Agenda
Council Meeting
August 11, 2014 - 7 p.m.

1 Call to Order
2 Singing of the National Anthem
3 Disclosures of (Direct or Indirect) Pecuniary Interest
4 Approval of Agenda
5 Adoption of Minutes of Previous Council Meetings
   The minutes of a special and regular meeting of Council, held on July 14, 2014.
6 Proclamations and Presentations
6.1 Motivational Video – Every Town Needs a Doc (M04)
   Mr. Bob Burnside to present a motivational video on community development.
7 Question Period
8 Petitions and Delegations
8.1 Concerned Citizens of Orangeville and Dufferin County – Dufferin County Forest Management Plan 2015 – 2035 (M04)
   Mr. Jim Phillips, 675147 Hurontario Street, Mono, L9W 2S5, on behalf of Concerned Citizens of Orangeville and Dufferin County to address Council with respect to the Proposed Dufferin County Forest Management Plan 2015 – 2035.
8.2 Orangeville Police Association – Police Services Board – Legal Fees (P16)

Mr. James Giovannetti, President, Orangeville Police Association, to address Council with respect to Police Services Board legal fees.

9 Correspondence

9.1 Orangeville Business Improvement Area – Mill Street Temporary Road Closure – Taste of Orangeville (T08)

Correspondence from the Orangeville Business Improvement Area, dated June 28, 2014, with respect to a temporary road closure and parking restrictions on Mill Street, from 10:00 a.m. August 15 to 12 noon August 17, 2014, to facilitate the Taste of Orangeville Event. (Comments from Fire and Police Services, and the Public Works Department attached).

Recommendation:

That correspondence from the Orangeville Business Improvement Area, dated July 28, 2014, with respect to a temporary road closure and parking restriction, from 10:00 a.m. August 15 to 12 noon August 17, 2014, to facilitate the Taste of Orangeville Event be received;

And that the request be approved and a by-law enacted.

9.2 Information Items

The following items are presented for the information of Council:


9.2.2 2014 Capital Progress Report (TF-2014-26) (C11/F05)


9.2.3 Investment Report for the 2013 Fiscal Year (TF-2014-24) (C11/F12)


9.2.4 2014 Second Quarter Operating Fund Variance Report (TF-2014-33) (C11/F05)

9.2.5 Geographic Information System (GIS) Implementation (PL-2014-25) (C11/D22)


9.2.6 Plan of Subdivision Application S 1/14 – Hamount Investments Ltd., 20 & 32 C Line (PL-2014-26) (C11/D12)


9.2.7 Certificate of Approval – Site Plan Application SP 2/14 (D11)

SP 2/14 – Nova Cheese Inc. (Woolwich Dairy), 425 Richardson Road.

9.2.8 Heritage Permit Application (R01)

HR 6/14 – Meridian Credit Union, 190 Broadway.

9.2.9 Dufferin County Official Plan – Notice of Statutory Public Meeting (A16)

Notice of the County of Dufferin Official Plan Statutory Public Meeting to be held on August 13, 2014.

9.2.10 Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing – County of Dufferin Official Plan – Delegated Authority (A16)

Correspondence from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, dated July 24, 2014, with respect to the Town of Orangeville’s interest in maintaining delegated approval authority regarding official plans.

Recommendation:

That the information items be received.

10 Reports

10.1 Ontario Municipal Board Appeal – Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications OPZ 1/14 – Tony Ajayi, 45 Church Street (PL-2014-27) (C11/A09)


Recommendation:

That report PL-2014-27, dated July 15, 2014, with respect to the Ontario Municipal Board Appeal – 45 Church Street, be received;
And that expert planning opinion and legal counsel be sought to represent the Town at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing, as needed.

10.2 Proposed Amendments to the Sign By-law 28-2013 (BB-2014-04) (C11/T07)

A report from Councillor S. Bradley, Chair, Sign Development Committee, dated June 19, 2014.

Recommendation:

That report BB-2014-01, dated June 19, 2014, with respect to proposed amendments to Sign By-law 28-2013, be received;

And that Council consider a by-law to amend Sign By-law 28-2013 to adopt the following:

- Section 7.7 (b) be amended to read as follows: Ground signs can incorporate up to 45% of the total sign display area as a readograph or electronic message display on lots with less than 30 m of highway frontage, or on lots with more than 30 m but less than 45 m of highway frontage up to a maximum of 40% of the total sign display area, or for Commercial lots only with more than 45 m of highway frontage up to a maximum of 33% of the total sign display area.

- Section 7.7 add clause (d) to read as follows: Ground signs incorporating readograph or electronic message display shall come equipped with automatic dimming technology which automatically adjusts the sign’s brightness in direct correlation with ambient light conditions.

- Section 7.7 add clause (e) to read as follows: Ground signs incorporating an electronic message display shall not contain a flashing or continuous scrolling message or image. Where the message is of other than scrolling script, the frequency of any image change shall not be less than every 7 seconds.

- Sections 6.2(a)(vi), 6.5(a)(iv), 6.6(a)(iv), to be amended to add the following: “If the lot frontage of the property is less than 30 m, a second ground sign for the purpose of readograph or electronic message display will not be permitted.

- Sections 6.2(a)(vi), 6.5(a)(iv), 6.6(a)(iv), to be further amended to include the following:

“That the one additional ground sign permitted not exceed a height of 3 m.”
- Section 4.9 add clause (x) to read as follows: Temporary signs, including bag signs and coroplast signs, with the exception of signage erected by community associations, charitable organizations, and non-profit corporations and with the exception of one temporary sign for a building contractor or home renovation operator working on site for a maximum 30 day period.

- Section 3.19 change the definition name from Digital Signage to Digital Image Signage.

10.3 Town of Orangeville Annual Accessibility Plan (BB-2014-08) (C11/A22)

A report from Councillor G. Campbell, Chair, Accessibility Committee, dated July 21, 2014.

Recommendation:

That report BB-2014-08 dated July 21, 2014, with respect to the Town of Orangeville’s annual Accessibility Plan, be received;

And that the Town of Orangeville’s annual Accessibility Plan, as presented, be approved.

10.4 2014 Development Charges Background Study and By-law (TF-2014-32) (C11/F21)

10.4.1 A report from Mr. B. Parrott, Treasurer, dated August 11, 2014.

10.4.2 Correspondence from the Orangeville Business Improvement Area Board of Management, dated July 30, 2014.

Recommendation:

That report TF-2014-32, dated August 11, 2014, with respect to the Development Charges Background Study and 2014 Development Charges By-law, be received;

And that Council adopt the 2014 Development Charges Background Study and the Addendum to the Study as presented without an additional public meeting;

And that Council approve the 2014 Development Charges By-law as submitted.

10.5 Comments on the Amended Proposed Source Protection Plan (PW-2014-42) (C11/A01)

Recommendation:
That report PW-2014-42, dated July 25, 2014, with respect to comments on the Amended Proposed Source Protection Plan, be received;

And that staff be directed, as part of the final consultation process, to submit comments on the Credit Valley, Toronto and Region, and Central Lake Ontario Source Protection Plan to the Source Protection Chair by August 22, 2014.

10.6 Tender Results for the Reconstruction of Mill Street (Broadway to Little York Street/Armstrong Street) (PW-2014-43) (C11/F18)

10.6.1 A report from Mr. R. J. Lackey, Manager of Operations and Development, dated July 25, 2014.

10.6.2 Correspondence from the Orangeville Business Improvement Area Board of Management, dated July 31, 2014.

Recommendation:
That report PW-2014-43, dated July 25, 2014, with respect tender results for the Mill Street Reconstruction Project, be received;

And that Council accept the tender of Drexler Construction Limited in the amount of $543,373.70, exclusive of HST;

And that staff be authorized to transfer $255,000 from the Water Works Reserve Fund and the Wastewater Reserve Fund to this capital project;

And that Council consider a by-law authorizing the Mayor and the Clerk to sign the construction contract with Drexler Construction;

And that staff be authorized to approve contract change orders as may be required to complete the project.

10.7 Clothing and Boot Allowance Policy (HR-2014-02) (C11/P09)


Recommendation:
That report HR-2014-02, dated July 24, 2014, with respect to Clothing and Boot Allowance Policy, be received;

And that Council approve Policy HR-002 Clothing and Boot Allowance effective January 1, 2015.

10.8 Request for Quotation Results – Amelia Street Trail and Boardwalk (PR-2014-12) (C11/F18)

A report from Mr. E. Brennan, Director of Parks and Recreation, dated July 23, 2014.
Recommendation:

That report PR-2014-12, dated July 23, 2014, with respect to Request for Quotation results for Amelia Street Trail and Boardwalk, be received;

And that Council approve the proposal from Whispering Pines Landscaping;

And that the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to enter into an agreement with Whispering Pines Landscaping as per the terms and conditions of the Request For Quotation and their proposal;

And that staff be authorized to carry out any change orders required to complete this project within the allocated budget.

11 Committee Minutes (C06)

11.1 The following minutes are presented for the information of Council:

Accessibility Committee – June 10
Property Standards Committee – October 2
Trailway Committee – April 15

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the meeting listed be received.

12 Resolutions

13 By-laws (C01)

(Agreements not attached to the by-laws are available in the Clerk’s Department for perusal).

Bill 14 – 066 A by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Corporation of the Town of Orangeville at its special and regular meeting held on July 14, 2014.


Bill 14 – 068 A by-law to authorize a lending agreement with TD Canada Trust for the amount of $600,000 principal (Tony Rose Arena floor project -TF-2014-29).

Bill 14 – 069 A by-law to establish Development Charges for Townwide and area specific services.

14 Notice of Motion
15 **New Business**
(Including verbal reports on Associations, Boards and Committees on which Council has representatives).

16 **Closed Meeting**
Section 239.(2) of the Municipal Act, 2001;

(b) personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local board employees (Town employees);

(c) advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose?? (Lease Agreement – Orangeville Visitor Information Centre, Memorandum of Understanding)

(d) labour relations or employee negotiations (Town employees);

(g) a matter in respect of which a council, board, committee or other body may hold a closed meeting under another Act: Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, s. 9(1), Relations with governments and s 15, information soon to be published (Memorandum of Understanding)

(g) a matter in respect of which a council, board, committee or other body may hold a closed meeting under another Act: Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, s. 11, Economic Interests (Lease Agreement – Orangeville Visitor Information Centre)

17 **Adjournment**

Portions of this document may not be Accessible. An Accessible copy is available from the Clerk's Department.
Minutes of a special meeting of Council
held on July 14, 2014, 6:00 p.m.

Members Present
Deputy Mayor W. Maycock
G. Campbell
M. Rose
J. Williams
S. Wilson

Member Absent
Mayor Rob Adams (notice)

Staff Present
Mr. R. Schwarzer, CAO
Mr. E. Brennan, Director of Parks and Recreation
Ms. D. Fraser, Chief Librarian
Ms. S. Greatrix, Clerk
Mr. D. Jones, Director of Public Works
Mr. B. Parrott, Treasurer
Mr. R. J. Lackey, Manager, Operations & Development
Ms. H. McGinnity, Manager, Environmental Services
Ms. K. Mills, Deputy Treasurer

Call to Order
The Chair, Deputy Mayor Maycock, called the Council meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Disclosure of (Direct or Indirect) Pecuniary Interest
None.

Petitions and Delegations
None.
Education Session
2014 Development Charges Background Study (F21)

Mr. Andrew Grunda, Watson & Associates, Economists Ltd. presented the 2014 Development Charges Background Study and responded to questions from Council.

Adjournment

1 Moved by Councillor Wilson
Seconded by Councillor Bradley

That the meeting be adjourned (6:39 p.m.)

Warren Maycock, Deputy Mayor

___________________________
Susan Greatrix, Clerk
The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville
Council Chambers
87 Broadway, Orangeville, Ontario

Minutes of a regular meeting of Council
held on July 14, 2014, 7:00 p.m.

Members Present

Deputy Mayor W. Maycock Councillors:
   S. Bradley
   G. Campbell
   M. Rose
   J. Williams
   S. Wilson

Member Absent

Mayor R. Adams (notice)

Staff Present

Mr. R. Schwarzer, CAO
Ms. S. Greatrix, Clerk
Mr. E. Brennan, Director of Parks and Recreation
Ms. D. Fraser, Chief Librarian
Mr. D. Jones, Director of Public Works
Mr. B. Parrott, Treasurer
Ms. N. Tuckett, Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation
Deputy Chief W. Kalinski, Orangeville Police Services
Ms. S. Duncan, Communications Manager
Ms. J. Gohn, Manager, Human Resources
Mr. R. J. Lackey, Manager, Operations & Development
Ms. K. Mills, Deputy Treasurer
Ms. H. McGinnity, Manager, Environmental Services
Ms. R. Phillips, Manager, Economic Development
Ms. D. Armstrong, IT Technician
Call to Order

The Chair, Deputy Mayor Maycock, called the Council meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Singing of National Anthem

Disclosure of (Direct or Indirect) Pecuniary Interest  None.

Approval of Agenda

The Chair announced that Report BB-2014-04, Proposed Amendments to the Sign By-law, had been removed from the Agenda and would be presented to Council for consideration on August 11, 2014.

1 Moved by Councillor Wilson
Seconded by Councillor Bradley

That the agenda of July 14, 2014, be approved, as amended.

Carried.

Adoption of Minutes of Previous Council Meeting

The regular minutes of a meeting of Council held on June 23, 2014, were presented.

2 Moved by Councillor Campbell
Seconded by Councillor Rose

That the regular minutes of a meeting of Council held on June 23, 2014, be adopted as printed and circulated.

Carried.

Proclamations and Presentations  None.

Question Period

Mr. Nick Garisto, 243 Beechfield Crescent, L9W 4N3, requested that Council approve temporary signage for Fabric Land as outlined in Report BB-2014-06.

Mr. Chris Thompson, 42 Elm Avenue, L9W 3G4, asked how the earlier Special Council meeting had been advertised. The Clerk advised that it had been posted on the Town website and confirmed that staff will change the time on the website calendar when there is another Special Council meeting.
Mr. Don Kidd, 55 Meadow Drive, L9W 4C4, asked about Report BB-2014-004, Proposed Amendments to the Sign By-law and was advised by the Chair that the report had been removed from the Agenda and would be presented to Council for consideration on August 11, 2014.

Petitions and Delegations

Public Meeting – 2014 Development Charges Background Study (F21)

The Chair advised that the public meeting was being held pursuant to the Development Charges Act, that Council would not be taking any action and the purpose of the meeting was to give the public an opportunity to ask questions, provide comments and make representations on the Development Charges Background Study and proposed by-law. The Chair noted that the deadline for written responses is July 18, 2014.

Mr. Andrew Grunda, Watson & Associates, Economists Ltd., provided an overview of the Development Charges Background Study and responded to questions from Council.

The Chair invited comments from the public with respect to the study.

Don Kidd, 55 Meadow Drive, L9W 4C4, questioned whether other municipalities impose development charges on industries. Deputy Mayor Maycock advised that some municipalities do not impose development charges on industries, while others do, and noted that it is a lever for Orangeville to attract business.

Mr. Kidd further questioned how population and costs are projected and how accurate they’ve been in the past. Deputy Mayor Maycock advised that the consultant has expertise in the field and uses a formula based on the number of persons per household, but emphasized that the figures are predictions. He confirmed that staff and Council have confidence in the consultant and the predicted numbers, and noted that growth varies but the predictions for development charges have been accurate in the past.

Mr. Chris Thompson, 42 Elm Avenue, L9W 3G4, questioned whether the growth in fire costs is due in part to services provided outside of Orangeville and asked if there was some way to obtain assistance from the County. Deputy Mayor Maycock confirmed that Orangeville taxpayers bear the capital costs for some services provided to other municipalities (e.g. library and fire) and development charges can only be imposed on new development within the municipal boundaries.

Mr. Nick Garisto, 243 Beechfield Crescent, L9W 4N3, advised that he was in favour of the status quo for zero development charges on industry to attract business.
Moved by Councillor Wilson  
Seconded by Councillor Bradley

That the information be received and forwarded to staff for a further report.

Carried.

Credit Valley Heritage Society – Proposed Heritage Tourism Trail Project (M04)

Ms. Susan Robertson, Environmental Planner, Credit Valley Heritage Society, addressed Council with respect to the proposed heritage tourism trail project concept for the Credit River Watershed.

Moved by Councillor Bradley  
Seconded by Councillor Wilson

That the information provided by Ms. Susan Robertson, Environmental Planner, Credit Valley Heritage Society, with respect to the proposed heritage tourism trail project concept for the Credit River Watershed, be received.

Carried.

Mr. Nick Garisto – Bocce Ball Court – Lions Club Sports Park (M04)

Mr. Nick Garisto, 243 Beechfield Crescent, L9W 4N3, addressed Council with respect to permission to build a bocce ball court at the Lions Club Sports Park at no cost to the Town.

Moved by Councillor Wilson  
Seconded by Councillor Bradley

That Mr. Garisto’s bocce ball court proposal be referred to the Parks and Recreation Committee.

Carried.

Correspondence

Orangeville Business Improvement Area – Board of Management – Membership (A01)

Correspondence from the Orangeville Business Improvement Area – Board of Management, dated May 30, 2014, with respect to changes to the Board of Management membership, was presented.
Moved by Councillor Wilson
Seconded by Councillor Campbell

That correspondence from the Orangeville Business Improvement Area, dated May 30, 2104, with respect to its Board of Management, be received;

And that the resignations of Paul Korsten and Michael Hill from the Orangeville Business Improvement Area Board of Management be accepted;

And that Joe Sammut and Shawn Koroscil be appointed to the Orangeville Business Improvement Area Board of Management for the remainder of the term of Council or until their successors are appointed;

And that Joe Sammut be appointed as the Orangeville Business Improvement Area representative on the Façade Improvement Grant Committee.

Carried.

Town of Mono – Dufferin County Forest Management Plan 2015-2035
Proposal to Permit Off Road Motorcycle Use of County Forest Properties (C10)

A resolution from the Town of Mono, dated July 2, 2014, and copy of the CAO’s report, with respect to Dufferin County Forest Management Plan 2015-2035, was presented.

Moved by Councillor Rose
Seconded by Councillor Wilson

That the resolution from the Town of Mono, dated July 2, 2014, and copy of the CAO’s report, with respect to Dufferin County Forest Management Plan 2015-2035, be received.

Carried.

Information Items

The following items were presented for the information of Council:

Mr. John Green – Waste Removal Issue (M04)
Correspondence from Mr. John Green, 31 Cambridge Avenue, L9W 3M1, dated July 3, 2014.

New Businesses in Orangeville – May 1 to June 30, 2014


Moved by Councillor Williams
Seconded by Councillor Rose

That the information items be received;

And that the correspondence from Mr. John Green, 31 Cambridge Avenue, L9W 3M1, dated July 3, 2014 regarding a Waste Removal Issue be forwarded to the County of Dufferin for consideration.

Carried.

Reports

Temporary Signage for Fabric Land – 224 Centennial Road (BB-2014-06) (C11/P11)

A report from Mr. V. Douglas, Director of Building and By-law Enforcement, dated June 26, 2014, was presented.

Moved by Councillor Rose
Seconded by Councillor Williams

That report BB-2014-06, dated June 26, 2014, with respect to temporary signage for the Fabric Land unit located at 224 Centennial Road, be received;

And that the temporary sign be permitted while the mall owner goes through the approval process to permit rear wall signage as outlined in the report.

Carried.

Section 357 Tax Appeals (TF-2014-28) (C11/F23)

A report from Ms. K. Mills, Deputy Treasurer, dated July 14, 2014, was presented.

Moved by Councillor Bradley
Seconded by Councillor Wilson

That report TF-2014-28, dated July 14, 2014, with respect to Tax Appeals for 2013 and 2014 under Section 357, be received;
And that Council provide authorization to adjust taxes under Section 357 of the Municipal Act, for the 2014 Tax year.

Carried.

Proposed Consolidation and Elimination of Reserves and Reserve Funds (TF-2014-16) (C11/F20)

A report from Ms. K. Mills, Deputy Treasurer, dated July 14, 2014, was presented.

11 Moved by Councillor Bradley
Seconded by Councillor Rose

That report TF-2014-16, dated July 14, 2014, with respect to the reserve consolidation, be received;

And that Council adopt the suggested uses of reserves versus reserve funds;

And that Council adopt the suggestions of consolidation as outlined in Appendix A.

Carried.

Funding Options for Public Works 5-Ton Truck (TF-2014-30) (C11/F00)

A report from Mr. B. Parrott, Treasurer, and Mr. D. Jones, Director of Public Works, dated July 14, 2014, was presented.

12 Moved by Councillor Rose
Seconded by Councillor Campbell

That report TF-2014-30, dated July 14, 2014, with respect to funding options for a Public Works 5-ton truck, be received;

And that Council approve the option of borrowing for the acquisition of the 5-ton truck cab from the Capital Reserve Fund, payable back over a 5 year, interest free period.

Carried.

Results of Request for Quotation for Term Debt – Tony Rose Arena Floor Project (TF-2014-29) (C11/F18)

A report from Mr. B. Parrott, Treasurer, dated July 14, 2014, was presented.
That report TF-2014-29, dated July 14, 2014, with respect to results of the Request For Quotation for Term Debt—Tony Rose Arena Floor Project, be received;

And that Council authorize the Treasurer to enter into a lending agreement with TD Canada Trust for the amount of $600,000 principal.

Carried.


A report from Mr. D. Jones, Director of Public Works, dated June 30, 2014, was presented.


Carried.


A report from Mr. D. Jones, Director of Public Works, and Mr. E. Brennan, Director of Parks and Recreation, dated June 30, 2014, was presented.

That report PW-2014-35, dated June 30, 2014, with respect to the tenders for general road maintenance/rehabilitation, be received;

And that the tender of Aecon Construction and Materials Ltd., be accepted in accordance with the requirements of Tender 13PW-14.

Carried.

Tenders for the Repair & Rehabilitation of Catchbasins & Maintenance Holes Tender 04PW-14 (PW-2014-36) (C11/F18)

A report from Mr. R. J. Lackey, Manager of Operations and Development, dated June 30, 2014, was presented.
Moved by Councillor Rose
Seconded by Campbell

That report PW-2014-36, dated June 30, 2014, with respect to the tenders for the repair and rehabilitation of catchbasins and maintenance holes, Tender 04PW-14, be received;

And that the tender of C & G Concrete be accepted in accordance with the terms and conditions of Tender 04PW-14.

Carried.

Tenders for Sidewalk Reconstruction (Tender No. 14PW-14) (PW-2014-37) (C11/F18)

A report from Mr. R. J. Lackey, Manager of Operations and Development, dated June 30, 2014, was presented.

Moved by Councillor Rose
Seconded by Councillor Bradley

That report PW-2014-37, dated June 30, 2014, with respect to tenders for sidewalk reconstruction (Tender 14PW-14) be received;

And that the tender of Bennington Construction Ltd., in the amount of $78,490.90, plus applicable taxes, be accepted in accordance with the requirements of Tender 14PW-14.

Carried.

Council Authorization to Close Broadway to Facilitate the Rehabilitation of the Intersections of First Street and John Street (PW-2014-41) (C11/T08)

A report from Mr. R. J. Lackey, Manager of Operations and Development, dated June 30, 2014, was presented.

Moved by Councillor Wilson
Seconded by Councillor Rose

That report PW-2014-41, dated June 30, 2014, with respect to the closure of Broadway between John Street and Wellington Street, be received;

And that Council consider a by-law to authorize a temporary road closure on Broadway between John Street and Wellington Street during the time and/or times described in the report to facilitate the rehabilitation of the bricks in the intersections of Broadway and First Street and John Street.

Carried.
New Name and Logo for the Town of Orangeville Accessibility Committee
(BB-2014-07) (C11/C12)

A report from Councillor G. Campbell, Chair, Accessibility Committee, dated June 26, 2014, was presented.

19 Moved by Councillor Campbell
Seconded by Councillor Bradley

That report BB-2014-07, dated June 26, 2014, with respect to a name change and logo change for the Accessibility Committee, be received;

And that Council approve the Accessibility Committee's name change to Access Orangeville;

And that Council approve the use of the Access Orangeville logo attached to this report;

And that Council approve the use of the poster attached to this report, which will promote local retailer’s commitment to accessible shopping within their establishment.

Carried.

Committee Minutes (C06)

The following minutes were presented for the information of Council:

Arts and Culture Committee – May 14
Committee of Adjustment – June 4, July 2
Economic Development Committee – April 22
Heritage Orangeville – April 23
Mayor’sSeniors’Advisory Committee – June 4
Orangeville Public Library Board – May 28
Sign Development Committee – June 5

20 Moved by Councillor Wilson
Seconded by Councillor Rose

That the minutes of the meetings listed be received.

Carried.

Resolutions

None.
By-laws (C01)

21 Moved by Councillor Wilson
Seconded by Councillor Bradley

That bills 14-062 to 14-065 be read, enacted, signed, sealed and numbered as follows:

By-law 63-2014 A by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Corporation of the Town of Orangeville at its meeting held on June 23, 2014.

By-law 64-2014 A by-law to authorize an engineering agreement with Triton Engineering Services Limited for upgrades to the traffic signals at First Street and Fifth Avenue.

By-law 65-2014 A by-law to authorize an engineering agreement with Triton Engineering services Limited for professional consulting services (Watermain and sewer replacement – Mill Street).

By-law 66-2014 A by-law to authorize a temporary road closure to facilitate the rehabilitation of certain sections of Broadway (July 14-17 and July 21-24, 2014).

Carried.

Notice of Motion
None.

New Business

Councillor Wilson commented that the Mayor’s Youth Advisory Committee (MYAC) had a very successful 20th Anniversary Celebration with over 300 participants on Saturday, July 12, noting that Councillor Rose started MYAC when she was Mayor. Councillor Wilson thanked Zehrs and Enbridge for their contributions to the barbecue lunch; staff, particularly Darla Fraser, Sheila Duncan and Stephanie Pavao for organizing and promoting the event; and Council for their continuing support of MYAC.

Closed Meeting
None.
Adjournment

22 Moved by Councillor Campbell
Seconded by Councillor Rose

That the meeting be adjourned (8:11 p.m.)

Carried.

W. Maycock, Deputy Mayor                                Susan Greatrix, Clerk
Dear Mayor and Council,

Rod Adams, Mayor  
Wayne Maycock, Deputy Mayor  
Sylvia Bradley, Councillor  
Gail Campbell, Councillor  
Mary Rose, Councillor 
Jeremy Williams, Councillor  
Scott Wilson, Councillor  

Members of Council

My name is Jim Phillips and I am from 675147 Hurontario Street, Mono, Ontario and I have been a local taxpayer for 26 years.

Regarding the Dufferin County Forest Management plan 2015 -2035 and the proposal to allow Off Road Motorcycles.

The Dufferin Forests are a great resource for the area and for many of Orangeville residents. Their availability for quiet and environmentally low impact activities is a reason many people and businesses gravitate to the area and to Orangeville.

Orangeville Council is in a unique position because of its influence at County Council and the vote on this issue this fall. The forests were established with great foresight to reduce erosion, protect the environment and provide its residents with quiet natural spaces. A vote to allow any access to forests by motorized vehicles would cause immediate and long term consequences to that natural space. The adverse effects caused by motorized vehicles on public forests and parks have been well documented in other areas. These forests not only provide the current and very fortunate generation of users with an environment for low impact recreational activities, but also future generations to come. To allow the destruction of these areas and encourage the resulting noise by allowing off-road vehicle use would be very short sighted. As said, Orangeville Council’s position on this issue will very likely be the determining factor, so very serious consideration is required. Areas most affected by the vote have taken positions not to support inclusion of off-road vehicles, as have agencies such as Niagara Escarpment Commission.

I thank you for providing the time to voice this opposition to including off-road vehicles in county forests. Below is a referenced summary as well as the presentation made to County Council on the same topic.

Best regards,

Jim Phillips
Comments on the recreational use policy in the Dufferin County

Forests, specifically motorized vehicle use.

Colleen W. Mitchell, BSc, DVM, DVSc, DipACVR, 26 year resident and ratepayer of Mono

As an avid user of the Dufferin Forests, specifically the Mono tract, I would like to comment on the proposal being considered to allow the use of off road motorized vehicles in the forests. I appreciate that the Ontario Federation of Trail Riders are likely conscientious responsible individuals, however the introduction of motorized vehicles into the forests will have many detrimental effects.

The Dufferin Forests are now frequented by quiet users (hikers, bicyclists, horseback riders, hunters, anglers and bird watchers). In the US, the vast majority of recreational visitation on public lands is by quiet users. Off road motorized vehicles only comprise 3% of the total recreational visits to all US national forests; and 6.6% of the hunting and fishing visits (USDA,2003). Motorized vehicles are incompatible with quiet users due to noise, speed, dust, trail damage and general safety concerns. Quiet users are disproportionately affected by the presence of motorized vehicles because these vehicles cover a large amount of ground quickly and are loud. In other jurisdictions that have allowed motorized vehicles in publicly owned land, there have been conflicts with and eventually displacement of quiet users, resulting in motorized activities becoming the primary use. Quiet users enjoy visits to these sites less and eventually stop using them. Managers often wrongly assume the displacement of quiet users is a reflection of decreased demand for these activities and may commit greater resources to the offending activity.(Switalski and Jones, 2008; Waalen, 2006) The displacement of the current trail users in the Dufferin Forests by motorized vehicles would come at a considerable economic and social cost.

If motorized vehicles are allowed into the County forests, additional services will have to be available including emergency responders (ambulances, firetrucks and police), parking, sanitation facilities, fencing and waste collection, as well as additional liability insurance. Supervision, monitoring and policing will be necessary due to complaints/conflicts with other users/neighbors, accidents, trespassing, damage to property, speed violations, noise, littering, road right of way violations, underage operators, unregistered vehicles and intoxicated operators. There will be difficulty enforcing restrictions on the type of vehicle used, which trails used and the time of use.

A recent survey of federal rangers in the US show that off road vehicle use is out of control and has become a significant law enforcement problem (Rangers for responsible recreation survey, 2007). The trails will have to be adapted to allow motorized
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Motorized vehicles create negative effects on soil, vegetation and wildlife. They aid the spread of exotic and invasive plants by carrying seeds and changing the soil conditions. There is considerable erosion with motorized vehicles. The runoff from tire ruts increases sediment load in streams which may threaten fisheries. The emissions from motorized vehicles are high in carbon monoxide and carcinogens and contribute to climate change. The noise from motorized vehicles affects other users, neighbors and wildlife. Wildlife may be frightened from the area or be disturbed from feeding, breeding or their daily patterns. (Stokowski and LaPointe, 2000).

Off road motor vehicles are not snowmobiles. Snowmobilers have an established network of trails incorporating public trails with a large number of privately owned properties with whom they have built long term relationships built on land stewardship. Other motorized vehicles are not welcomed by property owners since they disturb residents and neighbors, damage property and create noise and dust. Snowmobilers operate when the ground is frozen, plants are dormant, animals are less active and there is less outdoor activity by residents.

The fitness and health claims of off road vehicles are questionable. The study quoted by the OFTR was sponsored by the Canadian Off Highway Vehicle Manufacturers Association (COHV). The findings of this study have been disputed in the same journal in which it was published. There was little evidence in this study to suggest that off road or all terrain vehicular activities are effective training modalities. The aerobic fitness and musculoskeletal testing of the study participants did not significantly increase. There is a high morbidity and mortality rate associated with these activities. The long term exposure to exhaust fumes is substantial. The exhaust not only contains carbon monoxide, but also carcinogens including benzenes, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde and acrolein. The authors concluded that the use of these vehicles is very dangerous and poses serious health, environmental, social and economic issues (Milburn et al, 2012). Considering the Mono tract specifically, there are numerous reasons why motorized vehicles should not be permitted. This tract is adjacent to the Mono Cliffs Provincial Park, Niagara Escarpment, provincially significant wetlands and to the Mono Cliffs Outdoor Education Center which is owned by the Toronto District School Board. Also neighboring this tract are 10 horse farms. This tract is currently frequented by local residents year round and snowmobilers (OFSC) in the winter. There are no parking lots available for this tract and the town of Mono has a bylaw which does not allow off road vehicles on their roads, so access to this tract by motorized vehicles is presently impossible.

The Dufferin County forests were established by our predecessors because they realized that trees were important for stabilization of the soils and maintaining water and
timber supplies. This land reclamation began in 1905 and now comprises 2606 acres. The County has responsibly managed these forests up until now, including hiring a full time manager who has worked to develop a 20 year plan and recreational use policy. The mandate of the manager and the county should be protection of the natural environment and community access for complementary recreational activities. I feel the Forest Plan Advisory Team is being manipulated by a special interest group whose members are not necessarily residents and who have hired a full time employee to lobby for access to public land.

The OFTR (off road motorcyclists) are on the forest plan advisory committee and they are lobbying for the change of use to allow their vehicles into our forests. The Ontario Federation of ATV Clubs is also on the advisory committee and they will also want access to our forests.

Residents and forest users of the Dufferin County will have to live with what the Dufferin County Council decides in 2014 around this issue. Please consider your decision carefully!

Thank you,
Colleen Mitchell
675147 Hurontario Street
Mono

References:
USDA, Forest Service 2003 National Forest Visitor Use Monitoring Program.
Switalski and Jones 2008 Best management practices for off road vehicle use on forestlands. Wildlands CPR and Wild Utah Project.
Waalen 2006 ATVs in Wisconsin. Presented to the Natural Resources Board.
Rangers for Responsible Recreation. 2007 Survey of Federal Law Enforcement Officers in the Southwest on off road vehicle (ORV) issues.
Stokowski and LaPointe 2000 Environmental and social effects of ATVs and ORVs. School of Natural Resources, University of Vermont.

Presentation to County Council July 10, 2013

Council Members for the 2010 to 2014 Term of Council are:
Rob Adams, Mayor of Orangeville
Ken Bennington, Deputy Mayor of Shelburne
Rhonda Campbell Moon, Deputy Mayor of Mulmur
Ed Crewson, Mayor of Shelburne
Good evening Warden Hill and to the members of County Council and thank you for this time.

My name is Jim Phillips and I am from 675147 Hurontario Street in Mono. I have been a local taxpayer for 26 years.

Regarding Dufferin County Forest Management Plan 2015 – 2035 and the proposal to allow Off Road Motorcycles

Introduction

This proposal and the decision making process around the proposal provides great concern for a large number of Dufferin County residents. It is a decision that is of significant importance to the area as this change, if allowed, could very quickly alter the face of the forests and the genie will not be able to be put back in the bottle as the damage could be significant and severe. The concerns come from a wide variety of community members as the change would be inconsistent with the currently stated primary goal and use of the properties by off road vehicles and would negatively impact:

- The environment
- Current recreational users – All of which leave a much smaller foot print than use of Off Road motorcycles
  - Hikers
  - Bicyclers
  - Nature Enthusiasts
  - Bird Watchers
  - Dog walkers
  - Joggers
  - Horse riding enthusiasts
- Pose safety concerns to current primary recreational users
- Impact primary intended users and residents at a time of the years when most of the use and enjoyment of the outdoors takes place
- Wildlife including endangered species
- Inflict long term damage quickly to the impacted areas
- Impact adjoining Trails and Parks potentially changing any accretive value.
- Impact adjoining private properties
- Pose conflicting bylaws issues between County and Townships
  - These vehicles are not allowed on roads in many townships – how would they get there?
Parking is not available and not allowed on roads
- Noise bylaws
- Raise the cost of maintaining forests
- Add safety, liability and infrastructure costs
  - Such as fencing to limit use in adjoining parks, trails and property
  - Creation of parking lots
  - Increased signage and trail markings
  - Insurance
  - Access ways for emergency vehicles and personnel
- Is being done without any impact studies specifically relating to the forests in question
  - Impact of Noise
  - Impact on Current use
  - Economic Impact
  - Environment
- The request for motorized vehicle use is primarily from outside of Dufferin County and is driven by a well-organized, well-staffed and well-funded advocacy group.

Challenges and Concerns with the Process
- This proposed amendment to the Recreational Policy of the Dufferin Forests is not going through a rigorous process as one would expect. I am told this is because it does not have go through an official change of use because the forests are County owned property. If this amendment did have to go through an official change of use – other authorities would have been consulted and asked to provide comments.
- There is a recent question if it is now in the Official County Plan.
  - It appears that the following has been slipped into the draft official plan on page 30 section 3.6 d) “The County and local municipalities are encouraged the promote the provision of trails, to accommodate a variety of uses (e.g. walking cycling, all-terrain vehicle, snowmobile and equestrian) where appropriate in the Countryside Area”
- I contacted the Niagara Escarpment Authority – they were not aware of the process (Mr. Baran). They were very concerned and have since started a review. Currently motorized vehicle use is illegal on public land in the NE.
- I contacted the Ministry of Natural resources and they told me they were not aware but were also concerned particularly as it concerned adjacent properties and provincial parks (Kim Benner)
- Toronto District School Board owns adjacent property (Mono Cliffs Outdoor Education Center). They were unaware of the proposed amendment and were particularly concerned about liability. They have now started to review the suggested changes.
- Headwaters Tourism was not aware and is significantly concerned.
- Headwaters Horse Country was also not aware. They provide a significant amount of resources attracting horse owners to relocate to the area as well as horse events to locate in the area.
• HELG - Headwaters Equestrian leadership group has done an economic impact study.
• “The equine industry is a significant contributor to the economy of our communities in
the Headwaters region. With 9 major agriculture and horse show facilities, 4
internationally recognized event facilities, 23,000 horses,$100 million annual
expenditures in the care and feeding of horses and another $300 million in capital
expenditures on horse and property improvements, the impact of this sector is
significant.”
• “In determining a strategy for the Dufferin County Forest, the Headwaters Equine
Leadership Group would ask that any plans be developed with a sensitivity to protecting
the assets that make our region what it is –specifically the protection of our natural
assets, heritage communities and landscapes, and a rural economy that is built on our
agricultural sector and our sense of community.”

Problems:
• Because the use of off road motor vehicles is not part of the draft official plans and will
not be by the time this is voted on in the fall – those Stakeholder– Natural Resources,
Min of Environment, Oceans and Fisheries, Niagara Escarpment, etc. will not review or
comment prior to the proposed vote
• The public process was derailed during the June 17 public meeting. The published
objective of this meeting was:
  o “The Forest Plan Advisory Team, which has been advising the County
throughout the development of the draft plan, is holding this open public meeting
to hear input regarding the draft forest management plan, draft recreation policy,
and the OFTR proposal for access to the Forest by off-road motorcycles. This is
an additional opportunity for any members of the public to have input on the
recreational and other uses of the forest.”
  o However during this meeting, the chairman, Mr.Oosterhof, stated that he did not
want to hear why people “don’t want things” but wanted to only hear solutions
and compromise. One of the solutions off the table at this specific meeting was
that this type of use is inappropriate period. This attitude at this specific
meeting is inconsistent with the process in general.
• As previously said there have been no relative impact studies done with regards to the
properties. An overwhelming amount of the peer reviewed, independent and substantive
information available does not support the use of these vehicles due to the detrimental
impact on the environment, wildlife, land and on other primary uses for the land.
• The townships most impacted by this change of use have stated their opposition.
• Other County residents that enjoy the use of these facilities would not be interested in
this type of use (off road motorcycle) and would be opposed to its introduction.
• The Advisory Team is underrepresented by primary recreational users and community
stakeholders.
• Why are All Terrain Vehicles represented on the Advisory Committee - are they next?
In Closing:
The vast majority of recreational visitation on public lands is by quiet users (hikers, cyclists, joggers, horseback riders, etc). Off road motorized vehicles only comprise 3% of total recreational visits to all US national forests. Motorized vehicles are incompatible with quiet users due to noise, speed, dust, trail damage and safety concerns. It has been well documented in the US that once off road vehicles (ORVs) are allowed into publicly owned land, quiet users abandon the property and the ORVs become the primary user. If dirt bikes are allowed in the county owned forests, this will come with a large economic and social impact to Dufferin County.
Dufferin Forests are not set up to accommodate ORVs. Investment in infrastructure (parking lots, sanitation facilities), liability insurance, emergency responders and supervision/policing will be considerable. How is this going to be sustainable for the small number of additional users who will disproportionately affect or displace the present users?
The County Forest manager has not made the recommendation that ORV use be included in our 20 year plan or the recreational policy.
No one is denying the negative impact ORVs will have on the natural environment: erosion, disturbance of wildlife and destruction of vegetation.
Or the negative impact ORVs will have on the communities surrounding the forests: noise, pollution, trespassing, decreased enjoyment of rural life and values.
If no one is denying these detrimental impacts exist, why are we considering the proposed changes to the recreational policy of the Dufferin County Forests?
The answer must be that special interest groups representing off road motorcycles are manipulating the advisory team to their own advantage.
If the OFTR are granted access to the County Forests, the ATV group on the advisory team will expect the same.
Please County Council, consider your decision wisely!
July 29, 2014

To: Mayor Rob Adams & Members of Council

Request for Road Closure for Taste of Orangeville
Friday, August 15th to Sunday August 17th

The Orangeville BIA respectfully requests approval for a road closure as follows:

Event: Taste of Orangeville

Date/Time: Friday, August 15th, 2014 10am to Sunday, August 17th 12pm.

Locations: 1. Mill Street from Broadway to Armstrong/Little York
2. That the parking be prohibited for the duration of the road closure and that towing be authorized after 12pm on Friday, August 15th.

As in the past, we respectfully request that Public Works close the street with appropriate detour signage.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact the BIA office at (519) 942-0087 or events@downtownorangeville.ca.

Sincerely,

Julia Poletto
Event Coordinator
To: Susan Garetrix, Clerk's Dept

From: Ronald A.J. Morden, Fire Dept

Date: July 17, 2014 – amended Aug. 6, 2014

Subject: Mill Street closure – Taste of Orangeville
Aug. 15th – Aug. 17th, 2014

Please be advised that this Department is aware of the upcoming requested road closure from 10 a.m. Friday, August 15th through Noon, Sunday, August 17th. As always please ensure access is maintained for emergency vehicles.

Should you have any questions or concerns regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

RONALD A.J. MORDEN
Deputy Fire Chief
Hi Johanna – I checked with the Chief and Deputy Chief. They have no issues with this request as long as access for emergency vehicles is provided if required.

Thank you
Melody

Please find attached a request for comments from the BIA to be considered at the next Council meeting scheduled for August 11, 2014.

Many thanks,

Johanna Wilson
Administrative/Licensing Assistant
Clerk’s Department
Town of Orangeville
87 Broadway
Orangeville, ON
L9W 1K1
Phone: 519-941-0440, Ext. 2239
Toll Free: 1-866-941-0440, Ext. 2239
Fax: 1-519-941-9033
jwilson@orangeville.ca
www.orangeville.ca
To: Susan Greatrix, Clerk

From: Douglas G. Jones, M.E.Sc., P.Eng., Director of Public Works

Date: July 29, 2014

Subject: Temporary Lane Closures – A Taste of Orangeville:
10:00 a.m. on Friday, August 15, 2014 to 11 a.m. on Sunday, August 17, 2014

This memo is to advise that Public Works has no objection to the road closures for the 2014 Taste of Orangeville to be held from Friday, August 15th until Sunday, August 17, 2014.

Broadway is not covered under By-law 07-041, and to simplify implementation for Staff, the closure of the following sections of streets/lanes to vehicular traffic on the above dates, can be authorized through a new By-law adopted by Council:

- The left turn lane (westbound Broadway to Mill Street);
- The right turn lane (eastbound Broadway to Mill Street); and
- Mill Street from Broadway to Armstrong Street.

Road closures will be set up and dismantled by Public Works. There is an expectation that the OBIA will maintain them in the form on the approved traffic plan throughout the event (see attached).

Sincerely,

Director of Public Works

File: Correspondence – Traffic By-law
Report

Information Item

To: Mayor Adams and Members of Council
From: Nancy Tuckett, MSc. Pl., BEd., MCIP, RPP
Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation
Date: July 17, 2014
Report: ED-2014-10
Subject: Orangeville Annual Economic Development Report - 2013

Purpose
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an overview of the economic highlights and economic development related projects and activities that occurred in 2013.

Background and Discussion
Staff has completed its first Orangeville Annual Economic Development Report in order to provide Council with a summary of the numerous economic development activities completed in the last calendar year and to provide an overview of the economic highlights, trends and indicators for the Town.

The completion of a year-end review provides Council and staff with an opportunity to measure areas of growth and competitiveness in the community as well as the outcomes of activities undertaken in the previous year. Completion of a year-end review helps the municipality to identify economic trends and activities that could create new opportunities and it provides a baseline that can establish goals and objectives for the upcoming year. The report also provides an opportunity to recognize successes, partnerships and contributions made within the past year.

The 2013 Orangeville Annual Economic Development Report is attached as Appendix A to this report.

Financial Impact
None.

Vision and Values
Encouraging business growth
Continued monitoring of economic trends and activities helps the Town to gauge the competitiveness of its economy and evaluate and respond to changes. Furthermore, the annual Economic Development review highlights the Town’s strengths as a destination to live and work.

**Recommendation**

For the information of Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by,

---

Nancy Tuckett, MSc. Pl., BEd., MCIP, RPP  
Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation

Ruth Phillips,  
Economic Development Manager
Orangeville
Annual Economic Development Report
2013
Incorporated in 1863, the Town of Orangeville celebrated its 150th birthday in 2013. Our sesquicentennial celebrations carried on throughout the year and provided many opportunities to re-connect with friends, meet new contacts, and celebrate the community attributes that help make Orangeville a great town. The celebration also provided an opportunity to reflect back on the Town’s progress and to examine opportunities and plans for our continued success in the future.

It was the beauty of Orangeville - equipped with all of the amenities of a large urban centre within a natural rural environment - that helped attract a new manufacturer to Orangeville in 2013. Caledon Woodworks purchased a portion of the Town-owned employment lands in July 2013 and is in the process of building a new customized furniture manufacturing plant that will serve the GTA area. The Town continues to actively market the re-development of two hectares of lands with manufacturing investment and job creation being a priority. Recognizing the current challenges faced by the manufacturing sector, the decision to purchase the employment lands in 2011 was made with a longer-term vision of securing opportunities for this sector over time. Despite the challenges faced by manufacturers today, manufacturing remains an integral part of our economy and experienced modest growth over the past year.

The Town’s investment in its Central Business District through beautification efforts and an ongoing, active façade improvement program have made Orangeville’s downtown the envy of many small communities across Ontario. In 2013, the Town continued to support its retail and tourism sectors by partnering with the Business Improvement Area to purchase property on the Town’s main thoroughfare with the goal of creating additional professional office space in the downtown core.

With development of the Orangeville Visitor Information Centre completed, delivery of visitor services from its high profile location at Broadway and Highway 10 commenced in early 2013. The Centre attracts visitors to the community and helps drive traffic to the Town’s key tourism destinations, retail shops and recreational amenities. In addition to fielding 4,400 inquiries in 2013, progress was made in attracting group tours, with more than 60 tour groups visiting Orangeville to attend Theatre Orangeville, the Credit Valley Explorer, the tree sculptures, and spend time shopping and dining in the community.

Growth of the creative class has also been impressive in the past year. Most notably, jobs in the information and cultural industry grew by 26% over the past year, compared to a 5% growth rate across the province. These workers are important to our community. Earning higher than average wages, workers in the information and cultural industry grew by 26% over the past year, compared to a 5% growth rate across the province.

These workers are important to our community. Earning higher than average wages, workers in the information and cultural industry are attracted to communities like Orangeville for the quality of life benefits, accessibility of high speed Internet and the cultural and recreational amenities the Town provides.

In the coming year, the Town of Orangeville will continue to work towards ensuring steady and diversified growth through new and existing investment opportunities, strengthening relationships with existing businesses, and forging new partnerships across all sectors to create opportunities for prosperity for all of our businesses and residents.

### 2013 Economic Highlights

Orangeville’s economy remained relatively stable in 2013. While the total number of businesses operating in 2013 declined slightly, overall job creation improved. Mirroring the provincial average, the Town saw an overall increase in jobs of one per cent to a total of 12,643.

Retail trade (with 2,448 jobs), Health Care and Social Services (1,869 jobs), and Manufacturing (1,430 jobs) continued to represent significant components of the local economy.

Emerging trends indicate that the Information and Culture, Educational Services and Accommodation and Food Services sectors are growing industries in Orangeville. Job growth in these three sectors far surpassed provincial averages.

### Economic Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>12,483</td>
<td>12,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Businesses Operating</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Value</td>
<td>$50,549,483</td>
<td>$43,782,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Construction Value</td>
<td>$34,836,198</td>
<td>$17,398,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Construction Value</td>
<td>$3,250,285</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Construction Value</td>
<td>$10,577,000</td>
<td>$15,755,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Construction Value</td>
<td>$1,886,000</td>
<td>$9,949,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Resale Activity</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average House Selling Price</td>
<td>$343,324</td>
<td>$345,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dwelling Units</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate by %</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Highlights

- **Total Employment**: Increased from 12,483 in 2012 to 12,643 in 2013.
- **Number of Businesses Operating**: Decreased from 2008 in 2012 to 1867 in 2013.
- **Total Construction Value**: Decreased from $50,549,483 in 2012 to $43,782,221 in 2013.
- **Residential Construction Value**: Decreased from $34,836,198 in 2012 to $17,398,221 in 2013.
- **Industrial Construction Value**: Decreased from $3,250,285 in 2012 to $680,000 in 2013.
- **Commercial Construction Value**: Increased from $10,577,000 in 2012 to $15,755,000 in 2013.
- **Institutional Construction Value**: Increased from $1,886,000 in 2012 to $9,949,000 in 2013.
- **Housing Resale Activity**: Increased from 615 in 2012 to 630 in 2013.
- **Average House Selling Price**: Increased from $343,324 in 2012 to $345,342 in 2013.
- **New Dwelling Units**: Increased from 115 in 2012 to 65 in 2013.
- **Unemployment Rate by %**: Decreased from 5.4% in 2012 to 5.3% in 2013.

### Mayor’s Message

Mayor Adams attended the Fall SIOR event on October 10 to help promote Orangeville to more than 200 industrial and commercial realtors and site selectors from across the GTA.

Working to make Orangeville even better, with a 100% exemption of non-residential development charges for most industrial uses, Orangeville demonstrates its commitment to industrial development. With the site plan completed and submission of a full permit application, time periods for permit issuance vary from 10-30 business days depending on the classificación of the structure.

---

1 OMAFRA Angled Data, DESI 2014
2 Census Division 22, 23, 24, Dufferin, Wellington and Huron Counties, Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey
3 Census Division 22, 23, 24, Dufferin, Wellington and Huron Counties, Statistics Canada, Labour Force Survey
4 OMAFRA Angled Data, DESI 2014
5 This report uses the data from the December 2012 and December 2013 Census Divisions.
6 OMAFRA Angled Data, DESI 2014
7 Construction Industry Report, December 2012 and December 2013
8 Business Data Patterns, December 2012 and December 2013
9 OMAFRA Angled Data, DESI 2014
10 OMAFRA Angled Data, DESI 2014
11 OMAFRA Angled Data, DESI 2014
12 OMAFRA Angled Data, DESI 2014

Mayor Adams attended the Fall SIOR event on October 10 to help promote Orangeville to more than 200 industrial and commercial realtors and site selectors from across the GTA.
Key Findings for Orangeville

Results of the 2011 National Household Survey were released in three installments throughout 2013. The survey was a voluntary questionnaire distributed to approximately 4.5 million households in Canada following the 2011 Census. The survey provided social and economic information on such topics as: immigration, citizenship, place of birth, ethnic origin, visible minorities, religion, Aboriginal peoples, labour, education, place of work, commuting to work, mobility and migration, language of work, income, earnings, housing and shelter costs. The 2011 voluntary survey was the first time that Statistics Canada had collected this data by voluntary survey as opposed to the previously mandatory long-form census.

97.4% of Orangeville’s population were Canadian Citizens

Between 2006 and 2011, 305 immigrants arrived in Orangeville, with the majority of immigrants arriving from Asia

74% of households spend less than 30% of household total income on shelter costs

Average monthly costs for rented dwellings was $954, and average monthly shelter costs for owned dwellings was $1422

78.3% of households were privately owned

The average value of dwellings in Orangeville was $310,461

Total population in the labour force was 15,945, demonstrating a 72.5% participation rate (aged 15 years and over)

8% of the total employed workers were self-employed

56.6% of the population aged 25 to 64 years held post-secondary education

Median commuting time for work was 25.6 minutes

The average before-tax family income was $94,104

80.6% of total income came from employment income

Income Levels and Sector Performance 2013

In the past year, jobs in the Information and Culture sector increased by 26%, far exceeding the provincial sector growth rate of 5%. Jobs in Accommodation and Food Services also increased by 8%, compared to 3% at the provincial level. Growth in these sectors demonstrates a positive trend in the community and support the Town’s recent investment in its tourism, arts and cultural activities.

The average earning in Orangeville was $38,622 in 2013.

Educational Services also experienced a strong growth rate of 7%, compared to a provincial growth rate of 1%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th># of jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information and Culture</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation / Food</td>
<td>1302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>2416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation / Warehousing</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, Technical</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care / Social Assistance</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Services</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New promotional videos showcasing the community’s business, tourist, and lifestyle benefits were created through the Town’s Communications office in 2013 and launched on the Town’s new website in early 2014.

The Town helps celebrate long-term business successes.

The Town’s 2013 EDC Business Breakfast was held on October 23 in partnership with the TD Bank. General Rick Hillier was the keynote speaker to a sold-out crowd of 205 business and community leaders.
### 2013 Industrial, Commercial and Residential Market Overview

#### Industrial Activity $680,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2123114 Ontario Inc.</td>
<td>5-48 Centennial Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tire Discount Group</td>
<td>95 John Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS Handling Systems Ltd.</td>
<td>595 Riddell Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolyOne Canada</td>
<td>17 Tideman Drive</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon Woodworks</td>
<td>195 Centennial Road</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commercial $15,840,900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Elizabeth Medical Building</td>
<td>1 Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riddell Car Wash</td>
<td>640 Riddell Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Dufferin Health Unit</td>
<td>178-184 Broadway</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$5,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riocan Holdings - temporary</td>
<td>85-115 Fifth Avenue</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zehrs</td>
<td>50 Fourth Avenue</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRICK</td>
<td>225-245 Centennial</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmart</td>
<td>93-37 First Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$5,005,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Orangeville</td>
<td>275 Alder Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optrust</td>
<td>225-245 Centennial</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Concrete Forming</td>
<td>685 Riddell Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edelbrock County Office</td>
<td>30 Centre Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker Milk Company Limited</td>
<td>108 Dawson Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Insurance Solutions</td>
<td>685 Riddell Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Deck</td>
<td>34 Mill Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffers Pharmacy</td>
<td>1 Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobey's</td>
<td>500 Riddell Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricland</td>
<td>224 Centennial</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunvale Homes</td>
<td>200 Lakeview Court</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wishart Kenneth</td>
<td>169 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungle Oasis</td>
<td>695 Riddell Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFL Environmental</td>
<td>19 Commerce Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Be Customized</td>
<td>117 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter David</td>
<td>75 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperators Insurance</td>
<td>235 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine School Daycare</td>
<td>32 First Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duong Phung</td>
<td>121 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasty Market</td>
<td>312 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commercial continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up Yer Kilt</td>
<td>114 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogeys</td>
<td>275 Alder Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Depot Holdings</td>
<td>49 Fourth Avenue</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangeville Citizen</td>
<td>10 First Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R J Burnside &amp; Assoc</td>
<td>15 Town Line</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB Panda Chinese Restaurant</td>
<td>115-125 First Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Health Clinic</td>
<td>229 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanju Ent. Inc (Gas Station)</td>
<td>17 Town Line</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine Hair Salon</td>
<td>190-210 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Deck</td>
<td>34 Mill Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Bank</td>
<td>190-210- Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrafficHawk</td>
<td>229 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangeville Hearing Clinic</td>
<td>15 Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered Native</td>
<td>218 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Hortons</td>
<td>40 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$337,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Hortons</td>
<td>40 Broadway</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Western Inn &amp; Suites</td>
<td>5-7 Buena Vista</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>170 Lakeview Court</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Institutional $10,035,500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UGDSB - Spencer St. Public</td>
<td>15 Spencer Avenue</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGDSB - Parkinson Central ES</td>
<td>120 Lawrence Ave</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGDSB - Credit Meadows ES</td>
<td>220 Blind Line</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGDSB - Island Lake ES</td>
<td>50 Oak Ridge Dr</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGDSB - Princess Elizabeth ES</td>
<td>51 Elizabeth St</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$2,503,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGDSB - Westside SS</td>
<td>300 Alder Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGDSB – ODDS</td>
<td>22 Faulkner St.</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGDSB – Montgomery PS</td>
<td>70 Montgomery Blvd</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGDSB – Westside SS</td>
<td>300 Alder Street</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$43,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster United Church</td>
<td>247 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$190,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal Church</td>
<td>556 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwaters Health Care Centre</td>
<td>100 Rolling Hills Dr</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon Retirement Home</td>
<td>355 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Youth For Christ</td>
<td>9 Centre Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry’s Place Autism Services</td>
<td>58A First Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Orangeville - Fire Station</td>
<td>10 Dawson Road</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Orangeville - Alder Rec</td>
<td>275 Alder Street</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Orangeville - Library</td>
<td>144 Broadway</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Orangeville Building Department, 2013
A revitalized commercial district creates optimism, employment opportunities, stability, and a reliable tax base for the municipality. Orangeville’s Downtown Heritage District Façade Assistance Program was created in 1998 as an incentive for building and business owners to preserve the architectural heritage in the Central Business District.

The quality of heritage buildings has always been a source of pride for businesses in Orangeville. Investing in façade improvements has been proven to have a positive economic benefit and Orangeville’s downtown core is frequently cited as an example of excellence across the Province.

In 2013, a total of $108,961 was spent in façade improvements in the Central Business District. The Town of Orangeville invested $29,962 in the Façade Assistance Program, and leveraged investment of an additional $78,999 to revitalize the historic downtown area and support our local business community.

Façade Projects included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Private Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>148-158 Broadway</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$6,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-28 Mill Street</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$58,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195 Broadway</td>
<td>$1,450</td>
<td>$1,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 First Street</td>
<td>$8,384</td>
<td>$8,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 Broadway</td>
<td>$4,628</td>
<td>$4,628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Façade improvements help to create high demand for space in the Central Business District.

Several new businesses were launched in the BIA district in 2013, including: Barley Vine Rail Co., Lavender Blue Catering, Just Be Customized, Coldwell Banker, Framed X Design, Cash 4 You, Co-operators, Bearly Worn, Stranded Hair Studio, Orchid Hair Salon, Kitchen Art, Cunningham Massage, Blown Away, Rogue Citrus, Mortgage Architects, Son of a Chef, and Up Yer Kilt.

In 2013, four monthly markets were also offered during the winter months inside Town Hall, and plans exist to expand these dates in 2014.

Taste Of Orangeville/Doors Open – August 17-18

Four historical buildings (Orangeville Town Hall, Orangeville Public Library, Westminster United Church, and St. Mark’s Anglican Church) were open on August 17 and 18 as part of the Doors Open Ontario program. The 2013 program also featured a free heritage walking tour of Orangeville’s downtown. On August 17, the Doors Open event was complemented by a sidewalk sale and the inaugural Taste of Orangeville event which featured samplings from several great Orangeville eateries (participants in 2013 included One99, Mochaberry, White Truffle, Soulyve, Mill Creek Pub, Corriander, Bluebird Café, and Forage).

150 Birthday Bash

The highlight of Orangeville’s year-long sesquicentennial celebrations was the Birthday Bash held on July 6. Approximately 20,000 guests attended the various events and provided a great economic boost for local stores and eateries. From a free breakfast and lunch to a kid’s zone, heritage walking tours, art exhibit, unique projection show, theatrical productions, and concerts, the Birthday Bash was a huge success.
The Orangeville Blues & Jazz Festival was awarded one of the top 100 festivals and events in Ontario by Festival and Events Ontario for the third year in a row. This popular annual event attracted 30,000 people to 26 venues throughout the three-day event.

“Footsteps from our Past” Guide
Building on the trend of experiential holidays, in the Spring of 2013 the Town’s Heritage Committee released “Footsteps from our Past” as part of the Town’s 150 Celebrations. The guide helps to promote heritage tourism and attract visitors and residents to Orangeville. The guide showcases the varied architecture of the community, highlights heritage buildings, and offers walking tour options. The booklet has been well received, and with interest growing in Canada’s heritage places, the guide helps to attract visitors to the community by providing yet another heritage-related activity to undertake.

2013 Mayor’s Breakfast for the Arts
First launched in 2010, the fourth annual Mayor’s Breakfast for the Arts was held on September 26 to help kick off Culture Days (September 27-29). The Mayor’s Breakfast for the Arts celebrates arts and culture in Orangeville and helps build awareness and participation in this growing sector. Seven awards were distributed to individuals who demonstrated leadership within the cultural sector.

With 120 guests in 2013, The Mayor’s Breakfast for the Arts has grown by more than 30% since its inception.

Theatre Orangeville and the Orangeville Opera House
The Town continued to provide a cultural initiatives grant to Theatre Orangeville of $35,000 in 2013. The grant was made in recognition of Theatre Orangeville’s contribution towards cultural and economic development in the Town of Orangeville and to assist with the costs associated with managing the Opera House on the Town’s behalf. The Opera House underwent an estimated $280,000 renovation in 2013. Numerous technical upgrades, new seating and accessibility improvements were made. The Opera House was booked for approximately 130 days in 2013 and attracted more than 21,000 visitors.

Arts and Culture Committee
Formed in 2011, the Arts and Culture Committee served as a steering committee for the development of the Town’s first cultural plan – Orangeville’s Cultural Advantage. The project encompassed significant community engagement through consultations, interviews and discussions with stakeholders, interaction with residents and visitors, a comprehensive economic impact analysis, a SWOT analysis and detailed recommendations for action. The Cultural Plan was undertaken with funding support provided by the Province of Ontario and launched in March 2014.

The Orangeville & Area Small Business Enterprise Centre (SBEC) provides prospective entrepreneurs and small business owners in Orangeville and its surrounding communities with support, guidance, resources and information as they launch and grow their businesses locally. The Orangeville & Area SBEC celebrated its 10th anniversary of operation in 2013 and during the last decade has become an important community resource. In 2013, the SBEC:

- Assisted with the start-up of 158 new businesses and the creation of 330 jobs
- Fielded 1588 general business inquiries and conducted 605 in-depth consultations
- Delivered 20 seminars and events to more than 700 entrepreneurs

The Orangeville & Area SBEC held its 11th annual Bridges to Better Business event on November 5. Attended by more than 65 entrepreneurs, the 2013 event featured sessions on trends affecting the future of business and resources for workforce development.

Make Your Pitch
Initially launched in 2012 in partnership with the Greater Dufferin Chamber of Commerce, the Young Professionals Networking Group continued to gain momentum in 2013. Four networking/learning sessions were held throughout the year and provided professionals and entrepreneurs, aged 35 and under, with opportunities to learn and network in a casual environment.

Make Your Pitch
Four students successfully completed the 2013 Summer Company Program. These youth, aged 15-29 and returning to school in the fall, took advantage of the training, mentorship and grants of up to $3000 provided through the program to launch their own summer ventures and gain entrepreneurial experience. The Summer Company Program is delivered in partnership with the Province of Ontario.

Ontario Network of Entrepreneurs (ONE)
In an effort to streamline services and cut red tape, the Orangeville & Area SBEC became part of the ONE network launched in 2013. The network is comprised of 57 SBEC offices, 17 Regional Innovation Centres (RICs) and the Provincial Business Advisory Services (BAS) and helps ensure that entrepreneurs of all sizes have the right resources at the right time to meet new challenges and take their businesses to the next level.

In an effort to streamline services and cut red tape, the Orangeville & Area SBEC became part of the ONE network launched in 2013. The network is comprised of 57 SBEC offices, 17 Regional Innovation Centres (RICs) and the Provincial Business Advisory Services (BAS) and helps ensure that entrepreneurs of all sizes have the right resources at the right time to meet new challenges and take their businesses to the next level.

The Orangeville Area SBEC launched its initial “Make Your Pitch” program in 2013 in partnership with the Province of Ontario. This initiative encourages high school students to create a two-minute video to sell their business ideas – real or imaginary. The videos are then uploaded for a province-wide competition. The program provides a fun introduction to the opportunities available through business ownership.
Tourism Development

Visitor Information Centre

With the goal of growing the tourism sector and supporting local businesses, the new Visitor Information Centre was completed in late 2012 and commenced operations from the new Centre in January 2013. In its first year of operation, the centre fielded almost 4,400 inquiries, with 70% coming from walk-in traffic. Truly a community effort, the Town partnered with several Orangeville business leaders to develop the Visitor Information Centre, including J.D. (Doc) Gillies, Devonleigh Homes, Rayburn Construction, Greenwood Aggregates, Smith Concrete Forming, Orangeville Renovations and Roofing, and Edenwood Custom Furniture. A grand opening of the Visitor Information Centre was held on September 14.

Group Tours Growing

The attraction of bus tours was a focus of development by Visitor Services staff and in 2013, 12 tours were completed. The tours offered various customized itineraries for groups and included the introduction of a popular “Triple Treat” experience – a trip on the Credit Valley Explorer, lunch or dinner downtown, and a theatre performance. Guided tours of the Tree Sculptures are another popular request supported by Visitor Services Staff. The Credit Valley Explorer also experienced increased success in building its relationship with tour companies. In 2013, the tourist train accommodated approximately 50 tour buses carrying 2500 guests, primarily through fall and winter excursions.

Joint Marketing Initiatives

Several joint marketing initiatives were undertaken in 2013 to build awareness of Orangeville as a tourism destination. Collaborating with the Orangeville Business Improvement Area, Theatre Orangeville, and the Blues and Jazz Festival, gains were made in marketing the community’s offerings throughout southern Ontario. Joint undertakings included creation and distribution of the Orangeville Visitor Guide to 48 tourist locations throughout the Hills of Headwaters region and to key locations across southwestern Ontario. Joint advertising was also undertaken in a number of publications, including the Best Western Visitor Guide, the Hockley Valley Golf Guide, Theatre Orangeville Anniversary Booklet, and the Drayton Theatre Guide.

Town of Orangeville Way-finding Plan

The development of a way-finding plan to direct tourists to major tourism attractions and destinations within the Town was undertaken in 2013 with $14,000 in partnership funding from Central Counties Tourism Association. The plan will be completed in 2014 and when implemented, will increase awareness of local offerings, help drive tourism to the community, increase traffic to the Town’s tourism operators, and also help reduce traffic congestion.

As an initial step in developing a sports tourism strategy for the community, the Town partnered with Central Counties Tourism Association to develop a sports facility inventory in 2013. The inventory will be available in 2014.

www.orangevilletourism.ca attracted 185,157 page views and 37,494 unique visits in 2013.

As part of its 150th birthday celebrations, The Town of Orangeville partnered with TD Friends of the Environment Foundation and Tree Canada to plant 150 trees in Orangeville in 2013. Urban landscaping projects like this help keep Orangeville attractive to residents and tourists alike.

Councillor Sylvia Bradley proclaimed the week of June 10-16, 2013 as Tourism Week in Orangeville.
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To: Mayor Adams and Members of Council
From: Karen Mills, Deputy Treasurer
Date: August 11, 2014
Report: TF-2014-26
Subject: 2014 Capital Progress Report

Purpose
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a corporate summary of the status of capital projects for the period ending June 30, 2014. The summary includes all projects completed within 2013/2014 fiscal years, all projects still in progress and those projects from 2013 and 2014 Capital Budgets that have not yet begun.

Background
In previous periods only the operating fund progress and variances have been reported to Council. This will provide Council with a better understanding of our investment in capital assets and infrastructure throughout the Town and capital variances at project closeout.

The progress report, found in Appendix A, is structured by functional class and it is further broken down by individual, departmental projects. Appendix A will also outline the Town’s future financial obligations of approved projects that have not yet commenced or expended any funds.

Note that the tables in Appendix A are subject to information timing differences between departments, such as delayed invoices, etc.
Discussion
The current total of all capital expenditures from January 2014 to June 30, 2014 is $2,107,579. This total includes items that are not outlined in Appendix A, such as the purchase of 172 Broadway ($733,987) and holdback related items. These expenditures can be further broken down by department as follows:

- Treasury: $14,242
- IT: $66,078
- B&B: $51,586
- Fire: $16,913
- Police: $80,685
- Library: $98,690
- Parks and Recreation: $611,421
- Public Works – Transportation: $187,051
- Public Works - Environmental: $246,926
- Land Purchase (172 Broadway): $733,987

Parks and Recreation’s capital expenditures are significantly higher than other departments due to the progress on the rink replacement at Tony Rose Rec Centre. The land purchase of 172 Broadway is supported by the BIA.

Financial Impact
There is no financial impact arising from this report. This is a capital status report and project reconciliations will be dealt with in future Reports to Council.

Vision and Values
Reporting the progress of the approved capital projects relates to spending tax payers’ money wisely and responsibly and a well-maintained infrastructure.

Recommendation
Respectfully submitted,

Karen Mills
Deputy Treasurer

Prepared by,

Angela Shipway
Financial Analyst, Capital & Reserves

Reviewed by,

Brian Parrott
Treasurer

Attachments
Appendix A: Capital Progress by Functional Class
## Appendix A: Capital Progress by Department

### Table 1 – Completed Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Funding Approved</th>
<th>Capital Expenditures</th>
<th>Surplus (Deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Historical Site Repairs – Mill Creek</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>22,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>Tourism Info Centre – Signage</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>5,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>Tourism Info Centre – Bell Tower</td>
<td>20,096</td>
<td>26,347</td>
<td>(6,251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>Tourism Info Centre – Parking Lot</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,381</td>
<td>(381)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treas.</td>
<td>Folding/Postage Machine &amp; Steel Table</td>
<td>3,564</td>
<td>10,862</td>
<td>(7,298)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protection Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Fire Exhaust System – retrofit</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>14,637</td>
<td>(4,637)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Separate Showers/Change Room</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>26,089</td>
<td>(11,089)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Fire Hall Parking Lot</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>67,803</td>
<td>(12,803)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Police Vehicle Replacement</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>42,705</td>
<td>2,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation and Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Lighting Upgrades – Ball Fields</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>70,341</td>
<td>14,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Waterslide Stair Replacement</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>49,028</td>
<td>9,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Resurface Ball Diamonds</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>106,245</td>
<td>3,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Purchase 3 New Pickup Trucks</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>93,639</td>
<td>11,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Attachment for Mini Track Loader</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>12,260</td>
<td>5,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Fuel Management System</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>18,050</td>
<td>(5,550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Cannon Court Resurfacing</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>106,848</td>
<td>(1,848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Cambridge St Resurfacing</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>106,848</td>
<td>(1,848)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Trailer Mounted Valve</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>61,422</td>
<td>3,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Exerciser/VAC System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Planting of 150 Trees</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,717</td>
<td>(717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Traffic Signal – Broadway &amp; First</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>36,171</td>
<td>8,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>2 Ton Truck with Aerial Bucket</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>108,891</td>
<td>11,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Brush and Tree Chipper</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>40,735</td>
<td>(11,735)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Aquacide Weed Killer System</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>16,063</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Water Pollution Control Plant – Short Term Upgrades</td>
<td>9,277,811</td>
<td>11,671,880</td>
<td>(2,394,069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Replace Waterworks Service Van – 1 Ton</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>33,570</td>
<td>6,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Replace Waterworks Service Van – 5 Ton</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>64,723</td>
<td>11,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>WPCP Truck Replacement</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>39,034</td>
<td>3,966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 – Capital Projects in Progress (Work in Progress = WIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Funding Approved</th>
<th>Capital Expenditures</th>
<th>Surplus (Deficit)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;B</td>
<td>172 Broadway Renovations</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>51,465</td>
<td>98,535</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>IT Hardware – Lifecycle Maintenance</td>
<td>61,425</td>
<td>48,325</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Fire Retardant System - Alder</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>19,276</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation and Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib.</td>
<td>Library Collections (2014)</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>30,551</td>
<td>149,449</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Fendley Park Splash Pad Construction</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>8,853</td>
<td>566,147</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Fire Proofing Steel Columns – Alder Green Rink</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>5,619</td>
<td>44,381</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Rink A Floor Replacement – Tony Rose</td>
<td>1,040,000</td>
<td>515,782</td>
<td>524,218</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Upgrade Boardwalk – Dragonfly Park</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>11,847</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Construct New Trails – Bythia to Centre St.</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>8,380</td>
<td>86,620</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Construct New Trails – Amelia St.</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>11,523</td>
<td>163,477</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Construction New Trails – Maywood Park Trail Extension</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>4,606</td>
<td>135,394</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Upgrade HVAC – IT Area &amp; Server Room</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>53,389</td>
<td>6,611</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Digital Exterior Signs</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,916</td>
<td>(916)</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Sports Pad Lighting</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>59,007</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Mill Creek Trail Rehab</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>35,551</td>
<td>34,449</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Detailed Design – Diane Dr. Park</td>
<td>45,090</td>
<td>20,674</td>
<td>24,416</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Budget 2014</td>
<td>Budget 2015</td>
<td>Budget 2016</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P&amp;R</strong></td>
<td>Lighting Upgrades – Alder Green Rink</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>13,109</td>
<td>6,891</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protection Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police</strong></td>
<td>911 Upgrades</td>
<td>171,800</td>
<td>34,303</td>
<td>137,497</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>Traffic Signal &amp; Power Feed – First St &amp; Fifth Ave</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>Design Stage Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>Reconstruction of Lawrence Ave</td>
<td>1,715,000</td>
<td>46,146</td>
<td>1,668,854</td>
<td>Tender Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>Snow Plow Replacement</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>Tender Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>Burbank Resurfacing</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>Tender Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>Mill Creek Rehabilitation</td>
<td>1,501,000</td>
<td>172,976</td>
<td>1,328,024</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>Broadway Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>309,000</td>
<td>148,795</td>
<td>160,205</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>Wellington St. Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>269,000</td>
<td>43,705</td>
<td>225,295</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>Reconstruction of Second St</td>
<td>1,087,000</td>
<td>808,910</td>
<td>278,090</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>Operations Centre – Salt Storage Shed</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>497,124</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>Replace Waterworks Service Van</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>Tender Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>WPCP Expansion</td>
<td>5,323,567</td>
<td>1,526,903</td>
<td>3,829,097</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>SCADA Upgrades</td>
<td>2,944,600</td>
<td>2,895,796</td>
<td>48,804</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PW</strong></td>
<td>First St. Pumping Station</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>123,213</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,860,915</td>
<td>5,756,138</td>
<td>10,104,777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3 – Capital Projects Approved, but Not Started

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Funding Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan.</td>
<td>Geographic Info. Systems</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation and Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Website Upgrade</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Electronic Circulating System</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Playground Structure Replacement – Mother Theresa Park</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Upgrade PA System – Alder</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Tony Rose Pool Change Room Re-design</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protection Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Digital Finger Print Scanner</td>
<td>45,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Emerald Ash Borer</td>
<td>23,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Valve Pits Improvements at Three Reservoirs</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Streetlight Replacement</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>School Crossing Signs – removal &amp; replacement</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Northerly Extension of B Line</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Transit Shelters</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Automatic Transfer Switch</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Infiltration Reduction Projects</td>
<td>255,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Well 7 Iron Filtration &amp; Removal System</td>
<td>124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Water Supply &amp; Distribution Study</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Well 5 Building &amp; Drainage</td>
<td>455,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Portable Diesel Generator</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Well 11 Rehabilitation</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Water-main &amp; Sewer Replacement – Mill St.</td>
<td>425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,216,826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Mayor Adams and Members of Council  
From: Brian Parrott, Treasurer  
Date: August 11, 2014  
Report: TF-2014-24  
Subject: Investment Report for the 2013 Fiscal Year

Purpose
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the Investment Report for 2013.

Background
Ontario Regulation 438/97, amended to O. Reg. 373/11 (the “Regulation”) under the Municipal Act, 2001, requires that if a municipality has an investment in a prescribed security, the Treasurer of the municipality shall provide to Council each year an Investment Report in a form prescribed by the Regulation. The Regulation defines prescribed securities and the Town does hold prescribed securities for investment purposes.

The Investment Policy for the Town was revised in 2014 to reflect changes to the Regulation.

Analysis
In 2013 the Treasurer commenced a more active investment strategy with the intent of increasing the investment income earned while not significantly increasing the investment risk of the portfolio. To this end, short term investments reside with TD Canada Trust and at year end, a small bond portfolio resided with Edward Jones. Another small portfolio with Raymond James was liquidated and the account closed.

The Regulation requires the following statements from the Treasurer:
1. The performance of the portfolio: please see Attachments.
2. No portion of the portfolio is invested in securities issued by the Town.
3. All investments are consistent with the Investment Policy of the Town.
4. A record of the portfolio transactions: please see Schedule A.
5. All investments are within the requirements of the Regulation. Investments that fell below the requirements of the Regulation were liquidated.
6. There is no other information to be disclosed.

With respect to subsequent events, approximately $3.0 million of medium and long term investments have been placed with the One Investment Program and approximately $800,000 of additional medium to longer term investments placed with Edward Jones.

**Financial Impact**

There is no financial impact arising from this report. Income, gain or losses have been included in the audited financial statements for the year.

**Vision and Values**

The Vision and Values statement adopted by Council sets out a direction for the Town by presenting a set of core values that guide Council’s and staff’s actions now and into the future. The preparation of this report supports the objective of disclosure, spending and reporting of taxpayers’ money wisely and responsibly.

**Recommendation**

That report TF-2014-24, dated August 11, 2014, regarding the Investment Report for the 2013 Fiscal Year, be received.

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by,

Brian Parrott,
H.B.Sc., CPA, CGA
Treasurer

**Attachments**

Investment Summary, as at December 31, 2013, Schedules 1 & 2
Investment Summary
as at December 31, 2013

Schedule 1: Cash Equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Date of Purchase</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust 8344799-02</td>
<td>$2,012,712</td>
<td>09-Dec-13</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust 8344799-03</td>
<td>$2,007,644</td>
<td>08-Oct-13</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust 8344799-04</td>
<td>$1,004,857</td>
<td>12-Nov-13</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp 8344772-02</td>
<td>$1,006,135</td>
<td>09-Dec-13</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp 8344772-03</td>
<td>$1,003,822</td>
<td>08-Oct-13</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp 8344772-04</td>
<td>$1,004,857</td>
<td>12-Nov-13</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWSDC 8344756-02</td>
<td>$1,006,356</td>
<td>09-Dec-13</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWSDC 8344756-03</td>
<td>$1,004,857</td>
<td>12-Nov-13</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDSDC 8344802-02</td>
<td>$502,489</td>
<td>08-Nov-13</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDSDC 8344802-03</td>
<td>$602,293</td>
<td>08-Oct-13</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDSDC 8344802-04</td>
<td>$502,428</td>
<td>12-Nov-13</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDSDC 8344802-05</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWHDC 8344748-03</td>
<td>$3,011,466</td>
<td>08-Oct-13</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWHDC 8344748-04</td>
<td>$3,018,398</td>
<td>16-Dec-13</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWHDC 8344748-05</td>
<td>$1,002,466</td>
<td>08-Nov-13</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWHDC 8344748-06</td>
<td>$1,008,872</td>
<td>09-Dec-13</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $14,674,439.20

The short-term portfolio earned $99,653 of income in 2013. This is apportioned to various funds.
### Investment Summary
as at December 31, 2013

#### Schedule 2: Bonds and Debentures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Adjusted Cost Base</th>
<th>Trxn Date</th>
<th>Purch/Sale</th>
<th>Proceeds</th>
<th>Gain/-Loss</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suncor Energy Inc</td>
<td>$ 45,321</td>
<td>26-Jun-13</td>
<td>Sale(1)</td>
<td>$ 56,082</td>
<td>$ 10,761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers Communications</td>
<td>$ 19,222</td>
<td>26-Jun-13</td>
<td>Sale(1)</td>
<td>$ 20,795</td>
<td>$ 1,573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldman Sachs Group</td>
<td>$ 34,215</td>
<td>26-Jun-13</td>
<td>Sale(1)</td>
<td>$ 36,889</td>
<td>$ 2,674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molson Coors Capital</td>
<td>$ 33,344</td>
<td>26-Jun-13</td>
<td>Sale(1)</td>
<td>$ 33,632</td>
<td>$ 288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell CDA 5%</td>
<td>$ 29,290</td>
<td>02-Jul-13</td>
<td>Sale(1)</td>
<td>$ 31,088</td>
<td>$ 1,798</td>
<td>$ 1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIBC FLT CL 3.15%</td>
<td>$ 39,726</td>
<td>05-Jul-13</td>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>$ 40,210</td>
<td>$ 484</td>
<td>$ 614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBC Investment Savings</td>
<td>$ 39,816</td>
<td>04-Jul-13</td>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>$ 39,997</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$ 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Investment Savings</td>
<td>$ 39,815</td>
<td>13-Nov-13</td>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>$ 39,996</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$ 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Capital Med Term Note</td>
<td>$ 21,525</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province of Ontario</td>
<td>$ 21,761</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTAA MTNS 2018</td>
<td>$ 22,319</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAV Canada 2019 5.304%</td>
<td>$ 22,564</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Housing Mort Bond</td>
<td>$ 20,378</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Bank 2017 3.660%</td>
<td>$ 20,931</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Bank Med Term Note</td>
<td>$ 19,401</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province of Ontario 2015 3.150%</td>
<td>$ 20,701</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Housing Trust Ser. 33</td>
<td>$ 20,510</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Bank Deposit Notes</td>
<td>$ 20,164</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSBC Deposit Notes</td>
<td>$ 4,896</td>
<td>22-Aug-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Capital 2016 3.350</td>
<td>$ 20,781</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIBC Deposit Notes</td>
<td>$ 7,000</td>
<td>16-Aug-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia Mun Finance</td>
<td>$ 21,045</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto SKG Fund Debs</td>
<td>$ 21,768</td>
<td>31-Dec-13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 285,743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sale(1): Securities sold to meet the requirements of O.Reg. 438/97
Information

To: Mayor Adams and Members of Council
From: Karen Mills, Deputy Treasurer
Date: July 18, 2014
Report: TF-2014-33
Subject: 2014 Second Quarter Operating Fund Variance Report

Purpose
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a corporate summary of the Operating Fund performance for the period ending June 30, 2014 and to provide explanations for unfavourable or favourable departmental results compared to budget for the second quarter.

Background and Discussion
Attached to this report is Appendix A – 2014 Second Quarter Operating Fund Variance which provides a comparison of the actual operating results to the operating allotment as of June 30, 2014 by department.

This report and the explanations provided are intended to highlight trends being monitored for Council’s information and to address year-to-date variances.

This report has been prepared with input from all departments responsible for operating accounts and analysis performed by Treasury staff.

As of June 30, 2014 consolidated expenditures to date show an unfavourable variance of $592,541 over the second quarter budget allocations. Expenditures to date represent approximately 50% of the annual budget, and are 0.6% lower than the same period last year.
The consolidated revenues to date show a favourable variance of $216,966 over the second quarter budget allotment. Revenues to date represent approximately 77% of the annual budget, and are 0.3% greater than the same period last year.

The net difference results in an unfavourable variance of $375,575 over the second quarter budget allocations, which equates to a 3.5% variance from the year-to-date budget and indicates a stable operating position. Appendix A, attached hereto, details the actual operating performance to date by department. A review of this attachment highlights minor departmental variances due to timing issues, however, the following items are the main contributing factors causing the unfavourable variance reported:

Surplus Items

$14,071 Committees – Overall committees are reporting a favourable variance due to the receipt of revenues that were not forecasted. These revenues were detailed in the 2014 First Quarter Variance report presented to Council on May 26, 2014. This surplus is expected to be used by future expenditures for which the monies were received.

$26,796 Human Resources – this favourable variance is predominately due to salary and wages expenditures reporting below budget as a result of salary gapping.

$31,717 Economic Development – this favourable variance is primarily a result of salary and wage expenditures coming in below budget as a result of vacancies.

$56,898 Small Business Enterprise Centre – this favourable variance is a result of salary and wages to date coming in below budget as a result of vacancies.

$33,955 Treasury – this surplus is a result of Processing Fee revenues trending higher than forecasted. This revenue item has exceeded the annual budget by $6,217 or 11%.

$301,120 Parks & Recreation – this favourable variance is predominately a result of timing issues, whereby the allocation of budget amounts vary slightly from actual receipts. Overall revenues are trending higher than forecast; with a favourable variance of $56,019 - $27,500 of this variance is a result of hourly rentals within Floor operations and $23,000 in pool operations.
Parks and Recreation expenditures are tracking lower than forecast by $245,101. Of this favourable variance $106,871 or 44% relates to timing issues within salary and benefits. A review of these budget allotments is underway. The remaining variances are spread throughout the budget and account for less than 0.05% of the budgeted expenditures to date.

**Deficit Items**

$60,275 Building & By-Law – The primary cause of this unfavourable variance is due to Building Permit revenues tracking below forecast. To date, building permit revenues are $64,283 less than 2013 and $18,766 less than 2012, however, at this time the current shortfall of $67,048 is anticipated to be recovered by year-end.

$496,314 Public Works – The cause of variance in the Public Works budget is a result of winter control costs which was detailed in the 2014 First Quarter Variance report presented to Council on May 26, 2014.

$307,279 Police – The primary cause of the unfavourable variance in the Police Services budget is a result of professional fees. This variance equates to approximately 4% of the approved Police Services budget.

The actual year-to-date revenues and expenditures are within 3.5% of the second quarter budget allotment. As a result, the second quarter operating fund performance indicates a stable operating position.

**Financial Impact**

There is no financial impact arising from this report.

**Vision and Values**

The Vision and Values statement adopted by Council sets out a direction for the Town by presenting a set of core values that guide Council’s and staff’s actions now and into the future. The preparation of this report supports the objective of disclosure, spending and reporting of taxpayers’ money wisely and responsibly.

Reporting of variances in the Operating Fund also relates to the Accountability and Transparency Policy approved by Council which requires that “The Municipality be open, accountable and transparent to its stakeholders by ensuring that fiscally responsible operating budgets are maintained on a yearly basis and to ensure the efficient management of municipal services to meet existing and future demands.”
**Recommendation**
That report TF-2014-33, dated July 18, 2014, regarding the 2014 Second Quarter Operating Fund Variance, be received.

Respectfully submitted,  
Prepared by,

Karen Mills,  
Deputy Treasurer

Lina Pacheco,  
Financial Analyst

**Attachments**
# 2014 Second Quarter Operating Fund Variance

For the Six Months Ending Jun 30, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As of Jun 30, 2014</th>
<th>Percent of YTD Budget remaining</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget Remaining</th>
<th>Percent of Budget remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual YTD Budget</td>
<td>Variance (unfavourable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor and Council Expenses</td>
<td>$ 153,332</td>
<td>$ 153,388</td>
<td>$ 56</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>297,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>153,332</td>
<td>153,388</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>297,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Expenses</td>
<td>(2,285)</td>
<td>4,117</td>
<td>6,402</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>(2,285)</td>
<td>4,117</td>
<td>6,402</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Culture Expenses</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Events Expenses</td>
<td>84,293</td>
<td>82,400</td>
<td>(1,893)</td>
<td>194,000</td>
<td>109,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(7,776)</td>
<td>(2,600)</td>
<td>5,176</td>
<td>(2,600)</td>
<td>5,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>76,517</td>
<td>79,800</td>
<td>3,283</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>191,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Expenses</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>6,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,800)</td>
<td>(1,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Senior Advisory Expenses</td>
<td>4,145</td>
<td>4,211</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16,550</td>
<td>12,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(2,400)</td>
<td>(1,200)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>(1,200)</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>15,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Youth Advisory Expenses</td>
<td>5,381</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>15,250</td>
<td>9,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>5,381</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Team Expenses</td>
<td>13,356</td>
<td>13,550</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>4,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(333)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>13,023</td>
<td>13,550</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Committees</td>
<td>95,209</td>
<td>109,280</td>
<td>14,071</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>271,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service / Function</td>
<td>Expenses Actual</td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>Variance (unfavourable)</td>
<td>Percent of YTD Budget remaining</td>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>153,297</td>
<td>153,927</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>311,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk’s</td>
<td>298,029</td>
<td>300,819</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>543,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>137,858</td>
<td>136,027</td>
<td>(1,831)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>278,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>163,981</td>
<td>190,777</td>
<td>26,796</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>413,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>197,553</td>
<td>216,481</td>
<td>18,928</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>429,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>117,631</td>
<td>146,195</td>
<td>28,564</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>290,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Enterprise</td>
<td>122,208</td>
<td>107,056</td>
<td>(15,152)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>218,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>494,252</td>
<td>501,516</td>
<td>7,264</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>984,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>344,200</td>
<td>347,987</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>700,591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of Jun 30, 2014
## Corporate Allocations

### Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Variance (unfavourable)</th>
<th>Percent of YTD Budget remaining</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent of Budget remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>468,498</td>
<td>480,988</td>
<td>12,490</td>
<td></td>
<td>848,683</td>
<td>380,185</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(27,462)</td>
<td>(38,275)</td>
<td>(10,813)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(91,862)</td>
<td>(64,400)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>441,036</td>
<td>442,713</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>756,821</td>
<td>315,785</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development Charge By-Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Variance (unfavourable)</th>
<th>Percent of YTD Budget remaining</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent of Budget remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>25,603</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(5,603)</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>(5,603)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>5,603</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,603)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5,603)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Variance (unfavourable)</th>
<th>Percent of YTD Budget remaining</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent of Budget remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>9,740</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>125,100</td>
<td>115,360</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(75,000)</td>
<td>(75,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(75,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>(65,260)</td>
<td>(62,700)</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>50,100</td>
<td>115,360</td>
<td>230%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Corporate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Variance (unfavourable)</th>
<th>Percent of YTD Budget remaining</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent of Budget remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>2,045,198</td>
<td>2,007,908</td>
<td>(37,290)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5,565,489</td>
<td>3,520,291</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(25,871,562)</td>
<td>(25,844,081)</td>
<td>27,481</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>(31,667,530)</td>
<td>(5,795,968)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>(23,826,364)</td>
<td>(23,836,173)</td>
<td>(9,809)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(26,102,041)</td>
<td>(2,275,677)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parks and Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Variance (unfavourable)</th>
<th>Percent of YTD Budget remaining</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent of Budget remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>2,672,087</td>
<td>2,917,188</td>
<td>245,101</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>6,154,374</td>
<td>3,482,287</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(1,383,030)</td>
<td>(1,327,011)</td>
<td>56,019</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>(2,910,579)</td>
<td>(1,527,549)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>1,289,057</td>
<td>1,590,177</td>
<td>301,120</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3,243,795</td>
<td>1,954,738</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Variance (unfavourable)</th>
<th>Percent of YTD Budget remaining</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent of Budget remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>1,709,309</td>
<td>1,711,028</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3,239,572</td>
<td>1,530,263</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(343,110)</td>
<td>(337,540)</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>(603,040)</td>
<td>(259,930)</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>1,366,199</td>
<td>1,373,488</td>
<td>7,289</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,636,532</td>
<td>1,270,333</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building & By-Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Variance (unfavourable)</th>
<th>Percent of YTD Budget remaining</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent of Budget remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>775,570</td>
<td>772,844</td>
<td>(2,726)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1,396,710</td>
<td>621,140</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(349,451)</td>
<td>(407,000)</td>
<td>(57,549)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>(770,671)</td>
<td>(421,220)</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>426,119</td>
<td>365,844</td>
<td>(60,275)</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>626,039</td>
<td>199,920</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>Variance (unfavourable)</th>
<th>Percent of YTD Budget remaining</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Percent of Budget remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>3,581,978</td>
<td>3,023,042</td>
<td>(558,936)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5,809,075</td>
<td>2,227,097</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(405,408)</td>
<td>(342,786)</td>
<td>62,622</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>(787,625)</td>
<td>(382,217)</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>3,176,570</td>
<td>2,680,256</td>
<td>(496,314)</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>5,021,450</td>
<td>1,844,880</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>Variance (unfavourable)</td>
<td>Percent of YTD Budget remaining</td>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
<td>Total Budget Remaining</td>
<td>Percent of Budget remaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>755,969</td>
<td>762,464</td>
<td>6,495</td>
<td>(unfavourable)</td>
<td>1,710,422</td>
<td>954,453</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(74,630)</td>
<td>(72,189)</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td></td>
<td>(170,900)</td>
<td>(96,270)</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td><strong>681,339</strong></td>
<td><strong>690,275</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,936</strong></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td><strong>1,539,522</strong></td>
<td><strong>858,183</strong></td>
<td><strong>56%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>4,929,543</td>
<td>4,593,998</td>
<td>(335,545)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,103,231</td>
<td>4,173,688</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(608,175)</td>
<td>(579,904)</td>
<td>28,271</td>
<td></td>
<td>(924,153)</td>
<td>(315,978)</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td><strong>4,321,368</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,014,094</strong></td>
<td><strong>(307,274)</strong></td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td><strong>8,179,078</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,857,710</strong></td>
<td><strong>47%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>19,261,554</td>
<td>18,669,013</td>
<td>(592,541)</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>38,718,326</td>
<td>19,456,772</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>(29,745,691)</td>
<td>(29,528,725)</td>
<td>216,966</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>(38,718,327)</td>
<td>(8,972,636)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td><strong>$ (10,484,137)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (10,859,712)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (375,575)</strong></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>10,484,136</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Mayor Adams and Members of Council

From: Nancy Tuckett, MSc., Pl., BEd., MCIP, RPP
Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation

Date: July 17, 2014

Report: PL-2014-25

Subject: Geographic Information System (GIS) Implementation

Purpose
The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the selection process moving forward with the implementation of GIS for the Town of Orangeville.

Background and Discussion
In November 2013 staff brought forward report PL-2013-38 for Council consideration to investigate and pursue implementation of a corporate wide Geographic Information System (GIS) to manage and utilize town data and to provide a universal platform of data sharing and geographic information for the Town.

The report provided background information in addition to information regarding previous consideration for the implementation of GIS, based on previous assessments undertaken. The report also included the basis for considering a GIS system for the management of digital spatial and attribute data, the benefits of having a GIS system, current AutoCAD usage at the Town, GIS needs of each department and a municipal comparison of other similar sized municipalities and those within Dufferin County that have GIS. It was suggested in the report that to effectively launch a GIS product there would be a need for approximately $55,000 for the software component and a total of $25,000 for services and training.
The GIS project was deferred to the 2014 operating budget discussion. The 2014 budget was approved with a total of $52,000 allocated to the GIS initiative with $32,000 for the purchase of GIS software and licences, and $20,000 for training.

Following budget approval, staff met with representatives of Esri Canada and from CGIS Spatial Solutions (CGIS) to discuss opportunities for launching a GIS product for the Town.

Two proposals were received from CGIS and from Esri Canada. CGIS is a Canadian owned company established in 1999 that provides GIS and data collection and data integration to 90 Canadian municipal clients. Their services are geared for the unique needs of small and medium sized urban municipalities that need GIS but do not have large budgets. They are able to launch a GIS within a municipality in a relatively short period of time.

As part of the proposal, CGIS would provide a fully hosted and supported GIS system that would only require a web browser such as Internet Explorer 9. The system would be delivered completely over the internet. There would be no requirement for in-house GIS staff but there would be a requirement for someone to have the ability to manipulate the data. There is no requirement for hardware or software in house. Essentially, the product is a fee for service. GIS technicians with the firm would provide data updates and advanced analysis as needed and they would meet with staff regularly to learn of emerging needs and to share ideas. These sessions would be documented and available to all clients, which would then create a GIS strategic plan for all municipalities. The firm offers unlimited hands-on training and support via phone and GoToMeeting (a web based service). All calls are answered directly by CGIS staff. There are also unlimited user licenses for all Orangeville staff. CGIS’s quote for the year to offer services to the Town is $21,960-$24,360 per year.

They are also willing to offer an option starting from August to year end for a total of $2,030 per month ($10,150). This would include setup and integration of parcels, roads, water, imagery, MPAC data, user accounts, Diamond/Great Plains Property Tax Integration, geo referencing and integrating Official Plan and zoning schedules (an additional fee of $5,000 would be required for this geo-referencing of the planning document schedules with the terranet or base map data although this could be done in house with the appropriate direction and training), servers and software and unlimited user licences. There would also be start up items and costs associated with any GIS technician work required to undertake initial configuration of the Town’s data layers. They indicated they would assist in launching the public component of the GIS system at a later date with the launch of Public CPAL module at an additional cost. The public component of the GIS would allow individuals to access GIS information directly from
the website such as a property’s land use designation under the Official Plan, zoning, locations of Town owned facilities, garbage pick-up days, MPAC property value information, closest school/school board district, etc.

The system that CGIS is offering is created for people with limited GIS experience and is designed to simplify the experience by outsourcing tasks that require a higher level of technical knowledge. This makes it a suitable option for budget constrained municipalities that are not looking to build an in house GIS team. There would however, be additional costs associated with ongoing technical support and data management completed by CGIS technicians and it is unknown how this work would affect the annual budget. CGIS uses AutoDesk’s “Map Guide” product through an online interface that does not appear to contain a lot of powerful mapping, editing or analysis tools. Advanced GIS analysis and data management tasks would be completed by CGIS staff which removes power from the individual user and relies on CGIS technicians. Furthermore, in the event where the internet is down, the Town would be unable to access Town maps and data due to the fact that CGIS is entirely web based and the data would be stored on an outside server.

Staff also received a proposal from Esri Canada for the delivery of GIS services. Esri’s proposal includes three phases. Phase 1 would be the preparation of remote services which is reviewing the AutoCAD data provided by the Town including the Official Plan, Zoning By-law, parcel fabric, address and road data (up to 10 layers), infrastructure and public works and assessment data. The second phase involves on-site services including the installation of one floating license for ArcGIS Desktop, up to two licenses for ArcGIS Server Workgroup Standard as well as the associated license manager software. They will also do the initial import of data required for the mapping template in phase one, including up to 10 layers of data. Phase 3 of the project involves the delivery of a high level summary document based on two reviews of the AutoCAD data layer. There is also up to 16 hours of remote support provided over 30 days (via e-mail, web conference and conference call) while the Town imports their data into the GIS software.

Esri will provide the ArcGIS software version 10.2.2. The Esri proposal has also outlined the necessary pre-requisite training required by staff who will be editors of the data. Training will be offered at Esri Canada or instructor-led online classroom training and will include:

- ArcGIS 1: Introduction to GIS (or equivalent knowledge);
- ArcGIS 2: Essential Workflows (or equivalent knowledge); and
- Building Geodatabases (or equivalent knowledge).
The total cost for the delivery of the first year of service would be $49,264 which would include the Esri GIS software, create and load Canadian Municipal Data model, web application install and user training. It is expected that the training will be taken by staff in IT, Planning and Public Works.

Representatives from Esri have also suggested that additional funds be allocated for 2015 for further phases of Esri services and training to ensure continued success of the GIS launch. ESRI works closely with their clients in order to create a plan for a GIS system that works to serve their clients’ particular needs.

Esri ArcGIS is an industry leading mapping and data management software that puts all the power in the hands of the individual user. It is the most powerful and most capable GIS software currently available for mapping, managing large datasets and performing spatial analysis. It requires dedicated GIS personnel to run the software, manage data, and create maps. ArcGIS will allow the Town to manage existing data, which is largely in the form of points that represent municipal infrastructure and fixed assets but also includes AutoCAD base maps and OP schedules. Shape files will need to be combined, edited and attribute data will need to be combined. These are straightforward tasks with software such as ArcMap but are made more difficult or impossible depending on the limitations of available software.

Aside from ArcMap, the main piece of software associated with ArcGIS suite, there are also other programs/extensions that can assist the Town with special projects, including the Town’s cultural mapping exercise. The Esri product would align with the vision of council for providing interactive mapping capabilities for Orangeville’s landmarks such as historical building locations and more recent sites such as tree carvings. It could also potentially be used for the provision of photo tour maps.

Esri ArcGIS and CGIS have been the two main options however, staff has also considered alternatives such as the Manifold System. Manifold is a stand-alone GIS that comes in desktop and enterprise formats. It does not provide the convenience and technical assistance of CGIS, nor does it have the power and capabilities of a system like Esri ArcGIS. The benefits are centered on lower up-front purchase costs. Manifold would require GIS personnel to run the software, manage data, create maps and it would require work on IT’s end to implement an enterprise system. It is not a preferred option as it does not provide the full benefits of CGIS or ArcGIS.

Staff in reviewing the proposals has determined that it would be in the Town’s best interest to consider the Esri product at this time. The $49,264 commitment provides the Town with the necessary software and training to launch GIS within the Town.
Although the CGIS option could be launched relatively quickly and could be purchased for a short trial period, the service would be an ongoing expense each year without the Town owning their own software.

ArcGIS products are utilized by a large number of municipalities, government bodies and thousands of corporations and organizations across the country and therefore, the compatibility of the product would be seamless with other organizations and groups that work closely with the Town. Even products that are not Esri based (i.e. Marmak and MiTown used by Dufferin County) would be compatible with the Esri products.

Financial Impact
Staff initially sought $55,000 in software and licences with $25,000 for training and support. Council approved a budget of $50,000, $32,000 of which is to be allocated to the purchase of GIS software and licences, and $20,000 for training for a total budget of $52,000.

It is expected that there will be an ongoing commitment to GIS in 2015 as well with the further roll out of GIS for the public at a future date.

Vision and Values
The Vision and Values statement adopted by Council presents a set of core values that will guide Council and staff actions now and into the future. In particular, the statement outlines that the Town will spend taxpayers’ money wisely and responsibly, enhance the Town’s environment, and ensuring a well-maintained infrastructure all of which would be accomplished with the implementation of a Geographic Information System for the Town.

Recommendation

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Tuckett, MSc. Pl., BEd, MCIP, RPP
Director of Economic Development,
Planning and Innovation
Report

Information

Reviewed by:

To: Mayor Adams and Members of Council
From: Nancy Tuckett, MSc., Pl., BEd., MCIP, RPP
       Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation
Date: July 14, 2014
Report: PL-2014-26
Subject: Plan of Subdivision Application S 1/14
         Hamount Investments Ltd.
         20 & 32 C Line

Purpose
The purpose of this report is to provide Council and the public with background
information regarding the above-noted Plan of Subdivision application for consideration
at a public meeting scheduled for September 8, 2014.

Background and Discussion
The subject property is located between Thompson Road and C Line, municipally
known as 20 and 32 C Line (see Schedule “A”). It has approximately 96 metres (315
feet) of frontage on both C Line and Thompson Road. The parcel is approximately 1.33
hectares (3.29 acres).

The subject lands are surrounded by residential uses of varying densities. To the south
is a developing townhouse project. To the west, across Thompson Road, are single-
detached dwellings on smaller lots and townhouse dwellings. To the north and east,
across and along C Line, are single-detached dwellings on larger lots.

The owners propose to demolish the two existing single detached dwellings and have
started construction of 12 freehold townhouse dwellings which are located on
Thompson Road. Five dwellings are currently under construction and will be severed by consent applications. The owner is also proposing to construct 38 common element condominium townhouse dwellings which will be located at 20 & 32 C Line. Only the property located at 20 & 32 C Line is the subject of this Plan of Subdivision application.

The Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment application that would permit the proposed development was approved on April 8, 2013 and the by-law enacted on May 6, 2013. The Removal of the Holding Symbol application and the Residential Demolition Permit applications were approved by Council on November 25, 2013. The Site Plan application was approved on February 14, 2014.

To develop the 38 townhouse dwellings as part of a common element condominium development, a Plan of Subdivision is required as the subject property is not part of a Registered Plan. A Plan of Subdivision will create a Registered Plan and therefore, allow the owner to apply for an exemption from Part Lot Control at a future date to subdivide the 38 townhouse dwelling lots. If the subject property was not part of a Registered Plan, there would be no feasible way to subdivide the 38 common element condominium townhouse dwellings into individual lots other than through the severance process which is onerous and can be fraught with errors and would generally be discouraged because of the number of lots being created in this instance.

In a common element condominium development, developers work with their solicitor to create and sell separate parcels of tied land (POTL) to each purchaser (in most cases this includes freehold townhomes), which are not part of the condominium corporation. They then create a condominium corporation which owns all the facilities, roads, services, amenity space, etc. The costs associated with these common elements are paid by the purchasers of the POTLs as part of condominium fees, similar to a standard condominium.

No changes to the development that was approved by Council as part of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications are being sought as part of the Plan of Subdivision application. The Plan of Subdivision application is needed for administrative purposes only to permit the further division of land.

Official Plan and Zoning By-law
The subject property is designated “Low Density Multiple” in the Official Plan and zoned Residential Seventh Density (R7) Zone and Special Provision 24.200 by Zoning By-law 22-90, as amended. The current Official Plan designation and zoning permit the proposed development of 38 common element condominium townhouses.
Comments Received

General Public
Notice of the application will be mailed to all residents within 120 metres of the property, a notification sign will be posted on the property and a notice will be published in the Orangeville Banner and the Orangeville Citizen 20 days in advance of the public meeting as required under the Planning Act.

Internal Departments and Outside Agencies
Staff is awaiting comments from staff and external agencies.

The statutory public meeting is scheduled for September 8, 2014.

Financial Impact
There is no financial impact to the Town arising from this application.

Vision and Values
The Vision and Values statement adopted by Council sets out a direction for the Town by presenting a set of core values that will guide Council’s and staff’s actions now and into the future. In particular, the statement outlines that the Town will “spend taxpayers’ money wisely and responsibly”. Staff processing this application will allow the proposed development, as approved by Council, to proceed.

Recommendation
For the information of Council.

Respectfully submitted,  Prepared by,

Nancy Tuckett, MSc. Pl., BEd, MCIP, RPP
Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation

Sandy Little, BES, MCIP, RPP
Planner

Attachments
Schedule “A” – Location Map
The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville
Certificate of Approval
Site Plan Application SP 2/14
Nova Cheese Inc. (Woolwich Dairy)

Part of Lot 1, Concession C, Parts 1 and 2, Reference Plan 7R-2752 and Parts 7 and 8, Reference Plan 7R-2791, Town of Orangeville, County of Dufferin, which is municipally known as 425 Richardson Road.

Whereas Section 41 of the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13 authorizes the Council of a municipality to delegate to either a committee of Council or an appointed officer of the municipality, any of Council's powers under Section 41;

And whereas By-law 61-2004, as amended, delegates the power to approve site plan applications to the Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation or, in the absence of the Director, the Chief Administrative Officer;

And whereas upon approval by the Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation or the Chief Administrative Officer, By-law 61-2004, as amended, authorizes the Mayor and Clerk to sign a site plan agreement and any other documents required to implement the conditions of approval;

Now therefore, the Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation confirms that Site Plan Approval Application SP 2/14 relating to the construction of a 268 square metre (2,885 square feet) addition to the existing building and two new silos as shown on Schedule “A” is hereby approved, subject to the execution of a site plan agreement.

Nancy Tuckett, MSc. Pl., BEd, MCIP, RPP
Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation

__________________________
Date
The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville

Heritage Permit

Heritage Permit Application HR 6/14
Meridian Credit Union
Plan 138, Block 6, Part of Lot 28, and
Block 8, Lots 8 to 10 and Part of Lot 11, and
Part of Lot 2, Concession E
Town of Orangeville, County of Dufferin
190 Broadway

Whereas subsection 42(1) of Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act RSO 1990, c.O.18, specifies that any changes to the exterior of buildings within a heritage conservation district must be approved by Council by the issuance of a permit;

And whereas on January 20, 2003, Council passed a resolution authorizing the Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation, in consultation with the appointed members of Heritage Orangeville, to review and issue heritage permits within the Downtown Orangeville Heritage Conservation District, on behalf of Council;

And whereas the application has been reviewed by the Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation (or her designate) and the appointed members of Heritage Orangeville;

Now therefore, the Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation confirms that Heritage Permit Application HR 6/14 relating to the proposal to:

• affix two vinyl applications on two existing wall signs
  - measuring 0.07 metres (0.25 feet) by 0.6 metres (2 feet);
  - with the wording “24 Hour Banking” in blue; and
  - on an orange background

is hereby approved, and a Heritage Permit issued for the works as described.

Nancy Tuckett, MSc. Pl., BEd, MCIP, RPP
Director of Economic Development, Planning and Innovation

July 15, 2014
Date
County of Dufferin Official Plan
NOTICE OF STATUTORY PUBLIC MEETING

Pursuant to Section 17 of the Planning Act, as amended, the Council for the County of Dufferin will hold a Statutory Public Meeting to receive input on the proposed new County of Dufferin Official Plan. The Public Meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 13, 2014 at the County of Dufferin Council Chambers, 51 Zina Street (2nd Floor), Orangeville, at 7:00 p.m.

The County Official Plan establishes policy direction on matters of County significance such as growth management, the promotion of economic development objectives, and the natural environment and resources. Detailed land use planning will continue to be managed and administered locally through the local municipal official plans which will remain in place to guide local decision making.

A copy of the proposed new County of Dufferin Official Plan and background materials will be available by July 24, 2014 on the County’s website at www.dufferincounty.ca/planning/ and available for inspection during normal business hours at the County of Dufferin Administration Offices, 55 Zina Street, Orangeville ON, L9W 1E5.

Notification: If you wish to be notified of the adoption of the Official Plan by County of Dufferin Council, you must make a written request to the Clerk, County of Dufferin, 55 Zina Street, Orangeville ON, L9W 1E5, or by email at clerk@dufferincounty.ca.

Submissions: Any person may attend the public meeting and/or make written or verbal representation either in support or in opposition to the proposed Official Plan and is encouraged to provide these comments by Tuesday, August 5, 2014 to the Clerk of the County of Dufferin for inclusion in the Council Agenda.

Delegations: Delegations wishing to speak at the Public Meeting are encouraged to preregister with the Clerk for the County of Dufferin. Those who have preregistered will have priority over non-registered parties. To ensure the meeting is conducted in a timely manner and to ensure everyone has a chance to speak, delegates will be given five minutes to address Council. To preregister, please call the Clerk for the County of Dufferin.

Approval of the Official Plan: Upon adoption of the new Official Plan by County of Dufferin Council, the Plan will be forwarded to the Minister of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to approve the Official Plan. As such, the proposed Official Plan is not subject to appeal until approved by the Minister.

Appeals: If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the County of Dufferin before the proposed new Official Plan is adopted by County of Dufferin Council, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Minister of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to the Ontario Municipal Board.
If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the County of Dufferin before the proposed new Official Plan is adopted, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to add the person or public body as a party.

Any questions related to this public meeting may be directed to:
Tracey Atkinson, MCIP, RPP
Project Manager, Dufferin County Official Plan
Phone: 519-941-2816 ext. 2508, Toll Free: 1-877-941-2816 ext. 2508
tatkinson@dufferincounty.ca

Dated at Orangeville this 4th day of July, 2014

Pam Hilllock, Clerk/Director of Corporate Services
Corporation of the County of Dufferin
55 Zina Street
Orangeville, ON L9W 1E5
Phone: 519.941.2816 ext. 2503
Email: clerk@dufferincounty.ca
Your Worship
Mayor Adams
Town of Orangeville
87 Broadway
Orangeville, ON L9W 1K1

Dear Mayor Adams:

Thank you for your letter of July 15, 2014 concerning the County of Dufferin Official Plan and the Town of Orangeville’s interest in maintaining delegated approval authority.

I am pleased to see that the County of Dufferin is making progress towards putting in place its first official plan. County official plans play a significant role in co-ordinating land use issues to appropriately shape local communities while protecting matters of provincial interest, and will continue to play a critical role in managing growth, co-ordinating infrastructure investments, and creating a climate for economic development while allowing for effective local decision making.

I am also pleased to advise that the Ministry has posted a notice on Ontario’s Regulatory Registry proposing a regulation under the Planning Act that would amend O.Reg 699/98 to authorize the County of Dufferin to pass a by-law exempting official plan amendments in the Towns of Orangeville and Mono from County approval under section 17 of the Act. The proposal notice is available at http://www.ontariocanada.com/registry.

Ministry staff in our Central Region Municipal Services Office will work closely with the County throughout the process. Once again, thank you for your letter and continued efforts on this important initiative.

Best Regards,

Ted McMeekin
Minister
Purpose
The purpose of this report is to bring forward for Council an update with respect to the appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) by the owner, Tony Ajayi, for the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for 45 Church Street and to seek Council direction for planning expertise and legal counsel in preparation for the hearing.

Background and Discussion
The subject lands are located on the south side of Church Street, between Bythia Street and William Street (see Schedule “A”) and are described as Lot 23, Registered Plan 73 and comprise 0.07 hectares (0.17 acres). The subject lands are predominantly surrounded by a mix of residential uses of varying densities including single detached, semi-detached, townhouse and apartment type dwellings.

The applicant was seeking to legalize a fourth apartment dwelling in an existing residential dwelling. The Official Plan designation and zoning does not allow for a converted dwelling unit containing four dwelling units. As such, the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments were sought to redesignate the property from “Low Density
Residential” to “Medium Density Residential” to permit the fourth unit and to rezone from the property from Residential Second Density (R2) Zone to Multiple Residential Medium Density (RM1) Zone in addition to a special provision to modify some of the zone regulations to allow the required parking spaces to be obstructed, to permit two driveways and to reduce the minimum required interior side yard and rear yard setbacks.

On May 12, 2014 the statutory public meeting was held to consider the applications. Several residents present spoke at the public meeting in opposition to the applications. As well, several residents, who were tenants of the dwelling, indicated that they were in support of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments to permit the fourth unit.

Staff prepared report PL-2014-19 in support of the application. In planning staff’s opinion the proposed Amendments met the policy direction contained in the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2006) and the Town’s Official Plan for the requested land use change. The applications seek an additional residential rental unit which provides a form and tenure of housing that is in demand in Orangeville and will continue to be as the population ages. For these reasons, town staff recommended approval of the applications.

Council passed the following resolution:

“That the correspondence from the following residents be received;
- Jason Bourne, 52 Church Street, L9W 1N7, dated June 18.
- Sandi and Jim Fitzsimmons, 65 Bythia Street, L9W 2S4, dated May 15.
- Susan Little, 45 Chrch Street, L9W 1N7, dated June 6.
- Chris and Pam Beatson, 8 William Street, L9W 2R5, dated June 23.
- Shelagh Roberts, 5 Church Street, L9W1N6, dated June 23.
- Bill and Jill Theeuwen, 59 Bythia Street, L9W 2S4, dated June 22.

And that report PI-2014-19, dated June 10, 2014, with respect to Official Plan and Zoning by-law Amendment Application OPZ 1/14, for the lands municipally known as 45 Church Street, as submitted by Anthony Ajayi, be received;

And that Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Application OPZ1/14 to redesignate the lands to “Medium Density Resienitlta” and to rezone the subject property to the “Mulitple Residnetial Medium Density (RM1) Zone” to permit a converted dwelling containing four dwelling units, be denied.”
The applicant has since registered his appeal with the Ontario Municipal Board, which was received by the Clerk's Office on July 10, 2014 (see Schedule “B”). Since Planning staff supported the proposal and recommended approval in planning report PL-2014-19, Council will need to retain external legal and planning consultants to represent the case at a hearing on the matter.

**Financial Impact**
There is a financial impact with respect to the requirement to hire external legal and planning consultants to represent the Town in the case of an OMB hearing.

**Vision and Values**
This report is consistent with the Town’s Vision and Values in that it demonstrates the need to spend taxpayers’ money wisely and responsibly and to provide an opportunity to enhance the Town’s environment while providing for a well-maintained infrastructure.

**Recommendation**
That Report PL-2014-27, dated July 15, 2014 regarding the Ontario Municipal Board Appeal – 45 Church Street, be received;

And that expert planning opinion and legal counsel be sought to represent the Town at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing, as needed.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Tuckett, MSc. Pl., BEd, MCIP, RPP
Director of Economic Development,
Planning and Innovation

**Attachments**
Schedule “A” – Location Map

Schedule “B” – OMB Appeals
### Part 1: Appeal Type (Please check only one box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</th>
<th>TYPE OF APPEAL</th>
<th>PLANNING ACT REFERENCE (SECTION)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td>Appeal a decision</td>
<td>45(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent/Severance</td>
<td>Appeal a decision</td>
<td>53(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal conditions imposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>53(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed to make a decision on the application within 90 days</td>
<td>53(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law Amendment</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of a Zoning By-law</td>
<td>34(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law - failed to make a decision on the application within 120 days</td>
<td>34(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law - refused by the municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Control By-law</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of an Interim Control By-law</td>
<td>38(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal a decision</td>
<td>17(24) or 17(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
<td>17(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Plan or Official Plan Amendment</td>
<td>Application for an amendment to the Official Plan - failed to make a decision on the application within 180 days</td>
<td>22(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application for an amendment to the Official Plan - refused by the municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan of Subdivision</td>
<td>Appeal a decision</td>
<td>51(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal conditions imposed</td>
<td>51(43) or 51(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed to make a decision on the application within 180 days</td>
<td>51(34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 2: Location Information

Address and/or Legal Description of property subject to the appeal: **PLAN 73, LOT 23, 45 CHURCH STREET, ORANGEVILLE, ONTARIO**

Municipality/Upper tier: **TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE**

A1 Revised April 2010
Part 3: Appellant Information

First Name: ANTONY  Last Name: AJAYI

Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation)

Professional Title (if applicable):

E-mail Address: tonyajay007@gmail.com

*By providing an e-mail address you agree to receive communications from the OMB by e-mail.

Daytime Telephone #: 905-629-8842  Alternate Telephone #: 647-298-7914 - Cellular  Fax #: N/A

Mailing Address: 70 ST. HUBERT DRIVE, BRAMPTON, ONTARIO, L6P 1Y5

Signature of Appellant: ___________________________ Date: July 10, 2014

Please note: You must notify the Ontario Municipal Board of any change of address or telephone number in writing. Please quote your OMB Reference Number(s) after they have been assigned.

Personal information requested on this form is collected under the provisions of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, and the Ontario Municipal Board Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 28 as amended. After an appeal is filed, all information relating to this appeal may become available to the public.

Part 4: Representative Information (if applicable)

I hereby authorize the named company and/or individual(s) to represent me:

First Name: CHRIS  Last Name: TONKS

Company Name: PROUSE DASH & CROUCH, LLP

Professional Title: LAWYER

E-mail Address: ctonks@odclawyers.ca

*By providing an e-mail address you agree to receive communications from the OMB by e-mail.

Daytime Telephone #: 905-451-6610 Ext. 293  Fax #: 905-866-5165

Mailing Address: 50 QUEEN STREET WEST, BRAMPTON, ONTARIO, L6X 4H3

Signature of Appellant: ___________________________ Date: July 10, 2014

Please note: If you are representing the appellant and are NOT a solicitor, please confirm that you have written authorization, as required by the Board’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, to act on behalf of the appellant. Please confirm this by checking the box below.

□ I certify that I have written authorization from the appellant to act as a representative with respect to this appeal on his or her behalf and I understand that I may be asked to produce this authorization at any time.
Part 5: Language and Accessibility

Please choose preferred language: ☑️ English  ❌ French

We are committed to providing services as set out in the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005. If you have any accessibility needs, please contact our Accessibility Coordinator as soon as possible.

Part 6: Appeal Specific Information

1. Provide specific information about what you are appealing. For example: Municipal File Number(s), By-law Number(s), Official Plan Number(s) or Subdivision Number(s):

The Appellant is appealing the denial of his Application to the Town of Orangeville, under file number OPZ 1/14, for a Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment.

The Appellant was seeking to have his property, located at 45 Church Street, in the Town of Orangeville (the "Property") re-designated from "Low Density Residential" to "Medium Density Residential". The Appellant was also seeking to have the Property re-zoned from "Residential Second Density (R2) Zone" to "Multiple Residential Medium Density (RM1) Zone" to permit a converted dwelling containing four units.

In addition, the Appellant was requesting a Special Provision to modify some of the zone regulations to permit two driveways, and to reduce the minimum required interior side and rear yard setbacks.

2. Outline the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal. Be specific and provide land-use planning reasons (for example: the specific provisions, sections and/or policies of the Official Plan or By-law which are the subject of your appeal - if applicable). **If more space is required, please continue in Part 9 or attach a separate page.


**Further particulars of the Appellants reasons for Appealing the decision of the Town of Orangeville in respect of his Application under file number OPZ 1/14 will be provided by counsel for the Appellant.

THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS (a&b) APPLY ONLY TO APPEALS OF ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENTS UNDER SECTION 34(11) OF THE PLANNING ACT.

a) DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED TO MUNICIPALITY: N/A for this type of appeal
   (If application submitted before January 1, 2007 please use the O1 'pre-Bill 51' form.)

b) Provide a brief explanatory note regarding the proposal, which includes the existing zoning category, desired zoning category, the purpose of the desired zoning by-law change, and a description of the lands under appeal:
   **If more space is required, please continue in Part 9 or attach a separate page.

N/A for this type of appeal
Part 7: Related Matters (if known)

Are there other appeals not yet filed with the Municipality? YES  ☑  NO  ☑

Are there other planning matters related to this appeal? YES  ☑  NO  ☑
(For example: A consent application connected to a variance application)

If yes, please provide OMB Reference Number(s) and/or Municipal File Number(s) in the box below:

**NOTE: The Appellant has filed two appeals on the same day in respect of the denials of the Town of Orangeville of his Application. One Appeal in reference to the Appellant's appeal of the Zoning decision, and one in respect of the Official Plan decision.

THE ASSIGNED FILE NUMBERS FOR EACH APPEAL (WHICH ARE SEPERATE, BUT RELATED) ARE:

TO BE DETERMINED

Part 8: Scheduling Information

How many days do you estimate are needed for hearing this appeal? ☑ half day  ☑ 1 day  ☑ 2 days  ☑ 3 days
☐ 4 days  ☑ 1 week  ☑  More than 1 week – please specify number of days: ____________

How many expert witnesses and other witnesses do you expect to have at the hearing providing evidence/testimony?:

The Appellant anticipates having 2-3 Witnesses at the Hearing.

Describe expert witness(es)' area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.):

Counsel for the Appellant to provide particulars of Expert Witnesses at a later date.

Do you believe this matter would benefit from mediation? YES  ☑  NO  ☑
(Mediation is generally scheduled only when all parties agree to participate)

Do you believe this matter would benefit from a prehearing conference? YES  ☑  NO  ☑
(Prehearing conferences are generally not scheduled for variances or consents)

If yes, why? ____________

Part 9: Other Applicable Information **Attach a separate page if more space is required.
Part 10: Required Fee

Total Fee Submitted: $125.00

Payment Method:  
- Certified cheque  
- Money Order  
- Solicitor's general or trust account cheque

- The payment must be in Canadian funds, payable to the Minister of Finance.
- Do not send cash.
- PLEASE ATTACH THE CERTIFIED CHEQUE/MONEY ORDER TO THE FRONT OF THIS FORM.
# APPELLANT FORM (A1)
## PLANNING ACT

### TO MUNICIPALITY/APPROVAL AUTHORITY

**Date Stamp - Appeal Received by Municipality**

**RECEIVED**

**JUL 10 2014**

---

**Part 1: Appeal Type (Please check only one box)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</th>
<th>TYPE OF APPEAL</th>
<th>PLANNING ACT REFERENCE (SECTION)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td>Appeal a decision</td>
<td>45(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent/Severance</td>
<td>Appeal a decision</td>
<td>53(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal conditions imposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed to make a decision on the application within 90 days</td>
<td>53(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law Amendment</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of a Zoning By-law</td>
<td>34(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law - failed to make a decision on the application within 120 days</td>
<td>34(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law - refused by the municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Control By-law</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of an Interim Control By-law</td>
<td>38(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal a decision</td>
<td>17(24) or 17(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
<td>17(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Plan or Official Plan Amendment</td>
<td>Application for an amendment to the Official Plan - failed to make a decision on the application within 180 days</td>
<td>22(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application for an amendment to the Official Plan - refused by the municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan of Subdivision</td>
<td>Appeal a decision</td>
<td>51(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal conditions imposed</td>
<td>51(43) or 51(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed to make a decision on the application within 180 days</td>
<td>51(34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Part 2: Location Information

Address and/or Legal Description of property subject to the appeal: **PLAN 73, LOT 23, 45 CHURCH STREET, ORANGEVILLE, ONTARIO, PIN# 34014-0161**

Municipality/Upper tier: **TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE**

---
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Part 3: Appellant Information

First Name: ANTONY
Last Name: AJAYI

Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation)

Professional Title (if applicable):

E-mail Address: tonyajay007@gmail.com

*By providing an e-mail address you agree to receive communications from the OMB by e-mail.

Daytime Telephone #: 905-829-8842
Alternate Telephone #: 647-298-7914 - Cellular
Fax #: N/A

Mailing Address: 70 ST. HUBERT DRIVE, BRAMPTON, ONTARIO, L6P 1Y5

Signature of Appellant: ____________________________ Date: July 10, 2014

Please note: You must notify the Ontario Municipal Board of any change of address or telephone number in writing. Please quote your OMB Reference Number(s) after they have been assigned.

Personal information requested on this form is collected under the provisions of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, and the Ontario Municipal Board Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 28 as amended. After an appeal is filed, all information relating to this appeal may become available to the public.

Part 4: Representative Information (if applicable)

I hereby authorize the named company and/or individual(s) to represent me:

First Name: CHRIS
Last Name: TONKS

Company Name: PROUSE DASH & CROUCH, LLP

Professional Title: LAWYER

E-mail Address: ctonks@pdclawyers.ca

*By providing an e-mail address you agree to receive communications from the OMB by e-mail.

Daytime Telephone #: 905-451-6610 Ext. 293
Fax #: 905-865-5165

Mailing Address: 50 QUEEN STREET WEST, BRAMPTON, ONTARIO, L6X 4H3

Signature of Appellant: ____________________________ Date: July 10, 2014

Please note: If you are representing the appellant and are NOT a solicitor, please confirm that you have written authorization, as required by the Board’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, to act on behalf of the appellant. Please confirm this by checking the box below:

I certify that I have written authorization from the appellant to act as a representative with respect to this appeal on his or her behalf and I understand that I may be asked to produce this authorization at any time.
Part 5: Language and Accessibility

Please choose preferred language: ☑️ English ☐ French

We are committed to providing services as set out in the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005. If you have any accessibility needs, please contact our Accessibility Coordinator as soon as possible.

Part 6: Appeal Specific Information

1. Provide specific information about what you are appealing. For example: Municipal File Number(s), By-law Number(s), Official Plan Number(s) or Subdivision Number(s):

The Appellant is appealing the denial of his Application to the Town of Orangeville, under file number OPZ 1/14, for a Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment.

The Appellant was seeking to have his property, located at 45 Church Street, in the Town of Orangeville (the "Property") re-designated from "Low Density Residential" to "Medium Density Residential". The Appellant was also seeking to have the Property re-zoned from "Residential Second Density (R2) Zone" to "Multiple Residential Medium Density (RM1) Zone" to permit a converted dwelling containing four units.

In addition, the Appellant was requesting a Special Provision to modify some of the zone regulations to permit two driveways, and to reduce the minimum required interior side and rear yard setbacks.

2. Outline the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal. Be specific and provide land-use planning reasons (for example: the specific provisions, sections and/or policies of the Official Plan or By-law which are the subject of your appeal - if applicable). **If more space is required, please continue in Part 9 or attach a separate page.


**Further particulars of the Applicants reasons for Appealing the decision of the Town of Orangeville in respect of his Application under file number OPZ 1/14 will be provided by counsel for the Appellant.

THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS (a&b) APPLY ONLY TO APPEALS OF ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENTS UNDER SECTION 34(11) OF THE PLANNING ACT.

a) DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED TO MUNICIPALITY: MARCH 17, 2014
   (If application submitted before January 1, 2007 please use the O1 'pre-Bill 51' form.)

b) Provide a brief explanatory note regarding the proposal, which includes the existing zoning category, desired zoning category, the purpose of the desired zoning by-law change, and a description of the lands under appeal:
   **If more space is required, please continue in Part 9 or attach a separate page.

Municipal Description of Lands: Plan 73, Lot 23, 45 Church Street, Orangeville, Ontario, Pin# 34014-0161
Existing Zone Category: Residential Second Density (R2) Zone
Existing Official Plan Designation: Low Density Residential
Desired Zone Category: Multiple Residential Medium Density (RM1) Zone
Desired Official Plan Amendment: Medium Density Residential
Purpose of Desired Changes: To permit/legalize an existing fourth dwelling unit, and to modify some of the zone regulations to permit two driveways.
Part 7: Related Matters (if known)

Are there other appeals not yet filed with the Municipality? YES ☑ NO ☑
Are there other planning matters related to this appeal? YES ☑ NO ☑
(For example: A consent application connected to a variance application)
If yes, please provide OMB Reference Number(s) and/or Municipal File Number(s) in the box below:

**NOTE: The Appellant has filed two appeals on the same day in respect of the denials of the Town of Orangeville of his Application. One Appeal in reference to the Appellants appeal of the Zoning decision, and one in respect of the Official Plan decision.
THE ASSIGNED FILE NUMBERS FOR EACH APPEAL (WHICH ARE SEPERATE, BUT RELATED) ARE:
TO BE DETERMINED

Part 8: Scheduling Information

How many days do you estimate are needed for hearing this appeal? ☑ half day ☑ 1 day ☑ 2 days ☑ 3 days ☑ 4 days ☑ 1 week ☑ More than 1 week – please specify number of days: ___________

How many expert witnesses and other witnesses do you expect to have at the hearing providing evidence/testimony?:

The Appellant anticipates having 2-3 Witnesses at the Hearing.

Describe expert witness(es)' area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.):

Counsel for the Appellant to provide particulars of Expert Witnesses at a later date.

Do you believe this matter would benefit from mediation? YES ☑ NO ☑
(Mediation is generally scheduled only when all parties agree to participate)

Do you believe this matter would benefit from a prehearing conference? YES ☑ NO ☑
(Prehearing conferences are generally not scheduled for variances or consents)
If yes, why?

Part 9: Other Applicable Information **Attach a separate page if more space is required.
Part 10: Required Fee

Total Fee Submitted: $125.00

Payment Method:  
- Certified cheque  
- Money Order  
- Solicitor's general or trust account cheque

- The payment must be in Canadian funds, payable to the Minister of Finance.
- Do not send cash.
- PLEASE ATTACH THE CERTIFIED CHEQUE/MONEY ORDER TO THE FRONT OF THIS FORM.
Purpose
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with information on proposed housekeeping amendments to Sign Bylaw 28-2013.

Background and Discussion
At Council's December 10, 2012 meeting, Council approved the establishment of a Sign Development Committee comprised of representatives of Council, the business community, Greater Dufferin Area Chamber of Commerce, Orangeville Business Improvement Area, local services clubs, and Heritage Orangeville. The Committee's mandate is to work with the business community on an individual basis, as needed, to improve its signage, as well, the Committee will make any recommendations with respect to portable temporary signage.

The Committee, over its term, has met five times to discuss various signage options for local businesses. During these meetings, a subcommittee was formed to research options for electronic display message and readograph signs and met with property and business owners regarding these options for improved signage.

At its most recent meeting, members discussed the progress that has been made along with the success in improving signage, however, realizing that there is still much more work to be done. Members also recommend that at this time, the Committee wishes to defer any recommendations specifically related to the phase in / phase out period of portable temporary signage until the next term of Council.

Committee members have reviewed and discussed Section 7.7 of the bylaw related to readograph and electronic message display, as well as other minor housekeeping items within the bylaw. Staff supports the recommended amendments made by the Sign Development Committee, and are submitting them for Council's consideration. The following is a summary of the proposed
amendments:

- Section 7.7 (b) be amended to read as follows: Ground signs can incorporate up to 45% of the total sign display area as a readograph or electronic message display on lots with less than 30 m of highway frontage, or on lots with more than 30 m but less than 45 m of highway frontage up to a maximum of 40% of the total sign display area, or for Commercial lots only with more than 45 m of highway frontage up to a maximum of 33% of the total sign display area.

- Section 7.7 add clause (d) to read as follows: Ground signs incorporating readograph or electronic message display shall come equipped with automatic dimming technology which automatically adjusts the sign’s brightness in direct correlation with ambient light conditions.

- Section 7.7 add clause (e) to read as follows: Ground signs incorporating an electronic message display shall not contain a flashing or continuous scrolling message or image. Where the message is of other than scrolling script, the frequency of any image change shall not be less than every 7 seconds.

- Sections 6.2(a)(vi), 6.5(a)(iv), 6.6(a)(iv), to be amended to add the following: “If the lot frontage of the property is less than 30 m, a second ground sign for the purpose of readograph or electronic message display will not be permitted.

- Sections 6.2(a)(vi), 6.5(a)(iv), 6.6(a)(iv), to be further amended to include the following: “That the one additional ground sign permitted not exceed a height of 3 m.

- Section 4.9 add clause (x) to read as follows: Temporary signs, including bag signs and coroplast signs, with the exception of signage erected by community associations, charitable organizations, and non-profit corporations and with the exception of one temporary sign for a building contractor or home renovation operator working on site for a maximum 30 day period.

- Section 3.19 change the definition name from Digital Signage to Digital Image Signage.

The attached Appendix A highlights these proposed amendments within Sign Bylaw 28-2013, for your reference.
Financial Impact
The proposed amendments to Sign Bylaw 28-2013 would not have a financial impact on the Town.

Vision and Values
The proposed amendments to Sign Bylaw 28-2013 are consistent with the Town’s Vision and Values in that it helps encourage business growth and supports arts and culture, while honouring our heritage.

Recommendation
THAT Report BB-2014-4 dated June 19, 2014, be received;

AND THAT Council consider a by-law to amend Sign By-law 28-2013 to adopt the following:

- Section 7.7 (b) be amended to read as follows: Ground signs can incorporate up to 45% of the total sign display area as a readograph or electronic message display on lots with less than 30 m of highway frontage, or on lots with more than 30 m but less than 45 m of highway frontage up to a maximum of 40% of the total sign display area, or for Commercial lots only with more than 45 m of highway frontage up to a maximum of 33% of the total sign display area.

- Section 7.7 add clause (d) to read as follows: Ground signs incorporating readograph or electronic message display shall come equipped with automatic dimming technology which automatically adjusts the sign’s brightness in direct correlation with ambient light conditions.

- Section 7.7 add clause (e) to read as follows: Ground signs incorporating an electronic message display shall not contain a flashing or continuous scrolling message or image. Where the message is of other than scrolling script, the frequency of any image change shall not be less than every 7 seconds.

- Sections 6.2(a)(vi), 6.5(a)(iv), 6.6(a)(iv), to be amended to add the following: “If the lot frontage of the property is less than 30 m, a second ground sign for the purpose of readograph or electronic message display will not be permitted.

- Sections 6.2(a)(vi), 6.5(a)(iv), 6.6(a)(iv), to be further amended to include the following: “That the one additional ground sign permitted not exceed a height of 3 m.

- Section 4.9 add clause (x) to read as follows: Temporary signs, including bag signs and coroplast signs, with the exception of signage erected by community associations,
charitable organizations, and non-profit corporations and with the exception of one temporary sign for a building contractor or home renovation operator working on site for a maximum 30 day period.

- Section 3.19 change the definition name from Digital Signage to Digital Image Signage.

Respectfully submitted,

______________________________
Councillor Sylvia Bradley, Chair, Sign Development Committee

Prepared by,

______________________________
Vern Douglas, CBCO, Director of Building and Bylaw Enforcement
Sign By-law 28-2013 – Sections with proposed amendments

Part 3 Definitions

3.19 “Digital Image Signage” is digital generated artwork that can be in colour and is placed onto a coroplast backing and affixed to the frame of a 4.5m$^2$ portable temporary sign face;

4.9 Prohibited Signs

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this by-law, no person shall erect, or cause to be erected or permit on any premises, any of the following signs:

(a) A sign which is located so as to obstruct the view of any pedestrian or motor vehicle driver so as to cause a hazardous condition;

(b) A sign other than a wall sign within 9.0 metres of the base of a traffic light;

(c) A sign which is located so as to obstruct or impede any flue, air intake, fire escape, fire exit, door, window, skylight or exhaust or so as to impede free access by fire fighters to any part of the premises;

(d) A sign which projects over any area to which pedestrians have access unless located at least 2.5m above the surface of such area;

(e) A sign which does not comply with the provisions of the Building Code;

(f) A sign which does not comply with the provisions of the Electrical Safety Code, the Occupational Health and Safety Act, the Construction Safety Act, or any other applicable government regulations;

(g) A sign which does not comply with the provisions of this by-law;

(h) A sign encroaching onto a required fire route unless approved by the Municipality’s Fire Chief or his/her designate;

(i) A sign which is located on public property unless expressly permitted by this by-law;

(j) A sign which is located on any median, traffic island or centre boulevard unless expressly permitted by this by-law;

(k) A sign, including posters, flyers, stickers or decals, which is attached to any public utility facility or which interferes with any municipal or public utility services;
(l) A **sign** which is painted on or attached to any fence, tree, tree support, stone or other natural object or noise attenuation wall;

(m) A **roof sign**;

(n) A **sign** which depicts violence, nudity or other sexually explicit conduct;

(o) An **off-premises/billboard sign**;

(p) Any **illuminated sign** that directs light that will affect neighbouring properties;

(q) Any **illuminated sign** in the Residential, C5 and Institutional Zones, with the exception of **illuminated “open” window signs** in the C5 Zone subject to the provisions of Section 4.8(i);

(r) Unless deemed appropriate by the **Municipality**, a **portable temporary sign** located at either the Alder Street Recreation Centre or the Tony Rose Memorial Sports Centre;

(s) **Banners**, flags, balloon or spiral advertising devices, **flashing sign**, or any flashing or moving illumination which varies in intensity or which varies in colour and **signs** which have any visible moving parts or visible mechanical movement of any description;

(t) A **sandwich board sign** advertising a home occupation in Residential Zones;

(u) A **ground sign** in Residential Zones;

(v) A **readograph** or **electronic message display** forming part of and being incidental to a **wall sign**; and

(w) A **portable temporary sign** in the Heritage Sign Special Policy District, C5 Zone and Residential Zone.

(x) **Temporary signs**, including **bag signs** and **coroplast signs**, with the exception of signage erected by community associations, charitable organizations, and non-profit corporations and **with the exception of one temporary sign** for a building contractor or home renovation operator working on site for a maximum 30 day period.
6.2 Commercial Zones

Except as otherwise permitted in this by-law, no person shall erect, or cause to be erected or permit a sign in a Commercial Zone, save and except the following:

(a) Ground Signs

Ground signs shall be permitted subject to the following:

(i) all ground signs on a lot shall have a generally consistent height, appearance, shape, size, massing, background colour and border;

(ii) all ground signs shall be mounted in a landscaped setting on a lot;

(iii) no ground sign shall be permitted on an inside lot or a corner lot which has a highway frontage of less than 12m;

(iv) one (1) ground sign may be erected on an inside lot or corner lot which has a highway frontage of at least 12m;

(v) two (2) ground signs may be erected on a through lot, however only (1) sign is permitted on each highway frontage;

(vi) with the exception of the Heritage Sign Special Policy District and the C5 Zone, one additional ground sign shall be permitted in addition to the signage permitted by subsections (iv) and (v) above, so long as the sign face is no larger than 4.5m², the sign is used solely for the purpose of advertising using a readograph or electronic message display, the sign does not exceed a height of 3 m, and the sign is permanently located in a landscaped plot. If the lot frontage of the property is less than 30 m, a second ground sign for the purpose of readograph or electronic message display will not be permitted;

(vii) the maximum height of a ground sign on properties with a highway frontage of less than 30m shall be 4.5m;

(viii) for each additional 5m of highway frontage, an additional 0.3m of sign height shall be permitted to a maximum of 8m;

(ix) the maximum sign area for ground signs on lots with less than 30m of highway frontage shall be 4.5m²;

(x) the maximum sign area for ground signs on lots with more than 30m but less than 45m of highway frontage shall be 6m²;
(xi) the maximum **sign area** for **ground signs** on **lots** with more than 45m of **highway frontage** shall be 9m²;

(xii) notwithstanding subsection (xi) above, for **lots** with 45m or more of **highway frontage** on Highway 10, a **ground sign** that is oriented to traffic on Highway 10 may have a **sign area** of 9m² plus an additional 0.1m² for each metre in excess of 45m of **highway frontage** on Highway 10 up to a maximum of 20m²;

(xiii) one (1) **directional sign** at each point of vehicular entrance and exit shall be permitted in addition to the **signs** permitted above so long as such **signs** do not exceed 0.6m² in **sign area**;

(xiv) **ground signs** shall be located a minimum of 1m from any front or side **lot** line;

(xv) in the **parking areas** of shopping centres having a **lot** area greater than 0.8 hectares, **wall** and **ground signs** shall be permitted as required for the direction of traffic or pedestrians, so long as the **sign area** of each **sign** is less than 0.6m²; and

(xvi) the street number of the **lot** shall be prominently displayed on a **ground sign** such that it is visible from the **highway**.

### 6.5 Industrial Zones

Except as otherwise allowed in this by-law, no person shall **erect** or cause to be **erected** or permit a **sign** in an **Industrial Zone** save and except the following classes:

(a) **Ground Signs**

**Ground signs** shall be permitted subject to the following:

(i) no **ground sign** shall be permitted on an **inside lot** or a **corner lot** which has a **highway frontage** of less than 12m;

(ii) one (1) **ground sign** may be **erected** on an **inside lot** or **corner lot** which has a **highway frontage** of at least 12m;

(iii) two (2) **ground signs** may be **erected** on a **through lot**;

(iv) one additional **ground sign** shall be permitted in addition to the signage permitted by subsections (ii) and (iii) above, so long as the **sign face** is no larger than 4.5m², the **sign** is used solely for
the purpose of advertising a readograph or electronic message display, the sign does not exceed a height of 3 m, and the sign is permanently located in a landscaped plot. If the lot frontage of the property is less than 30 m, a second ground sign for the purpose of readograph or electronic message display will not be permitted;

(v) the maximum height of a ground sign on properties with a highway frontage of less than 30m shall be 4.5m;

(vi) for each additional 5m of highway frontage, an additional 0.3m of sign height shall be permitted to a maximum of 8m;

(vii) the maximum sign area for ground signs on lots with less than 30m of highway frontage shall be 4.5m²;

(viii) the maximum sign area for ground signs on lots with more than 30m of highway frontage shall be 6m²;

(ix) one (1) directional sign at each point of vehicular entrance and exit shall be permitted so long as such signs do not exceed 0.6m² in sign area;

(x) ground signs shall be located a minimum of 1m from any front or side lot line;

(xi) in the parking areas of multi-tenant buildings having a lot area greater than 0.8 hectares, wall and ground signs shall be permitted as required for the direction of traffic or pedestrians, so long as the sign area of each sign is less than 0.6 m²; and

(xii) the street number of the lot shall be prominently displayed on a ground sign such that it is visible from the highway.

6.6 Institutional Zones

Except as otherwise allowed in the by-law, no person shall erect or cause to be erected or permit a sign in an Institutional Zone save and except the following classes:

(a) Ground Signs

Ground signs shall be permitted subject to the following:

(i) no ground sign shall be permitted on an inside lot or a corner lot
which has a **highway frontage** of less than 12m;

(ii) one (1) **ground sign** may be **erected** on an **inside lot** or **corner lot** which has a **highway frontage** of at least 12m;

(iii) two (2) **ground signs** may be **erected** on a **through lot**;

(iv) one additional **ground sign** shall be permitted in addition to the **signage** permitted by subsections (ii) and (iii) above, so long as the **sign face** is no larger than 4.5m², the **sign** is used solely for the purpose of advertising a **readograph** or **electronic message display**, the **sign** **does not exceed a height of 3 m**, and the **sign** is permanently located in a landscaped plot. **If the lot frontage of the property is less than 30 m, a second ground sign for the purpose of readograph or electronic message display will not be permitted**;

(v) the maximum **height** of a **ground sign** on properties with a **highway frontage** of less than 30m shall be 4.5m;

(vi) for each additional 5m of **highway frontage**, an additional 0.3m of **sign height** shall be permitted to a maximum of 8m;

(vii) the maximum **sign area** for **ground signs** on **lots** with less than 30m of **lot** frontage shall be 4.5m²;

(viii) the maximum **sign area** for **ground signs** on **lots** with more than 30m of **highway frontage** shall be 6m²;

(ix) one (1) **directional sign** at each point of vehicular entrance and exit shall be permitted so long as such **signs** do not exceed 0.6m² in **sign area**;

(x) **ground signs** shall be located a minimum of 1m from any front or side **lot** line;

(xi) in the **parking areas** of multi-tenant buildings having a **lot** area greater than 0.8 hectares, **wall** and **ground signs** shall be permitted as required for the direction of traffic or pedestrians, so long as the **sign area** of each **sign** is less than 0.6m²; and

(xii) the street number of the **lot** shall be prominently displayed on a **ground sign** that it is visible from the **highway**.
7.7 Readographs or Electronic Message Displays

(a) **Readographs** or **electronic message displays**, that are an integral part of **ground signs** and **wall signs** are permitted in all **Commercial, Industrial and Institutional Zones**, except the **Heritage Sign Special Policy District, Residential Zones** and the **C5 Zone**.

(b) **Ground signs** incorporating **readographs** or **electronic message displays** may have a **sign area** that is 25 percent greater than the **sign area** otherwise permitted by this by-law provided that the **area of the readograph or electronic message display** is limited to a maximum of **3.5m²**.

Ground signs can incorporate up to 45% of the total sign display area as a readograph or electronic message display on lots with less than 30 m of highway frontage, or on lots with more than 30 m but less than 45 m of highway frontage up to a maximum of 40% of the total sign display area, or for Commercial lots only with more than 45 m of highway frontage up to a maximum of 33% of the total sign display area.

(c) The intensity of illumination for **readographs** or **electronic message displays** shall be maintained at a constant level.

(d) Ground signs incorporating readograph or electronic message display shall come equipped with automatic dimming technology which automatically adjusts the sign’s brightness in direct correlation with ambient light conditions.

(e) Ground signs incorporating an electronic message display shall not contain a flashing or continuous scrolling message or image. Where the message is of other than scrolling script, the frequency of any image change shall not be less than every 7 seconds.
Report

Reviewed by:

To: Mayor Adams and Members of Council

From: Councillor Gail Campbell, Chair, Access Orangeville

Date: July 21, 2014

Report: BB-2014-8

Subject: Town of Orangeville Annual Accessibility Plan

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the 2014 annual Accessibility Plan for review and consideration.

Background and Discussion

The Ontarians with Disabilities Act 2001 received royal assent on December 14, 2001. This Act put into place mandatory requirements for municipalities related to accessibility, including the requirement to form Accessibility Committees. The purpose of this Act is to improve opportunities for people with disabilities and to provide for their involvement in the identification, removal and prevention of barriers to their full participation in the life of the Province. To this end, the ODA mandates that each municipality prepare and implement an annual Accessibility Plan. Updated plans are to be received and approved by Council and available for review by the general public by September 30, of each year.

Bill 118, the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 received royal assent on June 14, 2005. It will help achieve an accessible society where all Ontarians have the opportunity to learn, work, play and otherwise participate to their fullest potential. Developing, implementing and enforcing accessibility standards in order to achieve accessibility for Ontarians with disabilities with respect to goods, services, facilities, accommodation, employment, buildings, structures and premises must happen on or before January 1, 2025.


In March 2010, the Town filed with the Accessibility Directorate of Ontario its first annual online Accessibility Report related to the Customer Service Standards. The Town will continue to strive to
provide its services in a way that respects the dignity and independence of persons with disabilities and is committed to giving persons with disabilities the same opportunity to access its goods and services, as well as allowing them to benefit from the same services, in the same place and in a similar way as other customers.

The Integrated Accessibility Standard, Ontario Regulation 191/11 is comprised of the Information and Communications Standards, Employment Standards, and Transportation Standards. The compliance dates for implementation of the standards are being phased in from 2011 to 2025. Town Departments have been working diligently to comply with the specified requirements set out in these standards as they become due.

In April 2013 Council adopted a multi-year accessibility plan with targets and timelines for a number of mandatory requirements, as well as Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation (IASR) Policies and Procedures Statements. A status report on the measures taken and the progress made to implement the initiatives in the multi-year plan will be submitted to the Province.

In general, the compliance initiatives for the IASR will form the work plan or accessibility plan for the Town of Orangeville for the next five years. The Town has completed the mandatory IASR requirements by January 1, 2014. A proactive approach towards accessibility over the past few years has put the Town of Orangeville in a good position to comply with the IASR requirements.

Accessibility Standards for the Built Environment will help remove barriers in buildings and public spaces for everyone, including people with disabilities, seniors and families. The standard will apply to new construction and planned renovation. On December 27, 2013, Ontario Regulation 368/13 was filed to amend the new 2012 Building Code, O.Reg. 332/12. The effective date of the amendment is January 1, 2015. The amended requirements will substantially enhance accessibility in newly constructed buildings and existing buildings that are to be extensively renovated. They maintain Ontario’s leadership role in requirements for barrier-free design.

Access Orangeville has completed an updated Accessibility Plan for 2014 and has included it as an attachment to this report for Council's review and consideration.

Councillor Campbell and staff would be pleased to answer any questions members of Council may have.
Vision and Values
The Town of Orangeville's Accessibility Plan documents how the Town continues to strategically identify, remove and prevent as many barriers as possible in our community and reconfirms Council's commitment to providing a barrier free community for all residents.

Recommendation
That report BB-2014-8 dated July 21, 2014, with respect to the Town of Orangeville's annual Accessibility Plan, be received;

And That the Town of Orangeville's annual Accessibility Plan, as presented, be approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Councillor Gail Campbell, Chair, Access Orangeville

Prepared by,

Vern Douglas, CBCO, Director of Building and Bylaw Enforcement

Attach.
Corporation of the
Town of Orangeville
87 Broadway
Orangeville, ON
L9W 1K1

Annual Accessibility Plan
September 2014

Contact:
Vern Douglas
Director, Building and By-Law Enforcement
Town of Orangeville
519-941-0440 x2228
vdouglas@orangeville.ca
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Town of Orangeville Highlights

The Town of Orangeville is located in south-central Ontario, the heart of Canada’s engine of economic growth. Downtown Toronto lies only 80 kilometres south-east of Orangeville and over six million people live within a 300 kilometre radius of the Town. Orangeville’s population as of December 2011 was 28,520.

Orangeville is the county seat for Dufferin County and is surrounded by natural beauty and bountiful resources and has a tradition of industry and prosperity.

The Town of Orangeville has two public libraries, police station, fire department consisting of full time and volunteer firefighters, an Operations Centre, which is a separate building from the Municipal Office, and two sports complexes, one with banquet hall facilities. Orangeville opened its second recreation centre in 2003; it includes two ice surfaces, two swimming pools, gymnasium, meeting rooms and a satellite library. The new recreation centre was designed to be fully accessible for everyone. Orangeville built an animal shelter in 2003, which is designed to be completely accessible. In 2006, as the existing police station was beyond its capacity, a new police station was built adjacent to Orangeville Hydro. This facility has been designed to be fully accessible for everyone.

Orangeville is fortunate to offer the services of two community colleges, Georgian and Humber.

Humber College is currently housed in the Town of Orangeville’s $18 million Alder Street Recreation Complex.

Orangeville is the perfect mix of lifestyle, prosperity and location. In countless ways, the Town’s services and programs affect the day-to-day life of every Orangeville resident, business, and visitor. Every day the Town of Orangeville strives to make this a better place for everyone by making every step a step forward.

Executive Summary

The purpose of the Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001 (ODA) is to improve opportunities for persons with disabilities and to provide for their involvement in the identification, removal and prevention of barriers to their full participation in the life of the Province. To this end, the ODA mandates that each Municipality prepare and implement an annual Accessibility Plan.

Bill 118, the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 (AODA) received royal assent on June 14, 2005. It will help achieve an accessible society where all Ontarians have the opportunity to learn, work, play and otherwise participate to their fullest potential.
A “barrier” means anything that prevents a person with a disability from fully participating in all aspects of society because of his or her disability; including a physical barrier, an architectural barrier, an informational or communications barrier, an attitudinal barrier, a technological barrier, a policy or a practice. Barriers prevent persons with disabilities from going to school, to work and participating fully in our community.

Access Orangeville has identified a number of barriers for persons with disabilities in the community and has been working very diligently with Town staff, and members of the community when appropriate, to eliminate, where possible, all barriers.

Objectives of Plan

The Plan describes the measures that the Town of Orangeville has taken in the past and the measures the Town will take in the current year to identify, remove and prevent barriers to persons with disabilities who utilize the facilities and services of the Town of Orangeville.

The Plan will:

1. Describe the process by which the Town of Orangeville will identify, remove and prevent barriers to persons with disabilities.

2. Review earlier efforts to remove and prevent barriers to persons with disabilities.

3. List the facilities, policies, programs, practices and services the Town of Orangeville will review in the coming year to identify barriers to persons with disabilities.

4. Describe the measures the Town of Orangeville will take in the coming years to identify, remove and prevent barriers to persons with disabilities.
Access Orangeville

Access Orangeville is an advisory committee of Council and reports to Council on a regular basis advising members of barriers and initiatives the Committee believes need to be addressed. Access Orangeville is dedicated to promoting a barrier free environment for all persons, regardless of needs, to participate as fully as possible in all aspects of community life. The Committee Members offer a wide range of knowledge of many disabilities including: physical, visual, hearing impairment, intellectual, mental health, communication and seniors issues. The Committee considers all disabilities when making recommendations. The Committee meets the second Tuesday of each month from 10:30 am to 12:00 pm and meeting times are restricted to one and a half hours maximum to conserve members’ limited energy and use their valuable time wisely. If a subcommittee is struck to deal with certain projects, additional meetings are scheduled, if the workload warrants it, for the subcommittee members to accomplish their goal.

Access Orangeville was initiated prior to the *Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2001 (ODA)* being established. The Town was grateful to receive information and assistance from many municipalities including Windsor and Peterborough as this project was undertaken. Since our inception, Orangeville has received requests for assistance from other jurisdictions as they participate in this process. Access Orangeville has been delighted to offer any assistance possible and has prepared a package outlining our Committee operations, which is sent to all who request it. See Appendix “A” for covering letter. The Committee has developed a handout containing suggestions to enhance access to buildings for persons with disabilities. The handout is distributed by the Building Department to all building permit applicants. See Appendix “B” for a copy of the handout. We have developed our own letterhead incorporating Orangeville’s new logo to enhance accessibility awareness in our community and it is used on all of the Committee’s correspondence. Access Orangeville attempts to have representation at as many information sessions on accessibility as possible, in order to receive and share information. Access Orangeville believes that these practices will enable all of us to work toward our goal of accessibility for everyone in the community.
The members of Access Orangeville are:
Councillor Gail Campbell - Committee Chair
Michael Gravelle – Volunteer Member
Sarah Murray – Volunteer Member
Larry Rankin - Volunteer Member
Peter Roy - Volunteer Member
Vern Douglas - Director of Building and By-Law Enforcement, Town of Orangeville
Sandra Kirby - Administrator, Building and By-Law Enforcement, Town of Orangeville

Mission Statement

Access Orangeville is dedicated to promoting a barrier free environment for all persons, regardless of needs, to participate as fully as possible in all aspects of community life.

Goals and Objectives

The goals of Access Orangeville are to encourage and facilitate accessibility on behalf of all persons by:

1. Promoting public awareness and sensitivity to accessibility issues.
2. Encouraging cooperation among all service and interest groups to ensure a better community for all persons.
3. Identifying and documenting relevant accessibility issues and concerns with respect to all municipal property and buildings.
4. Liaising with Town Departments and local organizations in addressing accessibility issues that are related to municipal property and buildings.
5. Recognizing that the needs of all persons are constantly changing.
Terms of Reference

To assist Council by advising, reviewing and making comment and recommendations on Federal and Provincial legislations and Municipal By-laws of the Town of Orangeville in the interest of creating a barrier free environment. Within the framework of the goals and objectives, the Committee will deal with accessibility for all persons.

The following procedures will be followed:

1. Access Orangeville will be a Committee of Council.
2. The Committee will schedule regular daytime meetings.
3. The minutes of Committee meetings will include recommendations for Council’s consideration.

Composition of Committee

1. Access Orangeville will consist of at least 1 Council representative, 2 staff representatives and up to 5 public members with an interest in at least one of the following disability types: visual, hearing, intellectual, physical, learning, medical, communication and older persons accessibility.

2. All public member positions are to be volunteer positions. The term for the public members will be 4 years and will be concurrent with the term of Council. Members will continue in the position until successors are appointed.

3. All interested applicants must complete an application form and provide details as to his or her interest in Access Orangeville. Applications will be reviewed and Council will appoint the members.

4. All Committee members must be residents of the Town of Orangeville.

Council’s Commitment to Accessibility Planning

Through accessibility planning and with the advice of Access Orangeville, the Town of Orangeville will strategically identify, remove and prevent as many barriers as possible.

The Council of the Town of Orangeville is committed to:
• The continual improvement of access to all municipally owned facilities, premises and services for all those with disabilities.

• The provision of quality services to all members of the community with or without disabilities.

The Ontario Government now has five sets of standards under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 (AODA) to achieve the vision of a barrier-free Ontario by 2025.

The Integrated Accessibility Standard, Ontario Regulation 191/11 is comprised of the Information and Communications Standards, Employment Standards, Transportation Standards and Design of Public Spaces Standards. The compliance dates for implementation of the standards are being phased in from 2011 to 2025. Town Departments have been working diligently to comply with the specified requirements set out in these standards as they become due.

In April 2013 Council adopted a multi-year accessibility plan with targets and timelines for a number of mandatory requirements, as well as Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation (IASR) Policies and Procedures Statements. A status report on the measures taken and the progress made to implement the initiatives in the multi-year plan will be submitted to the Province.

In general, the compliance initiatives for the IASR will form the work plan or accessibility plan for the Town of Orangeville for the next five years. The Town has completed the mandatory IASR requirements by January 1, 2014. A proactive approach towards accessibility over the past few years has put the Town of Orangeville in a good position to comply with the IASR requirements.

Accessibility Standards for the Built Environment will help remove barriers in buildings and public spaces for everyone, including persons with disabilities, seniors and families. The standard will apply to new construction and planned renovation. Work is continuing on this standard.

Accessibility Standards for Customer Service, Ontario Regulation 429/07 came into force on January 1, 2008. Since January 1, 2010, municipalities, being designated public sector organizations, must have policies, practices and procedures in place. Other providers of goods and services were required to have their policies and procedures in place by January 1, 2012.

The purpose of the Customer Service Standards Policy is to fulfill the requirements set out in the regulation by establishing a policy for the Town to govern the provision of its goods or services by its employees, agents or volunteers to persons with disabilities. In general, the Town must deliver its services in a way that is in keeping with the key principles of dignity, independence, integration and equal opportunity.
In March 2010, the Town filed with the Accessibility Directorate of Ontario its first annual online Accessibility Report related to the Customer Service Standards. The Town will continue to strive to provide its services in a way that respects the dignity and independence of persons with disabilities and is committed to giving persons with disabilities the same opportunity to access its goods and services, as well as allowing them to benefit from the same services, in the same place and in a similar way as other customers.


In 2005, Council created a Vision and Values statement for the Town of Orangeville. The Vision statement reads, “We value our heritage, natural environment, and small town appeal while embracing the future with a progressive and innovative spirit.” The first value in the list of 12 is, “We Value: a barrier free community”. This statement reconfirms Council’s commitment to a barrier free community for all residents.

In 2001, Council passed a motion that all Town of Orangeville sponsored events, including meetings, open houses and presentations, take place in accessible venues.

Council has authorized Access Orangeville to prepare an accessibility plan annually that will enable the Council to meet these commitments.

Site Audit of Municipally Owned Buildings

Town of Orangeville staff, along with members of Access Orangeville, has identified any barriers that exist in Town of Orangeville owned properties and are removing them as funds become available. All municipally owned properties will be continually monitored and improved upon as new technologies are developed to increase accessibility. Access Orangeville will be directly involved in the design process of any new municipally owned properties to ensure the prevention of any barriers to accessibility for all of our residents.

In October 2005, Committee members conducted audits of all municipally owned facilities. Once the audits had been completed and all accessibility issues had been documented, Committee members reviewed the results at their March 2006 meeting. The Committee then proceeded to forward these results to each Department Head to make them aware of the accessibility issues discovered in each of their facilities. The Committee had advised the Department Heads that they would be willing to offer financial assistance for enhancing signage within their facilities. The Committee has received response letters from both the Parks
and Recreation Department and the Library acknowledging the accessibility issues and how they plan to rectify or deal with each issue.

The Committee is planning to conduct a repeat audit this year.

Identifying Barriers

Access Orangeville meets once a month and during these meetings, each member is given the opportunity to discuss barriers or issues that they have encountered or have been made aware of. Committee members and the community have been assured that all concerns will be investigated and a response given. The Committee addresses these items at each meeting adding them monthly to their Current To-Do List. Each item is assigned accordingly to the appropriate individual and is given a time frame for completion. The Committee’s To-Do List is an evolving document and the items on it will remain there until they can be completed, even if the time frame is unknown. When the item is completed to the satisfaction of the Committee, it is taken off the Current To-Do List and added on to the Completed List, which allows the Committee to have an up to date list of their accomplishments. Council and the local press are kept current by receiving monthly minutes of Access Orangeville’s activities. The general public is kept informed by having the Committee’s minutes posted on the Town of Orangeville’s official website.

The Town of Orangeville has already taken steps to eliminate barriers that prevent persons with disabilities from participating in the community, but more can be done. Based on their commitment and vision of a strong, caring, safe community and the requirements of the ODA and AODA, to date, the Town has identified and eliminated the following barriers in 2014:

**2014 Current List of Identified and Completed Problems and Barriers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Type of Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy for Removal or Prevention</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Committee will provide a free swim/skate at Tony Rose Memorial Sports Centre on December 31, 2014. Kiosk will be set up containing information about the Committee.</td>
<td>To be completed Dec 31, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier</td>
<td>Type of Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy for Removal or Prevention</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Session with Stakeholders</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Committee meets with various organizations in Dufferin County to discuss accessibility in the community and the projects they have been working on to remove barriers in the community. This session is repeated annually.</td>
<td>To be completed November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Committee will provide a free swim/skate at Alder Street Rec Centre on October 26, 2014. Kiosk will be set up at containing information about the Committee.</td>
<td>To be completed October 26, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countdown signals to inform pedestrians of time remaining before signal changes</td>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>Committee will purchase and install additional countdown signals for the intersections at Montgomery Blvd and Riddell Road</td>
<td>To be completed in October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Session</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Meeting with the County of Dufferin’s Accessibility Committee to review ways in which the two Committees can work together</td>
<td>To be completed September 9, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible transportation to Fall Fair</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Committee partnered with First Student to provide accessible transportation on Saturday of this year’s Fall Fair. First Student provided the bus and the Committee advertised in local papers.</td>
<td>Completed September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fendley Park Splash Pad</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Committee has purchased an inclusive piece of playground equipment – OmniSpin Spinner to be installed in 2014 when the construction of the park is completed.</td>
<td>To be completed in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Logo and name to identify Accessibility Committee</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>A new Committee name – “Access Orangeville” will be used to promote the Committee and its programs.</td>
<td>July, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier</td>
<td>Type of Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy for Removal or Prevention</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>To celebrate National Access Awareness Week, Committee provided free swim at Alder Street Rec Centre on June 7, 2014. Kiosk was set up at this location with information about the Committee.</td>
<td>Completed June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>To celebrate National Access Awareness Week, Committee provided free transportation for everyone on public transit on June 4, 2014.</td>
<td>Completed June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting accessibility within our community</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>During National Access Awareness week, Van’s Jewellers was presented with the “Promoting a Barrier Free Community Award” for exceptional measures to make their establishment accessible. Award is presented annually.</td>
<td>Completed May, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Proclaimed June 1 – June 7, 2014 as National Access Awareness Week.</td>
<td>Completed June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible transportation to Lions Club Home Show</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Committee partnered with First Student to provide accessible transportation on Saturday of this year’s Lions Club Home Show. First Student provided the bus and the Committee advertised in local papers.</td>
<td>Completed April 5, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Committee provided a free swim/skate at Alder Street Rec Centre on March 14, 2014. Kiosk was set up at containing information about the Committee.</td>
<td>Completed March 14, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier</td>
<td>Type of Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy for Removal or Prevention</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Advertise in local papers semi-annually the Emergency Responses Registry allowing persons with special needs to register with the Fire Dept alerting them of their disabilities and accommodations should they ever need to call 911 for assistance.</td>
<td>April and October annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility along Town trailways</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Council has approved that all main trailways be accessible.</td>
<td>October 2009 and Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of curb cuts</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Committee partnered with Public Works by providing funding to paint yellow strips on downtown curb cuts to increase visibility. Curb cuts at Alder Street Recreation Centre have also been painted yellow for increased visibility. Maintenance of these strips is ongoing.</td>
<td>Completed September 2009 and ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countdown Devices</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>The Committee purchases and installs countdown devices for existing signaled intersections as required when budget funds allow.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlarged street signs at intersections</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>The Committee purchases and installs enlarged street signs as required when budget funds allow.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Addressing Barriers**

The Town, through its Committee, continues to identify barriers that can and will begin to be addressed in the current year and into future years.

These barriers are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Type of Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy for Removal or Prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible services at local stores</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Working with local grocery stores to publicize the accessible services they provide of which residents may be unaware. Committee to provide poster to businesses to promote “Access Orangeville” in their store windows and will also advertise these services on the town website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility concerns within our community</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Our Committee will meet jointly with any organization, as necessary, to find solutions to mutual accessibility concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Accessibility Web Page on Town of Orangeville’s Web Site</td>
<td>Technological and Informational</td>
<td>Continue to investigate various ways to enhance our Web Page to make it more accessible. All documents posted to website are now in accessible format in compliance with the Integrated Accessibility Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible parking spaces not appropriately signed</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>New site plans will include the requirement to have accessible parking signage on posts. Will continue to monitor signage in Town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing times at traffic lights too short</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Public Works Dept are monitoring crossings that are believed to be too short and will adjust the time accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource library for accessibility issues</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Committee has a kiosk with information relating to accessibility issues and handouts for the general public, which is set up at the Committee’s public awareness events, information sessions and is also taken to local trade shows. Information is updated as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Accessibility Standards</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>The Town continues to work towards compliance with the IASR Regulations as they implement the requirements set out in their five year accessibility plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countdown signals and Audible Pedestrian Signals (APS) signals to inform pedestrians of time remaining before signal changes and for the visually impaired</td>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>Committee continues to investigate existing intersections where there is a need for countdown signals and APS signals. This is an ongoing project and is dependant on funds available. Public Works installs countdown signals at all new intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier</td>
<td>Type of Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy for Removal or Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting a barrier free environment in the community and within publicly owned buildings</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Committee has developed an Awards Program for individuals or businesses that have made modifications to their buildings to make them more accessible, developed innovative concepts or have come up with different ideas to assist the persons with disabilities. An award is handed out each year during National Access Awareness Week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Day and Annual Open House to inform residents of what the Town of Orangeville is doing to create a more barrier free community</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Committee members organize annually an Awareness Day and Public Open House which offers either or both free skating and free swimming. The Committee has confirmed dates for October 26, 2014 and December 31, 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlarged street signs at intersections</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Committee continues to investigate intersections where there is a need to have enlarged street signs erected. Committee has agreed to order more enlarged street signs for busy intersections throughout Town. This is an ongoing project and depending on funds remaining in the Committee’s budget, more intersections may receive enlarged street signs. All major intersections now have enlarged signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration for caregivers on duty</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>On duty caregivers accompanying their clients will be admitted free of charge to Town facilities, including Theatre Orangeville and public transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier</td>
<td>Type of Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy for Removal or Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Standards for Customer Service</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Accessibility Standards for Customer Service, Ontario Regulation 429/07, came into force on January 1, 2008 and requires municipalities to have policies and procedures in place by January 1, 2010. In August 2009, Council passed the Town’s Policies and Procedures with respect to the Customer Service Standard and following that, by January 1, 2010, Human Resources provided in house training to all employees as required in the policy, relating to the provision of the Town’s goods and services to persons with disabilities. The Town will continue to strive to provide its services in a way that is in keeping with the key principles of dignity, independence, integration and equal opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible transportation to Fall Fair</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Committee contacts First Student each year to ask if they would like to partner with the Committee and provide free accessible transportation to the fall fair and the Committee advertises the date in local papers. Our Committee is grateful that Orangeville Fall Fair Board and First Student Bus Lines now pay for this service. This ongoing project is approved annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Committee has agreed to arrange annual meetings with various organizations within Dufferin County to touch base and discuss accessibility issues. County of Dufferin Dufferin is hosting next meeting in November 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps for disabled</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Committee has developed a ramp subsidy program. Orangeville’s disabled residents, businesses and organizations are eligible to receive a $250 subsidy when purchasing a portable ramp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Day Camp for children with disabilities</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Committee has offered to purchase equipment that may be required by Parks and Recreation to run a day camp for children with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier</td>
<td>Type of Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy for Removal or Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various modes of transportation have different ways of accommodating</td>
<td>Physical,</td>
<td>Committee has sent a form letter to various cruise lines, railways and air lines to see how they accommodate passengers with accessibility needs. This information has been assessed and a plan to increase accessibility in these transportation modes has been forwarded to the Minister of Transportation for comment and hopefully action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passengers with accessibility needs</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible picnic tables in Town Parks</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Committee purchased an accessible picnic table which will be installed in Alexandra Park and will continue to purchase accessible picnic tables as funds allow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Responses Registry</td>
<td>Informational and</td>
<td>Committee in conjunction with Orangeville Fire Dept have developed an Emergency Responses Registry allowing persons with special needs to register with the Fire Dept alerting them of their disabilities and accommodations should they ever need to call 911 for assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility along Town trailways</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Park benches for the Town’s trailway system will continue to be purchased as funds allow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair security in vehicles</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>The Committee has written to all provincial party leaders as well as our MPP requesting legislation to secure wheelchairs in vehicles. Our Committee continues to work towards this goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies and Programs

The Town of Orangeville’s Traffic By-Law, accessible parking section, has been amended to include the minimum monetary penalty as dictated by Bill 125, Section 29.

The Town of Orangeville’s Official Plan now includes a section acknowledging the need to remove barriers for persons with disabilities within our community.
Orangeville Police Services

The Orangeville Police Service strives to provide services that are accessible to all persons and ensure that we are in compliance with the Customer Service Standard of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

The Orangeville Police Service continues to revise and update its policies, procedures and training to ensure that officers are sensitive to the needs of persons with sensory or cognitive disabilities, and are able to assist them. This year in our annual block training for all officers we partnered with other community agencies such as; Caledon Dufferin Victim Services, Family Transition Place, Headwaters Hospital, Victim Witness Assistance Program and the Crown’s Officer to ensure we utilize all resources to best serve the needs of victims of crime.

The Orangeville Police Service launched a Vulnerable Person Registry in January of 2013. The Registry for Vulnerable People is an initiative to identify members of the community who may come into contact with the Police Service that are vulnerable due to a physical or intellectual disability they have. Vulnerable Persons include, but are not limited to, persons with: Autism, Alzheimer’s, physical or developmental disabilities etc.

The registry promotes communication and gives police quick access to critical information about a registered vulnerable person. The Registry can provide police with emergency contact information, detailed physical descriptions, known routines, favourite attractions or special needs of the vulnerable individual. This information can assist officers in communicating with, attending a residence of or dealing with an emergency involving a vulnerable individual.

Registering a family member can be readily completed online at www.orangevillepolice.ca and clicking on the link to register a vulnerable person or by attending the Orangeville Police Service at 390 C Line Orangeville.

The police communications centre has a TTY communications capacity for persons with hearing disabilities and in the next year will be upgrading to talk to text technology.

Accommodation requests for interpreter service can be made to any police officer. Anytime an accommodation request is made, every effort shall be made to facilitate the request.
Orangeville Public Library

The Orangeville Public Library’s Statement on Accessibility is as follows: The Orangeville Public Library, following the leadership provided by the Town of Access Orangeville, is dedicated to promoting a barrier free environment for all persons using the Library, regardless of needs, allowing all persons to participate as fully as possible in all aspects of community life.

The Orangeville Public Library has recently completed the following projects as part of its ongoing commitment to accessible library service for all residents of our community:

- A barrier free, fully accessible public washroom was added to the Mill Street Library as part of the 2013 renovation project;
- A Home Delivery Service was introduced in November 2012 to meet the needs of patrons who have limited mobility and cannot visit the library in person;
- To ensure access to Board documents, starting in 2014 all minutes are created in an accessible format.

Additional Services to support equitable access:

- Accessible computer workstations at both locations with BrowseAloud (screen reader software) and large print high contrast keyboards;
- Elevator/lift access to all levels at Mill Street and elevator access to second floor at Alder Street (library is on one level);
- Fire alarm has strobe light for persons with hearing disabilities;
- Service animals are welcome in the library and at programs;
- Automatic door openers at both location;
- Flush curbs for wheelchair access to both locations;
- Parking spaces close to entrances for individuals with accessible parking permits;
- TTY phone access 519-942-0517.

Additional Resources available:

- Downloadable eBooks (settings can be adjusted for personal preference on text size) and audiobooks;
- Audiobooks on CD for all ages;
- Daisy reader and Daisy books;
- Closed-captioned DVDs;
• Large Print books;
• Partner with CELA (Centre for Equitable Library Access) for material in a broad range of formats including books and magazines in audio, e-text and Braille formats, newspapers in e-text and children’s picture books with Braille.

Parks and Recreation Department

This year, the Committee has committed to purchasing a piece of inclusive playground equipment which will be installed next year in Fendley Park, when the splash pad is constructed. The Committee continues to work jointly with the Parks and Recreation Department and where possible, the Committee purchases park benches and accessible picnic tables for installation in Town parks and along trailways by staff of the Parks and Recreation Department.

In past years, Committee members have reviewed site plans of the Town’s Dog Park and the splash pad at Fendley Park, which has allowed members to provide comments, where necessary, on possible accessibility concerns. The Committee has also participated in a survey for Brown’s Farm Park which will determine what residents would like to see as possible uses for this area.

Access Orangeville met with the Parks and Recreation Department’s Director in 2007 to discuss various accessibility issues within Town facilities, parks and trailways. The two groups continue to work together towards a common goal of a totally accessible community with plans for new parks and park improvements to be reviewed by Access Orangeville.

In September 2007, the Town of Orangeville entered into a partnership with Teamworks Community Support Advocacy group to provide aquatics programs for individuals with autism and other related disabilities.

The Town of Orangeville adopted a policy in 1998 that requires all new parks and replacement equipment in existing parks to include play equipment of a “boundless” nature for the benefit of children of all levels of abilities. In 2006, Council amended the Parks and Playground Equipment Policy to include, that as a condition for receiving a grant for school playground equipment, the equipment must be accessible and inclusive. These policies are currently under review to ensure a consistent standard is established for playground improvements and to ensure that the three main components of routes, surfaces, and equipment are addressed when creating accessible play spaces. Following a Council resolution in 2006, the Parks and Recreation Department will provide an annual report regarding the status of playground improvements and their adherence to the accessibility policies.
Accessibility and inclusiveness is a priority of the Parks and Recreation Department with a focus on how to get more people in the community active, regardless of their needs. For example in 2007 Council passed a motion allowing all caregivers of persons with special needs to attend Town recreation programs free of charge. In addition, the Parks and Recreation Department is developing relationships and building partnerships with various community groups representing persons with disabilities to ensure programming issues and needs are addressed.

Access Orangeville receives regular updates on items being undertaken by the Parks and Recreation Committee and are informed if there any accessibility issues on the agenda so that members have the opportunity to voice any potential concerns.

**Orangeville Transit**

All Town of Orangeville buses are wheelchair accessible and drivers are trained to efficiently tie down electric wheelchairs to minimize schedule disruptions as well, Town of Orangeville buses can now accommodate patrons needing assistance with walkers. As well, transit passes have been issued to all students with special needs in Orangeville schools. Access Orangeville has one of their members on the Transit Committee. This individual provides the Committee with a regular update on items being undertaken by the Transit Committee and voices to them any concerns that Access Orangeville has related to accessibility issues.

**Trailway Committee**

Access Orangeville has one of their members on the Trailway Committee. This individual provides the Committee with a regular update on items being undertaken by the Trailway Committee and voices to them any concerns that Access Orangeville has related to accessibility issues.

**Theatre Orangeville**

Theatre Orangeville has completed upgrades to provide greater accessibility to everyone. These improvements have included the removal of stairs in the aisle ways which will be replaced by sloped aisle ways, new seats and additional wheelchair seating. Construction was completed in September 2013.

Enhanced listening devices have been purchased by the Committee and installed by Theatre Orangeville for the benefit of patrons needing hearing assistance. The seating area is being reconfigured in order to accommodate more patrons who use wheelchairs. Up to sixteen wheelchair spaces can be centrally located with excellent sight lines.
Monitoring Process

The Town of Orangeville’s Council continues to work within its resources and priorities to remove barriers. Council relies on Access Orangeville, Town staff and the public to monitor and keep it informed of accessibility barriers. The Town recognizes that the investment it makes in identifying and removing barriers for persons with disabilities will benefit everyone.

The Town of Orangeville, through Access Orangeville will continue to identify problems and barriers. Once a barrier is identified, it is added to the Ongoing To-Do List of Identified Problems and Barriers. It will remain there until it has been resolved to the satisfaction of Access Orangeville. Completed items are then transferred to the List of Identified and Completed Problems and Barriers.

Availability of Plan

This Plan will be available on the Town of Orangeville’s web site (www.orangeville.ca); Town of Orangeville’s Municipal Office, Building and By-Law Department, located at 87 Broadway, Orangeville; David Tilson’s office, MP for Dufferin-Caledon, located at 229 Broadway, Unit #2, Orangeville, and Sylvia Jones’ office, MPP for Dufferin-Caledon, located at 244 Broadway, Orangeville. Orangeville has an embosser to translate this Plan to Braille when necessary. The Town will make every attempt to make the Plan available to those with disabilities for their perusal and review.
Dear •:

Thank you very much for your interest in our Committee. I would like to provide you with a few details of the set up and operation of our Committee. I am a member of Town Council and am the Chair of Access Orangeville. We currently have five members on Access Orangeville and the Director of Building and By-Law and his Administrative Assistant are staff resource members of the Committee. Our Committee meets once every month (weather permitting) during the day and our meetings last no longer than one and a half hours in order to conserve the Members energy. We have found that we get much accomplished during this tight timeline.

Enclosed please find our Committee’s Terms of Reference, our current and completed “To Do” lists, a copy of Bill 118, our approved Accessibility Standards for Customer Service and our current Accessibility Plan.

I hope you find this information helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact either myself or Sandy Kirby, Administrative Assistant for the Building and By-Law Department at 519-941-0440 x2228 or (skirby@orangeville.ca).

Sincerely,

Councillor Gail Campbell
Chair, Access Orangeville
We appreciate your investment in our town!

Access Orangeville is dedicated to promoting and enhancing, where possible, a barrier free environment for all persons, regardless of needs, to participate as fully as possible in all aspects of community life.

To ensure a barrier free development, we recommend the following be taken into consideration when constructing a new building or doing renovations to an existing building.

Our Committee is available to discuss any questions or concerns you may have and would appreciate it if you would please consider incorporating the following 8 suggestions during construction:

1) Increase hallway widths to provide easier access.

2) Doorways with a width of 2’ 10” or greater permit easier access for persons with disabilities.

3) Exterior doors should open onto landings sized to meet Ontario Building Code Requirements to permit unrestricted access for persons who use wheelchairs.

4) When possible, interior doors should not open into a hallway, providing that there are no Ontario Building Code requirements for the specific application, because they will block the passing of a wheelchair or a walker and they will be an obstacle for persons with visual disabilities.

5) Consideration to installing strobe lighted fire alarms for persons with hearing disabilities.

6) When designing for elevators, please give consideration to installing devices that give verbal directions for persons with visual disabilities.

7) The controls for power doors should not be put in a location that would require people who use wheelchairs to back up as the door opens. (Please give consideration to exceeding the current Ontario Building Code requirements.)

8) Consider accessible washrooms to be equipped with wide power doors and ample space inside to maneuver a wheelchair. (Please give consideration to exceeding the current Ontario Building Code requirements.)
Purpose
The purpose of this report is to present for the consideration of Council the 2014 Development Charges Background Study, including the Addendum to the Town of Orangeville 2014 Development Charges Background Study, and the By-Law To Establish Development Charges For Town Wide And Area Specific Services.

Background
Development Charges are governed by the Development Charges Act, 1997 (the “Act”) and the associated Ontario Regulation 82/98. The Treasurer has reported to Council with respect to the progress of the background study through reports TF-2013-18 Development Charges Background Study, and Water and Wastewater Rates Study Progress Report; and TF-2014-21 Development Charges Background Study Progress Report. The firm of Watson and Associates (the “consultant”) has been retained to undertake the Development Charges Background Study (“DC study”) and to assist with the preparation of the Development Charges By-law.

The consultant and staff have met twice with members of the property development industry to garner comment with respect to the DC study and proposed by-law. A mandatory public meeting was held on July 14 to present the study methodology and to receive questions and comment from the public and Council. The results of the public meeting have been considered in the Addendum and the proposed by-law. The Addendum to the Background Study is not significant enough to warrant an additional public meeting.

Within 20 days of the passage of the by-law, the Town must give notice of the passage of the by-law and the appeal deadline. The 2014 Development Charges By-law may be appealed up to 40 days after the passage of the by-law. The Town must prepare a pamphlet outlining the development charges within 60 days of the passage of the by-law or subsequent to the decision of Ontario
Municipal Board if the by-law is appealed. The preceding is an overview and the Town has specific obligations under the Act.

Analysis
The methodology for the computation of the development charges by unit type is presented in the Development Charges Background Study and the Addendum to the Study. The reader should refer to the by-law for the complete list of proposed rates.

Financial Impact
The projected financial impact of the 2014 Development Charges By-law is presented in the 2014 Development Charges Background Study. The exact amount of development charges and the timing of the receipt of the development charges are uncertain and represent a financial risk to the Town. This may impact on the capacity of the Town to undertake growth related capital projects that are substantially dependent on development charge funding.

Vision and Values
The Vision and Values statement adopted by Council sets out a direction for the Town by presenting a set of core values that will guide Council’s and staff’s actions now and into the future. This report is consistent with the value of spending taxpayers’ money wisely and responsibly.

Recommendation
THAT Report TF-2014-32, dated August 11, 2014, regarding the 2014 Development Charges Background Study and 2014 Development Charges By-law, be received; and

That Council adopt the 2014 Development Charges Background Study and the Addendum to the Study as presented without an additional public meeting; and

That Council approve the 2014 Development Charges By-law as submitted.
Respectfully submitted,

Brian Parrott,
H.B.Sc., CPA, CGA
Treasurer

Attachments

Addendum to the Town of Orangeville 2014 Development Charges Background Study
ADDENDUM TO: TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE

2014 DEVELOPMENT CHARGES BACKGROUND STUDY

FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

JULY 25, 2014
SUMMARY OF REVISIONS MADE TO JUNE 30, 2014 DEVELOPMENT CHARGES BACKGROUND STUDY

1. BACKGROUND

Commensurate with the provisions of the Development Charges Act, 1997 (DCA), the Town of Orangeville (Town) has undertaken a Development Charges (DC) Background Study and has distributed the study to the public. The following provides a summary of key dates in the DC Study process:

- June 30, 2014 – Release of the DC Background Study;
- July 14, 2014 – Public Meeting to present the DC Background Study and draft By-law; and
- Council to consider passage of the Development Charges By-law at a future Council Meeting.

The purpose of this addendum is to provide for changes to the 2014 DC Background Study to revise the capital needs listings for area-specific stormwater management services and area-specific wastewater services. Furthermore, this addendum provides changes to the treatment of the special care/special dwelling unit category. These refinements will form part of the DC Background Study and will be provided for approval by Council prior to consideration of the DC By-law.

2. DISCUSSION

Subsequent to the statutory public meeting, Town staff identified three adjustments required to the 2014 DC Background Study and draft DC by-law. These adjustments are summarized below.

**Area-Specific Stormwater Management Capital Needs**

The 2014 DC Background Study identifies growth-related capital costs related to the increase in needs for Stormwater Management Services. These capital costs are proposed to be recovered on an area-specific basis from the build-out growth forecast within the respective areas. The capital needs listing for area-specific stormwater management services included two projects emplaced by the Paula Court development (i.e. SWM-7 and SWM-10) at a combined growth-related cost of $312,655. The land owner of the Paula Court development has requested that these projects be removed from the DC by-law, in preference to utilizing best efforts mechanisms to recover these capital costs. As such, the 2014 DC Background Study and proposed DC by-law have been amended to remove these area-specific charges.
Area-Specific Wastewater Capital Needs

Similar to the storm water management services identified above, the 2014 DC Background Study includes the increase in capital needs for area-specific wastewater collection services. In the DC Background Study, the area-specific capital needs listing for wastewater services included one project emplaced by the Paula Court development (i.e. SS5) at a growth-related capital cost of $30,000. As discussed previously the land owner has requested that this project be removed from the DC by-law. As such, the 2014 DC Background Study and proposed DC by-law have been amended to remove this area-specific charge.

Special Care/Special Dwelling Unit Category

Chapter 7 of the 2014 DC Background Study summarizes the policy recommendations and rules for the DC by-law. The Study included a recommendation that a separate residential dwelling unit category be established for “special care/special dwelling units” (s.7.3.2). This is a change from the Town’s current policy of where these types of units are charged the residential development charge rate for bachelor and one bedroom apartments. Following the public meeting, Council recommended maintaining its current practice for these types of developments. As such, the 2014 DC Background Study and DC by-law have been amended to remove the special care/special dwelling unit category from the schedule of charges.

As a result of the adjustments noted above, the area-specific development charges for storm water management services and wastewater services contained in the DC Background Study have been recalculated. Moreover, the special care/special dwelling unit category has been removed form the proposed schedule of charges. No other changes have been identified impacting the proposed quantum of the development charges.

Table 1 summarizes the proposed schedule of area-specific development charges as amended, and also compares these proposed area-specific development charges to those currently imposed and those contained in the June 30th DC Background Study.

Table 2 summarizes the proposed schedule of development charges for special care/special dwelling units as amended, and also compares these proposed development charges to those currently imposed and those contained in the June 30th DC Background Study.
## TABLE 1
TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE
PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF AREA-SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Calculated June 30 Draft Study</th>
<th>Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Roads Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads - RSP1</td>
<td>12,393</td>
<td>13,417</td>
<td>13,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Water Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-1</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-2</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>3,373</td>
<td>3,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-3</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>1,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-4</td>
<td>4,961</td>
<td>5,326</td>
<td>5,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-5</td>
<td>24,495</td>
<td>25,229</td>
<td>25,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-6</td>
<td>7,220</td>
<td>8,182</td>
<td>8,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Wastewater Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS1</td>
<td>6,108</td>
<td>6,875</td>
<td>6,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS3</td>
<td>10,110</td>
<td>10,414</td>
<td>10,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS4</td>
<td>4,810</td>
<td>4,993</td>
<td>4,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,045</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Stormwater Management Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM1</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>3,435</td>
<td>3,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM2</td>
<td>12,293</td>
<td>13,268</td>
<td>13,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM3</td>
<td>12,410</td>
<td>12,775</td>
<td>12,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM6</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>4,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,045</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160,599</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE
PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF DEVELOPMENT CHARGES FOR SPECIAL CARE/SPECIAL DWELLING UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Residential ($/unit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Apartments - Bachelor &amp; 1 Bedroom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Wide Services:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Related</td>
<td>$1,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection Services</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>$179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Parking</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>$201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration - Studies</td>
<td>$46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Municipal Wide Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,098</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>$1,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Urban Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,170</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total - Urban Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,268</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the following list summarizes the revisions that have been made to the June 30, 2014 Background Study that are included herein:

- Pages 5-18, 5-20, and 5-21 – revised DC capital needs listings for area-specific wastewater and stormwater management services and corresponding textual changes;
- Pages 6-2 to 6-5 – revised development charge calculation and comparison tables;
- Page 7-2 – textual changes to reflect removal of the special care/special dwelling unit category; and
- Appendix C – revised draft DC By-Law.

3. PROCESS FOR ADOPTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT CHARGES BY-LAW

As noted earlier, these changes will be incorporated into the 2014 DC Background Study to be provided to Council and the general public prior to Council’s consideration and adoption of the proposed DC By-law.
If Council is satisfied with the above changes to the DC Background Study, then prior to by-law passage Council must:

- Approve the 2014 DC Background Study, as amended;
- Determine that no further public meetings are required on the matter; and
- Adopt a new DC By-law.
AMENDED PAGES
5.4 **Service Levels and Build-out Capital Costs for Area-Specific DC Calculations**

This DC Background Study provides for area-specific application for specific roads, water, wastewater, and storm services based on the respective needs and benefiting area. The anticipated development-related capital requirements for these services have been considered over the build-out of each benefiting area, consistent with the Town’s 2009 DC Background Study. Chapter 3 summarizes the benefiting areas (in net developable hectares).

### 5.4.1 Roads and Related Services

The area-specific roads program continues to identify the Hansen Blvd. bridge over Lower Monora Creek. Out of the gross capital estimate of approximately $1.4 million, approximately $20,000 has been deducted to reflect benefits to the existing population.

### 5.4.2 Water Services

All six area specific water projects that were identified in the 2009 DC Study have been carried forward, and the Town will continue to collect money towards them. The updated gross capital cost estimate for water projects totals approximately $2.2 million, which a benefit to existing deduction of $383,381 has been made. Furthermore, local service contributions in the amount of $702,530 are anticipated, and as such, approximately $1.1 million is carried into the calculation of the respective charges.

### 5.4.3 Wastewater Services

The wastewater services area-specific capital program includes total gross capital costs of $1.02 million. A benefit to existing deduction in the amount of $68,375 has been observed for the Hansen Boulevard trunk sanitary sewer and trunk sewer capacity increases to service development west of Blind Line. On a net cost basis, the total amount included in the calculation of the charge is $955,340.

### 5.4.4 Stormwater Management Services

The Town will continue to collect money towards stormwater projects identified in the 2009 Study. The total gross capital cost estimate for these area specific projects is approximately $6.37 million. After deducting $3.57 million for benefit to existing, and $0.70 million in recognition of local service contributions, the total amount included in the calculation of the charge is $2.1 million.
### INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS COVERED IN THE DC CALCULATION

Town of Orangeville  
Service: Stormwater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prj.No</th>
<th>Increased Service Needs Attributable to Anticipated Development</th>
<th>Benefit to Existing Development</th>
<th>Grants, Subsidies and Other Contributions Attributable to New Development</th>
<th>Potential DC Recoverable Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWM1</td>
<td>Lower Monora Creek Stream Retrofit and Protection Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES2, RES6, RES7, RES8, RES9, RES12, RES13, COM1, COM9,</td>
<td>2,853,000</td>
<td>1,975,548</td>
<td>284,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND16, IND17, INST1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWM2</td>
<td>Lower Monora Creek SWM Pond Retrofits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,099,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES1, RES3, RES4, RES5, RES14, RES15, RES16, COM2, COM3,</td>
<td>1,371,000</td>
<td>271,787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM4, COM5, COM10, COM14, IND9, IND10, IND11, IND12, IND13,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWM3</td>
<td>Mill Creek Stabilization of Moderate Priority Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>596,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES1, RES3, RES4, RES5, RES14, RES15, RES16, COM2, COM3,</td>
<td>795,000</td>
<td>198,805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM4, COM5, COM10, COM14, IND9, IND10, IND11, IND12, IND13,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWM4</td>
<td>Mill Creek Stream Stabilization of High Priority Sites and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Restoration at Kay Cee Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES1, RES3, RES4, RES5, RES14, RES15, RES16, COM2, COM3,</td>
<td>521,000</td>
<td>521,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM4, COM5, COM10, COM14, IND9, IND10, IND11, IND12, IND13,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWM5</td>
<td>Middle Monora Creek - Flood &amp; Erosion Control Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES11</td>
<td>713,000</td>
<td>603,308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWM6</td>
<td>Oversized SWM Pond - Mono Developments, Built Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES3, RES4, IND15</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total  |                                                               | 6,371,000                        | 6,371,000                                                  | 702,568                     | 2,097,985
### INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS COVERED IN THE DC CALCULATION

**Town of Orangeville**  
**Service:** Wastewater (Area-Specific)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prj.No</th>
<th>Increased Service Needs Attributable to Anticipated Development</th>
<th>Benefiting Areas</th>
<th>Gross Capital Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Other Deductions</th>
<th>Net Capital Cost</th>
<th>Less:</th>
<th>Potential DC Recoverable Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014-Build Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit to Existing Development</td>
<td>Grants, Subsidies and Other Contributions Attributable to New Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS1</td>
<td>Hansen Boulevard Trunk Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>RES2, RES7, RES8, RES9, RES11, RES12, RES13, COM1, COM9, IND17</td>
<td>567,849</td>
<td>37,916</td>
<td>529,933</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS3</td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Connection - Tribunal to B-Line/County Road 109 Properties</td>
<td>RES5, COM10</td>
<td>38,948</td>
<td>38,948</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS4</td>
<td>Trunk Sewer Capacity Increases to Service Development West of Blind Line (Bredin Pkwy, Third Street at Fourth Avenue)</td>
<td>RES2, RES7, RES8, RES9, RES11, RES12, RES13, COM1, COM6, COM9, IND17</td>
<td>416,918</td>
<td>30,459</td>
<td>386,459</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,023,715</td>
<td>68,375</td>
<td>955,340</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6-1
TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE
DEVELOPMENT CHARGE CALCULATION
Municipal-wide Services
2014-Build Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>2014 $ DC Eligible Cost</th>
<th>2014 $ DC Eligible Cost</th>
<th>SDU</th>
<th>per sq.mt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wastewater</td>
<td>$ 18,048,031</td>
<td>$ 1,784,970</td>
<td>$ 7,040</td>
<td>26.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Water</td>
<td>$ 12,976,022</td>
<td>$ 1,283,343</td>
<td>$ 5,061</td>
<td>19.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fire Protection Services</td>
<td>$ 1,485,628</td>
<td>$ 186,612</td>
<td>$ 579</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Police Services</td>
<td>$ 1,306,322</td>
<td>$ 164,089</td>
<td>$ 510</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Roads and Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>$ 9,305,273</td>
<td>$ 1,168,849</td>
<td>$ 3,630</td>
<td>17.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>$ 1,410,216</td>
<td>$ 177,139</td>
<td>$ 550</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DC ELIGIBLE CAPITAL COST</strong></td>
<td>$ 44,531,492</td>
<td>$ 4,765,003</td>
<td>$ 17,370</td>
<td>70.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build out Gross Population / GFA Growth (m²)</td>
<td>8,178</td>
<td>67,419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Capita / Non-Residential GFA (m²)</td>
<td>$ 5,445.28</td>
<td>70.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Residential Unit Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single and Semi-Detached Dwelling</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>$ 17,370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments - 2 Bedrooms +</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>$ 9,475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments - Bachelor and 1 Bedroom</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>$ 5,935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiples</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>$ 12,633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6-2
TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE
DEVELOPMENT CHARGE CALCULATION
Municipal-wide Services
2014-2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>2014 $ DC Eligible Cost</th>
<th>2014 $ DC Eligible Cost</th>
<th>SDU</th>
<th>per sq.mt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transit</td>
<td>$ 34,301</td>
<td>$ 3,572</td>
<td>$ 28</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Municipal Parking</td>
<td>$ 44,832</td>
<td>$ 4,668</td>
<td>$ 37</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$ 6,075,163</td>
<td>$ 319,745</td>
<td>$ 5,010</td>
<td>14.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Library Services</td>
<td>$ 701,626</td>
<td>$ 36,928</td>
<td>$ 579</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Administration - Studies</td>
<td>$ 121,981</td>
<td>$ 12,702</td>
<td>$ 101</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DC ELIGIBLE CAPITAL COST</strong></td>
<td>$ 6,977,903</td>
<td>$ 377,615</td>
<td>$ 5,755</td>
<td>16.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Year Gross Population / GFA Growth (m²)</td>
<td>3,868</td>
<td>22,817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Capita / Non-Residential GFA (m²)</td>
<td>$ 1,804.01</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Residential Unit Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single and Semi-Detached Dwelling</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>$ 5,755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments - 2 Bedrooms +</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>$ 3,139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments - Bachelor and 1 Bedroom</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>$ 1,966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multiples</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>$ 4,185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6-3

**TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE**

**DEVELOPMENT CHARGE CALCULATION**

**Area-Specific Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildout Forecast</th>
<th>2014 $ DC Eligible Cost</th>
<th>Benefiting Area (net developable ha.)</th>
<th>2014 $ DC Eligible Cost per Hectare</th>
<th>Benefiting Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roads and Related Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads - RSP1</td>
<td>$1,378,627</td>
<td>102.75</td>
<td>$13,417.29</td>
<td>RES3, RES4, RES6, RES7, RES8, RES9, RES10, COM8, IND15, IND16, IND17, INST1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-1</td>
<td>$39,552</td>
<td>29.26</td>
<td>$1,351.74</td>
<td>RES2, RES9, RES11, RES12, RES17, COM1, COM3, COM5, COM6, COM12, COM13, COM14, IND9, IND10, IND11, IND12, IND13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-2</td>
<td>$221,186</td>
<td>65.57</td>
<td>$3,733.28</td>
<td>RES3, RES4, RES6, RES7, RES8, RES9, RES13, IND15, IND16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-3</td>
<td>$34,731</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>$1,986.89</td>
<td>RES2, RES11, RES12, COM6, COM13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-4</td>
<td>$654,864</td>
<td>122.98</td>
<td>$5,324.96</td>
<td>RES1, RES3, RES4, RES5, RES6, RES7, RES8, RES10, RES13, RES14, RES15, RES16, COM4, COM5, COM10, COM17, COM18, IND1, IND2, IND3, IND4, IND5, IND7, IND8, IND14, IND15, IND16, IND17, INST1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-5</td>
<td>$94,355</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>$25,228.61</td>
<td>RES5, COM10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-6</td>
<td>$102,191</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>$8,181.83</td>
<td>RES10, RES14, IND1, IND2, IND3, IND4, IND5, IND7, IND8, IND14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS1</td>
<td>$529,933</td>
<td>77.08</td>
<td>$6,875.10</td>
<td>RES2, RES7, RES8, RES9, RES11, RES12, RES13, COM1, COM9, COM18, IND17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS3</td>
<td>$38,948</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>$10,413.90</td>
<td>RES5, COM10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS4</td>
<td>$386,459</td>
<td>77.40</td>
<td>$4,993.01</td>
<td>RES2, RES7, RES8, RES9, RES11, RES12, RES13, COM1, COM9, COM18, INST1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater Management Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM1</td>
<td>$284,576</td>
<td>82.85</td>
<td>$3,434.84</td>
<td>RES2, RES6, RES7, RES8, RES9, RES12, RES13, COM1, COM2, COM3, COM5, COM8, COM10, IND16, IND17, INST1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM2</td>
<td>$1,099,213</td>
<td>82.85</td>
<td>$13,267.51</td>
<td>RES13, COM1, COM9, IND16, IND17, INST1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM3</td>
<td>$598,125</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>$12,774.70</td>
<td>RES1, RES3, RES4, RES5, RES14, RES15, RES16, COM2, COM3, COM4, COM5, COM10, INST1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM4</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>RES16, COM2, COM3, COM4, COM5, COM10, INST1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM5</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>RES11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM6</td>
<td>$118,000</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>$4,370.37</td>
<td>RES3, RES4, IND15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6-4
SCHEDULE OF DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Residential (per sq.mt. of Gross Floor Area)</th>
<th>Non-Residential (per sq.mt. of Gross Floor Area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single and Semi-Detached Dwelling</td>
<td>Apartments - 2 Bedrooms +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Wide Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Related</td>
<td>$4,180</td>
<td>$2,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection Services</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>$316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>$510</td>
<td>$278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Parking</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$5,010</td>
<td>$2,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>$316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration - Studies</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Municipal Wide Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,024</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>$7,040</td>
<td>$3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$5,061</td>
<td>$2,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Urban Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,101</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,601</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL RURAL AREA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,024</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,013</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL URBAN AREA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,125</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,614</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>$/Net Developable Hectare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Roads Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads - RSP1</td>
<td>13,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Water Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-1</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-2</td>
<td>3,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-3</td>
<td>1,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-4</td>
<td>5,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-5</td>
<td>25,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-6</td>
<td>8,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Wastewater Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS1</td>
<td>6,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS3</td>
<td>10,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS4</td>
<td>4,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Stormwater Management Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM1</td>
<td>3,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM2</td>
<td>13,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM3</td>
<td>12,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM6</td>
<td>4,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6-5
COMPARISON OF CURRENT AND CALCULATED DEVELOPMENT CHARGES FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Residential ($/SDU)</th>
<th>Non-Residential ($/Sq.Mt.)</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Calculated</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Wide Services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Related</td>
<td>$3,986</td>
<td>$4,180</td>
<td>$19.26</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection Services</td>
<td>$512</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>$483</td>
<td>$510</td>
<td>$1.19</td>
<td>$2.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Parking</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$2,672</td>
<td>$5,010</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$14.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>$539</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration - Studies</td>
<td>$124</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$0.31</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Municipal Wide Services</strong></td>
<td>$8,342</td>
<td>$11,024</td>
<td>$22.15</td>
<td>$41.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>$5,148</td>
<td>$7,040</td>
<td>$24.69</td>
<td>$26.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$6,090</td>
<td>$5,061</td>
<td>$29.21</td>
<td>$19.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Urban Services</strong></td>
<td>$11,239</td>
<td>$12,101</td>
<td>$53.90</td>
<td>$45.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total - Urban Area</strong></td>
<td>$19,581</td>
<td>$23,125</td>
<td>$76.05</td>
<td>$87.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Roads Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads - RSP1</td>
<td>12,393</td>
<td>13,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Water Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-1</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-2</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>3,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-3</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>1,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-4</td>
<td>4,961</td>
<td>5,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-5</td>
<td>24,495</td>
<td>25,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - WD-6</td>
<td>7,220</td>
<td>8,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Wastewater Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS1</td>
<td>6,108</td>
<td>6,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS3</td>
<td>10,110</td>
<td>10,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater - SS4</td>
<td>4,810</td>
<td>4,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area-Specific Stormwater Management Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM1</td>
<td>3,182</td>
<td>3,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM2</td>
<td>12,293</td>
<td>13,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM3</td>
<td>12,410</td>
<td>12,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management - SWM6</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>4,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
additional development charges for area-specific roads and related, water, wastewater, and stormwater services be imposed in the benefiting areas only; and
one municipal development charge by-law be used for all services.

7.3 Development Charge By-law Rules

The following subsections set out the recommended rules governing the calculation, payment and collection of development charges in accordance with Section 6 of the Development Charges Act, 1997.

It is recommended that the following sections provide the basis for the development charges:

7.3.1 Payment in any Particular Case

In accordance with the Development Charges Act, 1997, s.2(2), a development charge be calculated, payable and collected where the development requires one or more of the following:

a) the passing of a zoning by-law or of an amendment to a zoning by-law under section 34 of the Planning Act;
b) the approval of a minor variance under Section 45 of the Planning Act;
c) a conveyance of land to which a by-law passed under section 50(7) of the Planning Act applies;
d) the approval of a plan of subdivision under Section 51 of the Planning Act;
e) a consent under Section 53 of the Planning Act;
f) the approval of a description under section 50 of the Condominium Act; or
g) the issuing of a building permit under the Building Code Act in relation to a building or structure.

7.3.2 Determination of the Amount of the Charge

The following conventions be adopted:

1) Costs allocated to residential uses will be assigned to different types of residential units based on the average occupancy for each housing type constructed during the previous decade. Costs allocated to non-residential uses will be assigned to industrial and commercial/institutional uses based on the gross floor area constructed.

2) Costs allocated to residential and non-residential uses are based upon a number of conventions, as may be suited to each municipal circumstance. These are summarized in Chapter 5 herein.
The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville

By-law Number __ - 2014
A By-Law to Establish Development Charges for Town Wide and Area Specific Services

Whereas the Development Charges Act, 1997 (the “ACT”) provides that the council of a municipality may by By-law impose development charges against land to pay for increased capital costs required because of increased needs for services;

And Whereas a development charge background study has been completed in accordance with the ACT;

And Whereas the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Orangeville (the “Council”) has given notice of the proposed development charges by-law and development charge background study and held a public meeting on the 14th day of July, 2014 and has heard all persons who applied to be heard and considered all submissions in accordance with the ACT and the regulations thereto;

And Whereas the Council has by Resolution determined in accordance with section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, that no further public meetings were required;

And Whereas the Council had before it a development charge background study entitled “The Town of Orangeville 2014 Development Charges Background Study” by Watson & associates Economists Ltd., dated June 30, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as the “Study”), wherein it is indicated that the development of certain lands within an area of the Town of Orangeville will increase the need for the services as defined herein;

And Whereas the Council on _______, 2014 received the Study, pursuant to the Development Charges Act, 1997 and have thereafter indicated its intent by Resolution that it intends to ensure that the increase in the need for services attributable to the anticipated development will be met;

NOW THEREFORE, THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

Definitions

1. In this By-law, the following items shall have the corresponding meanings:

2) “accessory use” means a use of land, a building or a structure which is naturally and normally incidental and subordinate in purpose and/or floor area, and exclusively devoted to, the principal use of such land, building or structure;

3) “apartment unit” means any residential dwelling unit within a building containing three or more dwelling units where access to each residential unit is obtained through a common entrance or entrances from the street level and the residential units are connected by an interior corridor;

4) “assembly plant” means a building to which parts for consumer goods are delivered, stores, and assembled into consumer goods and shipped.

5) “bedroom” means a habitable room larger than seven square meters, including a den, study or other similar area, but does not include a living room, dining room or kitchen;

6) “benefiting area” means an area defined by a map, plan or legal description in a front-ending agreement as referred to under Section 44 of the ACT as an area that will receive a benefit from the construction of a service;

7) “board of education” has the same meaning as set out in Section 1(1) of the Education Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.E2, as amended or any successor thereof;


9) “commercial use” means all the commercial uses permitted by Zoning By-law number 22-90 of the Town, as amended or any successor thereof;

10) “council” means the council of the town;

11) “development” means the construction, erection or placing of one or more buildings or structures on land or the making of an addition or alteration to a building or structure that has the effect of increasing the size or usability thereof, and includes redevelopment;

12) “development charge” means a charge imposed pursuant to this By-law;

13) “dwelling unit” means any part of a building or structure used, designed or intended to be used as a domestic establishment in which one or more persons may sleep and are provided with culinary and sanitary facilities for their exclusive
use; or in the case of a special care/special needs dwelling as defined in this By-law, a room or suite of rooms comprising a single housekeeping unit, used, designed or intended for use by, one person with our without exclusive sanitary and/or culinary facilities or more than one person if sanitary facilities are directly connected and exclusively accessible to more than one room or suite of rooms;

14) “grade” means the average level of finished ground adjoining a building or structure at all exterior walls;

15) “gross floor area” means;

a) in the case of a residential building or structure, the total area of all floors above grade of a dwelling unit measured between the outside surfaces of exterior walls or between the outside surfaces of exterior walls and the centre line of party walls dividing the dwelling unit from any other dwelling unit or other portion of a building; and

b) in the case of a non-residential building or structure, or in the case of a mixed-use building or structure in respect of the non-residential portion thereof, the total area of all building floors above or below grade measured between the outside surfaces of the exterior walls, or between the outside surfaces of exterior walls and the centre line of party walls dividing a non-residential use and a residential use;

16) “industrial use” means all of the industrial uses permitted by Zoning By-law number 22-90 of the Town as amended or any successor thereof;

17) “institutional use” means all of the institutional uses permitted by Zoning By-law number 22-90 of the Town as amended or any successor thereof, but does not include a religious institution or cemetery;

18) “local board” has the same meaning as in the ACT;

19) “local services” means those services, facilities or things which are under the jurisdiction of the municipality and are related to an application for consent or to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates and are to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under Sections 51 or 53 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, as amended, or any successor thereof;
20) “mobile home” means any dwelling that is designed to be made mobile, and constructed or manufactured to provide a permanent residence for one or more persons, but does not include a travel trailer or tent trailer;

21) “multiple dwelling” means all dwellings other than single-detached, semi-detached and apartment unit dwellings;

22) “municipality” means the Corporation of the Town of Orangeville;

23) “net developable hectare” means a buildable hectare of land but shall not include public highways, private roads (other than driveways) which are designed for the circulation of traffic in the same manner as public highways, and lands defined as hazard lands.

24) “non-residential use” means a building or structure of any kind whatsoever used, designed or intended to be used for other than residential use;

25) “owner” means the owner of land or a person who has made application for an approval for the development of land upon which a development charge is imposed;

26) “place of worship” means that part of a building or structure and land used in connection therewith that is exempt from taxation as a place of worship under Section 3, paragraph 3 of the Assessment Act R.S.O. 1990, c.A.31, as amended, or successor thereof;

27) “regulation” means any regulation made pursuant to The ACT;

28) “residential use” means land or buildings or structures of any kind whatsoever used, designed or intended to be used as living accommodations for one or more individuals;

29) “row house” means a free-standing building containing three or more dwelling units having a common wall between each two adjacent dwelling units having at least two private entrances;

30) “semi-detached dwelling” means a dwelling unit in a residential building consisting of two dwelling units having one vertical wall or one horizontal wall, but no other parts, attached or another dwelling unit where the residential units are not connected by an interior corridor;
31) “service” means a service designated in Schedule “A” to this By-law, and “services” shall have a corresponding meaning;

32) “servicing agreement” means an agreement between a landowner and the municipality relative to the provision of municipal services to specified lands within the municipality;

33) “single detached dwelling unit” means a residential building consisting of one dwelling unit and not attached to another structure and includes a mobile home;

34) “Town” means The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville;

35) “townhouse” has the same meaning as row house;

36) “warehouse” means a building to which goods of every nature are delivered, stored and from which such goods are shipped when storage is no longer required;

2. **Designation of Services**

2.1 It is hereby declared by the Council of the Town that all development of land within the Town will increase the need for services.

2.2 Once this By-law is in force, the development charge applicable to a development as determined under this By-law shall apply without regard to the services required or used by any individual development.

2.3 Development charges shall be imposed for the following categories of services to pay for the increased capital costs required because of increased need for services arising from development

   a) Roads and Related;
   b) Fire Protection Services;
   c) Police Services;
   d) Transit;
   e) Municipal Parking;
   f) Parks and Recreation;
   g) Library Services;
   h) Administration – Studies;
   i) Wastewater;
   j) Water;
   k) Area Specific Roads;
l) Area Specific Water;
m) Area Specific Wastewater; and
n) Area Specific Stormwater Management

2.4 The components of the services designated in section 2.3 are described in Schedule A.

3. **Application of By-law Rules**

3.1 For the purpose of complying with section 6 of the ACT

1. The rules developed under paragraph 9 of subsection 5(1) of The ACT for determining if a development charge is payable in any particular case and for determining the amount of the charge shall be as set forth in section 3.2 through 3.12 of this By-law;

2. The exemptions provided for by such rules shall be the exemptions set forth in section 3.7 and 3.8 of this By-law, and the indexing of charges shall be in accordance within section 3.6 of this By-law;

3. Determining the development changes payable on the redevelopment of land shall be in accordance with the rules set forth in section 3.9 of this By-law;

4. The area to which this By-law applies shall be the area described in section 3.2 of this By-law;

**Lands Affected**

3.2 Subject to the conditions and limitations contained herein, this By-law applies to all lands located within the Town of Orangeville.

**Application**

3.3

1) Development charges shall apply to lands to be developed with;

   a) residential dwelling units,
   b) commercial buildings,
   c) institutional buildings,
   d) industrial buildings
2) In the case of a development containing more than one use as described in subsection 1), development charges payable shall be the total of the development charges for each use.

3) Development Charges imposed on a special care/special needs dwelling unit shall be payable at the rate applicable to a bachelor and one bedroom apartment unit.

**Approvals Subject to Development Charges**

3.4

1) Subject to subsection (2) a development charge shall be calculated, paid and collected in accordance with the provisions of this by-law, where the development requires;

   a) the passing of a zoning By-law or of an amendment to a zoning By-law under section 34 of the Planning Act;
   
   b) the approval of a minor variance under section 45 of the Planning Act;
   
   c) a conveyance of land to which a By-law passed under subsection 50(7) of the Planning Act applies;
   
   d) the approval of a plan of subdivision under section 51 of the Planning Act;
   
   e) a consent under section 53 of the Planning Act;
   
   f) a consent under section 53 of the Planning Act;
   
   g) the approval of a description under section 50 of the Condominium Act; or
   
   h) the issuing of a permit under the Building Code Act, in relation to a building or structure.

2) Subsection (1) shall not apply in respect of local services to be installed or paid as a condition of approval under Section 51 and 53 of the Planning Act;

3) Nothing in this by-law prevents Council from requiring, as a condition of an agreement under Sections 51 or 53 of the Planning Act, that the owner, at his or her own expense, shall install or pay for such Local Services, as Council may require.
Imposition of Development Charges

3.5 Subject to section 3.6, 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9, the development charges set forth in Schedule “B” hereto shall be imposed, without phasing in, on all lands within the Town of Orangeville.

Indexing

3.6 Development charges imposed pursuant to this By-law shall be adjusted annually, without amendment to this By-law, commencing on the first anniversary date of this By-law and each anniversary date thereafter while this by-law is in force in accordance with the prescribed index in The ACT.

Exemptions for Intensification of Existing Housing

3.7

1) Development charges against land to be developed for residential use shall not apply in respect of the creation of;

   a) an enlargement to an existing dwelling unit;
   b) one or two additional dwelling units in an existing single-detached dwelling; or
   c) one additional dwelling unit in any other existing residential building.

2) Notwithstanding subsection 1)b), development charges shall be collected if the total gross floor area of the additional unit or units is greater than the total gross floor area of the existing dwelling unit.

3) Notwithstanding subsection 1)c), development charges shall be collected if the additional unit has a gross floor area greater than,

   a) in the case of a semi-detached or row house, the gross floor area of the existing dwelling unit; and
   b) in the case of any other residential building, the gross floor area of the smallest dwelling unit contained in the residential building.

Other Exemptions

3.8

1) No land, except land owned by and used for the purposes of a Board of Education, a municipality or a local board thereof is exempt from a
development charge by reason only that it is exempt from taxation under Section 3 of the Assessment Act.

2) Notwithstanding subsection 1), this By-law shall not apply to land that is used for the purposes of:

   a) cemetery;
   b) a place of worship, or;
   c) other uses as set out in Schedule D to this by-law.

3) If a development includes the enlargement of the gross floor area of an existing industrial building, the amount of the development charge that is payable in respect of the enlargement will be determined as follows:

   a) If the gross floor area is enlarged by 50% or less, the amount of the development charge in respect of the enlargement is zero; and
   b) If the gross floor area is enlarged by more than 50%, the amount of the development charge in respect of the enlargement is the amount of the development charge that would otherwise be payable multiplied by the fraction determined as follows:

         (1) Determine the amount by which the enlargement in gross floor area exceeds 50% of the gross floor area in existence at the time of the building permit application; and
         (2) Divide the amount determined under paragraph (i) by the amount of the enlargement.

**Redevelopment**

3.9  

1) If an existing building is demolished and replaced with a new building(s), a credit shall be given against the development charge otherwise payable pursuant to this By-law for the demolished building, the credit to be an amount equal to the development charge that would be applied to the demolished building if it were being developed as anew building with the use of the demolished building determined as its most recent legal use before the demolition, and the credit being calculated based on the applicable development charge for that use as of the date on which the development charge is payable for the new building(s) in accordance with Schedule “B” to this By-law.
2) If an existing building or a portion of an existing building is converted to another use, a credit shall be given against the development charge otherwise payable pursuant to this By-law for the converted building or portion of building, the credit to be an amount equal to the development charge that would be applied to the converted building of the converted portion of building if it were being developed as a new building with the use of the building or portion of building determined as its most recent legal use before the conversion took place, and the credit being calculated based on the applicable development charge for that use as of the date on which the development charge is payable for the conversion of the building in accordance with Schedule “B” to this By-law.

3) Notwithstanding subsection 1), the credit described therein shall apply provided that a building permit is issued within two years of the date of issue of a permit for demolition.

4) In no case shall the credit described in subsections 1) and 2) exceed the total development charges payable for the new or converted building(s).

**Timing and Calculation Of Payment**

3.10 Subject to the provisions of this by-law, development charges shall be calculated, paid and collected at the rates as set out in Schedule “B” to this by-law.

3.11

1) The development charge shall be payable on the date a permit is issued under the *Building Code Act*, in relation to a building or structure on land to which the development charge applies. No building permits shall be issued by the Town for the construction of any building or structure on land to which a development charge applied until the applicable development charges has been paid in full to the Town.

2) Notwithstanding subsection 1), the Corporation may enter into an agreement with any person who is required to pay a development charge providing for all or any part of the development charge to be paid before it would otherwise be payable.

3) The total amount of a development charge payable under an agreement pursuant to subsection 2) is the amount of the development charge that would be determined under this By-law on the date specified in the agreement or, if no such date is specified, at the earlier of:
a) the time the development charge or any part of it is payable under the agreement;
b) the time the development charge would be payable in the absence of the agreement.

4) If the Corporation enters into an agreement under subsection 2), the Corporation may charge interest, at a rate stipulated in the agreement, on that part of the development charge paid after it would otherwise be payable.

5) All development charges shall be calculated as of the date upon which they are payable, unless otherwise specified in an agreement under subsection 2).

6) Notwithstanding subsection 1), the Corporation may, by agreement, allow a person to perform work that relates to a service to which this By-law relates, and give the person a credit towards the payment of development charges in accordance with the agreement, the amount of the credit to be determined in accordance with the ACT.

7) Notwithstanding subsection 1), the Corporation may enter into a front-ending agreement under the ACT that relates to the services to which this By-law relates.

Unpaid Charges

3.12 If a development charge of any part of it remains unpaid after it is payable, the amount unpaid shall be added to the tax roll and shall be collected in the same manner as taxes.

3.13 Where any unpaid Development Charges are collected as taxes, the monies so collected shall be credited to a Development Charge reserve fund.

Headings For Reference Only

4. The headings inserted in this By-law are for convenience of reference only and shall not affect the construction or interpretation of this By-law.


Severability

5. If, for any reason, any provision, section, subsection or paragraph of this By-law is held to be invalid, it is hereby declared to be the intention of Council that all of the remainder of this By-law shall continue in full force and effect until repealed, re-enacted or amended, in whole or in part or dealt with in any other way.

Date By-law In Force

6. This by-law shall come into force and effect at 12:01 a.m. on _____________, 2014.

By-law Repeal


Transfer of Credit

8. As provided for in subsection 41(2) of the Act, a credit under any other by-law enacted by the Council, pursuant to the Act, may be used, subject to the discretion of the Council, against any Development Charge imposed by this By-law.

By-Law Registration

9. A certified copy of this by-law may be registered on title to any land to which this by-law applies.

Schedules to the By-Law

10. The following Schedules to this by-law form an integral part of this by-law:

   Schedule A  -  Schedule of Designated Municipal Services
   Schedule B  -  Schedule of Development Charges
   Schedule C  -  Schedule of Lands to which Area Specific Charges Apply
   Schedule D  -  Exemption Provisions
Short Title

12. The by-law may be cited as the Town of Orangeville Development Charge By-law.

PASSED IN OPEN COUNCIL THIS __th DAY OF __________, 2014.

__________________________________________  ____________________________
Mayor                                      Clerk
SCHEDULE A

Service Categories and Sub-Components

1. Municipal-Wide Services (90% Services)
   - Transit
   - Municipal Parking
   - Parks and Recreation
   - Library Services
   - Administration - Studies

2. Municipal-Wide Services (100% Services)
   - Roads and Related
   - Fire Protection
   - Police

3. Urban Services (100% Services)
   - Wastewater
   - Water

3. Area Specific Services
   - Roads and Related
   - Water
   - Wastewater
   - Stormwater Management
## SCHEDULE B
### SCHEDULE OF DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Non-Residential</th>
<th>Municipal Wide Services</th>
<th>Urban Services</th>
<th>Roads and Related</th>
<th>Fire Protection Services</th>
<th>Police Services</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Municipal Parking</th>
<th>Parks and Recreation</th>
<th>Library Services</th>
<th>Administration - Studies</th>
<th>Total Municipal Wide Services</th>
<th>Total Urban Services</th>
<th>Wastewater</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total Urban Services</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL RURAL AREA</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL URBAN AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single and Semi-Detached Dwelling</td>
<td>Apartments - 2 Bedrooms</td>
<td>Apartments - Bachelor and 1 Bedroom</td>
<td>Other Multiples</td>
<td>(per sq.m. of Gross Floor Area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Wide Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,180</td>
<td>$2,280</td>
<td>$1,428</td>
<td>$3,040</td>
<td>$19.97</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>$316</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td>$421</td>
<td>$2,77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$510</td>
<td>$278</td>
<td>$174</td>
<td>$371</td>
<td>$2.43</td>
<td>$5,010</td>
<td>$2,733</td>
<td>$1,712</td>
<td>$3,644</td>
<td>$14.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$0.16</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>$316</td>
<td>$198</td>
<td>$421</td>
<td>$1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Municipal Wide Services</td>
<td>$11,024</td>
<td>$6,013</td>
<td>$3,768</td>
<td>$8,017</td>
<td>$41.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,101</td>
<td>$6,601</td>
<td>$4,135</td>
<td>$8,801</td>
<td>$45.52</td>
<td>$11,024</td>
<td>$6,013</td>
<td>$3,768</td>
<td>$8,017</td>
<td>$41.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL RURAL AREA</td>
<td>$23,125</td>
<td>$12,614</td>
<td>$7,903</td>
<td>$16,818</td>
<td>$87.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL URBAN AREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,024</td>
<td>$6,013</td>
<td>$3,768</td>
<td>$8,017</td>
<td>$41.72</td>
<td>$23,125</td>
<td>$12,614</td>
<td>$7,903</td>
<td>$16,818</td>
<td>$87.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area-Specific Roads Services
- Roads - RSP1: 13,417

### Area-Specific Water Services
- Water - WD-1: 1,352
- Water - WD-2: 3,373
- Water - WD-3: 1,987
- Water - WD-4: 5,325
- Water - WD-5: 25,229
- Water - WD-6: 8,182

### Area-Specific Wastewater Services
- Wastewater - SS1: 6,875
- Wastewater - SS3: 10,414
- Wastewater - SS4: 4,993

### Area-Specific Stormwater Management Services
- Stormwater Management - SWM1: 3,435
- Stormwater Management - SWM2: 13,268
- Stormwater Management - SWM3: 12,775
- Stormwater Management - SWM4: -
- Stormwater Management - SWM5: -
- Stormwater Management - SWM6: 4,370
SCHEDULE C
SCHEDULE OF LANDS TO WHICH AREA SPECIFIC CHARGES APPLY
ROADS SERVICES
SCHEDULE C
SCHEDULE OF LANDS TO WHICH AREA SPECIFIC CHARGES APPLY
WATER SERVICES

[Map showing areas with different land uses and development projects]
SCHEDULE C
SCHEDULE OF LANDS TO WHICH AREA SPECIFIC CHARGES APPLY
WASTEWATER SERVICES
SCHEDULE C
SCHEDULE OF LANDS TO WHICH AREA SPECIFIC CHARGES APPLY
STORM WATER MANAGEMENT SERVICES
SCHEDULE D
EXEMPTION PROVISIONS

Exemption Provisions:

Notwithstanding other references within this by-law to the methods of calculation of development charges:

1. The development of land for the purposes of:

   a) manufacturing, producing, processing, storing or distributing something,
   b) research or development in connection with manufacturing, producing, processing, storing or distributing something
   c) retail sales by a manufacturer, producer or processor of something they manufactured, produced or processed, if the retail sales are at the site where the manufacturing, production or processing takes place
   d) office or administrative purposes, if they are,
      i) carried out with respect to manufacturing, producing, processing, storing or distributing something,
      ii) in or attached to the building or structure used for that manufacturing, producing, processing, storage or distribution

shall be charged 0% of the full non-residential development charge shown in Schedule B to the By-law.
Mayor Rob Adams & Members of Council  
Town of Orangeville  
87 Broadway  
Orangeville ON  
L9W 1K1  

July 30, 2014  

Dear Mayor Adams & Members of Council,  

The Orangeville BIA Board of Management has reviewed the Town of Orangeville’s recently published 2014 Development Charges Background Study and supports the Town in its efforts to bring development charges in line with the increase in service needs. The OBIA Board of Management was gratified to see that municipal parking needs were considered in the study; however it has some concerns with the study’s content and scope in the area of Municipal Parking.

First, the study lists the current number of public parking spaces in the downtown core at 533; however this number is incorrect and misleading. Twenty-nine (29) of the parking spaces included in this number are not public spaces, but are in fact, privately owned by the WDGPH Unit. In addition, fifty (50) of the spaces listed have not yet been created and are only proposed parking spaces for 27-29 First Ave. Therefore the number of parking spaces in downtown Orangeville should be listed as 454 not 533. Based on the OBIA and Town’s expenditures on other parking projects, the cost of each parking space is approximately $17,000. At a potential total cost of approximately $1,343,000, the inclusion of these 79 parking spaces in the study’s total is a significant error and means that Downtown Orangeville is that much farther from the 1175 spaces recommended in the 2006 Downtown Gap Analysis Report.

Second, while the Development Charges Study included the development of the rear of 172 Broadway into a parking lot, it did not include any accommodation for any future parking projects such as the conversion of 27-29 First Avenue properties. As was originally intended by Council, these 2 lots are perfectly positioned as a parking area for Town Hall employees and would significantly reduce the strain on weekday parking. **The 27-29 First Avenue parking lot conversion and other future projects should be funded through development charges.**

While the original plans for the properties at 27-29 First Avenue were set aside due to the concerns raised in 2009 by area residents, the OBIA Board of Management is confident that these issues are surmountable with proper planning and design. Each objection raised by the residents at that time is listed and possible solutions offered below:
• Concern over pedestrian safety: Many Town employees are currently parking on First Ave. so the additional traffic on First Ave. would not be significant. Restricting in and out access to First Avenue only would mean that there would be no additional traffic in laneway.

• Concern over security issues: If the parking lot was designated specifically for Town employees only, with access limited by a barrier (possibly an electronic barrier and access passes), the lot would be empty in the evenings. Weekend access could be limited to use by Farmers’ Market vendors and customers by raising the “in” barrier in morning and lowering it at the end of the Market day. This would restrict access in the evenings and overnight hours. Surveillance cameras could be installed to discourage unwanted activity in the lot during the overnight hours if necessary.

• Concern over potential increase in noise: Because the lot would be used primarily by Town employees, the increase in noise would be minimal and limited to the daytime hours.

• Concern over lighting: Very limited or no lighting would be required as the parking lot would be used during daytime hours only, very much like the overflow parking lot for Dods & McNair on Second Avenue.

• Concern over increased storm drainage: This would be addressed in the design of the lot.

• Concern over decreasing property values: The lot, as it is today is unattractive. With proper design and an investment in both landscape screening and curbing, this parking lot could be far more attractive than an empty lot.

• Parking on First Ave.: Parking on First Ave. would remain intact, leaving more parking for residents and their guests.

The lot, if sympathetically designed and usage is restricted to daytime hours only, would make a significant contribution in alleviating the parking strain and would cost significantly less than purchasing and developing parking spaces on Broadway (approximately $12,000 per space versus approximately $17,000 per space).

Overcoming the deficiencies in downtown parking has been a focus of the OBIA for the last decade and will continue to be a priority until the number of downtown parking spaces is more closely in line with demand. In partnership, the Town and the OBIA have made great strides in relieving the parking strain, but the work isn’t finished. The health of downtown Orangeville depends on the OBIA and the Town of Orangeville’s continuing commitment in creating new parking opportunities, especially in light of the increase in demand attributed to new development. As such, the OBIA Board of Management urges Council to take a proactive approach with this ongoing issue and increase the proposed development charges attributed to municipal parking to help defray development costs for the 27-29 First Avenue lot and other future parking projects.

Sincerely,

Rodney Hough
Chair, Orangeville BIA
Republiced by:

To: Mayor Adams and Members of Council

From: Heather McGinnity, P.Eng., Manager of Environmental Services

Date: July 25, 2014

Report: PW-2014-42

Subject: Comments on the Amended Proposed Source Protection Plan

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an opportunity to review staff comments that will be submitted to the Credit Valley, Toronto and Region, and Central Lake Ontario (CTC) Source Protection Committee (SPC) on the Amended Proposed Source Protection Plan (SPP) on behalf of the Town.

Background and Discussion

In accordance with the Clean Water Act, 2006 (CWA) the CTC SPC is required to prepare a Source Protection Plan for the CTC Source Protection Region. A Proposed SPP was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) in October 2012 and the CTC SPC has since received comments from the MOECC and other key stakeholders that have been considered and included in an Amended Proposed SPP.

On the July 14, 2014, Council received report PW-2014-40 that identified that a public consultation period would take place in July and August 2014 for the CTC Amended Proposed SPP. The Amended Proposed SPP is available on-line at www.ctcspw.ca. Following the public consultation period, it is anticipated that the CTC Amended Proposed Source Protection Plan will be submitted to the MOE for review and approval in Fall 2014.

A key component of the SPP is an Assessment Report that was prepared for the Credit Valley Source Protection Area and approved by the MOECC in January 2012. The Assessment Report includes delineations of vulnerable areas for all municipal supply wells (Wellhead Protection Areas, WHPAs) within the Credit River watershed, an enumeration of potential significant drinking water threats within these WHPAs based on existing land use, and a water balance for the watershed. The Assessment Report also identified drinking water quality “issues” relating to Sodium and Chloride in eight of the Town’s twelve municipal supply wells, and a significant water quantity risk associated with eleven the municipal supply wells.
The SPP also includes source protection policies to ensure that the twenty-one activities that are identified as prescribed threats to drinking water in the CWA never become, or cease to be, a significant drinking water threat to municipal water supplies. An activity is only considered a significant drinking water threat if it has been identified as such through a risk assessment process that considers factors such as groundwater vulnerability at the site, proximity of the site to the municipal supply well, the Time of Travel for groundwater supply to reach the municipal well from the site, and existing water quality “issues” at the municipal supply wells. If an activity is determined to be a significant drinking water threat, then source protection policies will apply to this activity.

Town staff have provided preliminary comments on the Amended Proposed SPP to the CTC SPC through the Dufferin County representative on the SPC (Bob Burnside), however the public consultation period provides the Town with a formal process to ensure our concerns about some of the proposed policies are documented prior to the CTC submitting the Amended Proposed SPP to the MOECC for approval. The comments that have been prepared by staff are included as Attachment No.1 to this report.

Vision and Values

The development and implementation of the CTC Source Protection Plan is keeping with the Town’s Vision and Values in that it cares for the environment and provides for well-maintained infrastructure.

Recommendations


AND THAT Staff be directed, as part of the final consultation process, to submit comments on the CTC Source Protection Plan to the Source Protection Chair by August 22, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather McGinnity, P.Eng.
Manager of Environmental Services

Reviewed by:

Director of Public Works
August 1, 2014

CTC Source Protection Committee
5 Shoreham Drive
Downsview, ON M3K 2C5

Attention: Chair, CTC Source Protection Committee

Subject: Comments on the CTC Amended Proposed Source Protection Plan

Dear Madam:

On behalf of the Town of Orangeville (Town), I would like to thank you for the opportunity to provide additional comments on the CTC Amended Proposed Source Protection Plan. The Town has provided comments to the CTC Source Protection Committee (SPC) in the past either through the Dufferin County representative on the committee or by letter. We appreciate that our concerns with the proposed policies are being heard and we hope they will be discussed and addressed before the Amended Proposed Source Protection Plan is submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) for approval.

This following is an overview of the Town’s concerns regarding some of the proposed policies in the Amended Proposed Source Protection Plan. Some of these concerns have been brought to the attention of the CTC SPC previously, while others are new.

WST-2: Storage of Hazardous or Liquid Industrial Waste/Storage of Wastes Described in Clauses (p), (q), (r), (s), (t) or (u) in the Definition of Hazardous Waste, or in Clause (d) in the Definition of Liquid Industrial Waste

The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC consider revising the proposed WST-2 policy from a Part IV, Section 58 policy to an Education and Outreach policy, consistent with the Proposed South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan. Since the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) exempts these wastes from requiring an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA), the Town believes that it will be difficult to identify all the locations where small quantities of waste included in this prescribed drinking water threat sub-category are present, and then subsequently manage them all through risk management plans. An Education and Outreach policy will ensure land owners and tenants in the identified vulnerable areas are aware of the potential risks to drinking water associated with the storage of these hazardous and liquid industrial wastes, and provide recommendations for best management practices.
WST-6: PCB Waste Storage

The Town’s interpretation of O. Reg. 362 made under the EPA is that PCB waste and PCB related waste shall only be disposed of or stored at PCB waste storage and disposal sites that have an existing ECA, or in accordance with written instructions from the Director. Based on this understanding, the only situations where the proposed WST-6 policy would apply is when written instructions from the Director for a PCB waste storage site exist. The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC provide additional guidance on what the Risk Management Official should include in the risk management plans for PCB waste storage sites beyond the Director’s requirements.

SWG-3: Septic Systems Governed Under the Building Code Act

The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC provide clarification on how a new septic system installed within any of the vulnerable areas identified in the proposed SWG-3 policy will “not become a significant drinking water threat.” While the Town agrees that management and inspection measures can be implemented, it is not clear what the Municipality should require in the hydrogeological assessment report that would result in a septic system not being identified as a significant drinking water threat through the risk assessment process.

SWG-6: Septic Systems Governed under the Building Code Act and the Ontario Water Resources Act

The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC clarify if the Municipality is being “encouraged” to pass a by-law requiring mandatory connections to municipal sanitary sewers where available in the specified vulnerable areas, or if this is a policy the Municipality must comply with (Legal Effect E).

SWG-7: Septic Systems Governed under the Building Code Act and the Ontario Water Resources Act

The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC provide further clarification on the requirement for the Municipality to “provide” education and outreach materials in cooperation with local health units and the Source Protection Authorities. Does this proposed policy require the Municipality to develop the education and outreach materials as well as distribute them? If so, the Town is requesting that staffing and funding limitations at smaller municipalities be considered before finalizing this policy.

SWG-11 & SWG-12: Discharge from a Stormwater Retention Pond

The MOECC Table of Drinking Water Threats does not identify discharge from a stormwater retention pond as a potential drinking water threat for Sodium, therefore
there is no requirement for the CTC SPC to develop a policy for stormwater management ponds in relation to Sodium. The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC modify these policies such that all references to Issue Contributing Areas (ICAs) for Sodium are removed from Part 2 of SWG-11 and SWG-12.

**SWG-17 & SWG-18: Combined Sewer Discharge from a Stormwater Outlet to Surface Water/Industrial Effluent Discharges/ Sewage Treatment Bypass Discharge to Surface Water/ Sewage Treatment Plant Effluent Discharges (Includes Lagoons)**

While the Town acknowledges that the Town’s Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) effluent forms a significant portion of the total Sodium and Chloride loading within the ICA for Well 10, the approved Assessment Report indicates that additional analysis is required for a link between the Sodium and Chloride in the WPCP effluent and the Sodium and Chloride in the Well 10 water supply to be established. Further, a review of the MOECC Table of Drinking Water Threats for the sub-threats identified in the proposed SWG-17 and SWG-18 policies indicates that sewage treatment plant effluent discharges are not a prescribed drinking water threat for either Sodium or Chloride. The only sub-threat considered in SWG-17 and SWG-18 that could become a significant drinking water threat for Sodium or Chloride is industrial effluent discharges to surface water in an ICA for Chloride.

Since none of the sub-threat categories included in the proposed SWG-17 and SWG-18 polices have the potential to become a significant drinking water threat for Sodium, there is no requirement for the CTC SPC to develop a policy for these sub-threats in relation to Sodium. As such, the Town is requesting that the CTC SPC modify the proposed SWG-17 and SWG-18 policies to remove all references to ICAs for Sodium.

Since the only sub-threat category identified in the proposed SWG-17 and SWG-18 policies that could become a significant drinking water threat in an ICA for Chloride is industrial effluent discharges to surface water, the Town is requesting that the CTC SPC revise the policies for SWG-17 and SWG-18 such that they only apply to industrial effluent discharges in an ICA for Chloride.

**NASM-2: Handling and Storage of Non-Agricultural Source Material (NASM)**

The Town requests that the CTC SPC consider revising the wording of the proposed NASM-2 policy from “Where the handling and storage of NASM (Category 1) to land is, …” to “Where the handling and storage of NASM (Category 1) is, …”
FER-6: Application of Commercial Fertilizer to Land/Handling and Storage of Commercial Fertilizer

The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC provide further clarification on the requirement for the Municipality to “deliver” education and outreach materials and programs in areas where the application, handling and storage of commercial fertilizers is, or would be, a significant drinking water threat. Does the proposed FER-6 policy require the Municipality to also develop the education and outreach materials and programs? If so, the Town is requesting that staffing and funding limitations at smaller municipalities be considered before finalizing this policy.

SAL-8: Application of Road Salt/Handling and Storage of Road Salt

The Town is requesting the CTC SPC to provide further clarification on the requirement for the Municipality to “deliver” education and outreach materials and programs in areas where the application, handling and storage of road salt is, or would be, a significant drinking water threat. Does the proposed SAL-8 policy require the Municipality to also develop the education and outreach materials and programs? If so, the Town is requesting that staffing and funding limitations at smaller municipalities be considered before finalizing this policy.

FUEL-4: Handling and Storage of Fuel

The wording in this policy suggests that the Municipality shall prepare and deliver education and outreach materials and programs. The Town feels that expertise at the Province and/or SPA should be relied upon to develop an education and outreach program for fuel handling and storage. The Town is requesting the CTC SPC consider revising the proposed FUEL-4 policy such that the Town implements a program based on materials developed by either the Province or the SPA.

DNAP-2: Handling and Storage of Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (DNAPL)

The Town is requesting the CTC SPC to provide further clarification on the requirement for the Municipality to “deliver” education and outreach materials and programs in areas where the handling and storage of DNAPLs is, or would be, a significant drinking water threat. Does the proposed DNAP-2 policy also require the Municipality to develop the education and outreach materials and programs? If so, the Town is requesting that staffing and funding limitations at smaller municipalities be considered before finalizing this policy.
DEM-4: An Activity that Takes Water from an Aquifer or Surface Water Body without Returning the Water Taken to the Same Aquifer or Surface Water Body

The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC clarify why the legal effect for the proposed DEM-4 policy in a WHPA-Q2 with a moderate risk would be “E.”

DEM-6: An Activity that Takes Water from an Aquifer or Surface Water Body without Returning the Water Taken to the Same Aquifer or Surface Water Body

The Town continues to have concerns about the implementation of the proposed DEM-6 policy. While the Town does not question the objectives of this policy, the Town believes that extensive involvement from the Province and Source Protection Authority will likely be required to implement it successfully. The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC review this policy in its entirety in the context of the level of involvement the Province is willing to commit to, as well as the timelines for implementation.

REC-1: An Activity that Reduces Recharge to an Aquifer

The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC clarify if the legal effect for the proposed REC-1 policy in a WHPA-Q2 with moderate risk should be “A” or “B.”

Part 5 of the proposed REC-1 policy requires that a report be provided to the satisfaction of the Planning Approval Authority that demonstrates how the proposed development will maintain recharge and protect water quality in ICAs for Sodium, Chloride, and Nitrates within the WHPA-Q2. The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC provide guidance to the Planning Approval Authority on the types of “reasonable” measures that would meet this requirement. Factors that the Town would like the CTC SPC to consider when determining if a measure is reasonable are the life cycle costs (capital, operating, and replacement), maintenance requirements, and the area of land required.

REC-2: An Activity that Reduces Recharge to an Aquifer

The current definition of an Existing Threat Activity includes “an expansion, alteration, or replacement of an existing building or structure that does not increase the risk of contaminating drinking water.” Based on this definition, it appears that the proposed policy for REC-2 will not apply to any building permit application where an existing structure exists. This seems to be contrary to the intent of this policy, as outlined in the explanatory document. The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC provide further clarification on how the REC-2 policy will apply to Existing Threat Activities if this is the intent of the CTC SPC.
If the proposed REC-2 policy is revised so that it does apply to Existing Threat Activities, the Town is concerned that this policy will result in a significant increase in scope, and as a result renovation costs, to the majority of building permit applicants if the requirement will be for the applicant to retrofit their existing property with the goal of restoring pre-development recharge. The Town is requesting that the CTC SPC consider revising this policy so that the ultimate recharge objective for the applicant is reduced, and the conditions under which this policy will apply are revised to only include expansions or new buildings/structures at the site.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide these comments. I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours truly,

Heather McGinnity, P. Eng.
Manager of Environmental Services

cc: Bob Burnside, CTC SPC Representative
Purpose

The purpose of this report is to recommend that Council accept the tender of Drexler Construction Limited (Drexler) to undertake the reconstruction of Mill Street.

Background and Discussion

At its meeting on May 12, 2014, Council received a report (PW-2014-24) regarding the design, tendering and reconstruction of Mill Street. A motion was passed amending the approved 2014 capital budget to include this project and authorizing the engineering design and tendering of Mill Street between Broadway and Armstrong Street. The Council motion also authorized the transfer of $425,000 from water and wastewater reserves to the Mill Street capital project.

Tenders for the reconstruction of Mill Street were received until 2:00 p.m. on Monday, July 28, 2014. Tenders were opened shortly thereafter. The following people were present at the tender opening:

Councillor Mary Rose;
John Lackey, P. Eng., Manager of Operations and Development;
Tony Dulisse, C.E.T., Public Works
Angela Shipway, Treasury Department
Howard Wray, P. Eng., Triton Engineering Services Limited; and
Contractor Representatives.

The results of that tender opening are summarized below. A copy of the completed tender is available in the Public Works Department should any member of Council wish to review it in more detail.
Attachment No. 1 to this report is a letter from Triton Engineering Services Limited (Triton), the Town’s consultant on this project. The Triton letter provides the details of their analysis of the tenders received and recommends that the tender be awarded to Drexler. Drexler was the low bidder with a bid price of $543,373.70, which is higher than the Engineer’s Estimate of $469,321.00. Both the Engineer’s estimate and the low bid are greater than the budget allocation for this project of $425,000.

The increased cost of this project may be attributed to a number of items, including: the decision to construct temporary water during the construction phase, thus ensuring a continual supply of water to residents and retailers during the reconstruction work; maintenance of pedestrian traffic throughout the construction period; a strict timeline and schedule for construction; construction in close proximity to aged structures, along with the need to relocate the storm sewer to achieve the Ministry of the Environment separation requirement. Staff supports Triton’s recommendation to award the tender to Drexler.

**Financial Impact**

The budget allocation for this project is $425,000.00. This allocation will not adequately cover the design, construction, construction inspection and contract administration costs and any contingency or unexpected items that need to be addressed during the construction phase. This project is solely funded by water and wastewater rates and thus there is no tax dollar impact to the budget. The project will however require a transfer of an additional $255,000 from the Water Works Reserve Fund and Wastewater Reserve Fund to appropriately fund the project. The additional transfer is based on an approximate cost of $680,000 inclusive of design, construction, contract administration services and a small contingency allowance.

**Vision and Values**

This report is consistent with the Town’s Vision and Values statement in that it spends taxpayers’ money wisely and provides for a well-maintained infrastructure.

**Recommendations**

That Report No. PW-2014-43, dated July 25, 2014, regarding Tender Results for the Mill Street Reconstruction Project, be received;
AND THAT Council accept the tender of Drexler Construction Limited in the amount of $543,373.70, exclusive of HST;

AND THAT staff be authorized to transfer $255,000 from the Water Works Reserve Fund and the Wastewater Reserve Fund to this capital project;

AND THAT Council consider a by-law authorizing the Mayor and the Clerk to sign the construction contract with Drexler Construction;

AND THAT Staff be authorized to approve contract change orders as may be required to complete the project.

*****

Respectfully submitted,

R. John Lackey, P.Eng.
Manager of Operations and Development

Reviewed by:

Director of Public Works
Dear Mr. Jones:

We are pleased to submit a tender report for the above noted project.

Tenders closed at 2:00 p.m. on Monday, July 28, 2014. Two tenders were received, and were opened publicly shortly thereafter. In attendance for the tender opening were the following:

- Councillor Mary Rose
- Angela Shipway, Treasury Dept.
- John Lackey, Mgr. Operations & Development
- Tony Dulisse, Engineering Technologist
- Howard Wray, Triton Engineering Services Limited

Contractor’s Representatives

The tenders were opened and checked to ensure that they were properly executed, and were accompanied by a Tender Deposit, and an Agreement to Bond. The tenders received provided the required documentation, and the prices were read out.

The tenders were then taken to the offices of Triton Engineering Services Limited for checking. Both tenders were deemed to be mathematically correct.
The final tender results are as follows:

Drexler Construction Limited $614,012.28

Moorefield Excavating Ltd. $661,380.53

The Engineer’s Estimate was $530,000.00.

Moorefield’s tender included a letter to the Town (copy attached) advising that they would be unable to complete the project by the specified completion date of October 31, 2014, and that they would only enter into a contract if the project could be built in the spring of 2015. It is our opinion that this represents a conditional tender, which may be rejected as informal. On this basis, the tender could be considered to be non-compliant. It is our recommendation that the Town consult their solicitor regarding whether a tender should be rejected as being non-compliant. However, since this was not the low tender, the Town may elect to take no further action in this regard.

The tender submitted by Drexler Construction Limited was reviewed for compliance with the tender requirements, and judged to be compliant.

In accordance with the Tender requirements, Drexler Construction Limited has furnished satisfactory evidence that they have sufficient capital, plant, and experience to carry out this work. They have completed numerous similar projects for the Town of Orangeville.

The tender break-down is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tender sub-total</td>
<td>$543,373.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% H.S.T.</td>
<td>$ 70,638.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$614,012.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We recommend that, subject to budget review, the contract be awarded to Drexler Construction Limited in the amount of $543,373.70 plus HST.

We trust that this is satisfactory, and would be pleased to review the recommendation with Council at your request.

Yours very truly,

TRITON ENGINEERING SERVICES LIMITED

Howard W. Wray, P. Eng.

HWW/yd
Mayor Rob Adams & Members of Council  
Town of Orangeville  
87 Broadway  
Orangeville ON  
L9W 1K1  

July 31, 2014

Dear Mayor Adams & Members of Council,

The imminent reconstruction of Mill Street provides opportunities for street improvements that would provide long lasting benefits to Mill Street, the Town of Orangeville and wider community; and would otherwise be cost prohibitive if considered post reconstruction. Narrow sidewalks and a distinct lack of boulevard trees or heritage details put Mill Street in sharp contrast to beautiful Broadway with its centre medians, wide boulevards, tree canopy, and heritage touches. While neither the sidewalks nor the street can be widened, an investment in aesthetic improvements would make a more welcoming environment, and the ability to easily erect a three seasons, 9000 square foot outdoor venue would be a tremendous asset to the heart of our community. These upgrades, as outlined below, will go a long way in making Mill Street a destination for locals and tourists alike, and will contribute to the BIA and other groups’ ability to host community and cultural events, in a more cost effective manner, for decades to come.

With this on mind, the Orangeville BIA Board of Management respectfully requests Council’s consideration for the following:

a) Upgrade of the concrete light standards to a style and colour more in keeping with Broadway’s heritage style light standards as per the recommendation made by Triton Engineering (see Appendix A);

b) Purchase and installation of permanent tent anchors to secure up to a 300 ft tent to be used during events such as the Taste of Orangeville, Founders’ Day, Blues & Jazz Festival, and Town of Orangeville community events; and to be cost shared with the OBIA (see Appendix B for project overview, engineering report, design options, and cost estimates).

c) Procure estimates to upgrade the Mill Street road surface from asphalt to paving bricks (a style and colour consistent with the intersection brickwork) and/or to upgrade concrete sidewalks to pavers or patterned concrete.
In addition, the OBIA Board of Management is seeking Council’s support in securing permission to use the as yet undeveloped Bravery Park property, owned by Orangeville Hydro, and the vacant Broadway Grand property, owned by Mr. Prestrin, as parking areas during the Mill Street road closure and until such times as these properties are developed. Securing the use of these lots would serve as replacement for the parking spaces lost due to construction; and would take of the pressure off of the already overused laneway east of Mill Street and supplement strained parking inventory until development of these properties commenced.

The Orangeville BIA Board of Management is confident that Council will find these requests to be worthwhile, with long lasting benefits to be enjoyed by residents, businesses, and property owners well beyond the Mill Street road closure. The investment in Mill Street’s future and in cultural and community event programming that will be appreciated by all.

Council’s time and consideration in these matters is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Rodney Hough
Chair, Orangeville BIA
light standards- Mill Street

1 message

Howard Wray <HWray@tritoneng.on.ca>  Wed, Jul 9, 2014 at 9:02 PM
To: "John Lackey (j lackey@orangeville.ca)" <jlackey@orangeville.ca>, Tony Dulisse <tdulisse@orangeville.ca>, "alison scheel (info@downtownorangeville.ca)"

As discussed at the PIC, this is a light standard we spec’d recently for a project in Fergus. It is available in LED. Would provide a little more decorative flair at reasonable cost.

It is a concrete direct buried pole that would work for our application. Available colours also attached.

Howard
NOTES:

1. The material removed from trenching under the existing curb and gutter on sidewalk must be replaced by tamping intermittently to ensure proper compaction with no channels.
2. All connections for the buried cable are to be made in the handhole of the concrete poles unless otherwise specified.
3. The contractor is to contact Hydro Authority for all connections to/reconnections from power.
4. Ground proposed poles using No. 6 and green ground wire. Connection is to be made using through weld "T" splice. Check the resistance to ground.
5. All luminaire are to be mounted on 1.5 m post above, unless otherwise specified.
6. If it is necessary for the contractor to work within 3 metres of primary Hydro lines, the contractor is to have the appropriate Hydro authority present for their assistance/advice to do the work.
7. All concrete lighting poles are to be located at a minimum distance of 500 mm from edge of sidewalk to face of pole.
8. All clearances to neutral, primary, communication, conductors and Hydro equipment are to be maintained as per local Hydro authority/pole owner, EMD, CCE, and the electrical safety code.
9. Existing illumination is to be maintained at all times until the proposed illumination is in operation.
The Decor Colors

Concrete colors that are more than just skin deep.

The Decor Series of colors adds warmth and vitality to an already attractive product, enhancing the ability of discerning designers to both beautify and harmonize any lighting project. Available in a wide selection of colors from earth tones to delicate pastels, Decor colors are unique in the pole world in that the color permeates through the entire pole rather than being merely a surface treatment. Both available surface finishes, etched or polished, combine the attributes of a solid colored matrix with the undefinable beauty of natural stone, with stunning results.

Polished Decorative Spun Concrete

Midnight Lace - S10  Eclipse Black - S11  Salt & Pepper - S30  Ash White - S35  Pearl Gray - S40

Dusty Rose - S41  Aztec Jade - S51  Oriental Jade - S52  Detroit Green - S53  Autumn Red - S60

Desert Sand - S70  Vintage Brown - S80  Rosewood - S91  Saluki Bronze - S90

Etched Decorative Spun Concrete

Midnight Lace - E10  Eclipse Black - E11  Salt & Pepper - E30  Ash White - E35  Pearl Gray - E40

Dusty Rose - E41  Aztec Jade - E51  Oriental Jade - E52  Detroit Green - E53  Autumn Red - E60

Desert Sand - E70  Vintage Brown - E80  Rosewood - E81  Saluki Bronze - E90

*All colors also available without acrylic, please specify NA in catalog code.
Mill Street Tent Anchor Project Overview

Goal: To create a large outdoor venue for downtown events that is easy to set up, is cost effective, and is protected from the elements.

Background: Mill Street is centrally located in the downtown core and is the perfect size in both width and length to house a large tent (30 ft x 50 ft – 300 ft in length) that serves to protect event guests from inclement weather. With tent sides and heaters installed, this tent can even be used in cooler weather. Large tents require very large weights and these weights are expensive to store and transport, and consequently add significant cost to each tent rental. These large concrete weights are also very bulky and take up a great deal of much needed space on site.

Challenge: To find a more permanent, cost effective, and site friendly alternative to large concrete tent weights.

Solution: To take advantage of the Mill Street reconstruction to install permanent, weather and trip-proof tent anchors into the sidewalks, making tent set up easier and much cheaper.

Method: Contract Criterium Engineering to structural survey and to research and design flush mount tent anchors with internal drainage.

Cost Analysis: 2 different anchors styles have been designed at an estimated cost of $300 - $350 per anchor. For a 300 ft. tent, 74 anchors are required. Total cost for anchor purchase: $22,200 - $25,900. Installation cost to be determined.
July 4, 2014

Orangeville BIA
c/o Rodney Hough
T: 519-940-1460
E: info@smallbizmastery.com

Subject: Proposal for Engineering Services to research and develop flush mount sidewalk anchors with internal drainage for a 40 foot wide by 300 foot long tent to be mounted on Mill Street for community events.

Attention: Orangeville BIA

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to be of service to you. This is to confirm the scope of engineering services to be provided by our office for your project.

This proposal is to research and develop flush mount sidewalk anchors with internal drainage for a 40 foot wide by 300 foot long tent to be mounted on Mill Street for community events.

Our services will include:
1) Structural Evaluation
2) Anchor Design
3) Detailed Drawing

The output of our work would be 3 drawings stamped by a licensed professional engineer. We would need approximately two weeks to complete this project.

FEES

Our estimated fee for this project is a contract not to exceed $1,570 plus HST. Please see the attached Standard Terms and Conditions for our rates.

The balance of the payment will be due upon delivery of the report.

The above fees assume no significant change in the scope of work that you have requested of us. You will be billed for the actual hours that we spend on this project plus related out-of-pocket expenses. If we anticipate deviating from our estimate by more than 10 percent, we will advise you in advance and will require your authorization to continue work on the project.
Your payment(s) will be due upon receipt of the invoice. Our *Standard Terms and Conditions* which are the basis of this agreement are attached to this letter. Please take a few minutes to review them thoroughly. Incidentals such as courier and printing will be billed at cost plus 20% and additional site visits over and above the number noted in this proposal are $265 per visit plus a standard hourly rate.

If you have any questions please advise us as soon as possible. We look forward to working with you on this project and are pleased that you selected Criterium – Jansen Engineers!

Sincerely,

Henry Jansen, P.Eng.
July 4, 2014

CLIENT AUTHORIZATION

CLIENT: Orangeville BIA
   c/o Rodney Hough
   T: 519-940-1460
   E: info@smallbizmastery.com

Project Title: Proposal for Engineering Services is to research and develop flush mount sidewalk anchors with internal drainage for a 40 foot wide by 300 foot long tent to be mounted on Mill Street for community events.

I hereby authorize Criterium – Jansen Engineers to undertake the engineering services assignment as described in the accompanying letter/proposal dated July 4, 2014 and guarantee payment of all fees and expenses when invoiced less any credits due by prepayments or retainers. I further agree to make payment for the services rendered in accordance with the attached Standard Terms and Conditions of Criterium – Jansen Engineers. I have read and understand the attached description of services to be provided, any noted limits on those services and the Standard Terms and Conditions.

Date ___________________ Print Name ___________________ Authorizing Signature ___________________

NOTE: Please return this Client Authorization form along with the retainer amount cheque to:
Criterium – Jansen Engineers
190 Broadway, Suite 205
Orangeville, ON L9W 1K3

Thank you.
STANDARD TERMS AND CONDITIONS
CRITERIUM - JANSEN ENGINEERS

Section 1: Standard of Service
Criterium – Jansen Engineers (company) is dedicated to providing its clients with quality service. Services performed by Criterium - Jansen Engineers under this agreement will be conducted in a manner consistent with that level of care and skill that is ordinarily exercised by members of the profession currently practicing under similar conditions at the time the services are performed. No other warranty, express or implied, is made. Client recognizes that interpretations and recommendations of Criterium - Jansen Engineers are based solely on the information available to the company. Criterium – Jansen Engineers will be responsible for those data, interpretations and recommendations, but shall not be responsible for the interpretation by others of the information developed.

Section 2: Charges
Services are generally provided on a lump sum or an hourly basis plus necessary out-of-pocket costs. Current hourly rates are as follows:

- Drafting ............................................................................................................................. $70.00/hr.
- Senior Engineer ............................................................................................................... $225.00/hr.
- Junior Engineer .............................................................................................................. $145.00/hr.
- Project Management ...................................................................................................... $225.00/hr.
- Site Visit ....................................................................................................................... min $265 per visit plus $145.00/hr.
- Typing/Clerical .............................................................................................................. $20.00/hr.

Where appropriate, company and personal vehicles used in conjunction with project work will be charged at $0.65 per kilometer. Vehicle rental or special vehicle requirements will be charged directly to the client. Out-of-pocket costs such as printing, word processing, reproduction, special consultant fees, permits, special equipment, extraordinary insurance, fares, telephone, overnight lodging or meals expense, and other similar project-related costs are billed at cost plus 20 percent. In the event that Criterium – Engineers shall be charged more than a nominal fee to obtain public information or documents of record from government offices and public agencies Criterium – Engineers may pass those costs along to you, our client, at cost plus 20 percent in addition to all other fees in our proposal.

Section 3: Terms of Payment, Invoice Submittals
Criterium – Jansen Engineers requires a retainer fee to be paid before commencing any project. Extended engagements may require interim invoicing on a weekly, monthly, or other basis. At the completion of the project, we will issue a final invoice.

Payment of each invoice is due upon presentation of our report unless credit terms have been established and are included in our project agreement. Unless otherwise agreed to in writing, invoices issued to clients with established credit will be due within 10 days from date of invoice. Failure to pay invoices within the allotted time period will constitute a breach of contract and may result in suspension of work until such time as all overdue payments are made in full. Should any suspension occur because of overdue payments, the time for contract completion, if any is stated, shall be extended by the period of the suspension.

All outstanding invoiced balances remaining unpaid for thirty (30) days after date of invoice will be charged a finance charge in the amount of 1½ percent per month from the date of invoice, with the annual percentage rate being 18 percent, computed on a monthly basis. In the event that any invoice remains unpaid and it
becomes necessary, in the opinion of Criterium - Jansen Engineers, to initiate collection procedures, the client hereby agrees to pay all collection costs including, but not limited to, reasonable fees for attorneys retained by Criterium - Jansen Engineers and court costs at our standard billing rate for time necessitated in court appearances or presentation of claim to the appropriate court jurisdiction. Exceptions to the foregoing “Terms of Payment, Invoice Submittal” must be specified in writing as part of our confirmation letter or project agreement.

Section 4: Insurance
Criterium - Jansen Engineers represents and warrants that it is protected by insurance and has such coverage under Public Liability and Property Damage insurance policies which Criterium - Jansen Engineers deems adequate. Certificates for all such policies of insurance shall be provided to the Client upon request in writing. Criterium - Jansen Engineers shall not be responsible for any loss, damage or liability arising from any acts by Client, its agents, staff and other consultants employed by it.

Section 5: Limitation of Liability
Neither Criterium - Jansen Engineers, its consultants, nor their agents or employees shall be jointly, severally, or individually liable to client in excess of the compensation to be paid pursuant to this agreement or of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars ($25,000.00), whichever is greater, by reason of any act or omission, including breach of contract or negligence.

Section 6: Ownership of Documents
All reports, field data, field notes, calculations, estimates and other documents prepared by Criterium - Jansen Engineers, as instruments of service, shall remain the property of Criterium - Jansen Engineers. Client agrees that all reports furnished to Client or his agents, which are not paid for, will be returned upon demand and will not be used by Client for any purpose whatever. Criterium – Jansen Engineers will retain all pertinent records relating to the services performed for a period of five years following submission of the report, during which period the records will be made available to Client at all reasonable times.

Section 7: Copies of Document
Criterium - Jansen Engineers agrees to furnish two copies of our report, drawings, or documents relating to the services performed. Additional copies may be provided upon request at cost plus 10 percent at Criterium- Jansen Engineers sole discretion. Any electronic copies that may be provided to clients are solely for the convenience of those clients and are not to be considered the final work product. Criterium – Jansen Engineers will always provide a final report on its letterhead, or, in the event that the client declines such a copy, shall retain a copy of the final report in its files.

Section 8: Termination and Assigns
This agreement to perform engineering services may be terminated by either party by written notice. In the event of termination, Criterium - Jansen Engineers shall be paid for services performed and expenses incurred up to the termination notice date, plus any expenses or penalties resulting from the termination. Neither the Client nor Criterium - Jansen Engineers may delegate, assign, sublet or transfer his duties or interest in this agreement without the written consent of the other party.

Section 9: Disputes
Any controversy or claim arising out of or relating to this agreement, or the breach thereof, shall be settled by arbitration in accordance with the Construction Industry Arbitration Rules of the ADR Institute of Ontario, and judgment upon the award rendered by the arbitrator(s) may be entered in any court having jurisdiction thereof.
In addition to and prior to arbitration, the parties shall endeavor to settle disputes by mediation in accordance with the Construction Industry Mediation Rules of the ADR Institute of Ontario currently in effect unless the parties mutually agree otherwise. Demand for mediation shall be filed in writing with the other party to this Agreement and with the ADR Institute of Ontario. If, in your opinion as our client, or any that of any third party granted reliance on Criterium – Jansen Engineers’ reports or services, Criterium – Jansen Engineers was negligent or in breach of contract, you and/or the named third parties shall have one year from the date of our field visit to make such a claim. In no event shall the demand for mediation be made after the date when institution or legal or equitable proceedings based on such claim, dispute or other matter in question would be barred by the applicable statute or limitations.

If the Client brings an action against Criterium - Jansen Engineers and Criterium - Jansen Engineers prevails, Criterium - Jansen Engineers shall be entitled to recover costs and expenses, including reasonable attorneys' costs and fees.
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Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to outline clothing/uniform, reflective, safety apparel and boot allowances and the corporate process for managing the employee allotments.

Background and Discussion
This policy was identified by the Joint Health and Safety Committee and supervisory group as one that needed review and updating. The policy did not address the diverse nature of jobs in each department. The current town corporate clothing and boot allowance is dated 2005. An ad hoc committee made up of supervisors from various departments was created in early January to work on researching best practices and drafting an updated policy. All of the affected departments were consulted extensively during the drafting of the policy and it has been reviewed and approved by the Policy Review Committee and the Corporate Leadership Team.

Financial Impact
The policy provides opportunity to redistribute clothing and boots allowances that are already in current department budgets. There is no predicted impact on budget.

Recommendation
THAT Report HR-2014-02 with respect to Clothing and Boot Allowance Policy be received.
AND THAT Council approve Policy HR-002 Clothing and Boot Allowance effective January 1, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,  

Prepared by,

__________  __________
Susan Greatrix     Cathy Moran, CHRP  
Clerk              Health and Safety Officer

**Attachments**
Policy HR-002 Clothing and Boot Allowance
Corporate Policy

Clothing and Boot Allowance

Policy Category: Human Resources
Policy Number: HR-002
Department: Human Resources
Attachments: None
Key Word(s): Clothing, footwear, boot, allowance
Related Documents/Legislation:
  Industrial Regulation 851, section 80-84
  Construction Regulation 213, section 21-25
  Occupational Health and Safety Act, section 25(2)(h)

Approved:
  By Corporate Leadership Team: July 16, 2014
  By Council: August 11, 2014

Revised: N/A
Replaces: N/A

1. Policy Statement
   The Town of Orangeville is committed to establishing a consistent policy for clothing and footwear allowances for eligible employees.

2. Purpose
   The purpose of this policy is to outline clothing/uniform, reflective, safety apparel and boot allowances and the corporate process for managing the employee allotments.

3. Definitions

4. Scope

   This policy applies to all Town of Orangeville employees who require safety boots, reflective and safety apparel, and/or identifiable Town clothing as part of their job, except members of the Orangeville Professional Firefighters’ Association.
5. **Policy**

For the purpose of this policy the clothing and boot allowances are broken down into 3 categories:

- Uniforms/Clothing
- Boot Allowance
- Safety wear - Reflective/outdoor apparel/Personal Protective Equipment

**Uniforms**

Certain job functions require employees to wear clothing that will identify them as employees of the Town of Orangeville. As a result, a yearly (per calendar year) clothing allowance is provided to the following employees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Titles</th>
<th>Maximum Allowance</th>
<th>Items covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Parks and Recreation: Any full time employee position directly involved in the physical maintenance and operation of the recreation facilities and parks on a daily basis including the front line supervisor and Facilities Manager</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>Choose from short and long sleeved shirts/t-shirts/button downs, overalls, pants, shorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Works: Any full time employee position that is based at the Operation Centre on C-Line or the Water Pollution Control Plant and is involved in the physical maintenance of the Town infrastructure on a daily basis including front line supervisors, the mechanic and the Operations Manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Inspectors</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>Winter /spring jacket as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-Law Enforcement Officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All front line, customer facing Parks and Recreation staff, including Aquatics Supervisors and Programing staff</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>Based on requirements for position – may include: Short and long sleeved shirts/t-shirts/button downs, overalls, pants, shorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Titles</td>
<td>Maximum Allowance</td>
<td>Items covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguarding positions, Other aquatics positions that require the employee to be in the pool</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>Bathing suits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Fire Fighters – upon successful completion of probation will receive one dress uniform</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Volunteers receive on full regular uniform after probation After that: annually – 2 pieces of clothing;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Town Issued Clothing Standard**

- All clothing purchased must meet the Town’s corporate graphic standards when using the Town logo.
- There is no carryover of clothing allotment from one year to the next.
- New employees will receive a designated set of clothing as identified by the department as necessary to start work.
- Employee starting part way through a year will be granted a uniform allotment pro-rated based on the hire date.
- The Fire Chief, Deputy Chief and Fire Administrator will receive uniforms on an as needed basis.
- The Fire Chief, Deputy Chief and Fire Administrator will follow the Orangeville Professional Firefighter’s Association Agreement for dry cleaning.
- Clothing provided under this allowance must be worn only while the employees are fulfilling their job duties, or travelling to and from work. Employees must not wear Town identifiable clothing when they are not on duty.
- When wearing Town issued uniform/clothing it the outer layer of clothing that is worn by the employee must be the Town approved clothing. If there is a need for layering, those layers will be worn underneath the Town issued clothing.
- If wearing Town issued clothing while on duty is a condition of employment, failure to do so may result in progressive discipline.
- Shorts must meet the Town dress code and may be prohibited by management for safety reasons.
- Proper footwear for the job will be designated by department head or designate.
- Department Heads may provide further assistance based on special circumstance.
Boot Allowance
Effective January 1, 2015, the Town will contribute to the purchase of Canadian Safety Approved (CSA) safety footwear, including work boots, insulated work boots, insulated waterproof boots, and/or rubber boots as follows:

1. Up to $300 annually for employees in the following positions:
   - Parks and Recreation: Any full time employee position directly involved in the physical maintenance and operation of the recreation facilities and parks on a daily basis including the front line supervisor and Facilities Manager
   - Public Works: Any full time employee position that is based at the Operation Centre on C-Line or the Water Pollution Control Plant and is involved in the physical maintenance of the Town infrastructure on a daily basis including front line supervisors and the Operations Manager.

2. Up to $200 annually for employees in the following positions:
   - Building and By-Law, Maintenance employees
   - Public Works technicians and any other Public Works positions that involve participation in observation/inspection/follow up of Public Works projects outside the office

3. Up to $200 every second year for employees in the following positions:
   - Director and manager level positions in the Public Works, Parks and Recreation (except the Facilities Manager and Public Works Operation Manager), the Health and Safety Officer and Joint Health and Safety Committee members, if not already covered under their department position

4. Up to $100 every second year for Seasonal and Part time employees working in Public Works or Parks and Recreation whose positions have been identified by the department head, manager or supervisor as requiring safety footwear

Crossing Guards are entitled to a $75 winter boot allowance annually with a receipt and an inspection from their direct supervisor. Volunteer firefighters receive a new pair of boots every 3 years.

General
- Employees can use their boot allowance to purchase more than one pair of CSA approved footwear. Regular work boots, winter insulated work boots, waterproof and wet wear boots are included in this allowance.
- Boot design and style must be approved by the supervisor, manager or director of the department.
- Safety footwear purchased with assistance of the Town’s Boot allowance may not be worn outside working hours and must be left at the work facility upon completion of the work day.
- There is no carryover of boot allowance from one year to the next.
• The Fire Chief, Deputy Chief and Fire Administrator will receive uniforms on an as needed basis.
• Department Heads may provide further assistance based on special circumstance.

Safety Wear – Reflective/Outdoor/Personal Protective Equipment
Safety wear including, but not limited to, outdoor reflective jackets, winter parkas, overalls, insulated overalls, rain suits, and vests will be provided to employees on an as-needed basis and replaced as needed. Old Items must be returned in exchange for a new item. Ear protection, eye protection, hard hats, gloves will be provided on an as needed basis.

Termination and Repayment
If an employee leaves the Town before completing 3 months of employment, the cost of any safety footwear issued to them will be deducted from his/her final pay cheque. Fifty percent of the cost will be deducted if the period of employment is less than 6 but more than 3 months.
Purpose
The purpose of this report is to recommend that Council accept the proposal from Whispering Pines Landscaping for the supply and construction of the Amelia Street Trail and Boardwalk.

Background and Discussion
Council approved a capital project in 2013 to construct a trail from Amelia Street and Credit Meadows Trail to the west end of Orangeville District Secondary School Fields.

R.J. Burnside and Associates was retained by the Town to manage the project. A RFQ was released on July 7, 2014.

Seven proposals were received at R.J. Burnside and Associates at 2 p.m. on July 21, 2014. A closed opening was held at 87 Broadway at 3 p.m. on July 21, 2014. Councillor Jeremy Williams, Staff from Parks and Recreation, Treasury and representatives from R.J. Burnside were present for opening of the proposals.

The proposals were evaluated by a representative of R.J. Burnside. The proposal from Whispering Pines Landscaping met the requirements of the RFQ. Whispering Pines Landscaping is a local landscaping company based out of Orangeville with over 20 years of experience.

The bid from Whispering Pines Landscaping is $99,852.45. This price includes all provisional pricing and HST.

Financial Impact
The project was approved in the 2013 budget for $175,000.
Vision and Values
This report is in keeping with the Town’s vision and values in that it spends taxpayers’ money wisely and responsibly and provides exceptional recreational and leisure opportunities.

Recommendation

That, report PR-2014-12 dated July 23, 2014, be received;

And that, Council approve the proposal from Whispering Pines Landscaping;

And that, the Mayor and Clerk be authorized to enter into an agreement with Whispering Pines Landscaping as per the terms and conditions of the RFQ and their proposal;

And that, Staff be authorized to carry out any change orders required to complete this project within the allocated budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Ed Brennan
Director, Parks and Recreation

Attachments
1. Letter from R.J. Burnside and Associates
July 22, 2014

Via: Email

Charles Cosgrove  
Town of Orangeville  
275 Alder Street  
Orangeville ON L9W 5H6

Dear Mr. Cosgrove:

Re:  Amelia Street Trail & Boardwalk  
Town of Orangeville  
Project No.: 300033277.0000

Tenders for the above referenced project closed at the Town Hall at 2:00 p.m. on Monday, July 22, 2014. The project was advertised and placed on Biddingo.com. Twenty-four contractors picked up bid documents. Seven bids were received prior to the specified closing time. Tenders were opened after the tender period closed in the presence of Councillor Jeremy Williams, Town Staff and Peter Bruce.

Tenders were checked for mathematical errors and found to be correct.

The official total bid prices are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Bidder</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>HST</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whispering Pines</td>
<td>$88,365.00</td>
<td>$11,487.45</td>
<td>$99,852.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vertical Horizons Contracting</td>
<td>$96,439.13</td>
<td>$12,537.09</td>
<td>$108,976.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Garden Grove Landscaping</td>
<td>$109,848.00</td>
<td>$14,280.24</td>
<td>$124,128.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sunshine Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>$116,578.00</td>
<td>$15,155.14</td>
<td>$131,733.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pine Valley</td>
<td>$118,82.37</td>
<td>$17,381.91</td>
<td>$135,704.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Anthony Furlano Construction</td>
<td>$121,730.00</td>
<td>$15,824.90</td>
<td>$137,554.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dig-Con International Limited</td>
<td>$208,890.00</td>
<td>$27,155.70</td>
<td>$236,045.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the submitted bidders included the required supporting documentation as noted in the RFQ except Sunshine Design and Construction and Anthony Furlano who did not provide the material.

Whispering Pines is a well-known Orangeville contractor and has experience in similar projects. They are capable of satisfactorily completing this project.

We would recommend the contract be awarded to Whispering Pines at the price bid of $99,852.45 (includes the contingency and provisional allowance items and HST).

We trust this is satisfactory, however, please call should you have any questions.

Yours truly,

R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited

Peter Bruce
PB:hl
Meeting was called to Order at 10:30 a.m.

Councillor Campbell welcomed everyone and introduced today’s guest, Councillor Jeremy Williams.

Acceptance of Minutes
- The acceptance of the minutes from the previous meeting on May 13, 2014 was moved by Peter Roy. Carried.

Guest
- As an introduction to Councillor Williams’ comments, Councillor Campbell explained the Committee has been dealing with the issue of the lack of full service gas stations and have been in touch with the major petroleum companies regarding this concern. Their responses have been that if assistance was needed their staff would provide it, but it has been our experience that this is not so.

- Councillor Williams explained that a concern was brought to his attention by a member of the public related to full service gas stations and the lack thereof in the community for persons with limited mobility. Councillor Williams further added he has done some research and has started to meet with local gas stations to ask for their participation in a program that would assist persons who are unable to pump their own gas. The proposed program would include a logo that would be displayed at the pumps containing the universal wheelchair symbol and a gas pump symbol and those participating could add their own conditions to the signage (i.e days of week and times where the public could come into the station and be provided with full service at the pumps.)

Members discussed Councillor Williams’ proposal for full service pumps and would like to pursue the idea of full service times being available at local gas stations. Councillor Campbell and Mr. Douglas propose to meet with Councillor Williams and interested gas station operators to discuss the full service proposal further.
The Committee agreed to allocate funds in their budget should there be interest in this program.

This item will be added to the July agenda for follow up.

**Committee Members Items for Discussion**

- Members were provided with three styles of accessible picnic tables for review. Larry Rankin provided members with a table design which is made of recycled plastic, hexagon shape, fully accessible seats and is slightly cheaper. Members discussed pros and cons of all tables provided.

  Motion by Peter Roy to purchase the accessible picnic table design submitted by Larry Rankin. Carried.

  Larry will provide staff will all contact details for this accessible picnic table.

- Councillor Campbell updated members that she attended a meeting of Insight Intouch Dufferin. From this meeting, members brought forward concerns regarding transit, which included concerns in relation to the bus stop at Walmart and concerns of the additional step on the new bus. Councillor Campbell reported that Public Works has contacted the concerned resident and updated them as to the status/solutions of these issues.

- A member expressed concerns that there is not a bench located at the bus stop at the front of the hospital and that those waiting for the bus generally lean on the window ledge. Staff will follow up with Sarah Pihel in the Public Works Department and report back at the next meeting.

- Members reviewed drafts of the proposed commemorative signage for the Omni Spin Spinner, which the Committee is donating to Fendley Park in conjunction with the Town’s 150th birthday and the Rotary Club’s installation of a splash pad. Members requested that staff send copies of the draft signage to them by email in order to properly review. After discussion, members also suggested staff contact Parks and Recreation as well as the Rotary Club, to see what their plans are for signage at the splash pad and how we may be able to participate in signage with them.

- Councillor Campbell reported that she has spoken with staff at David Tilson’s office with respect to the Committee’s concerns with wheelchair tie down systems in vehicles and the next steps the Committee can take after CSA advised they do not feel they are the proper forum for the Committee’s concerns.

- Members were informed that the countdown signals are currently on hold until the Public Works Department secures a new contractor.

- Councillor Campbell reported she will be following up with the Director of Public Works to find out when the annual curb cut painting will be completed this year.

- Members reviewed and discussed the existing Committee logo and the proposed Access Orangeville logo.
It was moved by Sarah Murray that the Committee change its name to Access Orangeville and will request that Council ratify this. Carried.

Staff will contact Sheila Duncan to discuss what changes could be made to include the Town’s logo and the draft Access Orangeville logo and report back at the next meeting.

Councillor Williams departed at 11:43 am.

New Business
- Committee members agreed on the wording for July’s tip of the month, as follows:

  Please ensure that your summer activities or your storage of recreational vehicles does not impede any pedestrian’s ability to pass safely.

- Update on Transit Committee. Peter Roy reported that there is no current update.

- Update on Recreation Committee. Sarah Murray reported that there is no current update.

- Update on Trailway Committee. Larry Rankin reported that there is no current update. Councillor Campbell reported that Council accepted the Trailways Committee report at last night’s Council meeting.

- Carrie Cunningham updated members on the budget. It was moved by Larry Rankin that the Committee allocate $500 of budget funds to be used for the full service gas station program. Carried.

  It was moved by Larry Rankin that the Committee purchase two additional picnic tables from this year’s budget, when purchasing the one table which was accrued from last year’s budget. These tables will be placed in Fendley Park, Every Kids Park and Alexandra Park. Carried.

- Members requested that staff follow up with Sheila Duncan regarding the partnering logo for the Access Orangeville program.

To Do List
Current To-Do-List was reviewed and updated.

It was moved by Peter Roy that the meeting be adjourned at 12:00 p.m. Carried.

Next Meeting:
Tuesday, July 8, 2014
Lower Committee Room – Town Hall
10:30 a.m. – noon
Attendees:
Councillor Sylvia Bradley, Chair
John French, Committee Member
Gary Kocialek, Committee Member
Rick Clark, By-law Enforcement Officer
Carrie Cunningham, By-law Enforcement Officer
Vern Douglas, Director of Building and By-law

Regrets:
Len Tucker, Appellant

Meeting was called to order at 4:45 pm.

Members were brought up to date by staff as to the status of the Order issued against 36 Karen Court dated September 11, 2013. Staff informed the Committee that Mr. Len Tucker was unavailable to attend as his job requires him to work long hours out of Town and currently will not be home until Friday. Mr. Tucker requested that the Committee proceed in his absence and forwarded an email to staff that was presented before the Committee explaining why he is requesting an extension.

Members reviewed Mr. Tucker’s email and also received further information from staff that Mr. Tucker had explained in a telephone conversation that he is currently in his busiest time at work and is working all the hours he can before business slows down at the end of November, at which time, he would be laid off, allowing him more time to deal with having to sell or find an alternate location to park the vehicle. Mr. Tucker is currently trying to sell the vehicle and has placed ads in the Toronto Sun and on Kijiji.

The Committee agreed to extend the Order to Remedy dated September 11, 2013 until Friday, November 1, 2013. A letter confirming the Committee’s decision will be forwarded to the appellant.

Acceptance of Minutes

Motion made by John French to accept the minutes from the August 22, 2013 meeting. CARRIED.

Review of Files

Rick and Carrie proceeded to update the Committee on current active property standards files. Pictures were shown to the Committee and questions were answered by Staff.
Other Business

Councillor Bradley advised the Committee that the emerald ash borer has been identified in Town and proceeded to update members on the measures being taken to identify ash trees that could potentially be affected.

Motion made by John French to adjourn the meeting at 5:25 pm. CARRIED.

Councillor Sylvia Bradley

Next Meeting:
At the call of the Chair
Present:

Public Members
Liz Harding Larry Rankin Barb Rankin
Wayne Donnelly Brian Wormington

Regrets
Councillor Jeremy Williams

Staff
Ed Brennan, Director, Parks and Recreation
Karen Hunt, Facilities Co-ordinator

1. Call to Order
The Trailway Committee meeting was called to order by Acting Chair L. Harding at 5 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda
The agenda was approved as presented.

   Moved by: B. Wormington

   THAT, the agenda for April 15, 2014 be approved as presented.
   Carried

3. Approval of Previous Minutes
The minutes of September 11, 2013 were approved.

   Moved by: L. Rankin

   THAT, the minutes of the Trailway Committee meeting held on September 11, 2013 be approved.
   Carried

4. New Business
4.1 New Subdivisions
The trail placement south of Spencer in the Riddell Road subdivision was discussed. The Developer has stated that that he does not want to put a trail in behind the housing to the south of Spencer, leading to the run-off pond. The trail is planned in the area behind the
housing to the north of Spencer. Instead, the Developer expects that the sidewalk would be used from that point.

The Committee strongly recommends that a path should be constructed behind the existing and proposed housing development southwest of Spencer, to line up with the storm water management pond.

4.2 Montgomery Village Seniors Centre – trail linkage

The Committee thought that there could be a connecting trail to link the senior’s centre north to the existing trail system on the west side of Riddell. It was suggested that the Trailway Committee could inquire of the Montgomery Village residents’ to see what the resident’s wishes may be. There is a path that enables residents to get to the Daisy Mart from the Centre.

Moved by: B. Wormington

That, the Trailway Committee meet with the Montgomery Village Seniors Centre to discuss future plans for trail linkages to connect with the trailway system, as well as the planting of trees in that area.

Carried

4.3 Trails Master Plan - review

In conjunction with the consultant for the Parks Master Plan, it is suggested that the Trails Master Plan should be updated. It was felt that the plan should be reviewed, but should wait until after the election for a formal review. The Development Charge study is being conducted at present as well. The Committee supported suggestions for improvements to the existing trailways, without opening the Trails Master Plan at this point in time. There followed a discussion regarding the surfaces of trails; it was felt that as long as the drainage is adequately addressed, that it was not necessarily a requirement that the trails are paved. The trails need to be accessible for wheelchairs, not for rollerblades, for instance.

5. Business Arising

5.1 Trails signage

This item was discussed with regard to the Town’s way finding project. There is a public meeting scheduled regarding the tree sculpture walk. The Committee felt that this item should be deferred until Chair Williams is in attendance.

5.2 Trails promotion

It was suggested that the Committee could be in attendance at certain events, including the tree planting at Montgomery Village Seniors Centre, or at the location of the barbeque.
5.3 **Update on trails projects**

The boardwalk at Bredin Park is designed, and once weather permits, construction and paving will begin.

Staff met with CVC last week, and the location of the trailway between Centre St. and Bythia has been approved, on the south side of the parking lot and the south side of the seniors centre building.

The north trail on Amelia St. has been approved with some minor changes. The south trail connecting Amelia St. with Blind Line is still in question. CVC has some remaining concerns regarding the numbers of users and the wetlands, and would like the usage monitored for a year. The Town would like to move forward and will work with the CVC on this.

The trail from Centre Street to Dawson is also still being reviewed by the CVC. They are not in favour of a bridge at that location due to the wetlands, and would the Town to propose how the trails may be connected to the west.

The feasibility study to look at trail linkages proposed in the 2014 budget may be achievable through funds from other trails projects.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

_________________________________   _______________________________
Liz Harding, Acting Chair                Alison Postma, Committee Secretary
The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville

By-law Number___________

A by-law to confirm the proceedings of the Corporation of the Town of Orangeville at its special and regular meeting held on July 14, 2014.

Whereas Section 5 (1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, as amended, provides that the powers of a municipal corporation shall be exercised by its council;

And whereas Section 5 (3) of the Municipal Act, 2001, as amended, provides that municipal powers shall be exercised by by-law;

Be it therefore enacted by the municipal Council of The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville as follows:

1. That all actions of the Council of The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville at its special and regular meeting held on July 14, 2014, with respect to every report, motion, by-law, or other action passed and taken by the Council, including the exercise of natural person powers, are hereby adopted, ratified and confirmed as if all such proceedings were expressly embodied in this or a separate by-law.

2. That the Mayor and Clerk are authorized and directed to do all the things necessary to give effect to the action of the Council of The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville referred to in the preceding section.

3. That the Mayor and the Clerk are authorized and directed to execute all documents necessary in that behalf and to affix thereto the seal of The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville.

Passed in open Council this 11th day of August, 2014.

_________________________
Rob Adams, Mayor

_________________________
Susan Greatrix, Clerk
The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville

By-law Number __________

A by-law to authorize a temporary road closure and Parking restrictions (August 15-17, 2014 – Taste of Orangeville)

Whereas the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, c.25, S.11, authorizes a municipality to pass by-laws respecting matters within the jurisdiction of highways;

And whereas Council wishes to temporarily close sections of municipal roads and lanes to accommodate a community event;

Be it therefore enacted by the municipal Council of the Corporation of the Town of Orangeville as follows:

1. That to accommodate the Taste of Orangeville event, the following sections of streets/lanes be closed to vehicular traffic from Friday, August 15 at 10 a.m. to Sunday, August 17, 2014 at 12 noon:
   - The left turn lane westbound on Broadway to Mill Street
   - The right turn lane eastbound on Broadway to Mill Street
   - Mill Street from Broadway to Armstrong/Little York Streets

2. That parking be prohibited on the above noted section of Mill Street for the duration of the closure.

Passed in open Council this 11th day of August, 2014.

__________________________
Rob Adams, Mayor

__________________________
Susan Greatrix, Clerk
The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville

By-law Number ______________

A by-law to authorize a lending agreement with TD Canada Trust for the amount of $600,000 principal.

Whereas the Town wishes to fund a portion of the cost of reconstructing the arena floor at Tony Rose Arena through debt financing;

And whereas the Town issued at Request for Quotation for Term Debt—Tony Rose Arena Floor Project;

And whereas Council received report TF-2014-29 in which the Treasurer stated that TD Canada Trust Commercial Banking submitted the most favourable response for the provision of term debt;

And whereas the interest rate will be fixed at the time that the loan agreement receives authorization;

Be it therefore enacted by the municipal council of The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville as follows:

1. That the Treasurer be authorized to enter into a lending agreement with TD Canada Trust for the amount of $600,000 principal.

Passed in open Council this 11th day of August, 2014.

______________________________
Rob Adams, Mayor

______________________________
Susan Greatrix, Clerk
The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville

By-law Number ______________

A by-law to Establish Development Charges for Town Wide and Area Specific Services

Whereas the Development Charges Act, 1997 (the “Act”) provides that the council of a municipality may by By-law impose development charges against land to pay for increased capital costs required because of increased needs for services;

And Whereas a development charge background study has been completed in accordance with the Act;

And Whereas the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Orangeville (the “Council”) has given notice of the proposed development charges by-law and development charge background study and held a public meeting on the 14th day of July, 2014 and has heard all persons who applied to be heard and considered all submissions in accordance with the Act and the regulations thereto;

And Whereas the Council has by Resolution determined in accordance with section 12 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, that no further public meetings were required;

And Whereas the Council had before it a development charge background study entitled “The Town of Orangeville 2014 Development Charges Background Study” by Watson & Associates Economists Ltd., dated June 30, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as the “Study”), wherein it is indicated that the development of certain lands within an area of the Town of Orangeville will increase the need for the services as defined herein;

And Whereas the Council on August 11th, 2014 received the Study, pursuant to the Development Charges Act, 1997 and have thereafter indicated its intent by Resolution that it intends to ensure that the increase in the need for services attributable to the anticipated development will be met;

Be it therefore enacted by the municipal council of The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville as follows:
1. Definitions:

In this By-law, the following items shall have the corresponding meanings:


2) “accessory use” means a use of land, a building or a structure which is naturally and normally incidental and subordinate in purpose and/or floor area, and exclusively devoted to, the principal use of such land, building or structure;

3) “apartment unit” means any residential dwelling unit within a building containing three or more dwelling units where access to each residential unit is obtained through a common entrance or entrances from the street level and the residential units are connected by an interior corridor;

4) “assembly plant” means a building to which parts for consumer goods are delivered, stores, and assembled into consumer goods and shipped.

5) “bedroom” means a habitable room larger than seven square meters, including a den, study or other similar area, but does not include a living room, dining room or kitchen;

6) “benefiting area” means an area defined by a map, plan or legal description in a front-ending agreement as referred to under Section 44 of the Act as an area that will receive a benefit from the construction of a service;

7) “board of education” has the same meaning as set out in Section 1(1) of the Education Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.E2, as amended or any successor thereof;


9) “commercial use” means all the commercial uses permitted by Zoning By-law number 22-90 of the Town, as amended or any successor thereof;

10) “council” means the council of the town;
11) “development” means the construction, erection or placing of one or more buildings or structures on land or the making of an addition or alteration to a building or structure that has the effect of increasing the size or usability thereof, and includes redevelopment;

12) “development charge” means a charge imposed pursuant to this By-law;

13) “dwelling unit” means any part of a building or structure used, designed or intended to be used as a domestic establishment in which one or more persons may sleep and are provided with culinary and sanitary facilities for their exclusive use; or in the case of a special care/special needs dwelling as defined in this By-law, a room or suite of rooms comprising a single housekeeping unit, used, designed or intended for use by, one person with our without exclusive sanitary and/or culinary facilities or more than one person if sanitary facilities are directly connected and exclusively accessible to more than one room or suite of rooms;

14) “grade” means the average level of finished ground adjoining a building or structure at all exterior walls;

15) “gross floor area” means;

   a) in the case of a residential building or structure, the total area of all floors above grade of a dwelling unit measured between the outside surfaces of exterior walls or between the outside surfaces of exterior walls and the centre line of party walls dividing the dwelling unit from any other dwelling unit or other portion of a building; and

   b) in the case of a non-residential building or structure, or in the case of a mixed-use building or structure in respect of the non-residential portion thereof, the total area of all building floors above or below grade measured between the outside surfaces of the exterior walls, or between the outside surfaces of exterior walls and the centre line of party walls dividing a non-residential use and a residential use;

16) “industrial use” means all of the industrial uses permitted by Zoning By-law number 22-90 of the Town as amended or any successor thereof;
17) “institutional use” means all of the institutional uses permitted by Zoning By-law number 22-90 of the Town as amended or any successor thereof, but does not include a religious institution or cemetery;

18) “local board” has the same meaning as in the ACT:

19) “local services” means those services, facilities or things which are under the jurisdiction of the municipality and are related to an application for consent or to a plan of subdivision or within the area to which the plan relates and are to be installed or paid for by the owner as a condition of approval under Sections 51 or 53 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, as amended, or any successor thereof;

20) “mobile home” means any dwelling that is designed to be made mobile, and constructed or manufactured to provide a permanent residence for one or more persons, but does not include a travel trailer or tent trailer;

21) “multiple dwelling” means all dwellings other than single-detached, semi-detached and apartment unit dwellings;

22) “municipality” means the Corporation of the Town of Orangeville;

23) “net developable hectare” means a buildable hectare of land but shall not include public highways, private roads (other than driveways) which are designed for the circulation of traffic in the same manner as public highways, and lands defined as hazard lands.

24) “non-residential use” means a building or structure of any kind whatsoever used, designed or intended to be used for other than residential use;

25) “owner” means the owner of land or a person who has made application for an approval for the development of land upon which a development charge is imposed;

26) “place of worship” means that part of a building or structure and land used in connection therewith that is exempt from taxation as a place of worship under Section 3, paragraph 3 of the Assessment Act R.S.O. 1990, c.A.31, as amended, or successor thereof;

27) “regulation” means any regulation made pursuant to The Act;
28) “residential use” means land or buildings or structures of any kind whatsoever used, designed or intended to be used as living accommodations for one or more individuals;

29) “row house” means a free-standing building containing three or more dwelling units having a common wall between each two adjacent dwelling units having at least two private entrances;

30) “semi-detached dwelling” means a dwelling unit in a residential building consisting of two dwelling units having one vertical wall or one horizontal wall, but no other parts, attached or another dwelling unit where the residential units are not connected by an interior corridor;

31) “service” means a service designated in Schedule “A” to this By-law, and “services” shall have a corresponding meaning;

32) “servicing agreement” means an agreement between a landowner and the municipality relative to the provision of municipal services to specified lands within the municipality;

33) “single detached dwelling unit” means a residential building consisting of one dwelling unit and not attached to another structure and includes a mobile home;

34) “Town” means The Corporation of the Town of Orangeville;

35) “townhouse” has the same meaning as row house;

36) “warehouse” means a building to which goods of every nature are delivered, stored and from which such goods are shipped when storage is no longer required;

2. Designation of Services

2.1 It is hereby declared by the Council of the Town that all development of land within the Town will increase the need for services.

2.2 Once this By-law is in force, the development charge applicable to a development as determined under this By-law shall apply without regard to the services required or used by any individual development.

2.3 Development charges shall be imposed for the following categories of services to pay for the increased capital costs required because of increased need for services arising from development;
a) Roads and Related;
b) Fire Protection Services;
c) Police Services;
d) Transit;
e) Municipal Parking;
f) Parks and Recreation;
g) Library Services;
h) Administration – Studies;
i) Wastewater;
j) Water;
k) Area Specific Roads
l) Area Specific Water;
m) Area Specific Wastewater; and
n) Area Specific Stormwater Management

2.4 The components of the services designated in section 2.3 are described in Schedule A.

3. Application of By-law Rules

3.1 For the purpose of complying with section 6 of the Act

1. The rules developed under paragraph 9 of subsection 5(1) of The Act for determining if a development charge is payable in any particular case and for determining the amount of the charge shall be as set forth in section 3.2 through 3.12 of this By-law;

2. The exemptions provided for by such rules shall be the exemptions set forth in section 3.7 and 3.8 of this By-law, and the indexing of charges shall be in accordance within section 3.6 of this By-law;

3. Determining the development changes payable on the redevelopment of land shall be in accordance with the rules set forth in section 3.9 of this By-law;

4. The area to which this By-law applies shall be the area described in section 3.2 of this By-law;

Lands Affected

3.2 Subject to the conditions and limitations contained herein, this By-law applies to all lands located within the Town of Orangeville.
Application

3.3

1) Development charges shall apply to lands to be developed with;
   a) residential dwelling units,
   b) commercial buildings,
   c) institutional buildings,
   d) industrial buildings

2) In the case of a development containing more than one use as in subsection 1), development charges payable shall be the total of development charges for each use.

3) Development Charges imposed on a special care/special needs unit shall be payable at the rate applicable to a bachelor and one apartment unit.

Approvals Subject to Development Charges

3.4

1) Subject to subsection (2) a development charge shall be calculated, paid and collected in accordance with the provisions of this by-law, where the development requires;
   a) the passing of a zoning By-law or of an amendment to a zoning By-law under section 34 of the Planning Act;
   b) the approval of a minor variance under section 45 of the Planning Act;
   c) a conveyance of land to which a By-law passed under subsection 50(7) of the Planning Act applies;
   d) the approval of a plan of subdivision under section 51 of the Planning Act;
   e) a consent under section 53 of the Planning Act;
   f) a consent under section 53 of the Planning Act;
   g) the approval of a description under section 50 of the Condominium Act; or
   h) the issuing of a permit under the Building Code Act, in relation to a building or structure.

2) Subsection (1) shall not apply in respect of local services to be installed or paid as a condition of approval under Section 51 and 53 of the Planning Act;
3) Nothing in this by-law prevents Council from requiring, as a condition of an agreement under Sections 51 or 53 of the Planning Act, that the owner, at his or her own expense, shall install or pay for such Local Services, as Council may require.

**Imposition of Development Charges**

3.5
Subject to section 3.6, 3.7, 3.8 and 3.9, the development charges set forth in Schedule “B” hereto shall be imposed, without phasing in, on all lands within the Town of Orangeville.

**Indexing**

3.6
Development charges imposed pursuant to this By-law shall be adjusted annually, without amendment to this By-law, commencing on the first anniversary date of this By-law and each anniversary date thereafter while this by-law is in force in accordance with the prescribed index in The Act.

**Exemptions for Intensification of Existing Housing**

3.7
1) Development charges against land to be developed for residential use shall not apply in respect of the creation of;
   
   a) an enlargement to an existing dwelling unit;
   b) one or two additional dwelling units in an existing single-detached dwelling; or
   c) one additional dwelling unit in any other existing residential building.

2) Notwithstanding subsection 1)b), development charges shall be collected if the total gross floor area of the additional unit or units is greater than the total gross floor area of the existing dwelling unit.

3) Notwithstanding subsection 1)c), development charges shall be collected if the additional unit has a gross floor area greater than,
   
   a) in the case of a semi-detached or row house, the gross floor area of the existing dwelling unit; and
   b) in the case of any other residential building, the gross floor area of the smallest dwelling unit contained in the residential building.
Other Exemptions

3.8

1) No land, except land owned by and used for the purposes of a Board of Education, a municipality or a local board thereof is exempt from a development charge by reason only that it is exempt from taxation under Section 3 of the Assessment Act.

2) Notwithstanding subsection 1), this By-law shall not apply to land that is used for the purposes of:

   a) cemetery;
   b) a place of worship, or;
   c) other uses as set out in Schedule D to this by-law.

3) If a development includes the enlargement of the gross floor area of an existing industrial building, the amount of the development charge that is payable in respect of the enlargement will be determined as follows:

   a) If the gross floor area is enlarged by 50% or less, the amount of the development charge in respect of the enlargement is zero; and
   b) If the gross floor area is enlarged by more than 50%, the amount of the development charge in respect of the enlargement is the amount of the development charge that would otherwise be payable multiplied by the fraction determined as follows:

(1). Determine the amount by which the enlargement in gross floor area exceeds 50% of the gross floor area in existence at the time of the building permit application; and
(2). Divide the amount determined under paragraph (i) by the amount of the enlargement.

Redevelopment

3.9

1) If an existing building is demolished and replaced with a new building(s), a credit shall be given against the development charge otherwise payable pursuant to this By-law for the demolished building, the credit to be an amount equal to the development charge that would be applied to the demolished building if it were being developed as anew building with the use of the demolished building determined as its most recent legal use before the
demolition, and the credit being calculated based on the applicable development charge for that use as of the date on which the development charge is payable for the new building(s) in accordance with Schedule “B” to this By-law.

2) If an existing building or a portion of an existing building is converted to another use, a credit shall be given against the development charge otherwise payable pursuant to this By-law for the converted building or portion of building, the credit to be an amount equal to the development charge that would be applied to the converted building or the converted portion of building if it were being developed as a new building with the use of the building or portion of building determined as its most recent legal use before the conversion took place, and the credit being calculated based on the applicable development charge for that use as of the date on which the development charge is payable for the conversion of the building in accordance with Schedule “B” to this By-law.

3) Notwithstanding subsection 1), the credit described therein shall apply provided that a building permit is issued within two years of the date of issue of a permit for demolition.

4) In no case shall the credit described in subsections 1) and 2) exceed the total development charges payable for the new or converted building(s).

Timing and Calculation of Payment

3.10 Subject to the provisions of this by-law, development charges shall be calculated, paid and collected at the rates as set out in Schedule “B” to this by-law.

3.11

1) The development charge shall be payable on the date a permit is issued under the Building Code Act, in relation to a building or structure on land to which the development charge applies. No building permits shall be issued by the Town for the construction of any building or structure on land to which a development charge applied until the applicable development charges has been paid in full to the Town.

2) Notwithstanding subsection 1), the Corporation may enter into an agreement with any person who is required to pay a development charge providing for all or any part of the development charge to be paid before it would otherwise be payable.
3) The total amount of a development charge payable under an agreement pursuant to subsection 2) is the amount of the development charge that would be determined under this By-law on the date specified in the agreement or, if no such date is specified, at the earlier of:

a) the time the development charge or any part of it is payable under the agreement;

b) the time the development charge would be payable in the absence of the agreement.

4) If the Corporation enters into an agreement under subsection 2), the Corporation may charge interest, at a rate stipulated in the agreement, on that part of the development charge paid after it would otherwise be payable.

5) All development charges shall be calculated as of the date upon which they are payable, unless otherwise specified in an agreement under subsection 2).

6) Notwithstanding subsection 1), the Corporation may, by agreement, allow a person to perform work that relates to a service to which this By-law relates, and give the person a credit towards the payment of development charges in accordance with the agreement, the amount of the credit to be determined in accordance with the Act.

7) Notwithstanding subsection 1), the Corporation may enter into a front-ending agreement under the Act that relates to the services to which this By-law relates.

Unpaid Charges

3.12. If a development charge of any part of it remains unpaid after it is payable, the amount unpaid shall be added to the tax roll and shall be collected in the same manner as taxes.

3.13 Where any unpaid Development Charges are collected as taxes, the monies so collected shall be credited to a Development Charge reserve fund.

4. Headings For Reference Only

The headings inserted in this By-law are for convenience of reference only and shall not affect the construction or interpretation of this By-law.
5. **Severability**

If, for any reason, any provision, section, subsection or paragraph of this By-law is held to be invalid, it is hereby declared to be the intention of Council that all of the remainder of this By-law shall continue in full force and effect until repealed, re-enacted or amended, in whole or in part or dealt with in any other way.

6. **Date By-law In Force**

This by-law shall come into force and effect at 12:01 a.m. on ____________, 2014.

7. **By-law Repeal**

On the effective date of this by-law the By-laws 78-2009, 79-2009, 80-2009, 81-2009, and 82-2009 are thereby repealed.

8. **Transfer of Credit**

As provided for in subsection 41(2) of the Act, a credit under any other by-law enacted by the Council, pursuant to the Act, may be used, subject to the discretion of the Council, against any Development Charge imposed by this By-law.

9. **By-Law Registration**

A certified copy of this by-law may be registered on title to any land to which this by-law applies.

10. **Schedules to the By-Law**

The following Schedules to this by-law form an integral part of this by-law:

- Schedule A - Schedule of Designated Municipal Services
- Schedule B - Schedule of Development Charges
- Schedule C - Schedule of Lands to which Area Specific Charges Apply
- Schedule D - Exemption Provisions

11. **Short Title**

The by-law may be cited as the Town of Orangeville Development Charge By-law

Passed in open Council this 11th day of August, 2014.

__________________________
Rob Adams, Mayor

__________________________
Susan Greatrix, Clerk