

Index

- 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments, 24, 26, 28, 173
- ability-to-pay (ATP) principle, 3–4, 6, 22, 56, 68, 82
- administrative feasibility, 30–31, 146, 174
- ALS impact fee, Cape Coral, FL, 103–105, 138–139, 163
- appeals process, 87, 100, 114, 120, 128, 152
- Australia, 28, 49–51, 169, 172–173, 177
 - Australian Capital Territory, 33–34
 - Brisbane, 62
 - developer contributions in, 32
 - development charges in, 30, 33
 - development contributions, 33–36, 38, 51
 - governance structure, 33–34
 - Growth Areas Infrastructure Contributions (GAICs), 36–37, 51, 55, 162, 167–168
 - New South Wales (NSW), 33–35, 37–38, 51, 54, 157–158, 161, 167
 - Northern Territories, 33, 37, 52, 157
 - Queensland, 35–38, 51, 54, 62, 157, 164, 168
 - South Australia, 33, 38
 - Special Infrastructure Contributions (SICs), 35–37, 51, 54, 167
 - Tasmania, 33, 37–38
 - Victoria, 33–34, 36–38, 51, 157–158, 162, 167–168
 - Western Australia, 33
- average cost, 3, 7–11, 111
- beneficiary-to-pay (BTP) principle, 3, 6–7, 9, 17, 19, 172
- capacity fee, 2
- capital expenditures, 2, 18, 27, 39, 44, 91–92, 102, 105, 117–118, 168, 177
- capital facilities fee, Fremont, 92–94, 96–97, 99, 138–139, 163
- case studies, development charge programs
 - Cape Coral, FL, 100–101
 - appeals process, 114
 - credits, exemptions, exclusions, and exceptions, 114
 - local level, 102
 - public safety impact fees, 103–105

- recreational facilities impact fee, 105–106
- revenue yield and stability, 111–113
- roads impact fee, 106–107, 111
- school impact fee, 108–110, 113
- state level, 101–102
- timing of payment, 114
- track fee revenue, 114
- utility capital expansion fees, 102–103
- water, irrigation, and wastewater fees, 110, 113
- Chennai, Tamil Nadu, 114–115
 - appeals process, 120
 - credits, exemptions, exclusions, and exceptions, 120
 - fee calculation methodology, 118
 - fee types and rates, 117–118
 - legal enabling framework, 115–117
 - new infrastructure needs
 - funded by impact fees in CMA, 119
 - revenue yield and stability, 118–119
 - timing of payment, 120
 - track fee revenue, 120–121
- development charges
 - ability to meet growth
 - management and other planning objectives, 168–169
 - to fund regional and state-level infrastructure, 168
 - to meet life cycle cost of infrastructure and service, 168
- enabling legal framework
 - forms of enabling legislation, 157
 - and horizontal equity, 158–159
 - and revenue yield, 157–158
 - vertical equity, 159
- enhancement of revenue yield, 166–167
- evaluation of US and India
 - adequacy of development charge revenues, 147
 - design features to meet
 - nexus and rough proportionality principles, 147–148
 - design features to promote vertical equity, 148
 - development charge programs, 149–155
 - enabling legal environment, 146
 - revenue yield and stability, 146–147
- Fremont, CA, 90
 - appeals process, 100
 - capital facilities fee, 96–99
 - credits, exemptions, exclusions, and exceptions, 99–100
 - local level, 92–95
 - state level, 90–91
 - timing of payment, 99
 - track fee revenue, 100
 - transport impact fee, 95
- impact fees, sensitivity analysis and comparison, 138–146
- mitigating horizontal equity
 - judicious exemptions, 163–164
 - no funding for existing deficiencies, 165

- variations in charges by land/property use and by intensity of use, 164–165
- mitigating vertical equity, 165–166
- Mumbai, Maharashtra
 - appeals process, 128
 - credits, exemptions, exclusions, and exceptions, 127
 - fee calculation methodology, 122–125
 - fee types and rates, 122
 - legal enabling framework, 121–122
 - new infrastructure needs
 - funded by impact fees in MMR, 127
 - revenue yield and stability, 125–127
 - timing of payment, 127
 - track fee revenue, 128
- local governments' institutional capacity, 170–171
- political feasibility enhancement, 169–170
- transparency in levying charges, 159–160
 - avoid double-counting, 161–162
 - clear development charge calculation methodologies, 160–161
 - show proportion of needs, 162
 - unbundle development charges, 162–163
- urban development in India
 - estimation of development charges, 128–137
- Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority (CMDA), 115, 119–121
- community infrastructure levy (CIL), 32, 161
- credits, development charge, 99–100, 114, 120, 127, 152, 154
- credits, impact fee, 66–67, 103, 105, 108. *See also* credits, development charge
- decentralization, 13–14, 28
- developer obligations, 177*n*1
- development charge enabling legislation. *See* Australia; infrastructure charges; South Africa; United States (US)
- development charges, 1, 5, 11, 29–33, 56–57. *See also* Australia; South Africa; United States (US)
- advantages of, 18
- boosts equity, 12
- cyclical to real estate market, 19, 70
- disadvantages of, 18–19
- enabling legislation, 69–70, 156–159
- framework for analyzing, 21–22
- impact on
 - house charges, 58–61
 - house prices, 61–63
- institutional capacity, 71
- monetary exactions, 2
- normative bases for levying, 19–21
- real estate market conditions, 70–71
- revenue yield and stability, 70–71
- development charges in India, 28, 73–88
- demographics characteristics, 23–24
- enabling legislation, 74–75
- erosion of local governments
 - fiscal autonomy, 24–25

- governance structure, 23
- role of, 27
- underinvestment in urban areas, 25–25
- urban local bodies (ULBs), 13, 23–28, 72–73
- development contributions, 33–36, 38, 42–43, 51–52. *See also* Australia; in-kind contributions; monetary contributions; non-monetary contributions
- development exaction(s), 2, 32–33, 45–46, 49, 69, 172, 176, 177*n*1. *See also* developer obligations
- development impact fee, 2, 32, 45, 152, 154. *See also* impact fee
- Dillon's Rule, 47
- Dolan v. City of Tigard* (1994), 48, 56–57, 90, 146, 149
- double-counting, 67, 82–83, 87–88, 110, 154, 161–162
- economic efficiency, 7, 19
- economic incidence, old view and new view, 58–59, 67
- economic rents, 3, 19–21
- efficiency, 7, 9, 11, 19. *See also* economic efficiency
 - diversify revenue stream, 12
 - market, 3, 20
 - user fees, 17
- eligible uses, development charges, 42, 54, 157–158, 166
- enabling legislation, 30–31, 34, 38, 49–50, 52, 66, 73–74, 77, 80–88, 165–166, 171, 174
 - and horizontal equity, 158–159
 - and revenue yield, 157–158
 - and vertical equity, 159
- equity, 3, 11, 30–31, 44, 54, 156, 174
 - considerations, 56–58
 - diversification to enhance, 12
 - horizontal (*see* horizontal equity)
 - impacts, 52–53
 - vertical (*see* vertical equity)
- exactions, 57, 91, 94, 108. *See also* development exactions
 - developer, 2
- exemption, 19, 44, 71, 83–84, 87, 99–100, 102, 114, 120, 127, 147–148, 159, 165, 167
 - affordable housing, 52, 68, 155
 - from development charges, 68, 82
 - judicious, 163–164
 - small properties and shops, 88, 155
- externality(ies), 3
 - defined, 6
 - negative, 6–7, 19–20
 - positive, 6–7
- facility fee, 2
- fire facilities fee, Fremont, 92–94, 96–97, 99, 163. *See also* case studies, development charge programs, Fremont, CA
- fire impact fee, Cape Coral, FL, 103–105, 109, 114, 138, 163. *See also* case studies, development charge programs, Cape Coral, FL
- Goods and Service Tax (GST), 11, 24, 29, 72
- governance structure, 2
 - Australia, 33–34
 - India, 22–23
 - South Africa, 40–41
 - United States, 45–47

- Herfindahl Index, 11
- Home Rule, 47–48
- horizontal equity, 6, 8–9, 22, 57, 91, 103, 160, 166–169, 175
- enabling legislation and, 158–159
- mitigation of impact, 163–165
- strategies for promotion of, 63–67
- house price impacts/effects, development charges, 38, 50, 52–53, 58–63, 68, 162, 169, 175–177
- hydraulic fee, Mumbai, 122, 124–125, 163, 165. *See also* case studies, development charge programs, Mumbai, Maharashtra
- I&A Fees, Tamil Nadu, 2, 32, 90–91, 97, 99–101, 115–122, 124–125, 127–128, 138–147, 150, 152–154, 159–163, 169. *See also* development impact fee; Infrastructure and Amenity Charges (I&A Charges), Chennai
- city infrastructure, 73
- infrastructure, 79
- park, 32–33
- zone-based, 20, 168
- Impact Fee Act, Florida, 101, 157–159, 165
- Infrastructure and Amenity (I&A) Fee, 57, 73–74, 115–120, 147–151, 153, 155, 157, 163–164, 167
- Infrastructure and Amenity Charges (I&A Charges), Chennai, 73, 115–120, 147–151, 153, 155, 157, 163–164, 167. *See also* I&A Fees, Tamil Nadu
- infrastructure charges
- in Australia, 32–39, 167
- See also* development charges
- infrastructure development charges (IDC), Chennai, 54, 115–120, 148, 150–151, 153, 163
- in-kind contributions, 42, 52–53, 92–93, 99, 102, 106, 108, 114, 127, 152, 154
- institutional capacity, 22, 34, 39, 52, 56, 71, 87, 156, 170–171
- intergovernmental transfers, 11, 15–18, 19–22, 25, 27, 173
- irrigation fee, Cape Coral, FL, 102–103, 109–111, 113
- key challenges and development charges
- Australia, 38–39
- South Africa, 43–44
- United States, 48–50
- lack of transparency, 49–50, 53, 121, 159–160
- land value capture (LVC), 21, 29, 172, 176
- legal framework, 22, 28, 30, 35, 37, 40, 45, 56, 69–70, 74–75, 89–90, 92, 101, 146, 156–159, 161, 166, 173–174
- to enable development charges, 41–43, 47–48
- to enable infrastructure charges, 34
- level of service (LOS) standard, 29, 60, 63, 80–81, 91, 101, 110, 148, 153, 158, 161
- to calculate charges, 65
- local public finance, 3
- extent of use, 13–19
- non-tax-based revenue sources, 5–7
- present day landscape of India, 22–27
- tax-based revenue sources, 3–4
- tax systems, 4–5

- marginal cost, 7–11, 18, 20, 29
- methodology, development charge calculation, 85, 147, 160–162, 165
- methodology, impact fee calculation, 49, 85, 95–96, 101, 105, 109–111, 118, 122–125, 138, 147. *See also* methodology, development charge calculation
- Mitigation Fee Act 1987, California, 50, 90, 92, 157, 160
- monetary contributions, 32–33, 35, 39, 45
- Mumbai Metropolitan Region Development Authority (MMRDA), 121
- Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai (MCGM), 11, 72, 121–122, 127, 152, 154, 171
- New Urban Agenda (NUA) adopted in UN-HABITAT III Conference, 172, 176
- nexus principle, 3, 6, 18, 22, 37, 48, 51, 56, 66–67, 77–84, 86–88, 90–91, 102, 118, 125, 146–148, 158, 168–169, 175, 177. *See also* nexus proportionality; *rational nexus* principle
- nexus proportionality, 3, 6, 18, 22, 48, 56–58, 63–67, 73, 75–84, 88, 90–91, 118, 125, 146–148, 150, 158. *See also* proportionality
- Nollan v. California Coastal Commission* (1987), 48, 56–57, 90, 146, 149
- non-monetary contributions, 32, 33, 39, 45, 172
- non-tax-based revenue sources, 3, 5–7, 11–13, 15–17, 27, 29, 31, 40, 148, 173
- octroi tax, 11, 25, 72
- operating expenditures, 18, 27, 118, 177
- operations and maintenance (O&M) expenses, 39, 44, 50, 79, 92, 101–102, 142, 168, 177
- own-source revenue, 13–17, 22, 25–28, 173
- park facilities fee, Fremont, 92–94, 97, 99, 163. *See also* case studies, development charge programs, Fremont, CA
- parkland fee, Fremont, 92–94, 96–97, 99. *See also* case studies, development charge programs, Fremont, CA
- periodic review, 105, 150, 174. *See also* periodic update
- periodic update, 85, 92, 175. *See also* periodic review
- planning obligations, 32, 161
- police impact fee, Cape Coral, FL, 103–104, 109. *See also* case studies, development charge programs, Cape Coral, FL
- political feasibility, 22, 156, 164
 - of development charges, 56, 68–69
 - enhance, 169
- polluter-to-pay (PTP) principle, 3, 19
- private goods, 4
- progressive taxation, 4–5
- property
 - tax, 4–5, 8, 11–13, 17–19, 21, 25–27, 29–30, 34, 41, 46–47, 50, 54, 59–63, 67, 69, 72–73, 89, 173
- taxpayers, 5

- proportional taxation, 4–6, 61
- proportionality, 5–6, 18, 39, 50, 162
- public facility fee, 90–92, 101, 158
- public finance, 3
 - neoclassical, 172
 - See also* local public finance
- public goods, 4, 6
 - features of, 3
- rational nexus* principle, 19, 22, 30, 48, 56–57, 89–90, 102, 108, 158, 168, 177
- real estate, 76, 84, 103, 111, 118, 121, 124–125, 127, 142, 146, 149, 176
 - developers, 159–160, 167, 169
 - development community, 69, 85, 120, 175
 - development stage, 68
 - market conditions, 70–71
 - transaction tax, 123
- recreational facility, 105
- recreational impact fee, Cape Coral, FL, 105. *See also* case studies, development charge programs, Cape Coral, FL
- regional impact fees, 45–46, 60, 167
- regressive taxation, 4–5, 8, 12, 18–19
- revenue, 2, 7, 9–10, 18–19, 22, 24–25, 30–31, 33–34, 37–41, 46–47, 49–54, 56, 60, 63, 66–67, 69–70, 72–73, 77–79, 81–83, 85–87, 89–91, 101–103, 105–106, 108, 110, 117–118, 141, 170, 173, 176–177
 - broad-base taxes, 62
 - charge-related, 160
 - diversified mix, 3, 11–13
 - fee-based, 29, 70
 - of government in India, 22
 - local, 16
 - miscellaneous, 14
 - mix, 3, 11–14
 - non-tax-based sources, 5–7, 27, 148
 - own-source, 13–17, 27–28, 173
 - stability, 3, 11, 22, 30, 89, 96–98, 111–113, 118–119, 125–127, 146–147, 149
 - tax-based sources, 1, 3–4, 29, 148
 - track fee, 100, 114, 120–121, 128, 146–147
 - volatility, 13
 - yield and stability, 3, 70–71, 96–97, 111–113, 118–119, 125–127, 146, 149, 156–157, 166–167
- See also* development charges
- revenue yield, 3, 31, 56, 70–71, 89, 96–98, 111–113, 118–119, 125–127, 146–147, 149, 156–158, 166
 - enhancement of, 166–167
- roads impact fee, Cape Coral, FL, 102, 106–107, 109, 150. *See also* case studies, development charge programs, Cape Coral, FL
- rough proportionality, 3, 22, 48, 56–58, 63–67, 73, 75–84, 88, 90–91, 118, 125, 146–148, 150, 158. *See also* proportionality
- rural and urban local bodies (RULBs), 72
- rural local bodies (RLBs), 13, 23–24, 28

- school impact fee, Cape Coral, FL,
 - 45–46, 106, 108–110,
 - 113–114, 138, 152–153,
 - 159, 162–163. *See also*
 - case studies, development
 - charge programs, Cape
 - Coral, FL
- sewerage fee, Mumbai, 122, 124–125,
 - 163, 165. *See also* case
 - studies, development
 - charge programs, Mumbai,
 - Maharashtra
- South Africa, 28, 30, 45, 50, 54,
 - 156–157, 167, 172–173
 - conditions for real estate
 - developers in, 52
 - development contributions,
 - 42–43, 52
 - development charges in, 33, 39–44
 - district municipalities, 40–41, 157
 - bulk/external infrastructure,
 - 43–44
 - governance structure, 39–40
 - infrastructure contribution
 - levies in, 32
 - internal infrastructure, 43–44
 - metropolitan municipalities, 40–41
- tax(es), 8, 14–19, 24–29, 31, 40, 52,
 - 56, 58–59, 72, 109, 120,
 - 122–124, 128, 141, 148,
 - 161–162, 170, 173
 - based revenue sources, 1, 3–4,
 - 11, 13
 - economic rents, 20
 - implicit, 60
 - increment financing, 21
 - land rents, 21
 - non-tax-based revenue sources,
 - 5–7, 11–13
 - property (*see* property tax)
 - recurring, 73
 - special, 47
 - system, 4–5
 - traditional, 41
- timing, levy development charges, 55
- track fee revenue, 18, 100, 114,
 - 120–121, 128
- traffic fee, Mumbai, 122, 124, 163,
 - 165. *See also* case studies,
 - development charge
 - programs, Mumbai,
 - Maharashtra
- traffic impact fee, Fremont, 92–99,
 - 162–163, 166. *See also*
 - case studies, development
 - charge programs, Fremont,
 - CA
- transparency, 38–39, 52, 54, 91,
 - 156, 160, 162, 166, 169,
 - 174–175. *See also* lack of
 - transparency
- United Nations (UN), 23
 - UN-HABITAT, 2, 21, 73, 172,
 - 176
- United States (US), 14–15, 20, 30–33,
 - 51–53, 69–70, 72, 78–80,
 - 82, 87–89, 95, 111, 122, 128,
 - 138, 146–148, 156–157,
 - 159–161, 164–165, 167–168,
 - 170, 172–173, 175, 177
- Constitution's 5th Amendment, 48
- development exactions, 177*n*1
- governance structure, 45–46
- impact fees in, 45–53, 90, 92,
 - 99–102, 168
- key challenges, 48–50
- legal framework enabling
 - development charges,
 - 47–48
- local revenue sources, 16

- municipal bonds, 5
- property taxes, 13
- user fees, 5, 12, 18, 27, 47, 60, 69, 89, 141, 173
 - benefits over property tax, 17
 - designing, 7–11
- user charges, 11, 17, 26, 29, 40–41
- utility capital expansion fees, Cape Coral, FL, 102–103.
See also case studies, development charge programs, Cape Coral, FL; utility fee, Cape Coral, FL
- utility fee, Cape Coral, FL, 102–103, 114
- vertical equity, 6, 22, 30, 56–58, 61, 73, 89, 91, 103, 146, 167–169
 - design features promote, 148–155
 - enabling legislation and, 83–84, 159
 - mitigation of impact, 165–166
 - strategies for promotion of, 67–68
- wastewater fee, Cape Coral, FL, 103–104, 109–110, 113–114, 151–152, 154, 162, 168. *See also* case studies, development charge programs, Cape Coral, FL
- water fee, Cape Coral, FL, 102–103, 109, 111, 113
- World Bank, 5, 21, 24, 73, 176