

**Appendix D: Survey of Other Cities**

The use of Local Improvement Programs (LIP) varies widely among Canadian cities. The policy options presented in this report were partly based on practices in other cities. A combination of web research and telephone interviews was conducted to determine the local improvement policies in place in other mid-sized Canadian cities.

Most provinces have legislation allowing municipalities to assess a special local improvement charge to properties benefiting from a local improvement. Based on web research, it appears several cities do not have or do not use a LIP comparable to Regina’s suspended program. Some cities with no program or a program suspended indefinitely include:

- Saskatoon, SK
- Calgary, AB
- Kelowna, BC
- Vancouver, BC
- Victoria, BC
- Saint John, NB
- St. John’s, NL

Telephone interviews were conducted with four cities that do have a LIP:

- Edmonton, AB
- Lethbridge, AB
- Winnipeg, MB
- Brandon , MB

Table 1 summarizes the use of LIPs in these cities.

Table 1: Use of Local Improvement Programs in Surveyed Cities

	City-Led Initiatives	Owner-Led Initiatives	Cost Sharing Available	Renewal of Existing Infrastructure	New Infrastructure	Program Regularly Used
Edmonton	Yes	No*	Yes**	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lethbridge	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Winnipeg	No	Yes	Yes**	No	Yes	Yes
Brandon	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No

\*If a group of owners requests a local improvement, the City will initiate the formal process.

\*\*Cost sharing is limited to defined programs only.

Edmonton uses its LIP only for City-led initiatives. Edmonton has a Neighbourhood Renewal Program, which provides 50 per cent city funding to sidewalk reconstruction in designated neighbourhoods. For work outside this program, including sidewalk replacement in non-designated areas, property owners pay 100 per cent of the cost. Edmonton is the only city to use a LIP for renewal of existing infrastructure, as Regina had prior to the suspension of the program. If property owners desire new infrastructure and wish to fund it as a local improvement, the City will lead the petitioning process.

Lethbridge uses its LIP only for resident-led initiatives and does not provide any funding. Lethbridge reported that their back alley paving program is quite popular. In Lethbridge, alley paving is not subsidized, yet an estimated 75 per cent of all gravel back alleys have been paved under the LIP. Lethbridge also reported that it is common for an alley paving project to be proposed by residents on blocks adjacent to those that have recently been paved.

Winnipeg uses its LIP for resident-led initiatives only, and almost exclusively for alley paving. In Winnipeg, a City subsidy of 50 per cent for alley paving is available under a temporary program from 2013 to 2019. Winnipeg reported that the back alley paving program has been very popular since the introduction of the city subsidy, but that non-subsidized programs are rarer, and generally used most often for connecting rural areas within city limits to municipal water and sewer. The City of Winnipeg representative estimated that the number of owner-led and funded projects numbers is highly variable but less than ten in any year.

Brandon has a LIP in theory, but has reported only completing one project under it in the last ten years. In Brandon, the local improvement process is entirely owner-initiated. Details on the program are not available.

Other cities such as Ottawa, Halifax, and London have significant areas of rural land within their city limits, and typically use the local improvement process to bring city services such as water and sewer to the areas within city limits that previously not had these services.