**Appendix 1** 





# Planning and Development Fee Review





2019

#### Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Study Objectives	2
Planning and Development Act, 2007	3
Guiding Principles	4
Planning and Development Fee Review Process	5
Review Process	6
Calculation Methodology	7
Process Mapping and Time Estimates	7
Identify Budget and Calculate the Cost of Service	8
Activity, Revenue and Workload Validation	9
Municipal Benchmarking	9
Trends and Background Information	10
Existing Fees—General Findings	11
Revenue and Expenditure Trends	12
Analysis and Recommended Fees	13
Introductory Analysis	14
Revenue Breakdown	16
Development Permits	17
Subdivision Fees	19
Zoning Fees	20
Discretionary Use	21
Concept Plan	22
Forecast Activity Levels	23
Recommended Fees	24
Municipal Fee Comparison	25
Municipal Fee Comparison	26
Subdivision Fee Comparison	27
Zoning Amendments	28
Summary of Recommendations	29
Summary of Recommendations	30



Introduction



#### Introduction

#### Study Objectives

In 2018, BMA Management Consulting Inc. was engaged by the City of Saskatoon to undertake a review and make recommendations with respect to building fees and planning operations. Phase one included the implementation of updated building fees commencing in 2019 with a phase-in period of three years.

Another phase of the engagement was the completion of a Planning and Development Operational review which was completed in Spring of 2019. During this phase, the planning fees analysis was completed. The purpose of the enclosed report is to provide an overview of the Planning and Development fee analysis and recommendations for 2020.

The objectives of the study included ensuring that the City is establishing fees that:

- Support financial sustainability;
- Are fair and equitable;
- *Recover the full cost of service;*
- Take into consideration the cyclical effect of the development through the development of sound reserve policies to mitigate risk;
- Consider future forecast for development activity;
- Are competitive and have been compared in a meaningful manner to "like municipalities" and explanations are provided where differences may occur; and
- Are compliant with all relevant legislative and regulatory requirements.



#### Planning and Development Act, 2007

The following summarizes the key sections pertaining the setting planning and development fees .

#### Fees

**51**(1) Subject to subsection (2), a council may, in the zoning bylaw or by a separate fee bylaw, prescribe a schedule of fees to be charged for the application, review, advertising, approval, enforcement, regulation and issuance, as the case may be, of:

- (a) a development permit;
- (b) a discretionary use;
- (c) a minor variance; and
- (d) an amendment to an official community plan or zoning bylaw.

(2) The fees prescribed pursuant to this section:

(a) may be based on the size, type and complexity of matters mentioned in subsection (1); and

(b) must not exceed the cost to the municipality of processing the application or of reviewing, advertising, approving, enforcing, regulating or issuing, as the case may be, the matters mentioned in subsection (1).

(2.1) If a council prescribes a schedule of fees pursuant to this section, the council shall, with the bylaw prescribing the fees, adopt a document that sets out the rationale for the fees.

(3) Before passing a fee bylaw, the council shall comply with the public participation requirements of Part X.

(4) A council is exempt from obtaining the minister's approval of the fee bylaw.

(5) The municipal administrator shall file with the director a certified copy of the fee bylaw and the document mentioned in subsection (2.1) within 15 days after the date on which the bylaw is passed.



#### **Guiding Principles**

The following Guiding Principles were used to provide a framework for the establishment of planning fees. The Guiding Principles help ensure that the City of Saskatoon has a consistent approach for establishing planning application fees. The Guiding Principles also provide for a more also facilitates a consistent and transparent decision-making process for determining fees; allows for better resource planning; and enhances the City's ability to forecast fee revenue.

#### Guiding Principle #1: Service Efficiencies

- Fees for service will be set to reflect the efficient cost level of carrying out the service.
- If inefficient practices are identified (either through a review of internal processes or in relation to peer municipalities), then consideration of the inefficiencies will be taken into account during costing and, where appropriate, measures will be implemented to remove inefficiencies.

#### Guiding Principle #2: Fairness and Equity

- Saskatoon will distribute the cost of providing the service by charging a fee to applicants who receive direct benefit.
- Fees will employ mechanisms that equitably distribute costs between the various types of applications to avoid cross subsidization.
- Saskatoon will not set the fees beyond 100% of the full cost of the service. Full cost of service will include direct and indirect costs, overhead costs.

# Guiding Principle #3: Transparency

• The cost of providing services, the allocation methodology of costs and the pricing structure will be transparent.



Planning and Development Fee Review Process



#### **Review Process**

The planning and development fee review process included:

- Understanding the current programs and services;
- Reviewing resources/costs to support the programs/services;
- Identifying the organizational structure used to support the programs and services;
- Developing process maps to identify the staff involved and the time required to complete each process;
- Reviewing the historic levels of development and planning applications and future growth projections;
- Identifying budgeted costs to achieve full cost recovery of planning and development activities;
- Developing an activity based costing model;
- Calculating proposed fees and making recommendations with regard to fee structures; and
- Benchmarking fees in Saskatoon in relation to other municipalities.



#### Planning and Development Fee Review—Calculation Methodology

The following provides an overview of the process used to calculate the fees.



#### **Process Mapping and Time Estimates**

The methodology used to determine building fees is based on leading practices and is referred to as a "bottom up" and "tops down" approach to cost analysis. Time spent per unit of fee activity is determined for each process. A process mapping exercise was completed by staff to identify the "average" time required to complete each step in the process. Utilization of time estimates is a reasonable and defensible approach, especially since these estimates were developed by experienced staff members who understand service levels and processes unique to the City of Saskatoon.

Time estimates were calculated using the following process:

- Estimates are representative of average times for providing service. Extremely difficult or abnormally simple projects were excluded from the analysis;
- Estimates provided by staff were reviewed and approved by the department and, in some cases, involved multiple iterations to ensure that the estimates were accurate; and
- Estimates were further reviewed by BMA for "reasonableness" against experience with other municipalities and validated against activity levels, staffing levels and available hours.



#### Identify Budget and Calculate the Cost of Service

Once time spent for a fee activity was determined, all applicable City costs were then considered in the calculation of the "full" cost of providing each service. This included the following costs:

- Salaries, benefits and wages—salaries and benefits of the staff undertaking work on the review and processing of applications.
- Other Expenditures—this includes office expenses, phones, advertising and other miscellaneous expenses.
- **Corporate Overhead**—this includes costs related to program support such as legal, finance, accommodation expenses, clerks, information technology, etc. This was calculated by the City of Saskatoon's Finance Department and reviewed for reasonableness by BMA.

2018 Operating Budget	2018
Existing Salaries, Benefits and Wages	\$1,073,400
Other Expenditures	\$67,900
Corporate Overhead	\$237 <i>,</i> 600
Cost Recovery Revenues	(\$134,700)
Total Gross Expenditures	\$1,244,200
Fee Revenues	(\$718,100)
Mill Rate	\$526,100
% Fees of total Expenditures	58%

Planning activities have approximately \$1.073 million in direct and indirect costs to be recovered from fees with an additional \$237,600 in corporate overhead (e.g. finance, accommodation, legal, clerks, administration), \$67,900 in non-salary related expenditures offset in part by cost recovery revenues. Revenues from existing planning and development fees was budgeted at \$718,100 for 2018, with a mill rate contribution of \$526,100. Fees as a percentage of total expenditures was budgeted at 58%.



#### Activity, Revenue and Workload Validation

 In addition to the collection of time estimate data for each fee or service, annual volume of activity data assumptions was also a critical component of the validation process. Collecting data on the estimated volume of activity for each service not only provided useful information regarding allocation of staff resources, it also provided assurance that staff resources have been appropriately accounted for and allocated to a fee for service, or "other non fee" related category. It is very important to ensure that services are not estimated at a level that exceeds budgeted resource capacity.

# Municipal Benchmarking

- While fees should be based on the underlying cost of service, and this will vary from municipality to municipality, a fee benchmarking exercise was undertaken to consider the proposed fee for service in Saskatoon compared with other municipalities. Municipal benchmarking also identified policies and practices with respect to reserves, fee recovery targets and the fee structure used in each municipality to identify best practices.
- As will be shown in the benchmarking section of the report, the fees in Saskatoon are currently low and the recommended fee increases are also well below the peer municipal average.



Trends and Background Information



# Existing Fees—General Findings

The following table provides a summary of the existing Planning and Development fees:

	20	18 Fees
Development Permits		
Development Permit Final - Flat Fee	\$	135
Development Permit Infill - Flat Fee	\$	135
Development Permit - Contruction Value (000's)		\$ 0.45
Subdivision		
Subdivision Application Fees	\$	650
Subdivision Approval Fees (per lot)	\$	115
Max Fee	\$	4,600
Condominium		
Condominium Fee	\$	750
Condominium Fee (per lot)		
Discretionary Use		
Discretionary Use - Standard Application	\$	1,050
Discretionary Use - Complex Application	\$	1,950
Discretionary Use - Highly Complex Application	\$	5,300
Zoning		
Text Ammendment	\$	3,750
Low Density	\$	3,750
Consistent with Approved Concept Plan	\$	3,750
Med/High Density	\$	5,000
Concept Plan	\$	1,875



#### **Revenue and Expenditure Trends**

 The following graph provides a summary of the revenues and expenditures related to planning and development application reviews and associated activity. Note that total expenditures reflects the entire Development Review area, not strictly the fee recovery portion.



- Based on an analysis of the staff time involved with the planning and development application processes, the target for fee cost recovery is 71%. Over the past five years, Planning revenues have recovered on average only 53% of the total program expenditures associated with development applications. The difference is currently funded from the mill rate.
- Budgeted revenues have consistently been below the target revenues over the past five years.



Analysis and Recommended Fees



#### Introductory Analysis

- The City, in accordance with leading practices has maintained, on an annual basis, the estimated time allocation for each staff and type of application to align the revenues and expenditures for cost recovery from fees. However, it is difficult to predict with certainty, on an annual basis, the level of activity and the resulting revenues.
- As shown previously, the average revenues from 2013 to 2017 collected at \$614,000 reflects that existing fees are considerably lower than the underlying expense. The mill rate is funding programs and services associated with development applications.
- An analysis was undertaken on the existing staff and associated allocations to each of the respective processes as well as the funding sources. This was undertaken by process mapping all major classifications of applications against staff involved on a typical application.
- This was also cross checked in terms of the number of applications and the time required to undertake the reviews and the approval of an application.
- The Development Permit area has struggled to meet service standards, particularly in the commercial review area and is not meeting applicant expectations. There are currently three full time Bylaw Inspector 16 positions that are 100% dedicated to undertaking development permit reviews and one additional contract position that is currently funded from the Stabilization Reserve. Based on an analysis of the activity levels, recommendations have been made to convert the contract position to full time and to fund this position from development permit fees.
- The City Centre Planner is involved in the co-ordination of applications, responsible for consolidating comments to ensure that there is internal agreement before sending to the Developer. This position is a permanent position but currently is funded from the Stabilization Reserve. Recommendations have been made to fund a portion of this position (20%) from fees based on the process mapping exercise undertaken.



• Based on changes in work processes and additional staff that are required to meet service standards, an updated allocation was developed to better align the staff resources to the underlying applications. Updated analysis using the revised allocation methodology.

2018 Operating Budget	2018	Revised
Existing Salaries, Benefits and Wages	\$1,073,400	\$1,073,400
New Position Direct Development Permits		\$85,100
New Positions Reserve (Senior Planner)		\$106,900
Other Expenditures	\$67,900	\$67 <i>,</i> 900
Corporate Overhead	\$237,600	\$237 <i>,</i> 600
Cost Recovery Revenues	(\$134,700)	(\$134,700)
Total Gross Expenditures	\$1,244,200	\$1,436,200
Fee Revenues	(\$718,100)	(\$1,022,214)
Mill Rate	\$526,100	\$413,986
% Fees of total Expenditures	58%	71%

- As illustrated above, this reflects that costs to be recovered from fees should be approximately \$1 million compared with the existing fee recovery target of \$718,000.
- Based on an analysis of the underlying expenditures and time allocations of staff to each of the processes, the actual expenditures attributed to planning and development fee activities for 2018 is approximately 71% of the total expenditures. This reflects fees that are lower than the full cost of service.



Revenue Breakdown							
		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
4000 REVENUE	\$	(30,950) \$	(41,550) \$	(28,650) \$	(37,050) \$	(23,300)	
4392 DEVELOPMENT PERMITS	\$	(319,304) \$	(351,789) \$	(448,467) \$	<b>(</b> 381,684) \$	(414,898)	
4393 SUBDIVISION APPLICATION	\$	(174,269) \$	(106,680) \$	<mark>(110,165)</mark> \$	(76,081) \$	(76,795)	
4394 DISCRETIONARY USE	\$	(10,800) \$	(22,500) \$	(24,000) \$	(35 <i>,</i> 950) \$	(23,750)	
4395 ZONING APPLICATIONS	\$	(67,200) \$	(62,500) \$	(79,500) \$	(62,450) \$	(61,875)	
Total Revenues	\$	(602,523) \$	(585,019) \$	(690,782) \$	(593,215) \$	(600,618)	

- Average annual revenues over the past five years was approximately \$614,000.
- As shown above, the majority of the revenues currently collected are related to development permits with almost \$415,000 of the total \$600,000 in revenues generated in 2017. As will be discussed in this section of the report, this is an area where the City is not recovering sufficient revenues to offset expenses.
- In 2017, almost \$77,000 in subdivision revenues were generated, well below the target full cost recovery level.
- Zoning applications in 2017 generated approximately \$61,900, also well below the cost of service.
- Discretionary Use applications are also generating insufficient revenues to recover the cost of service.



# **Development Permits**

- Development is defined by the Planning and Development Act as "... the carrying out of any building, engineering, mining or other operations in, on or over land or the making of any material change in the use or intensity of the use of any building or land." Where a municipality has a zoning bylaw, all development must obtain a development permit prior to beginning a project.
- Most land use activities are defined as development and therefore, require a municipal development permit from a municipality with a zoning bylaw. Municipalities with zoning bylaws follow the development permit review process described below.
- The applicant must contact the municipal administrator and submit a development permit application to the municipality. It should include as much information as possible to assist in making an informed decision. The required information may include:
  - dimensions and size of sites;
  - location of development on the site;
  - location of utilities;
  - environmental considerations and mitigation measures;
  - access management information;
  - municipal road impacts and resolution opportunities; and
  - reclamation considerations.

Source: Government of Saskatchewan – A Guide to the Municipal Planning Process in Saskatchewan

- The existing fee structure includes a base fee of \$135 per application plus \$0.45 per \$1,000 cost of construction.
- A review of the existing fees and structure was undertaken against the process maps and other possible alternative rate structures.



- Validation of the hours was undertaken to identify the cost of service. Based on a review of the budgeted expenditures, the City should be recovering approximately \$548,000 from development permit fees. This includes a recommendation that the City fund the temporary Development Officer from the fees, rather than the Stabilization Reserve as there is an ongoing requirement for four Development Officers to meet the service standards and activity levels
- Staff anticipate in the range of 1,500-1,600 applications each year over the next several years; an increase from the number of reviews undertaken in 2017.
- Based on discussions with staff and the process maps generated, the time to review a
  residential application for new construction does not vary by the cost of construction which
  is currently partially the basis upon which fees are charged. As such, it is recommended
  that a base fee with no cost per construction be included in the new fee structure for
  residential new construction. This also improves the transparency of the cost of service.
- It is further recommended that a lower fee for residential alterations, additions, demolitions and conversions be implemented to reflect the lower work required and eliminate the cost per construction portion of the fee.
- Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) process maps were completed for Alterations as well as new construction. Given the significant variation in the types of ICI applications, it is recommended that the base fee be updated to reflect base cost of service and maintain the same fee per \$1,000 of construction.

	Exi	sting Fee	Recorr	nmended
All Applications Base	\$	135.00		
+ \$1,000 construction	\$	0.45		
Residential New			\$	310
Residential Alterations, Additions, Conversions, Demolitions			\$	160
ICI New Base			\$	370
+ \$1,000 construction			\$	0.45
ICI Alterations Base			\$	190
+ \$1,000 construction			\$	0.45

• The following summarizes the existing and new development permit fees:



#### Subdivision Fees

- A subdivision is used to divide the land into smaller parcels for the purpose of legally registering separate ownership titles for the parcels with the provincial Information Services Corporation.
- A review of the existing fees and structure was undertaken against the process maps and other possible alternative rate structures.
- The base fee is currently too low and, based on the feedback from staff, the per unit cost is too high to reflect the additional work related to larger subdivisions.
- Based on discussions with staff and the process maps generated, two processes were completed; Subdivision application with 5 units and a Subdivision application with 25 units. The hours attributed to each of the above noted types of applications did not vary significantly.
- Most municipalities surveyed have a considerably higher base fee than in the City of Saskatoon, reflecting similar analysis undertaken in Saskatoon.
- The City's existing base fee of \$650 and a per unit fee of \$115 is not recovering sufficient revenues for a typical application. For example, a subdivision application with five units currently pays \$1,225 compared with the calculated fee at full cost recovery of approximately \$3,000.
- Based on a review of the budgeted expenditures, the City should be recovering approximately \$215,000. Currently, the average annual fees generated from subdivision applications is approximately \$98,000, reflecting a significant shortfall.
- The recommended approach is to increase the base fee and reduce the per unit fee to better reflect the cost of service and to align revenues with expenditures as follows:.

	Exi	Existing Fee		ommended
Subdivision Base Fee	\$	650	\$	2,500
Subdivision Per lot Fee	\$	115	\$	50
Maximum Fee lot fee	\$	4,600	\$	5,000



# **Zoning Fees**

- The primary legal and administrative means of implementing an Official Community Plan is the zoning bylaw. It divides a municipality into zoning districts and regulates development and use of land in those districts. A zoning bylaw permits a council to set local standards for the subdivision and use of land, and helps manage the delivery of municipal services and resources to new developments.
- The *zoning amendment review* of the municipality:
  - authorizes an officer to process development applications;
  - outlines development permit procedures;
  - establishes a Development Appeals Board;
  - provides for minor variances;
  - prescribes fees for permits and amendments; and
  - provides penalties.
- A review of the existing fees and structure was undertaken against the process maps and other possible alternative rate structures. Validation of the hours was also undertaken against the City's process maps to identify the cost of service.
- Based on a review of the budgeted expenditures, and the process maps, the City should be recovering approximately \$143,000. The City has not recovered revenues at this level in the past 5 years.
- Currently there is no differentiation in the fees between a Zoning Text Amendment application and a Low Density Zoning application in terms of the fee but based on process mapping, the Zoning Text Amendment requires considerably less staff time and the fee should be reduced accordingly. The City, however may wish to institute a zoning application text amendment for complex applications to recognize the additional work involved in the processes. The following table summarizes the existing and proposed fees:

	Existing		Recomm	ended
Zoning Applications - Text Amendment	\$	3,750	\$	2,960
Zoning Applications - Low Density	\$	3,750	\$	5,440
Zoning Applications - Consistent with	ć	2 750	ć	4 1 2 0
Approved Concept Plan	Ş	3,750	Ş	4,130
Zoning Applications - Med/High Density	\$	5,000	\$	6,660



#### **Discretionary Use**

- As stated in the Government of Saskatchewan's Guidelines, a Discretionary Use is where a development proposal is identified by the municipal zoning bylaw as a discretionary use, the application must be advertised pursuant to section 55 of the Planning and Development Act and presented to the council by the development officer at its next council meeting for review and decision.
- A review of the existing fees and structure was undertaken against the process maps and other possible alternative rate structures.
- Validation of the hours was also undertaken against the City's process maps to identify the cost of service.
- Based on a review of the budgeted expenditures and process maps, the City should be recovering approximately \$88,000, however, revenues, on average over the past 5 years has been approximately \$23,400.
- The City's existing base fee differentiates between the type of discretionary application, in accordance with leading practices. Updates to the fees are recommended based on the cost of service.
- While the table below reflects the full cost of service, some municipalities elect to implement a lower fee for some minor discretionary use applications to support affordability objectives for small businesses.
- The following summarizes the recommended fees, with further staff consideration for minor discretionary use applications:

	201			ew Fee
	2018	8 Fees	Calo	culations
Discretionary Use - Standard Application	\$	1,050	\$	4,140
Discretionary Use - Complex Application	\$	1,950	\$	4,700
Discretionary Use - Highly Complex Application	\$	5,300	\$	5,770



#### **Concept Plan**

- As defined by the Government of Saskatchewan, concept plans are prepared and are part of an Official Community Plan (OCP). They provide a framework for subsequent subdivisions and development. Concept plans may describe:
  - land use proposed for the area, generally or specifically;
  - density of the development proposed, generally or specifically;
  - general location of services proposed; and
  - phasing of development proposed.
- A concept plan forms a part of a municipality's OCP. Therefore, pursuant to section 44 of the Planning and Development Act (PDA), a municipality that has not been declared an approving authority pursuant to section 13 of the PDA must adopt and amend any concept plan by bylaw which requires ministerial approval. A municipality that has been declared an approving authority may adopt a concept plan by resolution.
- A review of the existing fees and structure was undertaken against the process maps and other possible alternative rate structures.
- Validation of the hours was also undertaken against the City's process maps to identify the cost of service.
- The City has not attempted to collect the full cost of service for concept plans. The new process map reflects that the fee should be \$16,920 compared with the existing fee of \$1,875.
- The practices vary considerably across Canada in terms of the definition of a concept plan and the processes. Regina is most comparable and their existing fee is \$49,900 and is currently under review.



#### Forecast Activity Levels

	2017 Activity	2018 Activity Estimated	2019 Activity	2020 Activity
Development Permit Appl	ications			
Development Permit	1,400	1,500	1,500	1,600
Development Permit - Contruction Value (000's)	495,750	463,875	463,875	475,480
Subdivision Application	ns			
Subdivision Applications	50	80	65	80
Subdivision Approval (per lot)	385	580	490	580
Zoning Applications				
Text Ammendment	1	2	1	1
Low Density	1	4	2	2
Consistent with Approved Concept Plan	9	12	9	10
Med/High Density	5	7	5	7
Contract Zone (additional fee)	3	3	3	3
Concept Plan Major (additional fee)	-	2	1	2
Concept Plan Minor (additional fee)	1	4	2	2
Direct Control District (requiring Council approval)	-	1	1	1
Architectural Control District - Major	-	1	1	1
Architectural Control District - Minor	-	1	1	1
Neighbourhood Concept Plan Ammendment - Major (without rezoning	1	2	1	1
Neighbourhood Concept Plan Ammendment - Minor (without rezoning	1	1	1	1
Official Community Plan	4	-	2	2
Discretionary Use Applic	ations			
Discretionary Use - Standard Application	8	4	6	6
Discretionary Use - Complex Application	7	15	10	15
Discretionary Use - Highly Complex Application	1	1	1	1
Other Applications				
Condo Application Fees (new)	8	15	15	15
Endorsement of Liquor Permits	3	15	15	15
Minor Variance Application Fees	2	4	4	4
Zoning Verification Letters	60	70	70	70

• The table above provides a summary of the historical activity as well as the forecast future activity over the next two years. This was used to assist in estimating revenues and resource requirements.



#### **Recommended Fees**

• Based on an analysis of the cost of service and projected activity levels, the following reflects the recommended fees, based on full cost recovery principles:

	2018	Faas		Full Cost covery Fees
Development Pern			net	
Development Permit Final - Flat Fee	\$	135		
Development Permit Infill - Flat Fee	\$	135		
Development Permit - Contruction Value (000's)		\$ 0.45		
Residential New			\$	310
Residential Alterations, Additions, Conversions, Den	nolition	s	\$	160
ICI New Base			\$	370
ICI Alterations Base			\$	190
+ \$1,000 construction (ICI only)				\$ 0.45
Subdivision				
Subdivision Application Fees	\$	650	\$	2,500
Subdivision Approval Fees (per lot)	\$	115	\$	50
Max Fee	\$	4,600	\$	5,000
Condominium				
Condominium Fee	\$	750	\$	2,500
Condominium Fee (per lot)			\$	50
Max Fee			\$	5,000
Discretionary Us	e			
Discretionary Use - Standard Application	\$	1,050	\$	4,140
Discretionary Use - Complex Application	\$	1,950	\$	4,700
Discretionary Use - Highly Complex Application	\$	5,300	\$	5,770
Zoning				
Text Ammendment	\$	3,750	\$	2,960
Low Density	\$	3,750	\$	5,436
Consistent with Approved Concept Plan	\$	3,750	\$	4,130
Med/High Density	\$	5,000	\$	6,660
Concept Plan	\$	1,875	\$	16,920



Municipal Fee Comparison



# Municipal Fee Comparison

In total, 13 municipalities were included in the peer comparative analysis as follows:

•	Burlington, ON	•	Edmonton, AB
•	Guelph, ON	•	Kelowna, BC
•	Kitchener, ON	•	Richmond, BC
•	Regina, SK	•	Markham, ON
•	Winnipeg, MB	•	Hamilton, ON

- Calgary, AB
   Vaughan, ON
- Ottawa, ON

The fees for two-tier municipalities includes both the local and the regional fees. Every municipality has unique processes and therefore fees are not always directly comparable. Further, the comparison of fees does not take into account any service level differences that may exist in terms of, for example, the time taken to process an application or the level of customer service provided to the applicant. Municipalities may also have different levels of cost recovery which will impact the fee for service.

As shown in the benchmarking comparative fee analysis in the next several pages of the report, the existing and recommended fees in Saskatoon continue to be well below the peer average. It should be noted that the fee comparison is using 2018 fee schedules. Further, it should be noted that the fees in Regina are currently under review.

It is recommended that in addition to comparing the fees across various jurisdictions, performance standards should be considered in future studies. While not all municipalities have established or report on performance standards, it is a leading practice.



City of Saskatoon—Planning and Development Fee Review

Subdivision 10 Units \$60,000 \$50,000 \$40,000 \$30,000 \$20,000 \$10,000 Ś-585Habon NEW Martham **Witchener** Burlington Edmonton Hamilton Richmond Average Vaughan Winnipes OFTAND Guelph Saskatoor +elowr Regime Calear \$90,000 Subdivision 25 Units \$80,000 \$70,000 \$60,000 \$50,000 \$40,000 \$30,000 \$20,000 \$10,000 Sastatoon NEW Pce alean ener Richmond Martham WinnipeB Hamilton Edmonton Average Burlington Vaughan Kelowna Guelph Ortawa Regina

Subdivision Fee Comparison

• Note: the City of Regina's fees are currently under review and are expected to increase to reflect the full cost of service.





City of Saskatoon—Planning and Development Fee Review

• Note: the City of Regina's fees are currently under review and are expected to increase to reflect the full cost of service.



Summary of Recommendations



#### Summary of Recommendations

- 1. Move to a full cost recovery fee model for all Planning and Development Applications in accordance with leading practices based on the summary table provided in this report. The impact of this recommendation would reduce the impact to the mill rate by approximately \$100,000-\$200,000 depending on the level of activity.
- 2. Update the allocation of staff to be recovered from fees, based on the process maps.
- 3. Increase fees annually based on an inflation and undertake a detailed review at least every 5 years.
- 4. Subdivision Permit Applications Increase the base fee to reflect standard work that is undertaken, regardless of the size of the property and lower the existing per unit cost to reflect the incremental additional work related to larger subdivisions.
- 5. Zoning Application Differentiate between a Zoning Text Amendment application and a Low Density Zoning application in terms of the fee to reflect that there is less staff time required for a Zoning Text Amendment.
- 6. Development Permit Applications
  - Residential Establish a base fee for a <u>residential</u> application and eliminate the existing additional fee for cost per construction as the cost for residential new construction applications does not vary by the cost of construction. Recommend a lower fee for residential alterations, additions, demolitions and conversions to reflect the lower work required and eliminate the cost per construction portion of the fee.
  - ICI Given the significant variation in the types of ICI applications, it is recommended that the base fee be updated to reflect the fixed cost component and maintain the same cost per \$1,000 of construction.

