Off-site Levy Bylaw Review – Industry Working Group Meeting Notes

Date/Time: November 5, 2025 / 1:00 – 2:30 PM

Location: Andrew Davidson Building, Florence Boardroom / MS Teams

Attendees:

Internal	External
Krista Campbell,	Brett Friesen
Pamela Ajoku	Joel Armitage
Natalia Ivanova	Bob Faktor
Brian Arthur	Jackie Stewart
Sara Alinaghi Pour	Graeme Melton
Shweta Sah	Greg Bodnarchuk
Quinn Eastlick	Mohamad Mohamad
Patrick Saunders (online)	Christian Undseth
Elizabeth Tan (online)	Joe Case
Laura Urbain (online)	Brian Hahn (online)
	Leasha Grandberg (online)
	Marcello Chiacchia (online)
	Grace Lui (online)
	Shameer Gaidhar (online)
Regrets	
Helen Hu	Leo Rahey
Erin Felker	

Agenda

1. **Welcome & introductions** (Quinn Eastlick, Krista Campbell)
2. **Agenda overview** (Pamela Ajoku)
3. **Land Introduction** (Pamela Ajoku)
4. **Land adjustments (denominator)** (Pamela Ajoku)
5. **Summary** (Pamela Ajoku)
6. **Questions & comments** (all)

Feedback & comments collected:

Data, Calculations & Assumptions

- Now that The City is using actuals, there is a significant difference between pace and estimate. If you were to project a straight line, we are getting an annual absorption of 570 ha. Looking at 1,576 ha DA signed.
- Explain 11 ha for Transportation? *(slide 10)*
- For the Aurora business park, could you have another look at that number? Thought it was closer to 205 ha. Get a larger number for leviable land.
- Could you explain where you got the 290 ha from the 2023 forecast? Want to be cautious on what we actually saw?
- Infrastructure type to denominator *(slide 5).* The change in denominator, the addition in hectares plus change in absorption, is going to impact the formula for Water. Wastewater and water treatment is per capita, so area shouldn't matter. Same with community services and transit? So we understand, the most impactable change from the addition of areas will be on linear water and wastewater absorption? Want to make sure we our spending our time on the right areas.
- To confirm, Water distribution includes everything but treatment? And it will be significantly impacted?
- For the three water models, they are not the same. This is a bit of an oddity, given your explanation. Could you explain this more on why you don't align for the next meeting?

Methodology & Technical Clarifications

- Why aren't the new ASPs included in Water?
- When you say the difference came from refinements, what do you mean? Measurement issue, not application issue?
- For sake of Transportation, assumed how much land is developable. When the City takes ER that wasn't previously considered ER, it is removed from the calculation. City is taking ER to the financial burden of the developer, they are also taking land from the denominator which increases the levy on developers.
- Water denominator. We had the discussion before, the City's position is that the notion that the denominator remains the growth area instead of the ASPs, and that moving to the ASPs would be a change in methodology. We don't see it as a change of methodology, just a change in numbers. In our opinion, this would be a welcome change, given the amount of land developed under a previous levy rate. If the only barrier to exploring an ASP denominator for Water is time, given the concept of having a levy rate change in the middle of a construction season, it may be beneficial to take that extra 6 months and have a clean break at January 2027 to get that ASP approach. Willing to accept volatility if justified. But using the ASP model smooths out the changes. Will want to continue that discussion.
- Not everything will be in the ten-year plan and vice versa. As it relates to leviable infrastructure and capital, why would there be any difference between what is in the levy and the ten-year plan?
- There was a note about a double count in Westview. For the next version, the double count would be removed.

Timing, Implementation & Process

- Talk a lot about how this bylaw review is an update but not changing. How does this happen to the bylaw? Is this an amendment to the bylaw? Does it need to go to a public hearing? When

will these updates come into effect? Will impact the speed with which people want their DA assessed.
- In years past, the effective date is sometime in December. You're saying 2026 rates won't be available until June? Escalation and inflation gets applied in January, then there's a second adjustment?
- Target of June to get updates to council?
- To clarify, we were hoping there would be an update for January 1, 2026.
- Once we go through all these calculations and if the difference is not material, would there be a decision at some point to maybe not do a mid-year update and wait until 2027?
- Would be good to let council know that we're working on this, even if the change wouldn't be material.

Industry Impact & Concerns

- Two major interests from industry are the volatility of the rate, and having a change mid-season creates a huge problem since you lose the first half of the year waiting for a council decision.
- Regarding the mid-year change, when we're negotiating lot pricing with builders, taking those proformas to banks, it creates uncertainty that could make, break, or improve our proformas.

Action Items

- Provide the breakdown for the Development Agreements issued in 2023, 2024, and YTD 2025.
- Follow up/clarify the note made related to the West View growth applications (219 HA represented the combined growth application inclusive of the 79 HA in the first West View growth application).
- Clarify the forecast horizon in the Water model for linear infrastructure as the OSL Bylaw Background report references 2048.
- Communicate industry desire to expand the Water denominator to the ASPs.
- Confirm when the City is expected to be able to share the final hectares of development agreements signed for 2025.