

**APPENDIX 2**

**Second Public Meeting: EDC Background Study and Proposed By-laws Comments Matrix**

Statistics point to people retiring in the new Sandwich South development so there would be no need for a new school.

How do you know that if it is based on a projection for a development that doesn't already exist?

What formula are you using to come up with that idea?



there is an urban sprawl component to this?

contemplated as a method for the public to be able to appeal a board's by-

suites which are not being captured, even



the Sandwich South lands for example) my confidence in the background report calculations lowers. It is suggested that there was more recent data that the City of Windsor did not consider. That error would apply here as well if the same figures were used.

Expected new builds include projections for intensification, but those that are exempt are removed before they divide the total cost projected by the number of projected units added. This makes the rate artificially high. Not necessarily bad if you are trying to drive intensification over sprawl when talking about within Windsor only. However, since the EDC's proposed for the county are much lower and the expected developments are not very far from the City of Windsor boundaries, there is concern that the fees would encourage sprawl.

In the projection of need for student seats, I don't see where we have assumed an increased student demand due to intensification – only for the non-exempt new builds (sprawl). Sarah mentioned this, they don't seem to anticipate student need increases for the downtown area, when it surely will have an increased need due to the CIP's. Also, I was not clear on how they calculated projected student needs overall. The speaker noted that people do not build 3000 square foot

The rate is not artificially high but rather is the correct rate based on legislation that statutorily requires the Board to exempt certain units that meet certain 'intensification' requirements.

Considering the quantum of the proposed EDCs there is little

<p>homes and live there without children. I disagree. In fact, that is exactly what we are seeing - the average income in Windsor/Essex County is lowering. Fewer younger people with growing families can afford high mortgages. Citizens are retiring to suburbs into new homes that don't require immediate up front maintenance or have Home Owner associations and lawn/snow maintenance contracts.</p> <p>They are calculating student demand without correcting for population shift. It was proposed it was not necessary to correct for this because they are talking totals for overall need. A student only needs one seat. If that seat moves to a different school, it is still only one seat. They are counting students twice while not discounting them anywhere. False growth.</p> <p>If you close a school and build a new one due to student distribution but not growth, that new site does not qualify to use EDC reserve funds. This may explain why we are not discounting the moved students.</p> <p>I seek clarification in what the speaker meant when he said if surplus funds were collected and new schools are not needed and not built, the surplus funds would just "go back". Go back where? I understand</p>			<p>The question asker's assertion that student demand is calculated without accounting for population shift is difficult to understand. The enrolment projections do not follow students. Enrolment projections are based on projecting the needs of the existing community (students that currently exist or students coming out of existing homes) and projecting the needs of students arising from new residential development.</p> <p>Students are never counted twice.</p> <p>I don't know what 'false growth' is.</p> <p>I don't know what the question asker means when they say we are discounting the moved students.</p> <p>The EDC reserve fund is self correcting in that every time the by-law is renewed, the balance of the reserve fund is included as part the net education land costs.</p>
--	--	--	--



<p>schools on the outskirts of Windsor in neighbourhoods where population is purportedly anticipated to increase. (A much lower EDC of \$682 in the county further diminishes the appeal of building a new home in one of Windsor's established neighbourhoods.) Yet current data projections do not support a sizeable influx of new residents overall. For the foreseeable future, many of Windsor's existing schools are expected to remain at less than full capacity.</p> <p>What I am suggesting is supported by the principle that only "growth pays for growth." Homeowners investing in older neighbourhoods should not be required to subsidize land acquisition for future greenfield development.</p> <p>Such a policy already exists for municipal development charges (DCs) in Windsor and could easily be replicated by the GECDSB. This policy exempts DCs in the northern section of the city bounded by Prince, Pillette and Tecumseh Roads. See <u>Windsor's Development Charge Pamphlet</u>.</p> <p>People cannot be faulted for wanting to migrate to new areas with updated infrastructure, even if this means leaving gaps in older neighbourhoods. Given a shifting population, rather than one with robust overall growth, the pressure to consolidate older schools is likely to continue, forcing the GECDSB to make difficult – and contentious - decisions. An unfortunate outcome of school</p>			
---	--	--	--

consolidations is more

the outskirts of the city, a more palatable approach is to use EDC pricing structures to *encourage* outcomes that reflect the intention of planning policies.

For this reason, a differentiated EDC structure that exempts fees in the city's older neighbourhoods -