

Clair-Maltby

Transform. Connect. Community.

Landowners Meeting October 19th, 2021 4:00 – 6:00 pm



Land Acknowledgement

As we gather, we are reminded that Guelph is situated on treaty land that is steeped in rich indigenous history and home to many First Nations, Inuit and Métis people today.

As a City we have a responsibility for the stewardship of the land on which we live and work.

Today we acknowledge the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation of the Anishinaabek Peoples on whose traditional territory we are meeting.

Introduction & Purpose

- Landowners are a unique stakeholder group in this process
- We hear you
- Potential future meetings with individual landowners
- Today we are here to discuss common issues
- OPA 42 Settlement properties future separate meeting



Agenda

- 4:00 4:10 Introductory Remarks
- 4:10 4:25 Land Use/Policy Overview
- 4:25 4:50 Servicing Overview
- 4:50 5:50 Fiscal Impact Assessment Overview & Workshop
- 5:50 6:00 Final questions and wrapup



Part 1 Policy/Land Use Overview

Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan process

Phase 1 (April 2016 - July 2017)

- Background data collection
- Identify problem/opportunity statement
- Develop vision/principles

Phase 2 (July 2017 - June 2018)

- Develop Conceptual Community Structure
- Detailed studies
- Consideration of Community Structure Alternatives

Phase 3 (July 2018 - 2022)

- Preferred Alternative
- Open Space System Strategy
- Draft Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Secondary Plan
- Final Master Environmental Servicing Plan and Secondary Plan to Council

Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan Process Diagram





Draft Land Use Schedule



Refer to Schedule E and NH-9 and NH-10 of the CEIS for area-specific mapping of Candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat.

Policy Topics

- Suggested policy amendments track changes
- Mix of housing
- Open Space System Moraine Ribbon
- Multi-use overpass
- Hall's Pond bathymetric survey & management plan
- Candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat
- Design Review Committee



Part 2 Servicing Overview

Mobility – Cross Sections

- Cross-Sections evaluated:
 - 17 arterial
 - 14 collector
 - 14 local
- Stakeholders:
 - City: water, wastewater, transportation planning, parking, urban forestry, emergency services, transit, street lighting, solid waste collection, planning and public works
 - Utilities: telecoms, hydro, gas

Mobility – Cross Sections

- "Wishlist" Widths:
 - Arterial: 38.20m
 - Collector: 32.40m
 - Local: 20.0m

• Preferred Alternative Widths:

- Arterial: 32.00m
- Collector: 27.50m
- Local: 18.50m



Mobility – Road Layout

 Four alternative road layouts based on CMSP Vision & Objectives





Mobility – Road Layout



Mobility – Street C/D



- Street C SB left turn = 117 "heavy"
- Street D SB left turn = 46
 - Both intersections required to avoid exceeding intersection capacity and resulting in traffic queues on Gordon

Stormwater Strategy -Development

- Maintain existing drainage boundaries
- Maintain drainage to significant depressional areas (>300mm capture)
- Maintain overall water balance
- No impacts offsite to private or public properties (i.e., peak flows, flooding)



ICAL SCALE DRAINAG BOUNDARY PLAN

Stormwater Strategy Development

- Apply distributed LID BMPs to replicate function of existing area-wide depressional features.
- 20mm surface water capture (public/private)replicates capture of frequent storm events (existing smaller depressional areas)





Stormwater Strategy Development

- Stormwater Capture Areas (SWCAs) replicate the function of existing significant depressional areas, capable of capturing and infiltrating/evaporating the Regional Storm (Hurricane Hazel).
- SWCAs sizing would increase without 20 mm capture.



Stormwater Strategy

Ī	Drainage Catchment	Drainage Area (ha)	Imperv. Coverage (%)	Top Area (ha)	Top Area / Drainage Area	Volume Provided (m ³)	Sizing Event
ľ	38_SW	9.07	62.5	0.80	9 %	13160	Regional
	36_SW	9.65	54.9	1.08	11%	14966	Regional
	39_SW	4.68	60.2	0.51	11%	6951	Regional
	42_SW	22.53	65.9	2.01	9%	35594	Regional
	47_SW	5.42	63.3	0.58	11%	7940	Regional
	49_SW	13.81	61.4	1.20	9%	21109	Regional
	50_SW	10.64	58.8	1.05	10%	17294	Regional
	51_SW	11.90	61.5	1.13	10%	17757	Regional
	52_SW	5.81	64.3	0.60	10%	8789	Regional
	53_SW	6.28	55.5	0.66	11%	8729	Regional
	55_SW ₁	9.47	60.2	1.01	11%	14896	Regional
	56_SW	5.45	58.9	0.60	11%	7728	Regional
	58_SW	11.31	61.8	1.14	10%	17525	Regional
	61_SW	25.04	60.4	2.27	9%	41287	Regional
	111_SW	33.74	57.1	3.02	9%	53383	Regional
	37_SW	9.24	65.0	0.92	10%	14727	Regional

Stormwater Strategy Development

- SWCAs have (where possible) been located next to parks and schools,(grading, use benefits)
- Largely dry facilities safety to be addressed through grading and deterrent planting and other measure
- SWCAs receive drainage after LID BMPs capture of 20 mm runoff.





Stormwater Strategy Development

- Site grading based on maintaining existing drainage boundaries to extent possible and changes required for roads/mobility etc. can be reviewed through draft plan of subdivision process.
- Grading and form of SWCAs can be adjusted to provide useable dry areas within SWCA footprint (outside of more frequently flooded areas) effectively increasing park's and school's usable areas.
- Safety measures will be dependent on use.





Stormwater Strategy Phasing

- Stormwater management (SWM) measures constructed as development precedes.
- SWCAs are proposed to be constructed near the commencement of construction of each development phase tributary to that SWCA.
- At-source public and conveyance SWM measures would be constructed during right-of-way construction and for LID BMPs located on private lands, during the construction of private lot grading and sodding.
- Staging of specific SWM measures will be detailed in the subdivision Stormwater Management Reports and reviewed by City and agency stakeholders.

Stormwater Strategy





Stormwater Strategy Development • Location of SWCAs can be adjusted within reason

 Location of SWCAs can be adjusted within reason based on proposed grading but will need to be located at/near low spots to mimic the function of existing significant depressional areas.



Water and Wastewater Servicing

Phasing

- Overall phasing and servicing strategy was established without considering existing property boundaries or ownership. Phasing of servicing primarily considered technical, environmental, social, and economic criteria order to establish the best phasing and servicing strategy for the overall site.
- Phasing of the development will generally align with the Wastewater Servicing and will be sequential from downstream to upstream, i.e. North to South.
- Phase 1 will consist of Catchments 4 and 5, gravity sewers to existing services. The water distribution system will include construction of a portion of the water transmission main from the Clair Maltby Water Booster Station.

Water and Wastewater Servicing Phase 1



Water and Wastewater Servicing

Phasing

 Phase 2 will include gravity sewers to Sewage Pumping Station 3 (SPS3), the downstream trunk sewer to the receiving branch and a forcemain from SPS3 to the Trunk Sewer. The water distribution system will include construction of a portion of the water transmission main from the Clair Maltby Water Booster Station.

Water and Wastewater Servicing Phase 2



Water and Wastewater Servicing

Phasing

 Phase 3 will include gravity sewers to Sewage Pumping Station 1 (SPS1), and a forcemain from SPS3. The water distribution system will include construction of the remaining portion of the water transmission main from the Clair Maltby Water Booster Station and the Water Storage Tank.

Water and Wastewater Servicing Phase 3



Water and Wastewater Servicing

Phasing

 Phase 4 will include gravity sewers to Sewage Pumping Station 2 (SPS2), and a forcemain from SPS2. The water distribution system will connect to the water transmission main from the Clair Maltby Water Booster Station and the Water Storage Tank.

Water and Wastewater Servicing Phase 4





Part 2

Fiscal Impact Assessment & Financing Tools



Overview

The fiscal impact is a high-level overview.

The project costs, timing and funding assumptions WILL change

The DC rates are not set, they will require a full background study – start in 2023

The tax and rate impacts were for order of magnitude estimates. Is it 1% or 10% tax impact?

The FIA was for Claire Maltby in isolation, the rest of the City costs and revenues will be impacted and considered

For the group *Try to focus questions / comments on broad themes rather than specifics* - we want to hear your thoughts.



Background

CM growth of 16,300 / 7200 units (mostly residential) *Tax* supported services include roads, parks and most operating *Rate* supported include Water, WW, Stormwater, and associated operating

Local Service Policy -Developer constructed assets DC's will be charged **after** completion of background study in 2023

FIA capital cost is all debt financed - we may need to consider other tools

Key Cost Drivers

New water and wastewater facilities

New servicing pipelines and water towers

New collector roads

•••

Operating costs for City services



Lifecycle costs for new assets



Parkland in excess of dedication (City Cost)

Parkland Dedication



Parkland dedicated at 1 hectare for 300 units



Total 33 hectares required. City will need to purchase a portion of lands required for parks



\$18.5M non DC funded land costs (DCs are for amenities not for land costs)

Local Service Policy

LSP – direct developer responsibility

Includes:

- Local roads
- Collector roads internal to the development
- Water and wastewater servicing less than 300mm and storm pipes less than 900mm
- Stormwater ponds
- Sanitary pump stations

These are **not** included in the DC's

Rate Тах 50.0 100.0

Capital Costs and Funding



Post Period - Oversizing

The infrastructure is being designed to service the maximum population of approximately 25,000 by 2051.

This fiscal study assumes 16,300 population at full buildout. Conservative estimate on revenues.

There could be changes in the population estimates for CM. Likely between 16,300-25,000.

Excess capacity could be used in other areas of the City if necessary (treatment plants for example).

Developers would only be charged for costs related to actual growth in their area. DC Study.

Infrastructure above 16,300 population is being considered "post period"

It would be financed by the city and recovered by future development

Approx. \$30 million in debt charges that remain outstanding at and will need to be funded.

Operating Impacts

Includes costs of usual City services: Waste, Snowplowing, Recreation, Transit etc.

We assume that new users will cost less per capita than existing users – some fixed costs are incorporated

Lifecycle costs also require an annual contribution for replacement - considered an operating cost



Overall Tax Impacts

Overall Rate Impacts



DC's Compared



Funding Challenges

Cost escalators and rates will change many of these assumptions Future grants may be available to offset some costs



We assume debt in the FIA but may be able to fund from reserves or other sources

Development Charges will need a full background study to set the rates.

Other cash flow tools may be needed to reduce reliance on debt (next slide)

Future Funding Options



FRONT-ENDING AGREEMENTS AREA-SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT CHARGES

•





DEVELOPER CASH-FLOW ASSISTANCE PREPAYMENT OF DEVELOPMENT CHARGES