•

١

ITEM	2 5		
MANA	GER'S REPO	RT NO.	35
COUN	CIL MEETIN	G May	12/75

Re: Land Exchange and Development Agreement D.L.'s 15 and 100 Subdivision Reference #131/74 - Community Builders Ltd. (Item 1, Report No. 19, March 17, 1975) (Item 21, Report No. 21, March 24, 1975)
(Item 1, Report No. 29, April 21, 1975)

On April 21, 1975, Council in connection with the subject land exchange and development agreement adopted the following recommendations:

- "1. THAT the Municipality accept Lots 16 to 21 inclusive, plus Lots 29, 30 and 31 within the subject subdivision; and
- 2. THAT Municipal properties in the subdivision be serviced at the same time as those of the developer; and
- 3. THAT the Municipality pay 9/62 of the actual costs of development not exceeding \$79,417.74, plus 9/62 of actual engineering inspection costs not exceeding \$3,176.71."

The following motion was then passed:

"That with reference to land exchange and development agreement, D.L.'s 15 and 100, Subdivision Reference #131/74, Community Builders Ltd., being Item 1, Municipal Manager's Report No. 29/7, the Municipal Manager bring forward a report clarifying what the Municipality would have realized under the sale of the land to Community Builders Ltd. as was proposed for \$127,090.00 whereas the Council recommended co-development which would mean the sale of the lots for about \$270,000.00 of which the municipal costs would appear to be \$82,500.00 meaning a profit of at least \$187,000.00 as compared to the original sale price of \$127,000.00 which is \$60,000.00 difference and that if that is the case then the Council should look at who made the initial report to sell for \$127,000.00."

Comments regarding this inquiry are contained in the <u>attached</u> report from the Land Agent.

This is for the information of Council.

160

ITEM	25		
MANA	GER'S REPORT	NO.	35
COUN	CIL MEETING	May	12/75

S.D. Ref. #131/74 - D.L. 15 and 100, Broadway & North Road

COMPARISON OF DIRECT SALE AND PARTICIPATION

DIRECT SALE OF MUNICIPAL LAND

.

1

.

	Sale Price: \$127,090. Value of \$127,090. used for estimate construction @ 9% interest per ann	ed time of Num	\$138,528.00
LAND	EXCHANGE AND PARTICIPATION		
	Market value of 9 serviced lots	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$270,000.00
	Direct Costs:		
	Land	\$127,090.00	
-	Servicing	79,417.74	
	Inspection Charges	3,176.68	
	Overhead - 13% of \$79,417.74	10,324.30	
	Indirect Costs:		
	Land - 9 months construction time	(1,1,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2	· · ·
	9% per annum	8,674,00	
	- 9 months inspection fees	0,014,00	
	9 9% per annum	217.00	
	- 6 months servicing costs	217.00	
	0 9% per annum	2 572 80	
	- legal	3,573.80	
		1,800.00	
	- advertising & promotions	250.00	\$234,523.52
	Holding costs on fully serviced lots	5	
	having a capital investment of		
	\$234,523.52 for a period of 3 mon	ths	
	for sales and administration		5,218.61
	TOTAL COST TO MUNICIPALITY		\$239,742.00
•	PROFIT TO MUNICIPAL	ITY	\$ 30,258.00
	Additional Costs a Private Developer subject to:-	would be	
	Real Estate Sales Commission 5% of \$270,000. Builders Profit -	\$13,500.00	
	15% of \$270,000.	40,500,00	
	Total:	\$54,000.00	

This is \$23,742. less than would be reasonably expected by a developer.

۰.

,

COUN	CIL MEET	ING May	12/75
MANA	GER'S RE	PORT NO.	35
ITEM	25		

Page 2 (S.D. Ref. #131/74 - D.L. 15 & 100, Broadway & North Rd.)

COMPARISON OF DIRECT SALE AND PARTICIPATION

Direct sale - interest on capital	\$11,438.
By participation anticipated profit	30,258. or 11% of gross
Difference in favour of participation	\$18,820.

Council must relate to our sequence of negotiations and our decisions as of that time.

Our original appraisal of the 25th July, 1974 took into consideration the value of plottage increment to the developer. This amounted to two additional lots, making his purchase a viable proposition at \$127,090.

On March 20th of this year we submitted a report explaining our reasons for making a recommendation to sell the municipal land for \$127,090. <u>Please note:</u> Had Community Builders insisted on a proportionate dedication of comparable area for the Stoney Creek improvements we would only have 8 lots. We considered this factor and made our recommendations accordingly. Fortunately Community Builders failed to make this request and we have come out ahead by one lot, value \$30,000. less servicing costs of approximately \$11,180. leaving a residual to land of \$18,820.

CONCLUSION

. . .

....

.

Ł

1

As a result of Community Builders not requiring a proportionate dedication for the Stoney Creek improvements the Municipality gained one lot.

It is the realization of the extra profit on one lot that makes our participation more desirable. Without that extra lot we would have to recommend a cash sale.

162