

Dear D.C. Gwen  
and the respected officials and leaders of this Township,

I am writing to you today with great disbelief, on what I just read in the “Development Charges Background Study” outlining the proposed charges to new builds in the area. The proposed is roughly an additional 10k to pay for township services from what I’m understanding. Isn’t that what our annual tax bill is for and what the township has budgeted for successfully in the past? I’m all for keeping taxes low but this is a huge financial hurdle for someone like myself to be able to get past, on top of the already difficult hurdles it takes for any first time home owner when choosing the building development route on an existing lot.

How can the township expect young adults in this area to stick around?

My name is Sebastian Hudder. I’m a 25 year old resident and Tax Payer of the Madawaska Valley. I recently acquired a lot in the area and I have been readying my finances for a future build with my partner. We’ve been in talks with all the banks, and a broker to forecast when we’d be able to make this happen, and the seemingly impossible budget to be able to afford to build was looking promising. We knew it would be difficult, but we have drive to save and were on track to build in 2 years! We love this area, despite the fact that there’s not the opportunity career-wise that the city would have to offer. But this proposal would be a HUGE financial delay for us and our building plans. The cost of tradesmen in in the area is unreal, and the latest mortgages rates are up at a 10 year high.

It’s so depressing to be a 25 year old who has made good choices, but is still living at home, because housing is impossible to afford. I went to college to level up. I moved back home and got a good paying full time job. I started and continue to run a side hustle. I paid off my debts. I save save save. I don’t spend money on drinking or smoking. I don’t even have a vehicle payment. But the cost to live is impossible and I don’t think those responsible for this proposal realize the extent of it.

I listened to the election meeting that was broadcasted this fall, before our new municipals were elected, and a popular subject, came up through-out the question period; which were concerning young adults, and our affordable housing crisis, along with the problem of not being able to keep young peoples in the area. This is a popular issue amongst those like myself and most choose the easier option of, moving to the cities for career opportunities and rental options.

Adding more red tape and financial hurdles only make this area more unliveable for the young people, hard working and future leaders of this township.

If your plans are to make this a Toronto retirement community, you will succeed. But who will care for our elderly? We need young people to stay and build families. We need affordable housing. We don’t need red tape from our municipality.

Please consider this letter when voting on mine and all the futures of the young people of this beautiful area.

Sincerely,  
Sebastian H.



The housing market is already unaffordable. How would first time home buyers/ and or builders be able to afford this housing market? How would we, or anyone for this matter be able to afford to live in this area? We plan to build this following year and this is already going to be a struggle without adding on anything additional, as it is we are already being charged for taxes and being charged for permits.

Thank you in advance for the consideration,

Chris Nicholas and Abigail Bowers



To All Council Members,

We are not able to attend the public meeting on January 12, 2023, therefore, we are writing to express our opposition to any development charges.

Madawaska Valley Township has become an unaffordable place for any young families trying to purchase or build a house in the last few years. They cannot afford the additional expense that the development charges will add to a single family dwelling.

We are asking council to please consider the affordability of housing in this area before passing this by-law.

Thank you.

Eric & Patti Nicholas

74 Hildebrandt Street

Barry's Bay, ON



January 9, 2023

To The Mayor and Council of Township of Madawaska Valley:

This letter is regarding the proposed Development Charges that the Township is hoping to impose on the already taxed residents or possible residents of Madawaska Valley.

It is difficult enough to keep young people in our area and in my opinion if these Development Charges exist, they will only drive people out of our Township and force them to seek employment and reside elsewhere. Although our Township is a gateway to Algonquin Park and larger city centers, make no mistake we are not a large center. Petawawa and Arnprior have been referenced and given their population we are nowhere near those population numbers and should not be compared to those cities.

I understand there are circumstances where Development Charges may benefit the Township such as resorts, subdivisions, etc. However, these charges do not benefit the average person planning to build on an existing township maintained road. The cost to the township for that particular build is zero, in fact they are only gaining an additional property tax that has all those development charges incorporated in the annual tax bill. Our nearby Townships currently do not have any additional fees and are actually encouraging new growth.

I hope that I have misunderstood the rather lengthy and I'm sure costly document as it is quite a confusing and unclear read.

In closing I would like to give my opinion opposing the Development Charges and really hope more residents of Madawaska Valley do the same. I also hope that Council thoroughly listens to the people of Madawaska Valley and act in our best interest.

Sincerely,



Christine Recoskie



January 11, 2023

Mayor Willmer and Members of Council:

I'm writing this brief letter in response to the Towns proposal for the implementation of municipal development charges.

We acquired the 18-acre parcel on Siberia Road directly across the road from the Hospital with the vision to create a seniors-oriented lifestyle community offering a variety of housing and ownership options at the most affordable price point possible. The land was zoned for such a development and the town council and community in general, seemed quite enthusiastic for such a project. We completed our feasibility analysis and decided to take the risk and proceed with the various studies and planning required to achieve a draft plan/ site plan approval. This is a costly endeavor, although an important and necessary component in the development process. We are excited and encouraged with many of the attributes that this particular property enjoys including the regional hospital across the road, the lake frontage and the proximity to the beautiful town of Barry's Bay. Almost ideal for the community concept that we envision.

The fact that Barry's Bay did not have development charges was a key component in our analysis and decision to proceed. It's a risky business at the best of times and the recent increase in construction, development and capital costs are concerning enough. The added cost of development charges at this stage is difficult and perhaps impossible to absorb. The main challenge being that in smaller communities such as Barry's Bay, although the need for housing exists, the costs for development and construction are the same or greater than the major urban centers, however the retail value of the units are significantly lower. We simply don't always have the luxury for increasing the end user costs to recover all expenses.

We understand that the current infrastructure can provide enough sewer and water capacity to service our proposed development. Implementation of the proposed development charges will potentially make this project no longer feasible. It is our hope that the proposed development charges can be deferred allowing us to continue with our vision to create a successful community that the town of Barry's Bay will be proud of. We are very happy to be involved in your community and look forward to a continued relationship with Barry's Bay, the council and the residents.

Respectfully,

Mark Wilson

On behalf of the Kings Landing Community proposal.



DEVELOPMENT CHARGES - PROPOSAL TO ENACT BY-LAW IMPOSING – MADAWASKA VALLEY TWP.

Public Meeting, February 9, 2023

TO: Mayor and Council

Comments and recommendations derived from Development Charges Act (Ontario) (the "Act"), Development Charges Background Study by Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. (the Study") and draft By-law (the "By-law")

Comments arising from Executive Summary of the Study:

Items 6. and 9. These sections assume that the Council will enact a DCA By-law. Is the public meeting being held merely to fulfill a requirement of the Act? Is it a foregone conclusion that a By-law will be enacted – now? The Council has the option and the right to decide NOT to enact a DCA By-law at all. Section 2(1) of the Act states: "The council of a municipality MAY by by-law impose development charges against land..." Presumably the Council will enact a By-law only if satisfied that it is in the best interests of the Township to do so – at this time.

Item 4. The thrust of the five pieces of very recent provincial legislation ("More Homes, More Choice", More Homes Built Faster", etc.) discussed under this item is to recognize and attempt to address the housing crisis in Ontario – the shortage and unaffordability of both new homes and rental accommodation. These recent statutes introduce amendments to the Act designed to reduce the impact of development charges on residential development. More exemptions from development charges are introduced (e.g., for "affordable units" and "attainable units" (as defined)). For a municipality which does not yet have one to proceed at this time to enact a development charges by-law and thereby further increase the cost of new development - including residential development – would run entirely counter to these very clear, current provincial and local objectives.

One of the recently-proclaimed statutes amends Section 37 of the Planning Act (Ontario) by empowering municipalities to "impose community benefits charges ("CBC's") against land to pay for the capital costs of facilities, services and matters required because of development or redevelopment". CBC's may be used to impose charges for services listed under the Act – but a municipality may not charge for the same services under both a development charges by-law and a CBC by-law. CBC's can only be imposed on development which involves at least 10 residential units. This might be a more appropriate technique for extracting money from corporate developers of plans of subdivision should larger-scale projects be proposed in the Township, as opposed to nailing with a \$10,000.00 development charge individuals wishing to erect one dwelling. The authors of the Report admit that "A CBC strategy has not been examined as part of this study process". In the body of the Report, the authors state (see page 1-7) state that "Currently, the Township is not undertaking a CBC process". Perhaps the Township should be doing so before enacting a development charges by-law?

Item 5. Consistent with the projection made for purposes of the 2020 County of Renfrew Official Plan, the Report projects very modest growth in the Township over the next 15 years – only 19 new residential units per year over the next 10 years and only 17 over the following 5 years. At about

\$10,000.00 per unit as proposed, this will generate only about \$200,000.00 of additional gross revenue per year. Has any municipality with such modest projected growth as this Township enacted a development charges by-law?

Item 8. and Table 5-4. Apart from "services related to a highway" (\$1.5 million), the substantial expenditures foreseen to be made over the next 10 years are for fire-protection services (new station, vehicles - \$922,000), a new library (\$1.54 million) and "parks and recreation services" (\$1.53 million), contributing to total projected expenditures of \$5.4 million. In calculating the amount to be raised by development charges, NO ALLOWANCE is made for "Other Funding" (see Table 5-4). Historically, much if not most of the funds expended on major capital projects (recently, Paugh Lake Road reconstruction) come from provincial/federal grants. The Council recently received a proposal for the redevelopment of Lakeshore Park at an estimated cost of \$2.3 million. The Mayor made it clear that actual development would have to wait until funding from sources other than the taxpayers became available. It is reported that the MV Library has struck a committee to be ready to apply for funding should any provincial or federal library grants become available.

Comments arising from the Act:

Section 3 "No land .....is exempt from a development charge by reason only that it is exempt from taxation (property taxes).....". Does this mean that if a development charge by-law is enacted, it will be collected on the pending Valley Manor redevelopment and the planned expansion of the Emergency Dept of St. Francis Memorial Hospital? The draft B-law (Appendix G to the Report) does not exempt either project from a development charge calculated at the (proposed) rate of \$5.99 per square foot of gross floor area.

Section 4.1 and ff. exempt from development charges "affordable" and "attainable" residential units - i.e., those rented or sold at 80% or less of the "average market rent" or "average purchase price" (as determined by bulletins issued by the provincial government) ONLY IF the developer of the unit enters into an agreement with the municipality undertaking to maintain the status of such units as such for 25 years, and the agreement is to be registered against the title to the unit and is enforceable against subsequent owners of the unit.

Section 26(2), 27 Ordinarily a development charge is paid when a building permit is applied for, but a municipality may in some circumstances require payment when a severance consent to the creation of a single lot is granted, even if the owner (who perhaps has created the lot for his child) does not intend to develop it for some considerable time.

Section 20 and others. The costs of administering a development charge By-law will be substantial. How much of the revenue collected (say, \$10,000.00 x 19 residential units + \$190,000.00 per year) will be consumed in collecting, accounting for and dealing with disputes concerning development charges? How time will be have to be devoted by the CBO, his assistant, the development and planning officer and support persons dealing with aspects of the By-law? What is the aggregate value of that time? Section 20 entitles persons from whom a development charge is demanded to complain to the COUNCIL about errors in the application of the By-law and /or the amount of the charge

(see Report, section 7.3.5). The Council is **REQUIRED** to hold a hearing. If the person is not satisfied with the Council's decision, he or she can appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal, probably resulting in the Township having to engage and pay a lawyer, its staff having to prepare for and attend a hearing, etc.

Section 33 requires the municipality to establish a separate reserve fund for **EACH** of the many services to which the **development charge** relates, to "sprinkle" each charge collected among the reserve funds, to spend **EACH** reserve fund only on the service for which it was collected, and to spend or allocate annually at least 60% of the amount in **EACH** reserve fund (see the Act, Sec. 35(2)). Will the Township need to hire another staff person to manage this additional accounting? By how much will the Township's auditor's annual fee go up?

And these administrative costs **ARE NOT** built into the calculation of the amount of the development charges imposed (although the cost of preparation of the Report is...).

**RECOMMENDATION:**

I urge the Council to **REJECT** the recommendation of the authors of the Report and to **decide NOT** to enact a Development Charges By-law – at least **NOT AT THIS TIME**.

The Report does **not** identify any cogent policy reasons **WHY** the Township should enact a Development Charges By-law. In fact, its authors acknowledge its potential depressive effect upon growth and its contribution to higher housing prices (see Report, sec. 7.2)

This Council did not commission the Report. It has been in office for only a few weeks. Three of the Councillors are newly-elected and deserve more time to become familiar with current priorities, the Township's overall financial position, etc. before being asked to commit to enacting a development charges by-law.

The Council deserves to know more about **CBC's** as a possible alternative to a development charge.

The power to enact a Development Charges By-law has existed since the Act was proclaimed in 1997, and will not be lost forever if the Council chooses to "pass up" this opportunity, and decides instead to turn its collective "thumb down", preferring at this difficult time not to impose a charge which will make all types of housing even more expensive, and for very little net financial gain.

Robert B. Howe  
46 Murray Park Street  
Barry's Bay, ON K0J 1B0  
howelers@hotmail.ca



Feb 8/23

from:- Eve-Marie Chamot  
POB 718  
Barry's Bay, Ontario  
K0J 1B0

e:- [eve.mimico@gmail.com](mailto:eve.mimico@gmail.com)

to:- Madawaska Valley Township Council  
per Gwen Dombroski, deputy clerk  
Township of Madawaska Valley  
85 Bay Street  
Barry's Bay, Ontario  
K0J 1B0

m:- PO Box 1000, Barry's Bay, ON, K0J 1B0

t:- 613.756.2747 Ext. 212 / tf 1-866-222-8699

f:- 613-756-0553

w:- [www.madawaskavalley.ca](http://www.madawaskavalley.ca)

e:- [gdombroski@madawaskavalley.ca](mailto:gdombroski@madawaskavalley.ca) / [info@madawaskavalley.ca](mailto:info@madawaskavalley.ca)

re:- comments re proposed development charges

Hello, I'm a permanent resident and ratepayer and also a retired senior in the Township of Madawaska Valley and I wish to state my complete and total opposition to the proposed by-law for development charges.

This silly by-law is completely unnecessary and will not accomplish anything useful and it will in fact actually be very harmful to the Township and its residents.

Development-charge bylaws are used only in rapidly growing towns and cities to pay for the new urban infrastructure needed to support new homes, businesses and institutions.

This is most definitely not the case in TMV where there is plenty of excess existing infrastructure and a low rate of new building which can be easily accommodated by existing infrastructure:- why is it necessary now to charge us exorbitant new development charges typical only for a fast-growing big city to build new homes and businesses and other buildings which otherwise increase total taxable assessment but which can be easily accommodated by existing spare infrastructure capacity?

The projections for future development in TMV by the consultant clearly indicate that even without the development charges there will be very little development but those projections fail to project the effect of those proposed charges in further discouraging future development.

Neighbouring Townships quite sensibly do not have these very toxic and unnecessary development charges  
with the result that much future development will shift to them  
and in fact these proposed grossly excessive development charges will be lucky to generate enough new tax revenue  
to cover the cost of the consultant's study:-  
in the past TMV has developed a very bad habit  
of becoming a big "make-work project" for various big-city lawyers and consultants  
to generate an endless stream of big fees for them for "services" of very dubious value  
at the great expense of local ratepayers  
and this proposal for new development charges is a good example of that.

This proposed by-law is clearly an attempt to make a mindless and unwarranted "tax-grab" by the previous Council  
which had a very bad habit of spending excessive amounts of taxpayer money on useless and counterproductive projects  
like the pointless and petty escalation of minor litigation to grotesque amounts of legal fees.

They then decided to introduce a new "development charge" to pay for all this nonsense  
since the ratepayers did not want any new tax increases on existing assessed property  
so they thought they would just "stick it" to new construction with grossly exorbitant development charges on new construction  
but this will actually be very counterproductive  
because it will chase all future development into neighbouring Townships  
and also impose gradual stagnation on the existing tax base as residents are discouraged from renovating and replacing  
and gradually but steadily Barry's Bay will evolve into a future "ghost town" like Hopefield and Brudenell  
and a few others:-  
this local community is not quite ready to curl up and quietly die like that!

The local ratepayers most definitely do not want this  
and that's why we voted out the old Council and replaced them with mostly new Councillors  
and this new Council should also "dump" this very stupid idea of development charges inherited from the previous Council.

One group which will especially suffer from this wretched new development tax will be young families:-  
it's very important for Barry's Bay to retain its young people  
and to recover young folks who have moved away in the past  
and this new development tax will completely frustrate that goal.

Councillors might also have noticed that our newest and youngest Councillor, young Mr Olsheski, is only 28 and has no previous municipal experience  
but he received far more votes than any other Council candidate from both older and younger residents who were very concerned about the intense propensity of the "old fogies" on the previous Council to "stick it" to younger residents so please do the sensible and fair thing  
and drop this wretchedly stupid development-tax proposal and very bad idea inherited from the previous Council:-  
we don't need it and we don't need to strangle this community with this type of fiscal suicide!

The balance of this letter will discuss constructive alternatives to proposed development charges to increase taxable assessment in the Township to increase total conventional tax revenues.

(A) The most desire for new development in the Township is for projects that need access to municipal water and sewerage in the village of Barry's Bay.

However, one major problem in accommodating such new projects in the old Village of Barry's Bay is the fact that long ago in the early 1970s the old Village Council made a very short-sighted decision to save on the cost of the then-new municipal water and sewerage system by severely limiting its expandability and extensibility so that now it is very difficult to impossible to extend water-mains and sewers into new areas to allow new urban development.

However some possibilities to do that still exist:-

- (1) an extension of Kelly St west along the old railway from Paugh Lake Rd to Martin's Siding Rd with accompanying sewers and watermains to accommodate a new light industrial park;
- (2) an extension of St Francis Memorial Drive north to Hwy 60 with accompanying sewers and watermains to accommodate new apartment and townhouse projects;
- (3) the above extension of St Francis Memorial Dr with water and sewer lines would also allow the extension of new water and sewer services eastward on Hwy 60 to Mintha St to connect with the existing terminus of water and sewer lines on Hwy 60 east of Mintha St and this would allow a major extension of Barry's Bay's main street with plenty of room for new commercial, office, and retail buildings;
- (4) There also needs to be a replacement of the old aging trunk water main on Trader's Lane to support all these other projects.

To get things moving Council should also establish a new joint "Infrastructure Committee" for this purpose

chaired by a Councillor and including other interested Councillors plus other interested and qualified citizens appointed by the Council:- the ideal chair would of course be young Mr Olsheski, who just happens to be an accredited professional civil engineer.

(B) Council also needs to establish a new joint Economic Development Committee chaired by a Councillor and comprising other interested Councillors plus other interested and qualified citizens appoint by Council.

This new Economic Development Committee would work on attracting various small and medium-sized businesses to TMV.

There's also the possibility of attracting some very big new businesses which do not need new municipal infrastructure:-

(1) There is a huge expansion underway globally in manufacturing wood-pellet fuels as Europeans replace Russian natural gas with wood fuel-pellets from North America but this trend seems to be bypassing the upper Madawaska Valley which is an ideal venue for wood pellet plants:-  
someone really needs to get out there and attract some of these pellet plants to this region.

(2) IKEA is the world's single biggest buyer of lumber for making furniture and it very much needs to find new sustainable supplies of wood to replace its former Russian sources.

The whole Algonquin region produces exactly the type of lumber which IKEA needs plus this region has plenty of low-cost derelict farmland and pasture land to accommodate new IKEA tree plantations  
but someone really needs to get out there and attract some of these new IKEA plants to this region.

(3) There is a huge shift underway in salmon aquaculture as both the Canadian and US governments ban coastal cage farms  
so many companies are now developing new RAS (recycling aquaculture system) fish farms in inland locations.

All of central Ontario from Muskoka to west Renfrew County and the north Kawartha and Haliburton regions is blessed with the type of cool clean oligotrophic waters which RAS salmon fish-farms need plus there are plenty of educated literate workers to staff these farms and excellent highway connections to urban markets  
but someone really needs to get out there and attract some of these new RAS fish farms to this region.

(C) Council should also encourage interested local citizens to establish a "Madawaska Valley Community Housing Corporation"  
to tap into various government programs to locally develop new assisted seniors' housing and rent-geared-to-income housing for people with disabilities.

(1) One possibility would be to acquire the moribund Pinewood Motel property which seems to be "dead" business-wise  
and redevelop that into a medium-rise apartment building:-  
it would be very easy to service it with sewer and watermain connections.

(2) Another possibility would be to persuade the "Suomi Koti" Finnish-Canadian seniors' residence in Toronto  
to relocate their seniors' home to Barry's Bay.

They very much need to make a major expansion to accommodate a growing wait-list but they are hemmed in by obscenely expensive Toronto real-estate prices which totally prevents that and they could actually sell their old Toronto property for enough money  
to build a much bigger and better seniors' residence in Barry's Bay  
to accommodate all their existing tenant-clients plus their entire wait-list plus even a few extra units for local seniors.

This region is geographically much like Finland but only even better and Finnish-Canadians would be a natural cultural fit for this region with a high-degree of compatibility plus the Toronto Fenno-Canadian community has extensive business connections in Finland so they could attract a lot of new forest-related and wood-working businesses here plus also tourism so what are we waiting for?

(3) Another idea Council should explore is to rezone all the older residential parts of Barry's Bay, other than the Sandhill subdivision, as "village residential" and allow homeowners in these zones to install one or two rental mobile homes or trailer homes on larger older lots with a lot of extra frontage provided that the homeowner pays additional property taxes on those units based on their assessable value and the usual residential mil rate.

Many older "biscuit-box" homes in Barry's Bay are on large lots with municipal services and paved roads which can easily accommodate one or even two additional rental mobile homes and trailer homes and the neighbours are generally not finicky about this and would not oppose it:- these trailer homes are quite inexpensive relative to new-builds and this could quickly add a lot of economical new family-oriented and also senior-friendly housing to the village plus a considerable amount of new taxable assessment.

However someone really needs to first get out there and make all this good stuff happen because it most certainly will not happen by itself.

So, in conclusion, there is no need for the proposed development tax plus it would kill a lot of potential progress and there are quite a few things Council can do to generate new taxable assessment in TMV instead of inflicting this proposed wretched new development tax on us.

However TMV has been burdened for too long by "do-nothing" Councils which found it easier to make new problems instead of solving old problems so these proposed solutions will take awhile to generate positive results.

Thank you / EMC