

MINUTES
OF THE
COUNCIL OF THE
COUNTY OF OXFORD

County Council Chamber
Woodstock
May 28, 2009

MEETING #17

Oxford County Council meets in special session this twenty-eighth day of May 2009, in the Council Chamber, County Administration Building, Woodstock.

1. CALL TO ORDER:

5:03 p.m., with Warden Holbrough in the chair.

All members of Council present except Councillor Howling.

Staff Present: M. R. Bragg, Chief Administrative Officer
L. S. Buchner, Director of Corporate Services
M. Metcalfe, Acting Director of Public Health and Emergency Services
M. Misk-Evans, Corporate Manager of Community and Strategic Planning
R. G. Walton, Director of Public Works
B. J. Tabor, Clerk

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

RESOLUTION NO. 1:

Moved by: Donald Doan
Seconded by: Don McKay

That the Agenda be approved.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried

3. DISCLOSURES OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF:

NIL

4. ADOPTION OF COUNCIL MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:

NIL

5. PUBLIC MEETINGS:

A-1 2009-26
Re: Development Charges

RESOLUTION NO. 2:

Moved by: Donald Doan
Seconded by: Don McKay

That the recommendation contained in Report No. A-1 2009-26, titled "Development Charges", be adopted.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried

Recommendation Contained in Report No. A-1 2009-26:

That the Council for the County of Oxford undertake to hold public meetings for the proposed County Development Charge by-laws and final report, pursuant to Section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997.

RESOLUTION NO. 3:

Moved by: Michael Harding
Seconded by: Sandra Talbot

That Council rise and go into a public meeting pursuant to Section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, to consider the County-wide Development Charge By-law, and that the Warden chair the public meeting.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (5:10 p.m.)

1. County-wide By-law

The Chair asks Craig Binning, representing the consulting firm of Hemson Consulting Ltd., to provide an overview of the results of the County's 2009 Development Charges Background Study.

C. Binning explains that the presentation he will give tonight is similar to the presentation made at the special Information Session held on April 8th, but this is the formal Public Meeting under the Development Charges Act to provide interested members of the public and Council with sufficient information to understand how the Development Charge rates have been calculated. The Background Study has been available a minimum of two weeks in advance of this meeting, under the requirements of the legislation and, in addition, the proposed Draft By-laws have also been available.

C. Binning, using a 49 screen PowerPoint presentation, presents the highlights of the "County of Oxford 2009 Development Charges Background Study" which was provided as an attachment to Council's electronic Agenda. The presentation covers the key topics: DC Study Status Update; Growth Forecast Summary; Capital Program Summary; Maximum Permissible Rates; Rate Comparisons; and Next Steps.

At the end of his presentation, C. Binning explains that, concerning the timeline moving forward, we are holding the statutory Public Meeting today, written and oral submissions will be responded to, they will make any necessary revisions to the Background Study, and will bring back a Report and By-laws for Councils' consideration sometime in June to ensure the new By-laws are in place before the current ones expire.

The Chair opens the meeting to questions from members of Council.

C. Binning responds to questions from Councillor Harding with respect to:

- whether the rates laid out take into account exemptions for those areas that have downtown community improvement plans
- whether there is an exemption for new industrial development included in the rates

C. Binning responds to questions from Councillor Molnar with respect to:

- the statement “future capital costs must be identified and Council must express its intent to undertake the capital projects”
- concerning these “realistic objectives” where does this information come from
- what is a subsidy in the calculation
- is there a formula that dictates how and when generic federal and provincial funding gets incorporated into specific projects
- confirmation that communication was received from the one urban municipality that did not currently have an exemption on their downtown central business district and incorporated into the document

C. Binning responds to a questions from Councillor Sobeski with respect to:

- the Summary of Growth Forecast and the fact that it was probably completed a year ago in better economic times – would the projections not be different today – what will the impact be of the projections being used today – should there be some concern

The Chair asks if there are any members of the public wishing to speak and draws Council's attention to a written submission received from the Woodstock District Chamber of Commerce, dated May 26, 2009 which was provided as an attachment to Council's electronic Agenda. The correspondence recommends that the County continue to support industrial growth by not implementing development charges on the industrial category and that any increase to other existing categories, i.e. new residential and commercial development, be phased in to lessen the impact during these difficult economic times.

James Stewart, a Woodstock businessman and a member of the Woodstock Economic Development Advisory Committee, comes forward and speaks independently in support of the continued exemption of industrial charges. He states that he gave the same message to the City of Woodstock at a meeting held on August 14th of last year. J. Stewart advises that economic development is essentially a \$500,000 expense at the City of Woodstock to bring business to Woodstock. The development charge exemption at the City level is about \$30,000 a year and affords the City and the County the ability to send a political message that there are no development charges in Woodstock similar to London, St. Thomas and Stratford, whereas areas to the east such as Milton, Guelph and others in the GTA have development charges. He states this is an advantage that is needed because we are situated beyond the GTA and if business and industry does not come to the area, we can't tax them. His opinion is that the development charge exemption is money well spent. J. Stewart states that because we market and develop Oxford County through the Southwestern Ontario Marketing Alliance with London, Stratford and St. Thomas, we want to keep our economic development people on level footing with their counterparts who do not have development charges. He states that industry does not vote in elections, but it does vote twice in that it votes whether it is going to come to our County and it votes whether it decides to leave our County. J. Stewart believes that keeping the exemption in place will send a great message for economic development and it is a good policy for citizens as the expansion of industry in the County benefits all citizens.

At 6:01 p.m., during the Public Meeting, Council recesses for a break.

At 6:12 p.m., Council resumes with Warden Holbrough in the chair.

All members of Council present except Councillor Howling.

Tom Scoon, of Thomas J. Scoon Real Estate Ltd. in Toronto, who, with a partner, owns 170 plus acres of industrial land in the City of Woodstock, comes forward to speak in favour of no development charges for industrial property. He states that the industrial land market is a very profitable one for municipalities. It does cost to service these properties, but the tax revenue is high. T. Scoon indicates that this is a competitive market and all across Ontario more serviced industrial land is being made available and to stay attractive you have to compete. When people look at coming to Woodstock, Oxford or any other municipality they look at labour, transportation, services, education, culture, other factors, and cost. When it comes to cost it is more important now than ever as everyone is sharpening their pencils. He states that the development charges that are emerging close to Toronto are now becoming, in the eyes of industry, punitive and is moving up the list of factors when people come to decide where to locate. Oxford is in a competitive market that way with the Kitchener, Waterloo and

Guelph markets having introduced significant development charges as a reflection of their proximity to the Toronto market and the fact that it is filling. Those municipalities have been able to get away with that, but the Woodstock market in order to compete, in his opinion, should continue to waive development charges. T. Scoon states that it is an important component to decision making and is a very important marketing issue. It gets the attention of developers, investors, owners, users and brokers when you say you have no development charges. In closing he encourages Council to pass the recommended by-law as a long-term investment in the future.

Gary Morrison, Director of Planning and Development, with B. G. Schickendanz Homes, comes forward and explains that his company has a development in Norwich known as Oxford Meadows. They have 112 homes in Stage 1 and are currently completing a model home and are now experiencing some sales which is encouraging. He states that, as a development group, they do understand the need to charge for emergency services such as fire and police. One of the questions they have is why the County is not dealing with development charges at the same time as water and sewer charges. G. Morrison states that they promote the stretching of these fees that come once they apply for building permits over a period of three to five years rather than hitting the developer all at once with the increase of the fees. He states that for years we have all paid taxes to the government for gas and the majority of these charges are for the repair of roads, but he is sure not a dime comes to the County and the Townships from the Province in that regard. G. Morrison feels it is unfair to have charges to the developer for water and sewer plants that have obviously needed repair for the last forty years where now the deterioration is impacting. He says that with the fortune of Woodstock and the County's hard work to get Toyota here it is certainly going to encourage industry. G. Morrison advises that he was previously Director of Development for Magna International Auto parts and understands what the gentleman who spoke before him stated about industry. He states that his company is very pleased to be in Oxford County and in Norwich and recognizes the efforts of the Township on their behalf. He requests that Council consider extending charges over a period of time rather than all at once in the first year.

G. Morrison responds to a question from Councillor Sobeski as to what he considers a "phase in". The answer is over a three year average time frame.

G. Morrison responds in the affirmative to a request for clarification from Councillor Molnar with respect to "phase in" as being considered a cash flow opportunity for the developer.

The Chair asks for any further comments on the County-wide charges.

C. Binning responds to questions from Councillor Harding with respect to:

- the idea of a "phase in" and how it works, being different than credit terms
- by phasing something in aren't we providing financing
- the idea of development charges rehabilitating or maintaining existing infrastructure

RESOLUTION NO. 4:

Moved by: Michael Harding
Seconded by: Sandra Talbot

That Council adjourn the public meeting and reconvene as Oxford County Council with the Warden in the chair.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:28 p.m.)

RESOLUTION NO. 5:

Moved by: James Hayes
Seconded by: Margaret Lupton

That Council rise and go into a public meeting pursuant to Section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, to consider the Woodstock Water and Wastewater (area-specific) Development Charge By-law, and that the Warden chair the public meeting.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:29 p.m.)

2. Woodstock Water and Wastewater (area specific)

The Chair opens the meeting to comments or questions relating to this particular section of the Study.

No comments or questions are forthcoming.

RESOLUTION NO. 6:

Moved by: James Hayes
Seconded by: Margaret Lupton

That Council adjourn the public meeting and reconvene as Oxford County Council with the Warden in the chair.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:31 p.m.)

RESOLUTION NO. 7:

Moved by: Donald Doan
Seconded by: Don McKay

That Council rise and go into a public meeting pursuant to Section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, to consider the Ingersoll Water and Wastewater (area-specific) Development Charge By-law, and that the Warden chair the public meeting.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:32 p.m.)

3. Ingersoll Water and Wastewater (area-specific)

The Chair opens the meeting to comments or questions relating to this particular section of the Study.

No comments or questions are forthcoming.

RESOLUTION NO. 8:

Moved by: Donald Doan
Seconded by: Don McKay

That Council adjourn the public meeting and reconvene as Oxford County Council with the Warden in the chair.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:33 p.m.)

RESOLUTION NO. 9:

Moved by: Margaret Lupton
Seconded by: James Hayes

That Council rise and go into a public meeting pursuant to Section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, to consider the Tillsonburg Water and Wastewater (area-specific) Development Charge By-law, and that the Warden chair the public meeting.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:33 p.m.)

4. Tillsonburg Water and Wastewater (area-specific)

The Chair opens the meeting to comments or questions relating to this particular section of the Study.

C. Binning and R. Walton, Director of Public Works, respond to questions from Councillor Molnar with respect to recovery of costs for the upgrade and expansion of the Wastewater Treatment Plant and the utilization of third party funding under wastewater.

RESOLUTION NO. 10:

Moved by: Margaret Lupton
Seconded by: James Hayes

That Council adjourn the public meeting and reconvene as Oxford County Council with the Warden in the chair.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:41 p.m.)

RESOLUTION NO. 11:

Moved by: Don McKay
Seconded by: Donald Doan

That Council rise and go into a public meeting pursuant to Section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, to consider the Drumbo Water and Wastewater (area-specific) Development Charge By-law, and that the Warden chair the public meeting.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:41 p.m.)

5. Drumbo Water and Wastewater (area-specific)

The Chair opens the meeting to comments or questions relating to this particular section of the Study.

C. Binning and R. Walton, respond to questions from Councillor Sobeski with respect to the line item "Water Model and Related Studies".

RESOLUTION NO. 12:

Moved by: Don McKay
Seconded by: Donald Doan

That Council adjourn the public meeting and reconvene as Oxford County Council with the Warden in the chair.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:46 p.m.)

RESOLUTION NO. 13:

Moved by: Stephen Molnar
Seconded by: Patrick Sobeski

That Council rise and go into a public meeting pursuant to Section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, to consider the Plattsville Water and Wastewater (area-specific) Development Charge By-law, and that the Warden chair the public meeting.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:46 p.m.)

6. Plattsville Water and Wastewater (area-specific)

The Chair opens the meeting to comments or questions relating to this particular section of the Study.

No comments or questions are forthcoming.

RESOLUTION NO. 14:

Moved by: Stephen Molnar
Seconded by: Patrick Sobeski

That Council adjourn the public meeting and reconvene as Oxford County Council with the Warden in the chair.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:47 p.m.)

RESOLUTION NO. 15:

Moved by: Patrick Sobeski
Seconded by: Stephen Molnar

That Council rise and go into a public meeting pursuant to Section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, to consider the Tavistock Water and Wastewater (area-specific) Development Charge By-law, and that the Warden chair the public meeting.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:47 p.m.)

7. Tavistock Water and Wastewater (area-specific)

The Chair opens the meeting to comments or questions relating to this particular section of the Study.

No comments or questions are forthcoming.

RESOLUTION NO. 16:

Moved by: Patrick Sobeski
Seconded by: Stephen Molnar

That Council adjourn the public meeting and reconvene as Oxford County Council with the Warden in the chair.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:48 p.m.)

RESOLUTION NO. 17:

Moved by: Patrick Sobeski
Seconded by: Stephen Molnar

That Council rise and go into a public meeting pursuant to Section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, to consider the Norwich Water and Wastewater (area-specific) Development Charge By-law, and that the Warden chair the public meeting.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:49 p.m.)

8. Norwich Water and Wastewater (area-specific)

The Chair opens the meeting to comments or questions relating to this particular section of the Study.

No comments or questions are forthcoming.

RESOLUTION NO. 18:

Moved by: Sandra Talbot
Seconded by: Michael Harding

That Council adjourn the public meeting and reconvene as Oxford County Council with the Warden in the chair.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:50 p.m.)

RESOLUTION NO. 19:

Moved by: Sandra Talbot
Seconded by: Michael Harding

That Council rise and go into a public meeting pursuant to Section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, to consider the Thamesford Water and Wastewater (area-specific) Development Charge By-law, and that the Warden chair the public meeting.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:51 p.m.)

9. Thamesford Water and Wastewater (area-specific)

The Chair opens the meeting to comments or questions relating to this particular section of the Study.

No comments or questions are forthcoming.

RESOLUTION NO. 20:

Moved by: Sandra Talbot
Seconded by: Michael Harding

That Council adjourn the public meeting and reconvene as Oxford County Council with the Warden in the chair.

DISPOSITION: Motion Carried (6:52 p.m.)

The Warden, in response to an inquiry and comments from Councillor Harding, advises that he will respond to the correspondence from the Woodstock District Chamber of Commerce the content of which was noted, earlier in the meeting, as a written submission under the Public Meeting held to discuss the County-wide By-law.

6. DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS:

NIL

7. CONSIDERATION OF DELEGATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS:

Not Required.

8. CONSIDERATION OF CORRESPONDENCE:

NIL

9. REPORTS FROM DEPARTMENTS:

A CORPORATE SERVICES

A-1 2009-26

Re: Development Charges

Report dealt with under Public Meetings.

B SOCIAL SERVICES AND HOUSING

NIL

C COMMUNITY AND STRATEGIC PLANNING

NIL

D PUBLIC WORKS

NIL

E HUMAN RESOURCES

NIL

F C.A.O./CLERK

NIL

G PUBLIC HEALTH AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

NIL

H WARDEN

NIL

10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

NIL

11. NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

NIL

12. NEW BUSINESS/ENQUIRIES/COMMENTS:

NIL

13. CLOSED SESSION:

NIL

14. CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CLOSED SESSION:

Not Required.

15. BY-LAWS:

NIL

16. ADJOURNMENT:

Council adjourns its proceedings until the next meeting scheduled for Wednesday, June 10, 2009 at 9:30 a.m.

6:57 p.m.

Minutes adopted on June 10, 2009

by Resolution No. 2

Paul J. Holbrough

WARDEN

Brenda J. Tabor

CLERK