



IBI Group
5th Floor – 230 Richmond Street West
Toronto ON M5V 1V6 Canada
tel 416 596 1930
fax 416 596 0644

Memorandum

To/Attention	Guelph DC Team	Date	July 24, 2013
From	Audrey Jacob	Project No	33974
cc	Bob Stratford	Steno	aj
Subject	Guelph DC 2014 - General information, Police, Fire, Ambulance, Traffic, Rolling Stock, Depots & Domes, Parks & Recreation, Library		

General

1. Please provide the details of the reserve fund to cross check the line entries in the growth related capital sheets.
2. Please review the timing of some of the 10 year capital projects; the header notes 2013-2031 but the timing in some instances identifies 2032.

Fire

3. What is the basis of the 26 / 74 res / non-res split? In the 2008 DC the split was 63 / 37.
4. The capital program shows a Fire Training Facility at 2023? Please provide details of this project. It is my understanding that a facility has been built. Has Council committed to the 2023 Fire Training Facility? Please provide documentation.
5. Please provide information on the South End Facility principal and interest entries.
6. The Aerial vehicle is identified at a cost of \$1.6 million; the City's 10 year Capital Budget identifies such a vehicle as \$1.3 million. Please explain the discrepancy.
7. In 2008, the DC identified a pumper vehicle at a cost of \$550,000; the 2014 estimate is \$1.352 million. Please explain the cost discrepancy.

Police

8. Headquarter renovations and expansion – please provide information on project including need. How were the growth related shares determined? PPB? BTE?
9. With respect to the joint training facility, similar to the Fire Training Facility at 2023, please provide details of this project.
10. The proposed police detachments capital program is \$9.3 million exceeds the maximum funding envelope calculated at \$8.9 million.

Ambulance – no questions

Traffic – no questions

Rolling Stock – no questions

Guelph DC Team – July 24, 2013

Depots & Domes

11. In the 2008 DC the Operations Main Building was identified as 3,367 sf; please explain the current entry of 30,000 sf.
12. The Annex Building at 50 Municipal Street was previously identified as having an area of 3,491 sf; now the building is identified as comprising 37,000 sf. Please explain.
13. Please explain the Community Services Entry.
14. Please describe the PW and Engineering Administration entry of 13,370 sf. Where is this located?
15. Please provide documentation / information on the capital program to ascertain level of City commitment and details (i.e., location, cost, size)

Parking

16. Please explain the change from the 2008 DC background study to the proposed capital program in terms of the BTE, PPB and growth related share of the two parkades.
17. Are the parkades in the capital budget? If yes, please provide documentation.
18. In the review of the 2008 DC Background study a parking study was provided in support of the municipal parking facilities. That study referenced that the need for the parking facilities was related predominantly to City Hall, library, shoppers/tourists. Has a new study been carried out?

Parks and Recreation

19. Please provide the details of the remaining phases of the Southend Community Park. Is it possible to get a summary of the phases of the park to put it in context?
20. Please provide basis of Guelph Trails costing, Kortright East costing
21. The Dallon and Pergola properties were included in the 2008 DC at significantly lower costs. Please provide an explanation regarding these projects and their associated costs.
22. Please explain the significant cost increase in the following:
 - a. Kortright Sports Complex
 - b. Kortright East Neighbourhood Park
 - c. York Open Space Development
23. Please explain the basis of the attribution between PPB, BTE and growth share for the South End Community Centre.
24. Please explain why the Victoria Road Expansion/Renovation is included in this service category.

Library

25. Please provide details of the library capital program in terms of location, size, purpose. Also please provide the rationale for the attribution to growth, BTE and PPB.

October 31, 2013

To: Robert Stratford and Audrey Jacobs

From: Sarah Purton, City of Guelph

**RE: Guelph DC 2014 - General information, Police, Fire, Ambulance, Traffic,
Rolling Stock, Depots & Domes, Parks & Recreation, Library**

Please find enclosed the City's responses to your memo dated July 24, 2013.

City Hall
1 Carden St
Guelph, ON
Canada
N1H 3A1

T 519-822-1260
TTY 519-826-9771

guelph.ca

General

1. Please provide the details of the reserve fund to cross check the line entries in the growth related capital sheets. **Please see attached. Note that the schedule has been adjusted to include potential OMB settlements.**
2. Please review the timing of some of the 10 year capital projects; the header notes 2013-2031 but the timing in some instances identifies 2032. **Watson and Associates has corrected this.**

Fire

3. What is the basis of the 26 / 74 res / non-res split? In the 2008 DC the split was 63 / 37. **This has been corrected to 60 / 40 res / non-res split similarly to the correction to Stormwater based on the population to employment forecast through to 2031(discussed at the August 1st meeting in response to question Sec D(b)).**
4. The capital program shows a Fire Training Facility at 2023? Please provide details of this project. It is my understanding that a facility has been built. Has Council committed to the 2023 Fire Training Facility? Please provide documentation.

The present training compound and live fire training trailer are meant to help achieve a minimum amount of training while we plan and wait for a proper facility.

The facility identified in the DC Background Study will result in the creation of a joint emergency services and police training facility would allow for onsite emergency services training in the areas of driver training, firearms range training, classroom training and fire training. This facility will also provide other City departments a facility to utilize for classroom training. An estimate has been forecasted at this time, but a facilities assessment would need to be completed to better understand the costs and functionality of the proposed facility. The location and size of the building is not known at this time. It is getting more difficult and costly to find land for training areas.

5. Please provide information on the South End Facility principal and interest entries. **Please see attached. Please note that interest payments included on the capital sheets are discounted by 2% annually.**
6. The Aerial vehicle is identified at a cost of \$1.6 million; the City's 10 year Capital Budget identifies such a vehicle as \$1.3 million. Please explain the discrepancy.

The City's 2013 capital budget reflected replacing the aerial vehicle based on the old service delivery which utilized a heavy duty aerial. Upon review of our needs through the update of the DC Background Study, it was determined that intensification is driving the need for a more agile vehicle. As such, the 2014 DC Background study reflects the cost of purchasing a light duty, rapid response single axle pumper aerial. The revised cost will be reflected in the City's 2014 capital budget.

7. In 2008, the DC identified a pumper vehicle at a cost of \$550,000; the 2014 estimate is \$1.352 million. Please explain the cost discrepancy.

The 2008 Study identified a pumper at a cost of \$550,000. The 2014 study has identified the need for a pumper/aerial to service growth at a cost of \$1.352

million. These are different vehicles. Due to increased growth, studies such as the Growth Management Study and Downtown Secondary Plan we have had to plan / strategize for the future to enable us to meet the future needs of the community and allow us to respond and carry out rescues without increasing staffing. This new vehicle (pumper/aerial) would replace the pumper while completing all pumper tasks and be able to gain access to all the restrictive streets and be able to elevate up to 100'. These are long service vehicles.

Police

8. Headquarter renovations and expansion – please provide information on project including need. How were the growth related shares determined? PPB? BTE?

Headquarters Renovation & Expansion	Existing sq. ft.	Additional sq. ft.	Total sq. ft.		
Level 1	23,745	5,576	29,321		
Level 2	19,999	5,317	25,316		
Level 3	20,398	18,180	38,578		
Level 4	2,605	18,180	20,785		
Addition over East Wing		3,599	3,599		
Total	66,747	50,852	117,599		
Growth/Non-Growth Share for Building	57%	43%	100%		
	Gross Cost	Existing Benefit		Growth Benefit	
Total Cost	34,000,000				
Building	29,900,000	57%	16,970,683	43%	12,929,317
Parking based on 82 spaces at \$50,000/space*	4,100,000	6%	246,400	94%	3,853,600
			17,217,083		16,782,917

* Existing Parking based on 44 existing surface spaces at \$5,600 each (Total \$246,400 existing value = 6% of total new costs)

9. With respect to the joint training facility, similar to the Fire Training Facility at 2023, please provide details of this project.

The creation of a joint emergency services and police training facility would allow for onsite emergency services training in the areas of driver training, firearms range training, classroom training and fire training. This facility will also provide other City departments a facility to utilize for classroom training. An estimate has been forecasted at this time, but a facilities assessment would need to be completed to better understand the costs and functionality of the proposed facility. The location and size of the building is not known at this time. It is getting more difficult and costly to find training areas.

10. The proposed police detachments capital program is \$9.3 million exceeds the maximum funding envelope calculated at \$8.9 million.

The difference between the \$9.3 million and the \$8.9 million is the interest on the growth related debt.

Ambulance – no questions

Traffic – no questions

Rolling Stock – no questions

Depots & Domes

11. In the 2008 DC the Operations Main Building was identified as 3,367 sf; please explain the current entry of 30,000 sf. **2008 Background Study used square meters in error. 2013 uses square feet (see table below).**
12. The Annex Building at 50 Municipal Street was previously identified as having an area of 3,491 sf; now the building is identified as comprising 37,000 sf. Please explain. **2008 Background Study used square meters in error. 2013 uses square feet (see table below)**

Location	2008 Background Study (Area in meters)	2008 Background Study converted to feet	2013 Background Study as per Bill Bar (feet)
45 Municipal	3,367	36,242	35,483
50 Municipal	3,491	37,577	37,000

13. Please explain the Community Services Entry. **The name has been changed. This was the space PW and Engineering Staff occupied prior to the New City Hall being constructed.**
14. Please describe the PW and Engineering Administration entry of 13,370 sf. Where is this located? **This is the space PW and Engineering staff occupy at City Hall.**
15. Please provide documentation / information on the capital program to ascertain level of City commitment and details (i.e., location, cost, size)
 - a. **GG0208 Municipal St Bldg Expansion: The corporate Fleet has out grown the size of its repair facility. It is becoming increasingly difficult to efficiently service the fleet with current space. Fleet services have made operations changes in recent years in an attempt to get full utilization the existing facility, including the introduction of a third (midnight) shift to distribute work over as much of 24 hour period as possible. However we are still finding there is insufficient space in the current shop foot print**
 - b. **GG0016 Processing Facility and Fleet Repair South End 2025 and 2028: This project is to fund facilities/buildings to provide service to the south end of the City and would include facilities to house/store and process sand, salt and brine. The project would also include a repair facility to service vehicles and equipment operating out this yard. As the City grows it will become less and less efficient to operate out of the single facility now located at 45 Municipal Street.**

Parking

16. Please explain the change from the 2008 DC background study to the proposed capital program in terms of the BTE, PPB and growth related share of the two parkades.

Please note that a revised schedule will be included for parking adjusting the timing of projects due to preliminary findings from the Parking Master Plan (see attached). In terms of BTE, PPB, Growth:

- a. BTE – the calculation is based on the number of parking spaces being replaced at each of the parkades. Both Wilson and Baker are currently parking lots.
 - b. PPB – the post period benefit represents consideration that excess capacity will be created due to the timing of the project and the number of new spaces being created as a result of the construction of the parkade.
 - c. Growth – the calculation is based on the number of new spaces being created as a result of the structure moving from a lot to a multi-level parkade.
17. Are the parkades in the capital budget? If yes, please provide documentation.

No, the parkades are not currently in the City's capital budget.

18. In the review of the 2008 DC Background study a parking study was provided in support of the municipal parking facilities. That study referenced that the need for the parking facilities was related predominantly to City Hall, library, shoppers/tourists. Has a new study been carried out?

Yes, the study is currently in progress. Results are expected to be released in Q4 2013.

Parks and Recreation

19. Please provide the details of the remaining phases of the Southend Community Park. Is it possible to get a summary of the phases of the park to put it in context?

There are two major items remaining – final lit and irrigated baseball diamond and wildlife corridor.

20. Please provide basis of Guelph Trails costing: In the capital budget (2014-2018), we have currently requested - \$1.435 million which should yield approximately 5.3 km stonedust trails and 170m bridges and boardwalks.

21. The Dallen and Pergola properties were included in the 2008 DC at significantly lower costs. Please provide an explanation regarding these projects and their associated costs. Both Dallen and Pergola properties are considered P2 (neighbourhood parks). The methodology for pricing these parks is outlined below.

22. Please explain the significant cost increase in the following:.

- a. Kortright Sports Complex: the 2008 DC study included the cost of a small parkette. The 2014 DC study includes a regional park complete with sports fields
- b. Kortright East Neighbourhood Park– methodology followed for pricing parks projects is outlined below.
- c. York Open Space Development – methodology followed for pricing parks projects is outlined below.

The pricing format for all parks:

- Determine classification of park (P1 – P4, plus urban parkette)
- Determine program based on park classification
- Establish average cost per acre for park programming
- Apply cost per acre to projected park size

23. Please explain the basis of the attribution between PPB, BTE and growth share for the South End Community Centre.

PPB 5% to recognize minor oversizing of the facility for the growth in the south area that is not in the current 10 year forecast. The 10% BTE was established by considering capacity issues at the existing recreation centres (ice time, pool time etc) and the impact a new recreation facility would have to those capacity issues.

24. Please explain why the Victoria Road Expansion/Renovation is included in this service category. This project refers to the expansion and renovation of the Victoria Road Recreation Centre.

Library

25. Please provide details of the library capital program in terms of location, size, purpose. Also please provide the rationale for the attribution to growth, BTE and PPB.

The Library capital program, as included in the draft DC Background Study, is comprised of:

- a. The Library – Main project. Details about this project, can be found at the following link: <http://www.library.guelph.on.ca/about/main/reports.cfm>
- b. The remaining two property purchases continue to be funded based on a 50/50% growth/non-growth split in accordance with the previous purchases. The PPB reflects that another large library expansion will not be required within the City and that excess capacity is being created to service future population.



IBI Group
5th Floor–230 Richmond Street West
Toronto ON M5V 1V6 Canada
tel 416 596 1930
fax 416 596 0644

Memorandum - Revised

To/Attention	Guelph DC Team	Date	October 25, 2013
From	Audrey Jacob	Project No	33974
cc	Bob Stratford	Steno	ahj
Subject	Guelph 2014 DC - IBI Group response to September 10, 2013 memo - General Information, Police, Fire, Ambulance, Traffic, Rolling Stock, Depots & Domes, Parks & Recreation, Library		

This memo provides my response to the City's September 10, 2013 memo.

I will provide my response to Transit and related tomorrow. I will rely on Bob's response to the Hard Services Review but may have some additional comments once I have read his submission to the City.

My comments/response provides my opinion on these matters as a peer reviewer for the City.

Fire

1. Re: Fire Training Facility – in response to the City's answer to my question 4 (and 9) I reviewed the City's 2012 Capital Budget. At page 319 it notes:

With a renewed and refocused commitment to reducing debt financing, several capital projects were not included in this budget forecast. These include:

- Downtown Main Library
- South End Recreation Centre
- Baker and Wilson St Parkades
- Fire/Police Joint Training Facility
- Downtown Improvement Projects for roads, bridges, parking lots, etc.

There is no intention or recommendation to abandon these projects. However, the City will investigate innovative and alternative means of funding to support their development rather than pursuing additional debt financing throughout 2012 and beyond.

Thus the projects noted above, including the Fire Training Facility, are no longer included in the capital budget forecast.

This may prove problematic given paragraph 3 of the Regulations which govern the DC Act:

For the purposes of paragraph 3 of subsection 5 (1) of the Act, the council of a municipality has indicated that it intends to ensure that an increase in the need for service will be met if the increase in service forms part of an official plan, capital forecast or similar expression of the intention of council has been approved by council. O.Reg 82/98.s.3.

The 2013 Capital Budget did not re-instate or include the Fire/Police Joint Training Facility.

In my view this should be excluded from the DC capital program.

Guelph DC Team – October 25, 2013

Police

2. The response to my question 8 was not fully answered. Absent from the response was the determination of the PPB component. I will assume that the PPB is simply the residual after deducting BTE and maximizing the funding envelope; if I am incorrect, please advise.
3. Also, with respect to my question 8, I disagree with the apportionment between BTE and growth for the parking component. Currently the City provides parking at a standard of 1 parking space for every 1,516 sf of space (i.e., $66,747 / 44 = 1,516$). This contrasts with the proposed parking ratio of 1 space for every 620 sf of space in the new building (i.e., $50,582 / 82 = 620$). On the basis of a fair and equitable approach if the average of 1 space for every 933 sf of space is used and this is applied to the existing and additional space, the split is 57 / 43. This would increase the BTE for this project from \$17,217,083 to \$19,307,683. Please review.
4. Further on the response to my question 8, I question the assumption of \$50,000 per parking space. Compared to the parking space level of service page the replacement cost for structured parking is \$38,200 per space. Please review.

Depots & Domes

5. In response to my question 14, it would be my position that any space in City Hall is not eligible for inclusion in either the level of service calculation or in the capital program.
6. In response to my question 15b., the buildings noted are not included in the City's capital budget. Please demonstrate commitment to build these facilities in other council approved documentation.

Parking Spaces

7. The response to my question 16 is not fulsome; it would be more helpful to supply the 'arithmetic' calculation rather than having to pull the numbers together. Regardless, it is my position that municipal parking is not attributed to growth as previously discussed. Also, see my #1 above related to the joint fire/police training facility and the exclusion from the City's Council approved Capital budget.
8. Please provide the Parking Master Plan to be released in Q4 2013 when it is available.

Parks

9. I have serious concerns with the 2013 value/acre identified in the parkland level of service. I appreciate having received the summary page with the basis of the determination of the costs for a parkette, urban parkette, neighbourhood park and community park. My concerns are as follows:
 - a. The increase from 2008 to 2013 is significant. The cost per acre for neighbourhood / community parks increased from \$75k/ac to \$376.1k/ac; regional parks increased from \$75k/ac to \$145.4k/ac. In 2008 parkettes were not identified so they have increased from \$0 to between \$620k/ac to \$813/ac.
 - b. Notwithstanding the fact that the recent experience reflected in recent tenders (the details of which should be provided to support these extraordinarily high costs), in my view the noted cost per acre might be appropriate for newly built parks but it is certainly not reflective of the replacement cost of existing parks. A new park typically has much different amenities. Today parks include much more hardscaping, much more diverse landscaping, furniture, lighting, water

Guelph DC Team – October 25, 2013

features and other amenities. By comparison, older parks are much simpler and generally have fewer amenities. To suggest that the City's current inventory of parks is reflective of the high quality standard in my view significantly overstates the value of the parkland inventory.

- c. We have determined that the City's per capita standard equates to \$2,400 for parkland. This contrasts to Oakville where the standard is \$670/capita, Pickering which is \$726/capita, Milton at \$965/capita. This needs to be seriously reviewed by the City.
- d. Also, it is difficult to comprehend the disconnect between the parkland development standard of City owned parks compared to parks owned by others. Neighbourhood / community parks that are City owned have a quality standard of \$376,100/ac compared to parks owned by others at \$81,000/ac. Similarly City owned Regional parks have a quality value of \$145,400/ac compared to \$81,000/ac for Regional Parks. Further, it is challenging to understand that Regional / Neighbourhood / Community parks owned by others have an equivalent quality value but the value for City parks is so different.
- e. In the case of City owned Urban Squares the inventory shows they have existed since at least 2003 and the inventory saw an uptick in 2011. The quality value at \$813,000/ac needs backup support; so does the \$620,000/ac for the parkette/village squares.
- f. I will assume that the summary page providing the cost basis for the parks has an error in the heading and that Community Park should read Regional Park.
- g. Please provide the quality value for the Urban Square artificial ice rink, pavilion and water feature/shrouds. Please also explain how this urban square was funded.

Reserve Fund Accounting

10. An overall comment would be one of appreciation for the change in DC Reserve Fund Accounting. The details around the funding of DC related projects is most helpful.
11. A review of the reserve fund accounting has lead to two concerns:
 - a. The City spent \$2.8 million of DC reserve funds for a recreation project GG0016 identified as Civic Administration Building. In the 2008 DC Background Study GG0016 was for Additional space for staff in the Administrative Centre at a cost of \$499,200.
 - i. Please confirm that the \$2.8 million reflects recreation staff space in City Hall.
 - ii. I note that the recreation related DC revenue collected 2009 to 2011 totalled just over \$2.8 million. This suggests that the money collected in the past 3 years for recreation purposes has been spent on City Hall space to accommodate recreation staff.
 - iii. I disagree that this is DC eligible or fundable.
 - b. It is impossible to follow the funding of parkland. An example is RP0227/PK0014 Eastview Community Park.

Guelph DC Team – October 25, 2013

- In the 2008 DCBS the Park had a capital cost of \$3.4 million and was to be built between 2008 and 2013. The calculation included the 10% discount.
- The DC Reserve Funding identifies some \$1.2 million was spent on this project from 2009 to 2011; a tax funded amount of \$15,500 is also noted.
- Now in the 2013 DCBS draft the capital cost is identified as \$5.95 million and is to be implemented over the 2013-2019 timeframe. A PPB of \$2.083 million is identified leaving a growth related cost of \$3.867 million.
- I undertook this review for a number of parks and came up with similar profiles. To the reader trying to watch the progression of a particular line item, there is no transparency. This is typically what is frustrating to the development industry. Where does the DC reserve funding on the project get reflected in the calculation?

Library

12. The Downtown Library is not included in the City's Capital Budget; see #1 of this memo. Similar to other projects now excluded from the City's capital budget, in my view this project should also be excluded. This requires further discussion.

November 14, 2013

To: Robert Stratford and Audrey Jacobs

From: Sarah Purton, City of Guelph

RE: Guelph 2014 DC - IBI Group response to September 10, 2013 memo -
General Information, Police, Fire, Ambulance, Traffic, Rolling Stock, Depots
& Domes, Parks & Recreation, Library

Please find enclosed the City's responses to your memo dated October 25, 2013.

City Hall
1 Carden St
Guelph, ON
Canada
N1H 3A1

T 519-822-1260
TTY 519-826-9771

guelph.ca

Fire

1. Re: Fire Training Facility – in response to the City's answer to my question 4 (and 9) I reviewed the City's 2012 Capital Budget. At page 319 it notes:

With a renewed and refocused commitment to reducing debt financing, several capital projects were not included in this budget forecast. These include:

- *Downtown Main Library*
- *South End Recreation Centre*
- *Baker and Wilson St Parkades*
- *Fire/Police Joint Training Facility*
- *Downtown Improvement Projects for roads, bridges, parking lots, etc.*

There is no intention or recommendation to abandon these projects. However, the City will investigate innovative and alternative means of funding to support their development rather than pursuing additional debt financing throughout 2012 and beyond.

Thus the projects noted above, including the Fire Training Facility, are no longer included in the capital budget forecast.

This may prove problematic given paragraph 3 of the Regulations which govern the DC Act:

For the purposes of paragraph 3 of subsection 5 (1) of the Act, the council of a municipality has indicated that it intends to ensure that an increase in the need for service will be met if the increase in service forms part of an official plan, capital forecast or similar expression of the intention of council has been approved by council. O.Reg 82/98.s.3.

The 2013 Capital Budget did not re-instate or include the Fire/Police Joint Training Facility.

In my view this should be excluded from the DC capital program.

During the capital budget process the timing of the project was changed but was not picked up in the DC. We anticipate an addendum to the Background Study will be required and this is one of the items that will be adjusted. The project was anticipated to be post the 10 year forecast period as can be seen under Ambulance as there is no portion of the project being attributed to the current 10 year forecast period.

Police

2. The response to my question 8 was not fully answered. Absent from the response was the determination of the PPB component. I will assume that the PPB is simply the residual after deducting BTE and maximizing the funding envelope; if I am incorrect, please advise.
3. Also, with respect to my question 8, I disagree with the apportionment between BTE and growth for the parking component. Currently the City provides parking at a standard of 1 parking space for every 1,516 sf of space (i.e., $66,747 / 44 = 1,516$). This contrasts with the proposed parking ratio of 1 space for every 620 sf of space in the new building (i.e., $50,582 / 82 = 620$). On the basis of a fair and equitable approach if the average of 1 space for every 933 sf of space is used

Bob Stratford and Audrey Jacobs

September 10, 2013

RE: **Guelph 2014 DC - IBI Group response to September 10, 2013 memo - General Information, Police, Fire, Ambulance, Traffic, Rolling Stock, Depots & Domes, Parks & Recreation, Library**

Page 3 of 15

and this is applied to the existing and additional space, the split is 57 / 43. This would increase the BTE for this project from \$17,217,083 to \$19,307,683. Please review.

4. Further on the response to my question 8, I question the assumption of \$50,000 per parking space. Compared to the parking space level of service page the replacement cost for structured parking is \$38,200 per space. Please review.

This response provides a consolidated answer to questions 2 - 4 above.

The total cost of the headquarters project is \$34 million including the parking component. Staff did not have a breakdown of the cost of the parking structure vs. the cost of the facility itself. We therefore estimate the parking at \$50,000 per space. Upon review, we agree that this is inconsistent with the costing applied other parking facilities and have revised the costing estimate to reflect \$38,200 per space when determining the overall allocation to the parking portion.

However, while this does not reduce the overall cost of the project (\$34 million), it does change the distribution between BTE, PPB and amount recoverable through development charges has been adjusted. The below chart shows the distribution between growth (recovered through development charges and PBB) and benefit to existing was determined.