private property which is to be acquired through DCC funding and $22M is the value of City owned property proposed for park development. This is a significant overall City contribution towards the DCC program. (page 6)

.....

The Province has advised that if a DCC is waived or reduced, the funding shortfall must be made up from general revenues, capital reserves, or other funding sources. These are not costs that can be passed on to other new development. (page 12)

Table 23
Current District of North Vancouver DCC Rate Structure (DCC Bylaws 6945 & 7135)
(Effective September 28, 1998)

Class of Land Use	Roads	Sanitary Sewers	Water Works	Drainage	Parks	Total DCC's Recoverable
RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY TYPE 1 (per dwelling unit - lot area greater than or equal to 9000 sq. ft)	$3,559	$120	$1,401	$508	$12,914	**$18,502**
RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY TYPE 2 (per dwelling unit -lot area 7000 to 9000 s.f.)	$3,381	$105	$1,226	$339	$11,300	**$16,351**
RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY TYPE 3 (per dwelling unit - lot area 5000 s.f. to 7000 s.f.)	$3,292	$96	$1,121	$305	$10,331	**$15,145**
RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY TYPE 4 (per dwelling unit -lot area less than or equal to 5,000 s.f.)	$3,203	$90	$1,051	$271	$9,685	**$14,300**
RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE FAMILY	$30.30	$20.37	$19.87	$12.87	**$17.84**	$101.25
per square metre of gross floor area	$15.75	$0.52	$6.00	$0.79	$55.27	**$78.32**
(per square foot)	($1.46)	($0.05)	($0.56)	($0.07)	($5.13)	**($7.28)**
COMMERCIAL						
per square metre of gross floor area	$15.32	$0.94	$10.93	$2.37	$8.08	**$37.64**
(per square foot)	($1.42)	($0.09)	($1.02)	($0.22)	($0.75)	**($3.50)**
INDUSTRIAL						
per square metre of gross floor area	$7.17	$0.32	$3.77	$1.10	$1.39	**$13.75**
(per square foot)	($0.67)	($0.03)	($0.35)	($0.10)	($0.13)	**($1.28)**
INSTITUTIONAL						
per square metre of gross floor area	$15.32	$0.49	$5.65	$1.46	$4.18	**$27.10**
(per square foot)	($1.42)	($0.05)	($0.53)	($0.14)	($0.39)	**($2.52)**

Proposed/sq-m

Proposed DCC for Parks : **$17.84/sq-m for multi-family**
Previous DCC for Parks: **$55.27/sq-m for multi-family**
Expected DCC for parks (based on increased land value is in excess of $100/sq-m - approx $10/sq-ft)

TABLE 24
Comparison of Typical DCC Rates ($) in Various Lower Mainland Municipalities for Single Family Residential Land Use

Municipality	Roads	Sanitary Sewers	Water Works	Drainage	Parks	Total DCC's Recoverable (per Dwelling Unit)
City of Surrey (March 2012) (RF, RF-G, RF-SS, RF-12 Zones)	$ 13,582	$ 2,238	$ 1,714	$ 3,352	$ 5,362	**$ 26,248**
Township of Langley (July 2008 - Residential 1)	$ 8,814	$ 879	$ 2,051	$ 3,663	$ 10,700	**$ 26,107**
City of N. Westminster - Queensborough (Jan. 2012 - Based on 7000 sq. ft. lot area)	$ 5,250	$ 2,240	$ 210	$ 140	$ 16,310	**$ 24,150**
City of Coquitlam (March 2008 - lots 555 sq.m. or greater)	$ 9,261	$ 568	$ 1,943	$ 4,763	$ 7,053	**$ 23,588**
City of Richmond (July 2007)	$ 4,682	$ 2,315	$ 768	$ 4,460	$ 9,232	**$ 21,457**
District of Maple Ridge (October 2011)	$ 12,399	$ 153	$ 572	$ 396	$ 3,194	**$ 16,714**
District of North Vancouver (Proposed 2013 DCC's)	$ 4,596	$ 2,525	$ 2,462	$ 4,210	$ 2,210	**$ 16,003**
District of West Vancouver (March 1994 - Area 4 above Upper Levels Hwy)	$ 2,621	Nil	$ 4,760	$ 1,037	$ 7,239	**$ 15,657**
District of North Vancouver (Sept. 1998) (Lot Area = 5,000 to 7,000 sq. ft.)	$ 3,292	$ 96	$ 1,121	$ 305	$ 10,331	**$ 15,145**
City of North Vancouver (April 1997 - based on 280 sq.m. S.F. unit)	$ 230	Nil	Nil	Nil	$ 13,571	**$ 13,801**
Corporation of Delta (January 2001)	$ 5,388	$ 648	$ 557	$ 1,209	$ 3,427	**$ 11,229**
District of Pitt Meadows (November 2011)	$ 4,933	$ 430	$ 574	$ 913	$ 2,751	**$ 9,601**
City of Burnaby Edmonds Town Center South (Jan. 1999)	$ 392	Nil	Nil	Nil	$ 6,521	**$ 6,913**
City of Port Coquitlam (Area 1) (October 2004)	$ 2,825	$ 114	$ 119	$ 454	$ 3,132	**$ 6,644**
City of Port Moody (Standard City DCCs) (June 2011)	$ 1,796	Nil	$ 544	$ 201	$ 1,119	**$ 3,660**

Note: The rates given above do not include the Greater Vancouver Sewerage & Drainage District Sewerage DCC.
The rates implemented in 1996 by GVS&DD for SINGLE FAMILY residential use per dwelling unit are as follows:

North Shore Sewerage Area	$ 1,291	per dwelling unit
Vancouver Sewerage Area	$ 944	per dwelling unit
Lulu Island Sewerage Area	$ 1,077	per dwelling unit
Fraser Sewerage Area (Langley, Surrey, etc)	$ 1,731	per dwelling unit

For a more comprehensive (summary) B.C. list see
http://www.cscd.gov.bc.ca/lgd/library/Local_Government_DCC_Rates.xls

TABLE 25
Comparison of Typical DCC Rates ($) in Various Lower Mainland Municipalities for Townhouse Residential Land Use
Based on an average floor area = 116.1 square metres (1,250 square feet)

Municipality	Roads	Sanitary Sewers	Water Works	Drainage	Parks	Total DCC's Recoverable (per unit)
City of Surrey (Mar 2012) RM-10, RM-15, RM-30 Zones	$ 7,250	$ 1,575	$ 1,200	$ 1,625	$ 6,975	**$ 18,625**
Township of Langley (July 2008 - Residential 3)	$ 7,492	$ 586	$ 1,367	$ 1,012	$ 7,134	**$ 17,591**
District of Maple Ridge (October 2011)	$ 7,677	$ 151	$ 1,715	$ 1,649	$ 4,618	**$ 15,810**
City of Richmond (July 2007)	$ 2,834	$ 1,847	$ 620	$ 2,429	$ 7,375	**$ 15,105**
City of Coquitlam (March 2008)	$ 4,093	$ 390	$ 1,332	$ 2,229	$ 4,836	**$ 12,880**
District of North Vancouver (Proposed 2013 DCC's)	$ 2,974	$ 2,272	$ 2,216	$ 1,658	$ 1,989	**$ 11,110**
District of North Vancouver (September 1998)	$ 1,850	$ 61	$ 705	$ 94	$ 6,493	**$ 9,203**
District of West Vancouver (March 1994 - Area 5 Infill)	$ 412	Nil	$ 509	$ 1,037	$ 7,239	**$ 9,197**
City of N. Westminster - Queensborough (January 2012)	$ 2,176	$ 810	$ 76	$ 50	$ 5,933	**$ 9,045**
Corporation of Delta (January 2001)	$ 3,489	$ 513	$ 441	$ 507	$ 2,677	**$ 7,627**
District of Pitt Meadows (February 2010)	$ 3,453	$ 336	$ 449	$ 593	$ 2,751	**$ 7,582**
City of Port Coquitlam (Area 1) (October 2004)	$ 2,506	$ 89	$ 142	$ 324	$ 3,132	**$ 6,193**
City of North Vancouver (April 1997)	$ 96	Nil	Nil	Nil	$ 5,400	**$ 5,496**
City of Burnaby Edmonds Town Center South (January 1999)	$ 392	Nil	Nil	Nil	$ 4,343	**$ 4,735**
City of Port Moody (Standard City DCCs) (July, 2009)	$ 1,796	Nil	$ 544	$ 201	$ 1,119	**$ 3,660**

Note: The rates given above do not include the Greater Vancouver Sewerage & Drainage District Sewerage DCC. The rates being charged by GVS&DD for TOWNHOUSE residential use per dwelling unit are as follows:

North Shore Sewerage Area	$ 1,129	per dwelling unit
Vancouver Sewerage Area	$ 826	per dwelling unit
Lulu Island Sewerage Area	$ 942	per dwelling unit
Fraser Sewerage Area (Langley, Surrey, etc)	$ 1,515	per dwelling unit

DNV proposes to have the lowest Parkland DCC in the Lower Mainland - despite DNV having one of the highest land costs! This does not compute...

Updated Value shown in red

TABLE 26
Comparison of Typical DCC Rates ($) in Various Lower Mainland Municipalities for Apartment Residential Land Use Based on an average floor area = 74.3 square metres (800 square feet)

Municipality	Roads	Sanitary Sewers	Water Works	Drainage	Parks	Total DCC's Recoverable (per unit)
Township of Langley (July 2008 - Residential 4)	$ 6,611	$ 453	$ 1,056	$ 645	$ 5,512	**$ 14,277**
City of Surrey (Mar 2012) RM-45 & RM-70 Zones	$ 5,976	$ 1,144	$ 872	$ 672	$ 4,504	**$ 13,168**
City of Richmond (July 2007)	$ 2,391	$ 1,203	$ 399	$ 1,084	$ 4,782	**$ 9,859**
District of West Vancouver (March 1994-Area 5 Apart. Infill)	$ 412	Nil	$ 509	$ 1,037	$ 7,239	**$ 9,197**
District of Maple Ridge (October 2011 - Apartment)	$ 4,936	$ 76	$ 857	$ 186	$ 3,002	**$ 9,057**
District of North Vancouver (Proposed 2013 DCC's)	$ 2,252	$ 1,514	$ 1,476	$ 956	$ 1,325	**$ 7,523**
City of Coquitlam March 2008 - Apartment)	$ 1,937	$ 222	$ 759	$ 969	$ 2,754 3,046	**$ 6,641**
District of Pitt Meadows (February 2010 - Apartment)	$ 2,960	$ 228	$ 305	$ 258	$ 2,751	**$ 6,502**
Corporation of Delta (June 2000 - Apartment)	$ 3,268	$ 351	$ 302	$ 266	$ 1,821	**$ 6,008**
District of North Vancouver (September 1998)	$ 1,165	$ 38	$ 444	$ 59	$ 4,090	**$ 5,796**
City of New Westminster-Queensborough (January 2012)	$ 1,323	$ 470	$ 48	$ 24	$ 3,483	**$ 5,348**
City of Port Coquitlam (Area 1) (November 2009)	$ 2,506	$ 89	$ 142	$ 324	$ 1,788	**$ 4,849**
City of North Vancouver (April 1997)	$ 62	Nil	Nil	Nil	$ 3,600	**$ 3,662**
City of Burnaby Edmonds Town Center South (February 1999)	$ 392	Nil	Nil	Nil	$ 2,840	**$ 3,232**

Note: The rates given above do not include the Greater Vancouver Sewerage & Drainage District Sewerage
The rates implemented in 1996 by GVS&DD for APARTMENT residential use per dwelling unit are as fo

North Shore Sewerage Area	$ 807	per dwelling unit
Vancouver Sewerage Area	$ 590	per dwelling unit
Lulu Island Sewerage Area	$ 673	per dwelling unit
Fraser Sewerage Area (Langley, Surrey, etc	$ 1,082	per dwelling unit

Specific References relating to this page:
(A) http://www.civicinfo.bc.ca/Library/Reports_and_Briefs/Overview_of_Development_Cost_Charges--Sechelt--April_2001.pdf

Discussion of Table 26

"ROAD" DCC's should be about 2% (based on median charge data of lower mainland) of home value. Thus for a $400,000 home this would amount to about $8,000

In 2001 Sechelt report the MEDIAN DCC charge for a lower mainland home was $12.000. Now DNV proposes, some 12 yrs later , to charge $7,523. Does this make sense?

Sechelt report of 2001 indicated "Total DCC as % of House Value" a Median value for the lower mainland of 5%. Thus for a $400,000 home in DNV this implies a total DCC charge of $20,000. Why are we proposing only $7,523 ?

Conversely. using the DNV proposed $7,523 as the total DCC charge AND assuming an average/median 5% charge of the house value (the 5% being based on data for the lower mainland) then the implied value of the homes to be sold in DNV would need to be only $150,460. Is that reasonable?

Again... if the toatl DCC charge for a $400,000 home in the DNV is only $7,523 then this implies a rate of 1.88% of the home value - which would be lower rate than any other lower mainland municipality. Is this reasonable?

TABLE 27
Comparison of Typical DCC Rates ($) in Various Lower Mainland Municipalities
Commercial Land Use

Municipality	Roads	Sanitary Sewers	Water Works	Drainage	Parks	Total DCCs Recoverable (per 1,000 sq.ft. gross floor area)
City of New Westminster (Queensborough - January 2012)	$ 9,620	$ 400	$ 40	$ 30	Nil	**$ 10,090**
City of Surrey (Mar 2012) Comm. Ground Floor	$ 5,970	$ 690	$ 530	$ 2,180	Nil	**$ 9,370**
City of Richmond (July 2007)	$ 5,970	$ 570	$ 190	$ 1,330	$ 1,140	**$ 9,200**
Township of Langley (July 2008)	$ 4,094	$ 282	$ 658	$ 833	Nil	**$ 5,867**
City of Coquitlam (March 2008)	$ 3,846	$ 132	$ 450	$ 1,186	Nil	**$ 5,614**
District of North Vancouver (Proposed 2013 DCC's)	$ 3,349	$ 704	$ 686	$ 711	$ 92	**$ 5,542**
City of North Vancouver (April 1997)	$ 476	Nil	Nil	Nil	$ 4,854	**$ 5,330**
District of West Vancouver (March 1994)	$ 206	Nil	$ 255	$ 518	$ 3,620	**$ 4,599**
City of Port Coquitlam -2007	$ 3,135	$ 74	$ 120	$ 306	$ 119	**$ 3,754**
District of North Vancouver (September 1998)	$ 1,424	$ 87	$ 1,016	$ 220	$ 750	**$ 3,497**
Corporation of Delta (January 2001)	$ 1,641	$ 276	$ 237	$ 337	Nil	**$ 2,491**
District of Maple Ridge (October 2011)	$ 1,994	$ 77	$ 877	$ 208	Nil	**$ 3,156**
District of Pitt Meadows (November 2011)	$ 1,719	$ 111	$ 146	Nil	Nil	**$ 1,976**
City of Burnaby (Metrotown Area) (February 1999)	$ 604	Nil	Nil	Nil	$ 500	**$ 1,104**
City of Port Moody (January 2006)	$ 780	Nil	$ 236	$ 87	Nil	**$ 1,103**

Note: The rates given above do not include the Greater Vancouver Sewerage & Drainage District Sewerage DCC.
The rates being charged by GVS&DD for non-residential use per 1,000 sq.ft. of developed floor space are as follow

North Shore Sewerage Area	$ 605	per 1000 sq. feet
Vancouver Sewerage Area	$ 443	per 1000 sq. feet
Lulu Island Sewerage Area	$ 505	per 1000 sq. feet
Fraser Sewerage Area (Langley, Surrey, etc)	$ 811	per 1000 sq. feet

TABLE 28
Comparison of Typical DCC Rates ($) in Various Lower Mainland Municipalities
Industrial Land Uses

Municipality	Roads	Sanitary Sewers	Water Works	Drainage	Parks	Total DCCs Recoverable	
City of Richmond (Lulu Island) (Light Industrial - July 2007)	$ 45.84	$ 6.13	$ 2.04	$ 14.31	$ 12.27	**$ 80.59**	**per sq. m. of building area**
District of North Vancouver (Proposed 2013 DCC's)	$ 22.53	$ 6.73	$ 6.57	$ 7.65	$ 0.52	**$ 44.00**	**per sq. m. of gross floor area**
City of Coquitlam (March 2008)	$ 20.70	$ 0.79	$ 2.69	$ 10.65	Nil	**$ 34.83**	**per sq. m. of gross floor area**
City of Surrey (March 2012) 85% site coverage	$ 14.30	$ 3.73	$ 2.83	$ 9.68	Nil	**$ 30.54**	**per sq. m. of gross floor area**
Township of Langley (May 2005)	$ 6.83	$ 1.20	$ 2.80	$ 8.49	Nil	**$ 19.32**	**per sq. m. of area of development**
City of North Vancouver (April 1997)	$ 7.55	Nil	Nil	Nil	$ 9.27	**$ 16.82**	**per sq. m. of gross floor area**
District of North Vancouver (September 1998)	$ 7.17	$ 0.32	$ 3.77	$ 1.10	$ 1.39	**$ 13.75**	**per sq. m. of gross floor area**
District of Pitt Meadows (February 2010)	$ 9.87	$ 0.60	$ 0.81	$ 1.64	Nil	**$ 12.92**	**per sq. m. of dev. area**
District of Maple Ridge (October 2011)	$ 8.16	$ 0.84	$ 3.15	Nil	Nil	**$ 12.15**	**per sq. m. of gross floor area**
City of N. Westminster - Queensborough (January 2012)	$ 6.78	$ 1.51	$ 0.11	$ 0.22	Nil	**$ 8.62**	**per sq. m. of gross floor area**
City of Port Moody (January 2006)	$ 3.99	Nil	$ 1.21	$ 0.94	Nil	**$ 6.14**	**per sq. m. of parcel area**
Corporation of Delta (June 2000)	$27,759.00	$3,516.00	$ 3,021.00	$ 5,715.00	Nil	**$40,011.00**	**per acre**
City of Port Coquitlam (August 2006)	$ 6,400.00	$ 645.00	$ 2,630.00	$ 5,277.00	$ 2,534.00	**$17,486.00**	**per acre**

Note: The rates given above do not include the Greater Vancouver Sewerage & Drainage District Sewerage DCC.
The rates being charged by GVS&DD for non-residential use per 1,000 sq.ft. of developed floor space are as follows:

North Shore Sewerage Area	$	605	per 1,000 sq. ft.
Vancouver Sewerage Area	$	443	per 1,000 sq. ft.
Lulu Island Sewerage Area	$	505	per 1,000 sq. ft.
Fraser Sewerage Area (Langley, Surrey, etc)	$	811	per 1,000 sq. ft.

TABLE 29
Comparison of Typical DCC Rates ($) in
Various Lower Mainland Municipalities
Institutional Land Uses

Municipality	Roads	Sanitary Sewers	Water Works	Drainage	Parks	Total DCCs Recoverable
City of Surrey (March 2012) Schools - Post Second.	$ 40.90	$ 7.43	$ 6.24	$ 14.10	Nil	**$ 68.67 per sq. m. of buildable area**
City of Coquitlam (March 2008)	$ 41.40	$ 1.57	$ 5.38	$ 12.77	Nil	**$ 61.12 per sq. m. of gross floor area**
District of West Vancouver (March 1994 - non-residential)	$ 2.22	Nil	$ 2.74	$ 5.59	$ 38.97	**$ 49.52 per sq. m. of gross floor area**
Township of Langley (July 2008)	$ 21.15	$ 3.04	$ 7.08	$ 7.98	Nil	**$ 39.25 per sq. m. of gross floor area**
District of North Vancouver (Proposed 2013 DCC's)	$ 18.03	$ 5.05	$ 4.92	$ 8.75	$ 0.55	**$ 37.30 per sq. m. of gross floor area**
District of North Vancouver (October 1998)	$ 15.32	$ 0.49	$ 5.65	$ 1.46	$ 4.18	**$ 27.10 per sq. m. of gross floor area**
Corporation of Delta (June 2000)	$ 6.62	$ 2.97	$ 2.55	$ 2.42	Nil	**$ 14.56 per sq. m. of gross floor area**
District of Pitt Meadows (May 2004)	$ 6.66	$ 0.98	$ 0.37	$ 1.13	Nil	**$ 9.14 per sq. m. of site area**
District of Maple Ridge (December 2011)	$3.18	$0.14	$1.54	$1.42	Nil	**$6.28 per sq. m. of site area**

Note: The rates given above do not include the Greater Vancouver Sewerage & Drainage District Sewerage
The rates being charged by GVS&DD for non-residential use per 1,000 sq.ft. of developed floor space are as follows:

North Shore Sewerage Area	$ 605	per 1,000 sq. ft.
Vancouver Sewerage Area	$ 443	per 1,000 sq. ft.
Lulu Island Sewerage Area	$ 505	per 1,000 sq. ft.
Fraser Sewerage Area (Langley, Surrey, etc)	$ 811	per 1,000 sq. ft.

APPENDIX 'B'

DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES AMENDING BYLAW

For more definitions see for example
http://www.metrovancouver.org/planning/development/housingdiversity/DCCAffordableHousing/GVSDD-DCC-Bylaw254-2010.pdf

APPENDIX 'B'

THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER
Bylaw ____

A bylaw to amend District of North Vancouver Development Cost Charges Bylaw No. 7135, 2000 pursuant to section 933 of the *Local Government Act* (RSBC 1996, c.323)

The Council for The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver enacts the following:

WHEREAS the *Local Government Act* empowers the Council of the District to provide for the imposition of development cost charges to assist the District in paying the capital costs of certain public works which service the development for which the charge is imposed;

AND WHEREAS the Council believes it is desirable to periodically review and update the development cost charges established to assist the District in paying the capital cost of providing, constructing, altering and expanding water, sewage, drainage and highway facilities, in acquiring park land or providing specified improvements in park land, or any of them, to serve, directly or indirectly, the development in respect of which the charge is being imposed;

AND WHEREAS Council has taken into consideration the factors prescribed in Section 934(4) of the *Local Government Act*;

AND WHEREAS the charges imposed under this bylaw are related to capital costs attributable to projects included in the District's financial plan,

NOW THEREFORE the Council of The Corporation of the District of North Vancouver, in open meeting assembled, enacts as follows:

Title

1. This bylaw may be cited as **"DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGE BYLAW, AMENDING BYLAW 2".**

Amendments

2. The following amendments are made to the "DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGE BYLAW NO. 7135, 2000"

(a) Section 2 Definitions are amended by:

(i) Deleting the definition for "*combination use*" in its entirety;

(ii) Deleting the definition for "*commercial use*" in its entirety and replacing same with the following:

"commercial use means a use providing for the carrying on of any business, including the sale or provision of goods, accommodation, entertainment, meals or services, but excludes an industrial use, institutional use or residential use"

(iii) Deleting the definition for "*comprehensive development use*" in its entirety;

(iv) Deleting the definition for "*industrial use*" in its entirety and replacing same with the following:

"industrial use means a use providing for the manufacturing, fabricating, processing, assembling, storing, transporting, warehousing, renting or wholesale distribution of goods, materials or things, but excludes an institutional use and excludes retail sales; party and meeting equipment rentals; wholesaling in conjunction with retail sales; household services and repairs; service stations, automotive repairs and auto body shops; restaurants, drive-ins and food outlets; or any uses accessory to any of the foregoing exclusions."

(v) Amending the definition for "*institutional use*" by inserting the following words after the words "Zoning Bylaw" in the first line: "other than golf courses, marinas, pet care establishments, ski resorts and any uses accessory to golf courses, marinas, pet care establishments and ski resorts."

(vi) Deleting the definition for "*Northlands Development Area Sector 1*" in its entirety;

(vii) Inserting a new definition as follows:

"residential subdivision means a subdivision under the Land Title Act or the Strata Property Act which creates parcels that may be used for residential occupancy; "

(viii) Deleting the definition for "*residential use*" in its entirety and replacing same with the following:

"residential use means a *single family* use, *residential multi family, apartment* use or *residential multi-family, ground oriented* use"

(ix) Deleting the definition for "*residential multi-family*" and inserting new definitions for "*residential multi-family apartment*" and "*residential multi-family ground oriented*" as follows:

"residential multi-family, apartment means a residential multi-family development consisting of two or more dwelling units, neither of which is a secondary suite, which have their principal access from a common internal hallway or foyer"

"**residential multi-family, ground oriented** means a residential multi-family development of two or more dwelling units on a parcel of land or in a strata subdivision other than a bare land subdivision, neither of which is a secondary suite, where each of the dwelling units is accessed through separate ground level doors which open directly to the exterior of the dwelling unit";

(x) Deleting the definitions for "*single family Type 1*", "*single family Type 2*", "*single family Type 3*", and "*single family Type 4*" and inserting a new definition for "*single family*" as follows:

"**single family** means land used for the purpose of a single residential building containing either one dwelling unit or one dwelling unit plus one secondary suite dwelling unit"

(xi) Inserting a new definition for secondary suite as follows:

"**secondary suite** means a secondary suite as defined in the zoning bylaw"

(b) Section 3 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"**Application**

3. This bylaw applies to all land in the District of North Vancouver."

(c) Section 4(a) is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

4(a) approval of a residential subdivision under the *Land Title Act* or the *Strata Property Act*;

(d) Section 8 Single Family Residential Charge Calculation is deleted in its entirety;

(e) Section 9, Multi-Family Residential Charge Calculation is deleted and a new Section 9 Residential Multi-Family Charge Calculation is inserted as follows:

"**Residential Multi-Family Charge Calculation**

9. Development cost charges imposed under this bylaw for residential multi-family ground oriented and residential multi-family apartment uses must be calculated on the basis of the gross floor area of the total number of dwelling units being built, to a maximum of $11,000 per "residential multi-family, apartment dwelling unit"; and $15,000 per "residential multi-family, ground oriented dwelling unit";

(f) Section 11, Combination Use Charge Calculation is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following:

"**Multiple Uses**

11. When a building or structure is used or intended to be used for more than one class of development, charges under this bylaw shall be calculated separately for the areas used for each class as though the area was a separate building, and the amounts payable shall be the combined total for all classes."

(g) Section 12, Comprehensive Development Charge Calculation is deleted in its entirety.

(h) Schedule A is deleted in its entirety and replaced with a new Schedule A as set out in Schedule A to this bylaw.

(i) Schedules B and C are deleted in their entirety.

SCHEDULE A

Development Cost Charges Applicable to the District of North Vancouver

CLASS OF LAND USE	TRANSPORTATION	SANITARY SEWERS	WATER WORKS	DRAINAGE	PARKS	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL SINGLE FAMILY (per subdivided lot)	$4,596.47	$2,524.64	$2,462.12	$4,209.91	$2,210.34	**$16,003.50**
RESIDENTIAL MULTI- FAMILY, GROUND ORIENTED per square metre of gross floor area	$25.61	$19.57	$19.08	$14.28	$17.13	**$97.67**
RESIDENTIAL MULTI- FAMILY, APARTMENT per square metre of gross floor area	$30.30	$20.37	$19.87	$12.87	$17.84	**$101.25**
COMMERCIAL per square metre of gross floor area	$36.05	$7.57	$7.39	$7.65	$0.99	**$59.66**
INDUSTRIAL per square metre of gross floor area	$22.53	$6.73	$6.57	$7.65	$0.52	**$44.00**
INSTITUTIONAL per square metre of gross floor area	$18.03	$5.05	$4.92	$8.75	$0.55	**$37.30**

http://www.dnv.org/article.asp?a=5606&c=557

NORTH VANCOUVER
DISTRICT

Development Cost Charge Bylaw Review

Public Information Meeting

Development Cost Charges (DCCs) are fees collected on new developments to pay for the expansion and upgrading of transportation, waterworks, sanitary sewers, drainage, and parks infrastructure to meet the growth needs of the community.

The District of North Vancouver is updating its Development Cost Charge (DCC) program and would like interested residents, property owners, and stakeholders to review the proposed changes before the required bylaw is presented to Council for consideration.

A public information meeting will be held as follows:

Tuesday, January 15, 2013
7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. – Presentation at 7:30 p.m.
Municipal Hall, Committee Room
355 West Queens Road

Information boards will be available in the lobby, and participants will have the opportunity to provide written comments. Municipal staff and the District's engineering consultants will be in attendance at this meeting to receive comments and input from the public.

To find out more about the proposed changes, a draft DCC Bylaw Review and Update Background Report can be viewed at www.dnv.org. A copy of the report is also available for viewing during regular working hours at the Engineering Department counter, lower level, Municipal Hall.

For more information, please contact Marcel Bernier, P. Eng., Engineering Department, at 604-990-2450 or mbernier@dnv.org.

Gavin Joyce, P. Eng.
General Manager, Engineering, Parks & Facilities

District of North Vancouver
355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, BC V7N 4N5
Main Line 604-990-2311

Find us on Facebook

www.dnv.org

Follow us on twitter

NORTH VANCOUVER
DISTRICT

COMMENT SHEET – DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGE REVIEW

Thank you for taking the time to attend the Public Open House on the proposed Development Cost Charges. Please leave your completed comment sheet with Marcel Bernier from the District of North Vancouver or Fraser Smith from Urban Systems. You may also drop off your comment sheet at the District of North Vancouver, or by email to Marcel Bernier at: bernierm@dnv.org by January 22, 2013. Thank you.

Overview: Concentrating on "Apartment" DCC's of Table 26. I assume none of munis are breaking the rules by charging excessively and that some may subsidize growth by undercharging certain components. Noting DNV's difficult topography, high land costs, and high wages, it is not unreasonable to take the sum of the maximum charged for each component (eg . water, sewer, parks etc). as a realistic DNV's projected charge. This yields a DCC charge of $15,466 / unit. Somewhat surprisingly the DNV calculation result was less than half that - $7,523/unit. (only 2 % of an apartment selling for $350,000)

Alternatively, let us start by examine the DCC's of 1998: At that time we had a DCC (again for "apartment") of $78.32 / sq-m. Now, some 15 years later it is proposed to charge $101.25/sq-m - an increase of 29% - which matches the CPI increase of 28% . However, land costs, have increased some 300%, and servicing costs (roads, sewers, water, etc.) have increased far above inflation. I can only conclude that the proposed "apartment" DCC's are woefully inadequate.

Another important issue is the proposed (very low) "parks" charge component of the DCC's (they are easily the lowest of any muni (Table 26) in the Lower Mainland) . It should be noted that most of the expected 20,000 people that may move here by 2030 are expected to move into apartments - which, unlike single family homes, provide little or no backyard play space. Thus these newcomers will need to be provided a larger proportion of local & neighbourhood parks than the currently existing residents. This aspect would be especially exacerbated if council decides to exempt or waive DCC charges for (profit and/or non-profit) "affordable rental housing". Note that the Background Report does not provide definitions of "affordabiliy" and many other terms used in the report.

I have assumed that council would follow the advice of staff and "establish charges on a municipal wide basis" as well as "adopt a municipal wide approach to administering the DCC program" . Hence the DCC charges on a proposed project should be independent of its location. Surprisingly this is not what is proposed. For example, the "parks" component of the DCC is calculated on the basis of local surplus or deficiency. The result of such a policy is that there is a race to the lowest possible parks requirement, using up surplus capacity without any cost to developers, and failing to provide equitable park space across the DNV. Note that provincial DCC legislation allows municipalities to charge for specific parkland development improvements such as fencing, landscaping, drainage, irrigation, trails, restrooms, changing rooms, playgrounds and playing field equipment (but not for roadways, parking, lighting, furnishing, etc)

Finally, I will examine the fairness of policies dealing with proposed upgrades to other services such as water mains and sewage pipes. Table 14 shows how 18.4% (= 20,000/(20,000+88,678) would be allocated to the DCC for water - to increase the watermain capacity - even though these upgrade (not repair, operation, or maintenance) requirements were solely due to population growth. Also, of the total $62.7m (Table 13) to be spent on sanitary sewers, only $18.4m is to be recovered by DCC's. Much, if not all, of this needed works is the direct result of growth. It seems unfair for the existing residents to contribute to these costs. In summary I have serious reservations and concerns about the current draft of the DCC bylaw.

Yours truly, Corrie Kost, 2851 Colwood Dr. N. Vancouver, V7R2R3

URBAN systems