



FR
.....

MENU

2017–2018: Building Code Commission annual report

Learn about dispute resolution activities under the *Building Code Act*, including performance measures and results achieved.

On this page

[Letter to the Minister](#)

[A. Mandate](#)

[B. About the Building Code Commission](#)

[C. Analysis Of Building Code Commission Performance](#)

[D. Financial Report](#)

[Appendix 1: Performance Measures Table](#)

[Appendix 2: Members of the Building Code Commission](#)

Letter to the Minister

Building Code Commission
12th Floor, 777 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5

Telephone: 416-585-6503
[ontario.ca/buildingcode](https://www.ontario.ca/buildingcode)

June 29, 2018

The Honourable Steve Clark
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
17th Floor, 777 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario

M5G 2E5

Dear Minister Clark:

**Re: Building Code Commission
Annual Report – Fiscal year – 2017 - 2018**

It is my pleasure, as Chair of the Building Code Commission, to present to you the Building Code Commission's Annual Report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2018.

The enclosed Annual Report highlights the Building Code Commission's accomplishments over the 2017 - 2018 fiscal year and outlines challenges that have been identified for the future. Overall, the Building Code Commission had a productive year, having received 33 new applications and conducted 31 hearings.

I would like to thank my fellow Commission members whose knowledge and dedication have earned the Building Code Commission an excellent reputation as a valuable service provider in the building and construction industry. On behalf of all members of the Commission, I would also like to express our thanks to the staff of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing for their exemplary expert support to the Building Code Commission. Without their excellent administrative, technical and legal assistance, the Building Code Commission simply could not function.

Sincerely,

Tony Chow, Chair
Building Code Commission

A. Mandate

The Building Code Commission (the "Commission") is an adjudicative agency whose legislative authority is set out in sections 23 and 24 of the *Building Code Act, 1992* (the "Act").

The Commission has a mandate to resolve disputes between proponents of construction projects and local enforcement officials. The Act sets out three types of disputes that can be heard by the Commission:

- those relating to the sufficiency of compliance with the technical requirements of the Building Code;
- those related to compliance with the prescribed time frames for permit processing; and
- those related to compliance with the prescribed time frames for site inspections.

Commitment to Service and Guiding Principles

The inaugural meeting of the Commission was held on February 9th, 1976, shortly after the first Building Code Act came into effect in 1974. Since then the Commission has endeavoured to provide a timely, cost effective and non-adversarial process for resolving Building Code disputes through a streamlined and accessible appeals system. In doing so, the Commission has earned a reputation within the construction industry of being an effective, useful and high quality adjudicative body.

The Commission has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Minister of Municipal Affairs in respect of the administration of the Commission. The Memorandum of Understanding sets out the relationship between the Chair of the Commission, the Minister and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs with respect to the Building Code Commission and the service it provides. The purpose of the Memorandum of Understanding is to establish the responsibilities of these parties and to ensure that accountability is a fundamental principle that is observed in the management, administration and operations of the Commission.

As an agency of government, the Commission conducts itself according to the management principles of the Government of Ontario. The Commission's proceedings are governed by the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*, the *Building Code Act, 1992*, the *Adjudicative Tribunals Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act, 2009*, the Building Code Commission's Guidelines, Policies and Procedures Handbook, Management Board of Cabinet Directives and the *Public Service of Ontario Act, 2006*. The principles and governance elements required of the Commission by these statutes and documents include ethical behavior, accountability, excellence in management, wise use of public funds, and high-quality service to the public by contributing to the health, safety, accessibility and energy efficiency of buildings in Ontario, and by playing a positive role within Ontario's design and construction sector.

B. About the Building Code Commission

Building Code Commission Process and Procedures

The process leading to a Commission hearing begins with the receipt of an application for hearing. Section 24 of the Act provides that the Commission may determine disputes between a chief building official, inspector or registered code agency and an applicant for a permit, a holder of a permit, or a person to whom an order is given. Parties to an application to the Commission are typically builders, developers, architects, engineers, building owners as applicants, and municipal chief building officials, plan reviewers, building inspectors, registered code agencies and health officials as respondents.

Once an application is submitted, the Commission requests confirmation of the dispute from the respondent by sending them a Confirmation of Dispute form for completion and return. The Confirmation of Dispute is similar to the application form. Its purpose is twofold: 1) to verify that there is a dispute involving the technical requirements of the Building Code, and 2) to allow the Respondent to explain their position on

the issue.

For disputes related to sufficiency of compliance with the technical requirements of the Building Code: once the Confirmation of Dispute is received, the Commission under their authority in subsection 24(6) of the Act, requests a technical report from the Building and Development Branch of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. This report, known as the Technical Background Information memo, analyzes the matters raised by the parties with regard to the provisions of the Building Code identified by the parties as being relevant to the disputed matter. The Technical Background Information memo examines the history, technical considerations, and proposed amendments (if any) regarding the pertinent Building Code provision(s).

For disputes related to the legislated time frames: a Technical Background Information memo is not requested, as no technical matters are involved in the dispute.

Hearing Procedures

Once all of the required information is received and has been provided to all parties to the hearing, a hearing is scheduled.

Commission hearings, while generally informal, are conducted in accordance with procedural rules established under the *Building Code Act, 1992* and the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*.

The Commission Chair, Vice-Chair, or Chair-Designate for the day conducts the hearing. Hearings begin with introductions of the parties and preliminary matters, such as identification of exhibits. Parties can represent themselves, but Applicants often choose a designated agent such as a contractor, architect, building and fire code consultant, or lawyer.

Once the hearing has concluded, the members of the panel deliberate on the evidence and render their decision. This decision is then provided to the parties to the hearing and is eventually posted on the [ministry's website](#).

Members and Staff

As of March 31, 2018, the Commission has a total of 19 part-time members, including the Chair. All Commission members are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council through an Order in Council. Current Management Board of Cabinet Directives permit individuals appointed to the Commission to serve a combined term of appointment of up to ten years.

Commission members preside over hearings and render decisions on disputes. The Chair and Vice-Chair also make administrative decisions regarding operations and relations with the ministry.

Commission members are provided with learning opportunities throughout the year, such as attendance at

the conference for The Society of Ontario Adjudicators and Regulators or in-house training provided by the Building and Development Branch on changes to the Building Code.

The Commission is provided with administrative, technical and secretarial support by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. The following divisions of the ministry support the Commission:

- Municipal Services Division's Building Services Transformation Branch and Building and Development Branch;
- Business Management Division's Corporate Services Branch and Controllershship and Financial Planning Branch;
- Legal Services Branch; and
- Community Services I&IT Cluster.

The direct support staff assigned by the ministry to the Commission consist of a 1.0 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Commission Secretary, a 0.4 FTE Coordinator, Building Innovation, and a 0.4 FTE administrative assistant.

The Commission notes that for eight and a half months of the 2017-2018 fiscal year, the Coordinator position was vacant. This resulted in additional duties for the Secretary to perform which had an impact on the overall performance of the Commission. In particular, this had an impact on the production of full written decisions.

With 14 members having been appointed during the 2016-2017 fiscal year, the Commission was able to continue to operate. However, the Commission is once again in a situation where the ten year maximum tenure of the majority of its membership occurs at the same time. This trend, in which the terms of appointment of large groups expire at the same time, will continue to be an issue.

The Commission believes it is appropriate to try and stagger the terms of appointment for Commission members. This staggering of terms of appointment can be achieved by appointing members in smaller groups so that Orders in Council will not expire all at once. This staggering will also allow for newly appointed members to be mentored by experienced members.

In order to mitigate this issue from continuing to occur, the Commission strongly urges that this be taken into account for any future appointments and that the Commission Chair considers this issue when making recommendations on reappointment of existing members.

In addition to ensuring an adequate number of members, the Commission must also work at maintaining the knowledge base of its membership. It is important for the Commission to continue to solicit new members with expertise that reflects the full spectrum of technical disciplines represented in the Building Code. As described in the Memorandum of Understanding, the role of the Chair includes keeping the

Minister informed of upcoming appointment vacancies and providing recommendations for appointments and/or reappointments to the Commission.

The Commission Chair and staff continue to work with the Public Appointments Secretariat and the Minister’s Office to improve the existing complement of regional representation and to maintain the gender diversity.

2017 - 2018 Caseload

The Commission can hold from six to 10 hearings in a month; however, the number of applications received determines the number of hearings the Commission needs to schedule. For the current reporting cycle, the Commission received 33 new applications and held 31 hearings.

The Commission received the following number of applications and held the following number of hearings over the last five years:

Fiscal Year	Building	On-site Sewage System	Permit Processing Prescribed Time Framed	Site Inspection Prescribed Time Frame	Total Applications	Total Hearings
2013-2014	29	5	6	0	40	38
2014-2015	30	4	1	0	35	26
2015-2016	42*	3	2	0	47	47*
2016-2017	30	4	1	0	35	33*
2017-2018	26	4	3	0	33	31*

Note: Difference in application vs. hearing totals may be attributed, in part, to matters being resolved between the parties before a hearing is held.

* In addition to the 42 building applications in 2015-2016, two more applications were referred to the Commission by the Superior Court of Justice under Section 25 of the *Building Code Act, 1992*. One of the court referred applications was heard over one hearing day. However, the other court reference has required the Commission to hold the hearing over multiple days and multiple fiscal years. There were 10 hearing days held during the 2015-2016 fiscal year, seven hearing days were held during the 2016-2017 fiscal year and a further four hearing days were held during the 2017-2018 fiscal year.

In the current reporting cycle, the number of applications has remained relatively consistent with previous years. It should be noted that while the number of applications has been maintained, the complexity of applications continue to increase. In addition, the Commission has also seen an increase in the number of applications requiring it to examine and determine its jurisdiction and mandate, because of disputes that may extend beyond the technical requirements of the Building Code.

C. Analysis Of Building Code Commission Performance

Performance Measures and Targets

The Commission has adopted the recommendations for performance measurement established by the Agency Reform (Guzzo) Commission. These are: fairness, accessibility, timeliness, quality and consistency, transparency, expertise, optimum cost, and courtesy. While not all of the goals were rated as “high” by the Commission, there are processes in place to ensure that all goals are integrated into the Commission’s operations and are, therefore, adequately addressed. The chart below indicates how the Commission ranked the goals.

Goals	Ranking
Fairness	High
Accessibility*	Low
Timeliness	High
Quality and Consistency	Medium
Transparency	High
Expertise	High

Optimum Cost	Low
Courtesy	High

* It should be noted that the term “Accessibility” for the purposes of the performance measurement recommendations of the Agency Reform Commission was related to providing seamless and simple access to dispute resolution so that the public can receive quality and timely services regardless of their familiarity with the system.

Measured Performance Results

Several steps have been taken to enhance the Commission’s performance and accountability over the past several years, including incorporating performance measurement in the ministry’s Estimates Briefing Book and introducing Commission-specific performance measures (Guzzo Report recommendations). Overall, the Commission has surpassed its targets for high rated goals. Performance measures based on these goals are found in Appendix 1.

Fairness

- The stated target of not more than 10% of hearings resulting in judicial review was again met in the 2017 - 2018 fiscal year. The Commission did not receive any judicial reviews. Survey results for the 2017 - 2018 fiscal year indicate that 92% of clients that responded to the survey agreed that they were treated fairly.

Timeliness

- In past general meetings, the Commission reviewed the wording of its performance measure related to timeliness of hearings. The Commission decided that the performance measure should track what the Commission is responsible for, which is providing hearing dates, and filter out matters beyond the control of the Commission, such as delayed return of documents or parties being unavailable for hearing dates.
- The Commission decided that the performance measure will read “Offer a date for a hearing to be held within 40 working days from receipt of a complete application for 85% of all hearings” and “Offer a date for a hearing to be held within 20 working days from receipt of the Respondent’s confirmation of dispute for 85% of all hearings”. The Commission’s process includes input from the parties; therefore the Commission’s ability to hold a hearing within a certain number of working days is based on the responses from the parties being received by the Commission within a specific time frame.
- The Commission met its target in one of these performance measures. The Commission offered a hearing date within 40 working days from receipt of a complete application in 88% of its cases.

However, the Commission did not meet its stated target of offering a hearing date within 20 working days from receipt of the Respondent's confirmation of dispute. The Commission was able to offer a hearing date within 20 working days from receipt of the Respondent's confirmation of dispute in 82% of its cases. The Commission was not able to offer hearing dates for on-site sewage system files until such time as members having the appropriate expertise were appointed.

- The above figures do not include the wait time associated with prescribed time frame appeals, for which the hearing must be held by the Commission not more than 5 business days after receipt of an application for hearing. In this regard, the Commission met the stated target 100% of the time.
- The Commission's performance in meeting its target for preparation and finalization of full written decisions has declined during this fiscal year. The Commission's target of preparing and finalizing full written decisions within six months of completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings was not met during this fiscal cycle. Written decisions for 45% of the technical disputes and for 100% of the time frame disputes have been completed within six months of completion of the hearing. This reduction in performance can be attributed to the fact that the Coordinator position was vacant for the majority of this fiscal year. In addition, the Commission finalized its Report for the Court Referral hearing during this fiscal year which took up a significant amount of effort and time.

Quality and Consistency

- The Commission has set a target that 85% of parties will feel that the process had a high degree of quality and consistency. Survey results indicate that 92% of clients that responded to the survey agreed that the processes and procedures had a high degree of quality and consistency.

Transparency

- The Commission has set a target that 85% of parties will feel that the process and procedures were clear and understandable. Survey results indicate that 92% of clients that responded to the survey agreed that the processes and procedures were clear and understandable.

Expertise

- The Commission has set a target that 85% of clients will be satisfied that Commission members demonstrated an appropriate level of expertise regarding the technical matters under consideration. Survey results indicate that 92% of clients that responded to the survey agreed that members demonstrated an appropriate level of expertise regarding the technical matters under consideration.

Courtesy

- The Commission has set a target that 85% of parties will feel that they are treated with courtesy throughout the application process and the hearing. Survey results indicate that 92% of clients that responded to the survey agreed that they were treated with courtesy by Commission staff throughout the application process, and 92% felt that they were treated with courtesy by

Commission members.

The “Goals” ranked high and medium were surveyed by the Commission, and the results can be found in Appendix 1.

Operational Performance

The Commission believes that in order to provide quality service, to the public and the design and construction sector in particular, the Commission as an agency must operate as effectively and efficiently as possible. This means more than having performance measurements in place to strive for service excellence on a day-to-day basis. It also means pursuing excellence from an operational and administrative standpoint over the long term. To achieve this, the Commission also assesses itself on its operational performance. As with the above performance measures, operational excellence ensures accountability. The following are some of its operational achievements in 2017 - 2018:

- The Commission continued to provide a cost effective and expeditious mechanism for resolution of disputes.
- The Commission continued to maintain its compliance with the Management Board of Cabinet's Agencies and Appointments Directive for agencies:
 - prepared, finalized and submitted its three year Business Plan for 2018-2021; and
 - its Annual Report for 2016-2017 fiscal year was completed and approved by the Commission within the specified time frame.
 - publically posted the Commission's Memorandum of Understanding, Business Plan and Annual Report as required by the Agencies and Appointments Directive.
- The Commission continues to maintain compliance with the *Adjudicative Tribunals Accountability, Governance and Appointments Act, 2009*.
- The Commission held two meetings of the full Commission, and will continue this practice as it accommodates the review and approval of accountability requirements such as the Annual Report and the Business Plan.
- Three new members were appointed to the Commission in August/September 2017.
- The Commission has achieved and maintained its gender diversity target set by the Ontario government that, by 2019, women make up at least 40% of all appointments to every provincial agency, board and commission.
- The Commission continued its practice of surveying clients and received an overall satisfaction rating of 92% from clients that responded to the survey.
- The Commission Chair and staff worked with the ministry and the Public Appointments Secretariat to develop a job advertisement which advertised vacant Vice-Chair positions. The Chair has

developed recommendations on candidates to be considered for an appointment to the position of Vice-Chair. These recommendations will be provided to the Minister for consideration.

- The Commission Chair and staff worked with the ministry and the Public Appointments Secretariat to develop a job advertisement to advertise the position of Chair of the Building Code Commission.
- As a result of an amendment to the Building Code, the Commission began collecting application fees for its services as of January 1, 2014. In accordance with the Building Code amendment, the application fee increased on January 1, 2017 and January 1, 2018.
- The Commission continues to be committed to providing services in accordance with the Accessibility Standards for Customer Service and the Integrated Accessibility Standards regulation made under the Accessibility for *Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005* (AODA).
- The Commission staff continues to work with the ministry to ensure that its webpage and its public documents comply with the accessibility requirements under the AODA.
- The Commission concluded its hearing related to a reference from the Superior Court of Justice under Section 25 of the *Building Code Act, 1992*. The hearing for this matter resulted in a total of 21 hearing days. The first hearing date was November 17, 2015 and the final hearing date was June 21, 2017.

D. Financial Report

Budget

The Commission has no financial budget of its own, separate from that of the Ministry. All of the Commission’s costs, including Commission members’ per diem remuneration, staff and administrative support, and operational costs, are borne by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs.

The chart below provides details on the costs associated with the Commission:

Expense Type	2018-2019 Estimates	2017-2018 Estimates	2017-2018 Actuals	2016-2017 Actuals
Per diems	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$74,086	\$100,965
Members’ travel and meeting expenses	\$12,000	\$11,500	\$15,598	\$20,772
Other administration	\$8,000	\$7,500	\$9,197	\$9,662

Subtotal	**\$70,000	**\$69,000	*\$98,880	*\$131,399
Full Time Equivalents - numbers	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
Full Time Equivalents - costs (salary + benefits)	\$152,000	\$148,000	\$137,716	\$139,583
Total Expenses	\$222,000	\$217,000	\$236,597	\$270,982

*The operating expenses cover costs associated with Commission hearings; per diems for Commission members; and reimbursement for out-of-pocket travel expenses related to meetings, including hotel accommodations, meal allowances (to the allowable maximum), parking and public transit.

**The number of hearings is determined by the application rate. Member per diem compensation rates are established by the Management Board of Cabinet’s Agencies and Appointments Directive. The expenditure estimates are based on typical application rates (using historical data and projecting forward), member per diem compensation rates and other operating expenses noted above.

Revenues

A fee for filing an application to the Building Code Commission was implemented starting January 1, 2014 (\$170 per application) and is set to increase annually up to the rate of the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Accordingly, the application fee increased to \$184, effective January 1, 2018. For the purposes of determining the estimated revenues for 2018-2019, a CPI increase of 2% was assumed resulting in a fee of \$187.00 effective January 1, 2019.

Revenues received from the application fee are recorded as part of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs non-tax revenues.

The chart below provides details of the revenues associated with applications to the Commission:

Revenues	2018-2019 Estimates	2017-2018 Estimates	2017-2018 Actuals	2016-2017 Actuals
Application Fees	\$6,500	\$6,300	\$6,184	\$5,314
Total Revenues	\$6,500	\$6,300	\$6,184	\$5,314

Remuneration of Commission Members

As part-time appointees, Commission members receive remuneration in the form of a per diem at rates established by Treasury Board/Management Board of Cabinet. Effective January 1, 2018, this per diem ranged from \$472 for members to \$583 for the Vice-Chair and \$744 for the Chair. Commission members are also reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses associated with attending Commission hearings, in accordance with the Management Board of Cabinet’s Travel, Meal and Hospitality Expenses Directive.

Costs associated with Commission activities, including operating costs and member per diems, form part of the overall budget for the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. The number of applications to the Commission and/or the complexity of issues raised in the applications directly impact the budget requirement in support of Commission activities.

It should be noted that the court referenced hearing resulted in an increase in the overall expenditures of the Commission.

Appendix 1: Performance Measures Table

Building Code Commission: Performance Measures

Outcomes	Measures	Targets	2017-2018 Status	2018-2019 Commitments
Fairness (processes and procedures that are fair and are seen to be fair)	Parties* are satisfied that the process was implemented fairly and without bias	Not more than 10% of hearings should result in judicial review on an annual basis	Target met. There were no judicial reviews in 2017-2018.	Not more than 10% of hearings should result in judicial review on an annual basis
Timeliness (quick resolution of technical construction disputes)	a) Number of working days from application to offered hearing date. b) Number of	a) Offer a date for hearing within 40 working days from receipt of complete application for	a) Target met. A hearing date was offered within 40 working days of receipt of complete application was offered for 88% of all hearings.	a) Offer a date for hearing within 40 working days from receipt of complete application for

working days from receipt of Respondent's confirmation of dispute to offered hearing date.	85% of all hearings.	b) Target not met. A hearing date was offered within 20 working days of receipt of Respondent's confirmation of dispute was offered for 82% of all hearings.	85% of all hearings.
c) Timely communication of decision.	b) Offer a date for hearing within 20 working days from receipt of Respondent's confirmation of dispute for 85% of all hearings.	c) Target met. Communicated decisions to parties within 20 working days of completion of hearing for 77% of all hearings.	b) Offer a date for hearing within 20 working days from receipt of Respondent's confirmation of dispute, for 85% of all hearings.
d) Timely preparation and finalization of full written decision.	c) Communicate decisions to parties within 20 working days of completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings.	d) Target not met. Full written decisions were prepared and finalized within six months of completion of hearing for 45% of hearings.	c) Communicate decisions to parties within 20 working days of completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings.
e) Timely posting of final written decisions on Building Code Commission internet site.	d) Full written decision to be prepared and finalized within six months of completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings.	e) Target met. 85% of full written decisions that were prepared and finalized were posted on the Building Code Commission internet site within ten working days of completion of the French translation.	d) Prepare and finalize full written decision within six months of completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings.
	e) Post 85% of final written decisions on the Building Code Commission internet site		e) Post 85% of final written decisions on the Building Code Commission

		within ten working days of completion of the French translation.		internet site within ten working days of completion of the French translation.
Timeliness (quick resolution of disputes related to municipal service levels)	a) Timely acknowledgement and notification of hearing date. b) Timely scheduling of hearing date. c) Timely communication of decision. d) Timely preparation and finalization of full written decision. e) Timely posting of final written decisions on Building Code Commission internet site.	a) Acknowledge receipt of complete submission and provide date for appeal hearing within two business days. b) Hear appeals regarding the issuance of municipal building permits and inspection service levels within five business days of receiving the completed application. c) Communicate decisions within 15 business days of receiving the completed application.	a) Target met. Receipt of complete submission acknowledged and provided date for appeal hearing within two business days in 100% of the cases. b) Target met. Appeals regarding the issuance of municipal building permits and inspection service levels were heard within five business days of receiving the completed application in 100% of the cases. c) Target met. Communicated decisions within 15 business days of receiving the completed application in 100% of the cases. d) Target met. Full written decisions were prepared and finalized within six months of completion of hearing for 100% of hearings.	a) Acknowledge receipt of complete submission and provide date for appeal hearing within two business days. b) Hear appeals regarding the issuance of municipal building permits and inspection service levels within five business days of receiving the completed application. c) Communicate decisions within 15 business days of receiving the completed application.

d) Full written decisions to be prepared and finalized within six months of completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings.	e) Target met. 100% of full written decisions that were prepared and finalized were posted on the Building Code Commission internet site within ten working days of completion of the French translation	d) Prepare and finalize full written decisions within six months of completion of hearing for 75% of all hearings.
e) Post 85% of final written decisions on the Building Code Commission internet site within ten working days of completion of the French translation.		e) Post 85% of final written decisions on the Building Code Commission internet site within ten working days of completion of the French translation.

Quality and Consistency (process and procedures that have integrity and uniformity)	Parties are satisfied that the Commission process was conducted with a high degree of quality and consistency.	85% of parties feel that the process had a high degree of quality and consistency.	Target met. 2017-2018 survey results indicate 92% of parties felt that the process had a high degree of quality and consistency.	85% of parties feel that the process had a high degree of quality and consistency.
Transparency (clear and understandable process and procedures)	Parties are satisfied that the Commission’s process and procedures were clearly understood.	85% of parties feel that the process and procedures were clear and understandable.	Target met. 2017-2018 survey results indicate 92% of parties felt that the process and procedures were clear and understandable.	85% of parties feel that the process and procedures were clear and understandable.

Expertise (thoughtful and sound Building Code Commission decisions made due to technical competence of members)	a) Parties are satisfied that the Commission members demonstrated an appropriate level of knowledge and technical competency. b) Timely notice to the ministry regarding upcoming Building Code Commission member terms of appointment expiration.	a) 85% of parties feel that the members were experts in the subject matter of the hearing. b) Provide four months' notice to the ministry in advance of member's appointments expiring.	a) Target met. 2017-2018 survey results indicate 92% of parties were satisfied that members were experts. b) Target met. The ministry was provided with four months' notice in advance of member appointments expiring in the fiscal year 2017-2018.	a) 85% of parties feel that the members were experts in the subject matter of the hearing. b) Provide four months' notice to the ministry in advance of member's appointments expiring.
Courtesy (polite and courteous treatment of all parties)	Parties are satisfied that they were treated with courtesy throughout the application process and at a hearing.	85% of parties surveyed feel that they were treated with courtesy throughout the application process and the hearing.	Target met. 2017-2018 survey results indicate that 92% of parties felt that they were treated with courtesy by Commission staff throughout the application process and 92% felt that they were treated with courtesy by the Commission members at the hearing.	85% of parties feel that they are treated with courtesy throughout the application process and the hearing.

* In this Table, “parties” are those recognized by the *Building Code Act, 1992*, namely BCC Applicants (i.e. applicants for building permits, holders of building permits or persons to whom an order has been issued) and Respondents (i.e. municipal enforcement officials and their designates).

Appendix 2: Members of the Building Code Commission

Building Code Commission Appointees List

As of March 31, 2018			
Commission Members	Original Appointment Date	Expiry Date of Current Appointment	Location
Tony Chow, Chair	February 27, 2002	November 30, 2018	Richmond Hill
Gary Burtch	August 21, 2001	October 8, 2018	Haliburton
Judy Beauchamp	September 13, 2017	September 12, 2019	Kitchener
Randal Brown	November 2, 2016	November 1, 2018	Toronto
Wayne Dempsey	November 2, 2016	November 1, 2018	Whitby
John Dunn	November 2, 2016	November 1, 2018	London
Christina Kalt	November 2, 2016	November 1, 2018	Toronto
Lisa Miller-Way	November 2, 2016	November 1, 2018	Toronto
Leszek Muniak	November 2, 2016	November 1, 2018	Toronto
Ann Pepper	November 2, 2016	November 1, 2018	Newmarket
Andrew Steen	November 2, 2016	November 1, 2018	Toronto
Stephen Wong	November 2, 2016	November 1, 2018	Toronto
Mazen Alkhaddam	November 30, 2016	November 29, 2018	Toronto
Carolyn Bilson	November 30, 2016	November 29, 2018	Fergus
Rick Mori	November 30, 2016	November 29, 2018	Markham
Hanna Regehr	November 30, 2016	November 29, 2018	Toronto

Alexandra Chow	February 2, 2017	February 1, 2019	Toronto
Katherine Rentsch	August 31, 2017	August 30, 2019	Hillsburgh
Ahmed Sharaf	September 13, 2017	September 12, 2019	Mississauga

Updated: September 27, 2018
Published: September 27, 2018

Rate



Topics

Plans and annual reports

Ministry of Municipal
Affairs and Housing

[about Ontario](#) [accessibility](#) [news](#)
[privacy](#) [terms of use](#)

© Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2012-18

Contact Us



Topics

- Arts and culture
- Business and economy
- Driving and roads
- Education and training
- Environment and energy
- Government
- Health and wellness
- Home and community
- Jobs and employment
- Law and safety
- Rural and north
- Taxes and benefits
- Travel and recreation