

MEA Development Engineering Committee (DEC) Meeting Minutes

Date: February 5, 2026

Time: 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Location: Microsoft Teams (Virtual)

Chair: Mike Pincivero, Town of Wasaga Beach

Recording & Transcription: Enabled via Microsoft Teams (announced at start)

1. Attendees

Note: Attendees provided their names and municipalities through the meeting chat as requested.

Key Participants Involved in Discussions (as explicitly identified in transcript):

- **Mike Pincivero** – Town of Wasaga Beach (Chair)
 - **Tom Wheeler** – Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury
 - **John Thompson** – Participant
 - **Andrea Dale** – Town of Whitby
 - **Dan Polak** – Town of Whitby
 - **Hoodad Abootalebi** – City of Richmond Hill
 - **Jonathan Stumm** – County of Brant
 - **Rollie Orial** – City of Oshawa
 - **Mary Angelo** – City of Guelph
 - **Bryan Worsley** – Town of The Blue Mountains
 - **Bryan Bishop** – Township of Woolwich
 - **Paul Guerreiro** – City of Richmond Hill
 - **Ary Rezvanifar** – City of Vaughan
 - **Xenia Pasiecznik** – Town of Grimsby
 - **Stephen Ruddy** – Town of Ajax
 - **Mansoor Ali** – City of Markham
 - **Natalia Codoban** – City of Richmond Hill
 - **Terri-Lynn Larocque** – City of Oshawa
 - **Daniel Hodge** – Town of Grimsby
 - **Pat Scanga** – City of Toronto
 - Numerous other DEC members (approx. 60+ in attendance)
-

2. Meeting Structure & Opening Remarks

Speaker: *Mike Pincivero*

- Confirmed recording & transcription were active.
 - Reviewed land acknowledgement for Town of Wasaga Beach.
 - Explained informal but structured meeting format, including **hand-raising**, identifying municipality before speaking, and use of chat for introductions.
 - Noted the meeting minutes would be generated using **Copilot AI based on the transcript** to reduce preparation time.
-

3. Administrative Items

3.1 DEC Circulation List Management

Speaker: *Mike Pincivero*

- ~160 people on distribution list; turnover continues.
- Undeliverable addresses are removed; additions made upon request.
- Goal is to keep the group inclusive and updated.

3.2 Review of Previous Minutes

Speaker: *Mike Pincivero*

- Previous minutes were circulated shortly before the meeting.
 - Members invited to send corrections directly by email.
 - Key past topics reviewed (Development review course, NIMBYism, auto-flushers, more-homes-built-faster initiatives, rear lanes standards, grading permissions, etc.)
-

4. Agenda Items & Discussion Summaries

4.1 Development Review Training Course (Anita – absent)

Speaker: *Mike Pincivero*

- Anita previously offered to provide a development review training resource.
 - Mike will follow up with her and circulate any materials received.
-

4.2 Infill Lot Grading & Building Permit Integration

Speaker: *Mike Pincivero*

Key Question:

Do municipalities still tie **infill lot grading plans** (application → approval → certification) to the **building permit and final inspection**?

Municipal Responses:

Whitby – Dan Polak / Andrea Dale

- Use **separate infill grading permits**; must be completed before a building permit is issued.
- Deposit amounts vary by dwelling type and grading scope.
- Not tied to occupancy.

Richmond Hill – Hoodad Abootalebi

- Separate **site alteration by-law process** since 2008.
- \$10,000 security (higher if significant grading).
- Final grading inspection triggers security release; not tied to occupancy.

County of Brant – Jonathan Stumm

- Grading review prior to building permit.
- Securities: \$2,200 (single), \$3,300 (semi), \$4,500 (townhouse).
- Not tied to occupancy.

City of Oshawa – Rollie Orial

- Separate permit; not tied to occupancy.

City of Guelph – Mary Angelo

- No security or certification for infill lots; only initial grading reviewed.

Town of Wasaga Beach – Mike Pincivero

- Fully tied to building permit and final occupancy.
- Recently increased deposit to \$5,000.
- Current practice gives municipality enforcement leverage.

Decision:

No formal DEC decision; practices vary widely.

Action Item:

Municipalities to share security amounts in meeting chat for benchmarking.

4.3 Dust Complaints – Construction Sites

Speaker: *Mike Pincivero*

Issue raised due to significant dust concerns from Costco site construction in Wasaga Beach.

Common Responses from Municipalities

Blue Mountains – Bryan Worsley

- Success through direct discussions with contractors; water trucks used.
- Seasonal restrictions on **soil screening** (not allowed in dry summer months).

Woolwich – Bryan Bishop

- Cash deposits (\$20–\$30k) used primarily for **street sweeping**.

Richmond Hill – Paul Guerreiro

- Enforced via **Clean Neighbourhoods Bylaw**.
- Bylaw officers inspect, issue orders to comply, and can levy fines.
- Use of calcium chloride, tarped loads, and active dust suppression required.

Action Item:

Wasaga Beach to review Richmond Hill's Clean Neighbourhoods Bylaw enforcement model.

4.4 Bill 17 – Development Charges Payable at Occupancy

Speaker: *Ary Rezvanifar (Vaughan)*

Seeking benchmarking on how municipalities adjust processes now that **DCs are payable upon occupancy** (not building permit).

Key Responses:

Wasaga Beach – Mike P.

- Treasury is concerned; procedures still evolving.

Richmond Hill – Paul G.

- **Two-invoice system** now used:
 1. Invoice #1 – Education DCs, parkland CIL, water meters, boulevard trees → required for issuing building permit
 2. Invoice #2 – City + Regional DCs → required before occupancy

4.5 Development Securities / Reach-Through Agreements

Speaker: *Ary Rezvanifar (Vaughan)*

Concern: developers pushing to avoid “double-securing” works for block plans and trustees.

Responses:

Markham – Mansoor Ali

- Negotiated 50% direct security + 100% with trustee; trustee's security not released without city approval.

Wasaga Beach – Mike P.

- Developers requesting incentives; municipality has not reduced securities.

Blue Mountains – Bryan W.

- Condo developers challenging need for securities; legal position still evolving.

General Finding:

No municipality supports “reach-through” security model at this time.

4.6 Condominium Securities

Discussion led by: *Bryan Worsley*

Most municipalities:

- **100% security** for external works; **25–50% for internal site works**.
 - Several noted: municipalities do **not** enter private property to complete deficiencies; securities act as leverage, not construction funding.
-

4.7 Using the Drainage Act for LID / Private Lots

Speaker: *Bryan Worsley*

Key concerns:

- CVC encouraging Drainage Act use for LID; municipalities find it unsuitable.
 - LID maintenance on private property difficult to enforce.
 - Mutual drainage agreements discussed as an alternative.
-

4.8 Site Plan Securities — Benchmarking

Covered extensively during earlier security discussions (Item 4.5). No further debate.

4.9 Local Service Policies (Bill 60)

Speaker: *Tracy Blanchard (Orillia)*

Municipalities must define what is a **developer responsibility** vs a **DC-funded municipal work**.

Key references shared:

- City of Guelph Local Service Policy
- Township of Woolwich policy

4.10 Tiebacks, Crane Swing, and Temporary Encroachments

Speaker: *Braedon Dane (Richmond Hill)*

Municipal Practices:

- **Orillia** – Encroachments via “License of Occupation.”
- **Markham** – Detailed encroachment agreements; security required.
- **York Region (Calvin M.)** – Strong policy:
 - **No shoring piles** allowed in municipal ROW.
 - Require minimum 1 m setback; if unavoidable, top 3 m of piles must be removed.
 - Encroachment permits required for temporary works.

4.11 Design Considerations for Underground Parking Structures

Speaker: *Mike Pincivero*

Expert hydrogeological input from **Natalia Codoban (Richmond Hill)**:

Key items to review:

- Hydrogeology (groundwater elevation, artesian pressure)

- Settlement impacts to adjacent properties/infrastructure
 - Pumping rates and discharge pathways
 - No permanent discharge to sanitary sewers
 - Dewatering discharge must meet stormwater quality criteria
 - Potential need for watertight “bathtub” designs (rare due to cost & buoyancy)
 - Pre-construction condition surveys & settlement monitoring
-

5. Additional Roundtable Items

5.1 Industrial/Commercial Stormwater Controls (Oshawa – Terri-Lynn)

- Seeking practices regarding SWM pond ownership vs. private controls.
- Responses show variation; some require 80% TSS removal onsite plus municipal pond quantity control; others avoid municipal ownership altogether.

5.2 Role of Development Engineering vs. Building (Grimsby – Dan Hodge)

- Municipalities vary; many engineer departments still review private site servicing due to network impacts.

5.3 ERO Proposal on “Complete Applications” (York Region – David Mhango)

- Concern: proposal may deem engineering submissions “complete” even if technically poor.
- Members awaiting PEO guidance.
- **POST MEETING NOTE:** The following email response was received by Pat Scanga from the PEO and shared with M. Pincivero:

Hi Mr. Scanga,

Thank you for contacting PEO.

PEO have provided comments to this regulation and you can view the response at [PEO's Comments | Environmental Registry of Ontario](#)

Specifically, you will see PEO’s comment related to your concern:

“Regarding the issue of which certified professionals should be included in the list of professionals whose reports/studies would be required to be accepted as final submissions by a municipality as part of a complete planning application, municipalities should be required only to accept signed and sealed reports prepared by appropriately certified professionals acting within their regulated scope of practice. Engineers, technicians, architects, and land

surveyors are regulated, however, land use planners, ecologists, urban designers, etc., are typically retained for these applications so their eligibility should be defined.”

I hope that this information is helpful for you. Please feel free to reach out if you have any further questions.

Please note that PEO can only comment on the Professional Engineers Act, its Regulations and PEO practice guidelines. PEO cannot provide advice on any legal matter or contractual issue.

NEW! PEO’s free practice guidelines and standards subscription service : [PEO’s free subscription](#)

Practice Advisory Services, External Relations

Professional Engineers Ontario

e: practice-standards@peo.on.ca

6. Decisions Made

- Meeting minutes to be prepared via Copilot (current document).
- Members to continue sharing bylaws, security policies, and procedures via email/chat.
- No formal motions or committee votes recorded.

7. Action Items

Item	Responsible	Notes
Follow up with Anita on Development Review Course	Mike Pincivero	Attach to minutes if available
Share lot grading security values	All municipalities	Via meeting chat / follow-up email
Wasaga Beach to review Clean Neighbourhoods Bylaw enforcement	Engineering staff	Related to dust complaints

Vaughan to circulate benchmarking matrix for tiebacks & encroachments	Braden Dane	To all DEC members
Towns to share Local Service Policies (Bill 60)	Guelph, Woolwich, others	Provided during meeting
Further guidance requested from PEO re: Complete Application regulations	DEC membe	

Appendix A – Chat Contributions & Links (Microsoft Teams)

This appendix compiles relevant chat messages and links shared during the meeting to support the discussion captured in Section 4 of the minutes. Timestamps and reactions are omitted for brevity.

Note: A few URLs pasted from Teams may be truncated (e.g., Toronto Infill Lot Grading; Woolwich DC study). Replace with full canonical links if needed when circulating.

4.2 Infill Lot Grading & Building Permit Integration — Chat highlights & resources

City of Toronto – Lot Grading Requirements for Infill Housing: [toronto.ca – Infill Lot Grading](https://toronto.ca/infill-lot-grading)

City of Richmond Hill – Site Alteration Permits: richmondhill.ca/site-alteration-permits

City of Richmond Hill – Swimming Pool Site Alteration Permit: richmondhill.ca/pool-site-alteration

Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury – follows similar infill grading process as Richmond Hill (per chat).

City of Orillia – Lot grading inspections moved to Building Division; Lot Grading Deposit \$2,000 (\$350 non-refundable inspection fee + \$1,650 refundable upon certification).

County of Brant – refundable grading securities: Single \$2,240; Semi \$3,360; Townhouses \$4,480 (per unit).

Town of Whitby – building department notes OBC only covers grading within ~2 feet of structure; hence grading not tied to permit. Security benchmarking discussion noted (per-unit deposits higher for singles than semis/THs).

4.3 Dust Complaints – Construction Sites — Chat highlights & resources

City of Oshawa – Dust and Mud Control By-law; Site Alteration By-law; Preservicing Earthworks approvals, with securities for compliance. PDF: [Control Nuisance Dust & Mud \(By-law 64-2020\)](#)

City of Richmond Hill – By-laws page: [richmondhill.ca – By-laws](https://richmondhill.ca/by-laws)

City of Toronto – Dust By-law overview: [toronto.ca – Dust](https://toronto.ca/dust)

City of Orillia – no dedicated dust control by-law/securities; complaints handled by Development Coordinator (per chat).

4.4 Bill 17 – Development Charges Payable at Occupancy — Chat highlights & resources

City of Oshawa – subdivision agreements revised to reflect DC timing changes; Building Services collect DCs (per chat).

City of Richmond Hill – Development Charges information: [richmondhill.ca – Development Charges](https://richmondhill.ca/development-charges)

Securities & bonds – several municipalities allow bonds; ongoing benchmarking and developer feedback noted (per chat).

4.5 Development Securities / Reach-Through Agreements — Chat highlights

Town of Whitby – West Whitby arrangement: LOG posted 100% securities with group trustee (accessible by Town); Town also held additional 30% COW performance LC as discretionary leverage, with penalties if obligations unmet (per chat).

City of Toronto – security practices shared: 65% of capital cost for subdivision securities; 100% for municipal infrastructure agreements used for Site Plan Control (per chat).

4.9 Local Service Policies (Bill 60) — Chat highlights & resources

Bill 60 status update shared in chat: passed third reading Nov 24, 2025; Royal Assent Nov 27, 2025 (per chat).

City of Guelph – 2023 Development Charges Background Study (Appendix E – Local Service Policy) referenced in chat.

Township of Woolwich – 2024 DC Background Study link pasted via browser extension path (replace with canonical URL when available).

4.10 Tiebacks, Crane Swing & Temporary Encroachments — Chat highlights & questionnaire

City of Richmond Hill (contact: Braedon.Dane@richmondhill.ca) shared the following questionnaire to benchmark municipal practices:

Do you have an Encroachment Policy that speaks to tiebacks and crane swing encroachments?

Is the Encroachment approval issued in the form of a permit or agreement? If an agreement, is it registered on title?

What are your application and processing fees and how are they established?

Do you collect securities and how are they established?

What is the duration of the permit/agreement? Does it have a timeframe or expiry date?

Do these encroachment permits/agreements cover other temporary construction activities (hoarding/fencing, trailers, overhead pedestrian protection, construction staging, temporary storage, etc.)?

Are encroachments categorized (e.g., Major vs. Minor)?

Does your Municipality use a Road Occupancy Permit to cover any temporary construction encroachments?

Which departments are the delegated authority/owners of the Encroachment Policy and of the permit/agreement?

Do you require SUE test holes prior to tieback installation, and Municipal Sewer CCTV before and after installation?

How do you manage vibrations/vibration monitoring? Any by-law/policy/procedure? Are monitoring conditions imposed in development agreements?

Destressing requirements?

Town of BWG – noted issues with high-rise tiebacks and crane swing; revisiting Construction Management Plan and encroachment agreements in Site Plan Agreements (per chat).

York Region Development Engineering – offered to provide group with guidelines and standards on shoring (per chat).

4.11 Design Considerations for Underground Parking Structures — Chat highlights & resources

Town of Whitby – 2025 Design Criteria & Engineering Standards: [whitby.ca – Design Criteria & Engineering Standards \(see Section I4.08\)](https://www.whitby.ca/Design-Criteria-Engineering-Standards)

Town of BWG – reliance on Sewer Use By-law for discharge quality to storm sewer (per chat).

PTTW (MECP) – required if discharge exceeds 50,000 L/day; otherwise registration under EASR (per chat correction).

5. Additional Roundtable Items — Chat highlights & resources

Industrial/Commercial Stormwater Controls – Oshawa (Terri-Lynn) sought input on onsite vs publicly owned SWM facilities, mitigation measures, and any voluntary financial contributions (per chat).

Appendix B – Attendance (self-identified in chat)

The following participants identified themselves in the chat. This list complements the attendee list captured in the transcript and may include external participants:

- Andrea Dale – Town of Whitby
- Grace Tesa – City of Toronto
- Dhiman Saha – Ajax (WRE)
- Xenia Pasiecznik – Town of Grimsby
- Dan Polak – Town of Whitby
- Calvin Mollett – York Region
- Rollie Orial – City of Oshawa
- Alex Lam – City of Peterborough
- Braedon Dane – City of Richmond Hill
- Paul Guerreiro – City of Richmond Hill
- Adam Santos – County of Brant
- Hoodad Abootalebi – City of Richmond Hill
- Tolga Aydin – City of Welland
- Farrukh Qureshi – City of Oshawa
- Mary Angelo – City of Guelph
- Jonathan Stumm – County of Brant
- Jennifer Bernard – Township of West Lincoln
- Natalia Codoban – City of Richmond Hill
- Devina Mohamed – Town of Innisfil
- Mansoor Ali – City of Markham
- Sean Wren – City of Toronto
- Tracy Blanchard – City of Orillia
- Neil Miles – County of Brant
- Jennifer Hazelton – City of Richmond Hill
- Rob Nicoll – City of Richmond Hill
- Tom Wheeler – Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury

- Julie Tot – Township of Woolwich
- Amy Mejia – Town of Wasaga Beach
- Don Cunningham – County of Brant
- Joe Alava – City of Mississauga
- Nicole Cameron – City of Peterborough
- Stephen Ruddy – Town of Ajax
- Lea Marshall – City of Windsor
- John Thompson – City of Richmond Hill
- Audrey Tam – York Region
- Gareth Hill – City of Oshawa
- David Hatherley – Town of Wasaga Beach
- Jacob O’Connor – City of Waterloo
- Nasir Mahmood – York Region
- Brent Vipond – City of Oshawa
- Kobi Karunakaran – Town of Whitby
- Bryan Bishop – Township of Woolwich
- Stefanie Thorne – Town of Collingwood
- Terri-Lynn Larocque – City of Oshawa
- Jesus Guerra – Town of Whitby
- Xing Zhang – City of Oshawa
- Irina Marouchko – City of Pickering
- Daniel Hodge – Town of Grimsby
- David Mhango – York Region
- Abdul Barakzay – County of Brant
- Sofia Polania – Town of Milton
- Brian Worsley – Town of The Blue Mountains
- John Lau – York Region
- Cynthia Tam – York Region
- Ary Rezvanifar – City of Vaughan

- Ryan Furtado – City of Thunder Bay
- Nhat-Anh Nguyen – City of Toronto
- Brian Kostuk – City of Niagara Falls
- Jason Peters – Town of Wasaga Beach
- Pat Scanga – City of Toronto
- Saleem Khan – City of Toronto
- Frank Lombardi – York Region
- Patti Kennedy – Clearview Township
- Ashley Traynor – York Region
- Rafael Campos – Loyalist Township
- Michael Stewart – City of Waterloo
- Lukasz Pawlowski – City of Toronto

Appendix C – Meeting Logistics (from Teams chat)

Meeting title: MEA DEC Meeting. Meeting created and recorded by Mike Pincivero. Recording saved to organizer's OneDrive. Meeting duration: 9:00 AM – 12:01 PM (3h 10m).

4.7 Using the Drainage Act for LID / Private Lots — Chat resources

Ontario – Mutual Agreement Drains (overview and how-to): [ontario.ca – Mutual agreement drains](#)

5.3 ERO Proposal on “Complete Applications” — Chat resources

Environmental Registry of Ontario – Proposed Regulations: Complete Applications (Notice 025-0462): [ero.ontario.ca – Notice 025-0462](#)