MARKHAM
the MARK of EXCELLENCE

Clerk's Department
Corporate Services Commission

November 26, 2003

RECEIVED
DEC 0 1 2003
R.M.Y.
CLERK

REGION OF YORK
CLERK'S OFFICE
FILE No. - P06

Mr. Dennis Kelly
Regional Clerk
The Regional Municipality of York
17250 Yonge Street
Newmarket, ON L3Y 6Z1

RE: **169-T-03 JENNINGS GATE ESTATES MUNICIPAL WATER SYSTEM TENDER AWARD (5.5)**

Dear Mr. Kelly:

This will confirm that at the meeting of Council held on November 25, 2003, Clause 4 of Report No. 65, was approved as follows:

> "That the staff report entitled "169-T-03 Jennings Gate Estates Municipal Water System Tender Award" be received;
>
> And that tender 169-T-03 Jennings Gate Estate, Municipal Water System be awarded to the lowest priced bidder, Kapp Contracting Inc. in their tender amount of $928,602.71 inclusive of $80,000 contingency and 7% GST ($893,888.59 inclusive of $80,000.00 contingency and 3% GST);
>
> And that the Jennings Gate Estates Municipal Water System proceed and the total cost of the work in the estimated amount of $1,047,290 be recovered by imposing an equal fee against each of the property owners abutting the works in accordance with Section 391 of the Municipal Act, 2001;
>
> And that the cost for construction, engineering, easements and all related administration costs at a total estimated amount of $1,047,290 be front-ended by the Town from the Waterworks reserve and recovered from the benefiting property owners with appropriate interest;
>
> And that any cash compensation from the Region of York be considered as funding contribution to the Town or property owners and the total project cost be adjusted accordingly; and that Regional Council be requested to respond to the residents' proposal before the end of December, 2003;

....2/

And that the actual construction cost, the easement cost, all the engineering and related administrative and financing costs front-ended by the Town form part of the total project cost and recovered in accordance with the requirements of Section 391 of the Municipal Act and the by-law approved by Council;

And that the necessary Fee By-law and other necessary documents for the Jennings Gate Estates Municipal Water System be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Section 391 of the Municipal Act, 2001;

And that the contract with Mitchell Hatt & Associates Inc. be extended in accordance with Purchasing By-Law 143-2000, Section 14 (1)(c) which states "...the extension of an existing contract would prove more cost-effective or beneficial". The extended contract will provide site supervision and contract administration services for the project at an estimated cost of $50,000;

And that Town staff meet with residents and the contractor to determine the preferred locations of the private service connections (stubs)."

Yours sincerely,

S. Birrell

Sheila Birrell
Town Clerk

Copy to: Stan Bertoia, General Manager, Construction & Utilities
Catherine Conrad, Town Solicitor
Ophir Bar-Moshe, Asst. Town Solicitor
Stan Lau, Senior Project Manager
Ivy Ho, Purchasing Supervisor

q:\finance and administration\clerks\clerks exec\marylou\council - nov. 25-03.doc

MARKHAM the MARK of EXCELLENCE

REPORT TO FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

TO:	Mayor and Members of Council
FROM:	Stan Bertoia, General Manager, Construction and Utilities Catherine Conrad, Town Solicitor
PREPARED BY:	Stan Lau, Senior Project Manager Ophir Bar-Moshe, Assistant Town Solicitor
DATE OF MEETING:	2003-November-17
SUBJECT:	169-T-03 Jennings Gate Estates Municipal Water System-Tender Award

RECOMMENDATION:

That the staff report entitled " 169-T-03 Jennings Gate Estates Municipal Water System-Tender Award" be received;

THAT tender 169-T-03 Jennings Gate Estate, Municipal Water System be awarded to the lowest priced bidder, Kapp Contracting Inc. in their tender amount of $928,602.71 inclusive of $80,000.00 contingency and 7% GST ($893,888.59 inclusive of $80,000.00 contingency and 3% GST);

That the Jennings Gate Estates Municipal Water System proceed and the total cost of the work in the estimated amount of $1,047,290 be recovered by imposing an equal fee against each of the property owners abutting the works in accordance with Section 391 of the Municipal Act 2001;

That the cost for construction, engineering, easements and all related administration costs at a total estimates amount of $1,047,290 be front-ended by the Town from the Waterworks reserve and recovered from the benefiting property owners with appropriate interest;

That any cash compensation from the Region of York be considered as funding contribution to the Town or property owners and the total project cost be adjusted accordingly;

That the actual construction cost, the easement cost, all the engineering and related administrative and financing costs front-ended by the Town form part of the total project cost and recovered in accordance with the requirements of Section 391 of the Municipal Act and the by-law approved by Council.

That the necessary Fee By-law and other necessary documents for the Jennings Gate Estates Municipal Water System be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Section 391 of the Municipal Act 2001;

That the contract with Mitchell Hatt & Asso tes nc. be extended in accordance with Purchasing By-Law 143-2000, Section 14 (1 c) v hich states "...the extension of an existing contract would prove more cost-effective or nefi :ial". The extended contract will provide site supervision and contract administration servi s fc the project at an estimated cost of $50,000

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to obtain Counc app: oval to proceed with the Jennings Gate Estates Municipal Water System and recove e c sts of such works in accordance with Section 391 of the Municipal Act.

BACKGROUND:

In December 2002, the Ratepayers Associati of . ennings Gate Estates submitted an informal residents survey requesting the Town to proc d w :h the design of a municipal watermain system for Jennings Gate Estates under the L al I nprovement Act (LIA). Based on the informal survey, 51out of the 61 homeowners (84%) v e in support of the watermain request. Residents also indicated their preference for equal cost arin ; per property instead of charges based on individual frontage (Appendix A).

At its meeting of February 25, 2003, Council pprc ved a staff report entitled "Jennings Gate Estates Municipal Water system". The report con mended the hiring of an engineering consultant to design and prepare a tender for pr ject. The report also indicated that when the contract price is known, staff will advise the ide ts of Jennings Gate Estates of the total estimated project cost and the amount to be le ed : gainst the property owners. The residents were requested to submit a formal petition to oce d with construction of the work.

In April this year, staff retained Mitchell Hatt As ociates Inc. to prepare the design and tender documents for the project. Tender was called d fo ur bids were received and opened by the Town Clerk on September 3, 2003.

OPTIONS/DISCUSSION

Implementation Options

There are three options available to the Towr or u idertaking the watermain and raising the cost for the work:

1. Local Improvement charges in accordanc wit Ontario Regulation 119/03 made under the Municipal Act, 2001;
2. Special service charges under Section 326 f the Municipal Act, 2001; or
3. A fee under s.391 of the Municipal Act, 2 1

Option 1: Local Improvement Charges

The Town may pass a by-law to raise all or y pa rt of the cost of local improvement work by imposing special charges on lots abutting on e w rk. Local improvement charges are assessed against owners according to the extent of the fro tage by imposing an equal charge per meter frontage.

There are four ways in which local improvement work may be undertaken:

1. By a sufficient petition in favour of the work;
2. By Council without a petition;
3. By Council on health grounds;
4. By Council without petition with the approval of the Ontario Municipal Board ("OMB")[1]

1 In the absence of a sufficient petition in favour of the work, a municipality may seek the approval of the OMB to protect itself from possible petition against the work which would prevent it from undertaking the work for at least two years.

A sufficient petition in favour of the work would eliminate the threat that the work will have to be stopped because of a petition against the work.

A local improvement by-law must contain an estimated cost of the work, the owners' share of the cost and the municipality's share of the cost. Any changes to the works after a by-law is approved have to be approved by the OMB.

Before passing a by-law to undertake the work, Council must:

1. procure a report prepared by an engineer and provide for the preparation of the assessment roll. Once Council adopts the engineer's report, it can enact a by-law authorizing the work; and

2. give notice of its intention to pass the by-law to the public and the owners of the lots liable to be specially charged.

After the work is completed and its exact cost is known, a special assessment roll is prepared for imposing the charges. The special assessment is then reviewed by a court of revision and confirmed or modified. Homeowners who object to the proposed assessment have a right to a hearing before the court of revision. The court has power to modify the roll and any reductions made in the assessment to the owners will be added to the Town's share of the cost. If the court of revision certifies the roll prior to the completion of the work, the municipality will be responsible for the difference between the actual and estimated cost.

Where the special assessment roll is certified, a by-law passed for borrowing money or imposing special charges with respect to the work cannot be quashed, set aside or be found invalid on the basis that it is illegal or for any other defect in it.

Advantages re Local Improvements

1. Local improvement charges amount to a tax and have a priority lien status. They can be collected in the same manner as taxes;

2. Allows ratepayers an opportunity to challenge the proposed local improvement roll.

Disadvantages re Local Improvements

1. Process: Cumbersome process requirin he ' own to give notice to the landowners of its intention to pass a by-law to undertake ie v ork. Prior to the charges being imposed, the Town will have to give notice of a heari by a court of revision (see 3 below) respecting any objections to the proposed roll;

2. Mandatory municipal cost: The Town i his c ase will have to pay for the entire cost of fire hydrants, which is estimated at $74,000;

3. Changes to charges: The Town will ed t establish a court of revision to hear any objections or revisions to the proposed l al i nprovement roll. A notice of such hearing has to be given to the public and landowners vol ed. The court of revision has power to modify the roll. Any reductions made in the c ners assessment are required to be added to the Town's share of the cost;

4. Calculation of Charges: Applying the le latin scheme will not result in an equal charge per lot. The Regulation requires that owners outt ng directly on the work be assessed according to the extent of their frontage by imp ing an equal special charge per meter frontage. Reductions or increases in charges are p nitte l in certain cases. For example:

   (i) reductions must be made in the c e of a corner lot that has flankage and frontage and all or part of the work that abuts fla kage is of no benefit to the lot;

   (ii) reductions or increases must be ade n the case of triangular or irregularly shaped lots having regard to the situati , va ue and area of the lot as compared with the other lots based on a just and equ ble asis.

   The Regulation does not allow a munic alit to increase the charges for regularly shaped lots. In order to impose an equal charge n e ch of the 61 lots in Jennings Gate, the Town would have to increase the charges imp ed c regularly shaped lots that have a lower than average frontage (e.g. lots 13-16, 40, 49 5 ar l 56). This is not authorized under Regulation 119/03.

Based on the lowest, acceptable tender price id a ding the estimated engineering, easement and administration costs, the estimated per metre ont ge cost and the cost for each lot based on the Local Improvement requirements was calcu ed a d is shown in Appendix B. Since the Local Improvement Act has strict guidelines on th alcu ation of frontage charges that can be levied, there is a wide range of costs to the property wne s varying from $11,000 to $23,000 per lot.

There are a total of 61 lots in the Jennings C e Es ates and the total chargeable frontage, based on the subdivision by-law, is 3209 metres. I cco dance with the Local Improvement Act, the Town is responsible for approximately $74,) of he estimated cost for installation of fire hydrants.

Option 2: A Special Service Charge
Section 326 of the Municipal Act, 2001 allows a municipality to enact a by-law to impose a special service charge to raise the cost of providing a water system. Such bylaw has to identify the service, determine the costs and designate the area where the charge would apply.

Charges are levied by by-law as a separate tax rate on the assessed value of each rateable property in the area designated in the by-law.

Advantages re Special Charge
1. Special charges are a form of tax and therefore have priority lien status. Unpaid charges could be collected by way of a tax sale;
2. There is no statutory appeal mechanism to challenge the by-law (application to the courts to quash the by-law is possible, but will not likely succeed if the legislative scheme was adhered to);
3. Unlike local improvement charges, there is no mandatory municipal share of the costs;

Disadvantage re Special Charge
1. Applying the legislative scheme will not result in an equal charge per lot. Charges are based on assessment values. The assessment value in the case of Jennings Gate varies considerably. For example, one of the lots is assessed at $604,000 while another is assessed at over $1.7 million;

Option 3: Fees By-law
Section 391 of the Municipal Act, 2001 allows a municipality to pass a by-law to impose a fee for capital costs related to sewage or water services on a class of persons that will receive a benefit from such services. Unlike a local improvement charge or special service charge, a fee imposed pursuant to section 391 does not have to be based on frontage or assessed value. This provision would enable the Town to impose a fixed charge on each of the lots in question.

A fee by-law may provide for interest charges and other penalties for fees that are due and unpaid. Fees may be added to the tax roll and collected in the same manner as taxes. They do not however have a priority lien status and a tax sale is not available.

Advantages re Fees By-law
1. Simplified process. Council has to pass a by-law in accordance with s.391 of the Municipal Act, 2001;
2. Unlike local improvement charges, there is no mandatory municipal share of the costs;
3. A flat and equal fee could be charged on each of the 61 lots in Jennings Gate notwithstanding that they differ in frontage, size, or assessed value;
4. No application can be made to the Ontario Municipal Board on the grounds that the fee imposed is unfair or unjust;

Disadvantages re Fees By-lawFees and charges imposed by a municipality do not have priority lien status and a tax sale is not available for unpaid fees. However, all other collection tools are still available to the Town. Because such fees are added to the tax roll, any future purchasers who request a tax certificate from the Town would be notified of such fees. In such cases, any outstanding fees will likely be settled prior to the property being conveyed or assumed by the new owner. Risk of non-recovery of fees v ıld lso be mitigated depending on the number of owners who choose to pay the entire fee in ε ımp ɜum payment. It is understood that the majority of the resi ıts i ı Jennings Gate Estates are of the opinion that an equal fee should be imposed on each of ɘ 6: lots involved. If this is the primary objective and the Town is willing to accept the risk as ɜiat ɖ with such fees not having priority lien status as described above, then it is recommende :hat the Town should proceed with Option 3 and enact a fee by-law. In all three options, alt: ıgh he homeowners have to pay their share of the project cost, they do not have to connect to e m ınicipal watermain, and can keep the well for drinking purposes.

Construction Tender

All bids were issued in accordance with the] :chε ing by-law 143-2000. The award is being awarded to the lowest priced bidder.

Advertised, place and date	Dε Nε Cor ɔrk (mercial News and Electronic Tender :TN)
Bids closed on	September 3, 2003
Number picking up bid documents	5
Number responding to bid	4

Four companies submitted qualified bids.

Companies	Inclusive of $8( )0 contingency & GS'	Inclusive of $80,000 contingency & 3% GST
Kapp Contracting Ltd.	$ 928, .71	$ 893,888.59
Trisan Construction	$1,224,).32	$1,179,119.28
Power Contracting Limited	$1,350, ι.34	$1,300,026.86
Hollingworth Construction*	$1,564, .97	$1,505,727.13

All tenders were checked for errors and omis ɔns. *Hollingworth's bid was corrected for mathematical error. Reference checks were : de ı n the previous performance of Kapp Contracting Ltd. and the result was satisfactc . T erefore, it is recommended that the contract be awarded to the lowest priced bidder Kapp ɔntı cting Ltd. in the amount of $928,602.71 inclusive of $80,000.00 contingency and 7% ST ı $893,888.59 inclusive of $80,000.00 contingency and 3% GST).

Total Project Costs

Using the lowest tendered price, the estimate otal project costs are summarized below:

Construction.. ....$893,890* (3% GST)
Engineering Fees (Design)........................ ....$ 48,400
Engineering Fees (Inspection/Contract admin.) ....$ 50,000
Easement Costs (Ontario Hydro/Private owner) ....$ 20,000
Easement Admin./Registration Fees............ ....$ 8,000
Admin. Cost (Town staff)......................... ....$ 20,000
Admin. Costs (Tendering, Advertising, Notices c)... ....$ 7,000
Total Prc t Cc t..................$1,047,290

* Service connection from the main to] 'per y line is included in the construction cost.

Retaining of Consultant

The service of an outside engineering consult t is equired to provide site supervision and contract administration for this project. Sinc Mitc ell Hatt Associates Inc. was the consulting engineer for the design and preparation of tender documents for the project, it is recommended that the firm be retained to provide the site supervision and contract administration services in accordance with Purchasing By-Law 143-2000, Section 14 (1) (c) which states "...the extension of an existing contract would prove more cost-effective or beneficial".

The estimated fees of $50,000 (approx. 5% of construction cost) by Mitchell Hatt Associates Inc. for provision of site supervision and contract administration is considered reasonable for projects of this size and nature.

Abandonment of existing wells

Some residents have asked whether they would be allowed to retain their existing water well, after connecting to the municipal water system, for the purposes of watering the lawn, refilling the swimming pool etc. Staff have consulted with the Ministry of Environment and the York Region Health Unit and have been advised that at present, there are no Provincial Regulation/Policy or Directive requiring the residents to abandon their wells, as long as they are not connected to the municipal water system and are maintained and in use.
Therefore, although staff have concerns regarding private cross connection by the property owners (intentionally or unknowingly) and possible contamination of the municipal water system, or potential ground water contamination from the septic tile beds, the Town or MOE cannot force the residents to decommission their existing wells.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

The Town is required to front-end the cost of this project in the estimated amount of $1,047,290 and recover the cost from the local residents. The project can be funded from Waterworks reserve and paid back with appropriate interest (or approx. $17,170 per lot based on onetime payment, no interest). In addition, there will be easements required to loop the watermain on Hydro One and a privately owned land. These associated costs have been estimated and included in the total project cost. Residents would have the option of paying the full amount at the time of connection or over 10 years with interest payable at the 10 Year Region of York Debenture Interest Rate.

Region of York Financial Mitigation

With respect to the proposed phase II trunk sanitary sewer construction on 16th Avenue by the Region of York and its potential impact on the existing wells in Jennings Gate Estates, the Town is currently in negotiation with ROY for cash compensation. Any such cash settlement will be considered as funding contribution to the Town or property owners and the total project cost will be adjusted accordingly.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS:

No adverse environmental impact is expected since all works are located within the existing Rights-of-Way.

BUSINESS UNITS CONSULTED AND A [ ]E(TED:

The Clerks Department and the Legal Depar[ ]ent [ ]ave been consulted, provided input and reviewed this report. The Finance Departme[ ] has [ ]eviewed and concurred with this report. Should Council approve this project, the Cle[ ] De[ ]artment in consultation with the Legal and Finance Department will be required to prep[ ] an[ ] publish the Fee By-law with all the terms and conditions in accordance with Section 3[ ] of t[ ]e Municipal Act 2001.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 'A' – Letter from Ratepayers Assc[ ]tio[ ]
Appendix 'B' – Frontage Charges Table

Stan Bertoia, P. Eng.
General Manager, Construction and Utilities

Catherine M. Conrad
Town Solicitor

Peter Loukes, P.Eng.
Director of Operations and Asset Manageme[ ]

Jim Sales
Commissioner of Community and Fire Services

Q:\Finance and Administration\Finance\Purchasing\2003 File Man[ ]nent\[ ]ontract Management\169-T-03 Jennings Gate Muncipal Water System\169-T-03 Award Report F & A.doc

JENNINGS GATE RATEPAYERS ASSOC.

Councillor Dan Horchik
Town of Markham
Re: Municiple Water

Dear Mr. Horchik,

The executive members of The Jennings Gate Ratepayers Association recently conducted a telephone survey (Nov.25th- Dec.8th 2002) regarding the residents position on municipal water supply to our subdivision.

The following conditions were proposed:

1) The total cost would be approximately $20,000.00
2) This cost includes fire hydrants – but not hook-up to individual homes
3) The residents would have approximately 20 years to pay through their property taxes

Jennings Gate Estates consists of 61 properties and property owners. 54 residents were contacted and 51 residents indicated "yes" to municiple water and 3 said "no". We were unable to reach the remaining 7 households. However, the 51 "yes" votes represents 83.6% of the total subdivision.

As a result of this survey, the Association officially requests the Town of Markham to proceed with the detail design and estimate for the supply of municipal water to The Jennings Gate Estates subdivision.

We ask that the final petition is sent to the Association executive for review and obtaining signatures, and that the cost / home is based on equal share of total costs not property frontage.

Dan, I thank you kindly for your assistance regarding this matter.

Yours truly

Lou Tucci
President

APPENDIX 'A'

JENNINGS GATE ESTATES - WATERMAIN PROJECT

Frontage Charges

Lot No.	Address	Frontage (m)	Lot Type	Area (s.m)	Ave.Frontage(m)	Variance (m)	Frontage Charged	Total Frontage Cost
1	2 Jennings Gate	58.207	C	4250	52.610	5.597	58.207	$18,282.53
2	8 Jennings Gate	39.054	I	5535	52.610	-13.556	52.610	$16,524.54
56	2 Boynton Circle	52.457		4048	52.610	-0.153	52.457	$16,476.48
57	4 Boynton Circle	53.700		4047	52.610	1.090	53.700	$16,866.90
58	6 Boynton Circle	53.400		4054	52.610	0.790	53.400	$16,772.67
59	8 Boynton Circle	47.833	I	4050	52.610	-4.777	52.610	$16,524.54
60	10 Boynton Circle	36.500	I	4208	52.610	-16.110	52.610	$16,524.54
61	12 Boynton Circle	37.000	C	4122	52.610	-15.610	37.000	$11,621.52
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	I	[illegible]	52.610	-16.110	52.610	$16,524.54
4	20 Boynton Circle	46.576	I	4047	52.610	-6.034	52.610	$16,524.54
5	22 Boynton Circle	52.834		4048	52.610	0.224	52.834	$16,594.90
6	24 Boynton Circle	37.115	I	4047	52.610	-15.495	52.610	$16,524.54
11	30 Boynton Circle	39.716	C	4053	52.610	-12.894	39.716	$12,474.60
12	32 Boynton Circle	42.491	I	4047	52.610	-10.119	52.610	$16,524.54
13	34 Boynton Circle	51.665		4047	52.610	-0.945	51.665	$16,227.72
14	36 Boynton Circle	51.724		4047	52.610	-0.886	51.724	$16,246.25
15	38 Boynton Circle	51.725		4047	52.610	-0.885	51.725	$16,246.56
16	40 Boynton Circle	51.725		4053	52.610	-0.885	51.725	$16,246.56
17	42 Boynton Circle	47.697	I	4048	52.610	-4.913	52.610	$16,524.54
39	46 Boynton Circle	45.600	I	4566	52.610	-7.010	52.610	$16,524.54
40	48 Boynton Circle	45.720		4060	52.610	-6.890	45.720	$14,360.42
41	50 Boynton Circle	45.731	C	4047	52.610	-6.879	45.731	$14,363.88

28	5 Boynton Circle	54.275	I	4047	52.610	1.665	52.610	$16,524.54
27	7 Boynton Circle	74.560	I	4048	52.610	21.950	52.610	$16,524.54
26	9 Boynton Circle	73.965	I	4047	52.610	21.355	52.610	$16,524.54
25	11 Boynton Circle	67.146	I	4047	52.610	14.536	52.610	$16,524.54
24	15 Boynton Circle	70.218	I	4047	52.610	17.608	52.610	$16,524.54
23	17 Boynton Circle	73.773	I	4047	52.610	21.163	52.610	$16,524.54
22	19 Boynton Circle	73.985	I	4048	52.610	21.375	52.610	$16,524.54
21	21 Boynton Circle	57.798		4047	52.610	5.188	57.798	$18,154.06
20	23 Boynton Circle	57.798		4047	52.610	5.188	57.798	$18,154.06
19	25 Boynton Circle	57.798		4047	52.610	5.188	57.798	$18,154.06
18	27 Boynton Circle	50.037	C	4047	52.610	-2.573	50.037	$15,716.37
38	49 Boynton Circle	52.033	C	4086	52.610	-0.577	52.033	$16,343.31
29	55 Boynton Circle	88.099	C	4060	52.610	35.489	52.610	$16,524.54
55	1 Ryan Crescent	51.550		4048	52.610	-1.060	51.550	$16,191.60
54	3 Ryan Crescent	53.900		4048	52.610	1.290	53.900	$16,929.72
53	5 Ryan Crescent	55.770		4048	52.610	3.160	55.770	$17,517.08
52	7 Ryan Crescent	51.526	I	4048	52.610	-1.084	52.610	$16,524.54
51	9 Ryan Crescent	36.500	I	7494	52.610	-16.110	52.610	$16,524.54
50	11 Ryan Crescent	36.500	I	4392	52.610	-16.110	52.610	$16,524.54
49	15 Ryan Crescent	45.720		4055	52.610	-6.890	45.720	$14,360.42
48	17 Ryan Crescent	45.720	I	4120	52.610	-6.890	52.610	$16,524.54
45	2 Ryan Crescent	78.000	C	4482	52.610	25.390	52.610	$16,524.54
46	4 Ryan Crescent	70.000		4130	52.610	17.390	70.000	$21,986.65
47	6 Ryan Crescent	73.499	C	4322	52.610	20.889	73.499	$23,085.67
42	22 Ryan Crescent	64.975	C	4346	52.610	12.365	64.975	$20,408.32

43	24 Ryan Crescent	49.170	I	4048	52.610	-3.440	52.610	$16,524.54
44	26 Ryan Crescent	47.837	C	4188	52.610	-4.773	47.837	$15,025.36
30	1 Forson Court	50.563	C	4431	52.610	-2.047	50.563	$15,881.59
31	3 Forson Court	61.526	I	4067	52.610	8.916	52.610	$16,524.54
32	5 Forson Court	69.007	I	4049	52.610	16.397	52.610	$16,524.54
33	7 Forson Court	36.500	I	4055	52.610	-16.110	52.610	$16,524.54
34	9 Forson Court	36.500	I	4091	52.610	-16.110	52.610	$16,524.54
37	2 Forson Court	54.054	I	4048	52.610	1.444	54.610	$17,152.73
36	6 Forson Court	57.814		4047	52.610	5.204	57.814	$18,159.09
35	8 Forson Court	45.009	I	4048	52.610	-7.601	52.610	$16,524.54
7	2 Wilmont Court	41.452	C	4047	52.610	-11.158	41.452	$13,019.87
9	6 Wilmont Court	36.721	I	4048	52.610	-15.889	52.610	$16,524.54
10	8 Wilmont Court	44.050	I	4090	52.610	-8.560	52.610	$16,524.54
	Block 63	0.000						$0.00
	Total	3209.215		255065.000			3219.668	$1,011,281.62

4181.3934 (ave. lot area)

per m frontage = 1,008,000/3209.215 $314.10

C = Corner Lot
I = Irregular Lot