# (企 <br> Municipality of <br> Magnetawan <br> AGENDA - Regular Meeting of Council <br> Wednesday, December 07 , 2022 <br> 1:00 PM <br> Magnetawan Community Centre 

## Page\# OPENING BUSINESS

1.1 Call to Order
1.2 Adoption of the Agenda
1.3 Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest
1.4 Adoption of Previous Minutes
STAFF REPORTS, MOTIONS AND DISCUSSION
2.1 Report from Fire Chief Derek Young, Wage Grid for Firefighters2.2 Correspondence from Greer Galloway, Civil Review - Albert Street Lot - Additonal FillPlacement Onsite
2.3 Report from Public Works Superintendent Scott Edwards, Landfill Methane Gas Test November 2022
2.4 Correspondence from Peter Wyatt, and Report from Public Works Superintendent Scott Edwards, Chapman Drive East Rubbish Site
2.5 Magnetawan River Watershed Communications Committee Meeting - Lake Bernard Minutes November 8, 2022
2.6 Report from Parks and Maintenance Manager Steve Robinson, Parks Department Staffing Complement
2.7 Report from Parks and Maintenance Manager Steve Robinson, Gravely Zero Turn Mower and Sidewalk Sanding Unit
2.8 DRAFT Resolution Year End Motions
2.9 DRAFT Fees and Charges for 2023 Bylaw
2.10 Report from Deputy Clerk Recreation and Communications Laura Brandt, 2022 Private Road Grant Program
2.11 Report from Deputy Clerk Recreation and Communications Laura Brandt, Outcome of 2022 Drive-in Movie Event
2.12 Council Appointments - Current Boards and Organizations
2.13 Almaguin Highlands Health Council DRAFT Terms of Reference September 2022
2.14 Discussion Bill 23 the Build More Homes Faster Act, Correspondence from Al Bottomley, Almaguin Climate Action (ACA), Correspondence Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Bill 23, the More Homes Built Faster Act, Correspondence from Watson \& Associates Economists Ltd, Correspondence from the Regional Municipality of York, Correspondence from the County of Wellington, Correspondence from the Township of Puslinch, Correspondence City of Mississauga, Correspondence from The Municipality of Lambton Shores, and Correspondence from the Town of Georgina
2.15 DRAFT Enter into an Agreement for Pound Services with the North Bay District Humane Society

## MUNICIPAL BOARDS AND COMMITTEE MINUTES

\subsection*{3.1 Almaguin Community Economic Development (ACED) Minutes October 27, 2022, Director of Economic Development (DoED) Report November 24, 2022, Almaguin Marketing Partnership Program Guide, Support in Principle for the New Horizons for Seniors Application, ACED Funding Option, 2023 Budget Sheets-Actuals as of December 31st 2022 <br> 3.2 District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board (DSSAB) Chief Adminstrative Officer's Report November 2022 <br> 3.3 Parry Sound Provincial Offences Act Court Manager's Report Q3 2022, 2022 POA Summary of Operations, Municipal Partners POA Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes May 26, 2022, Municipal Partners POA Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes November 24, 2022 and 2023 POA DRAFT Budget <br> 3.4 Almaguin Highlands Health Centre (AHHC) Minutes November 3, 2022 <br> CORRESPONDENCE <br> | 4.1 | Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities (FONOM), Council across the North start a <br> New Chapter \& FONOM Welcomes New Highway Safety Standard |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4.2 | OPP MPB Financial Services Unit (OPP) July to September 2022 Detachement Revenues <br> 4.3 |
| North Bay Parry Sound District Health Unit, Strong Recommendation to Mask in all Indoor <br> Public Settings and Layering Protections During the Fall Respiratory Season |  |
| 4.4 | Municipal Engineers Association (MEA), MEA Appoints New Bord of Directors at 2022 <br> AGM |
| 4.5 | Magnetawan Lions' Club Christmas Basket Fund Letter |
| 4.6 | Firefighter's Food Drive Poster <br> Correspondence Unsuccessful Outcome of Ontario Trillium Foundation Application - |
| 4.7 | Capital Building Fund |
| 4.8 | Kiss the Moose Mural Naming Contest Winner Poster <br> Lions' Pavilion Update Poster |
| 4.10 | ICYMI Council Highlights November 16, 2022 |}

## ACCOUNTS

5.1 Accounts in the amount of \$499,113.87

## BY-LAWS

6.1 Establish Fees and Charges for 2023
6.2 Enter into an Agreement for Pound Services with the North Bay District Humane Society

## CONFIRMING BY-LAW AND ADJOURNMENT

### 7.1 Confirm the Proceedings of Council and Adjourn



Municipality of
Magnetawan
Inaugural Meeting of Council
followed by
Regular Meeting of Council
COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
November 16, 2022
1:00 pm

## INUAGURAL MEETING OF COUNCIL <br> DECLARATIONS OF OFFICE <br> OPENING PRAYER REV SYLVIA POETSCHKE

SHORT REFRESHMENT BREAK

The meeting of the Council of the Corporation of the Munisipality of Magnetawan was held at the Magnetawan Community Centre on Wednesday November 16, 2022 with the following present:

Mayor Sam Dunnett
Deputy Mayor John Hetherington
Councillor Bill Bishop
Councillor Jon Hind
Councillor Brad Kneller
Staff: CAO/Clerk Kerstin Vroom and Deputy Clerk Recreation and Communications Laura Brandt were present for the entire meeting. Acting Deputy Clerk Planning and Development Erica Kellogg was present for her respective section in the meeting.

## OPENING BUSINESS

1.1 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

### 1.2 Adoption of the Agenda

RESOLUTION 2022-296 Hind-Hetherington
BEIT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan adopts the agenda as presented.
Carried.

### 1.3 Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest

Mayor Sam Dunnett stated that should anyone have a disclosure of pecuniary interest that they could declare the nature thereof now or at any time during the meeting.

### 1.4 Adoption of the Previous Minutes

RESOLUTION 2022-297 Hind-Hetherington
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan adopts the minutes of the meeting on October 19, 2022, as copied and circulated.
Carried.
STAFF REPORTS, MOTIONS AND DISCUSSION
2.1 Discussion Appointment of Deputy Mayor and DRAFT By-law RESOLUTION 2022-298 Kneller-Hind
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan appoints:
John Hetherington
as Deputy Mayor for the Municipality of Magnetawan, and a by-law on this matter will be passed later in the meeting.
Carried.

### 2.2 DRAFT Site Plan Agreement - 6 Cobalt Lane - Maunu/Stevens

RESOLUTION 2022-299 Hetherington-Hind
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan approves the DRAFT Site Plan Agreement - 6 Cobalt Lane - Maunu/Stevens, and the by-law on this matter will be passed later in the meeting.
Carried.

### 2.3 DRAFT Motion Ontario Land Tribunal - James

RESOLUTION 2022-300 Hind-Hetherington
WHEREAS Council for the Municipality of Magnetawan receiyed an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment for (James) PLAN 319 PT LOT 11W/S N SPARKS ST AND RP $42 R 3764$ PART 1 AND PLAN 319 PT LOT 11 AND 12 W/S N SPARKS ST RP 42R-9635 PART 1, formerly the Village of Magnetawan, municipally known as 154 \& 156 North Sparks Street;
WHEREAS Council for the Municipality of Magnetawan passed Motion 2022-142 defeating the application an the basis that the amendment does not meet the general inteht and purpose of the Municipality's Official Plan;
WHEREAS Council for the Municipality of Magnetawan received a Notice of Appeal and subsequent Notice of Hearing for the application for January 19th, 2023;
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan will defend their decision to deny the application and request a representative from MHBC Planning Urban Design \& Landscape Architecture and the Municipal Solicitor, if required Carried.

### 2.4 Council Meefing Dates for 2023

RESOLUTION 2022-301 Hind-Hetherington
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan receives and approves the DRAFT 2023 Council Meeting Dates as amended, meetings at 1:00 pm unless approved by Council to change the time at a prior meeting.
Carried.

### 2.5 Discussion ROMA Conference and Delegation

RESOLUTION 2022-302 Hind-Kneller
WHEREAS the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan receives the Correspondence ROMA Conference and Delegation - Sunday, January 22 to Tuesday, January 24;
AND the following Council Members will attend the ROMA Conference in 2023:
All Council
Carried.
Direction was given to Staff to request a delegation at the ROMA Conference with the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) in regard to the entrance at the municipally owned employment lands - 4855 Highway 520.

### 2.6 Council Appointment Central Almaguin Planning Board <br> RESOLUTION 2022-303 Hetherington-Hind

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan appoints
Sam Dunnett to the Central Almaguin Planning Board for the Council term (2022-2026).
Carried.

### 2.7 Council Appointment North Bay Parry Sound Board of Health Appointment 2023-2026 (Joint Board)

RESOLUTION 2022-304 Kneller-Bishop
WHEREAS the Parry Sound Board of Health is a jointly-made appointment with neighbouring municipalities:
AND WHEREAS Council may choose to recommend a member from Magnetawan or from another Council;
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan respectfully declines the appointment of d member of the Council of Municipality of Magnetawan.
Carried.

### 2.8 Council Appointment Parry Sound District Emergency Medical Services Advisory Committee

RESOLUTION 2022-305 Bishop-Kneller
WHEREAS the Parry Sound District Emergency Medical Services Advisory Committee is a jointly-made appointment with neighbouring municipalities;
AND WHEREAS Council may choose to recommend a member from Magnetawan or from another Council;
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan respectfully declines the appointment of a member of the Council of Municipality of Magnetawan.
Carried.

### 2.9 Almaguin Highlands Health Council DRAFT Terms of Reference September 2022

RESOLUTION 2022-306 Bishop-Kneller
WHEREAS the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan receives the Almaguin Highlands Health Council DRAFT Terms of Reference September 2022;
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan directs Staff to provide the amendments as discussed.
Deferred.
2.10 Almaguin Community Economic Development (ACED) Carpool Almaguin Staff Report
RESOLUTION 2022-307 Kneller-Bishop
WHEREAS the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan receives the Almaguin Community Economic Development (ACED) Committee Carpool Almaguin Staff Report October 3, 2022, requesting that each municipality help support this motion by:

- designating a parking lot suitable with sign installation
- accepting any costs/labour associated with sign installation
- ensuring that our lot is well maintained year-round and well lit in the evenings
- supporting the promotion of the campaign on social media

AND WHEREAS the Municipality of Magnetawan's current Carpool sign is still in good repair, Council respectfully declines the offer to participate in the purchase and installation of new signage; however, will continue to promote this initiative.
Carried.

### 2.11 Discussion on Christmas

 RESOLUTION 2022-308 Bishop-KnellerWHEREAS the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan appreciates its Staff and their great work throughout the year;
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council approves a Christmas Bonus of half a day paid for the $23^{r d}$, a staff luncheon and a turkey or ham for each department head, contract employee, and unionized employee for 2022.
Carried.

## MUNICIPAL BOARD AND COMMITTEE MINUTES

### 3.1 District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board Chief Administrative Officer's Report October 2022

3.2 Lakeland Holding Ltd 2022 Q3 Shareholder Update
3.3 Town of Parry Sound EMS Advisory Committee Minutes October 27, 2022

RESOLUTION 2022-309. Bishop-Kneller
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan receives the
Municipal Boards and Committee Minutes as copied and circulated.
Carried.

## CORRESRONDENCE

4.1 Office of the Chief Veterinarian for Ontario (OCVO) Avian Influenza (H5N1)

### 4.2 Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing More Home Built Faster: Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan 2022-2023

### 4.3 Ministry of Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada Ontario Wildlife Damage Compensation Program

4.4 BDO Canada LLP Chartered Professional Accountants Outcome of Gas Tax Audit
4.5 Correspondence Successful Outcome of 2022 - Fall Trail Care Grant - Trans Canada Sign Replacement
4.6 Correspondence Unsuccessful Outcome of Seniors and Accessibility Inclusive Community Grants Program - Age Friendly Plan
4.7 Correspondence Women's Own Resources $4^{\text {th }}$ Annual Red Gala November $\mathbf{2 8}^{\text {th }}$ Poster
4.8 Notice of Closure Lions' Pavilion Poster
4.9 Kiss the Moose Mural Naming Contest Poster
4.10 Remembrance Day Closure and Ceremony Poster
4.11 Christmas Tree Lighting Poster
4.12 ICYMI Council Highlights October 19, 2022

RESOLUTION 2022-310 Kneller-Bishop
be IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan receives the correspondence items as copied and circulated.
Carried.

## ACCOUNTS

5.1 Accounts in the amount of $\$ \mathbf{1 , 3 4 7 , 1 0 9 . 3 8}$

RESOLUTION 2022-311 Kneller-Bishop
BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan approves the accounts in the amount of $\$ 1,347,109.38$ as presented.
Carried.

## BY-LAWS

6.1 2022 Municipal Election Joint Audit Compliance Committee
6.2 Site Plan Agreement - $\mathbf{8 1}$ Tanner's Lañe - Stevanus RESOLUTION 2022-312 Kneller-Bishop
BE IT RESOLVED THAT by the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan that the following by-laws are now read a first, second and a third time, passed, signed by the Mayor and the Clerk, sealed with the seal of the Corporation, and engrossed in the bylaw book:
6.1 Appoint a Deputy Mayor
6.2 Site Plan Agreement - 6 Cobalt Lane - Maunu/Stevens

Carried.

## CONFIRMING,BY-LAW AND ADJOURNMENT

7.1 Confirm the Proceedings of Council and Adjourn

RESOLUTION 2022-313 Bishop Kneller
BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan that the Confirming
By-law is how read a first, second and a third time, passed, signed by the Mayor and the Clerk, sealed with the seal of the Corporation and engrossed in the by-law book;
AND FURTHER THAT, this meeting is now adjourned at $3: 15 \mathrm{pm}$ to meet again on Wedhesday December 07, 2022, at 1:00 pm or at the call of the Chair.
Carried.

Approved by:

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: |  |
| From: |  |
| Rate PORT TO COUNCIL |  |
| Report Title: | Day or and Council |

Recommendation: THAT Council receives and approves proposed wage increases for the Fire Department.

Background: Volunteer wages have not been increased on a regular basis or to align with the current demands placed upon firefighters. Mandatory certification has created a greater workload outside regular training; most of which they are not compensated for. The current wage does not compensate volunteers appropriately given the rise in fuel prices and cost of living.

Financial Implications: The wages will be based on the firefighter's current certification level with the incentive to continue certifying to higher levels. The previous honorariums will be eliminated, being replaced with higher wages for officers. The 2022 firefighter hours at the new wages would have meant an increase of $\$ 9,894.50$, compared to the current rate and honorariums. Appendix A details the proposed wages.

Request: I requested the new wages be implemented for the 2023 firefighter pay year and be increased yearly as per the union rate.

Conclusion: Volunteers are becoming increasingly difficult to find due to the amount of time required to attend training and calls. I believe increasing the wages will help attract more volunteers while considering the current dedication and skill level of the current members.

Respectfully Submitted,


Derek Young,
Fire Chief.

## Page 1 of 2

## APPENDIX A

| 2023 Proposed Renumeration |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Position | Rate |
| Dispatcher | 16.00 |
| Junior Firefighter | 16.00 |
| Recruit Firefighter | 17.00 |
| Firefighter I | 19.00 |
| Firefighter II (requires DZ License) | 21.00 |
| Acting Captain | 23.00 |
| Captain | 25.00 |
| Deputy Chief | 27.00 |
| *Honorariums eliminated |  |
| Volunteer Cost 2022 at \$15.50 | $54,040.25$ |
| Volunteer Cost 2022 at new wages | $63,934.75$ |
| Difference | $9,894.50$ |
| Totals calculated based on firefighter's current rank |  |

$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathbf{G} & \mathrm{R} & \mathrm{E} & \mathrm{E} & \mathrm{R}\end{array}$
GALLOWAY
consulurg I: NGINHERS. -

640 Cataraqui Woods Drive
Unit 2A
Kingston, Ontario
K7P 2Y5
-

Telephone
(613) 536-5420
-

Facsimile (613) 548-3793

E-mail
Kingston@greergalioway.com

October 27, 2022
Municipality of Magnetawan
PO Box 70 | 81 Albert St. | Magnetawan, ON POA 1PO
Phone 705-349-8477 | Fax 705-387-4875 | fire@magnetawan.com
Attention: Derek Young, Fire Chief

Re: Civil Review - Albert Street Lot- Additional Fill Placement Onsite

Dear, Mr. Young
Greer Galloway has reviewed the existing lot adjacent to 81 Albert Street, Magnetawan, Ontario. It is noted that the township is currently placing fill in this location in anticipation of the construction of a new fire hall.

Based on the site Greer Galloway suggest that prior to the placement of any more fill the township install environment protections systems (silt fence) onsite as per OPSD 219.130. Additionally, the township should strip the native topsoil prior to placement of any fill. Fill placed onsite should be restricted to engineered materials (crushed/ screened granular materials). This will ensure compliance with O. Reg. 406/19: ON-SITE AND EXCESS SOIL MANAGEMENT. The material should be placed in 300 m lifts and compacted as per OPSS 206.

Sincerely,

## GREER GALLOWAY

 CONSULTING ENGINEERSthim Araty

[^0]|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: |  |
| From: | Mayor and Council |
| Date of Meeting: | December |
| Report Title: | Landfill Methane Gas Test November 2022 |

Recommendation: THAT Council receives and approves this report as presented in regard to the Croft/Chapman Landfill Methane Gas Test as per Staff Heath and Safety Concern.

Background: It was brought to the Public Works Superintendents attention that there was a concern from a Landfill Staff member in regard to the possibility of Methane Gas release into the into the air around the Landfill site and having the potential of a negative affect on their health.

Evaluation: Given this is a Heath \& Safety Concern to which has the possibility of negative affects to heath for both our Staff and the our Residents it was prudent to contact our Engineering firm, being Pinchin Ltd who performs the Regular Scheduled Tests at the Landfill, to include a Methane Gas Test. It was considered highly unlikely as stated by the said Engineer "We do not typically see large methane build up in small rural sites. The setting for Croft is not conducive to methane build up. Similarly, the sand and gravel that hosts the Chapman site would result in natural venting". If testing indicates methane generation in excess of the OReg 232 standards we could implement a methane probe instrumentation program next spring. Costs are as per Financial Implications

Financial Implications: This Project will be from both the Landfill Monitoring Well Costs-Croft 1-4-40205020 and Landfill Monitoring Well Costs-Chapman 1-4-4020-5025 2022 Budget.
Two Rounds of Preliminary Testing at each site with Letter/Report
Estimated cost plus HST
Installation of Probes if required as per O. Reg 232
Estimated cost plus HST
\$6,000
Addition to regular test sting spring/fall
Estimated costs plus HST \$2,000

Budgeted for 2022 \$0

Conclusion: It is in the best interest of the Municipality to complete the Methane Gas Test given the Heath and Safety concern of both Staff and Residents alike; therefore, the Public Works Superintendent recommends we proceed with the Preliminary tests in question and determine if further testing and regular testing are required and budget accordingly for the 2023 Budget if so.

Respectfully Submitted,


Scott Edwards
Public Works Superintendent

## 24 October 2022

Dear Members of Council,
Last February I wrote to ask the Municipality to clear the dump that has existed for decades on the former Chapman Dr. (some of us call it "the old dump road"). The reason for this request was twofold. First, the rusting metals and broken glass constituted an eyesore and contravened the rubbish bylaw of the Municipality. Second, run-off from the rusting heavy metals would be a factor in the pollution of the Magnetawan watershed. Council agreed and voted to carry out the clean-up requested.

Earlier this autumn some action was taken, though it did not involve the removal of the rusting metals and glass. I have learned from the mayor that a tracked vehicle pushed much of the debris into a hole and then smoothed earth over the site. Aesthetically, this is no doubt an improvement, but just burying the heavy metals and glass does not answer the concern about pollution.

When I first wrote the Council, I had hoped that the clean-up of the old dump would be a collaborative effort between the Municipality and citizens on Chapman Dr. The Municipality could provide bins and local volunteers would work to clear the site, perhaps with the initial help of the tracked vehicle to dislodge half-buried materials. Those of us volunteering would have been happy to sign waivers, thus saving the Municipality from any liability if there were injury.

I am disappointed in the half-solution undertaken by the Municipality. It is not too late to undertake a thorough clean-up of the former dump, and I and engaged neighbours would be prepared to help.

Some of the neighbours who walk the old dump trail and care about the clean-up have chosen to add their names in support of this letter.

Faithfully,

Peter Wyatt
and Norman Cameron, Andrew Czernik, Elizabeth White

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: |  |
| From: | Magner and Council |
| Date of Meeting: | Public Works Superintendent |
| Report Title: | Chapman Drive East Rubbish Site Cleanup |

Recommendation: THAT Council receives and approves this report as presented for information purposes in regard to the Chapman Drive East Rubbish Site Cleanup.

Background: At the March 2, 2022, meeting of Council, Council passed resolution 2022-52 receiving the correspondence from Rev. Dr. Peter Wyatt, Requesting Chapman Road Rubbish Clean up and Council directed Staff to address the concerns brought forth in the Spring once weather permits.

Further correspondence dated October 24, 2022, has been received from Rev. Dr, Peter Wyatt regarding the completed rubbish site clean up.

The rubbish site is located on a Municipal Road Allowance that was at one time called Chapman Drive. As years past this was Municipal Road Allowance was unofficially used by Residents and/or local Farmers before the new road was developed and dates back as far as the 1940s as a dumping point for metal, glass, and tires from what could be determined by Staff. As years went by the Municipal Road Allowance evolved into a walking and ATV trail with only one notable address (civic address \# 405 Chapman Drive on a lot with a shed/outbuilding etc. on the premise but not inhabited).

The concerns brought forth were regarding rusting metal breaking down and working its way to the waterways causing an environmental and health hazard as well as the broken glass and rusty metal being. an eyesore and hazard to Residents/Pets along the trail. The Public Works Superintendent was tasked with a plan to remove and/or cap as required once the site was surveyed.

Evaluation: After surveying the site and delving into the history of the location and aged debris "dumped" along this portion of the Municipal Road Allowance it became apparent that to remove all the debris would require widening and building essentially a road to prevent equipment from getting bogged down. Given the found debris consisted of glass, metal, some tires and no liquids, it was considered prudent to cap and/or bury the material on site with just an Excavator. This would prevent injuries as well as remove an eyesore until this Municipal Road Allowance is potentially opened in the future as a functioning road, at which time the debris would be removed during construction. To note the Resident that use this section as a trail had offered to Volunteer with assistance from the Municipality in regards to a bin and excavator to assist in the removal of debris. Although this is greatly appreciated given the inherent dangers of rusted metals and broken glass from a safety and liability point of view it was decided the best course of action was to do this project inhouse with the Roads Department.

As there were no liquids found on site, only rusting metal found in a small given area a distance away from the lake, Staff have no concerns of environmental hazards at this time. An engineering report would need
to be completed and the findings of the report would need to justify a large-scale clean up and removal of extracted rubbish to an operational Landfill.

Financial Implications: This unbudgeted Project estimated total cost was as follows:
Survey site, Excavator with Operator, Truck and Float estimated at \$1762.50

Conclusion: Given the preliminary findings at the site, the decision to cap and bury the debris to address the immediate concerns, the most logical and cost-efficient solution was completed which ensured any immediate hazards and/or eyesores were mitigated for those who enjoy this "trail".

Respectfully Submitted,


## Scott Edwards

Public Works Superintendent







## Magnetawan River Watershed Communications Committee Meeting - Lake Bernard

November 8 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2022$
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## Overview

- Lake Bernard
- Legislative / Regulatory Framework for Dams
- Roles and Responsibilities
- Water Management Objectives
- Operations Factors
- What We've Heard From You
- Ministry Actions / Next Steps



## Lake Bernard

- Total Property Owners: 327
- Lake processes experienced to a greater degree vs other waterbodies in Mag. R. Watershed
- There is a narrowing downstream of the dam limiting outflow


Page 23 of 390

## Legislative/ Regulatory Framework for Dams

## Lakes and Rivers Improvement Act (LRIA)

The purposes of the LRIA are to provide for the:
a. management, protection, preservation and use of the waters of the lakes and rivers of Ontario and the land under them
b. protection and equitable exercise of public rights in or over the waters of the lakes and rivers of Ontario
c. protection of the interests of riparian owners
d. management, perpetuation and use of the fish, wildlife, and other natural resources dependent on the lakes and rivers
e. protection of the natural amenities of the lakes and rivers and their shores and banks and
f. protection of persons and of property by ensuring that dams are suitably located, constructed, operated and maintained and are of an appropriate nature with regard to the purposes of clauses (a) to (e).

## Roles and Responsibilities - Dams and Water-Related Natural Hazard Management

## MNRF

- Governs the construction, alteration, operation and safety of dams under the LRIA
- Considers the objectives of the LRIA and all applicable management direction documents and weighs the potential implications to all users of the lake (social, economic and environmental) against the known or potential benefits of certain operational objectives when considering establishing new or changing operations (i.e., balance interests via consultation)
- Provincial lead for emergencies including water-related natural hazards (floods, erosion, drought/low water and soil and bedrock instability). The province supports municipalities in their efforts to plan effectively, by providing provincial direction in the natural hazard policies contained within the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), issued under the Planning Act
Operators
- Dam owners are responsible for the safe operations of their dams
- The Dam Operating Plan (Rule Curve and Dam Operating Manual) establishes normal operating conditions for the Lake Bernard dam

Municipality

- Preparedness, prevention, mitigation, response and recovery for emergencies for their residents. This includes preparation (planning), mitigation and prevention (land use planning), response (declaring state of emergency, temporary evacuation centers) and recovery (clean-up, reconstruction of infrastructure)
- Develops emergency management plans (flood contingency plans) to limit exposure to public health and safety risks
- Makes decisions under the Planning Act consistent with the PPS through identifying areas subject to natural hazards (e.g., flood plain mapping) and incorporating policies in Official Plans to address new development

Water management is a collaborative endeavor seeking to consider a broad range of interests on the watershed such as Indigenous communities, riparian landowners, municipalities and interested groups

## Water Management Objectives

## Magnetawan River Water Control Operating Plan Goals and Objectives

- Objective 1: To ensure the safety of the watershed residents, users, property and natural resources with respect to natural hazards such as flooding.
- Objective 2: To maintain and enhance the use of the river as a valuable recreational resource in a manner most beneficial to the majority of users by maintaining acceptable water levels and flows.
- Objective 3: To maintain and enhance fish habitat and associated fish communities of lakes and tributaries within the Magnetawan River system, with particular emphasis on spawning habitat in the vicinity of the dams.
- Objective 4: To ensure cost-effective, safe dam operation, and maintenance of all water control structures as necessary to meet current dam safety guidelines.
$\square$ - Data collection and review to inform operations and local Flood Forecasting and Warning
- Operations consider target levels, water level impacts to affected stakeholders, downstream flows to ensure fishery and wastewater needs are met
- Balance water concerns and ecological objectives for continued minimum flow in Stirling Creek
- Maintenance of minimum flows in Stirling Creek
- Using daily data review to plan dam maintenance activities
- Long term infrastructure planning


## Operations Factors

Seasonal Objectives and Operational Constraints
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## What We've Heard

## Core Issues $\frac{\boxed{|c|}}{\pi}$

- Spring dam operations can dislodge ice sheets (formed during winter) from the lakebed when water levels increase. Floating ice sheets can cause damage to shorelines due to ice push
- This has impacted some landowners negatively through loss of shoreline and costs for repairs
- Those impacted by shoreline damage are seeking changes to dam operations
- Requested changes to dam operations include delaying placement of logs until after the ice is out in the spring \& remove logs from dam earlier in the fall

Is the summary of the core issues and proposed solution accurate ? Anything else to add? Are there additional factors or solutions that come to mind that we can explore?

## Ministry Actions

## To date:

- Reviewed the multiple factors that influence water levels on Lake Bernard
- Reviewed purposes of the LRIA and implementation tools that guide dam operations and decision-making
- Preparing to engage in a broader discussion with the public to confirm issues and possible solutions to ensure the public has an understanding of the potential benefits and implications and seek their input


## Ongoing:

Continue to gather and consider information to inform options
consult with ministry science staff (hydrological modelling opportunities, data analysis, etc.)
engage with engineering staff (technical/public safety expertise relating to dam operations in accordance with the Dam Operating Plan)

## Next Steps



Proposal for a Broader Public Meeting (date TBD):

- Engage with and seek feedback from a wide variety of stakeholders and individuals with interest in Lake Bernard water levels to confirm the core issues
- Explore and confirm options available, which could include changing dam operations
- Ensure public has clear, thorough and evidence-based information to facilitate meaningful discussion about potential benefits and implications

How can we collaborate on the next steps? Is there additional information that you need/can provide to support broader participation?

## Appendix - Summary of Lake Bernard and Operational Considerations

- The Bernard Lake dam was not designed to pass a large volume of water quickly. The dam does not have the functional ability to mitigate flooding or keep water levels within a narrow range
- Natural restrictions - such as minimal elevation change on the creek bed - restrict flows when water is high with the creek channel becoming the point of control (see slide 3)
- When all logs are removed from the dam, MNRF has no further operational control over water levels
- Lake Bernard has a relatively small drainage basin compared to other waterbodies on the Magnetawan River Watershed; there are limited inputs that contribute to water levels other than the spring melt and local precipitation
- In order to maintain summer recreational water levels (e.g., docks, boating), downstream ecology (i.e,. brook trout) and dilution of lagoon materials, MNRF seeks to operate the dam to minimize impacts (see slide 7). For example:
- Capturing spring runoff by logging in at the dam following the peak of freshet
- Delaying the start of filling the lake could result in low water throughout the summer season
- In 2007, the Lake Bernard Property Owners Association surveyed waterfront property owners around Lake Bernard regarding potential changes to the target operating water level. As a result of this exercise, MNRF implemented a Best Management Practice target line with the objective to balance concerns about high water levels with low water concerns and ecological objectives for continued minimum flow in Stirling Creek

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Mayor and Council |
| From: | Steve Robinson, Parks \& Maintenance Manager |
| Date of Meeting: | December 07, 2022 |
| Report Title: | Parks Department Staffing Complement |

Recommendation: THAT Council receives and approves this report as presented to revise the Parks Department Staffing Complement to 1 Full Time Lead Hand, 2 Full Time Parks Assistants, and 1 seasonal and/or casual if needed.
Background: The Parks Department historically has had a staffing complement under the supervision of Parks \& Maintenance Manager Steve Robinson of 2 Parks Assistants (FT), 3 Seasonal and 1 Casual. Currently the Parks Department has 2 Parks Assistants (FT), and 1 Seasonal Parks (summer only), and 2 casual Parks Assistants. We were fortunate that last winter, our two casuals essentially worked full time to cover the lack. Both of our casual employees have expressed to me that they do not want to work full time hours. We have been publicly advertising for both casual and seasonal positions and included invitations for summer students. The response has been negligible and there are no qualified applicants as of yet.
Further, I am responsible for the maintenance of all of the buildings and equipment, water systems, vehicles, as well as, budgeting, reports to Council, obtaining quotes, dealing with contractors, cemetery sales, burials which includes staking of graves and site visits with family members and monument makers, etc. I find myself not able to attend job sites as needed and/or organize staff. For this reason, I am requesting a Lead Hand, which would include a $\$ 2.00$ an hour increase, same as the Public Works Department.
Financial: The pay scale for the Parks positions are as follows:
Parks/Maintenance Assistant - $\$ 21.53$ (currently 2 full time and 2 casual)
Seasonal or Casual Parks - $\$ 16.88$ (currently 1 seasonal) The current seasonal position does not do water system management nor do they operate heavy equipment.

Full time employees have benefits and OMERS as well as standard deductions (WSIB,CPP.EI) which adds about $30 \%$ to their wage. Seasonal (working less than 24 hours on average per week) do not get benefits and we budget $10 \%$ for standard deductions.

Historical complement cost: $\$ 190,500$ ( $2 \mathrm{FT}, 3$ Seasonal ( 2 with water/heavy equipment, 1 as current), and a casual (to be called in if needed est 200 hours)
Proposed complement cost: $\$ 203,500$ ( $3 \mathrm{FT}, 1$ Seasonal (no water/heavy equipment, 1 casual est. 200 hours) It is anticipated that the seasonal position could eventually be phased out and/or used in other departments as a fill in if needed.

Conclusion: Staff recommends the Parks Staffing Complement be changed for the 2023 season to be comprised of: 1 Full time Parks Lead Hand, 2 Parks Assistants (FT), (water and able to operate heavy equipment), 1 Seasonal Parks (if needed) and a Casual to be used as fill in.


Steve Robinson
Parks and Maintenance Manager

|  | REPORT TO COUNCIL |
| :---: | :---: |
| To: | Mayor and Council |
| From: | Parks and Maintenance Manager Steve Robinson |
| Date of Meeting: | December 7, 2022 |
| Report Title: | Gravely Zero Turn Mower and Sidewalk Sanding Unit |

Recommendation: THAT Council receives and approves this report as presented and authorizes the purchase of a new Gravelly zero turn mower and sidewalk sanding unit, utilizing some of the funds budgeted for the insulation of the Wharf House/Rebuilding and Replacement of the Sand Shed by the Wharfhouse $\$ 25,000$ and directs Staff to include the rebuilding and replacement of the Sand Shed by the Wharfhouse in the 2023 budget.

Background: Council approved the insulation of the Wharfhouse and $\$ 25,000$ was allocated in the 2022 budget for this project. At the September 7, 2022, Council meeting, Council passed motion 2022-242 authorizing the rebuilding and replacement of the Sand Shed by the Wharfhouse utilizing some of the funds budgeted for the insulation of the Wharfhouse, $\$ 25,000$ and directed Staff to include insulating the Wharfhouse in the 2023 Budget.

Staff moved forward with relocating the Sand Shed but due to the disrepair of the existing Sand Shed, the Sand Shed started to fall apart which resulted in Staff having to dismantle it. For the 2022/2023 winter maintenance season Staff repurposed old jersey barriers and relocated the winter sand directly inside the big Wharfhouse which has been working out very nicely. Staff will need to move forward with the rebuilding and replacement of the Sand Shed by the Wharfhouse in 2023. Additionally, Staff no longer feels its necessary to insulate and renovate the large Wharfhouse and will not be including this project in the 2023 budget.

Staff does have an immediate need to purchase a new Gravely zero turn mower to replace our current 2014 unit and sidewalk sander. Staff have been repairing and replacing parts on our current sanding unit more frequently and as the unit is over 12 years old it has come to the end of its useful lifespan.

Financial Impact: The funds for the replacement of the Gravely zero-turn lawn mower and sander unit could be taken from the funds allocated for the Wharfhouse/Replacement of the Sand Shed, $\$ 25,000$ as the Municipality will need to upgrade these two pieces of equipment sooner than later to ensure that winter maintenance can be performed.

| Equipment | Cost |
| :--- | :--- |
| New Sand Unit | $\$ 6,130$ |
| New Gravely | $\$ 15,112$ |
| Less 2014 Gravely Trade-In | $\$ 4,800$ |
| Approximate Cost | $\$ 16,442$ plus tax |
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Conclusion: Staff recommends purchasing the new equipment from the funds allocated for the renovating of the Wharfhouse, $\$ 25,000$ as it is no longer needed and include the rebuilding and replacement of the Sand Shed by the Wharfhouse in the 2023 budget.

Respectfully Submitted,


Steve Robinson
Parks and Maintenance Manager
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Moved by: $\qquad$

Seconded by: $\qquad$

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan:

1) Authorizes the payment of accounts up to and including December 31,2022
2) Authorizes the Treasurer to transfer any 2022 year-end surplus into the Asset Management Reserve
3) Authorizes the Treasurer to draw any 2022 year-end deficit from the Working Funds Reserve

Carried $\qquad$ Defeated Deferred $\qquad$

Recorded Vote Called by: $\qquad$
Recorded Vote

| Member of Council | Yea | Nay | Absent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bishop, Bill |  |  |  |
| Hetherington, John |  |  |  |
| Hind, Jon |  |  |  |
| Kneller, Brad |  |  |  |
| Mayor: Dunnett, Sam |  |  |  |

# THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN 

BY-LAW NO. 2022 -<br>Being a By-law to Establish Fees and Charges


#### Abstract

WHEREAS Section 391(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended, authorizes the Council of a local municipality to pass by-laws imposing fees or charges for services or activities provided or done by or on behalf of it; for costs payable by it for services or activities provided or done by or on behalf of any other municipality or local board; and for the use of its property including property under its control;


AND WHEREAS Section 69 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, provides that the Council of a municipality may prescribe a tariff of fees for the processing of applications made in respect of planning matters;

AND WHEREAS Section 7 of the Building Code Act, 1992, S.O. 1992, c. 23, as amended, authorizes a municipal Council of a municipality to pass a by-law requiring the payment of fees on applications for and issuance of permits and prescribing the amounts thereof;

AND WHEREAS Pursuant to Section 270(1) of the Municipal Act the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Magnetawan provided notice in accordance with the Municipality of Magnetawan Provision of Notice Policy By-law 2016-12.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Magnetawan hereby enacts as follows:

## 1. GENERAL

1.1. Council hereby establishes the fees and charges as set out in the Schedule $A$ attached hereto and forming an integral part of this By-law.
1.2. This By-law shall be known and may be cited as the "Municipality of Magnetawan Fees and Charges By-law".
1.3. The fees set out in the attached Schedule A shall be paid for the services or activities listed, and all fees are per occasion or request.
1.4. No request by any person for any information, service, activity or use of Municipal property will be provided unless and until the person requesting the information, service, activity or use of Municipal property has paid the applicable fee in the prescribed amount as set out in the Schedules.
1.5. The fees and charges will be subject to Harmonized Sales Tax (HST), where applicable, as noted.

## 4. REPEAL OF PREVIOUS BY-LAWS

That By-law 2021-65 and any previously conflicting by-laws are hereby repealed.

## 5. EFFECTIVE DATE

This by-law shall take force and effect on the $1^{\text {st }}$ day of January 2023.
READ A FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD TIME, passed, signed and the Seal of the Corporation affixed hereto, this $7^{\text {th }}$ day of December, 2022

## SCHEDULE "A" To By-law 2022- <br> ALL FEES ARE NON-REFUNDABLE

 ALL FEES ARE SUBJECT TO APPLICABLE TAXESCOMMUNITY SERVICES -FACILITY SERVICES
Magnetawan Community Centre, Lion's Pavilion \& Ahmic Harbour Community Centre

| Magnetawan Community Centre <br> A damage deposit fee of $\$ 250$ per event is required upon booking. Deposit less repair costs, if any, will be returned following postrental inspection | Monday to Thursday (per day) | Friday to Sunday (per day) | Friday 6 pm to Sunday 6 pm (weekend) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial/ *Non-Resident full day | \$170 | \$195 | \$390 |
| Commercial/Non-Resident up to 4 hrs. | \$100 | per day \$120 |  |
| Resident full day | \$120 | \$145 | \$290 |
| Resident up to 4 hours | \$70 | per dav \$90 |  |
| **Non-profit full day | \$120 | \$145 | \$290 |
| Non-profit up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day $\$ 90$ |  |
| Add-ons |  |  |  |
| Kitchen Rental (Not Available for Individual Rental) | \$75 | \$85 | \$140 |
| Bar Rental | \$35 | \$55 | \$110 |
| Set-up Fee (including tables, chairs, etc.) | \$50 | per day \$50 |  |
| Coffee \& Tea Set-Up | \$20 | per day \$25 |  |
| Ahmic Harbour Community Centre <br> A damage deposit fee of $\$ 250$ per event is required upon booking. Deposit less repair costs, if any, will be returned following postrental inspection | Monday to Thursday (per day) | Friday to Sunday (per day) | Friday 6 pm to Sunday 6 pm (weekend) |
| Commercial/Non-Resident fuill day | \$120 | \$145 | \$290 |
| Commercial/Non-Resident up to 4 hrs . | \$80 | per day \$95 |  |
| Resident full day | \$90 | \$110 | \$220 |
| Resident up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day \$90 |  |
| Non-profit full day | \$90 | \$110 | \$220 |
| Non-profit up to 4 h | \$70 | per day $\$ 80$ |  |
| Add-ons |  |  |  |
| Set-up Fee (including tables, chairs, etc.) | \$50 | per day \$50 |  |
| Coffee \& Tea Set-up | \$20 | per day \$25 |  |
| Magnetawan Lions Pavilion <br> A damage deposit fee of $\$ 250$ per event is required upon booking. Deposit less repair costs, if any, will be returned following postrental inspection | Monday to Thursday (per day) | Friday to Sunday (per day) | Friday 6 pm to Sunday 6 pm (weekend) |
| Commercial / Non-Resident full day | \$120 | \$130 | \$260 |
| Commercial / Non-Resident up to 4 hrs. | \$80 | per day $\$ 90$ |  |
| Commercial/ Non-Resident Hourly | \$35 | per day \$40 |  |
| Resident full day | \$100 | \$110 | \$220 |
| Resident up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day $\$ 80$ |  |
| Resident Hourly | \$30 | per day \$35 |  |


| Non-profit full day | $\$ 100$ | $\$ 110$ | $\$ 220$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-profit up to 4 hours | $\$ 70$ | per day $\$ 80$ |  |
| Non-profit Hourly | $\$ 30$ | per day $\$ 40$ |  |
| Set-up Fee (tables, chairs, sports equipment, etc.) | $\$ 50$ | per day $\$ 50$ |  |

## Additional Fees - all locations

| Late Vacating Fee | $\$ 50$ per half hour, not including 10 min grace period for <br> first $1 / 2$ hour onlv. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Host Liquor Liability Insurance (if qualified may be purchased) | $\$ 50$ per event |

*Non-Resident is defined as a person who does not either reside within the Municipality or does not pay property taxes to the Municipality.
*Non-profit is defined as any recognized not-for-profit organization that does not gain any profit from its events

## CLERK'S OFFICE

| Fee Description | Fee |
| :---: | :---: |
| Photocopies per page (Black/White) | \$0.25 |
| Photocopies per page (Colour) | - \$0.50 |
| Commissioning of Documents | No charge for Residents $\$ 10.00$ non-residents |
| Freedom of Information Requests | As Provided for under MFIPPA |
| Records Research: <br> Retrieval, Research Subject \& Refiling (Not under MFIPPA) | ( $\$ 60.00 / \mathrm{hr}$. |
| Locks Passage: |  |
| Locks Daily Passage Fee | \$5.00 |
| Trailer License: |  |
| 1 Year License (issued from May $1^{\text {st }}$ to November $30^{\text {th }}$ ) please note a construction trailer license is a maximum of 18 months | \$750.00 per year |
| Monthly License (maximum of 3 months) | \$150.00 per month |
| Books: |  |
| Nipissing Road Book | \$13.00 |
| Historic Sites Book | \$5.00 |
| Looking Back Book | \$25.00 |
| All three Historic Books Package | \$35.00 |

## TREASURY/TAXES

| Fee Description | Fee |
| :--- | :---: |
| Tax Certificate | $\$ 50.00$ |
| Returned Item (Cheque or EFT) | $\$ 45.00$ |
| Assessment \& Tax Rate Search / History | $\$ 50.00$ (plus $\$ 20.00$ for each additional year prior <br> to 2003) |


| Residential Property Information Report (combination of Building and <br> Zoning) | $\$ 200.00$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Commercial Property Information Report (combination of Building and <br> Zoning) | $\$ 500.00$ |

LANDFILL CHARGES \& TIPPING FEES

| Fee Description | Fee |
| :--- | :---: |
| Replacement Landfill Card | $\$ 10.00$ and purchase of needed tags |
| Bag Tags (for waste only - not needed for recyclables) |  |
| Large Items | $\$ 2.00$ each |
| Couches | $\$ 20.00$ |
| Chairs | $\$ 10.00$ |
| Mattress or Box Springs | $\$ 25.00$ |
| Fridges/Freezers/AC | $\$ 10.00$ |
| Campers/Boats | $\$ 5.00$ per foot |
| Construction Waste |  |
| Pickup Truck, Van, or Single axle trailer | $\$ 25.00$ |
| Single axle Truck | $\$ 270.00$ |
| Tandem Truck 20-yard container | $\$ 540.00$ |
| Tri-Axle Truck 40-yard container | $\$ 1080.00$ |
| Tandem Axle Trailer | $\$ 150.00$ |
| Shingles |  |
| Pickup Truck or Van | $\$ 65.00$ |
| Single Axle Trailer | $\$ 125.00$ |
| Tandem Axle Trailer | $\$ 540.00$ |

## ADMINISTRATION FEES

| Dog Licensing | Fee |
| :--- | :---: |
| Service Animals | No Charge |
| Annual Dog Tag | $\$ 5.00$ |
| Lifetime Dog Tag | $\$ 30.00$ |
| Replacement Dog Tag | $\$ 5.00$ |
| Kennel License | $\$ 100.00$ kennel $+\$ 5.00$ per annual dog tag |
| Replacement Kennel License | $\$ 50.00$ kennel <br> the Pound Keeper |
| Impound Fee First Offence | $\$ 150.00+$ applicable fees as imposed by and payable to <br> the Pound Keeper |
| Impound Fee Second Offence | $\$ 200.00+$ applicable fees as imposed by and payable to <br> the Pound Keeper |
| Impound Fee Third Offence and each Subsequent Offence |  |



| Disinterment | $\$ 600.00$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Lot Transfer Fee | $\$ 50.00$ |

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - PLANNING SERVICES

| Planning Application | Fee | Deposit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff Pre-consultation Fee | \$250.00 | No deposit |
| Applications for Consent submitted for Review | \$700.00 | \$2,000.00 |
| Amendment to the Zoning By-law going to Residential | \$700.00 | \$2,000.00 |
| Amendment to the Zoning By-law going to Commercial | \$1,000,00 | \$3,000,00 |
| Road and Shore Road Allowance Closing Application | \$500,00 | \$2,500.00 |
| Road Allowance Purchase Price | Appraised value | No deposit |
| Shore Road Allowance Purchase Price | Appraised value | No deposit |
| Site Plan Agreement/ Limited-Service Agreement/ Licensing Agreement to Maintain Roads | $\$ 250.00$ | $\$ 1,000,00$ |
| Minor Variance Application | \$700.00 | \$2,000.00 |
| Encroachment/Driveway Agreement (to enter into) (does not include vearly fee, if applicable) | $\$ 250.00$ | \$1,000.00 |
| OPA *Major (with Zoning Amendment) | \$1,500.00 | \$2,500.00 |
| OPA *Minor (without Zoning Amendment) | \$1,000.00 | \$1,500.00 |
| Any other Property related By-law under the Planning Act (including Cost Acknowledgement, Deeming By-law, etc.) | \$500.00 | \$1,000.00 |
| Planner Consultation (Minor) | \$50.00 | \$500.00 |
| Planner Consultation (Major) | \$50.00 | \$1,000.00 |
| MNR Application for Work Permit | \$150.00 | No deposit |
| Proposed Plan of Subdivision for Review | \$1,000.00 | \$5,000.00 |
| Review \& Execution of a Proposed Subdivision Agreement | \$1,000.00 | \$10,000.00 |
|  | Resident | Non-Resident |
| Business Board Signs subject to Municipal Approval | No-Charge | \$75.00 |

EIRE SERVICES
[A description of the circumstances under which these fees may be charged is included in the Fire Department Establish and Regulate By-law]

| Equipment \& Staffing | Fee |
| :--- | :---: |
| Apparatus (First Hour Full \& Then Every Half Thereafter) | $\$ 500.00$ per hour |
| Administration Costs | Fee |
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TRANSPORTATION

| Fee Description | Fee | Deposit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Entrance Permit | $\$ 100.00$ | $\$ 500.00$ |
| Civic Address Sign, Post \& Measurement | $\$ 100.00$ | No deposit |
| Replacement Civic Address Sign | $\$ 20.00$ | No deposit |
| Letter of Suitable Location for Entrance | $\$ 50.00$ | No deposit |
| Unassumed Road Allowance Improvement Agreement | $\$ 250.00$ | $\$ 1,000.00$ |
| Inquiries/Records Search (Road Access, Maintenance, Services) | $\$ 30.00$ per hour | No deposit |
| Road Use Permit | $\$ 0.00-500.00$ | At the discretion of the <br> Public works <br> Superintendent |
| Damage to Municipal Property | Time and Material for <br> replacement costs | No deposit |

## THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN

BY-LAW NO. 2021-65<br>Being a By-law to Establish Fees and Charges

WHEREAS Section 391 (1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended, authorizes the Council of a local municipality to pass by-laws imposing fees or charges for services or activities provided or done by or on behalf of it; for costs payable by it for services or activities provided or done by or on behalf of any other municipality or local board; and for the use of its property including property under its control;

AND WHEREAS Section 69 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. /3, provides that the Council of a municipality may prescribe a tariff of fees for the processing of applications made in respect of planning matters;

AND WHEREAS Section 7 of the Building Code Act, 1992, S.O. I992, c. 23, as amended, authorizes a municipal Council of a municipality to pass a by-law requiring the payment of fees on applications for and issuance of permits and prescribing the amounts thereof;

AND WHEREAS Pursuant to Section 270(1) of the Municipal Act the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Magnetawan provided notice in accordance with the Municipality of Magnetawan Provision of Notice Policy By-law 2016-12.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Magnetawan hereby enacts as follows:

## 1. GENERAL

1.1. Council hereby establishes the fees and charges as set out in the Schedule A attached hereto and forming an integral part of this Bylaw.
1.2. This By-law shall be known and may be cited as the "Municipality of Magnetawan Fees and Charges Bylaw".
1.3. The fees set out in the attached Schedule A shall be paid for the services or activities listed, and all fees are per occasion or request.
1.4. No request by any person for any information, service, activity or use of Municipal property will be provided unless and until the person requesting the information, service, activity or use of Municipal property has paid the applicable fee in the prescribed amount as set out in the Schedules.
1.5. The fees and charges will be subject to Harmonized Sales Tax (HST), where applicable, as noted.
1.6. Unpaid Fees shall be added to the owner's tax account and collected in like manner as taxes.

## 2. SEVERABILITY

If any provision or part of a provision of this by-law is declared by any court or tribunal of competent jurisdiction to be illegal or inoperative, in whole or in part, or inoperative in particular circumstances, the balance of the by-law, or its application in other circumstances, shall not be affected and shall continue to be in full force and effect.
3. CONFLICT WITH ANY OTHER BY-LAW

In the event of any conflict between any provisions of this bylaw and any other by-law heretofore passed, the provisions of this by-law shall prevail.

## 4. REPEAL OF PREVIOUS BY-LAWS

That By-law 2021-48 be hereby repealed effective the date of passing of this By-law.
5. EFFECTIVE DATE

This by-law shall take force and effect on the $1^{\text {st }}$ day of January 2022.
READ A FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD TIME, passed, signed and the Seal of the Corporation affixed hereto, this $15^{\text {th }}$ day of December, 2021

THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN


SCHEDULE "A" To By-law 2021- 105 COMMUNITY SERVICES -FACIUTY SERVICES
Magnetawan Community Centre, Lion's Pavilion sa Ahmic Harbour Community Centre
All prices subject to applicable taxes (HST)

| Magnetawan Community Centre <br> A damage deposit fee of $\$ 250$ per event is required upon booking. Deposit less repair costs, if any, will be returned following postrental inspection | Monday to Thursday (per day) | Friday to Sunday (per day) | Filday 6 pm to Sunday 6 pm (weekend) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial/ *Non-Resident full day | \$170 | \$195 | \$390 |
| Commercia//Non-Resident up to 4 hrs. | \$100 | perday $\$ 120$ |  |
| Resident full day | \$120 | $\$ 145$ | \$290 |
| Resident up to 4 hours | \$70 | Der dav $\$ 90$ |  |
| **Non-profit full day | \$120 | \$145 | \$290 |
| Non-profit up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day $\$ 90$ |  |
| Add-ons |  |  |  |
| Kitchen Rental (Mot Available for Individual Rental) | \$75 | \$85 | \$140 |
| Bar Rental | \$35 | \$55 | \$110 |
| Set-up Fee (including tables, chairs, etc.) | \$50 | per day \$ $\$ 0$ |  |
| Coffee \& Tea Set-Up | \$20 | per day \$ $\$ 25$ |  |
| Ahmic Harbour Communlty Centre <br> A damage deposit fee of $\$ 250$ per event is required upon booking. Deposit less repair costs, if any, will be retumed following postrental inspection | Monday to Thursday (per day) | Friday to Sunday (per day) | Friday 6 pm to Sunday 6 pm (weekend) |
| Commercial/Non-Ressident full day | \$120 | \$145 | \$290 |
| Commercial/Non-Resident up to 4 hrs. | \$80 | per day \$95 |  |
| Resident full day | \$90 | \$110 | \$220 |
| Resident up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day \$ $\$ 0$ |  |
| Non-profit full day | \$90 | \$110 | \$220 |
| Non-profit up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day \$80 |  |
| Add-ons |  |  |  |
| Set-up Fee (induding tables, chairs, etc.) | \$50 | per day | \$50 |
| Coffee \& Tea Set-up | \$20 | per day \$25 |  |
| Magnetawan Lions Pavilion <br> A damage deposit fee of $\$ 250$ per event is required upon booking. Deposit less repair costs, if any, will be retumed following postrental inspection | Monday to Thursday (per day) | Friday to Sunday (per day) | Friday 6 pm to Sunday 6 pm (weekend) |
| Commercial / Non-Resident full day | \$120 | \$130 | \$260 |
| Commercial / Non-Resident up to 4 hrs. | \$80 | per day $\$ 90$ |  |
| Commerdal/ Non-Resldent Hourly | \$35 | per day $\$ 40$ |  |
| Resident full day | \$100 | \$110 | \$220 |
| Resident up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day $\$ 80$ |  |
| Resident Hourly | $\$ 30$ | per day \$35 |  |
| Non-profit full day | \$100 | \$110 | \$220 |
| Non-profit up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day $\$ 80$ |  |
| Non-profit Hourly | \$30 | per day \$40 |  |
| Set-up Fee (tables, chairs, sports equipment, etc.) | \$50 | per day \$50 |  |


| Additional Fees - all locations |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Late Vacating Fee | $\$ 50$ per half hour, not induding 10 min grace period for <br> first $1 / 2$ hour conly. |
| Low Risk Insurance (avallable for some events) | $\$ 50$ per event |

*Non-Resident is defined as a person who does not either reside within the Municlpallty or does not pay property taxes to the Municipality.
*Non-profit is defined as any recognized not-for-profit organization that does not gain any profit from its events

CLERK'S ${ }^{\text {OFELCE }}$

| Fee Description | Fee |
| :---: | :---: |
| Photocoples per page (Black/White) | \$0.25 |
| Photocopies per page (Colour) | \$0.50 |
| Commissioning of Documents | No charge for Residents \$10.00 non-residents |
| Freedom of Information Requests | As Provided for under MFIPPA |
| Records Research: <br> Retrieval, Research Subject \& Refiling (Not under MFIPPA) | \$60.00/hr. |
| Locks Passage: |  |
| Locks Daily Passage Fee | \$5.00 |
| Traller Licanse: |  |
| 1 Year License (issued from May $1^{*}$ to November $30^{\text {m }}$ ) | \$750.00 per year |
| Monthly License (maximum of 3 months) | \$150.00 per month |
| Books: |  |
| Nipissing Road Book | \$13.00 |
| Historic Sites Book | \$5.00 |
| Looking Back Book | \$25.00 |
| All three Historic Books Package | \$35.00 |

TREASURY / TAXES

| Fee Descitption | Fe0 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Tax Certificate | $\$ 50.00$ |
| Retumed Item (Cheque or EFT) | $\$ 45.00$ |
| Assessment \& Tax Rate Search / History | $\$ 50.00$ (plus $\$ 20.00$ for each additional year prior |
| to 2003) |  |

LANPFILLCHARGES \& TIPPING FEES

| Fee Description | Fee |
| :--- | :---: |
| Replacement Landfill Card | $\$ 10$ and purchase of needed tags |
| Bag Tags (for waste only - not needed for recydables) | $\$ 2.00$ each |
| Large Items |  |
| Couches | $\$ 20.00$ |
| Chalrs | $\$ 10.00$ |
| Mattress or Box Springs | $\$ 25.00$ |
| Fridges/Freezers/AC | $\$ 10.00$ |
| Campers/Boats | $\$ 5.00$ per foot |
| Constructlon Waste |  |
| Pickup Truck, Van, or Single axle trailer | $\$ 25.00$ |
| Single axle Truck | $\$ 270.00$ |
| Tandem Truck 20-yard container | $\$ 540.00$ |
| Tri-Ade Truck 40-yard container | $\$ 1080.00$ |
| Tandem Axle Trailer | $\$ 150.00$ |
| Shingles |  |
| Pickup Truck or Van | $\$ 65.00$ |
| Single Axde Trailer | $\$ 125.00$ |
| Tandem Axle Trailer | $\$ 540.00$ |
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ADMINTSTRATOM FEES

| Dog tioensing | Fea |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service Animals | No Charge |  |  |
| Annual Dog Tag - First Dog | \$5.00 |  |  |
| Annual Dog Tag - Every dog thereafter | \$5.00 |  |  |
| Lfetime Dog Tag | \$30.00 |  |  |
| Replacement Dog Tag | \$5.00 |  |  |
| Kennel License | \$100.00 kennel + \$5 per dog tag |  |  |
| Replacement Kemmel License | \$50.00 kennel |  |  |
| Impound Fee First Offence | $\$ 100.00+$ appllcable fees as imposed by and payable to the Pound Keeper |  |  |
| Impound fee Second Offence | $\$ 150.00+$ applicable fees as imposed by and payable to the Pound Keeper |  |  |
| Impound Fee Third Offence and each Subsequent Offence | $\$ 200.00+$ applicable fees as imposed by and payable to the Pound Keeper |  |  |
| Animal Control Service Fee | \$50/hr. (1 hour minimum) |  |  |
| Refreshment Carts a Vehicles | Resident | Non-Resident |  |
| Hawker/Peddler License | \$250.00 | \$500.00 |  |
| Hawker/Peddler Agent | \$50.00 | \$250.00 |  |
| Refreshment Vehide or Carts | \$500.00 |  |  |
| All other Businesses, Trades or Occupations | \$50.00 |  |  |
| Transient Trader |  |  |  |
| Door to Door Sales | \$250.00 |  |  |
| All other Transient traders | \$500.00 |  |  |
| Other Administrative Feas | Fee |  |  |
| Lottery license for Community Group | \$5.00 |  |  |
| Application for Event Permit | \$200.00 |  |  |
| Application for Multiple Event Permit | \$500.00 |  |  |
| By-Law Enforcement Admintitration Feas | Fee |  |  |
| By-law Administration Fee (indudes frivolous/vexatious complaints/notices/complaint letters | \$50.00/hr. |  |  |
| By-law Administration Fee (orders) | \$ $105.00 / \mathrm{hr}$. |  |  |
| Cemetary + HST | Fee |  |  |
| Lot | \$250.00 |  |  |
| Lot Care \& Maintenance | \$290.00 |  |  |
| Cremation Lot | \$175.00 |  |  |
| Cremation Lot Care \& Maintenance | \$175.00 |  |  |
| Niche Lot | \$600.00 |  |  |
| Niche Lot Care \& Maintenance | \$165.00 |  |  |
| Interments + HST + Stiding Fee | Fee |  |  |
| Staking Fee | \$50.00 |  |  |
| Vault | \$500.00 |  |  |
| Adult | \$500.00 |  |  |
| Children, ten (10) years and under | \$300.00 |  |  |
| Cremated Remains | \$150.00 |  |  |
| Niche per urn/opening | \$250.00 |  |  |
|  | Fee |  |  |
| Staking Fee | \$50.00 |  |  |
| Flat Marker (less than 172 sq. inches) | \$50.00 |  | onqer alloueo |
| Flat Marker (over 172 sq. inches) | \$100.00 |  | to Chore aspon |
| Pillow Marker | \$200.00 |  | BAO |
| Upright Monument (up to 4 feet high and 4 feet wide) | \$200.00 |  |  |
| Upright Monument (over 4 feet high and 4 feet wide) | \$400.00 |  |  |
| Disinterment | \$600.00 |  |  |
| Lot Transfer Fee | \$50.00 |  |  |
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DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - PLANMING SERYICES

| Planning Appillcation | Fee | Depposit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff Pre-consultation Fee | \$250.00 |  |
| Applications for Consent submitted for Review | \$700.00 | \$2,000,00 |
| Amendment to the Zoning By-law going to Residential | \$700.00 | \$2,000.00 |
| Amendment to the Zoning By-law going to Commercial | \$1,000,00 | \$3,000,00 |
| Road and Shore Road Allowance Closing Application | \$500.00 | \$2,500.00 |
| Road Allowance Purchase Price | Appraised value |  |
| Shore Road Allowance Purchase Price | Appraised value |  |
| Site Plan Agreement/ Limited-Service Agreement/ Licensing Agreement to Maintain Roads | \$250,00 | \$1,000,00 |
| Minor Variance Application | \$700.00 | \$2,000,00 |
| Encroachment/Driveway Agreement (to enter into) (does not indude yearly fee, if applicable) | \$250.00 | \$1,000.00 |
| OPA *Major (with Zoning Amendment) | \$1,500,00 | \$2.500,00 |
| OPA *Minor (without Zoning Amendment) | \$1,000.00 | \$1,500,00 |
| Any other Property related By-law under the Planning Act (including Cost Acknowledgement, Deeming By-law, etc.) | \$500.00 | \$1,000.00 |
| Planner Consultation (Minor) | \$50.00 | \$500.00 |
| Planner Consultation (Major) | \$50.00 | \$1,000,00 |
| MNR Application for Work Permit | \$150.00 | No deposit |
| Proposed Plan of Subdivision for Review | \$1,000.00 | \$5,000,00 |
| Review \& Execution of a Proposed Subdivision Agreement | \$1,000,00 | \$10,000.00 |
|  | Resident | Mon-Resident |
| Business Board Signs subject to Municipal Approval | No-Charge | \$75.00 |

ERE SERVICES
[A description of the circumstances under which these fees may be charged is induded in the Fre Department Estabilsh and Regulate By-law]

| Equipment \& Stafing + H\$T | Fee |
| :--- | :---: |
| Apparatus (First Hour Full \& Then Every Half Thereafter) | $\$ 500.00 / \mathrm{hr}$. |
| Administration Costs | Fee |
| Third Party Inspection | $\$ 50.00$ per inspection |
| Fire Inspection | $\$ 100.00$ per inspection |
| File Search | $\$ 100.00$ per search |
| Fire Report | $\$ 100.00$ per report |

## Equipment Damage

All equipment that is owned or contracted by the fire department that is damaged while the fire department is performing its dutles will be billed at the replacement or repaired cost induding all applicable taxes.

IRAMSPORTAILON

| Fee Descriptiont | Fee |
| :--- | :--- |
| Entrance Permit | $\$ 100,00+$ HST- Fee |
|  | $\$ 500.00-$ Deposit |
| Clvic Address Sign, Post Q Measurement | $\$ 100.00$ |
| Replacement Civic Address Sign | $\$ 20.00$ |
| Letter of Sultable Location for Entrance | $\$ 50$ |
| Unassumed Road Allowance Improvement Agreement | $\$ 250.00$ fee $+\$ 1,000.00$ deposit |
| Inquirles/Records Search (Road Access, Maintenance, Services) | $\$ 30.00$ per hour |
| Road Use Permit | $\$ 0.00-500.00+$ Deposit |
| Damage to Munldpal Property | Time and Material for replacement costs |
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|  | REPORT TO COUNCIL |
| :---: | :---: |
| To: | Mayor and Council |
| From: | Deputy Clerk Laura Brandt |
| Date of Meeting: | December 07, 2022 |
| Report Title: | 2022 Private Road Grant Program |

Recommendation: That Council receives and approves this report regarding the Private Road Grant Program as presented and directs Staff to budget $\$ 15,000$ for the Private Road Grant in 2023 and to make a recommendation of an increase for the 2024 budget if an upward trend is evident.

## Background and Comments:

By the program deadline of November 10, 2022, the Deputy Clerk had received twelve submissions for the Private Road Grant. It should be noted that nine of the submissions where not required to sign a Licensing Agreement as these roads were found to be privately owned and not municipally owned. The Private Road Grant By-law which states "Owners wishing to receive the grant for private maintenance on Municipal property must be entered into or willing to enter into a license agreement to maintain roads". All 12 applications received were from returning road groups with all road groups submitting an application in 2021 and one road group submitting their last application in 2020. Of the twelve submissions, three roads are municipally owned but privately maintained and nine roads are privately owned and privately maintained. All three road groups that are municipally owned but privately maintained have fully executed Licensing Agreements.

The final totals (with all applications for the 2022) program were:

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
\text { - Total dollars spent by applicants on road work } & \$ \$ 7,541.50 \\
\text { - Maximum allowable dollars (based on formula) } & \\
& \text { from submitted applications = } & \$ 15,612.50 \\
\text { - } \quad \text { Total dollars allocated for 2022 Private Road Grant } & \$ 15,000.00 \\
\text { - } \quad \text { Total kms maintained } & 23.07
\end{array}
$$

The final totals (with all applications for the 2021) program were:

$$
\begin{array}{llr}
\text { - Total dollars spent by applicants on road work } & \$ 74,921.87 \\
\text { - } & \text { Maximum allowable dollars (based on formula) } & \\
& \text { from submitted applications = } & \$ 18,600.00 \\
\text { - } & \text { Total dollars allocated for } 2021 \text { Private Road Grant } & \$ 15,000.00 \\
\text { - } & \text { Total kms maintained } & 25.73
\end{array}
$$

The final totals (without non-eligible applications) for the 2021 program were:

- Total dollars spent by applicants on road work $\$ 53,038.82$
- Maximum allowable dollars (based on formula) from submitted applications =
$\$ 13,207.50$
- Total dollars allocated for 2021 Private Road Grant \$ 15, 000.00
- Total kms maintained

The final totals for the $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ program were:

- Total dollars spent by applicants on road work
- Maximum allowable dollars (based on formula) from submitted applications =
- Total dollars allocated for 2020 Private Road Grant
- Total kms maintained

The final totals for the 2019 program were:

- Total dollars spent by applicants on road work
- Maximum allowable dollars (based on formula) from submitted applications =
- Total dollars allocated for 2019 Private Road Grant
- Total kms maintained


## $\$ 73,764.95$

\$ 19,880.00
$\$ 15,000.00$
30.72
$\$ 77,556.40$
$\$ 15,145.00$
$\$ 15,000.00$
22.95

Once again, the Municipality received multiple compliments on the grant program from residents thanking the Municipality for the continuation of this program as it continues to help local road groups upgrade their privately owned and/or privately maintained roads. It is also a great benefit to local businesses and contractors as many of the road groups support local.

Financial Implications: $\$ 15,000$ approved in the 2022 Budget.

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends budgeting \$15,000 for the Private Road Grant in 2023. Staff further recommends making recommendations of an increase for the 2024 budget if an upward trend is evident.

Respectfully Subhfinitted,


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | REPORT TO COUNCIL |
| Magnetawan |  |
| Mrom: | Mayor and Council |
| Date of Meeting: | Deputy Clerk Laura Brandt |
| Report Title: | December 07, 2022 |

Recommendation: That Council receives and approves this report as presented and directs Staff to include $\$ 7,000$ in the 2023 budget and to actively source for funding.

Background: The Municipality held their first Dinner and a Drive-In Movie Event in 2021 with the event being partially paid from the successful grant application to the 2021 Reconnect Festival and Event Program. Staff applied to the 2022 Reconnect Festival and Event Program by the deadline of February 2, 2022 and was unsuccessful in their application. Reconnect Ontario 2022 was very competitive, with the highest number of applications submitted in the program's history. The purpose of the funding provided by the Province of Ontario is to support innovative programming and marketing festivals and events to help create great Ontario staycation experiences for visitors and to stimulate local community economic development and recovery.

Evaluation: This year's event built upon the success of the previous year in 2021 and Staff modified the previous double feature to a two-night event that was held in the summer season on the same weekend as the Heritage Day Event ran by the Magnetawan Library instead of the previous Fall season due to feedback from residents as well as to support the Heritage Day Event.

Movie tickets were $\$ 10$ each and attendees were provided tickets and an information pamphlet on how to enter and exit the event, as well as which menus food vendors would have available.

Three vendors attended the event at no cost to the vendors. The Banger Truck which offers sausages, potatoes and grilled cheese set up in the municipal parking lot starting at noon to ensure that the sales were maximized to their full potential. The Almaguin Gazelles, a local girls hockey organization, used the event as a fundraising opportunity and provided popcorn and candy for the event and Ever Cool Ice Cream which offers hard ice cream, floats, banana splits, and milkshakes. Both the Banger Truck and the Gazelles are interested in returning next year and due to the distance of travel Ever Cool Ice Cream will re-evaluate in 2023.

Each attendee received "Magnetawan Bucks" used for admittance into the event and could be spent at local participating business from October 11, 2022, to November 14, 2022. This period of time is when local businesses typically see a dip in revenues. Staff ensured that each "Buck" was signed and laminated to reduce the risk of counterfeiting. After November $14^{\text {th }}$ participating businesses will submit the collected "Bucks" with an invoice for payment from the Municipality. Seven businesses participated in the "Magnetawan Bucks" program: Magnetawan Bait and Tackle, Magnetawan Grill and Grocery, Magnetawan Home Hardware, The Cornball Store, The Quiet Bay Café, Trader Ted's, and Algonquin Fine Foods.
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The recreation leader and myself volunteered to help direct parking, check movie tickets, and answer questions as well as helping with the disassembly of the screen. Parks Staff also helped set up and erect the screen prior to the event. It is recommended that there be at least 4-5 volunteers.

Advertising for the event was provided through Municipal social media platforms, website, electronic mailing list, digital sign as well as posters outside of the Municipal Office and on Community Boards. A "pre-roll" was created by Staff to play at the start of the event and in between movies informing attendees of key points of interest such as food vendors, washroom locations and "Magnetawan Bucks" local participating business as well as thanking the Province of Ontario for funding.

For the event the Municipality purchased two sets of each movie and afterwards one copy of Baby Boss Family Business and Cruella was donated to the Magnetawan Library for residents to rent. The other copies were drawn from the attendees that purchased tickets and the winners' names were posted on municipal social media platforms.

## Financial Implications:

| ITEM | COST |
| :--- | ---: |
| Fresh Air Cinema (screen providers) | $\$ 10,221$ |
| Two sets of Blu-ray Uncharted and The Bad Guys | $\$ 113$ |
| Movie Rights | $\$ 791$ |
| Reimbursement of Magnetawan Bucks | $\$ 1,400$ |
| Less Ticket Sales Revenue | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 7 5 0}$ |
| Total Cost | $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 7 7 5}$ |

Staff has received much positive feedback about this event in the last two years and moving forward if the Municipality held this event in 2023 it would be recommended to hold it in September for one or two evenings as it gets darker earlier. Some feedback received from residents is that the later start to the event in the Summer is to late for the younger children as it does not turn dark until approximately 9 pm .

There is also the possibility of growing this event year after year and inviting more vendors and potentially charging a fee to the vendors as the attendance increases. Also, as the event grows, we can sell advertising or charge for sponsorship of the event by selling advertising space on the pre-roll which can also be used to offset the costs of the events.

Below is what could be forecasted if the event is successfully built upon year after year and if the Municipality were able to offset costs by charging vendors and garnishing fees for advertising or sponsorship of the event. The end goal would be to eventually build and run the event to be self sustaining.
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|  | PROPOSED 2 NIGHTS |
| :--- | ---: |
| Fresh Air Cinema | COST |
| Two sets of Blu-ray | $\$ 10,000$ |
| Movie Rights | $\$ 150$ |
| *Reimbursement of Magnetawan Bucks (100 per event) | $\$ 791$ |
| *Less Ticket Sales Revenue | $\$ 2,000$ |
| Less Vendor Fees (5 vendors at $\$ 50 \times 2$ 2 events) | $-\$ 2,000$ |
| Less Advertising/Sponsorship (5 businesses at $\$ 250 \times 2$ events) | $-\$ 500$ |
| Total Estimated Cost | $-\$ 2,500$ |
| Estimated Funding | $\$ 7,941$ |
| Forecasted Net Cost | $\$ 3,970.50$ |

Conclusion: Staff recommends that due to the success of the event in 2021 and 2022 that Dinner and a Drive-in be held in 2023 and to include $\$ 7,000$ in the 2023 budget as well as have Staff reapply for funding if available to offset costs in 2023

Respectfully Submitted,


Laura Brandt
Deputy Clerk
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# LIST OF CURRENT COMMITTEES/BOARD/ORGANIZATIONS 2022 

Magnetawan Community Centre Board (1 Council appointee)<br>Magnetawan Cemetery Board (1 Council appointee) Magnetawan Public Library Board (1 Council appointee)<br>Magnetawan Property Standards Committee (1 Council appointee)<br>Local Boards and Committees:<br>Almaguin Highlands Health Centre Committee (1 Council appointee)<br>District-level Agencies, Boards, and Committees:<br>North Bay Parry Sound District Health Unit<br>Ryerson Beverly Abbott<br>Township of Strong Marianne Strickland<br>Parry Sound District Emergency Medical Service Advisory Committee Ryerson Glenn Miller<br>Eastholme Home for the Aged, Board of Directors<br>Township of Strong Marianne Strickland<br>District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board (2 representatives)<br>Village of Sundridge Sharon Smith<br>District of Parry Sound Municipal Association<br>Machar Township Lynda Carleton<br>Township of Strong Tim Bryson
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November 2, 2022

## SENT ELECTRONICALLY

Kerstin Vroom<br>CAO/Clerk<br>Municipality of Magnetawan<br>4304 HWY 520<br>P.O. Box 70<br>Magnetawan, ON POA 1P0

Dear Ms. Vroom:

RE: Board of Health Appointment - District of Parry Sound / Southeast
This letter is to advise you that Marianne Stickland's term of office on the Board of Health for the North Bay Parry Sound District Health Unit will expire November 14, 2022.

In accordance with Ontario Regulation 559, made under the Health Protection and Promotion Act, one member (municipal or citizen appointee) shall be jointly appointed to the Board of Health by the municipal councils of the Town of Kearney, the Village of Burk's Falls, the Townships of Armour, Joly, McMurrich/Monteith, Perry, Ryerson, and Strong, and the Municipality of Magnetawan.

Please forward the name, term of office, and the contact information for the Board of Health appointee, along with council's resolution prior to Wednesday, December 14, 2022, to Sheri Beaulieu, Management Administrative Assistant, at sheri.beaulieu@healthunit.ca or by fax to 705-474-8252.

The first meeting of the Board of Health for the 2023 - 2026 term is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, January 25, 2023, from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. In-person or virtual attendance is yet to be determined. The regular meeting schedule of the Board of Health for 2023 will be determined at the first meeting. A Board of Health orientation session for new and returning Board members will be scheduled prior to the first meeting.

I look forward to working with you to foster healthy living for the citizens in the Health Unit service area.
.../2

Wust fifotwo
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# To: Municipalities of Parry Sound Southeast 


Bureaude senté
Page 2 of 2
Date: November 2, 2022

## Sincerely yours,

Medical Officer of Health/Executive Officer
/sb

Letters sent to: Town of Kearney, Village of Burk's Falls, Townships of Armour, Joly, McMurrict/Monteith, Perry, Ryerson, and Strong, and the Municipality of Magnetawan
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Date: November 15, 2022
Resolution Number: $\mathbf{R}-177$ $-22$

Moved by: Councillor Miller

Seconded by: Councillor Robertson
Be it resolved that Ryerson Township Council appoint COUNCILLOR ABBOTT to the North Bay Parry Sound District Board of Health for the group: Kearney, Burks Falls, Armour, Joly, McMurrich/Monteith, Perry, Ryerson, Strong and Magnetawan.


Declaration of Pecuniary Interest by:

Recorded Vote due to electronic meeting.

| RECORDED VOTE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vote called by Clerk in random order, Chair to vote last |  |  |  |  |  |
| Members of Council | Yes | No | Abstention | Absent |  |
| Councillors | Beverly Abbott |  |  |  |  |
|  | Glenn Miller |  |  |  |  |
|  | Delynne Patterson |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dan Robertson |  |  |  |  |
|  | Meorge Sterling |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF STRONG

COUNCIL RESOLUTION
Date: November 22, 2022
Resolution \# R2022 406
Moved by: Jeff McLaren
Kevin Noaik
Jim Ronholm
Marianne Stickland


Seconded by: Jeff McLaren Kevin Noaik
Jim Ronholm Marianne Stickland


Be it resolved that the Council for the Township of Strong hereby support the appointment of Beverly Abbott to represent the Township of Strong and the Southeast Area on the North Bay Parry Sound District Board of Health.


Mayor Tim Bryson
$\qquad$ Carried For Against
Recorded Vote:
-
Tim Bryson
Jeff McLaren
Kevin Noaik
Jim Ronholm
Marianne Stickland
Conflict of Interest Declared and Seat (s)
Vacated: $\qquad$
Defeated $\qquad$

## THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF STRONG

COUNCIL RESOLUTION
Date: November 22, 2022
Moved by: Jeff McLaren Kevin Noaik Jim Ronholm Mariainne Stickland
 Resolution \# R2022 407
it resolved that the Council for the Township of Strong hereby support the appointment of Marianne Stickland to represent the Township of Strong and the Southeast Area on the North Bay Parry Sound District Board of Health.


Defeated $\qquad$

Recorded Vote:
For
Against
Tim Bryson
Jeff McLaren
Kevin Noaik
Jim Ronholm
Marianne Stickland
Conflict of Interest Declared and Seat (s)
Vacated: $\qquad$

52 Seguin Street Parry Sound Ontano P2A 184
Tel (705) 7462101 - Fax (705) 746-7461 'www townoformsound.com

October 26, 2022
Municipality of Magnetawan
PO Box 70
4304 Highway 520
Magnetawan, Ontario
P0A 1P0


## Re: Parry Sound District Emergency Medical Service Advisory Committee

## Dear Madam/Sir:

With the recent Municipal Elections and the above Committee's term ending, comes the task of new appointments.

Understanding that new Councils are not sworn in until after November $1^{\text {st }}$, the Town of Parry Sound would like to request your Municipality's representatives be appointed as soon as possible in order to deal with some upcoming EMS issues. It would be appreciated if a copy of your resolution could accompany your correspondence indicating your representative. Those Municipalities that share a committee member will need to decide amongst themselves who their one representative will be. Please see the attached Terms of Reference indicating the municipalities sharing a representative.

Currently your Municipality is represented by Mayor Cathy Still.
We thank you in advance for dealing with this issue at your earliest convenience and await your response.

Yours truly,

Dave Thompeon
Dave Thompson,
Director of Emergency and Protective Services
Encl. 1) EMS Advisory Committee, Terms of Reference

# PARRY SOUND DISTRICT EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE <br> - 1 - <br> Date Ammended: January 27, 2015 

## OBJECTIVE

(1) To identify, resolve and convey issues and concerns regarding the District E.M.S. System.
(2) To advise on the operation, and facilitate improvements of the Ambulance Service to meet the needs of the citizens of the District of Parry Sound, per the attached.

### 1.0 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

1.1 The Ambulance Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Committee is composed of (7) members as follows:
(1) Ryerson, Armour, Perry, Burk's Falls, Kearny, Magnetawan, McMurrich/Montieth,
(1) Machar, Jolly, Strong, Sundridge, South River,
(1) Callander, Nipissing, Powassan.
(1) Carling, McDougall, Whitestone, McKellar
(1) Seguin
(1) Archipelago
(1) Chair - As appointed by and representing the Town of Parry Sound
1.2 It is the decision of the local councils to decide who their representative is. Those multiple townships which join together to fill one position must come to a consensus amongst themselves and advise the Chair who this representative is.
1.3 As a advisory body, conclusions shall be reached by consensus. Landmark recommendations will be voted on and presented to the Town of Parry Sound Council through the R\&R process as the designated Delivery Agent, for their consideration.
1.4 The respective appointing municipalities shall be responsible for all costs and expenses of their members for participating in the EMS Advisory Committee. The Committee may make recommendations to the Town Council for expenditures that they would rule to be representative of the entire EMS Advisory Committee.
1.5 All members shall be entitled to write a minority report on any of the issues under the purview of this Committee and present such reports to the Town Council, however, any such report and presentation shall not include the collection of petitions, organization of lobbies or demonstrations.
1.6 All members in accepting to serve as members of this EMS Advisory Committee hereby undertake to comply with the conditions of these Terms of Reference.

## PARRY SOUND DISTRICT EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 2 -

Date Ammended: January 27, 2015

### 2.0 COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT

2.1 Committee Administrative Support shall be provided by the Town of Parry Sound.
2.2 The Director of Emergency and Protective Services shall be the Staff Resource person and a full participating non-voting member of the EMS Advisory Committee.

### 3.0 CHAIRPERSON AND SPOKESPERSON

3.1 The Chairperson is the official spokesperson for the Committee or their designate.
3.2 Section 3.1 does not prevent each of the members of this EMS Advisory Committee from reporting back to and discussing issues with the Municipalities which they represent.

### 4.0 MEETINGS

4.1 Regular meetings of the EMS Advisory Committee shall be held quarterly.
4.2 Meetings will be cancelled if there is no business to conduct.
4.3 Special meetings will be held upon call of the Chair or upon call of a majority of members of the Committee. In the latter case the meeting shall be called by the Town of Parry Sound Chief Administrative Officer. In the event of an emergency a committee member may contact the chairperson requesting an emergency meeting.

### 5.0 REPORTING THROUGH THE AMBULANCE EMS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

5.1 The EMS Advisory Commillee shall:
a) regularly report to all participating District of Parry Sound Councils through the distribution of its minutes.
b) formally report to the Council of the Town of Parry Sound, the Town being the Lead Agent for Land Ambulance Operations/Services.
c) provide an annual report to Council outlining definable results.
5.2 The Town of Parry Sound Council's views will be represented by Town Council membership on the EMS Advisory Committee. This does not prevent Council representatives from seeking direction and initiative from their Council, or the Town Council from directing specific requests to the EMS Advisory Committee. Any disputes between the participating Councils/members
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Date Ammended: January 27, 2015
shall be referred to the Town of Parry Sound Council.
5.3.1 Recommendations for decision, shall be brought forward by the EMS Advisory Committee through the Director of Emergency and Protective Services, to the Council of the Town of Parry Sound through the R\&R process. Reports considered by Council shall have prior consideration by the EMS Advisory Committee unless the reason for direct action by Council is clearly communicated, defined and accepted by Council.
5.3.2 Reports and recommendations must be presented to Town Council, through the EMS Advisory Committee for information, consideration and decision at the following landmarks:

Landmark Recommendations:
a) For the approval of these Terms of Reference.
b) For a change in the Terms of Reference.
c) Upon establishment of a protocol for engaging the employees and transferring the ambulance service in-house.
d) Upon establishment of an ambulance service model for the long-term.
c) Any recommendations that will have an annual impact in excess of the approved budget.
f) Change in EMS Advisory Committee membership with R\&R to Council.
g) To review and approve the District Land Ambulance Budget and Business Plan.
h) To review and approve Ambulance Station Leases and Rental Agreements.
i) To review and approve funding formulas and cost sharing agreements with other Districts.
j) To review and recommend new funding formulas for District cost sharing.

### 6.0 PUBLIC INFORMATION

6.1 The public shall be informed of the actions of the EMS Advisory Committee through the following means:

1. All meetings shall be public unless required to be in camera in accordance with the Town of Parry Sound Procedural By-law.
2. Through availability of minutes of each meeting via the Town of Parry Sound Web Site and/or upon request of any individual.
3. Through reports distributed to the participating Councils.

### 7.0 TERMS OF THIS EMS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
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7.1 The responsibilities and mandate of the EMS Advisory Committee shall coincide with Municipal elections, unless its term is extended by the Council of the Town of Parry Sound.

### 8.0 LONG-TERM RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EMS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

8.1 The long-term responsibilities of the EMS Advisory Committee shall be to comment and advise on the operation and possible improvement and expansion of the Ambulance Service, including but not limited to the following:
8.1.1 Delivery of the service to comply with legislative standards.
8.1.2 Establishment of a District Oversight Committee to manage and control the service.
8.1.3 To develop a plan and strategy to improve the service through the location of stations, additional resources, addition of advanced life support and training.
8.1.4 To develop Sub Committees and Task Forces as required.
8.1.5 To work with all levels of government to develop strategics to improve service and seek out efficiencies.
8.1.6 To review and approve the District Land Ambulance Operational Budgets.
8.1.7 To review and approve District Land Ambulance Capital Budgets.
8.1.8 To review and approve Ambulance Station Leases and Rental Agreements renewals.
8.1.9 To review and approve funding formulas and cost sharing agreements with other districts.
8.2.0 To approve Land Ambulance Insurance Contracts.
8.2.1 To review and recommend new funding formulas for District cost sharing.

CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF RYERSON

Date: November 15, 2022

176<br>Resolution Number: R- 14 - 22

Moved by: Councillor Abbott

Seconded by: Councillor Miller
 to the Parry Sound District Emergency Medical Service Advisory Committee for the East Parry Sound Group: Ryerson, Armour, Perry, Burks Falls, Kearney, Magnetawan, McMurrich/Monteith.

Carried $\square$ Defeated $\square$


Declaration of Pecuniary Interest by:

Recorded Vote due to electronic meeting.

| RECORDED VOTE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vote called by Clerk in random order, Chair to vote last |  |  |  |  |  |
| Members of Council | Yes | No | Abstention | Absent |  |
| Councillors | Beverly Abbott |  |  |  |  |
|  | Glenn Miller |  |  |  |  |
|  | Delynne Patterson |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dan Robertson |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mayor | George Sterling |  |  |  |

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF STRONG

COUNCIL RESOLUTION
Date: November 22, 2022
Resolution \# R2022 409

Moved by: Jeff McLaren Kevin Noaik Jim Ronholm Marianne Stickland


Be it resolved that the Council for the Township of Strong hereby support the appointment of Marianne Stickland to represent the Township of Strong and the Area \#3 on Eastholme Board of Management.


For
$\qquad$
Tim Bryson
Kevin Noaik
Jim Ronholm
Marianne Stickland
Conflict of Interest Declared and Seat (s)
Vacated: $\qquad$

November 17, 2022

Mayor Sam Punnet
Municipality of Magnetawan
By e-mail to: clerk@magnetawan.com

Dear Mayor Punnet and Council,
As your new term of Council commences, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you and wish you well in the next four years.

Under the DSSAB Act, the term of the present Board members who have been re-elected will come to an end on December 31 ${ }^{\text {st }}$, 2022. The present Board members who represent Area 5 are Lyle Hall and Teri Brandt. To provide continuous service to the District, two (2) members from your council should be appointed as soon as possible to represent Area 5.

Please find attached a document which contains information for Municipalities/TWOMOs.
The first Board meeting of the New Year will be held at 6:30 PM on Thursday, January 12, 2023 via Zoom Video Conference.

As well, we will be holding our Board Introduction on Friday, January 27, 2023 at the Log Cabin Inn located at 9 Little Beaver Blvd. in Sequin Township. It is vitality important for all Board members to attend this all-day event as it will orient them on the operations of the DSSAB.

Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to reach out to me at 705-746-7777 ext. 5290 or via email at jharris@psdssab.org.

Sincerely,


Jennifer Harris
Administrative Officer

# District of Parry Sound 

## Information for Municipalities/TWOMOs

| Contact Person: | Jennifer Harris, Administrative Officer |
| :---: | :---: |
| Address: | 1 Beechwood Drive, Parry Sound, ON, P2A 1J2 |
| Phone Number: | 705-746-7777 ext. 5290 |
| E-mail: | jharris@psdssab.org |
| Meeting Schedule: | Second Thursday of each month |
| Meeting Place: | Via Zoom video conference |
| Meeting Time: | 6:30 PM |
| Number of Members: | 15 |
| Payment to Members: | Refer to document "Board Honoraria \& Expenses" |
| Areas Represented: | Refer to document "Naming Board Members" |
| DSSAB Procedures: | Refer to document "Procedural Rules" |
| Electronic Meeting Protocol: | Refer to document "Protocol for Electronic Meetings" |
| Term Ending: | December 31 ${ }^{\text {st }}$, 2026 |

## BOARD HONORARIA AND EXPENSES

## HONORARIA:

The rates for honoraria paid will be as follows:

- Chair:
- Vice Chair:
- Reg. Board Member Rate:
- Conference Call Rate:
$\$ 620$ per month plus $\$ 205$ per Board Meeting $\$ 165$ per Board meeting
$\$ 135$ per meeting
$\$ 25$ per conference call

At the beginning of every new term of the Board, rates to be adjusted annually (rounded to the nearest $\$ 5.00$ ) as specified by the consumer price index.

## Honoraria Criteria

The following rules will be followed for payment of honoraria:

1. The meeting rate will be paid only for actual meetings attended. The rate is paid for each meeting or committee meeting held.
2. The Chair's and Vice-Chair's rate only applies to regular Board meetings. The regular Board member rate applies if other meetings must be attended in the month.
3. If Board committee meetings are held immediately prior to or following a duly called Board or Board committee meeting, the committee meeting shall be paid at $75 \%$ of the regular rate.
4. The regular meeting rate will be increased to $\$ 165$ for any Board meeting held prior to $4: 00$ p.m.
5. Each or any meeting exceeding 4 hours in length will be paid at $\$ 200$.
6. Attendance at conventions or training events is recognized at the regular meeting rates.

## TRAVEL \& EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT:

## Travel

The following criteria will be followed for payment of travel:

1. Attending meetings on behalf of the DSSAB will be reimbursed as authorized by the Board Chair.
2. When accommodations are needed for health \& safety reasons (such as weather conditions, tiredness/fatigue) they should be made in the same location of the meeting/training event and will be reimbursed upon submission of receipt.
3. Airfare, taxi fare and parking reimbursed by receipt.
4. Temporary Mileage rate (to be reviewed in February 2023): $\$ 0.55$ per kilometer

## Meals

The rates for meals paid will be as follows:

- Meal allowance for out of District: Breakfast $\$ 12.00$

Lunch $\$ 18.00$
Dinner $\quad \$ 35.00$

- Meal allowance for in District will be reimbursed upon submission of receipts.

Note: Cost of alcohol \& entertainment will not be reimbursed
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## Naming Board Members

Schedule 4 of O.Regulation 278/98, an amended regulation made under the District Social Services Administration Boards Act directs that "the district for the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board is the District of Parry Sound, excluding the area of the jurisdiction of the Corporation of the Municipality of Killarney" and ". . . shall be comprised of 15 members".

The district is represented by areas and membership by area is required as follows:

| AREA 1 - | 2 members from the: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Corporation of the Township of Seguin |

AREA 2 - $\mathbf{3}$ members appointed jointly from the:
Corporation of the Township of the Archipelago (2)
Corporation of the Town of Parry Sound
(Agreement established to rotate membership by term)
AREA 3 - 2 members appointed jointly from the:
Corporation of the Township of Carling
Corporation of the Municipality of Whitestone
Corporation of the Township of McDougall
Corporation of the Township of McKellar
AREA 4 - 2 members appointed jointly from the:
Corporation of the Town of Kearney
Corporation of the Village of Burk's Falls
Corporation of the Township of Armour
Corporation of the Township of Perry
Corporation of the Township of Ryerson
Corporation of the Township of McMurrich-Monteith
AREA 5 - 2 members appointed jointly from the:
Corporation of the Village of South River
Corporation of the Village of Sundridge
Corporation of the Township of Joly
Corporation of the Township of Machar
Corporation of the Township of Strong
Corporation of the Township of Magnetawan

## Naming Board Members

## AREA 6 - 2 members appointed jointly from the: <br> Corporation of the Municipality of Powassan <br> Corporation of the Municipality of Callander <br> Corporation of the Township of Nipissing <br> AREA 7 - 2 members, selected from the Territory Without Municipal Organization

Members must be Canadian citizens, at least 18 years of age and not employed by the Parry Sound DSSAB.

Resolutions appointing area members should be forwarded to the attention of:
Mrs. Jennifer Harris, Administrative Officer
District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board
1 Beechwood Drive
Parry Sound, Ontario
P2A 1J2
E-MAIL: jharris@psdssab.org

## Procedural Rules

Procedural rules to govern the proceedings of the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board.

## 1. Interpretation

In the Procedural Rules,
(a) "Board" means the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board.
(b) "Chair" means the Chair of the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board.
(c) "Vice-Chair" means the Vice-Chair of the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board.
(d) "Member" means a Member of the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board.
(e) Committee Chair means the Chair of a Committee of the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board.
(f) Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) means the CAO of the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board.
(g) "Rule of Procedure" means the rules and regulations provided in these Procedural Rules.

## 2. Rules of Procedure Adopted

The proceedings of the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board and all Committees thereof, the conduct of the Members and the calling of meetings shall be governed by the provisions of the Procedural Rules and the rules and regulations contained in the Procedural Rules, provided that the rules and regulations contained herein may be suspended by a vote of not less than eight members of the Board present and voting, excluding the Chair, and except as provided herein, the rules of parliamentary procedure as contained in Bourinot's Rules of Order Current Edition, shall be followed for governing the proceedings of the Board and the conduct of its members.

## 3. Execution of Documents

Whenever to give effect to any resolution or Procedural Rules of the Board or to perform any of the statutory duties of the Board the execution of any document is required, the Chair and the CAO are hereby authorized for and in the name of the Board to execute and to affix the seal of the Board, as needed, to such documents.

## 4. Recording Equipment

(a) At the meetings of the Board or it's Committees, the use of cameras, electric lighting equipment, flash bulbs, recording equipment, television cameras and any other device of a mechanical, electronic or similar nature used for transcribing or recording proceedings by auditory or visual means by any person other than the Administrative Officer of the meeting including but not limited to, members, representatives of any news media whatsoever or members of the public is prohibited unless authorized in advance by the Chair or Committee Chair as the case may be.
(b) When exercising the discretion to authorize the use of equipment such as described in (a) regard shall be had as to whether the use will be a distraction to the meeting and to whether there is an Administrative Officer of the Board present with the capability of providing a complete record of the meeting.

## 5. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

The CAO shall act as Chair and the election shall proceed in the normal manner by resolution of the members present provided that before a vote is taken the person nominated must agree to serve as Chair.

When a Chair has been elected the CAO shall vacate the chair and the Chair shall preside over the election of the Vice-Chair, which shall proceed in a like manner.

## 6. Chair

The Chair shall be entitled to vote at all meetings of the Board and shall be ex-officio a member of all Standing and other Committees of the Board and entitled to vote at those meetings.

## 7. Vice-Chair

The Vice-Chair shall be entitled to vote at all meetings of the Board and shall be ex-officio a member of all Standing and other Committees of the Board, when acting in place of the Chair and entitled to vote at those meetings.

## 8. Duties of Chair

It shall be the duty of the Chair or other presiding officer:
(a) to open the meeting of the Board by taking the Chair and calling the Members to order;
(b) to announce the business before the Board in the order in which it is to be acted upon;
(c) to receive and submit, in the proper manner, all motions presented by the Members of the Board;
(d) to put to vote all questions, which are regularly moved and seconded, or necessarily arise in the course of the proceedings, and to announce the result;
(e) to decline to put to vote, motions which infringe upon the rules of procedure;
(f) to restrain the Members, when engaged in debate, within the rules of order;
(g) to enforce on all occasions, the observance of order and decorum among the Members;
(h) to call by name, any Member persisting in breach of the rules of order of the Board, thereby ordering the member to leave the meeting;
(i) to receive all messages and other communications and announce them to the Board, with the support of the Administrative Officer;
(j) to authenticate by their signature, when necessary, all Procedural Rules, and resolutions;
(k) to inform the Board when necessary, or when referred to, for the purpose on a point of order or usage;
(1) to select Members who are to serve on committees when directed to do so by a resolution of the Board;
(m) to adjourn the meeting when the business is concluded;
(n) if they consider it necessary because of grave disorder, the Chair may adjourn the sitting without question put, or suspend the sitting for a time to be named by them.

## Board Meetings

## 9. Place

Meetings of the Board shall be held virtually with in-person meetings being held as required. Inperson meetings shall be held at the place designated and used by the Board from time to time for such purposes.

## 10. Ordinary Meetings

(a) Virtual meetings of the Board shall be held at the hour of 6:30 PM and in-person meetings shall be held at the hour of 7:00 PM on the second Thursday of every month unless otherwise provided by resolution of the Board or unless such a day shall be a public holiday or civic holiday in which case the Board shall meet at the same hour the next day, which is not a public or civic holiday, unless otherwise provided by resolution of the Board.
(b) Notice of all meetings of the Board setting forth the matters to be considered shall be given to all members of the Board by electronic means, not less than forty-eight hours in advance of the time fixed for the meeting.

## 11. Special Meetings of the Board

(a) The Chair may at any time summon a special meeting of the Board.
(b) The CAO may at any time summon a special meeting of the Board, in consultation with the Chair.
(c) Notice of all special meetings of the Board setting forth the matters to be considered at such special meetings shall be given to all members of the Board by electronic means, not less than forty-eight hours in advance of the time fixed for the meeting. The Administrative Officer shall give such other notice of the meeting to the members by telephone or otherwise as best can be done within the circumstances.

## Order of Proceedings at Board Meetings

12. 

(a) Presiding Officer: The Chair shall preside carrying out the duties authorized in Rule 8.
(b) Calling to Order: As soon after the hour fixed for the holding of the meeting of the Board and quorum is achieved, the Chair shall take the Chair and call the meeting to order. A quorum shall be 8 Members of the Board representing at least 4 of the 7 Areas.
(c) Absence of Chair: In the absence of Chair the Vice-Chair shall call the Members to order and shall preside until the arrival of the Chair and while so presiding the Vice-Chair shall have all the powers of the Chair. In the case of the absence of both, an interim Chair shall be appointed.

## 13. No Quorum

Lack of a quorum for a Board meeting may be resolved by one of the following procedures:
(a) If no quorum is present to enable a meeting to commence one half hour after the time appointed for a meeting of the Board, the Administrative Officer shall, call the roll and
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record the names of the members present and the members shall stand discharged from waiting further.
(b) When in the Chair's opinion, a Board meeting should not convene at the scheduled hour because of unforeseen circumstances on the day of a Board meeting that has been properly called then the Chair may:
i. direct the Administrative Officer to notify the members that the meeting will stand adjourned, not cancelled, at the appointed hour to reconvene at the same time of commencement on the next following day, or at such other time and place as the Chair shall then determine; or
(c) If during the course of a Board meeting a quorum is lost then the Chair may:
i. declare the meeting stand adjourned, not ended, to reconvene at such time and place as the Chair shall then determine;
(d) The Chair shall give notice of any meeting so adjourned and to be reconvened as best can be done within the time available.

## 14. Order of Business

The routine order of business for the ordinary meetings of the Board shall be as follows:

- Land Acknowledgement
- Minutes of Previous Meeting
- Deputations and Presentations
- Reports
- Outstanding Issues
- New Business
- Correspondence

And all business shall be taken up in the order of routine in which it stands as shown on the agenda unless otherwise decided by the concurring vote of the majority of the Members of the Board.

## Rules of Debate

## 15.

(a) Every Member previous to speaking to any question or motion shall address the Chair.
(b) When two or more Members attempt to speak, the Chair shall designate the Member who has the floor who shall be the Member who, in the opinion of the Chair, first spoke.
(c) The Chair may on any question or matter request the CAO to respond or to initiate an appropriate response to the Board.

## 16.

Every Member present at a meeting of the Board when a question is put shall vote thereon.

## 17.

When a Recorded Vote is requested by a Member, or is otherwise required, the Administrative Officer shall record the name and vote of every member of any matter or question.
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18. 

If a Member disagrees with the announcement of the Chair that a question is carried or lost they may, but only immediately after the declaration by the Chair, object to the Chair's declaration and require a Recorded Vote to be taken, without any further comment or discussion.

## 19.

When a Member is speaking no other member shall pass between the speaker and the Chair or make interruption except to raise a point of order.
20.

Any Member may require the question or motion under discussion to be read at any time during the debate but not so as to interrupt a Member while speaking.

## 21.

No Member shall speak more than once to the same question without leave of the Board, except that a reply shall be allowed to be made only by a Member of the Board who has presented the motion to the Board, but not by any Member who has moved an amendment or a procedural motion.
22.

No Member, without leave of the Board shall speak to the same question, or in reply, for longer than ten (10) minutes.
23.
(a) A Member may ask a question only for the purpose of obtaining information relating to the matter under discussion and such question must be stated succinctly and asked only of the previous speaker.
(b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), when a Member has been recognized as the next speaker, then immediately before speaking such Member may ask a question of the Chair or an employee of the Board on the matter under discussion but only for the purpose of obtaining information following which the Member shall speak.
(c) All motions shall be in writing with the mover and seconder recorded.

## Points of Order and Privileges

## 24.

The Chair shall preserve order and decide questions of order.

## Conduct of Members at Board Meetings

## 25.

No member shall disobey the rules of the Board or a decision of the Chair or of the Board on questions of order or practice or upon the interpretation of the rules of the Board; and in case a
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Member persists in any such disobedience after having been called to order by the Chair, the Chair may forthwith put the question, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed, "that such Member be ordered to leave their seat for the duration of the meeting of the Board": but if that Member withdraws their remarks, they shall be permitted to retake their seat.

## $\underline{26 .}$

Members shall conduct themselves in a respectful, professional and ethical manner including conduct among themselves and towards employees of the DSSAB. Members are responsible for setting a positive example and to behave and communicate in a manner which will not offend, embarrass or humiliate others. A respectful workplace values:

- Diversity and human rights of others related to their race, national or ethic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, marital status, family status, any physical or mental disability and sexual orientation
- The dignity of a person
- Courteous conduct
- Mutual respect, fairness and equality
- Collaborative working relationships


## 27.

Members shall maintain, at all times the confidentiality of all confidential information and records of the DSSAB concerning matters dealt with In-Camera or that is determined to be confidential by the Chair of the Board. Members shall not make use of or reveal such information or records that are not in the public domain. Members shall comply with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA) and the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA) at all times.

## 28.

Members must not accept gifts or personal benefits that are connected with their performance of the duties as a Board member of the DSSAB.

## 29.

Members shall not misappropriate or use the Board's assets for personal use and shall ensure that all Board property assigned to them is maintained in good condition and shall be accountable for such property. No members shall bid on or receive any property that has been offered for sale.

## Board Agenda

## 30. Order of Business

The CAO shall have prepared and printed a list of the items in the order of topics set out as the routine of business in Rule 14 hereof, for the use of each Member at an ordinary meeting.
(a) It shall be the duty of the CAO to ensure that the minutes of the last ordinary meeting, and all Committee meetings held more than five days prior to an ordinary meeting, together with the agenda delivered electronically to each Member not less than forty-eight hours before the hour appointed for the holding of such ordinary meeting.
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(b) Such minutes as referred to in clause (a) of this paragraph may be adopted by the Board without having been read at the meeting considering the question of their adoption.
(c) Minutes may be amended by the correcting of the record if necessary for accuracy but not otherwise deleting portions thereof.

## 31. Committee Reports

No action shall be taken with reference to committee report recommendations, until adopted by the Board.

## 32. Outstanding Issues

The items listed in the order of the topics set out in the agenda of prior meetings which have not been disposed of by the Board and the date of their first appearance on the agenda shall be noted and repeated on each subsequent agenda until disposed of by the Board, unless removed from the agenda by leave of the Board.

## Voting on Motions

33. 

(a) Motion Required: No discussion shall take place prior to the Chair reading the motion, which has been duly moved and seconded.
(b) Question Stated: Immediately preceding the taking of the vote, the Chair may state the question in the form introduced and shall do so if required by a Member.

## 34. Vote Not Allowed

A Member not present before the result of the vote on a question is declared, shall not be entitled to vote on that question.

## 35. Unrecorded Vote

The manner of determining the decision of the Board on a motion shall be at the discretion of the Chair and may be by voice, show of hands, or standing.

## Proceedings in Board Meetings

36. 

The rules governing the procedure of the Board and the conduct of Members shall be observed so far as they are applicable, provided that:
(a) no vote shall be recorded, unless requested by a Member;
(b) the number of times speaking on any question shall not be limited unless a Member moves that the vote be now taken;
(c) no Member shall speak more than once, except to make an explanation until every Member who desires to speak shall have spoken.

## 37.

The Chair shall be entitled to vote at meetings thereof as a Member but shall not have a second or casting vote in the event of an equality of votes of any question.

## Proceedings in In-Camera Meetings

## 38.

A Board meeting may be In-Camera (closed to the public) when the subject matter under consideration involves;
i. the security of the property and services of the Board;
ii. the disclosure of intimate, personal or financial information in respect of a member of the Board or a committee or an employee or prospective employee of the Board;
iii. the acquisition or disposal of property;
iv. a decision in respect of negotiations with employees of the Board;
v. an opinion of the Board's solicitor, disclosure of which would not be in the public interest;
vi. decision concerning negotiations for an agreement or contract between the Board and a third party, or
vii. the consideration of a request under MFIPPA/PIPEDA.

## Proceedings in Committee Meetings

39. 

(a) The Committee Chair or in their absence, such other Member of the Committee as may be appointed by the concurring vote of a majority of the Members of the Committee present, shall preside at every meeting and may vote on all questions submitted, but in case of an equal division of votes, the Committee Chair shall not have an extra casting vote and the question shall be deemed to have been decided in the negative.
(b) In the absence of the Committee Chair for a period of fifteen (15) minutes after the time appointed for the holding of a meeting of the Committee or if the Committee Chair leaves a meeting in progress, one of the other Members of the Committee, if there be a quorum present, may be appointed as provided in clause (a) of this paragraph and shall discharge the duties of the Committee Chair during the meeting or until the arrival or return of the Committee Chair.
(c) Upon the arrival or return, the Committee Chair shall have the option of assuming the chair. The option shall be exercised immediately following completion of discussion of the item under (d). If there be no quorum present thirty (30) minutes after the time appointed for the meeting, the meeting shall stand adjourned at the call of the Committee Chair.
(d) A majority of the Members of the Committee is necessary to constitute a quorum.
40.

Where two (2) or more Committees of the Board meet in joint session and a resolution is passed at such a meeting, the resolution shall be deemed to be a resolution or decision of each committee, provided a quorum of each committee is present. The Chair of a joint session shall be chosen by the majority of the members present. When a member including the Chair is a member of more than one of the Committees meeting in joint session, the member may be
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counted with each Committee when calculating quorum but when voting in a joint session shall have only one vote.

## 41.

The CAO or their designate shall be the secretary of each committee and shall forward a copy of the minutes of each committee to the Chair and to the members of the Board as soon as available if necessary or with the agenda for the next regular meeting of the Board.

## Amendments

42. 

(a) This by-law shall not be amended or repealed except by a simple majority vote of the Members of the Board other than the Chair.
(b) No amendment or repeal of the Procedural Rules or any part thereof shall be considered at any meeting of the Board unless notice of proposed amendment or repeal has been given at a previous ordinary meeting of the Board and the waiving of this notice by the Board is prohibited.

## Protocol for Electronic Meetings Open to the Public

The following procedures will be utilized to ensure effective and efficient participation in meetings using electronic means:

1. Attendance will be taken by the Administrative Officer and duly recorded to ensure all participants (Members and Staff) are recognized as in attendance, and to ensure there is a quorum of the Board.
2. All Members participating by electronic means must comply with the requirements of the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act by declaring a conflict with a specific item(s) on the Agenda.
3. Each participant shall ensure there is no background noise at the location from which they are using the electronic means to connect to the meeting. Participants should mute their phones when not talking. This substantially eliminates background noise and unnecessary feedback.
4. Each Member participating by electronic means will inform the Chair of their intention to leave the meeting either on a temporary or permanent basis to ensure a quorum is maintained at all times.
5. In the event that a participant is disconnected from the meeting, that person should reconnect unobtrusively. If the disconnection of a Member causes a lack of quorum, the Chair will recess for a short break, until the Member can reconnect.
6. The Chair shall call on staff, as needed.
7. Movers and seconders for all motions will be assigned by the Administrative Officer. The Administrative Officer will read each motion and indicate the member who is moving and seconding the motion. If, when the motion is read, you would prefer to not move or second a particular motion, please advise the Chair at that point.
8. Once the motion is on the table, each Member shall have an opportunity to address the motion. Members not speaking shall not interrupt those who are speaking. When there are no further speakers to the motion, the Chair shall put the motion to a vote.
9. After the vote, the Administrative Officer will announce whether the motion is carried.

## Protocol for Electronic Meetings Closed to the Public

1. In addition to the protocol for meetings open to the public, everyone participating by video or audio conferencing will ensure that they are situated in a location such that others not permitted to participate in the closed session meetings are unable to hear or see any and all proceedings of the closed session meeting. Confidentiality must be maintained at all times.
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## 2023 Board Meeting Dates

| DATE | TIME | LOCATION |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| January $1^{\text {th }}$ | 6:30 PM | Via Zoom Video Conference |
| January 27 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | All-Day <br> Event <br> Board Introduction |  |
| February $9^{\text {th }}$ | 6:30 Cabin Inn |  |
| 9 Little Beaver Blvd., Seguin |  |  |

Page 88 of 390

Village of Sundridge Council Resolution
November 23, 2022
Item (9.5)

District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board Appointment
Resolution \#202-385

## Moved By: Fraser Williamson

Seconded By: Jim MacLachlan
THAT the Council for the Corporation of the Village of Sundridge supports the nomination of Sharon Smith as the Area 5 Representative for the municipalities of South River, Sundridge, Joly, Machar, Strong and Magnetawan;

AND FURTHER THAT this resolution be forwarded to the Area 5 municipalities for support.

Recorded Vote
For
Against Jackson, Shawn
MacLachlan, Jim
x
$x$
Smith, Sharon $x$
Williamson, Fraser $x$
Leveque, Justine x
Carried

District of Parry Sound Municipal Association
c/o Township of Perry, 1695 Emsdale Road, Emsdale, ON
Secretary-Treasurer: Beth Morton

November 10, 2022
To: Member Municipalities - (Please copy and circulate to Members of Council)

## Association Background

The District of Parry Sound Municipal Association was formed in 1936. It currently has 23 member municipalities representing all of the municipalities in Parry Sound District and one in Nipissing District.

The Association holds two meetings per year, in the spring and fall, and the members rotate hosting the meetings alternately on the east and west side of the District. They are daytime meetings running from 9:00 a.m. to approximately 3:00 p.m. At the meetings a variety of presenters provide information on topics of common interest to the municipalities. The majority of the people in attendance are Mayors, Reeves, Councillors, and some municipal staff also attend. Staff from various ministries and agencies are also present. Approximately one hundred people attend the annual meetings. In addition to the interesting and informative speakers, the meetings are also a forum for presenting resolutions and expressing concerns about municipal issues. The resolutions are forwarded to the appropriate ministries or agencies.

The annual membership fee is $\$ 160.00$ per municipality (an invoice for 2023 will be sent out in the new year), and the cost of sending delegates to the meeting is $\$ 30.00$ per person and this includes the lunch. During 2021 and 2022 no invoices were sent out as the Association did not meet during COVID.

## Ward Appointments

It is time to consider the appointment of ward representatives to the Executive of the Association. The Executive usually meets in January and June to plan the spring and fall Association meetings.

The attached list shows the Wards and indicates if a Director is willing to stand again, or if there is a vacancy. Each Ward must decide among themselves who they wish to appoint as a Director. Even if a Director is willing to stand again it is up to the Ward to decide to accept that person or choose someone else. It would be appreciated if this could be done as soon as possible and a reply sent to the Secretary, as noted above.

The Executive also includes all past Presidents, if still an elected or appointed official. At this time, we have two past Presidents, Glenn Miller, Councillor of Ryerson Township and Norm Hofstetter, Mayor of Perry Township. Councillor Miller and Mayor Hofstetter will be included as part of the Executive for the 2022 to 2026 term.

## Spring Meoting

A new President is required to be elected at the first Municipal Association meeting after a municipal election.

More details on the spring meeting will follow in the new year once the Executive has been formed and has had an opportunity to prepare for the Spring Meeting.

If you have any questions or require any additional information on the DPSMA, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,


Beth Morton<br>Secretary-Treasurer beth.morton@townshipofperry.ca 705-636-5941

District of Parry Sound Municipal Association clo Township of Perry, 1695 Emsdale Road, Emsdale, ON Secretary-Treasurer: Beth Morton

## WARDS, MEMBERS, EXECUTIVE

Appointments for the 2022 to 2026 term

## WARD \#1

Seguin

## WARD \#2

Archipelago
Parry Sound

## WARD \# 3

Carling
McDougall
McKellar
Whitestone

## WARD \# 4

Armour
Burks Falls
Kearney
McMurrich/Monteith
Регry
Ryerson

## WARD \# 5

| Joly | Lynda Carleton is seeking re-appointment |
| :--- | :--- |
| Machar |  |
| Magnetawan |  |
| South River |  |
| Strong |  |
| Sundridge |  |

WARD \# 6
Callander Jordy Carr sat on the Executive from 2022 to 2026. The
Chisholm
Nipissing
Powassan
Ted Collins sat on the Executive from 2022 to 2026. The DPSMA has not received confirmation if he is seeking reappointment

Paul Borneman sat on the Executive from 2022 to 2026. Parry Sound has not confirmed their appointments at this time.

1 Director to be appointed

Norm Hofstetter is seeking re-appointment DPSMA has not received confirmation if she is seeking reappointment

## FONOM Rep

Lynda Carleton is seeking re-appointment

The President will be elected at the first Municipal Meeting in the Spring 2023. The Executive will make a recommendation to the Association for the appointment of President. There are two past presidents who will continue to serve on the Executive, being Councillor Glenn Miller of Ryerson Township and Mayor Norm Hofstetter of Perry Township.

FW: Appointment for DPSMA.

From: L Carleton [lcarleton50@gmail.com](mailto:lcarleton50@gmail.com)
Sent: November 24, 2022 8:18 PM
To: Nancy Austin [naustin@sundridge.ca](mailto:naustin@sundridge.ca)
Cc: Don [clerk@southriverontario.com](mailto:clerk@southriverontario.com); Kerstin Vroom [Clerk@magnetawan.com](mailto:Clerk@magnetawan.com) Subject: Appointment for DPSMA.

Hoping you will support my nomination for the municipal board. Thanks so much

District of Parry Sound Municipal Association Nomination Support

Date: November 28, 2022


BE IT RESOLVED THAT the/Cpunci of the Village of South River does hereby support the nomination of $\qquad$ to represent Ward \#5 for the District of Parry Sound Municipal Association.


Lost By: $\qquad$

| Name of Council Member | Yeas | Nays | Abstention | Pecuniary <br> Interest | Recorded <br> Vote |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mayor Coleman |  |  |  |  |  |
| Councillor Brandt |  |  |  |  |  |
| Councillor Brooks |  |  |  |  |  |
| Councillor O'Hallarn |  |  |  |  |  |
| Councillor Scott |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



TOWNSHIP OF JOLY
P.O. Box 519 , Sundridge , Ontario , P0A 1 Z0

Tel: 705-384-5428
November 23, 2022

## RESOLUTION

Resolution \# 2022-11-35
Agenda Item \# 4.11 District of Parry Sound Municipal Association (DPSMA) Ward 5 Rep

Moved By : Bill Black
Seconded By: Budd Brown
Formed in 1936 and representing all District of Parry Sound municipalities, school boards and road commissions in unorganized Townships in the Parry Sound District and part of Nipissing District (if they are members in good standing), DPSMA is a forum to present resolutions for expressing concerns about local and unique municipal issues. Resolutions are forwarded to the applicable ministry or agency.

Meeting Details: Executive meets bi-annually in winter and summer to prepare the biannual DPSMA events (evening) held each Spring and Fall (full day, lunch provided). The host municipality rotates.

Committee Administered by: Township of Perry (Beth Morton, Secretary-Treasurer)
Council Representative: One Representative on the Executive for all of Ward 5 (Joly, Machar, Magnetawan, South River, Strong and Sundridge). All of Council Members are encouraged to attend the bi-annual sessions

Therefore be it Resolved that the Council for the Township of Joly hereby supports the appointment of Tim Bryson from Strong Township as the Ward \#5 representative on the Executive of the District of Parry Sound Municipal Association.

## Carried

# Terms of Reference for 

# Almaguin highland health council 

(UPDATED: SEPTEMBER 2022)

## Definitions


#### Abstract

"Almaguin Highlands Health Centre" is a health centre building located at 150 Huston Street in Burk's Falls, Ontario and owned by Village of Burk's Falls. The Village of Burk's Falls manages the physical building and the leases with various healthcare service professionals housed in the building.


"Almaguin Highlands Health Council" is the name of the committee made up of appointed Municipal Council representatives from participating member municipalities. The mandate and composition of the Almaguin Highlands Health Council is outlined in this document.
"Approval" means the approval of the majority of the Health Council members.
"Health Council Member" is any member who sits on the Almaguin Highlands Health Council.
"Health Council" is an abbreviated name for the Almaguin Highlands Health Council.
"Village" means the Village of Burk's Falls.
"User(s)" is / are any member of the public using healthcare services in the Almaguin Highlands region.

## BACKGROUND

After the closure of the hospital, including the emergency departments in 2010, the former Burk's Falls and District Hospital was returned to the Village of Burk's Falls from Muskoka Algonquin Health Care (MAHC) due to a past agreement. The building, now known as the Almaguin Highlands Health Centre, continues to be owned and maintained by the Village of Burk's Falls. In 2011, a committee structure was created to represent the Health Centre and to advocate for continued health care services within the Almaguin Highlands Health Centre. The organization was comprised of municipal elected officials, area residents and members of health care agencies. A Letters Patent was filed in 2011 to become a non-profit charitable organization (Ontario Corporation Number 1836004, under the name Almaguin Highlands Health Centre) allowing the organization to receive donations from the public and private
sectors along with private citizens; however, Terms of Reference for the committee were not created at that time.

Since 2011, membership has experienced fluctuation, both in terms of members and represented municipalities. In 2018 following the municipal elections a call out for representation was made with ten municipalities appointed representation. In 2020, the organization re-branded its name from the original Almaguin Highlands Health Centre Committee to the Almaguin Highlands Health Council to separate its activities from those within the physical Health Centre building and to reflect a focus on healthcare services across the Almaguin Highlands region.

As the organization's representation has changed over the years so have its goals and intentions, including a focus beyond the Almaguin Highlands Health Centre building to services provided across the entire Almaguin Highlands region. These Terms of Reference have been created to finalize the structure of the Almaguin Highlands Health Council and to outline the roles and responsibilities for both the Council and the Village of Burk's Falls (being the property owner of the Almaguin Highlands Health Centre building).

## MANDATE OF THE ALMAGUIN HIGHLANDS HEALTH COUNCIL

Following are the key objectives of the Almaguin Highlands Health Council:

1. Represent the needs of citizens across the Almaguin Highlands region from a healthcare perspective;
2. Promote current healthcare related services delivered within the region of the Almaguin Highlands;
3. Advocate for the development of new / future services in the region, highlighting potential needs of the population to the administering Ministry or other governing body;
4. Actively participate on local healthcare boards, committees and other decision bodies in an effort to ensure that the Almaguin Highlands region has an appropriate level of representation and decision-making capability with respect to healthcare-related decisions and investments;
5. Assist with the development of healthcare services through fund-raising efforts and via resolutions with the various represented Municipalities to support specific healthcare initiatives.

## GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Build and foster strong relationships with healthcare providers and governing bodies with respect to healthcare initiatives across the Almaguin Highlands.

Advocate and champion meaningful partnerships.
Foster an environment of positive progress toward healthcare excellence for our region.
Communicate and share our goals and successes with our partners and constituents.

## ENGAGEMENT APPROACHES

1. Consult with our partners, healthcare providers, Ministry experts, and users of the healthcare system in our region. This will enable us to gain knowledge on funding models, determine healthcare service delivery options and determine areas of focus for the Health Council.
2. Advocate for health care service delivery providers and/or agencies as a means to inform governing bodies of the need and demand for the continuation and/or expansion of services within the Almaguin Highlands area.
3. Collaborate with stakeholders on enhancements to healthcare service delivery models in the Almaguin Highlands.
4. Assist healthcare providers through promotion of the Almaguin Highlands in efforts to recruit and retain healthcare professionals.
5. Communicate our activities and success across the Almaguin Highlands region.

## Almaguin Highlands Health Council

## Composition

The Council shall consist of municipal representation, community advocates, and healthcare professionals. This may include, but not be limited to, physicians / nurses / nurse practitioners, healthcare administrators, healthcare management, senior care services, patient advocates, and economic development representatives. Health Council participation is a voluntary position. In addition to the Council members, the Village of Burk's Falls will appoint one (1) person to act as the Administrator / Secretary for the Council (non-voting).

There shall be a maximum of fourteen (14) and a minimum of eight (8) members of the Council.

As at November 2018 and until such time as voting membership changes (see "Appointing Members" and "Termination of Members" below), following is the make-up of the voting Municipal members across the Almaguin Highlands:


## Member Roles

As elected representatives of the respective communities represented on the Almaguin Highlands Health Council, only municipally-appointed members will be "voting" members of the AHHC Council.

Each member of the Health Council shall have one vote of equal value on all decisions. From the membership there shall be two appointed positions, determined by majority vote from the
entire appointed membership, for the positions of Chair and Vice-chair. Proxy votes shall not be permitted.

Municipal representation on the Almaguin Highlands Health Council will align with the four-year municipal term.

## Almaguin Highlands Health Council Chair Responsibilities

a) The Chair shall preside over meetings ensuring each member provides input on matters. This position calls meetings to order and follows the prepared agenda items for discussions and summarizes outcome.
b) The Chair shall call for a vote on all decisions to be made by the Council.
c) The Chair shall have one vote and shall vote last on decisions.
d) The Administrator / Secretary shall report to the Chair any concerns between meetings regarding service delivery. The Chair will determine if the matter is urgent to call a Council meeting, or if it can hold until the next regular meeting.
e) The Chair shall ensure all members show respect during a meeting and shall have the right to remove a member should they continue to act out at a meeting.
f) The Chair shall act as a signing authority for the Health Council, where applicable.
g) The Chair acts as the official liaison with media.
h) A Vice Chair will be appointed amongst members and will attend meetings related to the Health Council if the Chair is unavailable.

Almaguin Highlands Health Council Member Responsibilities
a) Attend monthly meetings and special meetings as required.
b) Actively seek and foster working relationships with health and mental health providers and/or agencies.
c) Assist and participate in all decision-making processes.
d) Follow guiding principles of Terms of Reference.
e) Report back to respective Municipal Councils on the activities of the Almaguin Highlands Health Council and make requests of their Municipal Councils as required.

Administrator / Secretary Responsibilities
a) The Administrator / Secretary shall prepare agendas in conjunction with the Chair and record minutes for all Health Council meetings, as well as sending notice to each member of upcoming meetings.
b) The Administrator / Secretary shall collect and mail as necessary to ensure the Chair can compose timely responses to those inquiries.
c) The Administrator / Secretary shall ensure there is quorum for every meeting.
d) Working with the Chair coordinates the matters for discussion at each meeting through the preparation of an agenda.
e) The Administrator / Secretary shall be responsible for prompt payment of all bills.
f) The Administrator / Secretary shall be responsible for maintaining accurate and complete accounting records of all receipts and disbursements and submit a monthly and annual statement to the Health Council.

## Appointing Members to the Almaguin Highlands Health Council


#### Abstract

Every four years, after a municipal election the Administrator / Secretary shall solicit municipalities within the Almaguin Highlands area to appoint a representative to become an Almaguin Highlands Health Council member. This will include solicitation of all twelve (12) municipal councils in the region, whether or not they were participants in previous terms.

Municipal elected officials will be appointed by their respective municipal Council for a four-year term.

Should a vacancy occur mid term then a request will be made to that municipal Council seeking an alternative member from that Council.

Members from the healthcare field or the Almaguin Highlands community shall be accepted as non-voting members provided the maximum number is not exceeded. These members will be accepted by resolution through a majority vote of the Health Council.

Should a member wish to leave the Health Council a written resignation letter to the Chair shall be submitted with as much notice as possible.


## Termination of Member Appointment

Should an appointed member miss more than three (3) consecutive meetings without prior and reasonable explanation the member's seat will be deemed vacant and a replacement sought.
Should the Chair and a quorum of the Health Council agree that an appointed member has disrupted the ease of the Council and/or has breeched the code of conduct, ethics or any other behaviour that could cause the Almaguin Highlands Health Council harm and/or created a negative image of the Health Council, said member shall be terminated from the Health Council through notification to the representative municipality.

Should a represented Municipal Council decide to cease its participation in the Almaguin Highlands Health Council, a resolution indicating its decision from the individual Municipal Council shall be presented to the Almaguin Highlands Health Council Administrator / Secretary and / or Chair. This will be the case whether participation is ceased mid-term (i.e. of the fouryear municipal term) or at the start of a new four-year term.

## Council Quorum

The quorum of the Group will be $50 \%+1$ of its membership. If quorum is not achieved within 15 minutes of the meeting time, the meeting will not proceed, and no discussion or decisions will be made.

## Council Meeting Terms \& Requirements

A meeting will be called by the Chair once a month to discuss Almaguin Highlands Health Council progress. Every member of the Health Council is expected to attend all meetings. Each member of the Council will receive an agenda at least two days prior to the meeting date. A meeting may also be called when $2 / 3$ of the members call one.

## Almaguin Highlands Health Council Funds

Funds received by the Almaguin Highlands Health Council shall be derived from donations and / or from solicitation by resolution to the represented Municipal Councils. These funds shall be managed through the Village of Burk's Falls with use of funds determined by the Health Council. Funds will be used for the continuation and / or expansion of current and future health care services across the Almaguin Highlands region, as appropriate and agreed. Disbursement of funds shall be agreed through resolution and majority vote by the Health Council.

Funds collected from participating Municipal Councils for a specific, named purpose shall be used only for that purpose unless a resolution is received from each contributing Municipality directing the funds elsewhere. Tracking and allocation of these funds will be administered by the Village of Burk's Falls. Funds not directed for a specific, named use will be disbursed at the discretion of the Health Council through resolution and majority acceptance.
The Village of Burk's Falls will be accountable for the maintenance and repair of the Almaguin Highlands Health Centre Building, located at 150 Huston Street in Burk's Falls, Ontario. As representatives of their respective Municipal Councils, AHHC members will also consider requests for additional funding from the Village of Burk's Falls to cover occasional operating deficits related to the Almaguin Highlands Health Centre building. All requests will first be brought forward to the Health Council by the Village for discussion and transparency. Funding requests to member municipalities, however, will be made directly by the Village of Burk's Falls. Each Municipal Council must agree, by their own resolution, to assist.

## Health Council Conflict of Interest

Any form of conflict must be disclosed prior to each meeting to avoid any unfair voting or decision making. The Health Council is open to feedback from all members who are not in conflict. Every member is encouraged to read the Conflict of Interest Act to ensure their understanding of rules.

## Health Council Nepotism

The Council shall not hire, contract or favour any business based on relations between individuals. The Council shall not engage in meaningful occupational gain with parents, children or grandparents/children of member from the Council.

## Health Council Code of Conduct

All members of the Health Council are mandated to follow the Code of Conduct, and Workplace Harassment Policies. Failure to do so will result in removal from the Council.

## Village of Burk's Falls

As the Village of Burk's Falls maintains ownership of the properties located at 150 Huston Street and 162 Huston, the day-to-day operations of these buildings, including tenant relations is under the care and control of the Village of Burk's Falls. It is anticipated, however, that due its mandate, the Almaguin Highlands Health Council will provide input and assistance with respect to the addition of healthcare services at the building.

## From Almaguin Climate Action (ACA) re Bill 23 the Build More Homes Faster Act. (We ask you to share this document with your CAO and all other relevant staff members.)

We realize that you have not yet been sworn in as Mayor and Council, however, the matter at hand is of such urgency that we are sending this request to you now. An immediate response to Bill 23 is required from municipalities. We have put together some of the serious implications to municipalities and to Almaguin below with a request to Council. Please share this with your clerk to circulate to all councillors as we are only able to use emails posted during the election period for contact.

Both municipal and individual submissions to the public consultation are important. The deadline set by the Province for submissions to the public consultation are important. The deadline set by the Province for submissions is Thursday, Nov. 17 at 7pm: https://www.ola.org/en/apply-committees

Almaguin Climate Action (ACA) urges you to join municipalities across the province and take action to speak out against Bill 23, the Build More Homes Faster Act. We call on you to identify the Bill's abuse of power, expose the implications of key measures in this Bill and call on Premier Doug Ford and MPP Graydon Smith, one of the cocreators of this bill, to withdraw it immediately.

Bill 23, the Build More Homes Faster Act, is an assault on municipal governance, public consultation, and critical climate decision-making both locally and across the province.

The seriousness of this Bill cannot be understated. It limits municipal powers to enact any policies around land use, climate action, wetland protection, regional/District decision-making, building, and watershed-wide decision-making. It disregards Indigenous and Treaty rights. It strips municipal powers. Bill 23 gives the province the right to supersede municipal decisions, including Official Plans; to override the planning proposals and the advice of staff; and to ensure that any significant responses to the Climate Emergency are unattainable.

Intentionally introduced post-election with a very short response timeline, this Bill does not give new councils adequate time to respond. We understand and empathize with the challenges this presents to you as you transition to new members on Council taking over important municipal governance. In spite of this political move by the Ford government, Almaguin Climate Action (ACA) urges you to do an in-depth analysis of this legislation and respond with urgency.

Among the most significant concerns are:

- Less not more affordable housing will be the outcome of this Bill. Housing experts, including this government's own advisory board, state the urgent need for both an efficient use of limited resources, materials and infrastructure, and the need for densification in existing communities to meet the housing crisis. This bill will not deliver more housing, just bigger housing with more massive sprawl into rural areas - a developer's dream.
- Changes to the Planning Act will impact site plan approvals. Some requirements for plans of subdivision, industrial parks, businesses and site plan approvals will not require approval. By amending sec. 23 of the Planning Act, Ministerial Zoning Orders can be used to overturn
municipal decisions. This could open Almaguin to massive development exploitation at a time when protecting Almaguin for future generations has become an increasingly shared value across the District.
- Development fees, community benefit charges and parkland requirements will be removed including but not limited to affordable housing. This will seriously diminish the ability of municipalities to do their own planning, to manage their own budget, to protect any land, or have policies to try and protect the environment or the economy.
- Tax increases will be the only way for municipalities to pay for development when these development fees and permitting approvals are removed at the municipal level in order to expedite building. Municipalities will need to pay for the infrastructure services into these new developments in spite of being unable to collect development fees. There is no guarantee that the savings to developers to expedite building will reduce costs and make housing more affordable.
- Ecological, wholistic watershed planning is eradicated. It is being replaced by political boundary decision-making which will eradicate the integrated planning of lower tiers of government. As written, it will seriously compromise our region's ability to protect wetlands, forests, farmlands and fragile ecosystems. Decision-making will be fragmented and resources inadequate to do the job in every little community. This is a gift to developers and they are celebrating. It is also a nail in the coffin of climate mitigation and adaptation.
- Green Building Standards are gutted. The provisions of this Bill particularly attack municipalities' ability to require green building standards some of which are already in place in many communities across the province. While our local municipalities across Almaguin were only just on the verge of developing green building initiatives, this provision will seriously impact our ability to put the necessary standards in place. This means that it will be more difficult to build energy-efficient, climate resilient buildings which are both more affordable for residents and essential if we are to meet the legislated commitments to reduce GHG emissions as adopted by both District and municipalities across Almaguin.
- Climate Action will be restricted. We know buildings and transportation are the two highest sources of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Implementing upfront building standards (low carbon materials, air-source heat pumps) is far cheaper than the cost of retrofits down the line and saves home-owners considerable energy costs. Bill 23 will severely restrict and even eliminate the ability of a municipality to require this upfront energy efficiency in the design of new housing.
- Wetlands will be redefined. This legislation changes the criteria for the designation of critical wetlands and will result in the removal of some of our most essential natural heritage. The new criteria will make it difficult to protect wetlands from development. This weakens our ability to respond to climate change, maintain essential biodiversity, prevent flooding in extreme weather events and retain irreplaceable carbon sinks.
- Conservation Authorities stripped of power. Conservation Authorities (CA) will no longer rule on the environmental impact of a proposed development on protected farmland (our food
security), habitat, and waterbodies. The CA will not be able to prevent construction debris from impacting water supplies. This Bill opens the door to more contamination of land and water, more flooding and landslides. While we do not have a Conservation Authority in Almaguin, we are working hard to implement an Integrated Watershed Management Plan to make land use planning decisions to protect both the economy and ecological integrity of Almaguin, an imperative if we are to respond to the urgency of the climate crisis. This Bill will jeopardize not only our region's opportunities to make climate responsible decisions across all jurisdictions but it will also harm climate resiliency across all of Ontario.
- It violates Treaty and Indigenous Rights. Consultation and reconciliation efforts are not addressed in this Bill. Nowhere is there room for an Indigenous voice at the table.
- Bill 23 overrides Democratic Rights. Bill 23 removes requirements regarding public notification and public meetings on planning matters and removes the right for citizens to appeal planning decisions. These provisions infringe on our democratic rights and principles and must not be supported.
- It overrides municipalities' right to manage their money. Bill 23 requires municipalities to spend or allocate $60 \%$ of reserve funds annually making it difficult if not impossible to use development charges to gather funds for large infrastructure projects and for future needs for infrastructure growth.
- Reduces the number of affordable housing units and restricts time periods for affordability. While removing exclusionary zoning, it is watered down to have little impact on increasing affordable housing with compact, low cost, multiple-unit housing within our communities. We need to be able to add townhouses, semi-detached and walk-up apartments to our existing neighbourhoods to ensure the need for fewer cars, to provide walkable access to services, and to increase public transit within and between our communities. This Bill will instead build sprawl into our rural areas with irreversible consequences both to the landscape, the watershed, and to GHG reduction targets.

Many other municipalities are working night and day to respond to this egregious legislation. We urge you to be part of a unified voice of municipal dissent from across the province. The only benefactors of this legislation will be a few developers and land speculators who will profit enormously. Bill 23 is a developers' charter for unrestrained and unregulated growth. It will not contribute to more affordable and attainable housing. Instead, it will undermine our ability to build climate resilient, livable and affordable neighbourhoods. It will gut environmental protections and prevent decisive climate action.

The Secretary General of the UN, at the opening of COP27 last week said, "We are on the highway to climate hell with our foot firmly on the accelerator." Bill 23 is a Made in Ontario example.

We ask you, our local leaders, to join other municipalities and organizations across the province. Together, we must stand up and say "Stop!"

Best Regards,
Al Bottomley (Sundridge), Susan King (Emsdale), Deborah Kurtze (Armour Township), Christine Lauffer (Armour Township), members of ACA

Earlier this week Bill 23 - More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 passed Second Reading and was referred to the Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy. AMO has requested to present at Committee and will submit written comments by the November 17 deadline.

Bill 23 is proceeding quickly through the legislature, which means it is likely to pass before many municipal Councils have been sworn in, and before the AMO Board can prepare a response. Given these tight timelines, AMO's responses to the legislation and regulatory and environmental registry postings associated with it will be informed by our AMO Housing Blueprint and other recent work.

Bill 23 and the province's new More Homes Built Faster Plan, as proposed, will have economic, social, and environmental implications that cannot be ignored. That is why AMO is releasing a preliminary analysis as it continues to work through the complex policy changes. It focuses on the following Schedules:

- Schedule 2 - Conservation Authorities Act
- Schedule 3 - Development Charges Act, 1997
- Schedule 4 - Municipal Act, 2001
- Schedule 6 - Ontario Heritage Act
- Schedule 7 - Ontario Land Tribunal Act, 2021
- Schedule 9 - Planning Act.

Examples below are intended to illustrate AMO's early thoughts on how to approach an overarching response to Bill 23 and its related consultations. It is not intended to be exhaustive or inclusive of all proposed provisions.

Bill 23 proposes numerous changes to the Development Charges Act and Planning Act that, if passed, will significantly impact how municipal governments recover the costs associated with growth.

For example, Bill 23 proposes to exempt developers who build affordable, inclusionary zoning and select attainable housing units from paying development charges, parkland dedication fees, and community benefit charges. The bill also includes several additional changes, including reductions in costs associated with rental residential construction and changes to the method for determining development charges, amongst others.

The cumulative impact of proposed changes to municipal fees and charges is significant and contrary to the widely accepted concept that growth should pay for growth.

While AMO would like to support the province's housing objectives, it cannot support changes that largely place the burden of carrying the costs associated with development onto municipalities. AMO believes that the proposed changes may contradict the goal of building more housing in the long-term as it merely shifts the financial burden of growth-related infrastructure onto existing taxpayers.

Yesterday the AMO President sent a letter to the Honourable Peter Bethlenfalvy, Minister of Finance, urging the province to address the funding shortfall associated with changes proposed under Bill 23. The province is expected to release its Fall Economic Statement on November 14.

While some of the proposed amendments to the Planning Act, Heritage Act, Ontario Land Tribunal Act, and the Conservation Authorities Act have merit, it is unclear how these changes will improve a community's livability (i.e., connected to core infrastructure in an integrated and coordinated way).

AMO understands the desire to reduce barriers to planning and development approvals so that housing can be built faster. That is why many municipalities have made investments to streamline and digitize their processes and are working to improve processes in response to Bill 109.

The proposed changes to increase transparency around the heritage designations and the process at the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) will require implementation by already under-resourced municipal staff. The OLT also needs to be properly resourced to eliminate the existing backlog. AMO will be looking for more clarity around what constitutes an "undue delay," and the policy intent behind having a municipality use property tax dollars to pay the successful party's cost if its case is unsuccessful at the OLT.

A broader issue, however, is understanding what the implications are of the reduced role in land use planning proposed for some upper-tier municipalities and conservation authorities. The proposal that an upper-tier municipality could provide advice and assistance to lower-tier municipalities if there is mutual agreement is appreciated, however, the proposals (particularly in Schedule 9) could have the unintended consequence of having local planning disconnected from the servicing requirements that many upper-tier municipalities are responsible for managing and funding.

Many of the proposed amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act and the Planning Act in Bill 23 are concerning, as they signal a move away from environmental protection at a time when climate change impacts are being felt more at the local level.

Bill 23 proposes sweeping changes to the regulatory responsibilities of Ontario's 36 conservation authorities that, if passed, will undermine the collaborative and productive
changes put forward by the Ministry led Conservation Authority Working Group over the past two years.

The proposals under Schedule 2 have raised confusion around how these changes will impact the Conservation Authorities Act regulations that recently came into effect. AMO is seeking further clarification to understand how these amendments will impact municipal budgets and environmental outcomes. At first glance, they seem to result in negative consequences (i.e., increased flooding, liability), at a time when the impacts of climate change are increasingly prevalent.

Another emerging area of concern is the proposal to allow pits and quarries to request official plan amendments within two years of a new official plan or secondary plan coming into effect. Finally, there are numerous environmental implications associated with the use of more land and the proposed reduction in revenues to build parkland.

## Next Steps

AMO continues to work with provincial ministries to understand the proposed changes under Bill 23. In the meantime, AMO is meeting with stakeholders and our Task Forces to inform our Standing Committee submission and our responses to the relevant consultation postings. A list of regulatory and environmental registry postings has been created to show what should be prioritized.

We recognize that this is a challenging time for AMO members to provide feedback due to the recent municipal elections. If your municipality is providing comments and would like to share them with AMO, please contact policy@amo.on.ca. We will continue to provide further updates to members as the Bill and consultations progress.

Subject:
FW: Letter from Minister Steve Clark (4885)

From: Minister (MMAH) [minister.mah@ontario.ca](mailto:minister.mah@ontario.ca)
Sent: November 15, 2022 1:18 PM
To: Kerstin Vroom [Clerk@magnetawan.com](mailto:Clerk@magnetawan.com)
Subject: Letter from Minister Steve Clark (4885)

Ministry of
Municipal Affairs and Housing

Office of the Minister
777 Bay Street, $17^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Toronto ON M7A 2J3
Tel.: 416 585-
7000

## Ministère des

Affaires municipales et du Logement

Bureau du ministre
777, rue Bay, $17^{\circ}$ étage
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Tél. : 416 585-7000


November 15, 2022
Your Worship
Mayor Sam Dunnett
Municipality of Magnetawan
clerk@magnetawan.com
Dear Mayor Dunnett and Council:
Please accept my congratulations on your success in the recent municipal elections. I want to thank you for your decision to serve the public, and I look forward to working with you throughout the upcoming term.

As a former mayor, I know firsthand just how important municipal government is to Ontarians. I also know your constituents expect local government to be effective and responsive as you deliver critical local services, and that you expect the same in our relationship.

Throughout my time as Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, I have been proud to work with mayors and councils across Ontario to deliver on our shared priorities. I value the expertise and advice I have received from local governments, which has helped shape our decision-making to date.

There is much work ahead of us. Our government is working hard to make living in Ontario more affordable. Bill 23, the More Homes Built Faster Act, takes bold action to advance our plan to address the housing crisis by building 1.5 million homes across Ontario over the next 10 years. We will continue to work with all our municipal partners to get shovels in the ground and build more homes faster.

As we work together to serve the people of our great province, I want to hear about the challenges you face. I know that local representatives understand their communities and that you can help us ensure that local government is working harder, smarter and more efficiently. Best wishes to you and to council for success over the next four years.

Sincerely,


Steve Clark
Minister

November 16, 2022

To Our Municipal Clients:

## Re: Assessment of Bill 23 (More Homes Built Faster Act) - Community Benefits Charges

On behalf of our many municipal clients, we are continuing to provide the most up-todate information on the proposed changes to the Planning Act related to community benefits charges (C.B.C.s), as proposed by Bill 23 (More Homes Built Faster Act). As identified in our October 31, 2022 letter to you, our firm is providing an evaluation of the proposed changes to C.B.C.s along with potential impacts arising from these changes. The following comments will be included in our formal response to the Province, which we anticipate presenting to the Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy later this week.

## 1. Overview Commentary

The Province has introduced Bill 23 with the following objective: "This plan is part of a long-term strategy to increase housing supply and provide attainable housing options for hardworking Ontarians and their families." The Province's plan is to address the housing crisis by targeting the creation of 1.5 million homes over the next 10 years. To implement this plan, Bill 23 introduces several changes to the Planning Act, along with nine other Acts including the Development Charges Act (D.C.A.) and the Conservation Authorities Act, which seek to increase the supply of housing.

One of the proposed amendments to the Planning Act seeks to exempt affordable housing units (ownership and rental) and attainable housing units from C.B.C.s. While the creation of affordable housing units is an admirable goal, there is a lack of robust empirical evidence to suggest that reducing development-related fees improves housing affordability. Municipalities rely on C.B.C. funding to emplace the critical infrastructure needed to maintain livable, sustainable communities as development occurs.
Introducing additional exemptions from the payment of these charges results in further revenue losses to municipalities. The resultant shortfalls in capital funding then need to be addressed by delaying growth-related infrastructure projects and/or increasing the burden on existing taxpayers through higher property taxes (which itself reduces housing affordability). If the additional exemptions from C.B.C.s are deemed to be an important element of increasing the affordable housing supply, then adequate transfers from the provincial and federal governments should be provided to municipalities to offset the revenue losses resulting from these policies.

A summary of the proposed C.B.C. changes, along with our firm's commentary, is provided below.

## 2. Changes to the Planning Act - C.B.C.s

2.1 New Statutory Exemptions: Affordable residential units, attainable residential units, and inclusionary zoning residential units will be exempt from the payment of C.B.C.s., with definitions provided as follows:

- Affordable Residential Units (Rented): Where rent is no more than $80 \%$ of the average market rent as defined by a new bulletin published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- Affordable Residential Units (Ownership): Where the price of the unit is no more than $80 \%$ of the average purchase price as defined by a new bulletin published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- Attainable Residential Units: Excludes affordable units and rental units; will be defined as prescribed development or class of development and sold to a person who is at "arm's length" from the seller.
- Inclusionary Zoning Units: Affordable housing units required under inclusionary zoning by-laws.

The exemption is proposed to be implemented by applying a discount to the maximum amount of the C.B.C. that can be imposed (i.e., $4 \%$ of land value, as specified in section 37 of the Planning Act). For example, if the affordable, attainable, and/or inclusionary zoning residential units represent $25 \%$ of the total building floor area, then the maximum C.B.C. that could be imposed on the development would be $3 \%$ of total land value (i.e., a reduction of $25 \%$ from the maximum C.B.C. of $4 \%$ of land value).

## Analysis/Commentary

- While this is an admirable goal to create additional affordable housing units, further C.B.C. exemptions will continue to provide additional financial burdens on municipalities to fund these exemptions without the financial participation of senior levels of government.
- The definition of "attainable" is unclear, as this has not yet been defined in the regulations.
- Under the proposed changes to the D.C.A, municipalities will have to enter into agreements to ensure that affordable units remain affordable for 25 years and that attainable units are attainable at the time they are sold. An agreement does not appear to be required for affordable/attainable residential units exempt from payment of a C.B.C. Assuming, however, that most developments required to pay a C.B.C. would also be paying development charges, the units will be covered by the agreements required under the D.C.A. These agreements should be allowed to include the C.B.C. so that if a municipality needs to enforce the
provisions of an agreement, both development charges and C.B.C.s could be collected accordingly.
- These agreements will increase the administrative burden (and costs) on municipalities. Furthermore, the administration of these agreements will be cumbersome and will need to be monitored by both the upper-tier and lower-tier municipalities.
- It is unclear whether the bulletin provided by the Province will be specific to each municipality, each County/Region, or Province-wide. Due to the disparity in incomes across Ontario, affordability will vary significantly across these jurisdictions. Even within an individual municipality, there can be disparity in the average market rents and average market purchase prices.
- Where municipalities are imposing the C.B.C. on a per dwelling unit basis, they will need to ensure that the total C.B.C. being imposed for all eligible units is not in excess of the incremental development calculation (e.g., as per the example above, not greater than $3 \%$ of the total land value).


### 2.2 Limiting the Maximum C.B.C. in Proportion to Incremental Development:

 Where development or redevelopment is occurring on a parcel of land with an existing building or structure, the maximum C.B.C. that could be imposed would be calculated based on the incremental development only. For example, if a building is being expanded by $150,000 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. on a parcel of land with an existing $50,000 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$. building, then the maximum C.B.C. that could be imposed on the development would be $3 \%$ of total land value (i.e., 150,000 sq.ft. $/ 200,000$ sq.ft. $=75 \% \times 4 \%$ maximum prescribed rate $=3 \%$ of total land value).
## Analysis/Commentary

- With municipal C.B.C. by-laws imposing the C.B.C. based on the land total land value or testing the C.B.C. payable relative to total land value, there will be a reduction in revenues currently anticipated. At present, some municipal C.B.C. by-laws have provisions excluding existing buildings from the land valuation used to calculate the C.B.C. payable or to test the maximum charge that can be imposed. As such, this proposal largely seeks to clarify the administration of the charge.

We will continue to monitor the legislative changes and will keep you informed as the Bill proceeds.

Yours very truly,

## WATSON \& ASSOCIATES ECONOMISTS LTD.

Andrew Grunda, MBA, CPA, CMA, Principal
Gary Scandlan, BA, PLE, Managing Partner
Jamie Cook, MCIP, RPP, PLE, Managing Partner
Peter Simcisko, BA (Hons), MBE, Managing Partner
Sean-Michael Stephen, MBA, Managing Partner
Jack Ammendolia, BES, PLE, Managing Partner

November 16, 2022

## To Our Parkland Dedication By-Law Clients:

## Re: Assessment of Bill 23 (More Homes Built Faster Act)

On behalf of our many municipal clients, we are continuing to provide the most up-todate information on the proposed changes to the parkland dedication requirements of the Planning Act, as proposed by Bill 23 (More Homes Built Faster Act). As identified in our October 31, 2022 letter to you, our firm is providing an evaluation of the proposed changes to section 42 of the Planning Act, along with potential impacts arising from these changes. The following comments will be included in our formal response to the Province, which we anticipate presenting to the Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure and Cultural Policy later this week.

## 1. Overview Commentary

The Province has introduced Bill 23 with the following objective: "This plan is part of a long-term strategy to increase housing supply and provide attainable housing options for hardworking Ontarians and their families." The Province's plan is to address the housing crisis by targeting the creation of 1.5 million homes over the next 10 years. To implement this plan, Bill 23 introduces a number of changes to the Planning Act (along with nine other Acts, including the Development Charges Act (D.C.A.)), which seek to increase the supply of housing.

As discussed later in this letter, the proposed changes to parkland dedication would significantly reduce the amount of parkland conveyance and payments-in-lieu (P.I.L.) of parkland to municipalities. The proposed changes under Bill 23 would impact municipalities by:

- Reducing the amount of development subject to parkland dedication by exempting affordable, attainable, non-profit and additional residential dwelling units;
- Reducing P.I.L. revenues for some developments by grandfathering in charges by up to 2 years, reflecting land values at the time of Site Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications;
- Reducing and capping the alternative requirements for parkland dedication, which results in significant reductions in parkland conveyance and P.I.L. revenues, particularly for high-density developments;
- Increasing the administrative burden on municipalities by requiring the preparation of and consultation on a parks plan with the passage of a parkland
dedication by-law, whether utilizing the standard or alternative requirements, and by requiring the allocation and reporting on funds annually; and
- Limiting local decision-making by allowing the Province to prescribe criteria for municipal acceptance of incumbered lands and privately owned public space (POPs) for parks purposes.

It is anticipated that the resultant loss in parkland dedication from development will result in either a cross-subsidization from existing taxpayers having to provide increased funding for parks services to maintain planned levels of service in their community, or an erosion of service levels over time. The timing of these changes, and others proposed in Bill 23 to limit funding from development, is occurring at a time when municipalities are faced with increased funding challenges associated with cost inflation and the implementation of asset management plans under the Infrastructure for Jobs and Prosperity Act.

A summary of the proposed parkland dedication changes under section 42 of the Planning Act, along with our firm's commentary, is provided below.

## 2. Changes to Section 42 of the Planning Act

2.1 New Statutory Exemptions: Affordable residential units, attainable residential units, inclusionary zoning residential units, non-profit housing and additional residential unit developments will be exempt from parkland dedication requirements. For affordable, attainable, and inclusionary zoning residential units, the exemption is proposed to be implemented by:

- discounting the standard parkland dedication requirements (i.e., $5 \%$ of land) based on the proportion of development excluding affordable, attainable and inclusionary zoning residential units relative to the total residential units for the development; or
- where the alternative requirement is imposed, the affordable, attainable and inclusionary zoning residential units would be excluded from the calculation.

For non-profit housing and additional residential units, a parkland dedication by-law (i.e., a by-law passed under section 42 of the Planning Act) will not apply to these types of development:

- Affordable Rental Unit: as defined under subsection 4.1 (2) of the D.C.A., where rent is no more than $80 \%$ of the average market rent as defined by a new bulletin published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- Affordable Owned Unit: as defined under subsection 4.1 (3) of the D.C.A., where the price of the unit is no more than $80 \%$ of the average purchase price as defined by a new bulletin published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- Attainable Unit: as defined under subsection 4.1 (4) of the D.C.A., excludes affordable units and rental units, will be defined as prescribed development or class of development and sold to a person who is at "arm's length" from the seller.
- Inclusionary Zoning Units: as described under subsection 4.3 (2) of the D.C.A.
- Non-Profit Housing: as defined under subsection 4.2 (1) of the D.C.A.
- Additional Residential Units, including:
- A second unit in a detached, semi-detached, or rowhouse if all buildings and ancillary structures cumulatively contain no more than one residential unit;
- A third unit in a detached, semi-detached, or rowhouse if no buildings or ancillary structures contain any residential units; and
- One residential unit in a building or structure ancillary to a detached, semidetached, or rowhouse on a parcel of urban land, if the detached, semidetached, or rowhouse contains no more than two residential units and no other buildings or ancillary structures contain any residential units.


## Analysis/Commentary

- While reducing municipal requirements for the conveyance of land or P.I.L. of parkland may provide a further margin for builders to create additional affordable housing units, the proposed parkland dedication exemptions will increase the financial burdens on municipalities to fund these exemptions from property tax sources (in the absence of any financial participation by senior levels of government) or erode municipalities' planned level of parks service.
- The definition of "attainable" is unclear, as this has not yet been defined in the regulations to the D.C.A.
- Under the proposed changes to the D.C.A, municipalities will have to enter into agreements to ensure these units remain affordable and attainable over a period of time, which will increase the administrative burden (and costs) on municipalities. An agreement does not appear to be required for affordabie/ attainable units exempt from parkland dedication. Assuming, however, that most developments required to convey land or provide P.I.L. of parkland would also be required to pay development charges, the units will be covered by the agreements required under the D.C.A. As such, the Planning Act changes should provide for P.I.L. requirements if the status of the development changes during the period.
- It is unclear whether the bulletin provided by the Province to determine if a development is affordable will be specific to each municipality or aggregated by County/Region or Province. Due to the disparity in incomes across Ontario, affordability will vary significantly across these jurisdictions. Even within an individual municipality there can be disparity in the average market rents and average market purchase prices.
- While the proposed exemptions for non-profit housing and additional residential units may be easily applied for municipalities imposing the alternative requirement, as these requirements are imposed on a per residential unit basis, it is unclear at this time how a by-law requiring the standard provision of $5 \%$ of residential land would be applied.
2.2 Determination of Parkland Dedication: Similar to the rules under the D.C.A., the determination of parkland dedication for a building permit issued within two years of a Site Plan and/or Zoning By-law Amendment approval would be subject to the requirements in the by-law as at the date of planning application submission.


## Analysis/Commentary

- If passed as currently drafted, these changes would not apply to site plan or zoning by-law applications made before subsection 12 (6) of Schedule 9 of the More Homes Built Faster Act comes into force.
- For applications made after the in-force date, this would represent a lag in P.I.L. value provided to municipalities, as it would represent the respective land value up to two years prior vs. current value at building permit issuance. For municipalities having to purchase parkland, this will put additional funding pressure on property tax funding sources to make up the difference, or further erode the municipality's planned level of parks service.
2.3 Alternative Parkland Dedication Requirement: The following amendments are proposed for the imposition of the alternative parkland dedication requirements:
- The alternative requirement of 1 hectare (ha) per 300 dwelling units would be reduced to 1 ha per 600 dwelling units where land is being conveyed. Where the municipality imposes P.I.L. requirements, the amendments would reduce the amount from 1 ha per 500 dwelling units to 1 ha per 1,000 net residential units.
- Proposed amendments clarify that the alternative requirement would only be calculated on the incremental units of development/redevelopment.
- The alternative requirement would be capped at $10 \%$ of the land area or land value where the land proposed for development or redevelopment is 5 ha or less; and $15 \%$ of the land area or land value where the land proposed for development or redevelopment is greater than 5 ha.


## Analysis/Commentary

- If passed as currently drafted, the decrease in the alternative requirements for land conveyed and P.I.L. would not apply to building permits issued before subsection 12 (8) of Schedule 9 of the More Homes Built Faster Act comes into force.
- Most municipal parkland dedication by-laws only imposed the alternative requirements on incremental development. As such, the proposed amendments
for net residential units seek to clarify the matter where parkland dedication bylaws are unclear.
- Section 42 previously imposed the alternative requirement caps of $10 \%$ and $15 \%$ of land area or value, depending on the respective developable land area, for developments only within designated transit-oriented communities. By repealing subsection 42 (3.2) of the Planning Act, these caps would apply to all developable lands under the by-law.
- As illustrated in the figure below, lowering the alternative parkland dedication requirement and imposing caps based on the developable land area will place significant downward pressure on the amount of parkland dedication provided to municipalities, particularly those municipalities with significant amounts of highdensity development. For example:
- Low-density development of 20 units per net ha (uph), with a person per unit (P.P.U.) occupancy of 3.4 , would have produced a land conveyance of 0.98 ha per 1,000 population. The proposed change would reduce this to 0.74 ha, approximately $75 \%$ of current levels.
- Medium-density development of 50 uph, with a P.P.U. of 2.6 would produce land conveyance at $50 \%$ of current levels ( 0.64 vs. 1.28 ha/1,000 population).
- Low-rise development of 150 uph, with a P.P.U. of 2.6 would produce land conveyance at $20 \%$ of current levels ( $0.43 \mathrm{vs} .2 .15 \mathrm{ha} / 1,000$ population). P.I.L. would be approximately $1 / 3$ of current levels.
- High-rise development of 300 uph, with a P.P.U. of 2.6 would produce land conveyance at $10 \%$ of current levels ( 0.22 vs. $2.15 \mathrm{ha} / 1,000$ population). P.I.L. would be approximately $17 \%$ of current levels. ${ }^{[1]}$
${ }^{[1]}$ Low-rise and high-rise developments with sites larger than 5 ha would only be marginally better under the proposed changes, at $30 \%$ and $15 \%$ of land conveyance and $50 \%$ and $25 \%$ P.I.L., respectively.

- Based on the proposed alternative requirement rates and land area caps, municipalities would be better off:
- For land conveyance, imposing the alternative requirement for densities greater than 30 units per ha.
- Sites of 5 ha or less, land conveyance would be capped at $10 \%$ of land area at densities greater than 60 units per ha.
- Sites greater than 5 ha, land conveyance would be capped at $15 \%$ of land area at densities greater than 90 units per ha.
- For P.I.L. of parkland, imposing the alternative requirement for densities greater than 50 units per ha.
- Sites of 5 ha or less, land conveyance would be capped at $10 \%$ of land area at densities greater than 100 units per ha.
- Sites greater than 5 ha, land conveyance would be capped at $15 \%$ of land area at densities greater than 150 units per ha.
- For densities less than 30 units per ha, imposing the standard requirement of $5 \%$ of land area for land conveyance and P.I.L. of parkland.
2.4 Parks Plan: The preparation of a publicly available parks plan as part of enabling an Official Plan will be required at the time of passing a parkland dedication by-law under section 42 of the Planning Act.


## Analysis/Commentary

- The proposed change will still require municipal Official Plans to contain specific policies dealing with the provision of land for parks or other public recreational purposes where the alternative requirement is used.
- The requirement to prepare and consult on a parks plan prior to passing a by-law under section 42 would now appear to equally apply to a by-law including the standard parkland dedication requirements, as well as the alternative parkland dedication requirements. This will result in an increase in the administrative burden (and cost) for municipalities using the standard parkland dedication requirements.
- Municipalities imposing the alternative requirement in a parkland dedication bylaw on September 18, 2020 had their by-law expire on September 18, 2022 as a result of the COVID-19 Economic Recovery Act amendments. Many municipalities recently undertook to pass a new parkland dedication by-law, examining their needs for parkland and other recreational assets. Similar transitional provisions for existing parkland dedication by-laws should be provided with sufficient time granted to allow municipalities to prepare and consult on the required parks plan.
2.5 Identification of Lands for Conveyance: Owners will be allowed to identify lands to meet parkland conveyance requirements, within regulatory criteria. These lands may include encumbered lands and privately owned public space (POPs).

Municipalities may enter into agreements with the owners of the land regarding POPs to enforce conditions, and these agreements may be registered on title. The suitability of land for parks and recreational purposes will be appealable to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT).

## Analysis/Commentary

- The proposed changes allow the owner of land to identify encumbered lands for parkland dedication consistent with the provisions available to the Minister of Infrastructure to order such lands within transit-oriented communities. Similar to the expansion of parkland dedication caps, these changes would allow this to occur for all developable lands under the by-law. The proposed changes go further to allow for an interest in land, or POPs.
- The municipality may refuse the land identified for conveyance, providing notice to the owner with such requirements as prescribed. The owner, however, may appeal the decision to the OLT. The hearing would result in the Tribunal determining if the lands identified are in accordance with the criteria prescribed. These "criteria" are unclear, as they have not yet been defined in the regulations.
- Many municipal parkland dedication by-laws do not except encumber lands of POPs as suitable lands for parkland dedication. This is due, in part, to municipalities' inability to control the lands being dedicated or that they are not suitable to meet service levels for parks services. Municipalities that do accept these types of lands for parkland or other recreational purposes have clearly expressed such in their parkland dedication by-laws. The proposed changes would appear to allow the developers of the land, and the Province within prescribed criteria, to determine future parks service levels in municipalities in place of municipal council intent.
2.6 Requirement to Allocate Funds Recelved: Similar to the requirements for C.B.C.s, and proposed for the D.C.A. under Bill 23, annually beginning in 2023, municipalities will be required to spend or allocate at least $60 \%$ of the monies in a reserve fund at the beginning of the year.


## Analysis/Commentary

- This proposed change appears largely administrative, increasing the burden on municipalities. This change would not have a fiscal impact and could be achieved as a schedule to annual capital budget. Moreover, as the Province may prescribe annual reporting, similar to the requirements under the D.C.A. and for a C.B.C under the Planning Act.

We will continue to monitor the legislative changes and will keep you informed as the Bill proceeds.

Yours very truly,
WATSON \& ASSOCIATES ECONOMISTS LTD.

Andrew Grunda, MBA, CPA, CMA, Principal
Gary Scandlan, BA, PLE, Managing Partner
Jamie Cook, MCIP, RPP, PLE, Managing Partner
Peter Simcisko, BA (Hons), MBE, Managing Partner
Sean-Michael Stephen, MBA, Managing Partner
Jack Ammendolia, BES, PLE, Managing Partner

November 16, 2022

To Laurie Scott, MPP, Chair of the Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure, and Cultural Policy:

Re: Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022
Firstly, on behalf of Watson \& Associates Economists Ltd. (Watson), we would like to thank you for receiving our comments on the Province's proposed changes to the Development Charges Act (D.C.A.), Planning Act, and Conservation Authorities Act, by way of Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act. The following letter is submitted to the Standing Committee on Heritage, Infrastructure, and Cultural Policy (the "Standing Committee") to supplement the presentation by Gary Scandlan, Managing Partner, on November 17, 2022.

Watson is one of Canada's leading economic consulting firms, comprising municipal economists, planners, accountants, and support staff. The firm has been in operation since 1982. Our work has involved many aspects of municipal finance and economics, including assisting municipalities across the Province with development charges (D.C.s) studies, community benefits charges (C.B.C.) studies, parkland dedication studies, fiscal impact assessments, full cost user fee pricing models, demographic forecasts, growth management studies, and more.

Watson appreciates that the lack of attainable housing is an important issue facing the Province today. This letter, however, provides some commentary on how the Bill may negatively impact the Province's goal to "increase housing supply and provide attainable housing options for hardworking Ontarians and their families," along with the financial burden this legislation will have on municipalities and existing homeowners.

## 1. Impact on Housing Supply

As stated by the Province, the goal is to create an additional 1.5 million new homes over the next 10 years; however, the changes proposed in Bill 23 may actually limit the supply of housing. For urban growth to occur, water and wastewater services must be in place before building permits can be issued for housing. Most municipalities assume the risk of constructing this infrastructure and wait for development to occur. Currently, $26 \%$ of municipalities providing water/wastewater services are carrying negative D.C. reserve fund balances for these services ${ }^{[1]}$ and many others are carrying significant

[^2]growth-related debt. The following provides a list of the changes to the various pieces of legislation and how they would negatively impact the supply of housing.

## Development Charges Act

- Mandatory Phase-in: The Bill proposes to phase-in the D.C. over the first fiveyears of being in force. A review of various municipal D.C. by-laws indicates this proposed phase-in will cause a reduction in the amount of D.C. revenue collected by approximately $10 \%$ over the phase-in period. This loss in revenue will need to be funded by existing taxpayers, thus subsidizing growth. With respect to water, wastewater, and roads services, if the municipality does not have the ability to fund this lost revenue, it may delay the timing of capital projects, which in turn, will delay the availability of land for the construction of new homes. Additionally, this phase-in would apply to non-residential development. It is unclear how this would increase the housing supply. This matter is further compounded by the loss of revenue due to the additional statutory exemptions discussed in section 2 of this letter.
- Removal of Housing Services: Upper-tier and single-tier municipalities across the Province utilize D.C.s to help fund the construction of new affordable housing units with the goal of providing affordable housing to those in need. The removal of housing services as a D.C.-eligible service will reduce municipalities' participation in creating assisted/affordable housing units. Based on present D.C. by-laws, over $\$ 2.2$ billion in net growth-related expenditures providing for over 47,000 affordable housing units (or 3.1\% of the Province's 1.5 million housing target) would be impacted by this proposed change.
- Removal of Studies from the Definition of Capital Costs: Studies, such as Official Plans and Secondary Plans, are required to establish when, where, and how a municipality will grow. Master Plans, environmental assessments and other studies are required to understand the servicing needs development will place on infrastructure such as water, wastewater, stormwater, and roads. These studies are necessary to inform the servicing required to establish the supply of lands for development; without these servicing studies, additional development cannot proceed. Removing direct funding for these studies would restrict/delay the supply of serviced land and would be counter to the Province's intent to create additional housing units.


## Planning Act

- Removal of Planning Policy and Approval Responsibilities: Removal of these policies and responsibilities from the Regions of Durham, Halton, Niagara, Peel, Waterloo, and York, as well as the County of Simcoe (and potentially others in the future) may result in disjointed planning policies and a lack of coordination of Regional water and wastewater infrastructure. Lower-tier municipalities may have significantly different goals which may lead to inefficient
phasing/staging of development lands, less coordination of servicing plans, and an increased administrative burden for both lower-tier and upper-tier municipalities, as well as the Province.


## 2. Additional Financial Burden on Municipalities and Taxpayers

The proposed changes to the various Acts will have significant financial impacts on Ontario's municipalities along with their respective taxpayers. It is anticipated that these changes are in direct conflict with the principle that "growth pays for growth" and will put additional pressure on property taxes and water and wastewater rates. This increase in funding of growth-related needs from existing taxpayers and ratepayers will create affordability issues for existing homeowners, thus transferring the financial burden of home ownership, not reducing it. The following provides a summary of the proposed changes and how they would increase the financial burden on municipalities and existing taxpayers.

## Development Charges Act

- Additional Statutory Exemptions (also applies to C.B.C.s and Parkland Dedication) and Discounts: The Bill provides for a number of statutory exemptions for additional residential units, affordable housing, attainable housing, non-profit housing, and affordable units through inclusionary zoning. In addition, discounts for rental housing will be required.
- The definition of "affordable" is based on $80 \%$ of the market value, whereas municipalities define "affordable" relative to income levels. This broader definition will result in more housing units being eligible for D.C. exemptions which do not meet municipal definitions of "affordable."
- The definition of "attainable" appears to be even more broad; however, no details are provided on the proposed regulatory definition.
- These exemptions will result in a loss of D.C. revenue of approximately $10-15 \%$ that the municipalities will have to fund from other sources (i.e., property taxes or water/wastewater rates).
- Mandatory Phase-in: As noted in section 1 above, this may result in a loss of $10 \%$ in D.C. revenues to municipalities.
- Removal of Housing Services: As noted in section 1 above, based on present D.C. by-laws in place, over $\$ 2.2$ billion in net growth-related expenditures providing for over 47,000 units (or $3.1 \%$ of the Province's 1.5 million housing target) would be impacted by this change.
- Revised Definition of Capital Costs: The Bill proposes to remove the cost of land for certain services (yet to be defined) and studies from the definition of costs eligible for D.C.s.
- Land - Land represents a significant cost for some municipalities in the purchase of property to provide services to new residents (e.g., water
plants, new roads, etc.). This is a cost required due to growth and should be funded by new development, if not dedicated by development directly.
- Studies - Master planning and Environmental Assessments are integral to construction of hard infrastructure required to service new development. Removing these costs from being D.C. eligible will shift the burden of these growth-related costs to existing taxpayers and ratepayers.


## Planning Act - Parkland Dedication

- Reduction in Alternative Parkland Dedication Requirements: The alternative dedication requirement where land is being conveyed of 1 hectare (ha) per 300 dwelling units would be reduced to 1 ha per 600 dwelling units. Where the municipality imposes payment in lieu (P.I.L.) alternative requirements, the amendments would reduce the amount from 1 ha per 500 dwelling units to 1 ha per 1,000 net residential units. Municipalities already face challenges with the supply of adequate parkland due to the rising cost of land and current limitations under the Planning Act relative to municipal parkland standards. By cutting the parkland dedication requirements in half, this will further reduce the municipalities' ability to purchase parkland and will result in additional burden on taxpayers to maintain municipal parkland standards or result in a reduction in the level of parks service over time.
- 10-15\% Cap on Land Area for Alternative Rate: The alternative requirement would be capped at $10 \%$ of the land area or land value where the land proposed for development or redevelopment is 5 ha or less; and $15 \%$ of the land area or land value where the land proposed for development or redevelopment is greater than 5 ha. These caps would significantly reduce parkland dedication, particularly for high-density residential development and place the maximum dedication levels equivalent to medium-density developments. Given that highdensity developments provide limited parklands on site, the contribution made towards creating more land to service the land needs generated is significantly under contributed. Again, these shortfalls will have to be funded by property taxes if Council wishes to maintain municipal parkland standards for existing and future residents.


## 3. Summary Commentary

The above summarizes our concerns with the proposed legislative changes and their impact on the housing supply as well as their financial impact to municipalities and their taxpayers. There are a number of other concerns with the proposed legislation that we have outlined in our detailed responses provided in the attachments. These are as appended as follows:

- Attachment 1 - Changes to the D.C.A.
- Attachment 2 - Changes to the Planning Act
- Attachment 3 - Changes to the Planning Act - Parkland Dedication
- Attachment 4 - Changes to the Planning Act - Community Benefits Charges
- Attachment 5 - Changes to the Conservation Authorities Act.

To conclude, while the goal of these proposed changes is to reduce the upfront cost to a new home purchaser, the funding loss for this will come from the existing taxpayer, i.e., existing residents and businesses subsidizing new home purchasers, hence increasing housing affordability concerns.

Over the past 40 years, our firm has undertaken numerous fiscal impact studies of residential development and, as a whole, the new taxes and fees generated by residential growth do not equal the new operating costs required to support these developments. As well, based on past changes to the D.C.A., historical reductions have not resulted in a decrease in the price of housing, hence it is difficult to relate the loss of needed infrastructure funding to affordable housing.

As a result, we would provide the following considerations for the Standing Committee:

1. From the proposed legislation, phase-in charges and exemptions for services essential to creating developable land supply (water, wastewater, stormwater and roads) should be removed...or funded by grants from senior levels of government.
2. Reduction in parkland contributions, caps for high-density development and developer ability to provide encumbered lands/POPS should be removed from parkland dedication legislation to continue to allow municipalities to determine the appropriate level of service for parks.
3. Alternatively, to minimize the overall impact on the taxpayer and ratepayer, provide access to other revenue sources (e.g., HST, land transfer tax) to fund all D.C., parkland dedication, and C.B.C. revenue losses.
4. Municipal housing should continue as an eligible D.C. service.

We again want to thank the Standing Committee for receiving our presentation and correspondence and would appreciate the Committee's consideration of our concerns.

Yours very truly,
WATSON \& ASSOCIATES ECONOMISTS LTD.

Andrew Grunda, MBA, CPA, CMA, Principal
Gary Scandlan, BA, PLE, Managing Partner
Jamie Cook, MCIP, RPP, PLE, Managing Partner
Peter Simcisko, BA (Hons), MBE, Managing Partner
Sean-Michael Stephen, MBA, Managing Partner
Jack Ammendolia, BES, PLE, Managing Partner
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## Attachment 1 - Changes to the D.C.A.

1. Additional Residential Unit Exemption: The rules for these exemptions are now provided in the D.C.A., rather than the regulations and are summarized as follows:

- Exemption for residential units in existing rental residential buildings - For rental residential buildings with four or more residential units, the greater of one unit or $1 \%$ of the existing residential units will be exempt from D.C.
- Exemption for additional residential units in existing and new residential buildings - The following developments will be exempt from a D.C.:
- A second unit in a detached, semi-detached, or rowhouse if all buildings and ancillary structures cumulatively contain no more than one residential unit;
- A third unit in a detached, semi-detached, or rowhouse if no buildings or ancillary structures contain any residential units; and
- One residential unit in a building or structure ancillary to a detached, semidetached, or rowhouse on a parcel of urban land, if the detached, semidetached, or rowhouse contains no more than two residential units and no other buildings or ancillary structures contain any residential units.


## Analysis/Commentary

- For existing single-family homes, this change will not have an impact. For other existing low/medium-density units and for all new units, however, this allowance of a third additional unit that will be exempt from D.C.s adds a further revenue loss burden to municipalities to finance infrastructure. This is of greatest concern for water and wastewater services where each additional unit will require additional capacity in water and wastewater treatment plants. This additional exemption will cause a reduction in D.C.s and hence will require funding by water and wastewater rates.
- Other services, such as transit and active transportation, will also be impacted as increased density will create a greater need for these services, and without an offsetting revenue to fund the capital needs, service levels provided may be reduced in the future.

2. Removal of Housing as an Eligible D.C. Service: Housing services would be removed as an eligible service. Municipalities with by-laws that include a charge for housing services can no longer collect for this service once subsection 2 (2) of Schedule 3 of the Bill comes into force.

## Analysis/Commentary

- The removal of housing services will reduce municipalities' participation in creating assisted/affordable housing units and/or put further burden on municipal
taxpayers. This service seeks to construct municipal affordable housing for growing communities. The removal of this service could reduce the number of affordable units being constructed over the next ten years, if the municipalities can no longer afford the construction. Based on present D.C. by-laws in place, over $\$ 2.2$ billion in net growth-related expenditures providing for over 47,000 additional units (or $3.1 \%$ of the Province's 1.5 million housing target) would be impacted by this change.

3. New Statutory Exemptions: Affordable units, attainable units, inclusionary zoning units and non-profit housing developments will be exempt from the payment of D.C.s, as follows:

- Affordable Rental Units: Where rent is no more than $80 \%$ of the average market rent as defined by a new bulletin published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- Affordable Owned Units: Where the price of the unit is no more than $80 \%$ of the average purchase price as defined by a new bulletin published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- Attainable Units: Excludes affordable units and rental units; will be defined as prescribed development or class of development and sold to a person who is at "arm's length" from the seller.
- Note: for affordable and attainable units, the municipality shall enter into an agreement that ensures the unit remains affordable or attainable for 25 years.
- Inclusionary Zoning Units: Affordable housing units required under inclusionary zoning by-laws will be exempt from a D.C.
- Non-Profit Housing: Non-profit housing units are exempt from D.C. instalment payments due after this section comes into force.


## Analysis/Commentary

- While this is an admirable goal to create additional affordable housing units, further D.C. exemptions will continue to provide additional financial burdens on municipalities to fund these exemptions without the financial participation of senior levels of government.
- The definition of "attainable" is unclear, as this has not yet been defined in the regulations.
- Municipalities will have to enter into agreements to ensure these units remain affordable and attainable over a period of time which will increase the administrative burden (and costs) on municipalities. These administrative burdens will be cumbersome and will need to be monitored by both the upper-tier and lower-tier municipalities.
- It is unclear whether the bulletin provided by the Province will be specific to each municipality, each County/Region, or Province-wide. Due to the disparity in
incomes across Ontario, affordability will vary significantly across these jurisdictions. Even within an individual municipality, there can be disparity in the average market rents and average market purchase prices.

4. Historical Level of Service: Currently, the increase in need for service is limited by the average historical level of service calculated over the ten year period preceding the preparation of the D.C. background study. This average will be extended to the historical 15-year period.

## Analysis/Commentary

- For municipalities experiencing significant growth in recent years, this may reduce the level of service cap, and the correspondingly D.C. recovery. For many other municipalities seeking to save for new facilities, this may reduce their overall recoveries and potentially delay construction.
- This further limits municipalities in their ability to finance growth-related capital expenditures where debt funding was recently issued. Given that municipalities are also legislated to address asset management requirements, their ability to incur further debt may be constrained.

5. Capital Costs: The definition of capital costs may be revised to prescribe services for which land or an interest in land will be restricted. Additionally, costs of studies, including the preparation of the D.C. background study, will no longer be an eligible capital cost for D.C. funding.

## Analysis/Commentary

- Land
- Land costs are proposed to be removed from the list of eligible costs for certain services (to be prescribed later). Land represents a significant cost for some municipalities in the purchase of property to provide services to new residents. This is a cost required due to growth and should be funded by new development, if not dedicated by development directly.
- Studies
- Studies, such as Official Plans and Secondary Plans, are required to establish when, where, and how a municipality will grow. These growthrelated studies should remain funded by growth.
- Master Plans and environmental assessments are required to understand the servicing needs development will place on hard infrastructure such as water, wastewater, stormwater, and roads. These studies are necessary to inform the servicing required to establish the supply of lands for development; without these servicing studies, additional development cannot proceed. This would restrict the supply of serviced land and would be counter to the Province's intent to create additional housing units.

6. Mandatory Phase-in of a D.C.: For all D.C. by-laws passed after June 1, 2022, the charge must be phased-in annually over the first five years the by-law is in force, as follows:

- Year $1-80 \%$ of the maximum charge;
- Year 2-85\% of the maximum charge;
- Year 3-90\% of the maximum charge;
- Year $4-95 \%$ of the maximum charge; and
- Year 5 to expiry - 100\% of the maximum charge.

Note: for a D.C. by-law passed on or after June 1, 2022, the phase-in provisions would only apply to D.C.s payable on or after the day subsection $5(7)$ of Schedule 3 of the Bill comes into force (i.e., no refunds are required for a D.C. payable between June 1, 2022 and the day the Bill receives Royal Assent). The phased-in charges also apply with respect to the determination of the charges under section 26.2 of the Act (i.e., eligible site plan and zoning by-law amendment applications).

## Analysis/Commentary

- Water, wastewater, stormwater, and roads are essential services for creating land supply for new homes. These expenditures are significant and must be made in advance of growth. As a result, the municipality assumes the investment in the infrastructure and then assumes risk that the economy will remain buoyant enough to allow for the recovery of these costs in a timely manner. Otherwise, these growth-related costs will directly impact the existing rate payer.
- The mandatory phase-in will result in municipalities losing approximately $10 \%$ to $15 \%$ of revenues over the five-year phase-in period. For services such as water, wastewater, stormwater, and to some extent roads, this will result in the municipality having to fund this shortfall from other sources (i.e., taxes and rates). This may result in: 1) the delay of construction of infrastructure that is required to service new homes; and 2) a negative impact on the tax/rate payer who will have to fund these D.C. revenue losses.
- Growth has increased in communities outside the Greater Toronto Area (G.T.A.) (e.g. municipalities in the outer rim), requiring significant investments in water and wastewater treatment services. Currently, there are several municipalities in the process of negotiating with developing landowners to provide these treatment services. For example, there are two municipalities within the outer rim (one is 10 km from the G.T.A. while the other is 50 km from the G.T.A.) imminently about to enter into developer agreements and award tenders for the servicing of the equivalent of 8,000 single detached units (or up to 20,000 high-density units). This proposed change to the D.C.A. alone will stop the creation of those units due to debt capacity issues and the significant financial impact placed on
ratepayers due to the D.C. funding loss. Given our work throughout the Province, it is expected that there will be many municipalities in similar situations.
- Based on 2020 Financial Information Return (F.I.R.) data, there are 214 municipalities with D.C. reserve funds. Of those, 130 provide water and wastewater services and of those, 34 municipalities (or $26 \%$ ) are carrying negative water and wastewater reserve fund balances. As a result, it appears many municipalities are already carrying significant burdens in investing in water/ wastewater infrastructure to create additional development lands. This proposed change will worsen the problem and, in many cases, significantly delay or inhibit the creation of serviced lands in the future.
- Note that it is unclear how the phase-in provisions will affect amendments to existing D.C. by-laws.

7. D.C. By-law Expiry: A D.C. by-law would expire ten years after the day it comes into force. This extends the by-law's life from five years, currently. D.C. by-laws that expire prior to subsection 6 (1) of the Bill coming into force would not be allowed to extend the life of the by-law.

## Analysis/Commentary

- The extension of the life of the D.C. by-law would appear to not have an immediate financial impact on municipalities. Due to the recent increases in actual construction costs experienced by municipalities, however, the index used to adjust the D.C. for inflation is not keeping adequate pace (e.g., the most recent D.C. index has increased at $15 \%$ over the past year; however, municipalities are experiencing 40\%-60\% increases in tender prices). As a result, amending the present by-laws to update cost estimates for planned infrastructure would place municipalities in a better financial position.
- As a result of the above, delaying the updating of current D.C. by-laws for five more years would reduce actual D.C. recoveries and place the municipalities at risk of underfunding growth-related expenditures.

8. Instalment Payments: Non-profit housing development has been removed from the instalment payment section of the Act (section 26.1), as these units are now exempt from the payment of a D.C.

## Analysis/Commentary

- This change is more administrative in nature due to the additional exemption for non-profit housing units.

9. Rental Housing Discount: The D.C. payable for rental housing development will be reduced based on the number of bedrooms in each unit as follows:

- Three or more bedrooms - $25 \%$ reduction;
- Two bedrooms - 20\% reduction; and
- All other bedroom quantities $-15 \%$ reduction.


## Analysis/Commentary

- Further discounts to D.C.s will place an additional financial burden on municipalities to fund these reductions.
- The discount for rental housing does not appear to have the same requirements as the affordable and attainable exemptions to enter into an agreement for a specified length of time. This means a developer may build a rental development and convert the development (say to a condominium) in the future hence avoiding the full D.C. payment for its increase in need for service.

10. Maximum Interest Rate for Instalments and Determination of Charge for Eligible Site Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications: No maximum interest rate was previously prescribed. Under the proposed changes, the maximum interest rate would be set at the average prime rate plus $1 \%$. How the average prime rate is determined is further defined under section 9 of Schedule 3 of the Bill. This maximum interest rate provision would apply to all instalment payments and eligible site plan and zoning by-law amendment applications occurring after section 9 of Schedule 3 of the Bill comes into force.

## Analysis/Commentary

- Setting the maximum interest rate at $1 \%+$ the average prime rate appears consistent with the current approach for some municipalities but is a potential reduction for others.
- It appears a municipality can select the adjustment date for which the average prime rate would be calculated.
- The proposed change will require municipalities to change their interest rate policies, or amend their by-laws, as well as increase the administrative burden on municipalities.

11. Requirement to Allocate Funds Received: Similar to the requirements for community benefits charges, annually, beginning in 2023, municipalities will be required to spend or allocate at least $60 \%$ of the monies in a reserve fund at the beginning of the year for water, wastewater, and services related to a highway. Other services may be prescribed by the regulation.

## Analysis/Commentary

- This proposed change appears largely administrative and would not have a financial impact on municipalities. This can be achieved as a schedule as part of the annual capital budget process or can be included as one of the schedules
with the annual D.C. Treasurer Statement. This, however, will increase the administrative burden on municipalities.

12. Amendments to Section 44 (Front-ending): This section has been updated to include the new mandatory exemptions for affordable, attainable, and non-profit housing, along with required affordable residential units under inclusionary zoning by-laws.

## Analysis/Commentary

- This change is administrative to align with the additional statutory exemptions.

13. Amendments to Section 60: Various amendments to this section were required to align the earlier described changes.

## Analysis/Commentary

- These changes are administrative in nature.
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## Attachment 2 - Changes to the Planning Act

The following summary of proposed key housing and planning related changes, along with our firm's commentary, is provided below. It is noted that this commentary specifically focuses on the impacts of Bill 23 regarding long-range planning and growth management initiatives at the municipal level.

## 1. Streamlining Municipal Planning Responsibilities

Schedule 9 of the Bill proposes a number of amendments to the Planning Act. Subsection 1 (1) of the Act is proposed to be amended to provide for two different classes of upper-tier municipalities; those that have planning responsibilities and those that do not. Changes are proposed to remove the planning policy and approval responsibilities from the following upper-tier municipalities: Regions of Durham, Halton, Niagara, Peel, Waterloo, and York, as well as the County of Simcoe. In addition, the proposed changes could potentially be applied to additional upper-tier municipalities in the future via regulation.

The proposed amendments under Schedule 9 of the Bill introduce numerous questions related to the approach to ensuring effective leadership, management and integration of regional and local land use planning across the affected jurisdictions. In addition to providing a broad vision and planning direction with respect to the longterm management of urban, rural and natural systems, upper-tier municipal planning authorities also play a critical role regarding the coordination, phasing, and delivery of water, wastewater and transportation infrastructure as well as other municipal services. The Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (P.P.S.) sets out specific responsibilities for upper-tier municipalities, in consultation with lower-tier municipalities, related to planning coordination, housing, economic development, natural environment and municipal infrastructure. Furthermore, the P.P.S. directs upper-tier municipal planning authorities to provide policy direction to lower-tier municipalities on matters that cross municipal boundaries.

While the proposed amendment to the Bill aims to streamline the land use planning process across the affected municipalities, it risks increasing complexity and miscommunication while adding to the technical and administrative efforts of both lower-tier and upper-tier municipalities, as well as the Province.

Furthermore, it would remove critical planning resources and knowledge at the upper-tier level which are required when addressing matters that cross technical disciplines and municipal jurisdictions. This would potentially result in disjointed efforts and outcomes with respect to local planning approvals and regional municipal service delivery.

## 2. Review of the Potential Integration of A Place to Grow and the Provincial Policy Statement (P.P.S.)

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is undertaking a housing-focused policy review of A Place to Grow: the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (G.G.H.), 2019, as amended, hereinafter referred to as the Growth Plan, and the P.P.S. The Province is reviewing the potential integration of the P.P.S. and the Growth Plan into a new Province-wide planning policy framework that is intended to:

- Leverage housing-supportive policies of both policy documents, while removing or streamlining policies that result in duplication, delays or burden the development of housing;
- Ensure key growth management and planning tools are available to increase housing supply and support a range and mix of housing options;
- Continue to protect the environment, cultural heritage, and public health and safety; and
- Ensure that growth is supported with the appropriate amount and type of community infrastructure.

Since the release of the Growth Plan in 2006 under the Places to Grow Act, 2005, G.G.H. municipalities have been in a continuous cycle of developing and defending growth management processes and Official Plan updates. Over the past several years, all G.G.H. upper-tier, single-tier, and most lower-tier municipalities have initiated the process of updating their respective Official Plans to bring these documents into conformity with the Growth Plan. Within the G.G.H., this process is referred to as a Municipal Comprehensive Review (M.C.R.). Many of these municipalities have completed their draft M.C.R. analyses and draft Official Plan updates for provincial approval, while several others are approaching completion.

The required technical analysis associated with the growth analysis and urban land needs assessment component of the M.C.R. process is set out in the Provincial Land Needs Assessment (L.N.A.) methodology, which is specific to G.G.H.
municipalities. ${ }^{[1]}$ The M.C.R. process has required tremendous time and effort on behalf of municipalities, consulting agencies, stakeholder groups and involved residents. The results of these efforts represent a key planning milestone for all G.G.H. municipalities and provide a solid foundation to build on as it relates to future growth management implementation, monitoring and benchmarking.

Ontario municipalities located outside the G.G.H. are also now in the process of updating their respective Official Plans in accordance with the P.P.S. For municipalities in these jurisdictions, this process is referred to as a Comprehensive Review (C.R.). While there are potential benefits regarding the consolidation of the

[^3]P.P.S. and the Growth Plan, as it relates to the M.C.R. and C.R. process, there are a number of issues that should be considered regarding this effort, particularly as they relate to long-term growth management and urban land needs, discussed below.

## Long-Term Population and Employment Forecasts

Schedule 3 of the Growth Plan establishes minimum long-term population and employment forecasts for upper-tier and single-tier municipalities in the G.G.H. to the year 2051. The Ministry of Finance (M.O.F.) also establishes long-term population forecasts for all Ontario Census Divisions (C.D.s), which typically represent upper-tier municipalities, separated municipalities, and single-tier municipalities. The M.O.F. forecasts are not recognized as official forecasts for planning purposes in Ontario; however, they are updated annually and can be used to inform population forecasts in Official Plans. Under a consolidated Growth Plan and P.P.S., consideration would need to be given to the role and source of growth forecasts established by the Province for all Ontario municipalities.

## Provincial Land Needs Assessment Methodology Guidelines

As previously noted, the L.N.A. methodology for G.G.H. municipalities was updated by the Province in 2020. In accordance with the Growth Plan, the L.N.A. methodology provides a step-by-step approach to conducting growth forecasts and urban land need assessments for upper-tier and single-tier municipalities for both Community Areas (i.e., living areas) and Employment Areas. All other Ontario municipalities rely on the 1995 Provincial Projection Methodology Guidelines (P.P.M.G.) for guidance regarding the technical approach to growth forecasts and urban land need assessments. It is noted that the 1995 P.P.M.G. suggests that a simplified methodology can be used for smaller or low-growth municipalities. It is further noted that the P.P.M.G. is meant to be used as "best practices" and the guidelines are not mandatory. Under a consolidated Growth Plan and P.P.S., consideration is required regarding the application of a standardized L.N.A. methodology for all Ontario municipalities.

## Addressing Urban Land Needs for Urban Settlement Areas

An important term used in the P.P.S. in the context of both urban land needs and housing affordability is the Regional Market Area (R.M.A.). The R.M.A. is defined in the P.P.S. and Growth Plan (with modifications) as follows:
"an area that has a high degree of social and economic interaction. The upper- or single-tier municipality, or planning area, will normally serve as the regional market area. However, where a regional market area extends significantly beyond these boundaries, then the regional market area may be based on the larger market area. Where regional market areas are
very large and sparsely populated, a smaller area, if defined in an official plan, may be utilized."

With respect to urban residential land needs assessments, the broad objective of this policy is to ensure the efficient and wise use of all designated urban lands, both occupied and vacant, within the R.M.A. before expanding Urban Settlement Area boundaries. Across southern Ontario municipalities, a key challenge with the application of this policy is the mismatch of urban residential land needs at the urban settlement area level within the defined R.M.A. geography.

If the R.M.A. definition is interpreted too rigidly, it can constrain urban residential development within Urban Settlement Areas, and more broadly across entire municipalities, where identified urban land surpluses have been determined elsewhere within the R.M.A. Neither the P.P.S. nor the Growth Plan provide adequate direction for addressing residential urban land supply and demand mismatches within the R.M.A. Subsection 2.2.1.6 of the Growth Plan provides policy direction regarding Excess Lands, which applies exclusively to Outer Ring G.G.H. municipalities. Under a consolidated Growth Plan and P.P.S., a review of the R.M.A. and Excess Lands policies would be required to determine an appropriate and standardized approach to addressing localized urban residential land needs for Urban Settlement Areas and local municipalities.

## Residential Intensification Targets and Minimum Density Requirements

Subsection 2.2.7.2 of the Growth Plan provides direction with respect to minimum greenfield density targets for G.G.H. upper-tier and single-tier municipalities. These densities range between 40 and 50 people and jobs per gross hectare (ha). Minimum density requirements are also prescribed in the Growth Plan for Strategic Growth Areas, such as Urban Growth Centres and Major Transit Station Areas (M.T.S.A.s). The P.P.S. does not prescribe minimum density targets for Ontario municipalities but does require municipalities to establish density targets for areas adjacent, or in proximity, to M.T.S.A.s and corridors.

Subsection 2.2.2.1 of the Growth Plan requires upper-tier and single-tier G.G.H. municipalities to establish minimum intensification targets within delineated built-up areas (B.U.A.s). These were established under the Growth Plan, 2006. The delineated B.U.A.s within G.G.H. municipalities have remained unchanged since the Growth Plan was established in 2006. The P.P.S. also requires municipalities to establish residential intensification targets but does not prescribe minimum density targets for Ontario municipalities. Furthermore, the P.P.S. does not require municipalities to delineate built area boundaries in Official Plans; however, some Ontario municipalities outside the G.G.H. have delineated built area boundaries for planning purposes. It is noted that the delineation of built area boundaries may be subject to change or update for municipalities outside the G.G.H., while B.U.A.s within the G.G.H. will remain fixed as of 2006. Under a consolidated Growth Plan
and P.P.S., a standardized approach to minimum density requirements and residential intensification targets would be required for all Ontario municipalities.

## Rural Housing

An identified area of the Growth Plan and P.P.S. review is to provide policy direction to enable more residential development in Rural Areas. Rural Settlement Areas include existing hamlets or similar existing small settlement areas that are established in Official Plans. These communities are typically serviced by individual, private, on-site water and/or private wastewater systems. Rural Settlement Areas provide clusters of business operations that are essential to future economic growth. Infilling and minor rounding out of existing residential and non-residential development within Rural Settlement Areas is important to ensure that these areas remain vibrant, sustainable and complete communities. Under a consolidated Growth Plan and P.P.S., enabling more residential development in Rural Settlement Areas, and Rural Areas more broadly, would need to be considered within the context of the existing provincial and local policy frameworks, the land use hierarchy identified in Official Plans, the provision of servicing, as well as the protection of natural heritage and agricultural lands.

## Employment Area Conversion

An identified area of the Growth Plan and P.P.S. review is to provide policy direction to streamline and simplify the conversion of Employment Areas to new residential and mixed-use development, where appropriate. Employment Areas form a vital component of a municipality's land use structure and represent an integral part of the local economic development potential and competitiveness of municipalities. If not carefully evaluated, the conversion of Employment Areas to non-employment uses can potentially lead to negative impacts on the local economy in several ways. First, Employment Area conversions can reduce employment opportunities, particularly in export-based sectors, creating local imbalances between population and employment. Second, Employment Area conversions can potentially erode employment land supply and lead to further conversion pressure as a result of encroachment of non-employment uses within, or adjacent to, Employment Areas. Finally, Employment Area conversions can potentially fragment existing Employment Areas, undermining their functionality and competitive position. Under a consolidated Growth Plan and P.P.S., policy direction regarding the conversion of Employment Areas should emphasize principles and criteria that examine both the quantity and quality of Employment Areas within the context of the local and regional market attributes, as well as the planned urban function of the subject conversion sites.

## 3. 2031 Municipal Housing Targets

The Province has identified that an additional 1.5 million new housing units are required to be built over the next decade to meet Ontario's current and forecast
housing needs. Furthermore, the Province has assigned municipal housing targets, identifying the number of new housing units needed by 2031, impacting 29 of Ontario's largest and many of the fastest growing single/lower tier municipalities. Key observations on the Province's plan are as follows:

- The municipal housing targets for 2031 collectively account for 1,229,000 units, representing about $82 \%$ of Ontario's overall 1.5 million new homes target.
- Of the 29 municipalities with housing targets identified, 25 are within the G.G.H. and four are located in other areas of southwestern and southeastern Ontario.
- Within the G.G.H. municipalities, the municipal housing targets are generally higher than approved housing forecasts. In non-G.G.H. municipalities, there is generally less discrepancy between the approved housing forecasts and the Province's targets. Having said that, the Municipal Housing Pledges are not intended to replace current municipal Official Plans.
- The municipal housing targets are based on current and future housing needs. A share of the overall housing need is attributed to a structural deficit in existing housing inventories, while a portion of the housing need is linked to anticipated population growth over the next decade.
- The housing targets are adapted from the housing needs assessment provided in the "Ontario's Need for 1.5 Million More Homes" report, prepared by Smart Prosperity Institute, dated August 2022.
- The impacted municipalities are being asked to prepare Municipal Housing Pledges to meet these housing targets. These pledges must include details on how the municipality will enable/support housing development through a range of planning, development approvals and infrastructure related initiatives.
- These housing pledges are not intended to replace current municipal Official Plans and are not expected to impact adopted municipal population or employment projections.
- While the municipal housing targets do not specify housing form, density, or geographic location (e.g., greenfield, intensification), it is anticipated that any needs beyond adopted housing forecasts will largely comprise rental and affordable housing units primarily located within B.U.A.s, and to a lesser extent, designated greenfield areas (D.G.A.s).
- To develop effective local policies and programs to support the achievement of the housing targets, it is recommended that municipalities assess their existing and future housing needs through a local lens, building on the high-level assessment provided by the Province.
- Local housing needs should be considered within a broader growth management framework, reflecting population, labour and employment/economic growth potential, and addressed through a planning, economic, fiscal and housing affordability lens.


## 4. Potential Changes to Inclusionary Zoning

Inclusionary zoning is a tool that can be used by municipalities to ensure the provision of affordable housing. Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 232/18 implements inclusionary zoning in Ontario. The proposed amendments to O. Reg 232/18 would:

- Establish $5 \%$ as the upper limit on the number of affordable housing units; the $5 \%$ limit would be based on either the number of units or percentage share of gross floor area of the total residential units; and
- Establish a maximum period of twenty-five (25) years over which the affordable housing units would be required to remain affordable.

While the proposed changes provide certainty with respect to affordable housing to be provided under inclusionary zoning, they greatly limit a municipality's ability to tailor the provision for affordable housing to the local market and for development feasibility considerations identified through the required Inclusionary Zoning Assessment Report.

## Attachment 3 - Changes to the Planning Act - Parkland Dedication

1. New Statutory Exemptions: Affordable residential units, attainable residential units, inclusionary zoning residential units, non-profit housing and additional residential unit developments will be exempt from parkland dedication requirements. For affordable, attainable, and inclusionary zoning residential units, the exemption is proposed to be implemented by:

- discounting the standard parkland dedication requirements (i.e., $5 \%$ of land) based on the proportion of development excluding affordable, attainable and inclusionary zoning residential units relative to the total residential units for the development; or
- where the alternative requirement is imposed, the affordable, attainable and inclusionary zoning residential units would be excluded from the calculation.

For non-profit housing and additional residential units, a parkland dedication by-law (i.e., a by-law passed under section 42 of the Planning Act) will not apply to these types of development:

- Affordable Rental Unit: as defined under subsection 4.1 (2) of the D.C.A., where rent is no more than $80 \%$ of the average market rent as defined by a new bulletin published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- Affordable Owned Unit: as defined under subsection 4.1 (3) of the D.C.A., where the price of the unit is no more than $80 \%$ of the average purchase price as defined by a new bulletin published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- Attainable Unit: as defined under subsection 4.1 (4) of the D.C.A., excludes affordable units and rental units, will be defined as prescribed development or class of development and sold to a person who is at "arm's length" from the seller.
- Inclusionary Zoning Units: as described under subsection 4.3 (2) of the D.C.A.
- Non-Profit Housing: as defined under subsection 4.2 (1) of the D.C.A.
- Additional Residential Units, including:
- A second unit in a detached, semi-detached, or rowhouse if all buildings and ancillary structures cumulatively contain no more than one residential unit;
- A third unit in a detached, semi-detached, or rowhouse if no buildings or ancillary structures contain any residential units; and
- One residential unit in a building or structure ancillary to a detached, semidetached, or rowhouse on a parcel of urban land, if the detached, semidetached, or rowhouse contains no more than two residential units and no other buildings or ancillary structures contain any residential units.


## Analysis/Commentary

- While reducing municipal requirements for the conveyance of land or P.I.L. of parkland may provide a further margin for builders to create additional affordable housing units, the proposed parkland dedication exemptions will increase the financial burdens on municipalities to fund these exemptions from property tax sources (in the absence of any financial participation by senior levels of government) or erode municipalities' planned level of parks service.
- The definition of "attainable" is unclear, as this has not yet been defined in the regulations to the D.C.A.
- Under the proposed changes to the D.C.A, municipalities will have to enter into agreements to ensure these units remain affordable and attainable over a period of time, which will increase the administrative burden (and costs) on municipalities. An agreement does not appear to be required for affordable/ attainable units exempt from parkland dedication. Assuming, however, that most developments required to convey land or provide P.I.L. of parkland would also be required to pay development charges, the units will be covered by the agreements required under the D.C.A. As such, the Planning Act changes should provide for P.I.L. requirements if the status of the development changes during the period.
- It is unclear whether the bulletin provided by the Province to determine if a development is affordable will be specific to each municipality or aggregated by County/Region or Province. Due to the disparity in incomes across Ontario, affordability will vary significantly across these jurisdictions. Even within an individual municipality there can be disparity in the average market rents and average market purchase prices.
- While the proposed exemptions for non-profit housing and additional residential units may be easily applied for municipalities imposing the alternative requirement, as these requirements are imposed on a per residential unit basis, it is unclear at this time how a by-law requiring the standard provision of $5 \%$ of residential land would be applied.

2. Determination of Parkland Dedication: Similar to the rules under the D.C.A., the determination of parkland dedication for a building permit issued within two years of a Site Plan and/or Zoning By-law Amendment approval would be subject to the requirements in the by-law as at the date of planning application submission.

## Analysis/Commentary

- If passed as currently drafted, these changes would not apply to site plan or zoning by-law applications made before subsection 12 (6) of Schedule 9 of the More Homes Built Faster Act comes into force.
- For applications made after the in-force date, this would represent a lag in P.I.L. value provided to municipalities, as it would represent the respective land value
up to two years prior vs. current value at building permit issuance. For municipalities having to purchase parkland, this will put additional funding pressure on property tax funding sources to make up the difference, or further erode the municipality's planned level of parks service.

3. Alternative Parkland Dedication Requirement: The following amendments are proposed for the imposition of the alternative parkland dedication requirements:

- The alternative requirement of 1 hectare (ha) per 300 dwelling units would be reduced to 1 ha per 600 dwelling units where land is being conveyed. Where the municipality imposes P.I.L. requirements, the amendments would reduce the amount from 1 ha per 500 dwelling units to 1 ha per 1,000 net residential units.
- Proposed amendments clarify that the alternative requirement would only be calculated on the incremental units of development/redevelopment.
- The alternative requirement would be capped at $10 \%$ of the land area or land value where the land proposed for development or redevelopment is 5 ha or less; and $15 \%$ of the land area or land value where the land proposed for development or redevelopment is greater than 5 ha.


## Analysis/Commentary

- If passed as currently drafted, the decrease in the alternative requirements for land conveyed and P.I.L. would not apply to building permits issued before subsection 12 (8) of Schedule 9 of the More Homes Built Faster Act comes into force.
- Most municipal parkland dedication by-laws only imposed the alternative requirements on incremental development. As such, the proposed amendments for net residential units seek to clarify the matter where parkland dedication bylaws are unclear.
- Section 42 previously imposed the alternative requirement caps of $10 \%$ and $15 \%$ of land area or value, depending on the respective developable land area, for developments only within designated transit-oriented communities. By repealing subsection 42 (3.2) of the Planning Act, these caps would apply to all developable lands under the by-law.
- As illustrated in the figure below, lowering the alternative parkland dedication requirement and imposing caps based on the developable land area will place significant downward pressure on the amount of parkland dedication provided to municipalities, particularly those municipalities with significant amounts of highdensity development. For example:
- Low-density development of 20 units per net ha (uph), with a person per unit (P.P.U.) occupancy of 3.4, would have produced a land conveyance of 0.98 ha per 1,000 population. The proposed change would reduce this to 0.74 ha, approximately $75 \%$ of current levels.
- Medium-density development of 50 uph, with a P.P.U. of 2.6 would produce land conveyance at $50 \%$ of current levels ( 0.64 vs. 1.28 ha/1,000 population).
- Low-rise development of 150 uph, with a P.P.U. of 2.6 would produce land conveyance at $20 \%$ of current levels ( $0.43 \mathrm{vs} .2 .15 \mathrm{ha} / 1,000$ population). P.I.L. would be approximately $1 / 3$ of current levels.
- High-rise development of 300 uph, with a P.P.U. of 2.6 would produce land conveyance at $10 \%$ of current levels ( 0.22 vs. $2.15 \mathrm{ha} / 1,000$ population). P.I.L. would be approximately $17 \%$ of current levels. ${ }^{[1]}$
- Based on the proposed alternative requirement rates and land area caps, municipalities would be better off:
- For land conveyance, imposing the alternative requirement for densities greater than 30 units per ha.
- Sites of 5 ha or less, land conveyance would be capped at $10 \%$ of land area at densities greater than 60 units per ha.
- Sites greater than 5 ha, land conveyance would be capped at $15 \%$ of land area at densities greater than 90 units per ha.
- For P.I.L. of parkland, imposing the alternative requirement for densities greater than 50 units per ha.
- Sites of 5 ha or less, land conveyance would be capped at $10 \%$ of land area at densities greater than 100 units per ha.
- Sites greater than 5 ha, land conveyance would be capped at 15\% of land area at densities greater than 150 units per ha.
- For densities less than 30 units per ha, imposing the standard requirement of $5 \%$ of land area for land conveyance and P.I.L. of parkland.

[^4]
4. Parks Plan: The preparation of a publicly available parks plan as part of enabling an Official Plan will be required at the time of passing a parkland dedication by-law under section 42 of the Planning Act.

## Analysis/Commentary

- The proposed change will still require municipal Official Plans to contain specific policies dealing with the provision of land for parks or other public recreational purposes where the alternative requirement is used.
- The requirement to prepare and consult on a parks plan prior to passing a by-law under section 42 would now appear to equally apply to a by-law including the standard parkland dedication requirements, as well as the alternative parkland dedication requirements. This will result in an increase in the administrative burden (and cost) for municipalities using the standard parkland dedication requirements.
- Municipalities imposing the alternative requirement in a parkland dedication bylaw on September 18, 2020 had their by-law expire on September 18, 2022 as a result of the COVID-19 Economic Recovery Act amendments. Many municipalities recently undertook to pass a new parkland dedication by-law, examining their needs for parkland and other recreational assets. Similar transitional provisions for existing parkland dedication by-laws should be provided with sufficient time granted to aliow municipalities to prepare and consult on the required parks plan.

5. Identification of Lands for Conveyance: Owners will be allowed to identify lands to meet parkland conveyance requirements, within regulatory criteria. These lands may include encumbered lands and privately owned public space (POPs). Municipalities may enter into agreements with the owners of the land regarding POPs to enforce conditions, and these agreements may be registered on title. The suitability of land for parks and recreational purposes will be appealable to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT).

## Analysis/Commentary

- The proposed changes allow the owner of land to identify encumbered lands for parkland dedication consistent with the provisions available to the Minister of Infrastructure to order such lands within transit-oriented communities. Similar to the expansion of parkland dedication caps, these changes would allow this to occur for all developable lands under the by-law. The proposed changes go further to allow for an interest in land, or POPs.
- The municipality may refuse the land identified for conveyance, providing notice to the owner with such requirements as prescribed. The owner, however, may appeal the decision to the OLT. The hearing would result in the Tribunal determining if the lands identified are in accordance with the criteria prescribed. These "criteria" are unclear, as they have not yet been defined in the regulations.
- Many municipal parkland dedication by-laws do not except encumber lands or POPs as suitable lands for parkland dedication. This is due, in part, to municipalities' inability to control the lands being dedicated or that they are not suitable to meet service levels for parks services. Municipalities that do accept these types of lands for parkland or other recreational purposes have clearly expressed such in their parkland dedication by-laws. The proposed changes would appear to allow the developers of the land, and the Province within prescribed criteria, to determine future parks service levels in municipalities in place of municipal council intent.

6. Requirement to Allocate Funds Received: Similar to the requirements for C.B.C.s, and proposed for the D.C.A. under Bill 23, annually beginning in 2023, municipalities will be required to spend or allocate at least $60 \%$ of the monies in a reserve fund at the beginning of the year.

## Analysis/Commentary

- This proposed change appears largely administrative, increasing the burden on municipalities. This change would not have a fiscal impact and could be achieved as a schedule to annual capital budget. Moreover, as the Province may prescribe annual reporting, similar to the requirements under the D.C.A. and for a C.B.C under the Planning Act.


## Attachment 4 - Changes to the Planning Act - Community <br> Benefits Charges

1. New Statutory Exemptions: Affordable residential units, attainable residential units, and inclusionary zoning residential units will be exempt from the payment of C.B.C.s., with definitions provided as follows:

- Affordable Residential Units (Rented): Where rent is no more than $80 \%$ of the average market rent as defined by a new bulletin published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- Affordable Residential Units (Ownership): Where the price of the unit is no more than $80 \%$ of the average purchase price as defined by a new bulletin published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
- Attainable Residential Units: Excludes affordable units and rental units; will be defined as prescribed development or class of development and sold to a person who is at "arm's length" from the seller.
- Inclusionary Zoning Units: Affordable housing units required under inclusionary zoning by-laws.

The exemption is proposed to be implemented by applying a discount to the maximum amount of the C.B.C. that can be imposed (i.e., $4 \%$ of land value, as specified in section 37 of the Planning Act). For example, if the affordable, attainable, and/or inclusionary zoning residential units represent 25\% of the total building floor area, then the maximum C.B.C. that could be imposed on the development would be $3 \%$ of total land value (i.e., a reduction of $25 \%$ from the maximum C.B.C. of $4 \%$ of land value).

## Analysis/Commentary

- While this is an admirable goal to create additional affordable housing units, further C.B.C. exemptions will continue to provide additional financial burdens on municipalities to fund these exemptions without the financial participation of senior levels of government.
- The definition of "attainable" is unclear, as this has not yet been defined in the regulations.
- Under the proposed changes to the D.C.A, municipalities will have to enter into agreements to ensure that affordable units remain affordable for 25 years and that attainable units are attainable at the time they are sold. An agreement does not appear to be required for affordable/attainable residential units exempt from payment of a C.B.C. Assuming, however, that most developments required to pay a C.B.C. would also be paying development charges, the units will be covered by the agreements required under the D.C.A. These agreements should be allowed to include the C.B.C. so that if a municipality needs to enforce the
provisions of an agreement, both development charges and C.B.C.s could be collected accordingly.
- These agreements will increase the administrative burden (and costs) on municipalities. Furthermore, the administration of these agreements will be cumbersome and will need to be monitored by both the upper-tier and lower-tier municipalities.
- It is unclear whether the bulletin provided by the Province will be specific to each municipality, each County/Region, or Province-wide. Due to the disparity in incomes across Ontario, affordability will vary significantly across these jurisdictions. Even within an individual municipality, there can be disparity in the average market rents and average market purchase prices.
- Where municipalities are imposing the C.B.C. on a per dwelling unit basis, they will need to ensure that the total C.B.C. being imposed for all eligible units is not in excess of the incremental development calculation (e.g., as per the example above, not greater than $3 \%$ of the total land value).

2. Limiting the Maximum C.B.C. in Proportion to Incremental Development: Where development or redevelopment is occurring on a parcel of land with an existing building or structure, the maximum C.B.C. that could be imposed would be calculated based on the incremental development only. For example, if a building is being expanded by 150,000 sq.ft. on a parcel of land with an existing 50,000 sq.ft. building, then the maximum C.B.C. that could be imposed on the development would be $3 \%$ of total land value (i.e., 150,000 sq.ft. $/ 200,000$ sq.ft. $=75 \% \times 4 \%$ maximum prescribed rate $=3 \%$ of total land value).

## Analysis/Commentary

- With municipal C.B.C. by-laws imposing the C.B.C. based on the land total land value or testing the C.B.C. payable relative to total land value, there will be a reduction in revenues currently anticipated. At present, some municipal C.B.C. by-laws have provisions excluding existing buildings from the land valuation used to calculate the C.B.C. payable or to test the maximum charge that can be imposed. As such, this proposal largely seeks to clarify the administration of the charge.


## Attachment 5 - Changes to the Conservation Authorities Act

## 1. Changes to conservation authority involvement in the development approvals

 process- Programs and services that are prohibited within municipal and other programs and services:
- Authorities would no longer be permitted to review and comment on a proposal, application, or other matter made under a prescribed Act (if not related to their mandatory programs and services under O. Reg. 686/21). The Province proposes that a new regulation would prescribe the following Acts in this regard:
- The Aggregate Resources Act
- The Condominium Act
- The Drainage Act
- The Endangered Species Act
- The Environmental Assessment Act
- The Environmental Protection Act
- The Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act
- The Ontario Heritage Act
- The Ontario Water Resources Act
- The Planning Act
- Exemptions to requiting a permit under section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act
- Where development has been authorized under the Planning Act it will be exempt from required permits to authorize the development under section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act. Exemptions to permits would also be granted where prescribed conditions are met.
- Regulation making authority would be provided to govern the exceptions to section 28 permits, including prescribing municipalities to which the exception applies, and any other conditions or restrictions that must be satisfied.
- Shortened timeframe for decisions
- Applicants may appeal the failure of the authority to issue a permit to the Ontario Land Tribunal within 90 days (shortened from 120 days currently).


## Analysis/Commentary

- These changes would focus an authority's role in plan review and commenting on applications made under the above Acts (including the Planning Act) to the risks of natural hazards only, limit the developments in which permits under section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act would be required, and shorten timeframes for issuing permits. Authorities would no longer be able to review applications with respect to the natural heritage impacts.
- With respect to natural heritage review requirements, the Province is proposing to integrate the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (P.P.S.) and A Place To Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe into a new Province-wide planning policy instrument. It is proposed that this new instrument could include changes to natural heritage policy direction.
- Recent amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act have already been implemented to limit a conservation authority to programs and services within their core mandate unless they have entered into an agreement with a municipal partner. Conservation authorities are able to efficiently provide services, such as natural heritage review required under the P.P.S., to municipalities across their watershed. Removing this ability from conservation authorities may result in municipalities having to find other external sources with the expertise to undertake this review, adding to the cost and timeframes for development approvals and negatively impacting the Province's goal of creating more housing.


## 2. Minister's ability to freeze fees

- The Minister would have the ability to direct an authority to not change the amount of any fee it charges (including for mandatory programs and services) for a specified period of time.


## Analysis/Commentary

- Limiting the ability of conservation authorities to recover the costs of plan review and permitting from benefiting developers and landowners will place additional financial burdens on conservation authorities and municipalities to fund these activities.
- As the goal of the Province is to create more housing, it is suggested that any limitations to conservation authority fees that are implemented should only apply to plan review and permitting fees related to the construction of new homes.


Page 157 of 390

## Introduction

- At the outset, we would like to thank the Committee for inviting us to speak.
- We are providing a high-level summary PowerPoint presentation along with a detailed letter submission re Bill 23 as it relates to:
- Development Charges (D.C.s)
- Planning
- Parkland Dedication (P.L.D.)
- Community Benefits Charges (C.B.C.s)
- Conservation Authorities (cost recovery and input to the planning process).
- This presentation will provide certain highlights for the Committee's consideration.


## Background on Watson \& Associates <br> Economists Ltd.

- Watson \& Associates Economists Ltd. is a firm of municipal economists, planners and accountants which has been in operation since 1982. With a municipal client base of more than 250 Ontario municipalities and utility commissions, the firm is recognized as a leader in the municipal finance/local government and land economics field.
- Our background is unprecedented including:
- Having undertaken over one-half of the consulting work completed in Ontario in the D.C. field during the past decade;
- Provided submissions and undertook discussions with the Province when the Development Charges Act (D.C.A.) was first introduced in 1989 and with each subsequent amendment undertaken in 1997, 2015 and 2019 (including being a member of the Provincial Technical Working Group on the 2020 D.C. and C.B.C. regulations;
- Undertaken numerous studies that focus on growth management, population and employment forecasting, urban land needs, municipal competitiveness, land use planning policy and financial/economic impact analysis;
- Our work also includes the preparation of asset management plans, P.L.D. reviews, C.B.C.s and conservation authority fees and charges.


## 1. Proposed Changes Which May Restrict/Inhibit the Future Supply of Developable Lands

## Present Situation

- For urban growth to occur, water and wastewater services must be in place before building permits can be issued for housing.
- Most municipalities assume the risk of constructing this infrastructure and wait for development to occur.
- Currently, $26 \%$ of municipalities providing water/wastewater services are carrying negative D.C. reserve fund balances for these services and many others are carrying significant growthrelated debt.
- Where the total cost of infrastructure is unaffordable, or will cause municipalities to exceed their debt capacity limit, many municipalities enter into front-ending and pre-payment agreements to share the cashflow and risk with developers.


## 1. Proposed Changes Which May Restrict/Inhibit the Future Supply of Developable Lands (Cont'd)

## Bill 23 Impacts

- In addition to the present situation, Bill 23 proposes to:
- Phase-in any new by-laws over five years which, on average, would reduce D.C. revenues by approximately $10 \%$.
- Introduce new exemptions which would provide a potential loss of 10-15\% of the D.C. funding.
- Remove funding of water/wastewater master plans and environmental assessments which provide for specific planning and approval of infrastructure.
- Unclear whether land costs for treatment facilities and/or for the purchase of land for linear infrastructure will continue to be an eligible capital cost.
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## 1. Proposed Changes Which May Restrict/Inhibit the Future Supply of Developable Lands (Cont'd)

Bill 23 Impacts (Cont'd)

- Make changes to the Planning Act that would minimize upper-tier planning in two-tier systems where the upper-tier municipality provides water/ wastewater servicing. This disjointing between planning approvals and timing/location of infrastructure construction may result in inefficient servicing, further limiting the supply of serviced land.
- The loss in funding noted above must then be passed on to existing rate payers. This comes at a time when municipalities must implement asset management plans under the Infrastructure for Jobs and Prosperity Act to maintain existing infrastructure. Significant annual rate increases may then limit funding to the capital budget and hence delay servicing of additional developable lands for housing.
- Note that Stormwater and Roads are needed at a similar time to support the creation of developable lands.

2. Proposed Changes which will Impact the Provision of Municipal Housing

- The removal of housing service as an eligible service will reduce municipalities' participation in creating assisted/ affordable housing units.
- Based on present and in-place D.C. by-laws, over $\$ 2.2$ billion in net growth-related expenditures providing for over 47,000 units (or $3.1 \%$ of the Province's 1.5 million housing target) would be impacted by this change.
- Note that several municipalities who are not collecting for the housing service are considering this service for their updated background studies
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## 2. Proposed Changes which will Impact the Provision of Municipal Housing (Contd)

Housing Services For Region and Single Tier Municipalities

*Total number of units - the net DC amount is after BTE
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## 3. Proposed Changes - Affordable Housing vs. Housing Affordability

There are numerous changes which would reduce municipal revenue recovery and shift the financial burden from development to the existing taxpayer and ratepayer, as follows:

- Added exemptions for affordable rental/owned residential units, attainable residential units, inclusionary zoning residential units, nonprofit housing and additional units in existing homes provide a loss of funding for all D.C. services as well as C.B.C.s and P.L.D. services.
- D.C. phase-in, loss of study and land costs for new infrastructure, municipal housing as an ineligible D.C. service, loss of C.B.C. revenue and parkland contributions reduced by $50 \%$ or more (with 10-15\% caps) for higher-density developments.
- Minister freeze on conservation authority fees: lowers funding for the authority which increases costs passed on to existing taxpayers for funding.
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## 3. Proposed Changes - Affordable Housing vs. Housing Affordability (Cont'd)

- While the goal of these proposed changes is to reduce the upfront cost to a new home purchaser, the funding for this will come from the existing taxpayer, i.e., existing residents and businesses subsidizing new home purchasers, hence increasing housing affordability concerns.
- Over the past 40 years, our firm has undertaken numerous fiscal impact studies of residential development - as a whole, the new taxes and fees generated by residential growth do not equal the new operating cost required to support these developments.
- Based on past changes to the D.C.A., historical reductions have not resulted in a decrease in the price of housing; hence, it is difficult to relate the loss of needed infrastructure funding to affordable housing.


## 4. Considerations for the Standing Committee

- From the proposed legislation, phase-in charges and exemptions for services essential to creating developable land supply (water, wastewater, stormwater and roads) should be removed...or funded by grants from senior levels of government.
- Reductions in parkland contributions, caps for high-density development and developer ability to provide encumbered lands/POPS should be removed from P.L.D. legislation to continue to allow municipalities to determine appropriate levels of service for parks.
- Alternatively, to minimize the overall impact on the taxpayer and ratepayer, provide access to other revenue sources (e.g., HST, land transfer tax) to fund all D.C./P.L.D./C.B.C. revenue losses.
- Municipal housing should continue as an eligible D.C. service.


## Thank you.

## Questions
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November 29, 2022

## Dear Clients:

## Re: More Homes Built Faster Act

In our continued efforts to keep our clients up to date on the legislative amendments resulting from Bill 23 (More Homes Built Faster Act), we are writing to inform you that Bill 23 received Roval Assent on November 28, 2022. This letter highlights the changes that were introduced with the Second Reading of the Bill and identifies the amendments that are currently in effect for the Development Charges Act (D.C.A.), as well as section 37 (community benefits charges (C.B.C.s)) and section 42 (parkland dedication) of the Planning Act.

## Development Charges Act

- Second Reading of the Bill introduced two substantive modifications to the proposed changes, including:
- For the phase-in of the charges over the first four years of a development charges (D.C.) by-law, under First Reading the transition provisions only applied to existing D.C. by-laws passed on or after June 1, 2022. These rules now apply to a D.C. by-law passed on or after January 1, 2022.
- The discount for rental housing developments is applicable to a D.C. payable under a section 27 agreement, for prescribed developments that were entered into before the More Homes Built Faster Act received Royal Assent. These discounts do not apply to payments made under the agreement prior to this date.
- All sections of Schedule 3 of the More Homes Built Faster Act are in effect as of November 28, 2022 (date of Royal Assent) with the exception of:
- Subsection 4.1 of the D.C.A., which provides exemptions for affordable and attainable residential units;
- Rules under front-ending agreements with respect to affordable and attainable residential units; and
- Regulation powers related to defining attainable housing and criteria for arm's length transactions.
These exceptions will come into effect on the date of proclamation. As of the date of this letter, proclamation has not been given.


## Section 37 of the Planning Act - Community Benefits Charges

- Second Reading of the Bill introduced an additional change to the proposed C.B.C. amendments under section 37 of the Planning Act. The change allows a municipality to enter into an agreement with a landowner for the provision of in-

[^5] Office: 905-272-3600 Fax: 905-272-3602 www.watsonecon.ca
kind contributions. It also allows for this agreement to be registered on title of the land to which the charge applies.

- Section 10 of Schedule 9 of the More Homes Built Faster Act is in effect as of November 28, 2022 (date of Royal Assent) with the exception of:
- Subsection 37 (32.1) of the Planning Act, which provides reductions in the maximum charge for developments containing affordable and attainable residential units.
This subsection of the Planning Act will come into effect on the date of proclamation. As of the date of this letter, proclamation has not been given.


## Section 42 of the Planning Act - Parkland Dedication

- No additional changes or modifications were made since First Reading of the Bill with respect to the parkland dedication amendments under section 42 of the Planning Act.
- Section 12 of Schedule 9 of the More Homes Built Faster Act is in effect as of November 28, 2022 (date of Royal Assent) with the exception of:
- Subsections 42 (1.1) and 42 (3.0.3) of the Planning Act, which provide reductions in the standard and alternative parkland dedication requirements for affordable and attainable residential unit developments; and
- Subsections 42 (4.30) through 42 (4.39) of the Planning Act which allow a landowner to identify the land for parkland conveyance under the by-law. These subsections of the Planning Act will come into effect on the date of proclamation. As of the date of this letter, proclamation has not been given.

We would be pleased to discuss the changes resulting from the More Homes Built Faster Act with you in further detail at your convenience.

Yours very truly,
WATSON \& ASSOCIATES ECONOMISTS LTD.

Andrew Grunda, MBA, CPA, CMA, Principal
Gary Scandlan, BA, PLE, Managing Partner
Peter Simcisko, BA (Hons), MBE, Managing Partner
Sean-Michael Stephen, MBA, Managing Partner
Jamie Cook, MCIP, RPP, PLE, Managing Partner
Jack Ammendolia, BES, PLE, Managing Partner

# The Regional Municipality of York 

Regional Council<br>November 10, 2022<br>Report of the Chief Administrative Officer<br>\section*{Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act 2022}

## 1. Recommendation

1. The Regional Clerk forward this report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing seeking an extension of the comment period to at least December 31, 2022, to allow for a more informed consultation period and constructive feedback.
2. The Regional Clerk circulate this report to the Clerks of the local municipalities.

## 2. Summary

This report is to inform Council of Bill 23, the More Homes Built Faster Act, omnibus legislation that received first reading in the provincial legislature on October 25, 2022.

Key Points:

- Bill 23 proposes to amend nine Acts with varying levels of impact on the Region and introduces a new Act addressing "Upper York" servicing in York Region
- Amendments most impactful to the Region are to the Development Charges Act and the Planning Act. The new Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022, deals with Upper York servicing and is also the subject of a separate report. These most impactful elements of Bill 23 are summarized in Attachment 2 to this report
- Attachment 3 summarizes the details of other amendments proposed through Bill 23
- Preliminary review suggests that, at minimum, Bill 23 will significantly impact how the Region and our local municipalities coordinate growth management with infrastructure planning and while challenging the ability to pay for infrastructure. The deadline for comments through an Environmental Registry posting is November 24, 2022 for most of the proposed changes.


## 3. Background

## On October 25, 2022 the Province tabled Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022

Bill 23, the More Homes Built Faster Act is omnibus legislation that proposes changes to nine Acts and proposes a new Act, the Support Growth and Housing in York and Durham Region's Act, 2022 as outlined in Minister Clark's letter dated October 25, 2022 (Attachment 1). This Bill is the most substantial proposal to date under the Provincial initiative to increase housing supply in Ontario to build 1.5 million homes in the next 10 years. This target significantly exceeds the Growth Plan forecasts (as communicated to Councii's Housing Affordability Task Force on September 22,2022) and will most certainly require more predictability in Provincial approvals and funding than what has been in place for the last two decades.

A number of proposed changes are posted on the Environmental Registry of Ontario and impact the Region and Regional areas of interest. Attachments 2 and 3 outline the changes proposed through amendments to the nine existing Acts; the Support Growth and Housing in York and Durham Region's Act is addressed through a separate report on this Council agenda.

The deadlines for comments range from November 24, 2022 to December 31, 2022.

## 4. Analysis

## Proposed changes to the Development Charges Act, 1997 reduce the share of infrastructure funded through development charges and place pressure on the Region's debt capacity, tax levy and/or water rates

Bill 23 proposes several changes to the Development Charges Act, 1997 beginning with permitting a bylaw to have a maximum term of 10 years, up from the current 5 . It also proposes to require phasing in a new bylaw's development charge rates over the first five years - with a suggestion that it will apply retroactively to bylaws passed after June 1, 2022.

The Bill also proposes to exempt or discount development charges on affordable housing, "attainable" housing, not-for-profit housing, inclusionary zoning units and rental units (details are summarized in Attachment 2). Affordable ownership has been defined as $80 \%$ of the average purchase price for ownership, while affordable rental has been defined as $80 \%$ of average market rent for rental units. A definition of "attainable" will be prescribed through regulation, though it would not include rental. Rental development, which is eligible for development charge discounts, is defined as a building or structure with four or more residential units all of which are intended for use as rented residential premises.

Other proposed changes to the Development Charges Act include:

- No longer being able to collect development charges for housing services, growth studies and land costs
- Capping of the interest rate on frozen and installment development charges payments at bank prime rate plus $1 \%$
- Requirement that municipalities spend or allocate at least $60 \%$ of the monies in the water, wastewater and roads development charge reserves at the beginning of each year
Any development charge reduction, exemption, discount, or removal of services/costs that limits cost recovery may impact the ability of the Region to deliver vital, growth-related infrastructure or the gap may need to be funded from tax levy or user rates.


## The Bill proposes changes to the Planning Acf which remove planning responsibilities from York Region

The More Homes Built Faster Act proposes changes to the Planning Act which remove planning responsibilities from York Region as well as Durham, Peel, Halton, Niagara and Watertoo Regions, and Simcoe County. These changes eliminate Council's approval authority for local planning matters, require local municipalities to implement the Regional Official Plan, and remove the Region's right to appeal land use planning decisions.

The Regional Official Plan, once approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, would become the responsibility of local municipalities in conjunction with their own Official Plans. The intent is that local municipal Official Plans incorporate Regional Official Plan policies within their jurisdiction. In the interim, Planning Act decisions would be made by local municipalities having regard for both documents with the Regional Official Plan prevailing in the event of conflict.

Other proposed changes to the Planning Act include:

- Up to three residential units per urban residential lot as-of-right
- Limiting the role of Conservation Authorities
- Removing all aspects of site plan control for residential development proposals up to 10 units
- Setting maximums for parkland dedication


## Coordination to address cross-boundary, public and Regional interests need to be considered

As noted by the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and others (see Attachment 4), many of the proposed changes need to be better understood as they seem to transfer risk from private developers to the public. Regional and Provincial planning has been strengthened over the last 20 years, with changes to the Growth Plan as recently as 2019 , recognizing the need for comprehensive planning of matters including but not limited to transportation, transit, water and wastewater services and a financially sustainable means to provide them. The current process of planning and prioritizing Regional infrastructure and service delivery will need to continue.

A move towards local-level decision-making needs to ensure that progress in coordinated, comprehensive planning is not lost and that the public and municipalities are protected from unintended consequences.

York Region and local municipalities already collaborate extensively to coordinate planning matters. Most routine planning matters have already been delegated to local municipalities. Other Regions still have subdivision approval, so in those jurisdictions, the changes are more impactful.

## Responses to Environmental Registry of Ontario postings will be provided to Council for consideration and additional comments

Environmental Registry postings regarding changes proposed through Bill 23 are being reviewed and assessed. Comments will be provided to the Province in response to these postinys and their comenent deadlines. In light of the incoming Council's first business meeting scheduled for December 8, 2022 the Province will be advised that any comments provided by staff to meet the imposed deadines are preliminary with Council consideration and additional comments to follow.

## 5. Financial

Changes proposed through Bill 23 could have implications on how the Region funds growthrelated infrastructure, potentially conflicting with the principle that growth pays for growth. Bill 23 proposes several exemptions and discounts to support affordable, non-profit, and rental housing. These incentives, which limit cost recovery, may need to be funded from the tax levy or user rates. The Region currently has in place a number of development charges deferral programs supporting the same desired outcomes, but do not need to be funded from the tax levy or user rates.

If passed, Bill 23 would also amend the Development Charges Act to prohibit municipalities from collecting development charges for housing services, growth studies and land costs. To maintain the current capital program, any growth-related capital costs not recovered through development charges may also need to be made up from tax levy and/or user rates.

## 6. Local Impact

The planning responsibilities of local municipalities will increase if the proposed changes pass. In addition to an increased approval authority role for applications previously approved by Council or delegated to Regional staff, local municipalities will also be taking on a greater role with respect to the Conservation Authority regulation for planning matters. This may, at least in the short term, have the unintended consequence of slowing planning approvals and increasing appeals to the Ontario Land Tribunal. This risk is further compounded by deadlines and the potential application fee refund regime of Bill 109.

Water and wastewater servicing planned, financed, built and operated by the Region is required for homes to be built. Ongoing collaboration and coordination between local
municipalities and the Region to ensure alignment between growth management planning, infrastructure planning and financial planning will be required.

Finally, many of the changes not highlighted in this report have consequences on local municipalities including those related to parkland dedication, urban design, heritage conservation, and more.

## 7. Conclusion

Bill 23 is sweeping omnibus legislation proposing numerous changes as outlined in Attachments 2 and 3 . If approved as currently written, the Bill appears to overlook unintended consequences counter to the objective of increasing the housing supply. Specifically, changes proposed to the Development Charges Act complicate how growthrelated infrastructure will be paid for. Planning Act changes risk uncoupling growth management planning from comprehensive and financially sustainable infrastructure and service planning.

Ongoing consultations, along with indications of the Provincial government's intentions for regulations that are expected to follow, will help form a better understanding. Staff will be responding as required to avoid missing the imposed deadlines but will also report back to Council relaying any resulting updates to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs. Responses will continue to be coordinated with our local and peer municipalities through AMO, AMCTO, MFOA and other municipal associations.

For more information on this report, please contact Paul Freeman, at 1-877-464-9675 ext. 71534 or Laura Mirabella at ext. 71600. Accessible formats or communication supports are available upon request.


Approved for Submission: Bruce Macgregor
Chief Administrative Officer

November 1, 2022
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Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Office of the Minister
777 Bay Street, $17^{\text {h }}$ Floor Toronto ON M7A 2J3 Tel.: $416585-7000$

Ministère des Affaires municipales et du Logement

Bureau du ministre
777, rue Bay, $17^{\circ}$ étage
Toronto ON M7A 2J3
Tél: : 416 585-7000


234-2022-4624

October 25, 2022

Good afternoon,
On October 25, 2022, our government released More Homes Built Faster: Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan 2022-2023 that proposes bold and transformative action to get 1.5 million homes built over the next 10 years.

Details about the range of measures in our plan can be found in the news release here.
The More Homes Built Faster Plan proposes policies and tools that reflect recommendations from the Housing Affordability Task Force Report and builds on More Homes, More Choice and the More Homes for Everyone Plan. Our plan also draws on many elements from AMO's 2022 A Blueprint for Action: An Integrated Approach to Address the Ontario Housing Crisis and ROMA's 2022 Task Force Report on Attainable Housing and Purpose-Built Rentals. These changes are providing a solid foundation to address Ontario's housing supply crisis over the long term and will be supplemented by continued action in the future.

Our government has also introduced the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022, and is seeking feedback on the changes proposed under the legislation and associated regulations. Additionally, various housing and land use policy reviews - including a housing-focused policy review of A Place to Grow and the Provincial Policy Statement, with a theme of supporting rural and northern housing - are being undertaken to identify and remove barriers to getting more homes built. These and other related consultations can be found through the Environmental Registry of Ontario and the Ontario Regulatory Registry.

We encourage you share this information with senior staff in the municipality and to inform the newly elected head of council and council members. Our government is building a strong foundation for action that will continue to ensure Ontario is a prosperous and growing province - and the best place in the world to call home. We look forward to continued collaboration with our municipal partners to get more homes built faster.

Sincerely,


Steve Clark
Minister
c. The Honourable Michael Parsa, Associate Minister of Housing

Kate Manson-Smith, Deputy Minister
Ryan Amato, Chief of Staff, Minister's Office
Joshua Paul, Assistant Deputy Minister, Housing Division
Municipal Chief Administrative Officers

## Summary of Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 <br> Changes to Development Charges Act and Planning Act

Development Charges Act, 1997

| Area (ERO\# 019-6172) | Summary of Changes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Duration of Development Charges (DC) by-law | Maximum by-law term is extended from 5 to 10 years. |
| Mandatory phase-in of new DC by-law rates | New DC by-law rates, resultant from a by-law update/amendment, phased in over first 5 years; no more than $80 \%$ in year 1 to 100\% by years 5 and onwards. Applies retroactively to by-laws passed on, or after, June 1, 2022 and for subsequent by-laws. |
| New DC exemptions or partial <br> exemptions/discounts <br> Proposed definitions: <br> *Average market rent - the average market rent for the year in which the residential unit is occupied by a tenant, as identified in the bulletin entitled the "Affordable Residential Units for the Purposes of the Development Charges Act, 1997 Bulletin", as it is amended from time to time, that is published by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing <br> **Average purchase price - the average purchase price applicable to a residential unit is the average purchase price for the year in which the residential unit is sold, as identified in the bulletin entilted the "Affordable Residential Unils for the Purposes of the Development Charges Act, 1997 Bulletin", published by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing | 1. Affordable housing (full exemption) <br> Rental - rent is no greater than $80 \%$ of the average market rent*. <br> Tenant is at arm's length to landlord. <br> Ownership - price of the residential unit is no greater than $80 \%$ of the average purchase price ${ }^{* *}$; sold to a person who is dealing at arm's length. Requires agreements with the local municipality, which may be registered against the lands. <br> 2. Attainable housing (full exemption) <br> Must meet the following criteria: <br> - Unit is not an affordable unit <br> - Not intended for use as a rental <br> - Developed as part of a prescribed development or class of developments <br> - Sold to a person who is dealing at arm's length with the seller <br> Requires agreements with the local municipality, which may be registered against the lands. <br> 3. Not for profit housing (full exemption) <br> Means a corporation to which the Not-for-Profit Corporations Act, 2010 applies; a corporation without share capital to which the Canada Not-for-profit Corporations Act applies; a non-profit housing co-operative. <br> 4. Inclusionary zoning units (full exemption) <br> Residential units that are affordable housing units required to be included in a development or redevelopment pursuant to a by-law passed under section 34 of the Planning Act to give effect to the |


|  | policies described in subsection 16 (4) (Inclusionary zoning policies). <br> 5. Rental housing (discount/partial exemption) <br> Rental means development of a building or structure with four or more residential units all of which are intended for use as rented residential premises. Discounts are as follows: <br> 3 bedrooms or more - 25\% discount <br> 2 bedrooms - $20 \%$ discount <br> Any other - $15 \%$ discount |
| :---: | :---: |
| Exemptions for second suites in existing and new buildings (including additional units in rental buildings, limited to the greater of 1 or $1 \%$ of existing units) | Moves from regulations to legislation with minor changes. |
| Removal of service Housing | Municipalities are no longer able to collect development charges for Housing Services, as at Royal Assent. |
| Removal of DC-eligible costs - studies and land | Growth studies, including other studies, no longer eligible for subsequent by-laws. <br> Costs to acquire land or an interest in land, including a leasehold interest except in relation to such services as are prescribed for the purposes of this paragraph (underlined is new). |
| Interest rate changes on frozen DCs/instaliment payments <br> Proposed Definition: <br> * Average prime rate, means the mean, rounded to the nearest hundredth of a percentage point, of the annual rates of interest announced by each of the Royal Bank of Canada, The Bank of Nova Scotia, the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, the Bank of Montreal and The Toronto-Dominion Bank to be lts prime or reference rate of interest in effect on that date for determining interest rates on Canadian dollar commercial loans by that bank in Canada. | Capped at average Prime plus 1\%. |
| Historic average service level timeframe | Extended from 10 years to 15 years. |


| Allocation of monies in <br> reserve fund | Beginning in 2023 and in each calendar year thereafter, a <br> municipality shall spend or allocate at least $60 \%$ of the monies <br> that are in a reserve fund for services at the beginning of the year. <br> Applies to water, wastewater and roads. Additional services to <br> which this change applies may be prescribed. |
| :--- | :--- |

## Planning Act

| Area (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Additional Residential Units | Allow up to three units per lot (i.e., up to three units in the primary building, or up to two in primary building and one in ancillary building or structure). These changes would apply to any parcel of urban residential land in settlement areas with full municipal water and sewage services. <br> Prohibit municipalities from imposing development charges (regardless of unit size), parkland dedication or cash-in-lieu requirements, applying minimum unit sizes or requiring more than one parking space per unil wilh tegard lo itew unils buill under this permission. |
| Planning Appeals | Limit third-party appeals. Appeals would only be maintained for key participants (e.g., applicants, province, public bodies, First Nations, and utility providers that participated in the process) except where appeals have already been restricted (e.g., Minister's decision on new official plan). |
| Upper-tier and Lower-tier Municipal Planning Responsibilities | Remove planning responsibilities in the County of Simcoe, and the Regional Municipalities of Halton, Peel, York, Durham, Niagara and Waterloo. <br> Regulation-making authority to prescribe additional upper-tier municipalities as an "upper-tier municipality without planning responsibilities" in the future if needed. <br> Where upper-tier planning responsibilities are removed: <br> - Existing upper-tier official plans would be deemed to form part of the applicable lower- tier municipality's official plan, until the lower-tier official plan has been updated <br> - Lower-tier official plans and amendments would be approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Minister's decision on new official plans and section 26 updates would not be appealable) <br> - The upper-tier municipality would not be able to appeal land use planning decisions |


| Area (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | - The approval authority for subdivisions and consents would be assigned to lower-tier municipalities, unless the Minister provides otherwise through regulation <br> The proposed changes would also have the effect of removing the following upper-tier municipal roles and requirements for an "upper-tier municipality without planning responsibilities": <br> - Requirement to have planning advisory committees <br> - Ability to have land division committees <br> - Ability to have a local appeal body <br> - Ability to assume any authority, responsibility, duty or function of a lower-tier municipality <br> - Ability to use the protected major transit station area tool. <br> As a result of the proposed changes, the following provisions would no longer be applicable in an "upper-tier municipality without planning responsibilities": <br> - Allowing the Minister to delegate approval authority for official plans/amendments to/from upper-tier municipalities, and provisions for upper-tier municipalities to delegate to/from upper-tier municipal staff/committees or lower-tier municipalities <br> - Requiring lower-tier official plans to conform with upper-tier official plans <br> - Limits on appeals of official plans/amendments that are only relevant to upper-tier municipalities <br> - Requiring lower-tier official plan policies for a community planning permit system (CPPS) to conform with the upper-tier municipality's CPPS policies. |
| Role of Conservation Authorities | Streamlined processes to sever and dispose of land. Expedite the existing processes associated with the severance and conveyance of land, regardless of whether provincial grant money was provided under the Conservation Authorities Act, for the purposes of projects related to flood control, erosion control, bank stabilization shoreline management works or the preservation of environmentally sensitive lands. <br> Limit conservation authority appeals, when acting as a public body, other than when acting as an applicant, of land use planning decisions under the Planning Act to matters related to natural hazards policies in provincial policy statements issued under the Planning Act. |
| Zoning Around Transit | Require municipalities to amend their zoning by-laws to conform with official plan policies that establish minimum densities and heights around transit Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA) and |


| Area (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Protected MTSAs within one year of the official plan policies being approved by the Minister. <br> Restriction on appeals of the implementing zoning by-law amendments regarding permitted heights and densities and permitted uses would expire after one year of the protected major Iransisil statiun olficial plan policies coming inlo effecl. |
| Community Benefit Charges (CBC) | The maximum CBC payable could not exceed the prescribed percentage of the value of the land (maximum CBC of $4 \%$ of land value) multiplied by a ratio of the floor area of the new building or structure that is proposed to be erected as part of the development or redevelopment to all buildings and structures on the site. <br> Maximum CBC payable ( $4 \%$ of land value) for a development or redevelopment to be discounted based on the floor area of affordable housing units, attainable housing units and inclusionary zoning affordable housing units as a proportion of the floor area of the total development. |
| Site Plan Control | Remove all aspects of site plan control for residential development proposals up to 10 units, except for land lease communities. The proposed changes would also limit the scope of site plan control by removing the ability to regulate architectural details and limiting the ability to regulate aesthetic aspects of landscape design. |
| Parkland Dedication | Affordable and attainable housing units as well as affordable housing units required by inclusionary zoning exempt from parkland dedication requirements. The maximum $5 \%$ basic rate for residential development would be discounted based on number of these units relative to total units in the development. These units would also not be included for the purposes of determining the maximum alternative rate. Not-for-profit housing developments would also be exempt from parkland dedication requirements. <br> A second, or second and third residential unit in a detachedhouse, semi-detached house or rowhouse would be exempt from parkland dedication requirements, as would one residential unit in an ancillary structure. <br> Require parkland dedication rates to be determined at time of zoning/site plan application. <br> The maximum alternative parkland dedication rate for land conveyed of 1 hectare for each 300 dwelling units would be |


| Area (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | changed to 1 hectare for each 600 net residential units and for <br> payments in lieu, the current rate of 1 hectare for each 500 <br> dwelling units would be changed to 1 hectare for each 1000 net <br> residential units. |
| No more than 15\% of the amount of land subject to the <br> development proposal (or equivalent value) could be required for <br> parks or other recreational purposes for sites greater than 5 <br> hectares and no more than 10\% for sites 5 hectares or less. |  |
|  | Require municipalities to develop a 'parks plan' before passing a <br> parkland dedication by-law instead of developing such a plan <br> before adopting the official plan policies required to be able to use <br> the alternative parkland requirement. |
| Beginning in 2023, the proposed changes would require <br> municipalities to allocate or spend at least $60 \%$ of their parkland <br> dedication reserve balance at the start of each year. |  |

New Act: Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022

| Area (ERO\# 019-6192) | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :--- | :--- |
| General | Mandate the planning, development and construction of two <br> wastewater projects. Both exempt from the Environmental <br> Assessment Act, however environmental impact reports must be <br> prepared. The Act creates a mandatory consultation process for <br> Indigenous communities. |
| York Region Sewage <br> Works Project | Expand the existing York Durham Sewage System to <br> accommodate growth to 2051. Revokes instruments for the Upper <br> York Sewage Systems Solution and terminates that <br> Environmental Assessment application. |
| Lake Simcoe <br> Phosphorus Removal <br> Project | One or more prescribed municipalities to develop, construct and <br> operate a new treatment facility that will remove phosphorus from <br> drainage water that flows from the Holland Marsh to Lake Simcoe. |

## ATTACHMENT 3

## Summary of Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 New Act and Changes to Other Acts

## Conservation Authorities Act

| Area (ERO\# 019-2927 <br> and ERO\# 019-6141) | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposed Regulation | Repeal the 36 individual regulations under the Conservation <br> Authorities Act, a single regulation is proposed for all 36 <br> Authorities in the province. |
| Identify Lands for <br> Housing | Require a land inventory to identify conservation authority-owned <br> or controlled lands that could support housing development. <br> Dispnsition (sales, <br> ownesements, leases) of consend will be streamlined to facilitate development of these <br> lands. |
| Limitation on <br> commenting | Prevents a review or commenting role for a wide array of <br> legislation, which cannot be included under an agreement with a <br> municipality. |
| Community Infrastructure |  |
| and Housing Accelerator | Require conservation authorities to issue permits for projects <br> subject to a Community Infrastructure and Housing Accelerator <br> order and allow the Minister to review and amend any conditions <br> attached to those permits to expedite zoning changes. |
| Minister's Zoning Order <br> conditions | Gives authority to the Minister to prescribe conditions on a permit <br> issued by a conservation authority where there is a Minister's <br> Zoning Order, and to also prescribe limits on what conditions a <br> conservation authority may include. |
| Permit Exemptions | Exempt development authorized under the Planning Act from <br> requining a permit under the Conservation Authorities Act in <br> municipalities set out in regulation, where certain conditions are <br> met as set out in regulation. |
| Permit Decisions | "Pollution" and "conservation of land" no longer considered in <br> development permit decisions. |
| Appeal Timeframe | Change the timeframe in which a permit applicant can appeal to <br> the Ontario Land Tribunal if a CA does not issue a permit from <br> 120 days to 90 days. |
| Review of development <br> related proposals and <br> applications | Scope conservation authorities' review and commenting role with <br> respect to development applications and land use planning <br> policies under prescribed Acts to matters within their core <br> mandate (primarily flooding and erosion). |
| Fee freeze | Conservation Authority fees will be frozen at current levels. |

Municipal Act, 2001

| Area | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :--- | :--- |
| Residential Rental | Establishes authority for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and <br> Properties |
| Housing to make regulations imposing limits and conditions on <br> the powers of a municipality to prohibit and regulate the <br> demolition and conversion of residential rental properties. |  |

Ontario Land Tribunal Act

| Area (Proposal \#22- | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :--- | :--- |
| MAG011) | Dismissal of Proceedings | | The Tribunal may dismiss a proceeding without a hearing if the |
| :--- |
| Tribunal is of the opinion that the party who brought the |
| proceeding has contributed to undue delay of the proceeding or if |
| that a party has failed to comply with an order of the Tribunal in |
| the proceeding. |

## Ontario Heritage Act

| Area (ERO\# 019-6196) | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :--- | :--- |
| Heritage property <br> designation | Permits the Minister of Citizenship and Multiculturalism to review, <br> confirm and revise, the determination of a property, <br> Implements higher standards to require a property to meet two or <br> more criteria. Listed properties would need to meet one of the <br> criteria. Municipalities to review existing registers and decide if <br> properties should be designated. Limit non-designated properties <br> from being on the register indefinitely. Certain properties may be <br> exempt from heritage standards and guidelines if it advances <br> provincial priorities of transit, housing, health and long-term care <br> or other priorities. |
| If a non-designated property listed is not designated within 2 <br> years, it is removed from the list. The property cannot be included <br> on the list for another 5 years. |  |
| Heritage Conservation <br> Districts | Heritage Conservation District Plans can be amended or <br> repealed, and a regulatory authority would prescribe this process. <br> A statement must be provided explaining the cultural heritage <br> value or interest and how the Heritage Conservation District <br> meets two or more of the criteria. |

New Home Construction Licensing Act, 2017

| Area (Proposal\#22- | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :--- | :--- |
| MGCSO21) | Minister's powers increased (use of funds, penalties, etc.) and <br> may be exercised by order instead of by regulation. |
| Minister's powers |  |

Administrative Monetary Penalty (AMP) and regulation

Increase the maximum allowable amount for an Administrative Monetary Penalty (AMP) from $\$ 25,000$ to $\$ 50,000$

Increase the maximum fines that a court may impose after a person or entity has previously been convicted of an offence specifically, a maximum fine of $\$ 100,000$ for a subsequent conviction in the case of an individual, and a maximum fine of $\$ 500,000$ for a subsequent conviction in the case of a person or entity that is not an individual.

Allow for AMPs to be imposed retroactively to contraventions that occurred on or after April 14, 2022;

Enable the Home Construction Regulatory Authority (HCRA) to use the proceeds of AMPs and fines to provide funds to adversely impacted consumers and make a related regulation requiring the HCRA to establish, maintain and comply with a policy to this effect.

Ontario Underground Infrastructure Notification System Act, 2012

| Area (Proposal \# 22- <br> MGCS022) | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :--- | :--- |
| Administrative | Minister authority to appoint Chair and Administrator, greater role <br> in confict resolution, and provide regulation making authority to <br> Lieutenant Governor in Council. |

## Additional Proposed Changes

| Area | Summary of Proposed Changes |
| :---: | :---: |
| Municipal Housing Targets and Housing Pledge (ERO\# 0196171) | Assignment of municipal housing targets to 29 selected lowerand single-tier municipalities over the next 10 years <br> Four municipalities in York Region have housing targets: <br> - City of Markham: 44,000 <br> - City of Vaughan: 42,000 <br> o City of Richmond Hill: 27,000 <br> o Town of Newmarket: 12,000 <br> Direct municipalities to create a 'housing pledge' to implement housing targets which outlines actions municipalities will take to meet targets, and a 'vehicle' for identifying policy proposals to increase housing and infrastructure needs. Pledges are due March 1,2023 with reporting towards the target annually. |
| Review of A Place to Grow and Provincial Policy Statement (ERO\# 019-6177) | Proposal to integrate the PPS and A Place to Grow into a single new province-wide plan |


| Revocation of the Parkway Belt West Plan (ERO\# 019-6167) | Proposal is to revoke the Parkway Belt West Plan created in 1978 to potentially increase housing supply |
| :---: | :---: |
| Proposed Building Code changes (Proposal \# 22MMAH016 Proposal \# 22-MMAHO19, ERO\# 019-6211) | A number of changes are proposed including, but not limited to, better alignment with National Building Code, Fire Management, accessibility and providing greater clarity. |
| Rent-to-Own Arrangements (Proposal \#22-MMAH018) | Explore 'rent-to-own' home financing model in supporting housing attainability in the province. Potential to engage in a rent to own arrangement with two contracts: <br> - Rental agreement <br> - Rent to own agreement <br> The province is seeking feedback on the viability, barriers and issues for renters on the rent to own model, as well as the provincial role to facilitate these agreements. |
| Proposed Updates to the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (ERO\# 019-6160) | Proposed changes to content in the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES) manuals including new guidance and moving approval to the professional opinion of wetland evaluators and local decision makers including municipalities. Removal of species at risk and wetland grouping criteria in determining a wetland's significance. |
| Conserving Ontario's Natural Heritage (ERO \# 019-6161) | A discussion paper seeks feedback on how Ontario could offset development pressures on wetlands, woodlands, and other natural wildife habitat. <br> The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry is considering developing an offset policy that would require a net positive impact on these features and help reverse the decades-long trend of natural heritage loss in Ontario. |
| Inclusionary Zoning (ERO \#019-6173) | Proposed changes to inclusionary zoning rules would standardize the following across the province: <br> - Set a maximum affordability period of 25 years <br> - Limit the number of affordable units to $5 \%$ of the total number of units or $5 \%$ of the total gross floor area of the total residential units, not including common areas <br> - Set affordability at $80 \%$ of the average resale price of ownership units or $80 \%$ of the average market rent for rental units |

# Ontario's New Housing Supply Action Plan: Some Troubling Features <br> Municipalibes Ontario 

NEWS PROVIDED BY<br>Assoclation of Municipalities of Ontario $\rightarrow$<br>Oct 25, 2022, 1751 ET

TORONTO. Oct. 25, 2022 /CNW/ - The Covernment of Ontario today introduced the next phase of its Housing Supply Action Plan: the proposed More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022. The Plan includes a broad array of legislative and regulatory changes related to land use planning, property taxes, building code, heritage, conservation, and the infrastructure financing framework that supports growth.
"Municipalities will welcome some of the proposed changes, and will be very concerned about others, such as changes to the Development Charges Act," said AMO President Colin Best. "We will work with the government on the ideas that have the potential to make housing more affordable, and we will oppose changes that undermine good economic and environmental policy."

Proposed changes include discounting and, in some cases, eliminating development charges and related developer obligations. When communities grow, infrastructure and public services must be scaled up to meet new demands. The new legislation would shift some of those costs from developers to current property taxpayers.

The Ontario government has signaled it may offset some of the financial impacts for municipalities. However, shifting growth costs from developers to taxpayers represents a fundamental change from the principle that growth should pay for growth, and that current homeowners and renters should not be required to subsidize new development. There are no mechanisms to ensure that developers will pass on cost savings to consumers in need of more affordable housing options.

For years, municipalities have been sounding the alarm about housing affordability and homelessness. Municipal governments deliver many of the front-line services that respond to these complitated and difficult challenges. Municipalities are committed to doing what they can to make housing more affordable, and to support economic growth.

Ontario had 100,000 housing starts in 2021, the highest in $\mathbf{3 0}$ years. However, some municipalities have seen a sharp decline in permit applications in 2022, due to factors such as higher interest rates and labour shortages.

AMO is the collective voice of Ontario's municipal sector advocating for good public policy that supports strong, sustainable, and prosperous communities. AMO's member municipal councils govern and provide key services to about one in three Canadians.

Follow AMO on Twitter, @AMOPolicy

SOURCE Association of Municipalities of Ontario

For further information: Brian Lambie, AMO Media Contact, 416-729-5425, lambie@redbrick.ca

## Summary of Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 <br> Changes to Development Charges Act and Planning Act

The new Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022 is the subject of a separate report.
There are a number of proposed legislative changes with no Regional implications and that not summarized below, including:

- Ontario Heritage Act (ERO\# 019-6196)
- New Home Construction Licensing Act, 2017 (Proposal \#22-MGCS021)
- Ontario Underground Infrastructure Notification System Act, 2012 (Proposal \#22-MGCS022)
- Proposed Building Code changes (Proposal \# 22-MMAH016, Proposal \# 22-MMAH019, ERO\# 019-6211)

Development Charges Act, 1997

| (ERO\# $019-6172$ ) | Summary of Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Duration of Developmet Maximum by-law term is extended <br> Charges (DC) by-law <br> from 5 to 10 years. | - No immediate financial <br> implications as current <br> development charges bylaw has a <br> prescribed expiry of June 16, 2027 | - While the change provides <br> municipalities with the potential to <br> have a bylaw for up to 10 years <br> when taken together with <br> proposed new phase-in rules, <br> municipalities will need to assess <br> whether they should update the <br> bylaw prior to the 10-year <br> expiration to maximize cost <br> recovery |  |
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| (ERO\# 019-6172) | Summary of Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mandatory phase-in of new DC by-law rates | - New DC by-law rates, resultant from a by-law update/amendment, phased in over first 5 years; no more than $80 \%$ in year 1 to 100\% by years 5 and onwards. Applies retroactively to by-laws passed on, or after, June 1, 2022 and for subsequent by-laws. | - No immediate financial implications as York Region's 2022 DC Bylaw was passed on May 26, 2022 | Disincentivizes municipalities to update DC Bylaws earlier than the maximum 10-year term because of the phase-in provisions that prohibit full DC rate recovery in the first four years of a new bylaw <br> Subject to section 5(6)3 of the Act, any shortfall from phasing in of DC rates $m$ may need to be made up from tax levy or user rates <br> Any reduction in DC cost recovery could limit the Region's ability to deliver on its growth-related capital plan which could potentially slow housing construction |
| New DC exemptions or partial exemptions/discounts <br> Proposed definitions: *Average market rent - the average market rent for the year in which the residential unit is occupied by a tenant, as identified in the bulletin entitled the "Affordable Residential Units for the Purposes of the Development Charges Act, 1997 Bulletin", | 1. Affordable housing (full exemption) <br> Rental - rent is no greater than $80 \%$ of the average market rent*. Tenant is at arm's length to landlord. Ownership - price of the residential unit is no greater than $80 \%$ of the average purchase price**; sold to a person who is dealing at arm's length. Requires agreements with | - Immediate financial implications are unknown and subject to future take-up | - The Region currently has a number of DC deferral programs that support affordable, rental and non-profit housing, which do not need to be funded from the tax levy or user rates <br> - Subject to section 5(6)3 of the Act, any shortfall from DC exemptions or discounts may need to be made up from tax levy or user rates |
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| (ERO\# 019-6172) | Summary of Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| as it is amended from time to time, that is published by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing <br> *"Average purchase price the average purchase price appllicable to a residential unit is the average purchase price for the year in which the residential unit is sold, as identified in the bulletin entitled the "Affordable Residential Units for the Purposes of the Development Charges Act, 1997 Bulletin", published by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing | the local municipality, which may be registered against the lands. <br> 2. Attainable housing (full exemption) <br> Must meet the following criteria: <br> - Unit is not an affordable unit <br> - Not intended for use as a rental <br> - Developed as part of a prescribed development or class of developments <br> - Sold to a person who is dealing at arm's length with the seller <br> Requires agreements with the local municipality, which may be registered against the lands. <br> 3. Not for profit housing (full exemption) <br> Means a corporation to which the Not-for-Profit Corporations Act, 2010 applies; a corporation without share capital to which the Canada Not-forprofit Corporations Act applies; a non-profit housing co-operative. <br> 4. Inclusionary zoning units (full exemption) |  | - Any reduction in DC cost recovery could limit the Region's ability to deliver on its growthrelated capital plan which could potentially slow housing construction <br> - $80 \%$ of the average purchase price of a home in York Region is $\sim \$ 1.03 \mathrm{M}$ (2021), which based on the proposed definition, could be deemed as affordable. This is a significantly higher threshold than municipalities are using to define affordability. As reported in the 2021 Measuring and Monitoring Report, households at the $60^{\text {th }}$ percentile (who make 132k) can only afford a home worth 536K <br> - Additional clarification will be needed from the Province to determine what qualifies as 'attainable' housing |
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| (ERO\# 019-6172) | Summary of Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Residential units that are affordable housing units required to be included in a development or redevelopment pursuant to a by-law passed under section 34 of the Planning Act to give effect to the policies described in subsection 16 <br> (4) (Inclusionary zoning policies). <br> 5. Rental housing (discount/partial exemption) Rental means development of a building or structure with four or more residential units all of which are intended for use as rented residential premises. Discounts are as follows: <br> - 3 bedrooms or more - 25\% discount <br> - 2 bedrooms - $20 \%$ discount <br> - Any other - 15\% discount |  |  |
| Exemptions for second suites in existing and new buildings (including additional units in rental buildings, limited to the greater of 1 or $1 \%$ of existing units) | - Moves from regulations to legislation with minor changes. | - Immediate financial implications are unknown and subject to future take-up | - In 2021, the Region saw 139 registered second suites (which were exempt from DCs). Given the proposed changes, the number of secondary/additional suites could increase <br> - Subject to section 5(6)3 of the Act, any shortfall from DC exemptions may need to be |
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| (ERO\# 019-6172) | Summary of Changes | Reglonal Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | made up from tax levy or user <br> rates |
|  |  |  | - Any reduction in DC cost <br> recovery could limit the Region's <br> ability to deliver on its growth- <br> related capital plan which could |
| potentially slow housing |  |  |  |
| construction |  |  |  |
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| (ERO\# 019-6172) | Summary of Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | this paragraph (underlined is new - services to be prescribed). |  | Master Plans remain eligible for DC recovery <br> - Additional clarification will be needed from the Province to determine the services that will not be eligible for land cost recovery through development charges <br> - Any costs associated with growth studies and the acquisition of land, that are not recovered through DCs, may need to be made up from tax levy or water and wastewater user rates |
| Interest rate changes on frozen DCs/installment payments | - Capped at a maximum, average Prime plus 1\% <br> Proposed Definition: <br> * Average prime rate, means the mean, rounded to the nearest hundredth of a percentage point, of the annual rates of interest announced by each of the Royal Bank of Canada, The Bank of Nova Scotia, the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, the Bank of Montreal and The Toronto-Domin on Bank to be its prime or reference rate of interest in effect on that dale for detemining interest rates on Canadian dollar commercial loans by that bank in Canada. | - No immediate financial implications as the Region's current rate is $5 \%$, which is below the prescribed maximum rate | The Region will need to update its Interest Policy to reflect the change |
| Historic average service level timeframe | - Extended from 10 years to 15 years | - No immediate financial implications as this change would not take effect until the Region's next DC Bylaw update | - Increasing the timeframe for the historical service level used to calculate DCs, from 10 to 15 years, could potentially result in lower DC rates and delay DC collections |

## ATTACHMENT 5

| (ERO\# 019-6172) | Summary of Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | - Could impact the following services: Public Health, Waste Diversion, Court Services, Public Works, Police Services, Ambulance Services and LongTerm Care |
| Allocation of monies in reserve fund | - Beginning in 2023 and in each calendar year thereafter, a municipality shall spend or allocate at least $60 \%$ of the monies that are in a reserve fund for services at the beginning of the year. Applies to water, wastewater and roads. Additional services to which this change applies may be prescribed. | - Immediate implications, with respect to reporting under section 43 of the Development Charges Act, 1997, as this requirement takes effect as at Royal Assent and for 2023 <br> - York Region curtently complies with this requirement because of the amount of existing debt for services already prescribed in the Bill | - If by the end of 2023, and for every year thereafter, the Region does not spend or allocate 60\% of the monies in the Water, Wastewater and Roads reserves, the Region could be in nonconformity with this new section <br> - Additional clarification is needed from the Province to determine what is meant by 'allocate' and the result of non-conformity |

## Planning Act

| (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Additional Residential Units | - Allow up to three units per lot (i.e., up to three units in the primary building, or up to two in primary building and one in ancillary building or structure). These changes would apply to any parcel of urban residential land in settlement | - Potential positive increase in rental supply and affordable housing <br> - Potential to help increase transit ridership | - Require monitoring and reporting of units and prior confirmation of water and wastewater servicing capacity |


| (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | areas with full municipal water and sewage services <br> - Prohibit municipalities from imposing development charges (regardless of unit size), parkland dedication or cash-in-lieu requirements, applying minimum unit sizes or requiring more than one parking space per unit with regard to new units built under this permission |  |  |
| Planning Appeals | - Limit third-party appeals. Appeals would only be maintained for key participants (e.g., applicants, province, public bodies, First Nations, and utility providers that participated in the process) except where appeats have already been restricted (e.g., Minister's decision on new official plan). <br> - The "upper-tier municipality without planning responsibilities" would not be able to appeal land use planning decisions <br> - Region's rights to appeal have been removed on local plans and amendments, zoning by-laws, subdivisions, consent and minor variance | - Reduced public appeal rights and participation in the planning process <br> - The Region is losing the right to seek party status on appeals of local plans and amendments and other planning instruments <br> - Appeals made by a third-party that the Region is currently involved in will be dismissed unless the third party falls within the list of "specified persons" or public bodies specified or the appeal has been scheduled for a hearing on the rerits before Oct. 25, 2022 | - Provide appeal mechanisms to address matters related to natural systems, Regional roads, human services and infrastructure delivery, including appeals to urban expansion where there is no Regional servicing infrastructure |


| (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Upper-tier and <br> Lower-tier <br> Municipal Planning <br> Responsibilities | - Remove planning responsibilities in the County of Simcoe, and the Regional Municipalities of Halton, Peel, York, Durham, Niagara and Waterloo. <br> - Regulation-making authority to prescribe additional upper-tier municipalities as an "upper-tier municipality without planning responsibilities" in the future if needed <br> - Where upper-tier planning responsibilities are removed: <br> - Existing upper-tier official plans would be deemed to form part of the applicable lower- tier municipality's official plan, until the lower-tier official plan has been updated <br> - Lower-tier official plans and amendments would be approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Minister's decision on new official plans and section 26 updates would not be appealable) <br> - The approval authority for subdivisions and consents would be assigned to lower-tier municipalities, unless the Minister provides otherwise through regulation | - Planning for growth and servicing have been coordinated in manner to maintain fiscal sustainability at the Regional level. With the elimination of the upper-tier planning responsibilities, it is unclear how growth management and servicing will be addressed in this new model. The current process of planning and prioritizing Regional infrastructure and service delivery will need to continue. | - Could result in unintended inefficiencies and delays in the planning review/ development approval process and subsequent delay of housing construction <br> - Risk that Regional, crossborder, infrastructure, and comprehensive planning matters including but not limited to transportation, transit, water and wastewater services and financial sustainability may not be addressed. <br> - A transition towards local-level decision-making needs to ensure that progress in coordinated, comprehensive planning and environmental protection is maintained <br> - Planning and development of complete communities is coordinated at the Regional level to support health and quality of life. Collaborations between public health and planning will need to continue at the local municipal level to ensure plans and development |


| (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional limplications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | applications have the appropriate review to support public health and a healthy built environment <br> - Risk that comprehensive policies in the Regional Official Plan will be removed or amended through local officia! plans resulting in an inconsistent policy approach |
| Removal of municipal Uppertier roles | - The proposed changes would also have the effect of removing the following upper-tier municipal roles and requirements for an "upper-tier municipality without planning responsibilities": <br> - Requirement to have planning advisory committees <br> - Ability to have land division committees <br> - Ability to have a local appeal body <br> - Ability to assume any authority, responsibility, duty or function of a lower-tier municipality <br> - Ability to use the protected major transit station area tool | - The Region is no longer required to have the Planning Advisory Committee | - Regional governments play an essential role in planning, financing and delivering major infrastructure to support growth management in a coordinated manner <br> - Local municipal Planning Advisory Committees may increase public participation and input into local planning matters <br> - The Region can support local planning advisory committees on growth management, crossboundary and infrastructure matters |
| Removal of municipal Uppertier provisions | - As a result of the proposed changes, the following provisions would no longer be applicable in an "upper-tier | - Region's delegated approval authority from the Province removed for local official plans | - Approximately $80 \%$ of local official plan amendments are |
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| (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | municipality without planning responsibilities": <br> - Allowing the Minister to delegate approval authority for official plans/amendments to/from uppertier municipalities, and provisions for upper-tier municipalities to delegate to/from upper-tier municipal staff/committees or lower-tier municipalities <br> - Requiring lower-tier official plans to conform with upper-tier official plans (Existing upper-tier official plans would be deemed to form part of the applicable lower-tier municipality's official plan, until the lower-tier official plan has been updated) <br> - Limits on appeals of official plans/amendments that are only relevant to upper-tier municipalities <br> - Requiring lower-tier official plan policies for a community planning permit system (CPPS) to conform with the upper-tier municipality's CPPS policies | and local official plan amendments (would now be the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing) <br> - York Region's delegation authority removed for official plan amendment exemptions to local municipalities. | already exempt from Regional approval <br> - Minister's approval of lower-tier municipal official plans may result in slower decision timeframes given the increased number of approvals and less familiarity with the upper-tier plans, which may result in the unintended delay of the approvals process and subsequent delay of housing construction |
| Role of Conservation Authorities | - Streamlined processes to sever and dispose of land. Expedite the existing processes associated with the severance and conveyance of land, regardless of whether provincial grant money was provided under the Conservation Authorities Act, for the | - Results in conservation authority land being sold for development, reducing greenspace available to the public and climate mitigation and adaptation implications including flooding due to | - Conservation authority-owned lands should remain in public ownership and remain greenspace. <br> - Any land identified that could support housing development |


| (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | purposes of projects related to flood control, erosion control, bank stabilization shoreline management works or the preservation of environmentally sensitive lands <br> - Limit conservation authority appeals, when acting as a public body, other than when acting as an applicant, of land use planning decisions under the Planning Act to matters related to natural hazards policies in provincial policy statements issued under the Planning Act | increased impervious land use <br> - COVID-19 confirmed that urban greenspace is essential in higher density communities, and existing greenspace was inadequate in addressing demand Reduced greenspace will exacerbate inaccessibility. <br> - Sale of lands may result in development in areas outside settlement areas not contemplated within the land use planning context or for servicing under the water and transportation master plans. Increasing servicing needs in these areas is likely to add additional to already constrained infrastructure without the ability to add additional capacity in the near-term <br> - Will likely reduce the Region's ability to meet its forest canopy and woodland cover targets, along with reductions in the Region's Vision goal to | should be appropriate for such purposes and have servicing, access to amenities and services, and be located outside of hazard lands and environmental features <br> - Any new housing should have criteria including affordability and density <br> - Conservation authority sale of lands to unlock housing will also require servicing in areas not contemplated. Meeting servicing needs will require a concerted effort from multiple levels of government. Presently only wastewater conveyance has been streamlined, this will need to be extended to wastewater treatment, drinking water, and roads infrastructure. |
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| (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | increase greenspace per 100,000 residents |  |
| Zoning Around Transit | - Require municipalities to amend their zoning by-laws to conform with official plan policies that establish minimum densities and heights around transit Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA) and Protected MTSAs within one year of the official plan policies being approved by the Minister <br> - Restriction on appeals of the implementing zoning by-law amendments regarding permitted heights and densities and permitted uses would expire after one year of the protected major transit station official plan policies coming into effect | - Potential impact on ridership, best use of transit infrastructure if PMTSA densities can be appealed following 1 year of protection | - MTSA boundaries and densities should be afforded full in perpetuity protection from appeal |
| Community Benefit Charges (CBC) | - The maximum CBC payable could not exceed the prescribed percentage of the value of the land (maximum CBC of $4 \%$ of land value) multiplied by a ratio of the floor area of the new building or structure that is proposed to be erected as part of the development or redevelopment to all buildings and structures on the site <br> - Maximum CBC payable ( $4 \%$ of land value) for development or redevelopment to be discounted based on the floor area of affordable housing | - Not applicable | - Local municipality's responsibility to administer |


| (ERO\#\#19-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | units, attainable housing units and inclusionary zoning affordable housing units as a proportion of the floor area of the total development |  |  |
| Site Plan Control | - Remove all aspects of site plan control for residential development proposals up to 10 units, except for land lease communities <br> - The proposed changes would also limit the scope of site plan control by removing the ability to regulate architectural details and limiting the ability to regulate aesthetic aspects of landscape design | - Limiting scope of site plan control may have implications on the right-of-way, access control, tree planting, drainage, and high-quality urban design. | - Potential for the loss of sustainability measures obtained through site plan approval |
| Parkland Dedication | - Affordable and attainable housing units as well as affordable housing units required by inclusionary zoning exempt from parkland dedication requirements. The maximum $5 \%$ basic rate for residential development would be discounted based on number of these units relative to total units in the development. These units would also not be included for the purposes of determining the maximum alternative rate. Not-for-profit housing developments would also be exempt from parkland dedication requirements <br> - A second, or second and third residential unit in a detached-house, | - Reduction of parkland dedication could result in reduced greenspaces and increased pressure on existing greenspaces, including Regional forests. Greenspaces play an important role in quality of life, recreation, and climate mitigation and adaptation, benefits that could be impacted by reduced greenspaces. <br> - COVID-19 confirmed that urban greenspace is essential in higher density communities, | - Reduction of parkland dedication may make it difficult for municipalities to provide enough greenspace to meet resident demands <br> - Recommend ensuring parkland dedication prioritizes accessible and equitable allocation of green spaces for all types of housing units, including affordable and attainable housing units, and in higher density communities. |


| (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | semi-detached house or rowhouse would be exempt from parkland dedication requirements, as would one residential unit in an ancillary structure <br> - Require parkland dedication rates to be determined at time of zoning/site plan application <br> - The maximum altemative parkland dedication rate for land conveyed of 1 hectare for each 300 dwelling units would be changed to 1 hectare for each 600 net residential units and for payments in lieu, the current rate of 1 hectare for each 500 dwelling units would be changed to 1 hectare for each 1000 net residential units <br> - No more than $15 \%$ of the amount of land subject to the development proposal (or equivalent value) could be required for parks or other recreational purposes for sites greater than 5 hectares and no more than $10 \%$ for sites 5 hectares or less <br> - Require municipalities to develop a 'parks plan' before passing a parkland dedication by-law instead of developing such a plan before adopting the official | and existing greenspace was inadequate in addressing demand. Reduced greenspace will exacerbate inaccessibility. <br> - May reduce development costs for Regional and nonprofit community housing, consistent with Regional Council's resolution requesting local municipalities to exempt Housing York Inc. developments from local parkland fees. |  |


| (ERO\# 019-6163) | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | plan policies required to be able to use <br> the alternative parkland requirement <br> - Beginning in 2023, the proposed <br> changes would require municipalities to <br> allocate or spend at least 60\% of their <br> parkland dedication reserve balance at <br> the start of each year |  |  |

## Conservation Authorities Act

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { (ERO\# 019- } \\ & 2927 \text { and ERO\# } \\ & 019-6141 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Prellminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposed Regulation | - Repeal the 36 individual regulations under the Conservation Authorities Act, a single regulation is proposed for all 36 Authorities in the province. | - Minimal, additional powers will be provided for Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority to support the implementation of the Lake Simcoe Protectior Plan |  |
| Identify Lands for Housing | - Require a land inventory to identify conservation authority-owned or controlled lands that could support housing development. Disposition (sales, easements, leases) of conservation authority-owned land will be streamlined to facilitate development of these lands | - Results in conservation authority land being sold for development, reducing greenspace available to the public and climate mitigation and adaptation implications including flooding due to increased impervious land use <br> - COVID-19 confirmed that urban greenspace is essential in higher-density communities, and existing greenspace was | - Conservation authority-owned lands should remain in public ownership and remain greenspace <br> - Any land identified that could support housing development should be appropriate with servicing, access to amenities and services, and be located outside of hazard lands and environmental features |
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## ATTACHMENT 5

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { (ERO\# 019- } \\ & 2927 \text { and ERO\# } \\ & \hline 019-6141 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | inadequate in addressing demand. Reduced greenspace will exacerbate inaccessibility <br> - Will likely reduce the Region's ability to meet its forest canopy and woodland cover targets, along with reductions in the Region's Vision goal to increase greenspace per 100,000 residents <br> - Sale of lands may result in development in areas outside settlement areas not contemplated within the land use planning context or for servicing under the water and transportation master plans. Increasing servicing needs in these areas is likely to add additional to already constrained infrastructure without the ability to add additional capacity in the nearterm | - Any new housing should have criteria including affordability and density <br> - Conservation authority sale of lands to unlock housing will also require servicing in areas not contemplated. Meeting servicing needs will require a concerted effort from multiple levels of government. Presently only wastewater conveyance has been streamlined, this will need to be extended to wastewater treatment, drinking water, and roads infrastructure |
| Limitation on commenting and review of development | - Prevents a review or commenting role for a wide array of legislation, which cannot be included under an agreement with a municipality | - Prevents conservation authorities from undertaking a commenting role on behalf of the Region for a wide array of legislation, including the | - Conservation authorities perform an important role in the planning process on behalf of municipalities, limiting their ability to provide this support |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { (ERO\# 019- } \\ & \text { 2927 and ERO\# } \\ & 019-6141 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| related proposals and applications |  | Endangered Species Act, Environmental Assessment Act, Environmental Protection Act, and Planning Act <br> - Region relies on conservation authority expertise to execute municipal duties under the legislation listed, including reviewing these applications from a water resource sustainability perspective | impacts the ability of a municipality to execute its duties. This could result in the unintended delay of approvals and subsequent delay of housing construction |
| Community Infrastructure and Housing Accelerator | - Require conservation authorities to issue permits for projects subject to a Community Infrastructure and Housing Accelerator order and allow the Minister to review and amend any conditions attached to those permits to expedite zoning changes | - Given that conservation authorities' permitting authority is limited strictly to natural hazards, this infers a Community Infrastructure and Housing Accelerator order could occur in hazard lands such as floodplains, resulting in risk and insurance implications, and climate adaptation implications | - Conservation Authorities should not be compelled to approve permits for development within regulated areas unless appropriate to do so |
| Minister's Zoning Order conditions | - Gives authority to the Minister to prescribe conditions on a permit issued by a conservation authority where there is a Minister's Zoning Order, and to also prescribe limits on what conditions a conservation authority may include | - Given that conservation authorities' permitting authority is limited strictly to natural hazards, this infers a development could occur in hazard lands such as floodplains, resulting in risk and | - Conservation Authorities should not be compelled to approve permits for development within regulated areas unless appropriate to do so |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { (ERO\# 019- } \\ & \text { 2927 and ERO\# } \\ & \hline 019-6141 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Preliminary Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | insurance implications, and climate adaptation implications |  |
| Permit Exemptions | - Exempt development authorized under the Planning Act from requiring a permit under the Conservation Authorities Act in municipalities set out in regulation, where certain conditions are met as set out in regulation | - Limiting conservation authorities' permitting authority strictly to natural hazards reduces their ability to protect Regional watersheds | - Conservation Authorities should not be compelled to approve permits for development within regulated areas unless appropriate to do so |
| Permit Decisions | - "Pollution" and "conservation of land" no longer considered in development permit decisions | - Changes to permitting limiting conservation authorities permitting powers to natural hazard lands reduces their ability to reject development that has pollution or land conservation impacts, presenting additional environmental and source water protection risks | - Watershed and natural systems protection, including conservation of land is essential to ensuring healthy complete communities and quality of life to York Region residents by providing access to natural open spaces |
| Appeal Timeframe | - Change the timeframe in which a permit applicant can appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal if a CA does not issue a permit from 120 days to 90 days | - No Regional implications |  |
| Fee freeze | - Conservation Authority fees will be frozen at current levels | - No Regional implications | - Freezing fees may impact the ability to self-fund CA services putting additional pressure on municipal tax levy |

## Municipal Act, 2001

| Area | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Initial Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Residential Rental <br> Properties | - Establishes authority for the Minister <br> of Municipal Affairs and Housing to <br> make regulations imposing limits and <br> conditions on the powers of a <br> municipality to prohibit and regulate <br> the demolition and conversion of <br> residential rental properties | - This could reduce existing <br> affordable housing stock in <br> the Region due to demolition <br> and conversion | - Reducing affordable rental <br> housing stock contradicts the <br> Provincial objective of providing <br> more affordable rental housing |

Ontario Land Tribunal Act

| Area (Proposal <br> \#22-MAGO11) | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional limplications |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dismissal of <br> Proceedings | - The Tribunal may dismiss a <br> proceeding without a hearing if the <br> Tribunal is of the opinion that the <br> party who brought the proceeding <br> has contributed to undue delay of the <br> proceeding or if a party has failed to <br> comply with an order of the Tribunal <br> in the proceeding | - There may be some <br> implications for appeals <br> which are transitioned, <br> where the Region is already <br> a party | - York Region supports these <br> efforts to streamline appeals |
| Costs | Gives the Tribunal the power to order <br> an unsuccessful party to pay a <br> successful party's costs, intended to <br> encourage parties to reach an <br> agreement without going through the <br> Tribunal | - There may be some <br> implications for appeals <br> which are transitioned, <br> where the Region is already <br> a party |  |
| Regulation-Making <br> Authority | Lieutenant Governor in Council to <br> make regulations requiring the <br> Tribunal to prioritize the resolution of | - None |  |


|  | specified classes of proceedings, <br> such as cases that create the most <br> housing, for example |
| :--- | :--- |
| - The Minister will have power to make |  |
| regulations setting service standards |  |
| with respect to timing of hearings and |  |
| decisions for specific case resolution |  |
| activities |  |$\quad$.

## Additional Proposed Changes

| Area | Summary of Proposed Changes | Regional Implications | Initial Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Municipal Housing <br> Targets and <br> Housing Pledge <br> (ERO\# 019-6171) | - Assignment of municipal housing targets to 29 selected lower- and single-tier municipalities over the next 10 years <br> - Four municipalities in York Region have housing targets: <br> - City of Markham: 44,000 <br> - City of Vaughan: 42,000 <br> - City of Richmond Hill: 27,000 <br> - Town of Newmarket: 12,000 <br> - Direct municipalities to create a 'housing pledge' to implement housing targets which outlines actions municipalities will take to meet targets, and a 'vehicle' for identifying policy proposals to increase housing and infrastructure | - Uncertainties regarding population forecasts in the Growth Plan and the Regional Official Plan, and achievability and enforceability of proposed targets <br> -Without housing affordability, mix and type requirements, housing may be unaffordable | - Need to ensure alignment of targets with infrastructure capacity and timing <br> - Ensure targets for different housing mix and types, and affordability <br> - Ensure targets align with the ability of the private market and the labour force to deliver <br> - The Region has started the Affordable Private Market Housing Implementation Plan to look at mechanisms for local municipalities to use to implement housing pledges |


|  | needs. Pledges are due March 1, 2023 with reporting towards the target annually |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Review of A Place to Grow and Provincial Policy Statement (ERO\# 019-6177) | - Province seeking feedback on proposal to integrate the PPS and A Place to Grow into a single new province-wide plan, streamlining and providing greater flexibility in core elements including <br> - Residential Land Supply <br> - Attainable Housing Supply and Mix <br> - Growth Management <br> - Agriculture and Natural Heritage <br> - Community Infrastructure | - Through the Municipal Comprehensive Review, the Region has integrated Growth Plan policies and targets into the Regional Official Plan to achieve conformity. <br> - The York Region Official Pları provides 30 years of housing supply with comprehensive planning that integrates financial; infrastructure, and land use planning, ensuring a consistent approach to growth management for all nine local municipalities | - There are uncertainties regarding the relationship between merging the PPS and Growth Plan and increasing housing supply <br> - Integration of Growth Plan and PPS may reduce certainty making it more difficult to manage growth and deliver infrastructure <br> - Eliminating or watering down the Growth Plan would set comprehensive planning backward |
| Revocation of the <br> Parkway Belt West <br> Plan <br> (ERO\# 019-6167) | - Proposal to revoke the Parkway Belt West Plan to potentially increase housing supply | - No Regional implications | - The Region supports the proposal to revoke the Parkway Belt West Plan |
| Rent-to-Own <br> Arrangements <br> (Proposal \#22- <br> MMAH018) | - Explore 'rent-to-own' home financing model in supporting housing attainability in the province. Potential to engage in a rent-to-own arrangement with two contracts: <br> - Rental agreement <br> - Rent to own agreement <br> - The province is seeking feedback on the viability, barriers and issues for renters on the rent to own model, as | - No immediate Regional implications as any rent-toown agreement would be between the developer and the homebuyer <br> - Unclear if the Province is assuming a local role (i.e. for Service Managers) in administering a rent-to-own program | - The Province should consider setting a legal framework for rent-to-own agreements which developers must follow when entering into agreements with households, to ensure consumer protections. <br> - The Province should ensure alignment with any federal rent-to-own initiatives, as the Federal |
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|  | well as the provincial role to facilitate these agreements |  | government committed to supporting rent-to-own projects as part of the 2022 Budget. <br> - If the Province is assuming a role for municipalities (i.e. Service Managers) in the delivery of this program, administration funding must be provided and eligibility criteria should align with the priorities and needs within the service area. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposed Updates to the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (ERO\# 019-6160) | - Proposed changes to content in the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES) manuals including new guidance and moving approval to the professional opinion of wetland evaluators and local decision makers including municipalities. Removal of species at risk and wetland grouping criteria in determining a wetland's significance | - When considered in the context of the broader changes proposed in Bill 23, changes to the evaluation system opens the possibility of development on wettands and in floodplains. Such a change has the potential to reduce natural functions and groundwater recharge, while also presenting greater flooding risks | - Any changes to the wetland evaluation system should continue to place strong emphasis on maintaining wetland complexes and species at risk habitat and ensuring that development is not permitted in areas where it would present a risk to homeowners |
| Conserving Ontario's Natural Heritage (ERO \# 019-6161) | - A discussion paper seeks feedback on how Ontario could offset development pressures on wetlands, woodlands, and other natural wildlife habitat <br> - The Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry is considering developing an offset policy that | - This may result in natural heritage loss within the Region since there isn't a principle that requires the offsetting to happen locally | - Any offsetting should result in a net gain in natural heritage features and functions within the local area |


|  | would require a net positive impact on these features |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inclusionary Zoning (ERO \#019-6173) | - Proposed changes to inclusionary zoning (IZ) rules would standardize the following across the province: <br> - Set a maximum affordability period of 25 years <br> - Limit the number of affordable units to $5 \%$ of the total number of units or $5 \%$ of the total gross floor area of the total residential units, not including common areas <br> - Set affordability at $80 \%$ of the average resale price of ownership units or $80 \%$ of the average market rent for rental units | - Under the current IZ framework, local municipalities have the ability to set affordability periods, unit set aside rates and affordabe sales prices and rents to address local housing needs <br> - The proposed changes woulc standardize IZ policies across municipalities that choose to implement it, and limit the ability of municipalities to secure more units with longer affordability periods at deeper levels of affordability | - The Province is encouraged to continue to allow local flexibility; to ensure IZ policies address local housing needs <br> - Municipal incentives associated with providing IZ units should correspond to the financial value of the IZ units being provided, in terms of depth and length of affordability, and the number of units secured <br> - Provincial regulations must include transition rules to ensure tenants occupying the unit at the end of the affordability period do not experience significant rent increases |

## COUNTY OF WELLINGTON

## COMMITTEE REPORT

To: $\quad$ Chair and Members of the Planning Committee<br>From: Sarah Wilhelm, Manager of Policy Planning<br>Jameson Pickard, Senior Policy Planner<br>Date: Thursday, November 10, 2022<br>Subject: Bill 23 - More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022

### 1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of proposed changes recently introduced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing through the "More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022" (Bill 23) aimed at increasing housing supply in Ontario.

This report comments on parts of the amendments related to the land use planning and development approvals process and also highlights other changes under consideration that have impacts across County Departments, Member Municipalities and Conservation Authorities. The Treasury Department will report separately to the Administration, Finance and Human Resources Committee on the potential impacts related to development charges.

### 2.0 Background

The Provincial Government has proposed sweeping changes to multiple statutes, regulations, policies and other matters to help achieve the goal of building 1.5 million homes in Ontario over the next 10 years. Bill 23 impacts nine statutes, including major changes to the Planning Act, Development Charges Act and Conservation Authorities Act. The Government is moving fast and the changes are far reaching.

### 3.0 Major Themes

The proposed changes focus on the following major themes:

- building more homes;
- streamlining processes; and
- reducing costs and fees to build houses.

The Government has posted material for comment on the Environment Registry of Ontario and the Ontario Regulatory Registry about the proposed legislative and regulatory changes (see Appendix A for list). Planning staff have reviewed and summarized information to assist the County and Member Municipalities in their review of the material (Appendix B) but encourage those interested to review the proposed changes in their entirety.

Key changes are listed below.

### 3.1 Building More Homes

In an effort to build more homes, the Province has proposed the following changes:

| Additional Residential Units (ARUs) | - allow landowners to have up to 3 residential units per lot without the need for a zoning by-law amendment in municipally-serviced urban residential areas <br> - would permit 3 units in the main dwelling (including 2 ARUs) or a combination of 2 units in the main dwelling (including 1 ARU) and another ARU in an ancillary building <br> - zoning by-laws cannot set a minimum unit size or require more than one parking space per unit, but other zoning rules would apply |
| :---: | :---: |
| Housing targets to 2031 | - set housing targets to 2031 for 29 "large and fast-growing" municipalities in Southern Ontario (not applicable to Wellington County) |
| Major transit stations | - build more homes near major transit stations (not applicable to Wellington County) |
| Conservation Authorities | - identification of Conservation Authority lands suitable for housing |

### 3.2 Streamlining

The Provincial Government is looking to streamline a wide range of policies and procedures to reduce the time it takes for new housing to be built.

Public Involvement

Conservation Authorities (CAs)

- remove "third party" appeal rights for all planning applications (this would include appeals by the public)
- remove the public meeting requirement for draft plan of subdivision approvals
- remove Conservation Authority appeal rights for planning applications, except where the appeal would relate to natural hazards policies
- limit Conservation Authority responsibilities to review and comment on planning applications (either on behalf of a municipality or on their own) to focus on natural hazards and flooding
- change the Provincial wetland evaluation system, including shifting responsibility for wetland evaluation to local municipalities
- establish one regulation for all 36 CAs in Ontario

| New Provincial Planning Document | - eliminate duplication between the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and A Place to Grow (Growth Plan), by combining them into one document and providing a more flexible approach to growth management |
| :---: | :---: |
| Planning Responsibilities | - shift planning responsibilities from some upper-tier municipalities to lower-tier municipalities (not applicable to Wellington County) |
| Site Plans | - exclude projects with 10 or fewer residential units from site plan control <br> - exclude exterior design of buildings from site plan control |
| Heritage | - add more stringent requirements related to municipal heritage registers and timing of designation |
| Rental Unit Demolition and Conversion | - impose limits and conditions on the powers of a local municipality to prohibit and regulate the demolition and conversion of residential rental properties |

### 3.3 Reducing Costs and Fees

Reductions in costs and fees are mainly focused in the following areas:

| Development Charges and |
| :--- |
| Parkland Dedication |

- | exempt non-profit housing developments, inclusionary zoning |
| :--- |
| residential units (not applicable to Wellington County), and |
| affordable, additional and attainable housing units from |
| development charges and parkland dedication |
| - discount development charges for purpose-built rentals |
| - remove costs of certain studies from development charges |

Conservation Authorities
Other alternative parkland dedication requirements

### 3.4 Additional Matters

Beyond the proposed land use planning changes, other key changes include to:

- enable the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) to speed up processing of appeals
- provide the OLT with discretionary power to order the unsuccessful party at a hearing to pay the successful party's costs
- provide a potential rent-to-own financing model
- increase penalties under the New Homes Construction Licensing Act of up to $\$ 50,000$


### 4.0 Conclusion

Ontario is in the midst of a housing crisis. While there are no simple solutions to the problem, action is required. Several of the Government's initiatives support recommendations of the County's Attainable Housing Strategy such as:

- streamlining the land use planning approval process;
- reducing/exempting certain development charges and parkland dedication requirements;
- introducing an attainable housing category; and
- considering a potential rent-to-own financing model.

While the above proposals will likely increase the supply of housing, more information is needed to better understand how related cost reductions will be passed on to potential home buyers.

The County has previously commented to the Province about duplication between the Provincial Policy Statement and the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe Area and welcome the creation of one streamlined Provincial Planning document and a simplified process for comprehensive growth reviews. Planning staff do, however, have concerns about how this might impact the municipal comprehensive review (MCR) work completed to date.

We have significant concerns about actions to:

- essentially remove meaningful public participation from the land use planning process;
- reduce the protection of natural heritage features/natural hazards, and the resulting impact on public health, public safety, and climate change objectives;
- reduce the important role of Conservation Authorities in the review of development applications (a loss of technical expertise critical to rural municipalities); and
- eliminate the long-established regional planning framework in the Province.

Staff note that there is a substantial amount of material posted for consultation and little time to respond (most comments are due late November or early December). Unfortunately, this timeframe does not allow for many newly elected Councils (including Wellington County) to meet and discuss their comments. We understand that more information is to follow as Bill 23 also introduces the potential for additional policies and regulations. Therefore, the full impact of the proposed amendments is unknown.

### 5.0 Next Steps

At the time of writing this report, the Bill has passed second reading and is at the Committee stage in the Legislature. Staff will continue to monitor the proposed legislation as it moves through the legislative process. Staff will engage with AMO and other organizations to provide input and will report at a later date when the legislation comes into effect and/or additional policies and regulations are made available.

## Recommendations

That the report "Bill 23 - More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022" be received for information.
That this report be forwarded to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing on behalf of the County of Wellington and circulated to member municipalities for their consideration prior to Environmental and Regulatory Registry Provincial comment deadines.

Respectfully submitted,


Sarah Wilhelm, BES, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Policy Planning


Jameson Pickard, B. URPL, RPP, MCIP
Senior Policy Planner

PUSLINCH

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building, Queen's.
Park
Township of Puslinch
7404 Wellington Road 34
Puslinch, ON NOB 2J0
www.puslinch.ca
Toronto, ON M7A 1A1
VIA EMAIL:
November 17, 2022
premier@ontario.ca
RE: 9.3.3 Report ADM-2022-065 Bill 23 Proposed Changes
Please be advised that Township of Puslinch Council, at its meeting held on November 9, 2022 considered the aforementioned topic and subsequent to discussion, the following was resolved:

## Resolution No. 2022-366: Moved by Councillor Sepulis and Seconded by Councillor Bailey

That Report ADM-2022-065 entitled Bill 23 Proposed Changes and Consent items 6.6 and 6.15 and Correspondence Item 10.4 be received; and

Whereas the Township of Puslinch has received correspondence dated Oct. 25, 2022 from Minister Clark regarding the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 (Bill 23); and

Whereas the Township of Puslinch Council recognizes that there is a housing affordability concern in Ontario;

Be it resolved that the Township of Puslinch Council advise the Province that is has significant concerns about the actions contained therein to:

1. Essentially remove meaningful public participation from the land use planning process;
2. Reduce the protection of natural heritage features/natural hazards, and the resulting impact on public health, public safety, and climate change objectives;
3. Reduce the important role of Conservation Authorities in the review of development applications (a loss of technical expertise critical to rural municipalities);
4. Eliminate the long-established regional planning framework in the Province;
5. Streamlining aggregate applications by permitting Ministry staff to make decisions until such time that more information is provided;
6. Financial implications of all of the impacts of Bill 23 , by eliminating the long accepted concept of growth paying for growth, and shifting that burden to the tax payer through property taxes;
7. Proposed Heritage Act changes related to timelines to designate properties listed on the Registry with undesignated status undermines the ability of the community to save these structures through community engagement and goodwill; and

Whereas the Township of Puslinch received the presentation from the Mill Creek Stewards;

Be it Resolved, that Puslinch Council request that the Ministry review the presentation by the Mill Creek Stewards; and

Whereas the Township of Puslinch received the Hamilton Conservation Authority Board Resolution and the Halton Conservation Authority correspondence addressed to the Province;

Be it Resolved, that Puslinch Council supports the comments contained therein; and
That the presentation and the Council Resolution be forwarded to Premier Ford, Minister Clark, Speaker Arnott, County of Wellington, AMO, ROMA, Grand River Conservation Authority, Conservation Halton, Hamilton Conservation Authority and all Ontario municipalities.

As per the above resolution, please accept a copy of this correspondence for your information and consideration.

Sincerely,
Courtenay Hoytfox
Municipal Clerk

CC:
The Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing steve.clark@pc.ola.org
The Honourable Ted Arnott, MPP Wellington-Halton Hills ted.arnottco@pc.ola.org
The County of Wellington donnab@wellington.ca
Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) amo@amo.on.ca
Rural Ontario Municipal Association (ROMA) romachair@roma.on.ca
Grand River Conservation Authority planning@grandriver.ca
Conservation Halton cpriddle@hrca.on.ca
Hamilton Conservation Authority ereimer@conservationhamilton.ca
All Ontario Municipalities

Mill Creek Steward's Comments On

## Bill 23

## Building Homes Faster Action Plan
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Mr Mayor, Councillors

May we begin with our deepest sympathies, no l'm kidding, congratulations to you all on your recent election/acclamation. The Mill Creek Stewards believe you're going to have an especially significant and challenging term in office as municipalities try to define their role in the provincial-municipal relationship.

That relationship brings us to the "More Homes Built Faster Action Plan" proposed by the Ontario government and presented to you as Item 6.6 on today's Agenda.

The provincial government is trying to sell this Plan as a means of building homes faster and cheaper by empowering municipalities.
It does neither. This bill is a wolf in a sheepskin.
If we start with those innocent looking sheepskins. This plan supports:

1) Eliminating/reducing regional planning to allow more local input.
2) Streamlining and reducing the costs of development applications.
3) "As of right" Additional Residential Units ARUs
4) Building more homes near transit corridors.
5) Housing targets and helping homebuyers
6) Improving the Ontario Land Tribunal.

At least some are creditable goals!
We can't argue with those goals but if we look underneath we see wolves.

1) Eliminating regional planning. Does allow more local input but at significantly more local costs. At the same time, by stripping input from Conservation Authorities, the result is no cross-jurisdictional planning, a critical aspect of water, land and environment planning recognized and instituted decades ago and applauded internationally. To add insult to injury this plan requires CAs to define CA land suitable for housing development and removes barriers to their sale.
2) Streamlining and reducing application costs. Does allow for faster application approvals but is that the problem? The provincial government's own Housing Task Force in the spring of 2022 identified land availability and development applications as non-issues. Their maps showed the lands adjacent to communities, and still available for development, serve the province's needs for the next 30 years with minimal new lands and no greenbelt land. As well, lands proposed for removal from the greenbelt are farther from infrastructure and would cost municipalities significantly more to develop. It should be noted that there is a shortage associated with housing but its not land. The average house and lot size has doubled in the last twenty years, doubling resource consumption and creating a resource not housing shortage, which explains why so much approved-land sits undeveloped. While reducing application and development costs compromises the generation of critical municipal revenue necessary for essential housing infrastructure development, especially extended development. The province offers no offsets to cover municipality's significant losses in revenue, while at the same time downsizing CAs and regional governments, further increasing the administration costs of local municipalities.
3) "As of right" ARUs. A true sheep with no wolf but unnecessary as municipalities like Puslinch have already implemented this aspect in everything but name.
4) Building near transit corridors. Again a true sheep but very small compared to the wolves.
5) Housing targets and assisting homebuyers. Does help homebuyers through attainable housing targets and development fee exemptions but leaves large loopholes in who can buy attainable housing and especially resell, while fee exemptions include no provincial offsets, once again leaving the tax base of local municipalities to bear the costs.
6) Improving the OLT. Does sound positive but it's limited to eliminating third party i.e. community groups like ours from appealing any Official Plan or Zoning bylaw amendments while permitting industry to appeal. This is at the same time as the province has removed regional planning and the right of appeal from regional governments and right of input from CAs.

And sadly the province already has specific targets for these wolves:

Pitting its wolves against two Greenland agreements covering the Golden Horseshoe. The province seeks to reverse both agreements. In the case of both agreements, the means for amendments already exist. Its just criteria that protect critical aspects of the broader community need to be met first. The province claims these criteria that protect the environment, natural features and farmland are too slow but slower is not slow and slower is the way that democracy, government by the people, works to balance risk for the broad community.

Pitting wolves against the Greenbelt itself, where the province is seeking to remove large swaths of protected land, while promising to offset it with land elsewhere. No belt can do its job if its chewed in pieces and the Greenbelt is no different, especially when the offset lands are distant, less than presented and being recycled as they were trumpeted months ago. As stated previously, these lands are not even needed and the province was very clear prior to the election that the no land would be removed from the Greenbelt. At the same time the substitute restricted development lands are being passed to distant municipalities like Puslinch at no gain.

Pitting its wolves against two specific higher tier municipalities, Hamilton and Kitchener-Waterloo, whose land planning guided by referendums met provincial targets but ran counter to provincial wishes. In this case the province promises low tier municipalities the power to ignore higher tier planning. One of the most significant problems resulting from this Bill is the elimination of cross-jurisdictional planning associated with regional governments (higher tier) and our unique conservation authorities (watersheds).

Pitting its wolves against wetlands, farmland and natural heritage features is of particular concern to our group. The province has supplied little wolf detail in its Action Plan except in the case of wetlands through its "Proposed Changes to OWES". These changes are a preview of what we can expect with respect to all other areas of planning. The core of this proposal is reducing bureaucracy and its costs by eliminating provincial oversight. I refer you to the paper appendix where original text is in black and removed or added text is blue. Removed text has a line through it, which is most of the text. In essence little has been added and much taken way in the name of streamlining. This reduction doesn't empower municipalities. It is a crass means of cutting provincial costs, downloading research on municipalities and minimizing the effectiveness of land planning oversight: all while appearing to substitute municipal oversight, i.e. empowerment. Municipalities will either face significant additional planning staff costs or face approving by default, all applications for development.

Specifically the province proposes to almost totally eradicate Ministry input into land planning when it comes to evaluating farmland, water courses, natural heritage features, wetlands and endangered species. Unfortunately as a replacement it only offers municipalities one option: subjective evaluations done without the benefit of objective report frameworks (page 1), significantly reduced detail including references (page 2,3), potentially done by unskilled workers supervised at a distance, done without the benefit of experienced Conservation Authority and Ministry personnel and considered complete when presented to the appropriate planner regardless of comprehensiveness (page 4).
This is not municipal empowerment, just a means to chaos, chaos that disempowers municipalities in every case where the municipalities and province disagree.

Finally in finishing our review, we must comment on the cynical use throughout both Bill 23 and the OWES Plan, of the "offsets" concept. This offset concept sounds innocent but in effect it eliminates any protection municipalities may have still hoped to extend to their water sources, farmlands, wetlands, natural heritage
features, species habitats and greenlands. Worst is the offset fund aspect, which allows developers to circumvent substitution and simply pay for destruction. When destruction engenders millions of dollars, a few thousand dollars is a small price for developers to pay.

Bill 23 is not municipal empowerment but nuclear disempowerment. It won't build homes faster or cheaper but will have catastrophic effects on our environment including our Mill Creek.

We have no doubt the Township's staff have prepared a comprehensive review of this Plan but we felt given this Action Plan's massive and immediate impact even as far as the Provincial Policy Statement, required we add our voice in person.

We are especially concerned by its plan to deny community groups like ours the right to participate in planning decisions and further the right to appeal planning decisions if we somehow manage to learn about them.
Please consider a strong response to the province's request for input on this proposed Plan. Thank you for your time and attention.

Note this legislation while eliminating the right of community groups like ours to appeal municipal decisions, doesn't eliminate the right of industry (aggregate, housing etc.)
Note this legislation tries to distract from municipalities that are already resolving housing shortages with densification at much lower cost and speedier resolution.
Note the extremely short timeline for comment on this Bill as well as the shortened timelines on all ERO comment periods, reflects a provincial agenda while significantly stressing our municipal staff.
Note greenbelt lands and wetlands have already been bought cheaply by speculators anticipating government proposed changes, meaning the whole concept of greenbelt, i.e. its permanency, is being destabilized.
Note this legislation not only eliminates the requirement for CA input for development applications but forbids it, i.e. a gag order. "Required to look at watershed protection only without reference to development".

Note this legislation put the existence of the Provincial Policy Statement, the foundation of lower tier government planning, in question, as it over-rides the PPS on farmland, wetlands, natural heritage sites, species protection etc.


Hamilton
Conservation
Authority

A Healthy Watershed for Everyone

Via Email: gschwendinger@puslinch.ca

November 7, 2022

Glenn Schwendinger, CAO/Clerk
Office of the CAO/Clerk
Township of Puslinch Office
7404 Wellington Road 34
Puslinch, Ontario
NOB 2J0

Re: Hamilton Conservation Authority Board Resolution re. Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry proposals in support of Bill 23 More Homes Built Faster: Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan 2022-23

Dear Mr. Schwendinger,
On November 3, 2022, the Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA) Board of Directors passed the following unanimous resolution:

BD12, 3113
MOVED BY: Jim Cimba
SECONDED BY: Brad Clark
THAT the following key points regarding the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry proposals in support of Bill 23 More Homes Built Faster: Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan 2022-23 be sent to HCA's member municipalities:

- Proposed changes should take into account a watershed-based approach to balance growth with the environment and public health and safety.
- CAs should continue with the ability to review and comment on natural heritage in permitting and planning applications and retain responsibility for

Natural Hazard approvals to ensure safe development.

- We request continued collaboration with the Province in regard to the proposed changes and support Conservation Ontario's call to engage with the established multi-stakeholder Conservation Authorities Working Group (CAWG) that helped guide the Province in its implementation of the last round of changes to the CA Act.
- Municipalities should retain the option to enter into MOUs with CAs for municipally requested advisory services.
- Permit CAs to work towards cost recovery targets so that development pays for development.
- The Province should recognize the importance of CA lands and ensure clear policies to protect them.


## CARRIED

Sincerely,


Lisa Burnside
CAO, Hamilton Conservation Authority

## 9053361158

Fax: 905.336 .7014
2596 Britannia Road West
Burlington, Ontario L7P 0G3
conservationhalton.ca

Protecting the Natural Environment from Lake to Escarpment

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building, Queen's Park
Toronto, ON, M7A 1A1
premier@ontario.ca

The Honourable Graydon Smith
Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry
Whitney Block, 99 Wellesley St W,
Toronto, ON M7A 1W3
minister.mnrf@ontario.ca

The Honourable Steve Clark
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing College Park 17th Floor, 777 Bay St, Toronto, ON M7A 2 I3 steve.clark@pc.ola.org

The Honourable David Piccini
Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks College Park 5th Floor, 777 Bay St, Toronto, ON M7A 2 J3
david.piccinico@pc.ola.org

Dear Premier Ford, Minister Clark, Minister Smith and Minister Piccini,
We are writing to you in response to Bill 23, the More Homes Built Faster Act, which was announced on Tuesday, October 25th, 2022, specifically regarding Schedule 2.

We agree that there is a housing supply and affordability issue in Ontario that needs to be pragmatically addressed. We support the government's commitment to reducing unnecessary barriers to development and streamlining processes. We share this commitment and publicly report on the standards of service delivery to illustrate our goal of providing the best customer service to the municipalities, communities, residents and developers we serve.

We will do our part to help the Province meet its goal of building 1.5 million homes in Ontario over the next ten years. We think your stated outcomes are important but are concerned that your proposed legislative changes may have unintentional, negative consequences. Rather than creating the conditions for efficient housing development, these changes may jeopardize the Province's stated goals by increasing risks to life and property for Ontario residents.

## 1. Potential sweeping exemptions to transfer CA regulatory responsibilities to municipalities

Conservation Halton would like to understand the government's intentions with this proposed exemption. It is unciear whether it will be limited to certain types of low-risk development and hazards, or if the purpose is to transfer Conservation Authorities (CA) responsibilities to municipalities on a much broader scale. While the government wants to focus CAs on their core mandate, this proposed sweeping exemption signals the exact opposite. As proposed in the legislation, the CA exclusions will nullify the core functions of CAs and open up significant holes in the delivery of our natural hazard roles, rendering them ineffective. This will negatively
impact our ability to protect people and property from natural hazards, which seem to be more and more prevalent with extreme weather events.

Without limitations or further scoping, these proposed changes signal the likelihood of future delegation of CA permitting roles to municipalities that have neither capacity nor expertise in water resources engineering, environmental planning and regulatory compliance. This will result in longer response times and increased costs and impede the government's goal of making life more affordable.

Municipalities will also assume sole liability for the impact of development on natural hazards within municipal boundaries and on neighbouring upstream and downstream communities, which is a significant and new responsibility that they have never had to manage.

## Key Recommendations:

- Address this risk expressly - keep all hazard-related responsibilities with CAs.
- Engage with the existing multi-stakeholder Conservation Authorities Working Group (CAWG) to ensure there is a streamlined, consistent and scoped process for CAs to help the Province achieve its housing goals while ensuring costs are low, the process is fast and Ontario taxpayers are protected.

2. Proposed change that would prohibit CAs from entering into MOUs with municipalities for other services (e.g., natural heritage reviews, select aspects of stormwater management reviews, etc.)

Conservation Halton has demonstrated that we can deliver these services efficiently without lengthening the approvals process. There is no evidence that municipalities can do this faster or cheaper. Bill 23 as currently written, precludes municipalities from entering into agreements with CAs to provide advice on environmental and natural heritage matters. They will have to coordinate with neighbouring municipalities and the Province on a watershed basis, rather than taking advantage of expertise already available within many CAs.

## Key Recommendations:

- Municipalities should retain the option to enter into MOUs with CAs, with clearly defined terms, timelines and performance measures, as allowed under Section 21.1.1 (1) of the CA Act.
- Work with the CAWG to develop guidance for commenting and exploring the option of limiting CAs from commenting beyond natural hazards risks except where a CA has entered into an agreement or MOU.


## 3. Proposed change to freeze CA fees

This proposal has no guidelines on the timing or permanence of the fee freeze. Conservation Halton has already undertaken an extensive cost-based analysis that has been benchmarked against other development review fees to ensure our fees do not exceed the cost to deliver the service. We meet regularly with developer groups and municipalities to ensure our fees, processes and service standards are transparent, consistent and fair. We hope that you will be guided by your already approved fee policy that Conservation Halton supports, otherwise this change will impose additional costs on municipalities.

## Key Recommendation:

- Require CAs to demonstrate to the Province that permit and planning fees do not exceed the cost to deliver the program or service and only consider freezing fees if CAs are exceeding $100 \%$ cost recovery.


## 4. Wetland Offsetting

Wetlands play a critical role in mitigating floods. Further wetland loss may result in serious flooding, putting the safety of communities at risk. Wetlands are a cost-effective strategy for protecting downstream properties. The
government must be prudent when considering changes like offsetting, which could negatively affect the ability of wetlands to reduce flooding and confuse roles in wetland management and protection between municipalities and CAs.

Conservation Halton is disciplined and focused on providing mandatory programs and services related to natural hazards. We have a transparent and proven track record of providing regulatory services that are streamlined, accountable and centred on rigorous service delivery standards. Our commitment focuses on stakeholder engagement, from meeting homeowners on-site to engaging with the development community to better understand perceived barriers. This approach helps us find innovative solutions for continued and safe growth in the municipalities we serve.

To ensure the most effective implementation of this Bill, we believe it is critical that the government presses pause on the proposed changes we have highlighted and meet with us to clarify and consider more effective alternatives. It is our hope that we can work with you again to safeguard the best possible outcomes for the people of Ontario.
You had such great success through the multi-stakeholder CA Working Group, which your Progressive Conservative government created and which Hassaan Basit, President and CEO of Conservation Halton, chaired. We strongly suggest continuing this engagement and we stand ready to help.

Sincerely,

Gerry Smallegange


Chair
Conservation Halton Board of Directors

Mayor Rob Burton, BA, MS


Town of Oakville
Conservation Halton Board member

Mayor Gordon Krantz


Mayor Marianne Meed Ward
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Date: November 17, 2022
To: Mayor and Members of Council
From: Andrew Whittemore, M.U.R.P., Commissioner of Planning \& Building

Originator's files: LA.07.BIL

Meeting date:
November 23, 2022

## Subject

Bill 23 "More Homes Built Faster Act" and Implications for City of Mississauga

## Recommendation

1. That Council endorse positions and recommendations contained and appended to the report titled "Bill 23 'More Homes Built Faster' and Implications for City of Mississauga," and authorize staff to prepare additional detailed comments on Bill 23 and any associated regulations, as needed. In particular, the City be made whole for any revenue losses from changes to the imposition of development changes and parkland dedication.
2. That the Mayor or designate be authorized to make submissions to the Standing Committee with respect to issues raised in this report, or to otherwise provide written or verbal comments as part of the Ministry's public consultation process.
3. That the City Clerk forward this report to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing; Mississauga's Members' of Provincial Parliament, the Association for Municipalities Ontario, and the Region of Peel.

## Executive Summary

- Recent amendments have been proposed to several pieces of legislation that form Bill 23 "More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022" (the Bill) that impact the imposition of development charges (DCs), parkland dedication, planning and appeals processes and the environment.
- Staff support the need to improve the diversity and affordability of housing. However, staff's assessment is that Bill 23 is overly focused on blanket fee reductions that would apply for market rate developments with no guarantee that savings will be passed on to renters and homebuyers.
- It is estimated that the Bill could cost the City up to $\$ 815$ to $\$ 885 \mathrm{M}$ over the next ten years. ${ }^{1}$ Without corresponding provincial grants, Mississauga would need to recover that revenue through the tax base or by reducing service levels.
- A key part of this shortfall is generated by DC reductions, changes to what is DC eligible and DC exemptions. Staff estimate that the shortfall could be up to $\$ 325 \mathrm{M}$ over a ten-year period ${ }^{1}$.
- The Province has proposed arbitrary retroactive phase-ins to all of the City's DCs (including non-residential DCs). The way the Province has structured these reductions are punitive, apply to each municipality differently and will be challenging to administer.
- What is eligible for DC collection would also change with the removal of "affordable housing" and "studies," and the potential to limit the service for which land acquisitions can be recovered through development charges.
- City staff support some of the proposed DC exemptions (e.g. non-profits and second units), but the other contemplated exemptions could incent small, private condominium units, at the expense of more affordable units.
- The financial impacts are even more staggering when examining the proposed changes to parkland dedication. Staff estimate the City could lose $\$ 490$ to $\$ 560 \mathrm{M}$ in ten years, making up more than $70 \%$ of this revenue stream.
- For a standard development in the City (e.g. 500 unit tower on an acre), the City could go from collecting $\$ 10 \mathrm{M}$ to $\$ 1.7 \mathrm{M}$ in cash-in-lieu. It's noted land prices in Mississauga are close to $\$ 20 \mathrm{M}$ per acre in many of its growth areas.
- Moreover, the Bill would allow developers to choose where parkland is located on a site (e.g. they prefer to offer slivers of undevelopable land) and they would receive full parkland credits for Privately Owned Publicly Accessible Space (POPS). It is in condominium developers' financial interest to provide a privately owned park since it can allow for higher densities on the site (e.g. parking under the park). Condominium residents will be forced to maintain the asset indefinitely while the quality, access, and programing is typically inferior to a city-owned park.
- Some of the proposed changes could speed up the approvals process (e.g. gentle intensification and pre-zoning major transit station areas), and staff are supportive of these changes. However, others could undermine important planning considerations (e.g. not allowing architectural and landscape details to be considered at site plan could undermine quality of place. Furthermore, removing the City's ability to implement Green Development Standards could impact the creation of units that are more efficient and affordable to heat and operate).

[^6]- Given the provincial importance of creating more affordable housing, it is difficult to understand the policy rationale for reducing municipal tools to create new units.
- According to the Region of Peel the proposed elimination of Housing from Regional DCs puts at risk over 930 affordable housing units in various stages of planning and development in Mississauga for low and moderate income households e.g. East Avenue, Brightwater - with a possible shortfall of $\$ 200 \mathrm{M}$.
- Proposed revisions to inclusionary zoning (IZ) affordability thresholds will result in virtually no inclusionary zoning ownership units being affordable for low and middle income households.
- It is estimated that the $5 \%$ of development IZ cap will result in a minimum of $40 \%$ less affordable units than was anticipated with current IZ provisions.
- Moreover, the Province is consulting on potentially removing or scaling back rental protection-laws.
- The potential impacts on the environment are also significant, with proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities and the boundaries of the Greenbelt. These natural features are needed to help us adapt to a changing climate. The possibility of building on flood and hazard lands is concerning given increased storm events and potential liabilities.
- Given the broad potential impacts on the natural environment, community infrastructure, parks, transit, affordable housing and the quality of our urban environments; it is suggested the Province take the time to consult with a broader range of stakeholders to help refine this Bill and achieve a more balanced and strategic plan to create more housing.
- A summary of City staff's top requests to the Province are listed below:

1. It is estimated that the Bill could cost the City up to $\$ 815$ to $\$ 885 \mathrm{M}$ over the next ten years. ${ }^{2}$ It is requested that the Province make the City whole (e.g. provide offsetting grants) to cover any loss in revenue resulting from the legislative changes to DCs and CIL.
2. Remove non-residential DC discounts and restore City's ability to set its own DC rates.
3. Not remove or limit eligibility of "costs to acquire land" for DC collection.
4. Restore "affordable housing" and ability to fund "studies" as eligible for DC collection.
5. Remove "attainable" housing from the proposed exemptions to DCs, CBCs and Parkland.

[^7]6. Develop mechanisms to ensure any publically funded discounts go directly to homebuyer.
7. Maintain the income-based definition of affordable housing as per the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). If not, it is requested that the Province adapt the CMHC average existing market rent by bedroom for rental units and a $70 \%$ rate of average new unit price with separate values for unit size/bedrooms for ownership units.
8. Restore parkland rates, or at least remove the land value caps placed on rates.
9. Roll back ability for developers to determine park locations, or at least ensure parkland dedications are contiguous, link into the existing parkland network and have public street frontage and visibility.
10. Remove 100\% credit for POPS, or at least roll it back to some lesser amount to disincentivize developers providing a POPS over a public park.
11. Increase Inclusionary Zoning set-aside rate cap to $10 \%$.
12. Extend the affordability for "ownership" units to 99 years; this will have no impact on developers but will allow for more sustainable affordable housing supply.
13. Consider some type of incentive program to help capitalize infill projects in established neighbourhoods (e.g. a loan program that could help homeowners fund renovations to their homes to add second or third units).
14. Update Ontario Building Code to ensure singles and towns are built in a way that would support retrofitting for second units.
15. Restore urban design and landscape details at site plan stage.
16. Restore ability to consider sustainable design (e.g. use of Green Development Standards) at the site plan stage.
Maintain existing Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) process where costs are rarely awarded.
17. Maintain the City's ability to protect rental housing stock through its Rental Protection By-law.
18. Province could reconsider the benefits of the proposed heritage review process, as most likely it will slow down development.
19. Reconsider the benefits of limiting Conservation Authorities (CA) powers to comment on natural heritage, as the City will need to establish expertise and development process could be slowed down.
20. Maintain existing wetland protections, the benefits of developing on wetlands do not outweigh the potential environmental outcomes.
21. Not adopt a Provincial ecological off-setting policy. Technical ecological advice on offsetting should be provided in local context by the Conservation Authorities and the City, as appropriate.

## Background

Bill 23 works to implement some actions contained in Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan, with the goal of increasing housing supply in Ontario by building 1.5 million new homes by 2032.

On October 25, 2022, the Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (the Minister) introduced the Bill to the legislature with sweeping changes to 10 Acts (including the Planning Act, Municipal Act, Development Charges (DCs) Act, Ontario Heritage Act, Conservation Authorities Act, Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) Act) and the Ontario Building Code.

The Province has also proposed further consultation on a range of provincial plans, policies and regulations. This includes revoking the Parkway Belt West Plan, merging the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the Growth Plan) with the PPS and changing the boundaries of the Greenbelt Plan. The Province has also committed to create working groups with municipalities to limit land speculation and examine rental protection by-laws.

Comment periods on the proposed changes (via 19 Environmental Registry of Ontario postings and 7 Ontario Regulatory Registry postings) close between November 24 and December 30, with the majority closing on November 24, 2022. City staff will continue to update and advise Council on the impacts of Bill 23 as it advances and when implementation details become available.

The purpose of this report is to: highlight to Council the major changes proposed in Bill 23; the potential impacts on the City; identify areas of support and areas that should be reconsidered by the Province and have Council endorse all comments contained and appended to this report. In anticipation of the Bill advancing, staff also seek authority to submit comments to the Province as needed, where timelines do not permit reporting to Council in advance (e.g. over the Christmas/New Year break).

## Comments

The Province is setting a goal of Ontario building 1.5 million new homes by 2032. Of this total, Mississauga must pledge to build 120,000 homes in the next ten years (in other words 12,000 units a year). Staff question whether the development industry even has the capacity to construct that amount of units given persistent labour and material chalienges.

In 2021, Mississauga issued building permits for 5,500 new units. So far, 2022 is a record year, but the City has still only issued building permits for 6,100 new units. In other words, if Mississauga is to meet this Provincial target it must double its current levels of development. Fortunately, the City has been planning for growth well beyond its Regional allocation of 100,000 units so no City planning policy changes are needed to reach the provincial pledge. ${ }^{3}$

[^8]However, the Bill has the potential to significantly reduce the amount of money available to the City to provide the infrastructure required to create complete communities in these planned growth areas. Many of the measures appear designed to create short-term benefits for developers of market units while saddling municipalities and future unit owners with costs and reduced amenities for decades to come. While the Bill does have some positive provisions that are specifically intended to help build more affordable and purpose built rental housing, other provisions of the Bill would have the opposite effect by reducing the amount of this badly needed housing.

Staff have summarized key changes proposed into 7 themes:

- Mandatory and retroactive phase-in of DCs would lead to significant funding shortfalls;
- Delivery of the City's infrastructure program could be jeopardized by what is classified as "DC eligible" and fee exemptions;
- City's parkland revenue could be reduced by $70 \%$ and the quality of parkland could be diminished;
- Support proposals to streamline neighbourhood infill and intensification around transit station areas;
- Range of impacts stemming from major changes to planning and appeals processes, including planning powers removed from Region of Peel and uploaded to the Province;
- Elimination and reduction of municipal tools could further threaten affordable housing;
- Significant impacts on Ontario's heritage and natural environment and its ability to mitigate and adapt to a climate changing.

Please note that not all changes proposed are captured in the body of this Corporate Report. Please see Appendix 1 for a detailed list of changes, potential implications for the City and comments to be shared with the Province.

## 1) MANDATORY AND RETROACTIVE PHASE-IN OF DCs WOULD LEAD TO SIGNIFICANT FUNDING SHORTFALLS

City Council passed its current DC By-law on June 22, 2022. The proposed changes to the $D C$ Act direct that for any DC By-law passed after June 1, 2022, a $20 \%$ reduction must be applied to the DC rates in Year 1 of the By-law, with the reduction decreasing by $5 \%$ in subsequent years.

General estimates of the potential DC revenue lost, focusing solely on this proposal alone, are included below:

- Year 1: By applying a $20 \%$ discount, City will collect $\$ 22.2 \mathrm{M}$ less in DC revenues
- Total 4-Year DC revenue loss, estimated at $\$ 56.1 \mathrm{M}$.

As part of the 2022 DC By-law review, the City's DC rates increased by $12 \%$. Therefore if this proposal is implemented and a $20 \%$ discount is applied, the City would be collecting less revenue than prior to its 2022 DC by-law passage.
The mandatory discounts are punitive, arbitrary and the logic is unclear, given they affect each municipality so differently. For example, there are several municipalities that updated their $D C$ rates prior to June 1, 2022 that are not having to apply the discounts, and those municipalities that didn't update their by-law recently are also not having to apply the discounts. The mandatory discounts undermine Council's discretion to impose a discount or phase-in of the DC rates; many of such policies are developed with consultation with the development industry.

City staff request that the Province continue to allow municipal Council the sole discretion to set their own policies and DC rates and remove the mandatory retroactive phase-in. If not, staff recommend that the phase-in only apply to by-laws passed after Royal Assent of the Bill and/or only apply where the proposed DC rate increase is greater than $20 \%$.

These discounts also apply to non-residential development. City staff question how housing affordability and stock is improved by collecting less DC revenue from commercial and industrial developers. It is suggested to the Province that discounts be limited to the residential sector.

- Request that Province remove non-residential DC discounts and restore City's ability to set its own DC rates. Otherwise, a municipality should be made whole for these DC discounts


## 2) DELIVERY OF THE CITY'S INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM COULD BE JEOPARDIZED BY DC ELIGIBILITY AND FEE EXEMPTIONS

DC Eligibility

The proposed changes impact what is eligible for DC collection. It is proposed that studies and affordable housing can no longer be funded by DCs, and the ability to fund land acquisition for prescribed services will be limited by a future Regulation.

City staff's biggest concern is that a future regulation could limit land acquisition being an eligible cost recoverable through DCs for prescribed services. Land plays an integral part in the delivery of City services to its residents - whether it be the land for a library, community centre or arena, fire station, transit facility or land for the road network. Without land, or the funding to purchase land, the project itself would become unviable or unfunded. Without information about the scope of a future regulation, the financial impact is difficult to assess. However, if land were removed as an eligible cost for all services, the potential revenue loss would be approximately $\$ 34$ Million on an annual basis, upon the passage of the next DC by-law. City staff would ask the Province not to remove or limit land as an eligible DC cost.

Another concerning change is the removal of a municipality's' ability to fund affordable housing through DCs. In the past this funding has supported Regional capital projects as well as partnerships with the private sector to increase affordable housing supply.

Likewise, staff have concerns about not allowing for DC funded studies. These studies include, but are not limited to, the City's Future Directions Plans, Transit Infrastructure Plans and Growth Management Plans. It is suggested that the services be reinstated as collectively these measures help to build affordable and complete communities.

- As a priority, request that Province not remove or limit eligibility of "costs to acquire land" for DC collection. Also request that Province restore "affordable housing" and ability to fund "studies" as eligible for DC collection


## DC, Parkland and CBC Exemptions

## Affordable and Attainable Housing

The proposed changes exempt DCs, parkland dedication and Community Benefit Charge (CBCs) for "affordable" and "attainable" housing, Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) units, non-profit housing and second and third units.

The City already uses DCs as a tool to incentivize "missing middle" housing and exempts charges for second units, Accessory Dwelling Units and has approved DC grant based exemptions for non-profit affordable rental housing.

However, staff are concerned that broadly exempting all units that are $80 \%$ of market value could incentivize the creation of very small units (e.g. most bachelors and many one bedroom units in the city would likely meet this proposed definition) and not help achieve the types of "missing middle" housing that Ontarian households so desperately need.

At minimum, the "average" market price should be delineated for each unit size or bedroom count. Additionally, the Province should consider lowering the threshold to $70 \%$ to ensure exemptions are targeted to units affordable to low- and moderate- income households. For rental units, City staff suggest that a CMHC definition $100 \%$ AMR for rental units be adopted which is a common definition used for new rental unit incentives.

It is noted that City staff will be challenged to administer exemptions based on an $80 \%$ of the resale purchase price for ownership and $80 \%$ average market for rental for affordable units. DCs are often levied ahead of all units being sold and the price of units is in constant flux. It will be hard to determine which units may be eligible. It is also unclear how the $80 \%$ of average market rate will be determined and there could be opportunities for abuse.

The impact of exempting "attainable housing" from these growth charges is unknown. However, if the Province's definition is so broad that it applies to any unit that is not owned by an investor it could be financially catastrophic for the City. It is suggested the Province remove "attainable" housing from exemptions as the Bill already has polices exempting non-profit and gentle infill units from DCs and other charges.

As mentioned above, it is considered that the Province should make municipalities whole for any discounts offered. It is suggested that the Province could use Federal Housing Accelerator funding to address some of this municipal shortfall and staff would welcome that approach.

## Rental Housing

The proposed changes also result in the DC payable for a purpose built rental housing development being discounted based on the number of bedrooms in each units, the proposal as follows:

- Bachelor and 1 bedroom units - 15\% reduction in DCs
- Two bedroom units $-20 \%$ reduction in DCs
- Three+ bedroom units - $25 \%$ reduction in DCs

The potential revenue loss stemming from this change alone would be roughly $\$ 8.5$ Million over a ten-year period. Despite this shortfall staff are supportive of these changes as it could provide an incentive to build purpose built rental units, particularly larger units. Albeit the effectiveness of this measure is muted by DC discounts and exemptions being so widely applied across the board. Staff suggest senior grants such as the Federal Housing Accelerator be used to offset the lost revenue.

## Passing on Discounts to Buyers

It is suggested that the Province carefully examine safeguards to ensure any publically funded discounts are passed onto new homeowners. As noted in the recent report ${ }^{4}$ prepared by N . Barry Lyon Consultants, developers will price housing at the maximum level the market will support and increases/decreases in fees do not affect the sale price of units. Lost revenue leads to increased property taxes that reduce affordability overall.

City staff support requirement to enter into an agreement registered on title, to secure the exemptions, but would prefer to see an arrangement where the DCs are paid in full by the developer, then refunded to the purchaser, much like existing programs for first-time homebuyer tax rebates. This approach would help ensure that the cost savings are passed on to the homebuyer and would also expedite DC administration.

[^9]
## - Request that Province:

- Remove "attainable" housing from the proposed exemptions
- Develop mechanisms to ensure that those people looking to buy a home to live in benefit from these municipally funded discounts. DCs could be paid in full by the developer and then refunded to eligible purchasers
- Maintain the income-based definition of affordable housing as per the PPS. If not, it is requested that the Province adopt the $100 \%$ CMHC average market rent by bedroom type for rental units and a 70\% rate of average resale price with separate values for unit size/bedrooms for ownership units


## 3) CITY'S PARKLAND REVENUE COULD BE REDUCED BY 70\% AND THE QUALITY OF PARKLAND COULD BE DIMINISHED

Reduced Parkland Rates

The proposed changes include significant reduction to the current parkland dedication and Cash-in-Lieu (CIL) rates.

Specifically, maximum alternative dedication rates are lowered to 1 hectare per 600 units, from 1 hectare per 300 units for land. And 1 hectare for 1000 units for CIL, down from 1 hectare per 500 units. For high-density development, it is proposed that parkland is capped at $10 \%$ of land for smaller sites (up to 5 hectares) and $15 \%$ of land for large sites (over 5 hectares). These rates will be kept lower by being frozen at the date a zoning by-law or site plan is filed.

Mississauga has built out almost all of its greenfields and its development is changing to be more intensive. As a result, the City collects much of its CIL from medium and high density developments and uses these funds to acquire parkland (e.g. rather than through conveyance, which is more common in a greenfield context). The City is at a point in its development where significant future parkland will need to be acquired. However, the CIL rates proposed by the Bill are so low they will not allow the City to remain competitive buyers of land.

The full costs associated with this change are difficult to quantify. However on a site by site basis it is significant. For a routine application in Mississauga e.g. a tower of approximately 500 units on a site that is 1 acre, it is expected that subject to Bill 23 the City would collect $\$ 1.74 \mathrm{M}$ in CIL. This compares to $\$ 10.7 \mathrm{M}$ in CIL under the City's existing By-law (adopted June 2022).

This proposed Bill 23 rate is also well below the City's former by-law, that is 15 years old and was already unable to keep pace with rising land costs in Mississauga. Under the City's former By-law, it could have collected $\$ 5.0 \mathrm{M}$ in CIL payments.

Case Study: Typical Development in Mississauga and CIL Rates

| Development | Under Past by-law | Under New By-law | Under Proposed <br> Bill 23 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 storey mixed use <br> building containing <br> 427 <br> residential units <br> (no parkland <br> dedication) | $427^{*} \$ 11,710 /$ unit $=$ <br> $\$ 5,000,200$ | $@ 25,112$ Full <br> August 2023 CIL <br> Capped Rate | $\$ 1,734,300 \mathrm{CIL}$ <br> capped at $10 \%$ of <br> land value. |

A high-level estimate citywide suggested that under the recently approved by-law CIL revenues were anticipated to be in the order of $\$ 1.398 \mathrm{~B}$ between 2022 and 2041 , which was the amount of revenue needed to address parkland needs. With Bill 23, that is expected to be reduced to an approximate range of $\$ 284 \mathrm{M}-\$ 419 \mathrm{M}$ falling significantly short of projected needs.

Overall, these impacts are substantial and it is requested that the Province restore former parkland rates. However, if the Province wishes to maintain these lower rates it is requested that the $10 \%$ cap on parkland be removed as an urgent priority.

- Request that Province restore parkland rates, or at feast remove the land value caps placed on rates


## Land Owners to Determine Park Locations

A major concern for City staff is that the proposed changes allow developers to choose where to locate parkland. This will likely result in small sections of undevelopable land being dedicated. City staff strongly urge the Province to roll back this change, but at the very least add requirements that ensure parkland dedications are contiguous, link into the existing parkland network (where applicable) and have public street frontage and visibility.

The proposed change does allow the City to appeal a developer's parkland proposal to the OLT. However, if a developer is already going to the OLT over other issues related to their application, then any leverage the City may have had is lost. Under the proposed Bill, a municipality can also be required to take on parkland it does not want. Currently, the OLT rarely order a municipality take on parkland. It is suggested that this practice be maintained and a municipality should not be forced to manage undesirable lands.


- Request that Province roll back ability for land owners to determine park locations, or at least ensure dedications are contiguous, link into the existing parkland network and have public street frontage and visibility


## Privately Owned Publicly Accessible Spaces (POPS)

The proposed changes would allow POPS and encumbered parkland to receive the same credits as a publicly owned unencumbered park. This will make it difficult for the City to secure unencumbered parkland, particularly in its growth areas.

A POPS does not provide the same level of service as a public park. Hours of operation and maintenance of POPS are subject to an easement agreement with the owner, which may be limiting. POPS have limited programming ability and would rarely, if ever, include playground equipment and other needed park amenities. Also, because POPS are encumbered (e.g. have infrastructure underground) they will not support mature trees and are more routinely closed for maintenance.

Moreover, the creation of a POPS places a significant burden on new unit owners/condominium boards. Many new unit owners may not realize the full extent of the financial commitment they are making to manage a POPS. For large developments often more than one condominium board is responsible for managing a POPS, creating frictions and administrative challenges.

Overall, POPS arrangements generate one off value for developers. Both the City and the future residents will be forced to deal with challenges stemming from this arrangement indefinitely. City staff strongly urge the Province to remove this clause, or at least roll it back to some lesser amount to disincentivize a POPS arrangement over a public park.

- Request that Province remove $100 \%$ credit for POPS, or at least roll it back to a lesser amount to disincentivize developers providing a POPS over a public park


## 4) SUPPORT PROPOSALS TO STREAMLINE NEIGHBOURHOOD INFILL AND INTENSIFICATION AROUND STATION AREAS

## Neighbourhood Infill

The Province has proposed that three units be allowed on a lot as-of-right and parking rates are set at a maximum of one per dwellings. City staff are already working on permitting increased infill opportunities (e.g. up to 3 units) through the City's "increasing Housing Choices in Neighbourhoods" study and parking rates for infill developments were reduced in line with these recommendations earlier this year. Moreover, Mississauga had already waived development charges for up to three units in its latest DC By-law.

City staff would suggest that the Province carefully consider the many barriers to residential infill in existing neighbourhoods. Specifically, construction costs for even modest residential infill units are expensive and mortgages are difficult to secure. From the City's work, it is estimated that a one bedroom/ one storey garden suite is $\$ 250 \mathrm{~K}$, a two storey / two bedroom suite is $\$ 425 \mathrm{~K}$ and a garage conversion to a one bedroom unit is in the order of $\$ 92 \mathrm{~K}$. A loan program, or way of making capital available to homeowners, could go a long way to more of these opportunities being realized.

The Province could also consider updating the Ontario Building Code (OBC) to require that all single and semi-detached units be constructed in a way that would allow for easy conversion into second suites.

- Province could consider some type of incentive program to help capitalize infill projects (e.g. grants or loans) in established neighbourhoods
- Province could update OBC to ensure singles and towns are built in a way that would support retrofitting for second units


## Intensification around Stations

The Province has proposed "as-of-right" zoning in all MTSAs and is requiring zoning by-laws be updated within a year (reduced from three years). City staff will work to ensure these provincial deadlines are met, although would suggest to the Province that 18 months is a more realistic timeline. While updated zoning is important, staff do not expect that updating our zoning by-law will lead to a major increase in development. For twenty years, the City has pre-zoned its Downtown Core for unlimited heights and densities and while development remains steady, it is moderated by constraints around labour, materials, development phasing and other financial considerations.

## Site Plan Exemptions and No Architectural and Landscape Details

The Province has proposed that residential development of up to 10 units be exempt from site plan control, except for land lease communities. Staff can work with the exemption however, this change could shift more of the review effort to the building permit stage. Staff are seeking clarification from the Province on whether or not city standards (e.g. storm water management, road requirements and design etc.) can be applied where a new development may be exempt.

Staff are extremely concerned by the removal of architectural and landscape details at site plan. Elimination of this takes away the City's ability to shape the public realm and would undermine the quality of places in our city. It is also proposed to remove consideration of sustainable designs. This will limit the ability for the City to implement the Green Development Standards that contribute to more efficient homes being built in Mississauga that will reduce utility bills and GHG emissions.

- Request that Province restore urban design, sustainable design and landscape details at site plan stage


## 5) RANGE OF IMPACTS STEMMING FROM MAJOR CHANGES TO PLANNING AND APPEALS PROCESSES, INCLUDING MANY PLANNING POWERS BEING UPLOADED TO PROVINCE

## Regional Planning Powers

The Province has proposed to take on many new planning powers, with regional municipalities proposed to be completely removed from the planning process. A key outcome of these changes and this centralization of powers is that the Province could soon be the City's approval authority. Meaning it would be the Province that would sign off on the City's Official Plan and associated amendments rather than the Region of Peel and that the Province could redline and change the plans as they saw fit without consultation.

It is hard to gauge the impact this will have on the process. However, if it does aim to speed things up, the Province will need to build up significant expertise in municipal land use planning otherwise it is likely a bottleneck will occur.

Given the Bill downloads many responsibilities onto the City of Mississauga from the Region of Peel (and later in the report the Conservation Authorities), there could be significant staffing impacts and the need for the City to establish new areas of expertise.

## Limiting Third Party Appeals

The Province has proposed to limit third party appeals. City staff consider that limiting third party appeals for developers will significantly speed up the planning processes. Currently, the City's entire Official Plan (OP) can be appealed. In the past these broad OP appeals have taken near a decade to resolve. A similar appeals process can then unfold around site specific appeals. The collective outcome of this is a lack of certainty around the City's planning framework and increased speculation on land. However, this limit on appeals also extends to the community, who may wish to have the opportunity to participate more fully in the planning process.

## Awarding Costs

Staff are however, concerned about the proposal for the OLT to more routinely award costs against a loosing party. When coupled Bill 109 that requires a municipality to provide a decision in a very short space of time (or otherwise have to refund fees), a municipality could get caught in a position where it has to refuse an application because some major issue has not been resolved on the site and could later be punished by having costs awarded against them. City staff consider that the OLT's current process where costs are only awarded where there is a genuine attempt to obstruct a matter should continue, and costs should be rarely awarded.

## - Request that Province maintain existing OLT process where costs are rarely awarded

## Changes to Provincial Plans

The merging of the PPS and Growth Plan has also been proposed, yet limited details have been provided. The Growth Plan sets out the Greater Golden Horseshoe's urban structure (e.g. Urban Growth Centres served by transit etc.), and its growth forecasts are fundamental to good infrastructure planning. While no details are released, it is suggested that at the very least these aspects be maintained. Any changes to this document should occur in consultation with municipalities.

City staff are supportive of adding urban river valleys to the Greenbelt and already protect these lands. It is submitted that only lands be added to the Greenbelt and not subtracted.

- Request that Province:
- Consult municipalities as provincial plans are updated
- GGH urban structure of Urban Growth Centres and Major Transit Station Areas is maintained
- Growth forecasts are maintained for infrastructure planning
- Not change Greenbelt boundaries, aside from adding lands


## 6) ELIMINATION AND REDUCTION OF MUNICIPAL TOOLS THAT FURTHER THREATEN AFFORDABLE HOUSING

## Inclusionary Zoning (IZ)

## Definition, Set-aside Rate Cap, and Affordability Term Cap

Currently housing affordability is defined in terms of annual income spent on housing costs e.g. no more than $30 \%$. The Province is proposing a shift to a market-based definition of affordability that can be set at no lower than $80 \%$ of resale prices for IZ ownership units and no more than $80 \%$ of average market rent for IZ rental units. While it is unclear which data sources the Province will use to set these "average" rates, it appears that the only segment of the population that could afford an IZ ownership unit are those at the top end of the moderate-income band that is, households earning $\$ 95,000$ per year or more ${ }^{5}$ - pricing out the vast majority of Mississauga's essential workforce.

The Province has also proposed an IZ set-aside rate cap of 5\% of units / residential gross floor area. Mississauga's adopted IZ provisions require a rate ranging from $5 \%$ to $10 \%$ after an initial phase-in period. The rates are consistent with the results of the provincially mandated market

[^10]feasibility analysis. City staff do not support the $5 \%$ maximum as it will result in a minimum of $40 \%$ less affordable units than anticipated by the City's current IZ provisions. City staff request that the $5 \%$ cap be revised to $10 \%$ to help increase the supply of affordable units. In addition, with the DC, parkland, and CBC exemptions proposed for all IZ units, the feasibility of development is increased and therefore developments can absorb higher set-aside rates.

The Province is proposing a maximum affordability period of 25 years for $I Z$ units. The City's current IZ provisions require that in condominium projects and IZ rental units are to remain affordable for a minimum of 25 years (plus a 5 -year phase out) and $I Z$ ownership units are to remain affordable for a minimum of 99 years. The City is exempting purpose-built rental projects from IZ. The rental affordability term was intentionally set shorter than the ownership affordability term to encourage / incentivize delivery of $I Z$ rental units in condominium projects. Since the developer does not retain ownership of affordable ownership units, development feasibility is not impacted by the affordability term for IZ ownership units. Staff do not support the proposed maximum affordability period because it will cause ownership units to be lost from the IZ inventory sooner than necessary, and the proposed maximum term will have no impact on development feasibility / housing supply.

Overall, the collective impact of these proposed changes undermine the ability of this policy tool to work as intended and deliver affordable housing. The changes also reduce the efficiency of administering the $I Z$ program. Staff urge the Province to reconsider the proposed changes to the $I Z$ regulations, to ensure that $I Z$ can have a meaningful impact in communities.


- Request that Province increase IZ set-aside rate cap to $10 \%$
- Request that Province extend the affordability for "ownership" units to 99 years; this will have no impact on developers but will allow for more sustainable affordable housing supply
- Request Province maintain the income-based definition of affordable housing as per the Provincial Policy Statement


## Rental Protection By-law

Rental protection by-laws help to ensure that affordable rental supply continues to remain in areas designated for intensification and to mitigate unintended consequences of growth. Retaining affordable rental housing is critical to supporting our workforce needs and businesses. It is suggested to the Province that the power for municipalities to develop rental protection bylaws be maintained. Additional considerations could be made to tailor rental protection to local markets.

The City of Mississauga has taken a flexible approach to implementing this tool recognizing the need to enable property owners to upgrade and make more efficient use of existing rental properties. For example, the by-law requires that affordable rental units be replaced by same unit types by bedroom, rather than floor areas, at similar, not the same rents. A recent proposal
was approved in Mississauga wherein the property owner was able to increase the number of rental units from 8 to 15 units. The approval process is short and typically delegated to staff. - Request that Province maintain the City's ability to protect rental housing stock

## 7) SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ON ONTARIO'S HERITAGE, NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND ABILITY TO MITIGATE AND ADAPT TO A CHANGING CLIMATE

## Heritage

The proposed changes to the Heritage Act create a two-year limit to review all properties on the heritage register and designate properties. Only properties currently on heritage registers can be designated. All designated properties and heritage conservation districts are to meet two out of three criteria for designation and there is a new process for repealing designations. Some of these proposed processes are to be established in forthcoming regulations.

These proposed changes to the Heritage Act will create a large amount of work for the City's heritage community, including the Heritage Advisory Committee and Heritage Planning staff, with potentially little reward. Rather than the City carefully considering heritage attributes through a development application processes as they arise, the City will be required to go through a process of reviewing and potentially designating 1,000 listed properties (not designated properties) on the City's register.

These efforts will take time, have staffing implications, and potentially create a substantial number of appeals at the OLT. Staff are concerned they could hold up development rather than allow it to move forward more quickly.

- Province could reconsider the benefits of heritage review process, as most likely it will slow down development


## Conservation Authorities

Proposed changes to the Conservation Authority Act aim to streamline approvals by only permitting the Conservation Authorities (CAs) to focus on natural hazards impacts on people and their property, as opposed to protecting the Natural Heritage System as a whole. This could allow new developments to be built on lands that should be or were once protected.

Additionally, it is proposed that municipalities would exercise sole approval when a development application is filed, which may include decision making over hazard lands. The City relies heavily on the CAs for their technical review and analysis for both natural hazards as well as natural heritage. The City has excellent working relationships with Credit Valley Conservation (CVC), Toronto Region Conservation Authority and Conservation Halton. All have an excellent track record of delivering their expert technical advice in a timely manner.

Presently, the City does not have the expertise to take on these expanded responsibilities. The City will need to hire new staff in order to fill the current role of CAs and build up this knowledge base. Again, this will take time and will more likely slow down the process than speed it up.

> Request that Province reconsider the benefits of limiting CA's powers to comment on natural heritage, as the City will be solely responsible to review such matters, and in the short term processes will be slowed down as new staff are hired and expertise is established

## Natural Heritage System

The proposed changes to the Conservation Authority Act move Ontario from a holistic approach to protection of the environmental and social ecological values of a watershed to one focused on the protection of people and property against natural hazards. By framing the issue this way, Ontario could stand to loose the natural functions provided by its natural heritage system (e.g.: filtering air and water, mitigating flooding and erosion, storing carbon, providing habitat for fish and wildlife, and providing a wide range of recreation and tourism opportunities) in exchange for conventional infrastructure.

This change in approach creates a one-off financial benefit for developers. All of whom would have probably purchased newly approved land cheaply, because it would have likely been considered a flood plain with high erosion potential. Yet if this land is developed, these natural hazard burdens will be transferred to unit owners and municipalities.

Negative outcomes could be more pronounced if other measures proposed in this Bill result in the City's natural heritage system being reduced in size and as society at large works to adapt to a changing climate.

## Wetlands

Proposed changes to the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES) alter the way that wetlands are identified and evaluated. The proposed changes would remove the concept of wetland complexes, which will make it more difficult for small wetlands (<2ha in size) to be included and evaluated under the system. Given that wetlands comprise only about $0.9 \%$ of the city's land base and many are small and exist in a mosaic of smaller habitats, the identification
and protection of small wetlands is essential to maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem function at a local and landscape scale.

The proposed changes to the OWES will also allow for wetland boundaries to be re-defined after they have been evaluated and accepted; which could lead to a situation where unauthorized/unpermitted changes to wetlands have led to a reduction in their size or loss over time to facilitate more growth in areas that would have been otherwise protected.

## Ecological Offsetting Policy

Furthermore, the Province is consulting on a newly proposed "Ecological Offsetting" policy. Staff are concerned such a policy could result in Mississauga's natural heritage features and functions, that would otherwise be protected in-situ, being proposed for removal and replaced elsewhere, including outside of the city, region and/or watershed.

Staff are concerned that this proposal could lead to a steady reduction in the amount of natural space covered by the City's Natural Heritage System, weakening the entire system, with no mechanism to require that suitable compensation be provided within the city and/or assurances that an equal asset is provided elsewhere.

- Request that Province maintain existing wetland protections, the benefits of developing on wetlands do not outweigh the potential environmental outcomes.
- Not adopt a Provincial ecological off-setting policy. Technical ecological advice on offsetting should be provided in local context by the Conservation Authorities and the City, as appropriate.


## Financial Impact

The changes identified in the proposed Bill 23 will have significant financial impact for the City. The full cost and administrative burden cannot be determined without additional details that will be found in the regulations, when these are released. The following analysis is based on currently available details.

## Impact on Development Charges

It is estimated that the Bill could cost the City up to $\$ 325 \mathrm{M}$ over a ten-year period. The potential ten-year DC revenue loss is shown as follows.

|  | $2023-2032$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Forecasted DC Revenue |  |
| Less: Lost DC Revenue | $\$ 1,135,000,000$ |
| Net Forecasted DC Revenue | $(\$ 325,000,000)$ |

1. Forecasted DC Revenue is based on the development forecast contained in the 2022 Development Charges Background Study.
2. Lost DC Revenue based on: Mandatory retroactive phase-in, removing land and studies as DC eligible cost, 15year service level calculation, estimated DC discount on for-profit rental units, and the requirement to update the DC by-law upon its expiry in 2027.

It should be noted that there will be future financial losses stemming from Bill 23 that cannot be quantified at the time of writing of this report. The City requires full details, including Regulations and Bulletins, to be released by the Province to completely understand the financial impact. Of particular concern is the DC exemption for "Attainable Housing" which is currently only defined as not affordable nor rental units.

## Impact on Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland

Based on the proposals that are currently defined by the Province through Bill 23, the potential CIL Parkland revenue loss is shown as follows.

|  | 2023-2032 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Forecasted CIL Parkland Revenue ${ }^{1}$ | $\$ 700,000,000$ |
| Less: Lost CIL Parkland Revenue ${ }^{2}$ | $\$ 490,000,000$ to $\$ 560,000,000$ |
| Net Forecasted CIL Parkland Revenue | $\$ 140,000,000$ to $\$ 210,000,000$ |

1. Forecasted CIL Parkland Revenue is based on the 2022 Parkland Conveyance By-law Update Report.
2. Lost ClL Parkland Revenue is based on preliminary estimates prepared by Hemson Consulting Ltd. based on available data.

Some changes to parkiand dedication cannot be quantified in dollar values. For example, developers would be able to choose the location of their parkland dedication. This is of particular concern as the City may end up with remnant parcels of land or "slivers" of land that would be unsuitable for park amenities. As well, the City must accept encumbered and privately owned public space (POPS) as parkland dedication.

All of these proposed changes will create significant budget pressures. These discounts will either need to be made up by reducing service levels or increasing property taxes and charges. Transferring the burden from developers to new unit owners and taxpayers, all of which will undermine affordability in Mississauga on the whole.

## Conclusion

Mississauga has demonstrated a strong commitment to support provincial aims to create more housing, a greater mix of housing and efforts to make home ownership and renting more affordable. The City further supports the government's commitment to reduce red tape and make it easier to live and do business in Ontario. However, staff's assessment is that Bill 23 is overly focused on blanket fee reductions that would apply for market rate developments with no guarantee that savings will be passed on to renters and homebuyers.

A fundamental concern that staff have with the proposed Bill is that it fails to recognize the complexity of getting a development off the ground. Staff are supportive of provincial efforts to streamline processes and ensure zoning is up to date etc., but these measures address one part of the process. Developers are dealing with all manner of costs and constraints - including labour, construction costs, rising interest rates, financing, development phasing and so on. Without addressing these matters, it is unlikely that the Bill will result in the increased level of development that is being anticipated.

With so much on the line - the potential impacts on the natural environment, community infrastructure, parks, transit, affordable housing and the quality of our urban environments - the Province should slow down and reflect on the collective impact of these changes. Taking the time to consult with a broader range of stakeholders in meaningful ways could help achieve a more balanced and strategic plan for housing that meets the needs of Ontarians.

## Attachments

Appendix 1: Detailed Comments to Province
Appendix 2: List of All ERO and Related Postings
A hrittemore

Andrew Whittemore, M.U.R.P., Commissioner of Planning \& Building
Prepared by: Katherine Morton, Manager, City Planning Strategies, Planning Strategies and Data

Table 1 - Changes to City of Toronto Act, 2006 and Municipal Act, 2001 - Rental Protection
Provincial Comments Period closes on November 24, 2022 (ORR: 22-MMAH017)

| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rental Replacement <br> Minister given the authority to make regulations imposing limits and conditions on the powers of a local municipality to prohibit and regulate the demolition and conversion of residential rental properties. | - Could diminish ability to protect rental housing. The possible outcomes could be anything from reducing the conditions Mississauga can make on the Sec. 99 permit to eliminating Mississauga's ability to regulate rental demolition or conversions at all. <br> - Mississauga currently uses a flexible approach to protect rental supply while still encourage reinvestment in existing rental stock. It does not impact the tenant provisions of the Residential Tenancies Act (RTA). | - Staff are seeking clarification on the extent of Minister's authority. <br> - Staff would support approaches to rental protection that allow landowners to reinvest in the stock while protecting the existing (more affordable) supply. One example of flexibility is how Mississauga regulates the number of bedrooms but not unit sizes (GFAs). Financial offsets, provincial/federal tax credits and other innovative solutions should be explored. <br> - Staff would welcome participation in any working groups before regulations are enacted. |

Table 2 - Changes to Conservation Authorities Act, 1990
Provincial Comment Period closes on November 24, 2022 (ERO: 019-6141) and December 30, 2022 (ERO: 019-2927)

| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cannot Comment on Applications <br> Conservation Authorities cannot provide services related to reviewing and commenting on proposals and planning and | - Conservation Authorities act as technical advisors to the municipality on matters of natural heritage protection. Without their expertise, the municipality will have to grow this capacity on its team to address these matters. <br> - Furthermore, an individual municipality lacks the expertise to inform development decisions that may have cross-jurisdictional concerns (e.g. risk of | - Staff suggest the Province reconsider the proposed changes to enable Conservation Authorities to continue providing their essential review services to municipalities. Municipalities currently fack expertise and it would take time to grow these services, potentially leading to approval delays. |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| development related applications. <br> Minister can direct Conservation Authorities not to change the fees it charges for a program or service for a specified period of time. | flooding and water quality decisions upstream impact other municipalities downstream). Conservation Authorities can address these concerns through a watershed-based approach, which is important for Mississauga's downstream and lake-fronting location. | - A holistic approach of protecting our natural heritage systems and the public from natural hazards is important for residents, businesses and municipalities to be able to withstand and adapt to more extreme weather events because of climate change. |
| Removing the Consideration of Control of Pollution and Conservation of Land <br> Removing factors of pollution and conservation of land, and adding a new factor, namely, the control of unstable soil or bedrock when Conservation Authorities are making decisions. | - The removal of pollution and conservation of land from the oversight of the Conservation Authority would create a large gap in how matters are addressed through the planning process. It could lead to development that may pollute the natural heritage system (including aquatic habitat, watercourses and Lake Ontario), and allow for development inside natural features that would otherwise be protected from incompatible uses. These features form the backbone of Mississauga's natural heritage system (e.g. valleylands) and provide critical ecosystem functions. | - Staff recommend that the Province reconsider further scoping the oversight of the Conservation Authority to exclude pollution and conservation of land in order to retain the robust environmental protections that are required to ensure a healthy and resilient natural heritage system. <br> - A holistic approach of protecting the natural heritage systems and the public from Natural Hazards is critical for residents, businesses and municipalities to be able to withstand and adapt to more extreme weather events due to climate change. <br> - If existing controls are removed flood prone areas are subject to greater levels of development, then the Province could consider an environmental justice and equity lens. For example, homeowners may struggle to obtain appropriate home insurance for flooding or won't be able to afford the costs. Impacts could also be significant for renters. |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Obligations Regarding Land Disposition <br> The disposition of certain land requires the Conservation Authority to provide a notice of the proposed disposition to the Minister (rather than obtaining the Minister's approval). <br> Conservation Authorities to conduct public consultation before disposing of certain lands and the notice of public consultation must include description of the type of land, proposed date of disposition and proposed future use of the lands, if known. <br> The Minister would be allowed to impose terms and conditions on an approval given with respect to a project that involved money granted by the Minister under section 39. | - It is unclear what criteria would be established in order to determine land disposition. Given the reduction in scope of the Conservation Authorities to matters other than flooding and erosion, other areas that are currently owned for conservation purposes that play important ecological roles (i.e. wetlands, significant natural areas, habitat of endangered and threatened species etc.) may be proposed for future housing. | - Conservation Authority lands that are critical to securing ecosystem services should be maintained for conservation. Staff recommend that the Province remove this proposed amendment and prioritize the long term impacts on the environment. <br> - Should the amendment proceed, clear criteria should be developed that exclude lands that support conservation purposes from the disposition process. |
| Development for Which a Minister's Order is Issued <br> Conservation Authorities required to issue a permission | - The oversight provided by the Conservation Authority permit process provides an important level of protection for critical ecosystem features such as wetlands and watercourses. Depending on the intent of the MZO or Planning Act approval, if | - Staff recommend that the Province reconsider the approach to development in this case to enable greater oversight in natural heritage protection. |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| or permit where an order has <br> been made under section 47 of <br> the Planning Act (MZO) also | environmental protection is not at the forefront it <br> could result in the loss of portions of Mississauga's |  |
| apply to orders made under | Natural Heritage and associated ecological |  |
| section 34.1 of the Planning Act | functions. |  |
| (Minister's order at request of |  |  |
| municipality). |  |  |

## Table 3 - Changes to Development Charges Act, 1997

Provincial Comment Period closes on November 24, 2022 (ERO: 019-6172)

| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mandatory and Retroactive Phase-in of DC Rates for any DC By-law Passed on or After June 1, 2022 <br> Reduction in the maximum $D C$ that could otherwise be charged for the first four years a DC by-law is in force. Any DC imposed during the first, second, third and fourth years that the DC by-law is in force could be no more than 80,85 , 90 and 95 per cent, respectively, of the maximum DC that could have otherwise been charged. | - This would have an immediate detrimental financial impact to the City. Focusing solely on this proposal alone, the revenue loss to the City would be over $\$ 56$ million over a four-year period. <br> - The lost DC revenue would impact the City in various ways; if the capital project were to go forward in the time frame as planned, there would be property tax increase implications. Should property tax rate increases not be viable, the timing of the delivery of service could be delayed. As a worst case scenario, the lack of $D C$ funding could make a project completely unviable and the City may experience declines in its service levels. <br> - This proposal impacts the City unfairly, given that the City's DC by-law was passed only 21 days after the retroactive date the Province has chosen. It is | - Generally speaking, City staff are supportive of proposals contained in Bill 23 that would affect meaningful change to the overall affordability and supply of housing. City staff are of the view that the retroactive and mandatory phase-in does not achieve the Province's stated goal. <br> - City staff are unclear why the blanket reduction also applies to the non-residential sector. It is unclear how this would help support affordable housing. <br> - Request to the Province: <br> - Remove the application of the mandatory retroactive phase-in of DC rates to the nonresidential DCs. |


| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reductions are applicable to new DC by-laws imposed on or after June 1, 2022. | noted that municipalities that passed their $D C$ bylaw one day before the June 1, 2022 date are not impacted by this proposal. As such, the date seems fairly arbitrary. | - Continue to allow municipalities to set their own policies on phasing-in rate increases and not include any mandatory discounts in the DCA. <br> - Alternative Suggestions: <br> - Any mandatory phase-in provisions included in the DCA should only apply to DC by-laws passed after Royal Asset of the Bill. <br> - A mandatory phase-in only applies if the proposed DC rate increase is greater than $20 \%$. <br> - The phase-in period be reduced from 4 years to 2 years. |
| Changes to Eligible DC Costs <br> New regulation authority to prescribe services where land costs will not be an eligible capital costs. <br> Studies would no longer be an eligible capital cost. <br> Removal of Housing from the list of eligible DC services. | - The potential revenue loss stemming from removing land as an eligible cost would be approximately $\$ 34$ million on an annual basis. <br> - Without land, or the funding to purchase land, the project itself would become unviable or unfunded. <br> - This is an area of significant concern for City staff. <br> - The potential revenue loss stemming from removing studies as an eligible capital cost would be $\$ 800,000$ on an annual basis. <br> - The Region is the Housing Service Manager and therefore would be impacted if Housing was removed from the list of eligible $D C$ services. The Region's 2020 DC study projected $\$ 200 \mathrm{M}$ over the next ten years for critical affordable housing initiatives such as the housing master plan. The change to the DC Act puts projects in Mississauga such as East Avenue, Brightwater, and others at risk. | - Land plays an integral part in the delivery of City services to its residents - whether it be the land for a library, community centre or arena, fire station, transit facility or land for the road network. <br> - Again, City staff are concerned that the removal of land as an eligible capital cost is punitive and serves only to reduce the City's revenues. <br> - Request to the Province: <br> - Not remove or limit eligibility of "costs to acquire land" for DC collection. <br> - Studies play an integral part on how the City plans for future infrastructure and service delivery to its future residents. Restore studies as an eligible capital cost <br> - Restore Housing as eligible DC service |
| Discounts for Purpose Built Rental Units | - The potential revenue loss stemming from this change alone would be roughly $\$ 850,000$ on an annual basis. | - Staff are supportive of these changes as it could provide an incentive to build purpose built rental units, particularly larger units. |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Discounts are as follows: <br> $-25 \%$ for $3+$ bedrooms <br> -20\% for 2 bedrooms <br> $-15 \%$ for bachelor \& 1 bedroom | - This proposed discount would be in addition to the statutory deferral of the DCs over a six-year period, stemming from the change to the DC Act that came into effect on January 1, 2020. | - It is suggested the province consider using grants such as the Housing Accelerator Fund to offset lost revenue. |
| Change to the Historic Service Level Calculation <br> Historical service level for DC eligible capital costs (except transit) extended from 10 to 15 years. | - This particular proposal, again, seems arbitrary and affects each municipality differently <br> - The preliminary high level sensitivity analysis performed by City staff shows an overall neutral effect on the DC rates, with the exception of Fire Services where the City has utilized non-DC funding sources to increase its service levels and this proposal would see a decrease to the Fire DC rates. | - Because this proposal seems fairly arbitrary and seemingly has the desired effect to lower DC rates and overall revenues to municipalities, it is an undesirable change. <br> - However, given the gamut of proposed changes of Bill 23, City staff have an overall neutral position to this particular change. |
| Cap on the Interest Charged by Municipalities <br> The proposed amendment would cap the interest to prime rate plus 1 percent on rental and prescribed institutional developments. This also applies to the rates frozen at the time of application. | - The City and Region currently have a Council approved policy which levies an interest rate of 5.5\%. <br> - Subsequently, Council approved a policy that set the interest rate at 0\% for rental housing developments. <br> - By prescribing the maximum interest rate to the prime lending rate would more closely align with borrowing rates should the City need to debt finance growth-related capital projects. | - City staff have a neutral position towards this particular change in the legislation. |
| Requirement to Spend or Allocate 60\% of DC reserve funds <br> Beginning in 2023, municipalities will be required to spend or allocate at least | - The City has plans to utilize the Roads DC reserve fund balance through the City's long-term financial planning and annual budgeting exercises. <br> - Depending on how stringent the Province is on their definition of "allocate", this requirement may make it difficult to plan for larger capital projects, | - City staff have an overall neutral position towards this particular change in the legislation. |


| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $60 \%$ of the monies in a reserve fund for priority services (water, waste waster, distribution and treatment of services, and roads). | and the ability to change the capital forecast annually. |  |
| Expiration of DC By-law <br> Changing the DC by-law expiration from 5 to 10 years. DCs can still be updated anytime before the 10 year period. | - This proposal seems fairly arbitrary and seemingly has the desired effect to stagnate the DC rates for a period of ten years. | - Given that it is not a mandated ten year shelf life of the DC by-law, City staff have an overall neutral position towards this particular change in the legislation. |
| Exemptions from DCs for: <br> - > 1 unit or $1 \%$ of existing units in an existing purpose-built rental building <br> - Residential intensification (additional dwelling unit and ancillary units) | - The potential financial impacts would be nominal, given the changes made to the Regulations in 2020 which exempt additional dwelling units that are within or ancillary to a primary unit. | - City staff are general supportive of financial relief to units supporting gentle densification. |
| Exemptions from DCs for: <br> - Non-profit housing | - Many municipalities provide a grant-in-lieu of fees and charges to true non-profit housing providers. <br> - The potential financial impact would be nominal. | - Staff support fee exemptions (DCs, CBC, Parkland Dedication) for non-profit housing developments. |


| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Full Exemptions from DCs, CBCs and Parkland Dedication <br> Full exemptions from $D C$ charges for affordable units; attainable units; and inclusionary zoning units. Affordable housing generally defined as being priced at no greater than $80 \%$ of the average resale price or average rent in the year a unit is sold or rented. <br> Future regulations will give definition for "attainable housing units" | - The City has already passed a by-law with respect to DC grants for Affordable Rental Housing, but it differs from the proposal in a few ways: <br> - The grant would only be available to nonprofit rental housing units <br> - Only the City's portion of DCs would be eligible for a grant <br> - The value of the grant would be determined based on the proposed rents relative to AMR where rents up to $100 \%$ AMR would be eligible for up to a $100 \%$ grant and rents up to 125\% AMR would be eligible for up to a $50 \%$ grant <br> - The proposed changes are likely to support the creation of more housing units and increase supply, but is unlikely to have a true impact on creating (and preserving) affordable housing units. | - More information is requested to understand how "average resale price" and "average market rent" be set. Will the Province be setting these rates on an annual basis? Will this be done on a municipality-by-municipality basis and by unit type? <br> - Additional details regarding the information that will be included in the MMAH bulletin supporting determination of eligibility for exemptions is required to understand implementation and impacts. <br> - Further clarification is required for the definition(s) of "attainable housing units" and/or "development designated through regulation" to understand the magnitude and scope of DC fee exemptions. <br> - Staff support the requirement to enter into an agreement registered on title, to secure the exemptions. However, it's preferable to see an arrangement where the DCs are paid in full by the developer, then refunded to the purchaser, much like existing programs for first-time homebuyer tax rebates - this would help ensure that the cost savings are in fact passed on to the homebuyer. |
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## Table 4 - Changes to Ontario Heritage Act

Provincial Comment Period closes on November 24, 2022 (ERO: 019-6196)

| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Listing of Properties on Municipal Heritage Register <br> New requirements aimed to focus the use of the heritage register listing process with new threshold test (to meet certain prescribed criteria for cultural heritage value or interest) for listing a property. | - Increasing the threshold for designated properties from one to two criteria will have an impact on how Mississauga recognizes the heritage on equity-seeking groups. Many of the structures which play a foundational role in the community lack architectural value and are plain but have a significant importance and story behind them. | - Changing the threshold of designating properties from one to two criteria will limit the City's ability to recognize the heritage of equity seeking groups. <br> - Many equity seeking communities solidified themselves in buildings and locations which hold significant associative value to the community, but little architectural or design value. As such, the heritage of these communities would be undervalued against the heritage of more established and better documented communities. <br> - The Province could consider options and expanding the criteria to directly engage with equity-seeking communities and ensure that heritage is approached in an equitable manner. |
| Time Limits and De-listing of Properties <br> Requirement to review the heritage register and make decisions whether listed properties will be designated, and if not, the properties will be removed from the register. <br> If a municipality fails to take action in two yeas from the date the property is listed to initiate the designation | - Significant impact to the City's heritage resources by limiting the time a property can be listed on the register. Listing a property on the register gives Mississauga time to consider its heritage value and allow for other means of conserving and interpreting its heritage and history aside from protection through designation. | - This change will limit the City's ability to explore options of interpretation and commemoration outside of the standard designation process, making the heritage process less flexible and potentially cause more challenges to development. |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| process, then it will be required to remove the property. <br> If a property is removed from the register as a result of a municipality's non-action, they would be prohibited from listing that property again for a period of five years. |  |  |
| Freeze on Designation Process <br> The designation process would "freeze" once a prescribed event occurs (e.g. likely to include submission of some or most development applications) <br> Municipalities would not be permitted to issue a notice of intention to designate a property unless the property is already on the register when the current 90 day requirement for applications is triggered. | - The City would not be able to add properties to the heritage register when 'prescribed event' occurs. This places the onus on the City to be proactive in maintaining the heritage register and anticipating when a property may come up for development. |  |
| Heritage Conservation Districts <br> New proposed process to allow for heritage conservation district plans to be amended or repealed. | - Minimal impact to the City as this is already the process used when establishing and amending Heritage Conservation Districts. |  |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Requirement for municipalities <br> to first undertake a study of <br> the area to ascertain the <br> heritage it seeks to protect, <br> establish the district via by-law, <br> adopt a heritage conservation <br> district plan, and the plan <br> would have to explain how the |  |  |
| cultural heritage value or |  |  |
| interest of the district meets |  |  |
| new prescribed criteria. |  |  |

Table 5 - Changes to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) Act, 2021
Provincial Comment Period closes on November 25, 2022 (ORR: 22-MAG011)

| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dismissal of Appeals <br> Proposed changes to expand <br> OLT's authority to dismiss <br> proceedings without a hearing <br> on the basis of undue delay or <br> the OLT is of the opinion that a <br> party has failed to comply with <br> an OLT order. | Generally, improvements to the OLT are <br> welcomed however, the proposed changes will <br> impact public participation and reduce <br> municipalities' ability to serve the public interest. |  |


| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost Awards <br> Proposed changes to increase powers for the OLT to order an unsuccessful party to pay a successful party's costs. | - There may be instances where the unsuccessful party is a municipality and will have to pay the awarded costs. This greatly burdens municipalities and existing taxpayers, as well as, widens the gap for financial implications and budgetary shortfalls. | - Staff recommend the OLT maintain an approach where cost awards are rare, and recommend the Province exempt municipalities from having to pay costs if they are the unsuccessful party. |
| Prioritizing Resolution of certain proceedings <br> Proposed new powers for the Lieutenant Governor to make regulations setting standards with respect to timing of scheduling hearings and making decisions. <br> The Minister can prescribe timelines that would apply specified steps taken by the OLT in specified classes of proceedings. | - Generally, improvements to the OLT are welcomed, however the proposed changes centralize powers that reduce public participation, transparency and accountability. | - Staff recommend having written criteria for prioritizing hearings and making decisions. |
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Table 6 - Changes to the Planning Act, 1990
Provincial Comment Period closes on November 24, 2022 (ERO: 019-6163, ERO: 019-6172)

| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ministerial Amendment of Official Plan <br> New powers for the Minister to make amendments to an official plan and the power to make amendments based on Minister's opinion that the plan is likely to adversely affect a matter of provincial interest. | - Minister will be the approval authority for Mississauga's OP but it is unclear how it will use this power e.g. (ad hoc in between MCR processes). <br> - Staff are concerned with the uncertainty around timelines and approval of each individual third party initiated Official Plan Amendment (OPA) <br> - This also erodes the public process and reduces opportunities for public input into the Official Plan when these amendments occur. | - Seeking clarification on how new powers will be used and whether the Province will be approval authority for all amendments (e.g. even in instances where there are no conformity issues with provincial legislation) |
| Third-Party Appeals <br> Proposed changes will limit third party appeals and require that the prospective appellant be a specified person to quality for appeal rights (e.g. limited to public bodies). <br> The proposed limit on thirdparty appeal rights will be applied retroactively to appeals that have not had a hearing scheduled before October 25, 2022. changes would apply to all Planning Act decisions. | - Limits the rights of general public and participation in the appeals process. <br> - This means that city-initiated OPAs, would be approved by the province and cannot be appealed by the public, including landowners. See S. 17(24). <br> - Based on the transition policies, the OLT appeals received for existing projects could be dismissed unless there are new regulations specifying classes of appeals that may be exempt. | - Staff consider that removing the ability for developers to appeal will significantly speed up and create greater certainty in the planning process. Developers still have an opportunity to apply for an Official Plan Amendment/ rezoning through site-specific development application. <br> - This limit on appeals extends to the community, who may wish to have the opportunity to participate in the appeals process. |


| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cap on Community Benefit Charges Contribution <br> Introduction of a new cap on the total amount of a community benefit charge based on only the value of the land proposed for new development. <br> Affordable housing units will be exempt and implemented by discounting the max CBC of $4 \%$ of land value by the floor area of the affordable units as a proportion of total building floor area. | - Impacts to revenue and in turn, reduced benefits. <br> - Impacts to community infrastructure and long term planning and implementation of new community services/facilities | - The original $4 \%$ proposal by the Province did not provide for a meaningful revenue source to municipalities in the first place. This proposal continues to erode this funding source. |
| Site Plan Control Exemption <br> Developments of up to 10 residential units will be exempt from site plan control and there are no transition provisions. | Cumulative impacts of site plan exemption to the City include removing the ability to: <br> - Acquire land dedications (e.g. road widenings, sight triangles, greenbelt/hazard lands) and easements (e.g. stormwater/servicing easements <br> - Control access (e.g. access to main corridors), site circulation/design for vehicles and people, <br> - Local improvements (e.g. sidewalks, multi-use trails) and lack of ability to collect cash-in-lieu of sidewalks or have developer build missing portion of sidewalk <br> - Evaluate site servicing/capacity <br> - Stormwater management controls, and potential loss of the proposed measures all together | - Staff are seeking clarification on whether applicants still have to use/comply with City Standards. This is very important for a number of issues, but particularly for municipal servicing, stormwater management requirements/control measures, private road design/naming, etc. |


| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - Utility coordination and streetlighting improvement/relocation <br> - SP Agreement to deal with design of required municipal works and/or to include other required conditions or clauses <br> - Identify existing and proposed encroachments on City owned lands/ROWs, and identify need for encroachment, license, consent to enter agreements, etc. <br> - Not being able to identify existing easements or other site restrictions/constraints (these can impact setback distances to proposed buildings, proposed building footprint location can be impacted) <br> - Fencing and acoustic requirements <br> - Limiting the application of green development standards is likely to result in inefficient homes being built - leading to increases in greenhouse gas emissions and high utility costs for residents. <br> - This exemption will impact the City's ability to manage smaller, sensitive infill redevelopment projects. It will result in the elimination of the Replacement Housing (Infill) Site Plan process in Wards 1, 2, 5 and 7. <br> - This exemption would leave the City's Natural Heritage System vulnerable to removal and nonmitigated impacts. Loss of ability to provide technical advice on appropriate mitigation, restoration and compensation related to the Natural Heritage System (NHS). | - This exemption could reduce the size and quality of the City's natural heritage features which provide essential ecosystem services. |


| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Exclusions from Site Plan Control <br> Matters of exterior design, landscape architecture, streetscape and sustainable design will be removed from site plan control (however, exterior access to building with affordable housing will still be reviewed). | Exterior Design <br> - Removes ability to ensure durable materials and sustainable features are used, which leads to lower quality built form and long term maintenance issues. <br> Landscape Architecture / Sustainable Design <br> - Removes ability to ensure compatibility with surrounding properties <br> - Removes ability to ensure linkages to surrounding infrastructure such as pedestrian access to transit <br> - Removes ability to incorporate sustainable design features such as low impact design, stormwater management, planting and appropriate green features and Green Development Standards <br> - Removes ability to incorporate resolving stormwater impact adapting to climate change <br> Streetscape <br> - Removes municipal ability to obtain sidewalks, street trees and appropriate urban infrastructure required to create and sustain walkable, transit-oriented communities <br> - Removes an opportunity to coordinate utilities with city engineering requirements which will have financial impacts on cities: capital projects may be required to address to complete the public realm resulting from increased development activity | - Staff recommend that that these matters should be retained in site plan control in order to achieve walkable, liveable and desirable communities. <br> - Seeking clarification on whether these matters are removed from site plan control for commercial, industrial and institutional uses. <br> - Limiting the application of Green Development Standards could result in inefficient homes being built - leading to increases in greenhouse gas emissions and higher utility costs for residents. |
| Removal of Upper Tier Responsibilities and Approval <br> Proposed changes will remove all upper tier municipalities | - The Region's Official Plan will no longer exist. This will be a loss of regional planning expertise on cross-jurisdictional matters, such as, health of natural systems that Mississauga is part of. | - Seeking clarification on the extent of the Province's decision making (e.g. whether the Province will approve every individual amendment). |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| from the review and approval process for lower tier official plans, amendments and plans of subdivision. <br> The Minister will become the new approval authority for all lower tier official plans and amendments. The Minister's decisions cannot be appealed. | - Relevant parts of The Region's Official Plan will be deemed to be part of Mississauga's Official Plan. Staff and Council will have to make decisions regarding what parts of the Region's recently approved OP must be integrated directly into Mississauga's OP, what needs to be revised, how to eliminate redundancies and any conflicts and what parts to rescind. This will require significant time and resources. It is out of scope of the current Official Plan Review (OPR) process. <br> - As approval authority for the City's new Official Plan, the Province will be able to directly modify Council-approved Official Plan policies. Additionally, the Minister will now be able to modify any Official Plan policy at any time when the Minister considers it to be likely to adversely affect a matter of provincial interest. This appears to be similar to MZOs, but for Official Plan policy instead of zoning by-laws. <br> - Employment Conversion authority will be brought back to the City. <br> - The Region's OP has extensive environmental policy and mapping which will become the City's responsibility to administer and update as it pertains to Mississauga. Consequently, additional staff expertise and resources may be required. <br> - Some of Region's map schedules will have to be integrated into the City's new OP. <br> - City will now be responsible to make decisions on Smart Centre requested Employment Land conversions and the Heartland land use study. | - Seeking clarification on the transition, process and timeline to integrate and repeal Regional OP policies into Mississauga's OP. <br> - Clarification on conformity requirements, as there will not be an upper tier official plan (e.g. lower tier has one year to conform with upper tier plan). <br> - Seeking clarification on matters pertaining to conflicts between the Region's OP and Mississauga's OP amidst the local OP and OPAs getting approved e.g. which policies will prevail. <br> - If lower tier municipalities will be responsible for employment and population forecasting, while the Region will be the infrastructure provider, what will be the roles and relationship between the upper and lower tier municipalities? |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - City will need to determine how much of the Official Plan Review (OPR) should progress in light of Bill 23 (including elimination of Regional planning authority), which could still change and has an undetermined in-force date. It is likely prudent to delay the OPR Policy Bundle 3 release to address the Bill 23 changes and pending changes to the Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan that the Province has indicated is coming. It appears that the 1 year time requirement for the City to update its Official Plan to conform to the Region's Official Plan no longer applies, as the Region's Official Plan will no longer exist but will be deemed to form part of Mississauga's Official Plan, where applicable. |  |
| Increased Gentle Intensification <br> Proposed as of right permissions will allow up to three residential units permitted on the lot of a detached house, semidetached house and rowhouses, with no minimum unit size. <br> New units will be exempt from DC, Community Benefit Charge and parkland requirements. | - The City's Official Plan (as well as Official Plan Review draft policies) and Zoning by-laws will have to be revised to address this. <br> - This proposed change is in alignment with preliminary direction in Mississauga's Increasing Housing Choices in Neighbouroods Study (IHCN) and the Official Plan Review (OPR). <br> - Currently, the City's Zoning By-law requires 1.25 spaces per unit in a duplex or triplex. This will need to be revised. As per design work from the consultants on the IHCN project, staff are considering a maximum of 0.66 spaces/unit in a triplex (this would permit a two-car driveway and triplex building that fits within the existing footprint of a single-detached house and driveway). | - Staff are seeking clarification on implementation, including the application of zoning standards (e.g. can zoning provisions have the effect of limiting the zones/sites where 3 units on a lot are feasible?) and parking requirements. <br> - Seeking clarification on time requirements for implementation. |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - As part of Mississauga's recently approved Parking Regulations Study, an extra parking space is not required for a second unit. <br> - Consistent with this proposed change, the recently approved Parkland Conveyance By-law includes an exemption for up to two additional residential units (ARUs). The City's By-law provides a clear definition for ARUs. <br> - There is no language on timing requirements. This would mean the current 3 year zoning conformity requirement would apply once the OP is revised to conform to these new requirements, but it is unclear. |  |
| Appeals of Zoning By-laws for Protected MTSAs and Reduced Timeframe for Conformity <br> Municipalities with official plan policies for Protected MTSAs have no more than one year to amend all the zoning-by laws to conform with provincial policies and plans. <br> Zoning within Protected MTSAs can be appealed and amended if the updated zoning is passed more than one year after the official plan policies come into effect. | - Significant timing impact to Zoning Services work program, given requirement to amend zoning for PMTSAs within 1 year of OP policies being in place, instead of 3 years prior to Bill 23. <br> - The proposed wording makes it unclear as to when the 1 year requirement begins (i.e. the ineffect date of the Region's new OP or the ineffect date of Bill 23). <br> - Scope of required zoning changes is unclear, including how to incorporate minimum densities (i.e. whether use of minimum building floor space index will satisfy legislative requirements). <br> - It appears that a member of the public cannot appeal the initial bylaw itself (only public bodies and utilities have this right), but an applicant (e.g. a developer) would have the ability to submit a zoning bylaw amendment application to amend the MTSA zoning bylaw once it is in place if the 1 | - Seeking clarification on when the 1 year requirement begins. <br> - It is likely that the City will have to update its ZBL and then re-update it after the new $O P$ is approved. This diverts planning resources and creates inefficiencies in the process. <br> - Pending significant changes to the Provincial Policy Statement and the Growth Plan that have been announced by the Province will add to process inefficiencies, as some of this zoning conformity work may have to be redone after release of these revised documents. <br> - Consequently, it is recommended that a minimum of 18 months is given for zoning implementation. |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | year timeline is not achieved. The benefits of having Protected MTSAs, including having maximum building height certainty in most of our Strategic Growth Areas will be lost if the City is not able to achieve the 1 year timeline for zoning conformity. <br> - The new Regional OP was approved by the Province on Nov 4, 2022 and includes MTSA policies. It is unclear how any conflicts between the two official plan documents will be dealt with. |  |
| Changes to Parkland Dedication Requirements <br> Proposed changes reduce the amount of parkland for a development where the maximum amount of land that can be conveyed or paid in lieu is capped at $10 \%$ of the land for sites under 5 ha and at $15 \%$ for sites greater than 5 ha. <br> The maximum alternative dedicate rate will be reduced to $1 \mathrm{ha} / 600$ units for parkland and $1 \mathrm{ha} / 1000$ units for cash in lieu. <br> Parkland rates will be frozen as of the date that a zoning-by law or site plan application is | - The proposed reductions in the amount of parkland/ CIL that can be required of new development significantly impacts the City's ability to achieve parkland goals set out in the Parks Plan. Parkland requirements included in the recently approved Parkland Conveyance By-law accounted for the amount of parkland needed to 2041 to support new growth and ensure the provision of complete communities. <br> - The proposed new legislation would have the effect of reducing CIL revenues by approximately $70 \%-80 \%$ thereby significantly impacting the City's ability to provide the amount of parkland needed in Mississauga neighbourhoods. The result would be less new parkland where it is needed and increased pressure on the existing parkland supply. | - The proposed changes could result in lower standards for parkland provision and less access to parkland. The proposed caps in Bill 23 would undermine the principle that growth pays for growth. Funding shortfalls will be transferred onto the tax base reducing overall affordability in the city. <br> - The City is requesting that the Province restore the former rates, or that it remove the funding cap. |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| filed. The freeze is effective for two years after approval. If two years have passed since the contribution amount was calculated, then the value will be calculated based on the rate on the day of the first building permit. |  |  |
| Parkland Dedication <br> Exceptions <br> Proposed changes will exempt two additional residential units on a lot and non-profit housing from parkland dedication requirements. | - The recently approved Parkland Conveyance Bylaw includes an exemption for up to two additional residential units (ARUs). <br> - The recently approved Parkland Conveyance By law includes an exemption for any development or redevelopment undertaken by the Region of Peel, which could include some non-profit housing. The proposed new legislation proposes exemptions for affordable housing, IZ units, nonprofit housing and attainable housing, which is beyond the by-law exemptions. The impact to the City is a decreased ability to provide parkland, as part of a complete community, to support these types of developments. | - Staff support fee exemptions (DCs, CBC, Parkland Dedication) for additional residential units as it encourages additional density in existing residential neighbourhoods to make better use of existing infrastructure and services. |
| Requirement for a Parks Plan <br> The proposed change will require a municipality to prepare and make available a parks plan before passing of a parkland dedication by-law. | - The 2022 Parks Plan was approved by Council earlier this year. It is unclear if the proposed new legislation will require a new Parks Plan every time a Parkland Conveyance By-law is passed or an update to the existing Parks Plan. | - Seek clarification on the need for a new Parks Plan. |
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Public Meeting for Subdivision <br> Applications | This reduces the public's ability to participate in <br> the subdivision process |  |
| The proposed change will <br> completely remove the public <br> meeting from subdivision <br> applications. | Additionally, minor variances and consents are no <br> longer appealable by residents, which is a <br> significant change. |  |

Table 7 - Review of A Place to Grow (Growth Plan) and Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)
Provincial Comment Period closes on December 30, 2022 (ERO: 019-6177)

| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Merging the Growth Plan and <br> PPS | Few details have been provided to date on how <br> the Growth Plan and PPS would change. | Staff are requesting that the Province consult <br> with municipalities on changes to these <br> documents. <br> Consultation process on <br> merging the Growth Plan and <br> the PPS. |
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Table 8 - Municipal Housing Targets to 2031

| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Housing Targets for Municipalities <br> The Province has assigned Mississauga a new housing target of 120,000 units by 2031. Targets are based on current population and growth trends. | - In 2021, Mississauga issued building permits for 5,500 new units. So far, 2022 is a record year, but the City has still only issued building permits for 6,100 new units. <br> - If Mississauga is to meet the Provincial housing target, it must double its current levels of development. The City has been planning for growth well beyond its Regional allocation of 100,000 units so no city planning policy changes are needed to reach the provincial pledge. | - Staff suggest these targets may be hard to reach given constrains on the development industry (e.g. market conditions, high interest rates and labour and construction costs that influence viability and timing of development projects). |

Table 9 - Changes to Ontario Regulation 232/18 - Inclusionary Zoning
Provincial Comment Period closes on December 9, 2022 (ERO: 019-6173)

| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New definition of "Affordable" for Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) Units <br> Province is proposing that the lowest price/rent that a municipality can require a developer to sell / rent IZ units at is $80 \%$ of the average resale purchase price of ownership units or $80 \%$ of the average | - This change would require amendments to Mississauga's policies/IZ By-law and would raise questions about the fundamental utility of the IZ tool to increase housing supply that is affordable for Mississauga's moderate income households. The proposed definition for ownership IZ units would mean that IZ units are effectively unaffordable to the vast majority of Mississauga's moderate income households. | - Suggest the use PPS definition for housing affordability, which is based on annual income spent on housing costs. If it is decided to move to a market-based approach, affordable ownership units should be priced at $70 \%$ or less of resale price. <br> - Requesting that the Province maintain the income-based definition of "affordable housing" for IZ units. |
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| Proposed Changes | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Potential City Impacts }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Comments to the Province }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\begin{array}{l}\text { market rent (AMR) for rental } \\ \text { units. }\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Requesting clarification on methodology (e.g. will } \\ \text { it be a rate by unit type or one rate regardless of } \\ \text { type? }\end{array}$ |
| What is the source of the resale data? |  |  |$]$
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| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cap on Affordability Term <br> Proposed maximum affordability period of 25 years for IZ units. | - Impacts City's Official Plan and zoning provisions for IZ. <br> - Raises question of merit of IZ program given short affordability term. <br> - Mississauga's adopted policy and zoning provisions establish a 99-year affordability term for ownership units and a 25-year affordability term (plus 5-year phase-out) for rental units. The rental affordability term was intentionally set shorter than the ownership term to encourage delivery of rental units in condominium developments. The City exempts purpose-built rental projects from IZ. | - Staff do not support the proposed maximum affordability period because it will cause ownership units to be lost from the IZ inventory sooner than necessary, and the proposed maximum term will have no impact on development feasibility / housing supply. <br> - Request that Province extend the affordability for "ownership" units to 99 years; this will have no impact on developers but will allow for more sustainable affordable housing supply. |

Table 10 - Proposed Amendments to the Greenbelt Plan and Greenbelt Area Boundary Regulation
Provincial Comment Period closes on December 4, 2022 (ERO: 019-6216 and ERO: 019-6217)

| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Changes to the Greenbelt <br> Plan and Area Boundary | Removing land from the Greenbelt could have <br> environmental consequences both inside and <br> outside of Mississauga. <br> Environment impacts could be compounded by <br> a reduced role of Conservation Authorities. | There are no guarantees that removing some lands <br> from the Greenbelt while adding others will have <br> equal environmental value and ecological function. <br> City staff are supportive of adding urban river <br> valleys to the Greenbelt and already protect these <br> lands. <br> It is submitted that only lands be added to the <br> Greenbelt and staff are not supportive of removing <br> lands. |
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Table 11 - Proposed Updates to the Ontario Wetlands Evolution System
Provincial Comment Period closes on November 24, 2022 (ERO: 019-6160)

| Proposed Changes | Potential City Impacts | Comments to the Province |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Removing the Concept of Wetland Complexes <br> The proposed changes would remove the concept of wetland complexes and weaken the evaluation process. The changes will allow for wetland boundaries to be re-defined after they have been evaluated and accepted. | - It will be more difficult for smaller wetlands (<2 ha in size) to be included and evaluated under the system. <br> - Given that wetlands comprise only about $0.9 \%$ of the city's land base and many are small and exist in a mosaic of smaller habitats, the identification and protection of small wetlands will be impacted - they are essential to maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem function at a local and landscape scale. <br> - Given that boundary changes will be allowed after a wetland has been accepted, this could lead to a situation where unauthorized and unpermitted changes to wetlands lead to a reduction in their size or loss over time to facilitate growth in areas that would have been otherwise protected. | - The Province should maintain existing wetland protections. The benefits of developing on wetlands do not outweigh the potential environmental outcomes. |

## Appendix 2: List of All ERO and Related Postings

## Postings to the Environmental Registry of Ontario (ERO)

|  | Name of Posting | Link and ERO \# | Comment Deadline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Information Bulletins |  |  |  |
| 1 | Consultations on More Homes Built Faster: Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan 2022-2023 | 019-6162 | $n / a$ |
| 2 | 2031 Municipal Housing Targets | 019-6171 | $n / a$ |
| Legislation (Act) |  |  |  |
| 3 | Proposed Planning Act and City of Toronto Act Changes (Schedules 9 and 1 of Bill 23 - the proposed More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022) | 019-6163 | November 24, 2022 |
| 4 | Proposed Planning Act and Development Charges Act Changes: Providing Greater Cost Certainty for Municipal Development-related Charges | 019-6172 | November 24, 2022 |
| 5 | Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022 | 019-6192 | November 24, 2022 |
| 6 | Proposed Changes to the Ontario Heritage Act and its regulations: Bill 23 (Schedule 6) - the Proposed More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 | 019-6196 | November 24, 2022 |
| Regulation |  |  |  |
| 7 | Proposed updates to the regulation of development for the protection of people and property from natural hazards in Ontario | 019-2927 | December 30, 2022 |
| 8 | Legislative and regulatory proposals affecting conservation authorities to support the Housing Supply Action Plan 3.0 | 019-6141 | November 24, 2022 |
| 9 | Proposed Amendment to O. Reg. 232/18: Inclusionary Zoning | 019-6173 | December 9, 2022 |
| 10 | Proposed Changes to Ontario Regulation 299/19: Additional Residential Units | 019-6197 | December 9, 2022 |
| 11 | Proposed Changes to Sewage Systems and Energy Efficiency for the Next Edition of Ontario's Building Code | 019-6211 | December 9, 2022 |
| 12 | Proposed Amendments to the Greenbelt Area Boundary Regulation O. Reg. 59/05 | 019-6217 | December 4, 2022 |
| 13 | Proposed redesignation of land under the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan O. Reg. 140/02 | 019-6218 | December 4, 2022 |
| Policy |  |  |  |


| 14 | Proposed Updates to the Ontario Wetland Evaluation <br> System | $\underline{019-6160}$ | November 24, 2022 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | Conserving Ontario's Natural Heritage | $\underline{019-6161}$ | December 30, 2022 |
| 16 | Proposed Revocation of the Parkway Belt West Plan | $\underline{019-6167}$ | December 30, 2022 |
| 17 | Proposed Revocation of the Central Pickering <br> Development Plan | $\underline{019-6174}$ | November 24, 2022 |
| 18 | Review of A Place to Grow and Provincial Policy Statement | $\underline{019-6177}$ | December 30, 2022 |
| 19 | Proposed Amendments to the Greenbelt Plan | $\underline{019-6216}$ | December 4, 2022 |

## Postings to Ontario's Regulatory Registry (ORR)

|  | Name of Posting | Link and Proposal \# | Comment Deadline |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposal |  |  |  |
| 1 | Seeking Input on Rent-to-Own Arrangements | 22-MMAH018 | December 9, 2022 |
| Act |  |  |  |
| 2 | Seeking Feedback on Municipal Rental Replacement ByLaws | 22-MMAH017 | November 24, 2022 |
| 3 | Proposed Amendments to the Ontario Land Tribunal Act, 2021 | 22-MAG011 | November 25, 2022 |
| 4 | Amendments to the New Home Construction Licensing Act, 2017 to Protect Purchasers of New Homes | 22-MGCS021 | November 24, 2022 |
| 5 | Proposed legislative amendments to the Ontario Underground Infrastructure Notification System Act, 2012 under the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 | 22-MGCS022 | November 25, 2022 |
| Regulation - Minister |  |  |  |
| 6 | Proposed Building Code Changes to Support More Homes Built Faster: Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan: 2022-2023 (Phase 3 - Fall 2022 Consultation for the Next Edition of Ontario's Building Code) | 22-MMAH016 | December 9, 2022 |
| 7 | General Proposed Changes for the Next Edition of Ontario's Building Code (Phase 2 - Fall 2022 Consultation) | 22-MMAH019 | December 9, 2022 |

## Background and Other Provincial Updates

|  | Description | Link |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Community Infrastructure and Housing Accelerator - Final Guideline | Guideline |
| 2 | More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 - Backgrounder | Backgrounder |
| 3 | More Homes Built Faster Action Plan | Action Plan |
| 4 | Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 | Bill 23 |

1. That Council endorse positions and recommendations contained and appended to the report titled "Bill 23 'More Homes Built Faster' and Implications for City of Mississauga," and authorize staff to prepare additional detailed comments on Bill 23 and any associated regulations, as needed. In particular, the City be made whole for any revenue losses from changes to the imposition of development changes and parkland dedication.
2. That the Mayor or designate be authorized to make submissions to the Standing Committee with respect to issues raised in this report, or to otherwise provide written or verbal comments as part of the Ministry's public consultation process.
3. That the City Clerk forward this report to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing; Mississauga's Members' of Provincial Parliament, the Association for Municipalities Ontario, and the Region of Peel.

| Recorded Vote | YES | NO | ABSENT | ABSTAIN |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mayor B. Crombie |  |  | X |  |
| Councillor S. Dasko | X |  |  |  |
| Councillor A. Tedjo | X |  |  |  |
| Councillor C. Fonseca | X |  |  |  |
| Councillor J. Kovac | X |  |  |  |
| Councillor C. Parrish | X |  |  |  |
| Councillor J. Horneck | X |  |  |  |
| Councillor D. Damerla | X |  |  |  |
| Councillor M. Mahoney | X |  |  |  |
| Councillor M. Reid | X |  |  |  |
| Councillor S. McFadden | X |  |  |  |
| Councillor B. Butt | X |  |  |  |

Carried (11, 0, 1 Absent)

Re: Proposed Legislation<br>Bill 23 - More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022

Thank-you for the opportunity to comment on the above-noted proposed legislation.
Please be advised that the Council of the Municipality of Lambton Shores passed Resolution 22-1108-11 at its November 8, 2022 regular Council meeting:

THAT staff draft a letter to the province outlining Lambton Shores' concerns with Bill 23 and circulate to AMO and all Ontario municipalities.

Lambton Shores is a thriving, growing community on the shores of Lake Huron. It includes several communities experiencing appreciable growth in residential and commercial developments. Lambton Shores' beaches, lakeshore communities, places like Grand Bend and Pinery Provincial Park, and its provincially and internationally significant natural heritage areas make Lambton Shores a well-known tourist destination and desirable place to live and work. Like much of rural Ontario and perhaps more so, it has experienced housing shortages, increased development activity, and a sharp rise is housing costs in the last several years.

In general, Bill 23 seems to be intended to address approval process problems that exist in larger centers more so than portions of rural Ontario like Lambton Shores. Lambton Shores, on the whole, works well with the development community and issues timely planning and other development approvals. In Lambton Shores' case, Bill 23 will "fix" many things that are not really broken and will have the unintended effect of substituting relatively efficient processes with additional processes, time, and costs to development.

The Province conducted a very narrow, developer and real estate-focused, consultation in developing its strategy to address the housing crisis. It is misleading to lay so much blame on the easy target of municipalities. Delays are often due to a development proponent's reluctance to provide information, meet requirements, and follow processes that are overseen by municipalities, but provincially-established. If the Province wishes to speed up Municipal approvals, it should look at its own approval processes, legislation, and responsiveness with respect to matters related to the Endangered Species Act, Records of Site Conditions, archaeological assessments, Environmental Compliance Approvals, and the like.

The limiting factor in addressing the housing crisis is labour and material shortages, caused by government policy and the demographics of aging baby-boomers. The Province would better address the housing crisis by finding ways to increase the capacity of the building industry and direct that capacity towards forms of housing that produce more units (e.g. medium and high rather than low density), rather than placing expectations on municipalities that increase staffing needs and put more pressure to draw labour away from construction and manufacturing.

## Conservation Authorities

With respect to Conservation Authorities, the Municipality of Lambton Shores has an excellent working relationship with our two Conservation Authorities (Ausable Bayfield and St Clair Region). They are responsive given the level of resources they have and provide valuable expertise, resources, and services to the Municipality. These would not be practical for a Municipality of our size to provide internally. The Municipality wishes to retain the ability to obtain these services through memorandums of understanding.

- If the CAs are prohibited from commenting on natural heritage matters, the Municipality will need to instead refer development proposals to third party consultants, which will add time and cost to development proponents, contrary to the intent of Bill 23.
- Municipalities will be reluctant to grant planning approvals that would exempt development from Conservation Authority approvals. The Municipality lacks the expertise to assess natural hazards and does not wish for assume the liability. Just as planning approval processes were not designed to address Ontario Building Code matters, planning approval processes and Municipalities lack the unique tools and mechanisms of CAs and the Conservation Authorities Act to ensure development can proceed while appropriately addressing hazards.
- Repeal of the Regulations specific to each CA, in favour of a province-wide Regulation, will eliminate the local flavor of each CA and its ability to provide for the needs of its constituent municipalities, which are different in rural Ontario than in larger centers.


## Additional Dwelling Units

With respect to allowing three units as-of-right on residentially zoned lands:

- This permission potentialiy creates additional dwelling units in areas where existing municipal services are at full capacity.
- For a second or third unit to be permitted in a particular form of dwelling, it should be clarified that the applicable zone must permit that form of housing in the first place. The current wording of the legislation would seem to permit, for example, a single detached dwelling with a basement apartment on lands zoned and intended for medium and high density, contrary to the intent to Bill 23 to create more units.
- How will the province ensure that these additional dwelling units are used as primary residences, as intended by Bill 23? In significant tourist areas like the Municipality of Lambton Shores, these provisions will promote additional
conversions of existing primary residences into two or three short term rental accommodations, contrary to the intent of Bill 23.


## Waiving Fees

With respect to waiving development charges, parkland dedication and other requirements for additional dwelling units, not-for-profit housing, inclusionary housing, etc., the Municipality questions whether these savings to developers will be passed on in lower unit purchase prices. (Consumer demand and willingness to pay remains higher than the building industry's capacity to supply.) Development will however increase municipal service and infrastructure needs, the costs of which will be a burden passed on to the existing tax base, if not collected through development charges.

## Site Plan Approval

Waiving site plan approval for residential developments of ten or fewer dweiling units will create adverse impacts to public and municipal interests and developments. The site plan approval process currently provides a single mechanism to address relevant items such as parking, site grading, stormwater management, site servicing, servicing capacity, entrances, work on municipal lands, and sidewalk and road closures. These are important considerations even for smaller developments. In the absence of site plan approval, municipalities will be forced to rely on (or create) a variety of other mechanisms and bylaws to address these interests, which will be less efficient than site plan approval and contrary to the intent of Bill 23 to reduce process.

Yours Respectfully,


Chief Administrative Officer
cc. Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, premier@ontario.ca

Hounourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, minister.mah@ontario.ca
Honourable Graydon Smith, Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry, minister.mnrf@ontario.ca
Honourable David Piccini, Minister of Environmental Conservation and Parks. Minister.mecp@ontario.ca
Honourable Monte McNaughton, MPP Lambton - Kent - Middlesex, Monte.McNaughtonco@pc.ola.org
PlanningConsultations@ontario.ca
Association of Municipalities of Ontario
Ontario municipalities

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
Legislative Building, Queen's Park
Toronto, ON, M7A 1A1
premier@ontario.ca
The Honourable Graydon Smith
Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry
Whitney Block, 99 Wellesley St W,
Toronto, ON M7A 1W3
minister.mnrf@ontario.ca

The Honourable Steve Clark
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing College Park 17th Floor, 777 Bay St, Toronto, ON M7A 213
steve.clark@pc.ola.org
The Honourable David Piccini
Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks
College Park 5th Floor, 777 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M7A 2 J 3
david.piccinico@pc.ola.org

Dear Premier Ford, Minister Clark, Minister Smith and Minister Piccini:
Re: Corporation of the Town of Georgina Response - Proposed Bill 23, the More Homes Faster Act, 2022

On November 22, 2022, Georgina Council held a Special Council meeting to consider Bill 23 and related legislation under the Province of Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan and passed Resolution No. C-2022-0354, a copy of which is attached hereto.

On behalf of the Council of the Town of Georgina I want to firstly express that we understand and appreciate the severity of the housing crisis and the desire to take bold steps to create more housing that is affordable and attainable for all Ontarians. In this regard, we commend the Province for the comprehensive review and assessment undertaken by the York Region Wastewater Advisory Panel leading to Schedule 10 to Bill 23 Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022 to expedite the expansion and extension of the York Durham Sewage System effectively replacing the Upper York Sewage Solution project. Council views this as a strong and positive commitment to ensuring the health and viability of Lake Simcoe and its watershed, while at the same time advancing much needed housing within our neighboring municipalities in northern York Region.

However, Council at the same time is very concerned about many aspects of Bill 23, and particularly the potentially significant financial impact to local municipalities in terms of lost development charge revenue and parkland which is vital to support new growth. Clearly, growth will not be paying for growth, and it is unacceptable that our existing residents would have to pay more taxes to make up for this lost revenue. As a result, I respectfully submit that the ability

## GEORGINA

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
of local and regional municipalities to provide the critical infrastructure and services required for new housing construction in a timely manner will be severely compromised, and thus meeting the housing targets will not be possible.

Council is also very concerned that proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act and related legislation removes conservations authorities from an active role in supporting efforts to sustain the health of watersheds and in the case of Lake Simcoe, is counterproductive to efforts in the Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022 replacing the Upper York Sewage Solution Project with a servicing solution directed to the York Durham Sewage System.

In closing, Council concurs with York Region Council and many others that the legislative program under the umbrella of the Ontario Housing Supply Action Plan must be paused in order to have a more in-depth consultation with municipalities and other stakeholders. This will ensure that the proposed changes do not result in unintended consequences that will slow down the delivery of housing, but instead will be effective in giving municipalities the decision making authority, tools and financial resources needed to deliver new housing as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,


Attachments - November 22, 2022-Town of Georgina Council Resolution

- Region of York Report
c.

MPP's - York Region Municipalities
Interim Leader, New Democratic Party of Ontario
Interim Leader, Liberal Party of Ontario
Leader, Green Party of Ontario
Clerk, All Ontario Municipalities
Lake Simcoe Watershed MPPs
Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority
Association of Municipalities of Ontario

Please be advised that the Town of Georgina Council, at its meeting held on November 22, 2022, considered proposed Bill 23, the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 and subsequent to discussion, the following motion was passed:

Moved By Councillor Neeson
Seconded By Councillor Genge
RESOLUTION NO. C-2022-0354
WHEREAS on November 10, 2022, York Region Council adopted a resolution as follows:
"York Region requests the Province of Ontario to halt Bill 23 and begin consultation with the Housing Supply Action Plan Implementation Team to ensure municipalities can work in partnership with the Province of Ontario over the next few months to address the housing affordability concerns in our communities.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing be requested to appoint key stakeholders, such as the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), to the Housing Supply Action Plan implementation Team.

The Regional Clerk circulate this report, including new Attachment 5, presented as Item G.1.1 on the revised agenda, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, local municipalities, AMO, Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) and local MPPs."

AND WHEREAS Schedule 10 to Bill 23 Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022 proposes to expedite the expansion and extension of the York Durham Sewage System effectively replacing the Upper York Sewage Solution (UYSS) project;

AND WHEREAS The Council of the Corporation of the Town of Georgina supports the halting of the Upper York Sewage Solutions project and the redirection of related drainage Area flows to the York Durham Sewage System;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT The Council of the Corporation of the Town of Georgina supports the November 10, 2022 resolution of York Region Council concerning Bill 23, with the exception that The Council of the Corporation of the Town of Georgina supports Schedule 10 to Bill 23 Supporting Growth and Housing in York and Durham Regions Act, 2022 which proposes to expedite the expansion and extension of the York Durham Sewage System effectively replacing the Upper York Sewage Solution (UYSS) project;

AND FURTHER THAT The Council of the Corporation of the Town of Georgina support the resolution of the Board of the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority dated November 18, 2022 directing Staff to provide a submission to Environmental Registry of Ontario No. 019-6141 based on comments within Staff Report No. 40-22-BOD regarding Provincial Bill 23 - More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 and that Staff be directed to submit a letter to the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry and the Minister of Environment, Conservation and Parks requesting that the Conservation Authorities Workeng suoub bereremenapage 286 of 390

AND FURTHER THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Georgina opposes the proposed removal or re-designation of approximately 7,400 acres of protected lands from the Provincial Greenbelt Area and/or the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan for residential development as set out in ERO posting number 019-6217 and ERO posting number 019-6218;

AND FURTHER THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Georgina opposes the conversion of Conservation Authority lands, for housing purposes in the absence of a fuller understanding of the criteria that will be used to conduct the assessment and a Municipal Comprehensive Review that demonstrates the need for the conversion to meet population targets;

AND THAT this resolution be forwarded to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, the Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Honourable David Piccini, Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, the Honourable Graydon Smith, Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry, Caroline Mulroney, MPP, York-Simcoe, York Region MPP's, York Region municipalities, Lake Simcoe Watershed MPP's, the Honourable Peter Tabuns, Leader of the Opposition and interim leader of the Ontario New Democratic Party, the Honourable John Fraser, Interim Leader of the Ontario Liberal Party, the Honourable Mike Schreiner, Leader of the Green Party of Ontario, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and all Ontario municipalities.

# THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN 

BY-LAW NO. 2022 -

## BEING A BY-LAW TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE NORTH BAY AND DISTRICT HUMANE SOCIETY TO PROVIDE POUND KEEPING SERVICES TO THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN


#### Abstract

WHEREAS Section 5(3) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, requires a municipal Council to exercise a municipal power, including a municipality's capacity, rights, powers and privileges under Section 9, by by-law unless the municipality is specifically authorized to do otherwise;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Magnetawan enacts as follows:


1. THAT the Corporation of the Municipality of Magnetawan is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with the North Bay and District Human Society, hereinafter referred to as the "ND\&DHS", to provide pound keeping services to the Municipality, attached hereto as Schedule 'A' and forming part of this By-law;
2. THAT the Society is hereby named Pound Keeper for the Municipality of Magnetawan effective November 16, 2022;
3. THAT nothing in this By-law shall restrict the Municipality from entering into similar agreements with other providers of pound keeping services;
4. THAT the Mayor and Clerk-Administrator are hereby authorized to execute the Agreement on behalf of the Corporation.

THAT By-law 2018-38 and any previously conflicting by-laws are hereby repealed
READ A FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD TIME, passed, signed and the Seal of the Corporation affixed hereto, this $16^{\text {h }}$ day of July 2022

> THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN

# SERVICE CONTRACT AGREEMENT BETWEEN: THE NORTH BAY AND DISTRICT HUMANE SOCIETY AND THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN 

The following outlines an agreement for the North Bay and District Humane Society to provide pound keeping services for the Municipality of Magnetawan.

## 1. DEFINITIONS:

For the purpose of this Agreement, the term "animal" shall refer to domestic dogs and cats.

For the purpose of this Agreement, the North Bay and District Humane Society will be referred to as "NB\&DHS".

For the purpose of this Agreement, the Municipality of Magnetawan will be referred to as "the Municipality".

## 2. THE HUMANE SOCIETY AGREES:

## Shelter:

To provide an animal shelter capable of providing adequate accommodations, food and water, daily housekeeping and veterinary care (when deemed necessary) for animals impounded, and of meeting the requirements set for this type of building by the NB\&DHS, and of meeting the requirements of all applicable provincial legislation.

## General Service Provision:

a) To provide pound services up to an annual limit of 15 animals. Any decision relating to animals above the annual limit will be made at the discretion of the NB\&DHS.
b) To hold for claiming by owners, any stray animal delivered to the NB\&DHS shelter or any animal received or impounded by the Animal Control Officer of the Municipality, and, if not claimed by the owner, to dispose of such animal by sale or euthanasia. Owners of licensed and/or microchipped dogs and cats will be contacted, whenever possible.
c) To provide an animal shelter capable of providing adequate accommodations, food and water, daily housekeeping and veterinary care (when deemed necessary) for animals impounded.
d) To meet the requirements set for this type of building by the NB\&DHS and Provincial legislation.
e) To install in the animal shelter all the equipment necessary for the proper operation of the animal shelter, and, in particular, to supply the methods and equipment necessary to humanely euthanize unwanted or unclaimed animals, if necessary. Such methods and equipment must meet the standards and comply with the applicable Provincial legislation.
f) NB\&DHS will only receive stray dogs as defined in the Municipality's by-laws. NB\&DHS will not take seized, removed or aggressive dogs in relation to the Dog Owners' Liability Act or any other piece of legislation outside of the Municipality's by-laws.

## Hours of Operation:

The NB\&DHS shelter will be open to the public and in operation between 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday to Friday (exclusive of statutory holidays), between 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Saturdays, and between 12:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. Sundays. Hours of Operation may change at the discretion of the NB\&DHS.

It is understood by the Municipality and the NB\&DHS that ALL calls reporting complaints or concerns from residents of the Municipality will be forwarded to the Animal Control Officer of the Municipality.

## Licenses:

The NB\&DHS will NOT issue licenses for cats and dogs within the Municipality of Magnetawan jurisdiction.

## Invoicing:

The NB\&DHS will invoice the Municipality $\$ 100.00$ per animal.

## Indemnity:

To indemnify and save harmless the Municipality in respect to all charges, costs, expenses, suits, and damages, and claims for loss or accident or injury of any nature or kind whatsoever in connection with the carrying out of this agreement and in connection with the shelter.

## Insurance:

To insure and keep insured the shelter building for fire and any other hazards and to provide, if required, the Municipality a proof of insurance.

Such liability policy shall provide for the indemnification of the Municipality and the NB\&DHS against the loss arising from claims of damage, injury or otherwise in connection with the carrying out of the terms of this agreement.

The NB\&DHS shall maintain the policy of insurance in force during this agreement. The limits of such policy shall not be less than One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000.00) inclusive for public liability and property damage and for liability coverage for injury to animals caused by an accident and resulting in the death or destruction while in the care, custody and control of the NB\&DHS.

Such policy shall include the names of the Municipality and the NB\&DHS as the insured.

The Humane Society shall pay the premium on the policy.

## 3. THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN AGREES:

a) To appoint the NB\&DHS as Pound Keeper.
b) To grant the NB\&DHS the right to dispose of all animals impounded by the Humane Society in accordance with the By-laws.
c) To grant the NB\&DHS the right to dispose of the carcasses of all animals lawfully impounded and lawfully euthanized or found dead in accordance with the Bylaws.
d) To grant the NB\&DHS the right to collect impound fees, fines, destruction, and disposal fees levied by the Humane Society in accordance with the scale of fees and penalties authorized by the NB\&DHS.

## 4. DURATION OF AGREEMENT:

The duration of the contract will be for three (3) years from the date of signing.
This agreement may be terminated by either party upon three (3) months written notice of intention to terminate, delivered to the other party by prepaid registered mail.

This agreement is made on the $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 20 $\qquad$ .

FOR THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN:

Name:
Title:
Signature:

Name:

Title:
Signature: $\qquad$

FOR THE NORTH BAY AND DISTRICT HUMANE SOCIETY:

Jeff Beaudoin
President of the Board of Directors

Liam Cullin
Executive Director

# ALMAGUIN COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (ACED) 

## MINUTES <br> October 27, 2022

A regular meeting of the ACED Board was held at the Township of Armour Office and virtually on October 27, 2022 at 6:01pm.

Present: Wendy Whitwell, Township of Armour, Chair
Tim Bryson, Township of Joly
Jennifer Farquhar, AHCC Representative
Margaret Ann MacPhail, Township of Perry
Kelly Elik, Township of Strong
John Wilson, Village of Burk's Falls
Joseph Vella, Township of Ryerson
Ron Begin, FedNor
Trista Porter, MND
Regrets: Lyle Hall, Village of Sunridge
Peter Mclsaac, Municipality of Powassan
Brenda Scott, Village of South River
Staff: Dave Gray, Director of Economic Development
John Theriault, Township of Armour
Courtney Metcalf, Economic Development Officer
Guest: Justine Levesque

## Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 pm.

## Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of Thursday September 22, 2022, meeting were adopted as circulated.

## Director of Economic Development (DED) Report

The Director covered the following items from the report:

1. An update on core activity tracking, which lists what the department has done over the past month. These included business assistance, marketing, ACED website updates, social media activities, and communications.
2. Some of the updates in the report included:
a) 2022 BR\&E Survey - Survey appointments are booked and phone outreach is ongoing. Interviewing is expected to continue into 2023.
b) AHCC Partnerships - Working with AHCC to work through the G.R.O. program. Attended and supported the October 18, 2022 AHCC Business After-Hours event. Approximately 30 businesses were in attendance. AHCC will hold their AGM on November 9, 2022.
c) Transportation - Sent out a staff report on the Carpool Almaguin Campaign to all partners. Waiting for confirmation from municipalities that wish to participate.
d) Regional Brand Strategy Implementation - Explore Almaguin website continues to be advertised and updated regularly. Google Analytics is now up and running. The website seems to be well used.

The new Explore Almaguin billboards have been installed on the highway.
Patrick Gilbert Photography has started his contract with ACED. Some autumn photography and videography has been done. Moving forward ACED staff will be working with the contractor to plan business interviews and winter content.

The Almaguin Marketing Partnership Program has been distributed to municipalities with a recommendation to review any upcoming marketing projects and consider how this program could be used to enhance them. ACED staff is preparing a list of key items to consider for municipal webpages that relate to regional tourism and economic development.

Eight municipal partners have adopted the Almaguin brand by resolution. Five municipalities have not yet indicated a decision.
e) RED Gala - Planning for the Gala is continuing. Event has been rescheduled to November 28, 2022 to accommodate a new speaker and will be held at the Sundridge arena. Partnerships, Perseverance and Prosperity is the theme for the Gala.
f) Hollywood North Studio Launch - On Sunday October 30, 2022 between 1 and 4 pm , Hollywood North Studios will be announcing the commencement of their studio development phase. Board members are encouraged to attend.

## 2023 Budget and Work Plan

ACED staff are in the process of preparing the 2023 budget and work plan to be presented at the November 2022 ACED meeting. If any Board member has any items they would like added to the budget, please contact the DoED.

The Director of Economic Development showed the Board a first draft of one of the videos which is being produced to promote the region.

## Updates

## FedNor

FedNor has a new president. She has First Nations connections. Lots of projects coming in and being discussed. Claims are coming in with some discrepancies which need to be corrected.

Economic Development in the region started many years ago and it may be a good idea to bring the some of the original people who started economic development and thank them for the work they did which led to the creation of ACED.

MND
Many new projects coming in and nice to be able to meet people again. Programs are on hold for now, but some announcements will be coming in the future. One business in the area has been putting out information on the North and it may be a good idea to connect with this business and see if any connections can be made.

Kelly Elik thanked staff and the Board for the good work done and for working with all of the municipalities on economic development.

The Director of Economic development thanked Kelly Elik and Joseph Vella for the work they did on the Board and the support they showed for ACED.

## Resolutions

1. 2022-026 - Moved by Margaret Ann MacPhail; Seconded by Kelly Elik;

Be it resolved that the Almaguin Community Economic Development Board approve the minutes of September 22, 2022, as circulated. Carried

## Adjournment

2. 2022-027 - Moved by Jennifer Farquhar; Seconded by Tim Bryson;

Be it resolved that the Almaguin Community Economic Development Board adjourn the October 27, 2022, ACED meeting at 6:53 p.m. Carried

The next meeting will be Thursday November 24, 2022, at 6:00 p.m. If this changes, members will be advised.

## ACED

## Director of Economic Development (DoED) Report

 November 24, 2022 ACED Board MeetingCore Activity Tracking - (October)

| Activity: | Interactions | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Business Assistance |  |  |
| Start Up Files | 1 | Armour |
| Expansion Files | 1 | Magnetawan |
| Developer Files | 2 | 2 Armour |
| General Support | 2 | 2 Magnetawan |
| Business Visits | 2 |  |
| Program Referrals |  |  |
| BR\&E Visits / Completed | 1 | Perry |
| Marketing |  |  |
| ACED Website Updates | 3 | Community Profile, Business Directory, Events Page |
| Social Media Posting | 52 | ACED (10), Shop (19), Tourism (23) |
| Facebook Reach | 124,055 | ACED $(7,442)$, Shop $(4,399)$, Tourism $(112,214)$ |
| Facebook Likes | 5,063 | ACED (1,476), Shop (1,869), Tourism (1,718) |
| Website Tracking |  |  |
| Total Users / Sessions | $945 / 1.1 \mathrm{~K}$ |  |
| Most viewed pages | Events | Halloween themed events |
| (besides landing page) | Bus. Directory |  |
|  | Investment properties |  |
| Communications |  |  |
| Email Blasts | 1 | (475) Business After Hours |
| Organization Meetings | 3 | NECO, Labour Market Group, IION iRapid, |
| Partnership Projects | 1 | AHCC Business After Hours, |
| Support Opportunities | 3 | Almaguin Marketing Partnership (Attachment 1), New Horizons application (Attachment 2), AHCC GRO meeting |
| Media Comment Requests | 2 | RED Gala \& Brand Strategy |

## Current Files \& Projects (time of report update)

Project 1B-2022 Business Retention \& Expansion Survey
67 BR\&E visits have been completed as of the time of this report. The project was included in the AHCC AGM presentation to approximately 45 attending businesses. Staff have received several follow up support requests from businesses who had completed the survey earlier in the year.

As noted in the October report, the initiative will run in to 2023 with interviews continuing to be booked as time between other projects allows.

## Project 1C - Business Support Events

ACED Staff supported the Digital Mainstreet Event at the South River Brewing Co. on November $16^{\text {th }}$ by helping to coordinate the venue and catered lunch and advertise to the Almaguin business community.

The event was presented by CampTech and organized by ACED and The Business Centre. Businesses learned about digital tools, software, and apps to manage a small business.
Approximately 20 business operators attended the event.
Total ACED Contribution: $\mathbf{\$ 2 3 0}$ (Catering)

## Project 1D - AHCC Partnerships

Staff were invited to present an overview of ACED results and current projects to the Almaguin Highlands Chamber of Commerce Membership at their Annual General Meeting, which was held on Wednesday, November $9^{1 / h}$ at the Burk's Falls Legion. The Director presented several current projects and announced the dedicated funding for enhancements to the community guide facilitated through the brand strategy implementation funding.

## Project 3C - Transportation

ACED Staff have received written confirmation of support for the Carpool Almaguin Campaign from 6 municipalities, while others have indicated that it will be added to following Council meetings for discussion. At this time, we have two carpool sites located in Armour Township requiring new signage, two locations in South River requiring new signage, one location at in Emsdale requiring a new sign, and one location in Magnetawan which does not need a new sign but will continue to be a part of the program. Signcraft has been contacted to move forward with the development of 10 Carpool Almaguin signs, which will be distributed to the supporting municipalities with dedicated carpool lots.

Next Steps: In the new year, each carpool lot will be added to the ExploreAlmaguin.ca map, a dedicated webpage will be created, and a social media campaign supporting carpooling in Almaguin will take place over the course of the 2023.

ACED Cost in 2022: \$2250 +HST.

## Project 4A - Brand Strategy Implementation

## Explore Almaguin Website

Several functionality improvements have been completed by 9 Lives design.

- The map filter pop up was improved by adding a 'close filters' button at the bottom.
- A 'filter by municipality' feature was added to the investment properties inventory.
- Several bugs were fixed.

Staff have received some feedback regarding the load times for the 'Explore' interactive map. Long load times are present even on high-speed connections and are expected to be even higher on $<5 \mathrm{Mbps}$ connections. Staff are requesting feedback from the Board to determine their perceived value in keeping the map, versus removing it and looking for other map-based tools.

## Billboards

Staff were contacted on November $11^{\text {th }}$ by SignCraft and informed that the billboard in the North bound lane had been blown over by the wind. The lower panel was damaged as a result. A cost estimate of approximately $\$ 1500$ was provided to reprint the damaged panels, reinforce the frame and add additional weight. The Director authorized these items, which have been completed by SignCraft.

No activity presently scheduled. Winter content will be determined in the coming months.

## Almaguin Marketing Partnership Program

Staff have received an application from P.A.R.C. requesting $\$ 3000$ in funding support for improvements and additions to the Explore South River App. Improvements include:

- Six new trail additions (not limited to South River)
- Improved GPS tracking functionality (for guidance and other)
- Improved map drawing functionality

Almaguin branding will be added to the map and the Explore South River website. Staff met with PARC Director Todd Lucier to discuss the project and the potential for regional partners to consider building on the ESR foundation by using the platform to create their own community specific app that will feature their unique storjes and feed into a regional content management database.

## Almaguin Brand Adoption

There are no updates at this time.

## Project 5A - RED Gala

The RED Gala is moving forward on November $28^{\text {th }}$. All necessary bookings and arrangements have been made. Staff are finalizing remaining details throughout the week of November $21^{\text {st }}$ and are looking forward to a great event.

If you have not RSVP'd and would still like to attend, we have extended the RSVP deadline for municipalities until Friday, November $25^{\text {th }}$.

To Recap: Sueling Ching from the Ottawa Board of Trade will be the Keynote speaker and moderator for the Business Speaker Panel. Featured businesses on the Panel include:

- Debbie O'Reilly from The Mag Store (Burk's Falls),
- Jody Wright from The Bear Chair (South River),
- Rob Taylor from Pulled Smokehouse and Welcome Centre (Burk's Falls),
- Bill Hubbert from Hubbert's Maple Products (Strong Twp),
- Lisa Levesque from Outdoor Adventures ATV (Joly/South River), and
- Dan Porter from Muskoka Mudita (Strong Twp).

MPP Graydon Smith is tentatively booked to provide an opening statement. The Legislature is sitting that week and MPP Smith is hoping that his schedule will permit his attendance.

## Hollywood North Studios Launch

The Director attended the launch event for Hollywood Studio North along with Council representatives from Armour Twp and Perry Twp. The HNS announcement did not include any information regarding development start dates, etc. The Director was invited to participate in a panel discussion regarding the potential impacts of the development. To date, no further steps have been taken towards the proposed development in Armour Township.

## 2023 Budget and Work Plan Considerations

Please see the draft 2023 budget and revised funding projections (based on 8 partners) in attachment 3 and 3A. Please note that the budget does not include any operational contributions from FedNor beyond July 2023. Should there be any changes to the budget based on funding developments or project related expenses, they will be communicated in writing to all partners.

## Business Support/Events

- The Business Retention \& Expansion (BR\&E) initiative will continue through 2023. Staff will plan to produce a 2022 Survey Results Interim Report to assist with 2023 planning and initiative coordination
- In person events have been well attended in 2022. Staff will continue to partner with the AHCC for networking/social events and begin to plan workshops based off of BR\&E Results. Regional/support agency partners will be sought where priorities align.
- Continue to support Almaguin Highlands Chamber of Commerce partnerships, including:
- GRO Program
- Support for their new intern
- Community guide and map development

Carpool Almaguin Campaign

- Sign installation will be encouraged in the early Spring. Additional action items include web page development, partnership outreach with PopaRide, and promotion.

Almaguin Highlonds Secondary School Engagement

- Summer Company Presentation with The Business Centre
- Continued Longitudinal Study


## Continuation of Brand Strategy Implementation

- Municipal partnership: Create and deploy a consistent theme for municipal websites that includes economic development and tourism links, images, and the Almaguin logo.
- Business Brand Ambassador Program including how-to video
- Continued asset development (photo/video project, visitor guide enhancements)
- Create and deploy a content marketing strategy (using video/photo assets, tourism itineraries, stories, and other creative content)
- ACED Office Signage Replacement: Replace the BACED sign located at the Armour Township Office. The sign also has the old Villages of Almaguin logo.


## ACED Member Recruitment and Awareness

- New Council Presentations and Presentations to Non-Partner Municipalities
- Develop a presentation team that includes ACED Board members


## Agricultural Strotegy Implementation

- Host agricultural summit (in early Spring)
- Plan programs \& initiatives based on stakeholder engagement

Possible new projects

1. Long term housing strategy: This is a major element that has not been accomplished from the 2018 RED Plan. Housing has been a consistent barrier to job growth and development. The strategy was costed out in 2020 at approximately $\$ 65000$.
2. Develop wayfinding and location signage plan for parks, recreation facilities, and points of interest.


# Almaguin Marketing Partnership <br> Program Guide 

### 1.0 Program Guidelines

### 1.1 Program Overview

The Almaguin Marketing Partnership Program (AMP) is a promotional partnership program that supports joint efforts between Almaguin Community Economic Development (ACED) and eligible partners that promote tourism, lifestyle, and investment opportunities and initiatives within the Almaguin Region. The AMP fund will enable municipalities and other eligible partners to enhance their individual promotional efforts, marketing asset development, and campaign creation while creating regional unity through incorporating the Almaguin Brand.

The program will be administered by the Director of Economic Development (hereinafter referred to as the Administrator) on behalf of ACED and its partners. The AMP Program will be made accessible through the execution of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Township of Armour. Expressions of interest (SEE Appendix A) will be accepted and reviewed on a continual intake basis until August 31, 2023, or until the funds are exhausted.

Total AMP Program Funds:
Program Timeline:
$\$ 40000$
September 1, 2022, to August 31, 2023

### 1.2 Funding Details

AMP Partnership Funds will be provided up to $\$ 3000$ per partnership project at a maximum contribution rate of $75 \%$ of eligible project expenses. Exceptions to these limits may be reviewed on a case-by-case basis with the program administrator.

### 1.3 Eligible Partners

The AMP Program is available to partners whose physical address is located within Almaguin (further defined as the East Parry Sound District). Additionally, not-for-profit organizations and support agencies that provide services to clients and organizations in Almaguin are considered eligible AMP Partners. Eligible AMP Program partners include:

- Municipalities
- Not-for-profit organizations operating within Almaguin
- Support agencies providing services to Almaguin
- Almaguin Brand Ambassador businesses (See 2.7)


### 1.4 Eligible Project Activities

The following are a list of activities that would be eligible for AMP support:

- Design fees associated with signage projects (manufacturing costs excluded).
- Development of print publications such as community profiles, investment attraction literature, tourism publications, etc.
- Creation of digital assets such as videos and photography.


- Creation of digital content such as blogs or articles.
- Municipal website enhancement (to support the integration of regional resources, tools, imagery, and logos).
- Social media campaigns intended for regional, provincial, and/or federal audiences.


### 1.5 Ineligible Project Activities

The following activities are ineligible for AMP Support:

- Manufacturing costs associated with signage projects.
- Development or distribution of branded promotional products / giveaway items.
- Wages or internal costs incurred by the AMP Program partner, or their staff, for any project activities.


### 2.0 Terms and Conditions

### 2.1 General AMP Conditions

2.1.1 All approved projects must incorporate the Almaguin brand in a way that conforms to the brand use guidelines set out in the Almaguin Brand Book.
2.1.2 The Administrator and/or the Regional Brand Coordinator (RBC) shall have the final approval on the use and placement of Almaguin brand elements on all approved projects.
2.1.3 Logos from AMP Project Partners (FedNor and the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs) must be included on approved projects. The Administrator and/or the RBC will provide direction on the placement and inclusion of these logos.
2.1.4 AMP Program Partners are required to procure third party services (such as videography, photography, design, copywriting, etc.) in an ethical and transparent manner from a qualified service provider(s). Partners are not permitted to procure services from direct family members, friends or any other party that would result in a perceived or actual pecuniary conflict of interest.
2.1.5 The AMP Application must be approved prior to incurring project/activity related costs. Any costs incurred prior to the notice of approval will not be eligible for reimbursement.

### 2.2 Funding Administration

The Township of Armour (Armour), as the administrating municipality for ACED, will serve as the administrator for all financial matters associated with the delivery of the AMP Program Funds.
2.2.1 All invoices and/or expenses must be billed to, and paid for by, Armour.
2.2.2 Armour will invoice project partners according to the contribution amount set out in the partnership Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

### 2.4 Termination

The Administrator reserves the right to terminate any project or activity that:

- in any way negatively impacts the promotion, image, or reputation of the Almaguin Region.
- Fails to comply, either in whole or in part, with any clause listed in this agreement.



The Partner may choose to terminate their participation in the AMP Program provided that written notice is issued to the Administrator.

### 2.5 Photo Release / Consent

It is the responsibility of the Partner to ensure that photo release / consent forms are completed and retained for all subjects, models, or other persons captured in photography or videography projects. Copies of this completed consent forms may be required by ACED staff. See appendix B for a sample release form.

### 2.6 Ownership of Digital Assets

For projects that result in the creation of digital content, the content produced belongs to the AMP Partner. ACED reserve the right to obtain and keep copies of assets that could hold value for future departmental uses. The table below illustrates several (but not all) cases where assets may be held:

| Asset Type | Possible Use |
| :--- | :--- |
| Photos | May be kept and included in the regional Flickr photography stock <br> database |
| Videos | Raw / unedited footage may be kept for use in future promotional <br> videos, promotional campaigns, etc. |
| Blog posts / Articles | Copies may be kept for archive purposes, or for future edits, updates <br> and collaborative re-releases where the owner approves. |

### 2.7 Brand Ambassadors Businesses

Businesses who have registered to be brand ambassadors are eligible to participate in the AMP Program. To learn more about becoming am Almaguin Ambassador, please contact an ACED Staff member.

### 2.8 Responsibility for Damages

The Partner will indemnify and save harmless the Township of Armour against all claims, demands, loss, cost, damages, actions, suits, or other proceedings by whomsoever made, brought, or executed by, or attributed to any such damages, injury, or infringement because of activities under this program.

### 2.9 Regulation, Compliance and Legislation

The Partner will ensure all services and products provided in respect to this proposal are in accordance with, and under authorization of all applicable authorities, municipal, provincial and/or federal legislation.



## Appendix A - Almaguin Marketing Partnership Expression of Interest

| Section 1: Partner Information |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name: | PARC Association | Date: Nov 5, 2022 |  |
| Email: | visit@exploresouthriver.ca | Amount Requested: | \$ 3000 |
| Phone: | 705.498.9784 |  |  |
| Address: | 100 Ottawa Ave. South River, ON, POA $1 \times 0$ |  |  |
| Section 2: Project Details (Please attach any other relevant information to application) |  |  |  |
| The Explore South River project requires a small amount of funding to bring our handheld app up to current standards of Google and Apple. In addition we are enhancing the trails section of our app to remain a best in class example of a community based handheld app. Explore South River is a pilot project. the intent of which is to expand access to the undenying technology for other regions within Almaguin to create their own <br> "Explore . . . "apps and websites in a cost effective manner. <br> See attached report and quote from vendor. |  |  |  |
| Section 3: Memorandum of Understanding |  |  |  |
| By entering this agreement with the Township of Armour, the Partner confirms that all information provided in the application is accurate and complete. Costs associated with AMP projects must be invoiced directly to Armour Township from vendors and/or service providers $\backslash$. <br> Partners are required to meet the terms identified in the terms and conditions set out in the AMP program Guide. Should the Partner not be able to meet these terms for any reason, they are required to communicate any identified barriers to ACED. Should the project be unable to be completed as outlined in Section 2: Project Details. |  |  |  |
| Partner Name: | Todd Lucier, chair, PARC Association | Date (DD/MM/YY): | 05/11/22 |
| Partner Signature: | OR M M |  |  |
| Internal Use Only |  |  |  |
| Project Approved by: |  | Dave Gray <br> Director of Economic Development |  |
| Agreement Start Da |  |  |  |
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## Appendix B - Sample Photography and videography Release Form

Please note that this sample may not capture all liability concerns pertaining to the collection of content that includes individuals, personal property or other sensitive information. Additional information may need to be collected based on the nature of the content.

I, $\qquad$ , hereby grant permission to Almaguin Community Economic Development, and public sector partners, the rights of my image(s), in video or still, and of the likeness and sound of my voice as recorded on audio or video tape without payment or any other consideration. I understand that my image(s) may be edited, copied, exhibited, published, or distributed and waive the right to inspect or approve the finished product wherein my likeness appears. Additionally, I waive any right to royalties or other compensation arising or related to the use of my image or recording. I also understand that this material may be used in diverse settings within an unrestricted geographic area.

Photographic, audio or video recordings may be used for public sector marketing purposes which may include but is not limited to: Presentations, Courses, Online/Internet Videos, Media, News (Press). By signing this release, I understand this permission signifies that photographic or video recordings of me may be electronically displayed via the Internet or in the public educational setting.

There is no time limit on the validity of this release nor is there any geographic limitation on where these materials may be distributed. I acknowledge that I will not be consulted prior to the use of the images on a per-use basis.

By signing this release, I acknowledge that I have completely read and fully understand the above release and agree to be bound thereby. I hereby release all claims against any person or organization utilizing this material for regional promotional purposes.

| PHOTO / VIDEO Participant Information |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Full Name: | City: | Postal Code: |
| Address: |  |  |
| Street: | Date: |  |
| Email Address: |  |  |
| Signature: |  |  |

If this release is obtained from a presenter, or includes persons, under the age of 19 , then the signature of that presenter's parent or legal guardian is also required.

| Parent / Guardian Name* | Print | Signature: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |

* / certify that I am the parent or legal guardian of the individual noted above.
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October 27, 2022
Dan Truchon, Treasurer
The Township of Strong
28 Municipal Ln,
Sundridge, ON, POA1Z0
Delivered Via Email: treasurer@strongtownship.ca

## Subject: Support in Principle for the New Horizons for Seniors Application

Greetings Dan,
The Almaguin Community Economic Development (ACED) Department was extremely excited to learn about your application to the New Horizons for Seniors Program. ACED has been following Strong Township's progress towards establishing the Almaguin Outdoor Community Hub and are very excited to see the project come to life. We are equally excited to learn about the Township's focus on connecting seniors and youth within the community through developing engaging activities and programming.

As you know, ACED has had the opportunity to work alongside Strong Township as we explored the needs of the community through the 2021 Strong / Sundridge Healthy Communities, COVID-19 \& Recreation Survey. Through the survey, it was identified that a significant number of respondents experienced negative emotional and social impacts and further that many identified as senior citizens. Additionally, maintaining and expanding sports, recreational, and cultural opportunities (including facilities and programming) was a key recommendation in the 2018 Almaguin Highlands Regional Economic Development Strategic Plan. Creating a series of activities and programs that engages seniors, youth and other members of the community will help to meet these needs. Further, including seniors and community members in the development and planning process will help to create ownership and encourage participation in all activities. In short, this initiative will both serve as a means to introduce the Almaguin Outdoor Community Hub and ensure that it is well utilized by community members of all ages.

For these reasons, the Almaguin Community Economic Development Board and Staff hereby declare their support in principle for the Township's application to the New Horizons for Seniors Program. We look forward to partnering with you to further support and promote the activities that will be created through these efforts.

Should you, or any other party involved in this process, have any questions related to ACED's support, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,


David Gray,
Director of Economic Development
Almaguin Community Economic Development

## ACED

Funding Option - Base contribution and portion of assessment, population and households

| Organization | Base Contribution | $\begin{gathered} 2022 \\ \text { Assessment - } \\ 33 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Population } \\ \text { 2021Census - } \\ 33 \% \end{gathered}$ | Households <br> 2021 Census - <br> 33\% | Share of balance budget | Share for a $\$ 200,000$ <br> budget |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Township of Armour | \$10,000 | \$374,297,443 | 1,459 | 1,087 | \$12,450 | \$22,450.49 |
| Village of Burk's Falls | \$10,000 | \$86,028,474 | 957 | 523 | \$5,307 | \$15,306.87 |
| Township of Joly | \$5,000 | \$58,307,271 | 293 | 155 | \$2,037 | \$7,036.51 |
| Township of Perry | \$10,000 | \$472,012,392 | 2,650 | 1,710 | \$18,825 | \$28,824.74 |
| Township of Ryerson | \$10,000 | \$184,257,224 | 745 | 555 | \$6,265 | \$16,264.77 |
| Village of South River | \$10,000 | \$71,389,375 | 1,101 | 510 | \$5,391 | \$15,390.87 |
| Township of Strong | \$10,000 | \$296,447,146 | 1,566 | 953 | \$11,145 | \$21,145.46 |
| Village of Sundridge | \$10,000 | \$107,537,318 | 938 | 458 | \$5,310 | \$15,310.29 |
| Chamber of Commerce | \$10,000 | n/a | n/a | n/a | \$0 | \$10,000.00 |
| Totals | \$85,000 | \$1,650,276,643 | 9,709 | 5,951 | \$66,730 | \$151,730.00 |

Note: 2022 assessments are based on the 2022 EastHolme Municipal Levy Apportionment

## 2023 Budget Sheets - Actuals as of December 31st, 2022 <br> Regional Economic Development <br> Operating Budget - Page 1

| GL Number | Description | 2022 <br> Actual | $2022$ <br> Budgeted | 2023 Department Estimate | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Revenues |  |  |  |  |
| 13-807-000 | ACED surplus | \$0.00 | (\$5,000) | $(\$ 39,247)$ | Transferred from prior year's surpluses |
| 15-370-000 | Municipal \& Chamber Contributions |  |  |  |  |
|  | Armour | (\$7,500.00) | (\$10,000) | (\$22,450) |  |
|  | Burk's Falls | (\$7,500.00) | (\$10,000) | $(\$ 15,307)$ |  |
|  | Joly | (\$3,750.00) | $(\$ 5,000)$ | $(\$ 7,037)$ |  |
|  | Magnetawan | (\$7,500.00) | (\$7,500) | \$0 | Contribution ended Sept. 30, 2021 |
|  | Perry | (\$7,500.00) | (\$10,000) | $(\$ 28,825)$ |  |
|  | Powassan | (\$7,500.00) | (\$10,000) | \$0) | Contribution ended December 31, 2022 |
|  | Ryerson | (\$7,500.00) | (\$10,000) | $(\$ 16,265)$ |  |
|  | South River | (\$7.500.00) | (\$10,000) | (\$15,391) |  |
|  | Strong | (\$7,500.00) | (\$10,000) | (\$21,145) |  |
|  | Sundridge | (\$7,500.00) | (\$10,000) | (\$15,310) |  |
|  | Chamber of Commerce | (\$7,500.00) | (\$10,000) | (\$10,000) |  |
|  | Total Municipal \& Chamber Contri. | (\$78,750.00) | (\$102,500) | (\$151,730) |  |
| 15-370-005 | Events contributions | (\$1,403.25) | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 15-370-008 | Staycation contributions | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 15-371-000 | CIINO Funding | (\$125,620.00) | (\$162,000) | (\$89,585) | Represents projected balance of CIINO grant |
| 15-371-002 | FedNor - Harvest Spin/Staycation | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 15-371-003 | FedNor - Implement Brand Strategy | (\$22,794.00) | (\$86,000) | (\$49,978) | 36.17\% of \$138,175 |
| 15-371-005 | OBIAA Funding - Intern | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 15-371-007 | NECO - Staycation Program | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 15-371-008 | NECO - Regional Relief \& Recovery | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 15-372-000 | NOHFC Funding - Intern | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 15-372-001 | NOHFC - Almaguin Harvest Spin | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 15-372-002 | NOHFC - Almaguin Brand Strategy | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 15-372-003 | RED - Implement Brand Strategy | (\$31,129.82) | (\$119,500) | (\$69,088) | 50\% of \$138,175 |
| 15-373-001 | MHSTIC - Reconnect Grant | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Regional Economic Development revenues |  | (\$259,697.07) | (\$475,000) | (\$399,628) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
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# 2023 Budget Sheets - Actuals as of December 31st, 2022 <br> Regional Economic Development <br> Operating Budget - Page 2 

| GL Number | Description | 2022 <br> Actual | 2022 <br> Budgeted | 2023DepartmentEstimate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Expenditures |  |  |  |  |
| 16-801-000 | Salaries \& Benerits | \$202,961.24 | \$259,869 | \$218,750 | Reflects salaries for 2 employees for a full year. "Note 1 |
| 16-804-001 | Office Supplies | \$2,270.35 | \$3,000 | \$3,000 |  |
| 16-804-002 | Signage | \$5,067.66 | \$5,000 | \$2,000 | Highway 11 billboard signage. Portion allocated for maintenance. |
| 16-804-005 | Audit \& Accountant Fees | \$0.00 | \$4,500 | \$4,500 |  |
| 16-804-007 | Legal Fees | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 16-804-010 | Advertising \& Promotion | \$1,865.32 | \$4,500 | \$4,500 | *Note 3 |
| 16-804-020 | Telephone | \$1,919.37 | \$2,500 | \$2,500 | *Note 4 |
| 16-804-025 | Website | \$1,260.44 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |  |
| 16-804-030 | Events \& Seminars | \$3,132.68 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 | *Note 5 |
| 16-804-040 | Training \& Workshops | \$3,576.75 | \$4,000 | \$4,000 |  |
| 16-804-050 | Travel | \$3,369.48 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 |  |
| 16-804-062 | Regional Relief \& Recovery Program | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 16-804-063 | Almaguin Harvest Spin | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 16-804-064 | Almaguin Brand Strategy | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 16-804-065 | Regional Projects | \$3,148.83 | \$10,203 | \$10,203 | *Note 6 |
| 16-804-066 | Implement Almaguin Brand Strategy | \$20,326.75 | \$169,428 | \$138,175 | *Notes 287 |
| 16-804-070 | Transfer to EDC Reserve | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| 16-804-071 | Staycation Program | \$0.00 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
| Total Regional Economic Development expenditures |  | \$248,898.87 | \$475,000 | \$399,628 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Regional Economic Development |  | (\$10,798.20) | \$0 | 50 |  |
| Major changes: Budget based on two employees |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note 1 <br> Note 2 | 2022 Actual reflects a reduction in wages due to the Regional Brand Coordinator's transition to part time. <br> Much of the anticipated project expenditures were front loaded based on the available wages for the Regional Brand Coordinator Position. A significant amount of project funds have been pushed in to 2023. These can be reviewed on Sheet 2. |  |  |  |  |
| Committed and/or Underspent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note 3 | \$1500 Committed for Wrap Up Shop Local ad campaign, Gala, and Social Ads |  |  |  |  |
| Note 4 | Underspent due to staff reduction. |  |  |  |  |
| Note 5 | \$586 Committed for Gala Event and other business event expenses. |  |  |  |  |
| Note 6 | \$3750 committed Billboard Sign Repairs, Carpool Signage. Several underspent projects including Win this Space, Community G.R.O \& Ag Strategy |  |  |  |  |
| Note 7 | \$10926 Committed for photography/videography, Marketing Partnership, and Ambassador Programming |  |  |  |  |
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| GL Number | Expenditures | Item Cost | Budget AMT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16-804-001 | Office Supplies |  | \$3,000 |
|  | Office 365 (5 user) | \$ 113 |  |
|  | Kaspersky AN (5 user) | 113 |  |
|  | Survey Monkey | 461 |  |
|  | Zoom Account | 280 |  |
|  | Misc Supplies \& Software | 2,033 |  |
|  | Total | 3,000 |  |
| 16-804-010 | Advertising \& Promotion (General) |  | \$4,500 |
| 16-804-025 | Website |  | \$2,000 |
|  | Domain, hosting \& email fees (2 sites) | \$ 600 |  |
|  | Improvements/Fixes | \$ 1,400 |  |
|  | Total | \$ 2,000 |  |
| 16-804-030 | Events \& Seminars |  | \$4,000 |
|  | Business Support Events incl. AHCC Partnerships | \$ 4,000.00 |  |
|  | Total | \$ 4,000.00 |  |
| 16-804-040 | Training \& Workshops |  | \$4,000 |
|  | EDCO \& EDAC memberships | \$ 1,500 |  |
|  | Professional Development | 1,000 |  |
|  | General Admission Fees(Conferences, etc) | \$ 1,500 |  |
|  | Total | \$ 4,000 |  |
| 16-804-066 | Almaguin Brand Strategy |  | \$138,175 |
|  | Third Party Implementation Support | \$ 30,000 |  |
|  | Brand Ambassador Programming | \$ 8,000 |  |
|  | Regional Guide Creation, Mapping and Print | \$ 20,000 |  |
|  | Photography and Videography | \$ 13,200 |  |
|  | Brand Adoption \& Awareness | \$ 13,000 |  |
|  | Marketing Partnership Program | \$ 35,718 |  |
|  | General Marketing / Content Creation | \$ 18,257 |  |
|  | Total | \$ 138,175 |  |
| 16-804-065 | Regional Projects |  | \$10,203 |
|  | RED Gala | \$ 2,000 |  |
|  | Signage Replacement | \$ 1,000 |  |
|  | Agricultural Summit \& Projects | \$ 3,000 |  |
|  | Other | \$ 4,203 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## District of Parry Sound

# Chief Administrative Officer's 

 Report
## November 2022

## Mission Statement

To foster healthier communities by economically providing caring human services that empower and enable the people we serve to improve their quality of life.

## Thank you

With municipal elections now over, I regret to say that it's time for us to wish farewell to 5 DSSAB Board Members, each of whom served the DSSAB with his/her own passion, diligence, and commitment:

- Linda Alkins (representing the Municipality of Powassan, Corporation of the Municipality of Callander, Township of Nipissing)
- Roger Burden (Representing the Town of Parry Sound)
- Steve Crookshank (Representing the Township of Carling, Municipality of Whitestone, Township of McDougall, Township of McKellar)
- Lyle Hall (Representing the Village of South River, Village of Sundridge, Township of Joly, Township of Machar, Township of Strong, Township of Magnetawan)
- Joseph Vella (Representing the Town of Kearney, Village of Burk's Falls, Township of Armour, Township of Perry, Township of Ryerson, Township of McMurrich/Monteith)

To those departing, Board service is a challenging and sometimes thankless role, and to do this in support of the most vulnerable individuals in our community speaks volumes about your character. As your time on the DSSAB Board draws to a close, I'd like to express my sincere gratitude for your years of service to our Board and to the community.
The pandemic has placed pressures on this Board that have made this term one of adversity. Yet, through these challenges our teams have relied on the support of our Board to ensure that our messaging reached each community and that we remained accountable to the residents of the District of Parry Sound.
We know we will be welcoming some new faces to the DSSAB Board over the coming months, and we look forward to the positive contributions and perspectives that these members will bring to the organization. This will be a leaming curve for those new members, and I look to those remaining experienced members to provide them with support and guidance, as needed.

## Job Title Changes

Managers have received title changes to Directors to assist with recruitment and maintain parity with colleagues. There have been no increases in compensation as a result of these title changes.

## Canadian Alliance to End Homelessness (CAEH) Conference

Since its inception in 2013, the CAEH National Conference on Ending Homelessness has been equipping policymakers, funders, researchers, advocates, community leaders and front-line workers with the inspiration, information, tools and training they need to end homelessness in Canada. Last week we had the privilege of sending myself and several of our management team to collaborate, share, learn and be energized on the issue of homelessness with leaders and advocates across the country.

This year's program featured 85 sessions in 14 streams, delivered by hundreds of national and international subject matter experts for over 1,400 participants from across the country and around the globe. The ambitious program included Reconciliation and Indigenous homelessness, chronic, veteran and youth homelessness, lived experience, homelessness for women and 2SLGBTQ+, unsheltered homelessness, the right to housing, plus the latest in Canadian and international research and more.

## Magnetawan After School Program

After several unsuccessful attempts to recruit Registered Early Childhood Educators for the Magnetawan After School Program, it is with regret that this pilot program will come to an end on December 23 ${ }^{\text {rd }}, 2022$. The Near North District School Board has been notified of the closure of this pilot program and parents are being notified this week.

## OMSSA 47 Leadership Meeting

On October $20^{\text {th }} \mathrm{I}$ attended an in person OMSSA 47 Leadership Table meeting. OMSSA's Executive Director presented an update on their Strategic Plan, and other activities within the organization.
The Employment Services Transformation Secretariat Executive Director Gloria Lee spoke about the purpose and role of the secretariat which was followed by a Q\&A with the 47 Leads. An Employment Services Transformation update was provided on the prototypes with a discussion on their experiences to date regarding implementation of EST.
Gertie Mai, Executive Director of the Ontario Federation of Indigenous Friendship Centres facilitated a conversation with the 47 Leads about meaningful reconciliation between municipalities and Indigenous communities. The discussion helped to unpack some of the challenges the CMSMs/DSSABs face and provided approaches that work best and are supportive going forward.

## Electronic Payments

Families using Directly Operated DSSAB child care programs now have the ability to easily view their invoices and setup their payment automatically within the new Hi Mama billing app! Parents are able to setup their payment details by choosing either online banking or credit card payments and select autopay so payments are never missed! Parent fees are deposited directly into the DSSAB account from Worldline which is a global merchant leader in secure payments and trusted transactions. All of these new processes have resulted in giving parents a clear picture of their account, increased efficiencies and reduced administrative time within our organization.

## Recent Media Coverage

* October 7, 2022 - Neighbours voice continued concern over high-density Parry Sound development


## Progress on the Become an ECE Campaign

Over the next few weeks, all homes in the District of Parry Sound should receive a 'Become An Early Childhood Educator (ECE)' brochure in their mailbox through Canada Post. This direct mail campaign encourages readers to visit the www.becomeanece.ca website where they can find more information on what an ECE does, how to become an ECE, and financial supports available. To view the brochure, click here https:// bit.ly/3NIMy6Q

## Social Media

Facebook Stats

| District of Pary Sound Social Services Administration Board | APR <br> 2022 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAY } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JUNE } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AUG } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SEPT } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OCT } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Page Followers | 331 | 343 | 358 | 382 | 393 | 400 |
| Post Reach this Period (\# of people who saw post) | 5,194 | 8,396 | 8,955 | 10,269 | 3,847 | 3,827 |
| Page Views this Period | 60 | 104 | 127 | 183 | 166 | 424 |
| Post Engagement this Period (\# of reactions, comments, shares) | 412 | 854 | 692 | 945 | 446 | 406 |


| Esprit Place Family Resource Centre | $\begin{aligned} & \text { APR } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAY } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JUNE } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AUG } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SEPT } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OCT } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Page Followers | 118 | 118 | 119 | 121 | 121 | 121 |
| Post Reach this Period (\# of people who saw post) | 54 | 48 | 208 | 17 | 49 | 32 |
| Page Views this Period | 7 | 8 | 18 | 10 | 8 | 20 |
| Post Engagement this Period (\# of reactions, comments, shares) | 2 | 2 | 11 | 4 | 6 | 1 |


| The Meadow View | $\begin{aligned} & \text { APR } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAY } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JUNE } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AUG } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SEPT } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OCT } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Page Followers | 432 | 445 | 457 | 464 | 409 | 479 |
| Post Reach this Period (\# of people who saw post) | 1,098 | 7,320 | 8,636 | 461 | 3,041 | 260 |
| Page Views this Period | 250 | 522 | 263 | 143 | 96 | 68 |
| Post Engagement this Period (\# of reactions, comments, shares) | 133 | 877 | 448 | 36 | 39 | 31 |

Twitter Stats
Link to DSSAB's Twitter page - https://twitter.com/psdssab

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { APR } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAY } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JUNE } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AUG } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SAPT } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OCT } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Tweets | 3 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 3 |
| Total Impressions | 235 | 217 | 265 | 226 | 146 | 63 |
| Total Profile Visits | 37 | 230 | 200 | 20 | 16 | 11 |
| Total Followers | 15 | 16 | 18 | 25 | 23 | 23 |
| Total Mentions | - | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

## Linkedin Stats

Link to DSSAB's Linkedin page - https://bit.ly/2YyFHIE

|  | APR | MAY | JUNE | AUG | SEPT | OCT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2022 | 2022 | 2022 | 2022 | 2022 | 2022 |
| Total Followers | 50 | 53 | 98 | 179 | 274 | 297 |
| Search Appearances (in last 7 days) | 215 | 277 | 199 | 339 | 307 | 338 |
| Total Page Views | 13 | 21 | 33 | 61 | 132 | 150 |
| Post Impressions | 160 | 123 | 246 | 315 | 571 | 397 |
| Total Unique Visitors | 10 | 12 | 16 | 26 | 37 | 47 |

## Out and About in the Community

This month, DSSAB staff members attended the Health Fair at the Mary Street Centre in Parry Sound, hosted by the Aids Committee of North Bay \& Area. Other exhibitors included the Parry Sound Friendship Centre, the North Bay Parry Sound District Health Unit, B'saanibamaadsiwin Indigenous Mental Health, and the Canadian Mental Health Association (CMHA).

Pictured below: Vicky Marshall, Community Relations Worker (Housing Stability) \& Kathy Hughes, Program Lead (Housing Stability). Not shown in photo: JJ Blower, Communications Officer


COME LEARN ABOUT COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PROGRAMS AT THE PARRY SOUNO

## Health Fair



FOOD | PRIZES| GAMES | RESOURCES
HEP C/HIV TESTING \| NALOXONE


## Licensed Child Care Programs

Total Chilldren Utilizing Directly Operated Child Care in the District
September 2022

| Age Group | Fairview <br> ELCC | First Steps <br> ELCC | Highlands <br> ELCC | Waubeek <br> ELCC | HCCP | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Infant <br> $(0-18 \mathrm{M})$ | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 21 |
| Toddler <br> $(18-30 \mathrm{M})$ <br> Preschool <br> (30M-4Y) | 13 | 21 | 14 | 19 | 33 | 39 |
| \# of Active <br> Children | 35 | 23 | 34 | 58 | 87 | 237 |

Directly operated child care has been able to fill vacant spaces and enroll to near capacity in all programs as operations return to pre-pandemic levels. Ministry of Education licensing of the four child centres is now completed for 2022-2023.

School Age Programs

| September 2022 |  | Enrollment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location | Waitlist |  |
| Mapleridge After School | 19 | 8 |
| Mapleridge Before School | Opened in October |  |
| St. Gregory's After School | 12 |  |
| St. Gregory's Before School | 9 |  |
| Sundridge Centennial After School | 20 |  |
| Sundridge Centennial Before School | 5 |  |
| Magnetawan Central After School | 11 | 8 |
| Land of Lakes After School | 12 | 16 |
| Home Child Care | 25 | 113 |
| \# of Active Children |  |  |

A second room at Mapleridge After School Program has been secured to accommodate children from the waitlist. As well, a Mapleridge Before School Program opened in October so children will not have to be bussed in the morning. This will create a more seamless day for the children and families.

## Directly Operated Child Care Waitlist by Program

September 2022


All programs have drawn from their current waitlists to fill existing spaces. The programs will be reaching out to current wait listed families to determine their immediate needs.

- Fairview - First Steps * Highlands "Waubeek * HCCP

Online Application Form - OLAF
Fee Subsidy Applications

| $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ | Eligible | Not Eligible | 2022 | Eligible | Not Eligible |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| January | 1 | 7 | January | 2 | 4 |
| February | 0 | 5 | February | 2 | 6 |
| March | 1 | 6 | March | 0 | 5 |
| April | 0 | 6 | April | 0 | 3 |
| May | 0 | 3 | May | 0 | 3 |
| June | 4 | 11 | June | 0 | 2 |
| July | 0 | 3 | July | 2 | 2 |
| August | 1 | 7 | August | 2 | 4 |
| September | 1 | 5 | September | 3 | 3 |
| October | 1 | 3 | October |  |  |
| November | 0 | 3 | November |  |  |
| December | 1 | 4 | December |  |  |

Total Children by Funding Source
September 2022

|  | \# of <br> Children | \# of |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fanilies |  |  |$|$|  | 37 | 35 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Afterschool Fee Subsidy | 37 | 160 |
| Fee Subsidy | 232 | 222 |
| Full Fee | 10 | 9 |
| Ontario Works | 439 | 419 |
| Total |  |  |


| Funding Source - Mew | \# of <br> Children | \# of <br> Families |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Afterschool Fee Subsidy | 10 | 10 |
| Fee Subsidy | 38 | 37 |
| Full Fee | 51 | 48 |
| Ontario Works | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 100 | 96 |


| Funding Source - Erits | \# of <br> Children | \# of <br> Families |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Afterschool Fee Subsidy | 6 | 5 |
| Fee Subsidy | 16 | 16 |
| Full Fee | 11 | 10 |
| Ontario Works | 5 | 4 |
| Total | 38 | 35 |

## Inclusion Support Services

| September 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age Group | EarlyON | Licensed ELCC's | Monthly <br> Total | YTD Total | Waitlist | New Referrals | Discharges |
| Infant $(0-18 \mathrm{M})$ | 0 | 0 | $0$ | 0 | 0 | $0$ | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Toddler } \\ & (18-30 \mathrm{M}) \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 9 | 13 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Preschool <br> (30M-4Y) | 5 | 35 | 40 | 56 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| School Age (4Y+) | 8 | 21 | 27 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Monthly Total | 17 | 63 | 80 | - | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| YTD Total | 22 | 70 | - | 136 | 25 | 38 | 33 |

## EarlyON Child and Family Programs

September 2022

| Activity | September | YTD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of Children Attending | 479 | 3,386 |
| Number of New Children Attending | 47 | 424 |
| Number of Families Visiting | 448 | 2,631 |
| Number of New Families Visiting | 49 | 368 |
| Number of Virtual Programming Events | 0 | 79 |
| Number of Family Engagements with Virtual Events | 406 | 6,040 |

EarlyON has been planning the re-opening of satellite programs to better reach families that are in our more remote communities. Most satellites were fully operational by the end of October. The program will be starting a virtual Moms to Moms group through the Microsoft Teams App which will allow for mothers to connect who otherwise cannot access one of the in-person groups.

## Ontario Worics Caseload

September 2022


Ontario Works Intake - Social Assistance Digital Application \& Centralired Intake September 2022


Ontarlo Works appilications

24
Average recened per thwiness day

43
Recerved Sep 2022

Emergency Assistance applications

1 .
Aver age receined per business day

20
Recened 5ep 2022

Average number of business days from sereoning to grant

## Bmployment Assistance \& Performance Outcomes

\% of Closures Exiting to Employment

\% of Caseload Exiting to Employment
6.00\%
$5.00 \%$
4.00\%
3.00\%
2.00\%
1.00\%
0.00\%

——District of Parry Sound ——Provincial Average
DyBenefits Bnrollment 2022
$24.00 \%$

## DBD Emrolinent

Payment Receipt Method
September 2022


## Overpayment Recovery Rate

September 2022


- Less than 5\%

Exactly $5 \%$

- More than $5 \%$ but tess than $10 \%$
- Exactly $10 \%$
- More than $10 \%$


## Housing Stability Program - Community Relations Workers <br> September 2022

## Support

All services performed, provided, or arranged by the Homelessness Prevention Program staff to promote, improve, sustain, or restore appropriate housing for individuals active with the Homelessness Prevention Program, periodically within the month, not requiring intense case management.

| Income Source | East | West |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Senior | 5 | 11 |
| ODSP | 10 | 30 |
| Ontario Works | 4 | 11 |
| Low Income | 11 | 22 |

## Intense Case Management

Intense Case Management involves the coordination of appropriate services and the provision of consistent and on-going weekly supports, required by the individual to obtain, and sustain housing stability.

Contact/Referrals

| East |  | West | YTD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Homeless | 5 | 3 | 68 |
| At Risk | 2 | 8 | 67 |
| Esprit Outreach Homeless | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Esprit Outreach at Risk | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Esprit in Shelter |  | 1 | 13 |
| Program Total |  | 165 |  |


| Income Source | East | West |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Senior | 11 | 17 |
| ODSP | 10 | 24 |
| Ontario Works | 5 | 8 |
| Low Income | 7 | 21 |

Short Term Housing Allowance

|  | Active | YTD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| September | 16 | 96 |

Housing Stability: Household Income Sources and Issuance from HPP:

| Income Source | Total |  | HPP | Reason for Issue |  | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Senior | 1 | $\$ 25.00$ |  |  |  |  |
| ODSP | 3 | $\$ 679.00$ |  |  |  |  |
| Ontario Works | 2 | $\$ 225.00$ |  |  |  |  |
| Low Income | 6 | $\$ 534.80$ |  |  |  |  |
| No Income | 0 | $\$ 0$ | Rental Arrears | $\$ 404.00$ |  |  |
| Utilities/Firewood | $\$ 0$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transportation | $\$ 184.80$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Food/Household/Misc. | $\$ 875.00$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emergency Housing | $\$ 0$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Ontario Works: Household Income Sources and Issuance from HPP

| Income Source | Total |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | HPP


| Reason for Issue | Total |
| :--- | :--- |
| Rental Arrears | $\$ 4,144.41$ |
| Utilities/Firewood | $\$ 6,311.98$ |
| Transportation | $\$ 75.00$ |
| Food/Household/Misc. | $\$ 6,680.41$ |
| Emergency Housing | $\$ 0$ |
| Total | $\$ 17,211.80$ |

Hotel Project

|  | MidTown <br> Parry Sound |  | YTD Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | Caswells |
| :--- |
| Sundridge | YTD Total

These numbers represent the number of people who stayed in one of the hotel projects in the month of September

## By-Name List Report

September 2022


A By-Name List is a real time list of all people experiencing homelessness in our community who would like to receive assistance to access housing services and supports. This is an ongoing process with people being added to the list as they connect or re-connect. The list will be created by conducting a Point-in Time Count which includes collecting demographic information about people experiencing homelessness using a set of 17 common questions that align with the enumeration approach used by the federal Reaching Home Program.

A people-centered approach to the By-Name List process will consider individual needs and promote safety, including cultural safety and cultural appropriate responses and practices. People and their experiences and stories are vital to conducting both enumeration (Point-in Time Count) and the By-Name Lists.

## Housing Programs

| Social Ho <br> September | ntralized | itlist Repo |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | East | West | Total |
|  | Parry Sound | Parry Sound |  |
| Seniors | 34 | 102 | 136 |
| Families | 142 | 439 | 581 |
| Individuals | 503 | 217 | 720 |
| Total | 679 | 758 | 1,437 |
| Total Waitlist Unduplicated |  |  | 494 |

Social Housing Centralized Waitlist (CWL) 2021-2022 Comparison Applications and Households Honsing from the CWL

| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Month } \\ 2021 \end{array}$ | New <br> App. | New SPP | Cancelled | Housed | SPP <br> Housing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Month } \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New } \\ & \text { App. } \end{aligned}$ | New SPP | Cancelled | Housed | SPP <br> Housing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jan | 4 |  | 5 | 5 | 1 | Jan | 5 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Feb | 12 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  | Feb | 9 | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| Mar | 8 |  | 4 | 1 | 1 | Mar | 12 |  | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Apr | 9 |  | 6 | 1 |  | Apr | 12 | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| May | 8 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  | May | 11 | 1 |  | 3 |  |
| June | 8 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | June | 15 |  | 3 | 2 |  |
| July | 7 |  |  | 1 |  | July | 13 | 2 | 10 | 1 |  |
| Aug | 9 |  | 1 | 2 |  | Aug | 5 |  | 17 | 2 | 1 |
| Sept | 22 |  | 5 |  |  | Sept | 16 |  | 10 | 1 | 1 |
| Oct | 16 | 1 | 6 | 1 |  | Oct |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nov | 9 |  | 16 | 2 |  | Nov |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dec | 9 |  | 2 | 2 |  | Dec |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 121 | 6 | 55 | 19 | 3 | Total | 98 | 5 | 48 | 12 | 3 |

[^11]- Housing Programs approved 16 new applicants in the month of September
- One applicant was housed from the centralized waitlist - also held special priority status.
- 10 cancelled applications in September:
- 4 refused offers
- 3 requested to be removed from the CWL - via update form
- 1 online applicant requested to be removed
- 1 was found to have assets in excess
- 1 was deceased

Parry Sound District Housing Corporation
Septamber 2022
Activity for Tenant and Maintenance Services

|  | Current | YTD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Move outs | 1 | 15 |
| Move in | 3 | 49 |
| L1/L2 Forms | 0 | 3 |
| N4 - notice of eviction for non payment of rent | 0 | 5 |
| N5 - notice of eviction disturbing the quiet enjoyment of the other occupants | 0 | 9 |
| N6 - notice of eviction for illegal acts or misrepresenting income for RGI housing | 0 | 0 |
| N7 - notice of eviction for willful damage to unit | 0 | 0 |
| Repayment Agreements | 7 | 30 |
| Wellness Checks | 5 | 92 |
| Mediation/Negotiation/Referrals | 19 | 124 |
| No Trespass Order | 0 | 1 |

## Maintenance

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Pest Control } & 8 & \begin{array}{l}8 \text { buildings monitored monthly } \\
\text { one-bedroom (10); multiple bedroom (5) } \\
\text { (not inclusive of The Meadow View) }\end{array} \\
\text { Vacant Units } & 15 & 5\end{array}
$$ \begin{array}{l}Homeless individual, possible break in, disruptive tenant, no heat, lost keys <br>
3 staff participate in on call phone tree system <br>

maintenance work and related materials for the month of September\end{array}\right\}\)| Work Orders |
| :--- |
| Fire Inspections |
| Incident Reports |

## Capital Projects

## September 2022

## Local Housing Corporation and DSSAB Buildings

* Quotes requested for the replacement of 2 HVAC units, along with roof assessment underway for the Waubeek Childcare Centre
* Duplex Renovations: Burk's Falls, South River - final drawings being prepared
* Highlands Childcare Centre: Water/Mechanical Systems - plan in place; equipment installed and monitoring
* Esprit expansion - structural review underway, awaiting tender documents
* Other Work completed during this time:
$\checkmark$ Approved a quote for replacement of windows
$\checkmark 5$ heaters were replaced
$\checkmark$ Furnace filters were replaced at The Meadow View
$\checkmark$ Window and door sealants were replaced at the townhomes
$\checkmark$ Yardi training was completed
$\checkmark$ Dump runs were completed for various tenants/units to be turned over
$\checkmark$ Minor work orders were completed throughout the district
$\sqrt{ }$ Generator line at 118 Church Street was buried
$\checkmark$ Retained CDCD Engineering to assess the retaining wall
$\checkmark$ Unit inspections completed and toilets were replaced
$\downarrow$ Carpets cleaned at Beechwood building with quote to replace the carpets where flooding occurred in September; investigation underway
$\checkmark$ Interviews and onboarding have been completed for a replacement for a new part-time position


## Esprit Place Family Resource Centre

| Emergency Shelter Services | September 2022 | YTD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of women who stayed in shelter this <br> month (may be duplicated within the month <br> or year) | 4 | 40 |
| Number of children who stayed in the shelter | 3 | Number of women who stayed in the <br> shelter this year who were unique to <br> the shelter (unduplicated) <br> Direct service hours to women <br> (shelter and counselling) |
| Resident bed nights <br> (women and children) <br> Occupancy rate | 101 | 24 |
| Days at capacity | 169 | 702 |
| Days over capacity | $56 \%$ |  |
| Phone interactions |  |  |
| (crisis/support) |  |  |


| Outreach Services | September <br> 2022 | YTD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of women served this month | 6 | 79 |
| Number of NEW women registered in the program | 1 | 36 |
| Number of public ed/groups | 0 | 1 |


| Transitional Support | September <br> $\mathbf{2 0 2 2}$ | YTD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Number of women served this month | 6 | 35 |
| Number of NEW women registered in the program | 0 | 19 |
| Number of public ed/groups offered | 0 | 0 |


|  | September <br> 2022 | YTD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Child Witness Program | Number of children/women served this month | 6 |
| Number of NEW clients (mothers and children) <br> registered in the program | 2 | 60 |
| Number of public ed/groups offered | 1 | 25 |

# Parry Sound Provincial Offences Act Court Manager's Report 

Q3 2022

## Court Recovery Planning

Court recovery planning is still an ongoing discussion with the Ministry of the Attorney General and the Recovery Secretariat as many larger municipalities continue to struggle with pandemic related backlogs. The Office of the Regional Senior Justice of the Peace resumed in-person trials for 2023, albeit with far fewer dates scheduled for in-person. 2023 has a total of 37 court dates, with 9 dates reserved for in-person trials; 4 in Parry Sound and 5 in Sundridge.

## Collections Project

With most of the backlog cleared as of November 1, 2022, POA will resume its collection efforts. A largescale special project was created by and for the Manager of POA, in large part due to diminishing revenues. During October 2022 I generated a list of defaulted fines dating back to the nineties. This represents 8,300 matters totalling approximately $\$ 4.4$ million. While $60 \%-70 \%$ has been deemed uncollectable, approximately $\$ 1.5$ million has been flagged as collectable monies. The remainder was deemed uncollectable for several reasons such as age of the matter (older than 20 years), type of matter (Liquor Licence Act etc.) and missing information on the ticket or summons (address, DOB etc.).

After compiling data, approximately 3,000 matters were flagged for collections enforcement. Each matter requires its own investigation using the original ticket or summons and comparing internal data from ICON and CAMS to external data from MTO, Land Registry Office and other sources. Collections enforcement begins with a warning letter advising defendants to take action within a month. After this period has
elapsed, collection tactics can include adding to property tax, wage garnishments etc. The project is expected to be completed mid-2024.

## Administrative Monotary Penalty System (AMPS)

In 2023, Parry Sound POA and Bylaw will be working together to review the possibility of implementing AMPS to administer parking tickets and certain other bylaw tickets, which is an alternative system to the lengthy and costly POA process. Under AMPS, a disputed ticket is reviewed by a Screening Officer (can be Town employed) who decides to reject, reduce, or confirm the penalty. If the defendant disagrees, the matter is referred to an independent Hearing Officer who would make a final decision. Some benefits include increased customer service as matters are resolved much more quickly, fewer disputed tickets, reduced likelihood of tickets being withdrawn due to court delays, enforcement officers can focus on enforcement as there is no need to prepare for and attend court, ticket issuance increase, payment of tickets are made directly with municipality, POA court resources are used more effectively.

While details are currently extremely limited, for an AMPS to be worthwhile, it is my understanding that it would require the buy-in of most larger municipalities within the district. Once research has been completed and a viable business case made, individual municipalities will be approached for discussions.

POA Charges Received and Entered

| Running Yearly Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2022 | 2021 | 2020 | 2019 | 2018 | 2017 |
| January | 257 | 369 | 293 | 403 | 324 | 296 |
| February | 188 | 332 | 306 | 260 | 486 | 437 |
| March | 284 | 505 | 242 | 482 | 465 | 464 |
| Q1 SUBTOTAL | 729 | 1,206 | 841 | 1,145 | 1,275 | 1,197 |
| April | 281 | 416 | 85 | 520 | 486 | 730 |
| May | 297 | 442 | 359 | 649 | 647 | 838 |
| June | 205 | 484 | 271 | 504 | 391 | 500 |
| July | 346 | 674 | 487 | 613 | 645 | 799 |
| August | 266 | 394 | 410 | 468 | 583 | 856 |
| September | 267 | 350 | 367 | 428 | 445 | 659 |
| Q3 SUBTOTAL | 2,391 | 3,966 | 2,820 | 4,327 | 4,472 | 5,579 |
| October | 223 | 275 | 298 | 444 | 454 | 706 |
| November |  | 226 | 230 | 315 | 311 | 458 |
| December |  | 150 | 145 | 189 | 239 | 317 |
| Total |  | 4617 | 3493 | 5,275 | 5,476 | 7,060 |

Ticket issuance continues to be very low into 2022 with only 2,391 tickets issued during Q1-Q3 2022 compared to the lowest year on record being 2,820 tickets in 2020. Ticket issuance statistics for 2022 along with 2020, 2018, 2016 and 2014 were sent to West Parry Sound OPP Detachment Commander for comment. More specifically, Parry Sound POA asked WPSOPP what the reasons were for such drastic decreases in ticket issuance. Detachment Commander Jeremy McDonald provided 2 reasons:

1) Staff shortages: staffing numbers have been low for years, which has "impacted front line availability to focus on officer initiated traffic enforcement". Current staffing numbers are approaching normal levels.
2) Warnings: for the past 2 years, more warnings have been issued. "Our members now have the option to issue real warnings in the form of paper documentation rather than an actual PON".

## Ticket Processing

Ticket processing statistics improved through 2022 as the backlog of tickets caused by the pandemic diminished over time. As of November 1, 2022, the backlog has virtually been eliminated, except for Trials in Absentia which are required by legislation to be held in-person. These matters are currently being scheduled into 2023. It is expected that this backlog will continue into late 2023, unless we are provided with more inperson dates by the Office of the Regional Senior Justice of the Peace.

|  | Parry Sound | All Municipalities |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Average days to dispose at trial: Part 1 | 331 | 441 |
| Average days to dispose at trial: Part 3 | 649 | 707 |
| Percentage of charges disposed before trial | $89 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| Percentage of prepaid fines | $48 \%$ | $47 \%$ |

## 2022 POA Summary of Operations

## Revenues

Provincial Offences Revenues
Transcripts
TOTAL

## Expenditures

Salaries, Benefits \& Contracted Services
Office Administration \& Facilities
Partner's Adminstration Charge
Prosecution \& Justice of Peace
Interpreter Costs
Court related travel $\&$ witness fees
NCO \& A1 Collection Costs
Amortization of Capital Assets
Audit Costs
Fines \& By-Laws to Municipalities
Fines paid to other POA Offices
Transfer to Municipal Partners
Certificate of Offence charges
POA IT \& Software
Provincial Monitoring/Enforcement
VFS paid to Province
Dedicated Fines paid to Province
TOTAL

Distribution to Partners

| Q1 <br> TOTAL | Q2 <br> TOTAL | Q3 <br> TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 237,160.99$ |  | $\$ 449,849.00$ |
| $\$$ | - | $\$ 688,103.00$ |
| $\$$ | $\$$ | - |
| $\$ 237,160.99$ | $\$ 449,849.00$ | $\$ 688,103.00$ |


| \$ | 58,158.39 |  | 14,162.55 | \$ 183,317.00 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 4,476.66 | \$ | 10,420.34 | \$ | 25,061.00 |
| \$ | 14,493.50 | \$ | 28,987.00 |  | 57,974.00 |
| \$ | 22,572.47 | \$ | 64,747.37 |  | 102,847.00 |
| \$ | 926.60 | \$ | 3,754.96 |  | 12,057.00 |
| \$ |  | \$ |  | \$ |  |
| \$ | 2,678.71 | \$ | 6,451.54 | \$ | 7,496.00 |
| \$ | 270.50 | \$ |  | \$ | 1,082.00 |
| \$ | 1,100.00 | \$ | 2,200.00 | \$ | 4,400.00 |
| \$ | 1,795.00 | \$ | 4,175.00 | + | 6,300.00 |
| \$ | 5,286.20 | \$ | 5,190.20 | \$ | 25,570.00 |
| \$ |  | \$ | 86,602.29 | \$ | 86,602.00 |
| \$ | 1,391.36 | \$ | 1,973.87 | \$ | 3,649.00 |
| \$ | 2,390.34 | \$ | 5,624.49 | \$ | 7,168.00 |
| \$ | 1,407.00 | \$ | 2,814.00 | \$ | 4,221.00 |
| \$ | 36,959.06 | \$ | 66,014.06 |  | 101,869.00 |
| \$ | 18,925.00 | \$ | 46,700.00 | \$ | 58,395.00 |
| \$172,830.79 |  | \$ 449,817.67 |  | \$688,008.00 |  |
| \$ | 64,330.20 | \$ | 31.33 | \$ | 95.00 |

* Amounts under $\$ 100$ were not distributed
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## Meeting Minutes

## Date:

May 26, 2022

## Time:

1:30pm

## Location:

Zoom
https://us06web.zoom.us/i/85128706267?pwd=cW9GV1|xYWN6SDYxL1Z5dTdDUFAzZz09
Meeting ID: 85128706267
Passcode: 889343

## Members Present:

- Parry Sound Bonnie Keith
- McDougall

Sheri Brisbane

- Perry

Margaret Ann MacPhail

- Machar

Bart Wood

- Strong

Jody Baillie

- Armour

Bob MacPhail

- McMurrich/Monteith

Angela Friesen

## Staff Present:

- Parry Sound

Andre Couture

The Corporation of The Town of Parry Sound
Municipal Partners POA Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes May 26, 2022

## 1. Agenda

### 1.1 Additions to Agenda/Notice of Motion

### 1.2 Prioritization of Agenda

### 1.3 Adoption of Agenda

That the Committee agenda for May 26, 2022, be approved as circulated.
Moved by Jody Baillie
Seconded by Margaret Ann MacPhail
1.4 Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and the General Nature Thereof
2. Public Meeting
3. Minutes and Matters Arising from Minutes

### 3.1 Adoption of November 25, 2021 Meeting Minutes

That the Minutes from the committee meeting held November 25, 2021, be approved as circulated.

Moved by Angela Friesen
Seconded by Bart Wood

### 3.2 Questions of Staff

9. Resolutions and Direction to Staff

### 9.1 POA Court Services

### 9.1.1 POA Court Manager's Report Q1 2022

That the POA Court Manager's Report Q1 2022 be accepted.
Moved by Sheri Brisbane

The Corporation of The Town of Parry Sound
Municipal Partners POA Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes May 26, 2022

Seconded by Bob MacPhail

### 9.2 Other Business

The Committee tasked the Manager of POA Court Services to reach out to OPP for comment on why ticket issuance has significantly decreased.

### 9.3 Date of Next Meeting

That the next POA Municipal Partners Meeting will be held November 24, 2022, at 1:30pm.

Moved by Angela Friesen
Seconded by Sheri Brisbane

## 11. Adjournment

Personal Information collected in Section 2. Public Meeting, Section 4. Correspondence and/or Section 5. Deputations is collected under the authority of the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), Section 21. (1) $c$ and will be used to create a record available to the general public.

The Corporation of The Town of Parry Sound
Municipal Partners POA Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda November 24, 2022

## Agenda

## Date:

November 24, 2022

## Time:

1:30pm

## Location:

## Zoom

https://us06web.zoom.us/i/87029665287?pwd=b1hJRFcrN2YrazR6T2g2T2ExT1|2dz09
Meeting ID: 87029665287
Passcode: 458896

## Members Present:

## Staff Present:

## 1. Agenda

1.1 Additions to Agenda/Notice of Motion
1.2 Prioritization of Agenda
1.3 Adoption of Agenda

That the Committee agenda for November 24, 2022, be approved as circulated.
Moved by
Seconded by

The Corporation of The Town of Parry Sound
Municipal Partners POA Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda November 24, 2022

### 1.4 Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and the General Nature Thereof

2. Public Meeting

## 3. Minutes and Matters Arising from Minutes

### 3.1 Adoption of May 26, 2022 Meeting Minutes

That the Minutes from the committee meeting held May 26, 2022, be approved as circulated.

Moved by
Seconded by

### 3.2 Questions of Staff

## 9. Resolutions and Direction to Staff

### 9.1 POA Court Services

### 9.1.1 POA Court Manager's Report Q3 2022

That the POA Court Manager's Report Q3 2022 be accepted.
Moved by
Seconded by

### 9.2 Other Business

### 9.3 Date of Next Meeting

That the next POA Municipal Partners Meeting will be held May 25, 2023 at 1:30pm.
Moved by
Seconded by

The Corporation of The Town of Parry Sound
Municipal Partners POA Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda November 24, 2022

## 11. Adjournment

Personal Information collected in Section 2. Public Meeting, Section 4. Correspondence and/or Section 5. Deputations is collected under the authority of the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (MFIPPA), Section 21. (1) $c$ and will be used to create a record available to the general public.

|  | 2023 <br> Draft Budget | 2022 <br> Budget |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revenues |  |  |  |
| Provincial Offences Revenues | $\$$ | $825,531.00$ | $\$ 851,473.00$ |

Expenditures
Salaries, Benefits \& Contracted Services
Office Administration \& Facilities
Partner's Adminstration Charge
Prosecution \& Justice of Peace Interpreter Costs
Court related travel \& witness fees
NCO \& A1 Collection Costs
Amortization of Capital Assets
Audit Costs
Certificate of Offence charges
POA IT \& Software
Provincial Monitoring/Enforcement
Fines \& By-Laws to Municipalities
Fines paid to other POA Offices
Transfer to Municipal Partners
VFS paid to Province
Fines paid to Province

| $\$$ | $276,468.00$ | $\$$ | $267,832.00$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\$$ | $41,615.00$ | $\$$ | $42,985.00$ |
| $\$$ | $57,766.00$ | $\$$ | $57,974.00$ |
| $\$$ | $135,000.00$ | $\$$ | $140,000.00$ |
| $\$$ | $10,000.00$ | $\$$ | $15,000.00$ |
| $\$$ | $1,500.00$ | $\$$ | $1,500.00$ |
| $\$$ | $15,000.00$ | $\$$ | $15,000.00$ |
| $\$$ | $1,082.00$ | $\$$ | $1,082.00$ |
| $\$$ | $4,400.00$ | $\$$ | $4,400.00$ |
| $\$$ | $3,500.00$ | $\$$ | $2,000.00$ |
| $\$$ | $15,000.00$ | $\$$ | $21,500.00$ |
| $\$$ | $5,700.00$ | $\$$ | $5,700.00$ |
| $\$$ | $8,500.00$ | $\$$ | $8,500.00$ |
| $\$$ | $20,000.00$ | $\$$ | $36,000.00$ |
| $\$$ | $85,000.00$ | $\$$ | $107,000.00$ |
| $\$$ | $90,000.00$ | $\$$ | $90,000.00$ |
| $\$$ | $55,000.00$ | $\$$ | $35,000.00$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\$$ | $825,531.00$ |  | $851,473.00$ |



705-382-2900 www.almaguin-health.org

Minutes: November 3, 2022, 10.00 am via Zoom and in the AHHC boardroom
Present: Rod Ward (Chair), Carol Ballantyne, Joe Vella, Dennis Banka, Cathy Still, Norm Hofstetter, Barbara Belrose, Tom Bryson, Brad Kneller, Margaret McPhail, Candy Shuker (Secretary)
Regrets: Marianne Stickland (Vice Chair)
Guests: Courtney Metcalf (ACED), Kevin MacLeod (BFFHT)
Called to order at 10:00 am by Chair R. Ward

1. 2022-23 Moved by C. Still - Seconded by. T. Bryson.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Almaguin Highlands Health Council adopt the minutes from the regular meeting of October 6, 2022. Carried.
2. DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY OF INTEREST: None
3. DELEGATIONS: None
4. RESOLUTIONS PASSED: None

## 5. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

A) Discussion regarding "Ontario Announcement (OHT) The Ontario government, in partnership with Ontario Health, has approved three new Ontario Health Teams in Northern Ontario: Maamwesying, City \& District of Thunder Bay and Kiiwetinoong Healing Waters. With these three new teams, Ontario will have a total of 54 Health Teams.
B) Stats-Q2-OTN (July- Sept)
K. MacLeod shared an update on the stats for Q2 for OTN. There was a total of 35 visits, with all visits from local residents. This is nearly double from Q1.
OTN is operating at full capacity with 19 hours per week. The coordinator has also been supporting COVID-19 immunizations.
C) Support of Resolution for MAHC.

The following Municipalities have supported Resolution 2022-266 as issued by the Village of Burk's Falls to maintain MAHC services at the Almaguin Highlands Health Centre:
Township of Ryerson, Town of Kearney, Village of Sundridge, Township of McMurrich-Monteith, Township of Perry, Township of Machar, Village of Sundridge, Township of Strong, Township of Armour and Municipality of Magnetawan.
D) MAOHT Recruiter Funds: Deferred until next meeting.

2022-24 Moved by C. Ballantyne - Seconded by T. Bryson
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Almaguin Highlands Health Council adjourn at 10:18 am to meet again on December 1, 2022, at 10:00 am. Carried.

Location will be in person at the AHHC unless notified otherwise.

November 14, 2022

## Councils across the North start a New Chapter

The Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities (FONOM) is the unified voice of Northeastern Ontario, representing and advocating on behalf of 110 cities, towns, and municipalities.

Our mission is to improve the economic and social quality of life for all northerners and ensure our youth's future.

The FONOM Board wishes to congratulate your council as you begin your four-year term. Please consider FONOM as a resource, and please keep us informed on issues of regional importance.

As Northern Municipalities, we have unique challenges. We will address those challenges by working with our neighboring communities, our district association, and FONOM.

Sincerely,


Danny Whalen
President


Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities

November 22, 2022

## FONOM welcomes new Highway Safety Standard

The Federation of Northern Ontario Municipalities (FONOM) is applauding the provincial government's recent announcement that bare pavement on Northern highways will now be required within 12 hours of a winter storm.
"FONOM would like to thank Minister of Transportation Caroline Mulroney and the provincial government for making this critical change," said FONOM President Danny Whalen. "Highways in Northern Ontario connect our communities; and having highways 17 and 11 cleared quicker after the minimal standard is reached is important for road safety."

Previously this year, the province announced the 2+1 Highway pilot project on Highway 11 north of North Bay and the work of the Northern Ontario Transportation Task Force as steps to ensure highways 11 and 17 serve the residents of the North.

FONOM will continue to work with the Ministry and Ford Government on matters of importance to our member municipalities. The FONOM Board will continue this advocacy during the Rural Ontario Municipal Association conference this January.

FONOM is an association of some 110 districts/municipalities/cities/towns in Northeastern Ontario mandated to work for the betterment of municipal government in Northern Ontario and strive for improved legislation respecting local government in the North. It is a membership-based association that draws its members from Northeastern Ontario and is governed by an 11-member board.


President Danny Whalen
705-622-2479

## From:

Sent:
To:
Subject:

OPP MPB Financial Services Unit (OPP) [OPP.MPB.Financial.Services.Unit@opp.ca](mailto:OPP.MPB.Financial.Services.Unit@opp.ca) November 14, 2022 4:58 PM
Laura Brandt; Stephanie Lewin
Magnetawan M - July to September 2022 Detachment Revenues

## Good afternoon,

Revenues collected for worked performed by detachment staff is credited to municipalities quarterly throughout the year, approximately two months after the end of the quarter. Please note that effective June 13,2022 , the OPP implemented an online application system for the public to request security checks. The processing of security checks continues to be completed by detachment staff and the revenue collected for the security checks has been included in this distribution.

We are pleased to advise July to September 2022 revenue credits have been sent to Ontario Shared Services (OSS) for processing and should be issued within the week. Your municipality will be receiving a credit memo in the amount of $\$ 303.52$.

The breakdown of the April to June revenue credit is as follows:

Security Checks $=\$ 246$
Reports = \$0
Fingerprints $=\$ 57.52$
Other = \$0

We have been advised by OSS a call to 1-877-535-0554 is required to apply the credit to an outstanding invoice.
Should you have any questions please email OPP.MPB.Financial.Services.Unit@opp.ca.

Respectfully,

MPB Financial Services Unit

November 23， 2022
To：Community Partners and Business Owners／Operators in Nipissing and Parry Sound Districts

## RE：Strong Recommendation to Mask in all Indoor Public Settings and Layering Protections During the Fall Respiratory Season

The North Bay Parry Sound District Health Unit＇s（Health Unit）region is experiencing double the number of emergency department visits for flu－like and respiratory illnesses，compared to the pre－ pandemic three－year average．This is similar to what is being seen across the province and emphasizes the need for everyone to use layers of protection to help prevent the spread of these viruses．Across the province，COVID－19，influenza，and respiratory syncytial virus（RSV）are the viruses which are causing the majority of these hospital visits．

Influenza causes a wide spectrum of illness，ranging from seven to ten days with mild symptoms，to severe illness requiring hospitalization．Complications of the flu may include worsening of chronic health conditions，pneumonia，and respiratory failure．RSV is a virus that usually causes cold symptoms in children but can cause bronchiolitis－an infection of the tiny airways that lead to the lungs that cause wheezing and difficulty breathing．This infection is most serious for young babies． There are currently no vaccines available against this virus．

Flu－like illnesses can have other negative effects on not only those who are ill，but also their families and friends．This can include missed school，resulting in days off work for parents and caregivers，and possibly a short－term loss of income due to unpaid sick days．

To protect against the threat of infection and severe illness，I strongly recommend that organizations and individuals in the North Bay Parry Sound District Health Unit region promote using layers of protection against viral respiratory illness：
－Mask in indoor public settings，including workplaces
－Stay up to date with COVID－19 and influenza vaccines
－Screen for respiratory symptoms daily
－Stay home and stay away from others in your household if you are sick
－Always practice good hand hygiene and regularly clean high－touch surfaces．These measures are especially important for RSV and flu viruses．

ㄷ 705－746－2711

As community organizations and leaders, I am asking you to please consider how you can support masking and these other important measures in your respective settings.

When we use multiple layers of protection, we lower the risk of illness for ourselves and those around us, especially the most vulnerable. For more information, visit our website.


James Chirico, H.BSc., M.D., F.R.C.P.(C), MPH Medical Officer of Health/Executive Officer
/sm

E 705-474.8252

B 705-746-2711

## MEA APPOINTS NEW BOARD OF DIRECTORS AT 2022 AGM

The Municipal Engineers Association (MEA) is a non-profit association representing the interests of over nearly 1,100 professional engineers in Ontario who are employed in the municipal engineering and public works sectors at Ontario municipalities and provincial agencies, as well as consulting engineering firms acting as the engineer-of-record for Ontario municipalities.

The MEA's many pursuits include significant involvement (development and oversight) as the coproponents (along with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation \& Parks) for the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) process. Together with the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario, MEA administers Ontario Provincial Standards for Municipalities (OPS MUNI); many of our members participate in committees that establish standards and specifications used province wide.

MEA offers training courses for both MCEA and OPS as well as hosting an annual conference.
The MEA is also the preferred venue for employers to recruit professional municipal engineers and technologists/technicians through our online employment advertising platform.

Since 2008, the MEA has also awarded over $\$ 165,000$ in bursaries to students entering the first year of an accredited university engineering program as part of its annual bursary program.

The MEA recently held its 2022 Annual General Meeting at the Chelsea Hotel on November 17, 2022. As part of AGM business, a new Board was elected. We are pleased to present the new Board for the 2022/2023 term:

2022-2023 MEA Board of Directors \& Staff


Chris A. Traini, P. Eng. President
County Engineer and Deputy CAO
County of Middlesex ctraini@county.middlesex.on.ca


Matthew N. Miedema, P. Eng. Vice President Project Engineer Engineering Division City of Thunder Bay mmiedema@thunderbay.ca


Amanda Froese, P. Eng. Secretary-Treasurer Director, Transportation \& Environmental Services Bruce County afroese@brucecounty on ca


## dan.cozzi@municipalengineers.on.ca



Jason Cole, P. Eng., Past-President
General Manager, Infrastructure \& Development Services County of Lambton jason.cole@county-lambton.ca


Benjamin de Haan, P. Eng. Board Director
Director of Transportation Serv. United Counties of Stormont Dundas \& Glengarry
b dehaan@sdgcounties ca


Scott Hamilton, P. Eng. Board Director City Engineer City of Burlington
Scott.Hamilton@burlington.on.ca


Catherine J. Taddo, P. Eng. Board Director
Land Development \& Environmental Engineer
City of Sault Ste Marie c.taddo@cityssm.on.ca


Penelope Palmer, P. Eng. Board Director
Manager, Business Improvement \&
Stds., Eng'g \& Const'n Services City of Toronto
Penelope.palmer@loronto.ca

D.M. (Dan) Cozzi, P. Eng. Executive Director Municipal Engineers Association
dan cozzi@municipalengineers.on.ca


Taylor Crinklaw, P. Eng., Board Director Director of Infrastructure \& Development Services City of Stratford tcrinklaw@stratford.ca


Paul Acquaah, P. Eng. Board Director Manager of Engineering Capital Planning \& Delivery York Region
Paul.acquaah@york.ca


Amin Mneina, M.Sc., E.I.T. Member Services Coordinator Municipal Engineers Association
amin.meina@municipalengineers,onca

Please share this with members of your organization. Should you have any questions about the MEA or the new Board, please let me know.

Sincerely,

D.M. (Dan) Cozzi, P. Eng.

Executive Director
Municipal Engineers Association

## Dear residents:

It was nice to see so many familiar faces out and about again this summer. But it was also difficult time for some with high gas and food prices cutting into family budgets.

During the pandemic we purchased and delivered over 125 warm meals to seniors, living on their own. Recognizing the economic hardship being experienced the Magnetawan Lions donated $\$ 7,000$ to the local food bank, provided assistance to the Huntsville Hospice and contributed $\$ 10,000$ for the renovation and expansion of the Dunchurch nursing station use so many in our community.

The pandemic restrictions have meant that our club has not been able to hold the social events that we enjoy so much - Wild game dinner, fish fries, etc. The cancellation of these activities has had a devastating impact on our club's fundraising and badly affected our presence in the community, something we are working hard to remedy. At this point the Lions are planning the following events a Pancake Dinner on Shrove Tuesday, a spring fish fry and of course continuing our traditionally free swim lessons (July 17 to Aug 4 2023).

Due to the overwhelming support of our community, the Lions were able to help over 30 families/individuals again last Christmas. Support included providing full turkey/ham dinners, gifts for the children and gift wrapped tins of cookies for approximately 60 seniors. If you would like tomake a donation to our Christmas fund - a dedicated fund held separately from other community projects - your assistance would be most graciously appreciated. Donations can be made by cheque. to the Magnetawan Lions Club. Our mailing address is P.O Box 250, Magnetawan, Ontario, P0A 1P0 or by e-transfer to email Magnetawanlions@gmail.com Under message be clear that this is for the Christmas Fund.

I am proud that our club continues to serve the community of Magnetawan and 1 look forward to seeing you at an upcoming event soon. Have a safe and healthy winter.

Donation for the Magnetawan Christmas Basket Fund Detach and return with your kind donation so we can thank you. Enclosed is \$ $\qquad$ in aid of the Christmas Basket Fund.

Name .


Leave your porch light on so the firefighters will know to pick up the food you donate. Nonperishable items only please.

| Food will be |
| :---: |
| picked up in: |
| Burk's Falls |
| Katrine |
| Emsdale |
| Magnetawan |
| Kearney |
| Sprucedale |



Supporting the Burk's Falls and District Food Bank Serving Almaguin South

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:
donotreply@otf.ca
November 24, 2022 11:24 PM
Laura Brandt
Ontario Trillium Foundation Application ID\# CP123164 Funding Decision

## Please note: This is an unmonitored mailbox. Do not reply directly to this message.

Thank you for submitting an application to the Ontario Trillium Foundation (OTF). We appreciate the time and effort that went into the application, and we understand the commitment you have to the success of your organization's mission.

OTF receives a very high volume of applications and while there are so many worthy proposals, we are only able to fund a limited number of projects. Unfortunately, we are not able to fund your application which is further outlined further below.

We recognize this notification is arriving at a challenging time during which your organization is rebuilding its resiliency to provide valuable programs and services in your community.

Successful Capital grant applications demonstrate strength in four assessment areas. Based on our criteria for each of these assessment areas, your application:

- Could have more clearly demonstrated how the capital project will contribute to the social and economic wellbeing of the community (Community Need)
- Could have more clearly described the planning that was completed to support project implementation upon OTF approval (Process)
- Could have more clearly demonstrated that the financial workbook and total grant request are reasonable and aligned with key project activities (Process)

Please note that the next deadline for the Resilient Communities Fund is December 7, 2022. Information sessions and coaching calls are still available. If you wish to re-apply, we encourage you to:

- Visit OTF's Resilient Communities Fund page for information on eligibility requirements
- Contact the OTF Support Centre at 1800 263-2887 or otf@otf.ca

We wish you the very best with the important work you do in your community.
Thank you for applying to the Ontario Trillium Foundation.

Sincerely,
Melanie Maxwell
Director, Granting Support

## KISS THE MOOSE MURAL NAMING CONTEST

## IT'S OFFICIAL

## MAGNETAWAN IS HOME TO

## MORTIMER THE MOOSE!



## CONGRATULATION TO PAM

## WHO NOMINATED THE WINNING NAME!

Pam has won a $\$ 50$ Gift Certificate to a Business of Their Choice Located Within the Municipality

For more information contact the Municipal Office at (705) 387-3947 or by email at recreation@magnetawan.com
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## LIONS' PAVILION UPDATE The Lions' Pavilion is now OPEN!!!

The Lions' Pavilion Outdoor Rink now has new boards, plexiglass and netting!
These upgrades and repairs were made possible by NOHFC grant funding!


FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT US AT (705) 387-3947 OR ATINFO@MAGNETAWAN.COM


Muncicipality of Magnotawan

## ICYMI

In Case You Missed It!
Council Highlights November 16, 2022

To read the complete minutes, agenda packages and by-laws please visit our website at www.magnetawan.com


Council held their inaugural meeting and all of those elected completed their declarations of office for the 2022-2026 term. A special thank you to Rev. Sylvia Poetschke for providing our opening prayer. THANK YOU to all who ran for the 2022 Municipal Election and showed an invested interest in our Community! Council passed By-law 2022-57 Appointing John Hetherington as Deputy Mayor for the 2022-2026 Term of Council. CONGRATULATIONS JOHN on your appointment to Deputy Mayor!

GREAT NEWS Staff applied for grant funding and was successful in their application to the 2022 - Fall Trail Care Trans Canada Trail Funding. The Municipality will receive $\$ 1,000$ to put towards the revamping of the Trans Canada Trail Sign Replacement!


Council passed resolution 2022-301 receiving and approving the DRAFT 2023 Council Meeting Dates as amended. To view the 2023 Council Meeting Dates, visit our Mayor \& Council Page under Government or visit our Event Calendar on our website.


That the Municipal Office is open from 8am to 5pm Monday to Friday? The Municipal Office has had extended hours since the start of 2022 and does not close for lunch! Open earlier and longer to help serve YOU better!

The next meeting of Council is December 7, 2022, at 1:00 pm at the Magnetawan Community Centre followed.

Questions? Concerns? Ideas? Contact the Municipal Office at (705) 387-3947 or by email at info@magnetawan.com

Meeting Date: Dec. 7122
Accounts Payable
Batch \# 187
Cheque Date: $16 / 11 / 22$
from: 23642 To: 23642
Batch \# 191
Cheque Date: $30 / 11 / 22$
From: 23712 To: 23780
Batch \# 264
Cheque Date: $30 / 11 / 22$
From: 23781 To: 23813
EFT
Batch \# 262
Total Accounts Payable
$\$ 354,371.86$
Cancelled Cheques 23572 -PAD ON VISA $\langle 112.94\rangle$
$23143-23710$ PRINTER ERROR

Payroll
Staff Pay
Pay Period:\# 23
Direct deposit and
Cheque \#23641 to \# 23641
Staff Pay
Pay Period: $\# 24$
Direct deposit and
Cheque \# to \#
Council Pay
Pay Period: \# 24
All Direct deposit
Total Payroll
Total for Resolution

Amount
$\$ 127.13$
$\$ 230,554.48$
$\$ 37,812.22$
$s 40,934.46$
$s 99,607.70$
$54,312.79$
$\$ 144,854.95$
$5499,113.87$
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## MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN <br> Council/Board Report By Dept-(Computer)

| AP5130 |  | Page : | 8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date: | Nov 29, 2022 | Time : | $3: 29 \mathrm{pm}$ |
| Cheque Print Date: | 01-Jan-2022 | To | 30-Nov-2022 |
| Bank: 1 To 1 |  |  |  |
| Class : All |  |  |  |


| Vendor Invoice | Vendor Name Description |  |  |  | Batch Invc Date | Inve Due Dat |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G.L. Account | CC1 | CC2 | CC3 | GL Account Name |  | Amount |  |
| DEPARTMENT | 3101 | OVERHEAD |  |  |  |  |  |
| 83393 | HAND PACKER |  |  |  | 264 16-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |  |
| 1-4-3101-2080 |  |  |  | J - Small Tools and Supplies |  | 105.04 |  |
| 19037 | SLING-CHOKER MFG. (NORTH BAY) LTD. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 96426 | SAFETY SUPPLIES |  |  |  | 191 16-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |  |
| 1-4-3101-2020 |  |  |  | J - Safety Supplies |  | 537.65 |  |
| 96427 | SAFETY SUPPLIES |  |  |  | 191 16-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |  |
| 1-4-3101-2020 |  |  |  | J - Safety Supplies |  | 514.70 |  |
| 96558 | SAFETY SUPPLIES |  |  |  | 264 23-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 | 152.50 |
| 1-4-3101-2020 |  |  |  | J - Safety Supplies |  |  |  |
| 19070 | SPECTRUM TELECOM GROUP LTD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C1255258 | TOWER RENTAL - FIRE \& PUBLIC WORKS |  |  |  | 191 01-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |  |
| 1-4-3101-2120 |  |  |  | J- Office |  |  | 226.00 |
| 20052 | TOWLER MATTHEW S |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 113761 | WORK BOOTS REIMBURSEMEN |  |  | J - Safety Supplies | 264 22-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 | 200.00 |
| 1-4-3101-2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20083 | TRACKMATICS INCGPS MONITORING-PUBLIC WORKS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40165 |  |  |  |  |  | 191 05-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |  |
| 1-4-3101-2045 | J - GPS monitoring and data |  |  |  |  |  | 501.72 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Dapartment Totals : | 12,670.50 |  |



DEPARTMENT 3222
TRUCK \#22-2016 FREIGHTLINER TANDEM
06034 FREIGHTLINER NORTH BA $O$ O







## MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN Council/Board Report By Dept-(Computer)

| AP5130 | Page : | 15 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Date: | Nov 29, 2022 | Time : |
|  | $3: 29 \mathrm{pm}$ |  |


| Vendor: | 01010 To 27030 | Cheque Print Date : 01-Jan-2022 | To 30-Nov-2022 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Batch : | 187 To 264 | Bank: 1 To 1 |  |
| Department: All | Class : All |  |  |


| Vendor Invoice | Vendor Name Description |  |  |  | Batch Invc Date | Invc Due Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G.L. Account | CC1 | CC2 | cc3 | GL Account Name |  | Amount |
| DEPARTMENT | 7300 | COMMUNITY CENTRE AND PAVILION |  |  |  |  |
| 1-4-7300-2024 | HALL - Heating Fuel |  |  |  |  | 855.62 |
| 13242 | MOORE PROPA | LIMIT |  |  |  |  |
| 9012599 | PROPANE - COM | UNITY | NTRE |  | 191 09-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |
| 1-4-7300-2024 | HALL - Heating Fuel |  |  |  |  | 549.36 |
| 15068 | ORKIN CANADA CORPORATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| C-3767465 | MONTHLY RODENT CONTROI \& WASHROOM CARE |  |  |  | 264 22-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |
| 1-4-7300-2400 | HALL - Repairs \& Maintenance |  |  |  |  | 306.46 |
| 19097 | SOUND BARRIERS DIV. OF 1466147 ONT |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23026 | NEW PAVILLION BOARD |  |  |  | 191 16-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |
| 1-4-7300-8000 |  |  |  | HALL - Capital Expenditures |  | 76,749.60 |
| 23027 | NEW BOARDS - PAVILLION UPGRADE |  |  |  | 264 25-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |
| 1-4-7300-8000 |  |  |  | HALL - Capital Expenditures |  | 12,791.60 |
| 19145 | SIGNCRAFT CANADA INC. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1928 | DROP BOX SIGN |  |  | HALL - Materials/Supplies | 191 21-Oct-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |
| 1-4-7300-2010 |  |  |  |  | Department Totals : | 73.45 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 93,417.49 |


| DEPARTMENT 7600 HERITAGE CENTRE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01184 | AHMIC MARINE LTD. |  |  |  |
| 2022-616 | MUSEUM CABIN ROOF |  | 264 22-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |
| 1-4-7600-8000 |  | HERITAGE - Capital |  | $7,010.71$ |
|  |  |  | Department Totals : | 7,010.71 |
| DEPARTMENT | 7700 AHMIC COI | AHMIC COMMUNITY CENTRE |  |  |
| 11010 | KIDD'S HOME HARDWARE BUILDING CENTRE |  |  |  |
| 2897027 | AHMIC KITCHEN PARTS (VENT) |  | 264 28-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |
| 1-4-7700-2400 |  | AHMIC - Repairs \& Maintenance |  | 73.40 |
| 15050 | HYDRO ONE NETWORKS |  |  |  |
| 200198932621 | 60 AHMIC ST. |  | 191 01-Nov-2022 | 30-Nov-2022 |
| 1-4-7700-2030 |  | AHMIC - Hydro |  | 95.49 |
|  |  |  | Department Totals : | 168.89 |




# THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN 

BY-LAW NO. 2022-
Being a By-law to Establish Fees and Charges

WHEREAS Section 391(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended, authorizes the Council of a local municipality to pass by-laws imposing fees or charges for services or activities provided or done by or on behalf of it; for costs payable by it for services or activities provided or done by or on behalf of any other municipality or local board; and for the use of its property including property under its control;

AND WHEREAS Section 69 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990.c. P. 13, provides that the Council of a municipality may prescribe a tariff of fees for the processing of applications made in respect of planning matters;

AND WHEREAS Section 7 of the Building Code Act, 1992, S.O. 1992, c. 23, as amended, authorizes a municipal Council of a municipality to pass a by-law requiring the payment of fees on applications for and issuance of permits and prescribing the amounts thereof;

AND WHEREAS Pursuant to Section 270(1) of the Municipal Act the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Magnetawan provided notice in accordance with the Municipality of Magnetawan Provision of Notice Policy By-law 2016-12.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Magnetawan hereby enacts as follows:

## 1. GENERAL

1.1. Council hereby establishes the fees and charges as set out in the Schedule $A$ attached hereto and forming an integral part of this By-law.
1.2. This By-law shall be known and may be cited as the "Municipality of Magnetawan Fees and Charges By-law".
1.3. The fees set out in the attached Schedule A shall be paid for the services or activities listed, and all fees are per occasion or request.
1.4. No request by any person for any information, service, activity or use of Municipal property will be provided unless and until the person requesting the information, service, activity or use of Municipal property has paid the applicable fee in the prescribed amount as set out in the Schedules.
1.5. The fees and charges will be subject to Harmonized Sales Tax (HST), where applicable, as noted.
1.6. Unpaid Fees shall be added to the owner's tax account and collected in like manner as taxes.

## 2. SEVERABILITY

If any provision or part of a provision of this by-law is declared by any court or tribunal of competent jurisdiction to be illegal or inoperative, in whole or in part, or inoperative in particular circumstances, the balance of the by-law, or its application in other circumstances, shall not be affected and shall continue to be in full force and effect.

## 3. CONFLICT WITH ANY OTHER BY-LAW

In the event of any conflict between any provisions of this by-law and any other by-law heretofore passed, the provisions of this by-law shall prevail.

## 4. REPEAL OF PREVIOUS BY-LAWS

That By-law 2021-65 and any previously conflicting by-laws are hereby repealed.

## 5. EFFECTIVE DATE

This by-law shall take force and effect on the $1^{\text {st }}$ day of January 2023.
READ A FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD TIME, passed, signed and the Seal of the Corporation affixed hereto, this $7^{\text {th }}$ day of December, 2022

SCHEDULE "A" To By-law 2022-
ALL FEES ARE NON--REFUNDABLE

## ALL FEES ARE SUBJECT TO APPLICABLE TAXES

COMMUNITY SERVICES -FACILITY SERVICES
Magnetawan Community Centre, Lion's Pavilion \& Ahmic Harbour Community Centre

| Magnetawan Community Centre <br> A damage deposit fee of $\$ 250$ per event is required upon booking. Deposit less repair costs, if any, will be returned following postrental inspection | Monday to Thursday (per day) | Friday to Sunday (per day) | Friday 6 pm to Sunday 6 pm (weekend) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial/ *Non-Resident full day | \$170 | \$195 | \$390 |
| Commercia//Non-Resident up to 4 hrs. | \$100 | per dav \$120 |  |
| Resident full day | \$120 | \$145 | \$290 |
| Resident up to 4 hours | \$70 | ner dav $\$ 90$ |  |
| **Non-profit full day | \$120 | \$145 | \$290 |
| Non-profit up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day $\$ 90$ |  |
| Add-ons |  |  |  |
| Kitchen Rental (Not Available for Individual Rental) | \$75 | \$85 | \$140 |
| Bar Rental | \$35 | \$55 | \$110 |
| Set-up Fee (including tables, chairs, etc.) | \$50 | per day $\$ 50$ |  |
| Coffee \& Tea Set-Up | \$20 | per day $\$ 25$ |  |
| Ahmic Harbour Community Centre <br> A damage deposit fee of $\$ 250$ per event is required upon booking. Deposit less repair costs, if any, will be returned following postrental inspection | Monday to Thursday (per day) | Friday to Sunday (per day) | Friday 6 pm to Sunday 6 pm (weekend) |
| Commercial/Non-Resident full day | \$120 | \$145 | \$290 |
| Commercia//Non-Resident up to 4 hrs . | \$80 | per day \$95 |  |
| Resident full day | \$90 | \$110 | \$220 |
| Resident up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day \$90 |  |
| Non-profit full day | \$90 | \$110 | \$220 |
| Non-profit up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day $\$ 80$ |  |
| Add-ons |  |  |  |
| Set-up Fee (including tables, chairs, etc.) | \$50 | per day | \$50 |
| Coffee \& Tea Set-up | \$20 | per day \$25 |  |
| Magnetawan Lions Pavilion <br> A damage deposit fee of $\$ 250$ per event is required upon booking. Deposit less repair costs, if any, will be returned following postrental inspection | Monday to Thursday (per day) | Friday to Sunday (per day) | Friday 6 pm to Sunday 6 pm (weekend) |
| Commercial / Non-Resident full day | \$120 | \$130 | \$260 |
| Commercial / Non-Resident up to 4 hrs. | \$80 | per day $\$ 90$ |  |
| Commercial/ Non-Resident Hourly | \$35 | per day \$ 40 |  |
| Resident full day | \$100 | \$110 | \$220 |
| Resident up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day \$80 |  |
| Resident Hourly | \$30 | per day \$35 |  |
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| Non-profit full day | \$100 | \$110 | \$220 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-profit up to 4 hours | \$70 | per day $\$ 80$ |  |
| Non-profit Hourly | \$30 | per day \$40 |  |
| Set-up Fee (tables, chairs, sports equipment, etc.) | \$50 | per day \$50 |  |

Additional Fees - all locations

| Late Vacating Fee | $\$ 50$ per half hour, not including 10 min grace period for <br> first $1 / 2$ hour onlv. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Host Liquor Liability Insurance (if qualified may be purchased) | $\$ 50$ per event |

*Non-Resident is defined as a person who does not either reside within the Municipality or does not pay property taxes to the Municipality.
*Non-profit is defined as any recognized not-for-profit organization that does not gain any profit from its events

## CLERK'S OFFICE

| Fee Description | Fee |
| :---: | :---: |
| Photocopies per page (Black/White) | \$0.25 |
| Photocopies per page (Colour) | \$0.50 |
| Commissioning of Documents | No charge for Residents $\$ 10.00$ non-residents |
| Freedom of Information Requests | As Provided for under MFIPPA |
| Records Research: <br> Retrieval, Research Subject \& Refiling (Not under MFIPPA) | \$60.00/hr. |
| Locks Passage: |  |
| Locks Daily Passage Fee | \$5.00 |
| Trailer License: |  |
| 1 Year License (issued from May $1^{\text {st }}$ to November $30^{\text {th }}$ ) please note a construction trailer /icense is a maximum of 18 months | \$750.00 per year |
| Monthly License (maximum of 3 months) | \$150.00 per month |
| Books: |  |
| Nipissing Road Book | \$13.00 |
| Historic Sites Book | \$5.00 |
| Looking Back Book | \$25.00 |
| All three Historic Books Package | \$35.00 |

## TREASURY/TAXES

| Fee Description | Fee |
| :--- | :---: |
| Tax Certificate | $\$ 50.00$ |
| Returned Item (Cheque or EFT) | $\$ 45.00$ |
| Assessment \& Tax Rate Search / History | $\$ 50.00$ (plus $\$ 20.00$ for each additional year prior <br> to 2003) |

Page 5 of 10

| Residential Property Information Report (combination of Building and <br> Zoning) | $\$ 200.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Commercial Property Information Report (combination of Building and <br> Zoning) | $\$ 500.00$ |

## LANDFILL CHARGES \& TIPPING FEES

| Fee Description | Fee |
| :--- | :---: |
| Replacement Landfil Card | $\$ 10.00$ and purchase of needed tags |
| Bag Tags (for waste only - not needed for recyclables) | $\$ 2.00$ each |
| Large Items |  |
| Couches | $\$ 20.00$ |
| Chairs | $\$ 10.00$ |
| Mattress or Box Springs | $\$ 25.00$ |
| Fridges/Freezers/AC | $\$ 10.00$ |
| Campers/Boats | $\$ 5.00$ per foot |
| Construction Waste |  |
| Pickup Truck, Van, or Single axle trailer | $\$ 25.00$ |
| Single axle Truck | $\$ 270.00$ |
| Tandem Truck 20-yard container | $\$ 540.00$ |
| Tri-Axle Truck 40-yard container | $\$ 1080.00$ |
| Tandem Axle Trailer | $\$ 150.00$ |
| Shingles | $\$ 65.00$ |
| Pickup Truck or Van | $\$ 125.00$ |
| Single Axle Trailer | $\$ 540.00$ |
| Tandem Axle Trailer |  |

ADMINISTRATION FEES

| Dog Licensing | Fee |
| :--- | :---: |
| Service Animals | No Charge |
| Annual Dog Tag | $\$ 5.00$ |
| Lifetime Dog Tag | $\$ 30.00$ |
| Replacement Dog Tag | $\$ 5.00$ |
| Kennel License | $\$ 100.00$ kennel $+\$ 5.00$ per annual dog tag |
| Replacement Kennel License | $\$ 50.00$ kennel |
| Impound Fee First Offence | $\$ 100.00+$ applicable fees as imposed by and payable to <br> the Pound Keeper |
| Impound Fee Second Offence | $\$ 150.00+$ applicable fees as imposed by and payable to <br> the Pound Keeper |
| Impound Fee Third Offence and each Subsequent Offence | $\$ 200.00+$ applicable fees as imposed by and payable to <br> the Pound Keeper |
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| Animal Control Service Fee | \$50.00 per hour ( 1 hour minimum) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Refreshment Carts \& Vehicles | Resident | Non-Resident |
| Hawker/Peddler License | \$250.00 | \$500.00 |
| Hawker/Peddler Agent | \$50.00 | \$250.00 |
| Refreshment Vehicle or Carts | \$500.00 |  |
| All other Businesses, Trades or Occupations | \$50.00 |  |
| Transient Trader |  |  |
| Door to Door Sales | \$250.00 |  |
| All other Transient traders | \$500.00 |  |
| Other Administrative Fees | Fee |  |
| Lottery license for Community Group | \$5.00 |  |
| Application for Event Permit | \$200.00 |  |
| Application for Multiple Event Permit | \$500.00 |  |
| By-law Enforcement Administration Fees | Fee |  |
| By-law Administration Fee (includes frivolous/vexatious complaints/notices/complaint letters | \$50.00 per hour |  |
| By-law Administration Fee (orders) | \$105.00 per hour |  |
| Cemetery | Fee |  |
| Lot | \$250.00 |  |
| Lot Care \& Maintenance | \$290.00 |  |
| Cremation Lot | \$175.00 |  |
| Cremation Lot Care \& Maintenance | \$175.00 |  |
| Niche Lot | \$600.00 |  |
| Niche Lot Care \& Maintenance | \$165.00 |  |
| Interments + Staking Fee | Fee |  |
| Staking Fee | \$50.00 |  |
|  | Weekdays | Sundays, Saturdays, and Holidays |
| Vault | \$1,000.00 | \$1,300.00 |
| Adult | \$1,000.00 | \$1,300.00 |
| Children, ten (10) years and under | \$600.00 |  |
| Cremated Remains | \$150.00 |  |
| Niche per urn/opening | \$250.00 |  |
| Monument Care \& Maintenance + Staking Fee | Fee |  |
| Staking Fee | \$50.00 |  |
| Flat Marker (over 172 sq. inches) | \$100.00 |  |
| Pillow Marker | \$200.00 |  |
| Upright Monument (up to 4 feet high and 4 feet wide) | \$200.00 |  |
| Upright Monument (over 4 feet high and 4 feet wide) | \$400.00 |  |
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| Disinterment | $\$ 600.00$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Lot Transfer Fee | $\$ 50.00$ |

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES - PLANNING SERVICES

| Planning Application | Fee | Deposit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff Pre-consultation Fee | \$250.00 | No deposit |
| Applications for Consent submitted for Review | \$700.00 | \$2,000,00 |
| Amendment to the Zoning By-law going to Residential | \$700.00 | \$2,000.00 |
| Amendment to the Zoning By-law going to Commercial | \$1,000.00 | \$3,000,00 |
| Road and Shore Road Allowance Closing Application | \$500.00 | \$2,500.00 |
| Road Allowance Purchase Price | Appraised value | No deposit |
| Shore Road Allowance Purchase Price | Appraised value | No deposit |
| Site Plan Agreement/ Limited-Service Agreement/ Licensing Agreement to Maintain Roads | \$250.00 | \$1,000.00 |
| Minor Variance Application | \$700.00 | \$2,000,00 |
| Encroachment/Driveway Agreement (to enter into) (does not include yearly fee, if applicable) | \$250.00 | \$1,000.00 |
| OPA *Major (with Zoning Amendment) | \$1,500.00 | \$2,500.00 |
| OPA *Minor (without Zoning Amendment) | \$1,000.00 | \$1,500.00 |
| Any other Property related By-law under the Planning Act (including Cost Acknowledgement, Deeming By-law, etc.) | \$500.00 | \$1,000.00 |
| Planner Consultation (Minor) | \$50.00 | \$500.00 |
| Planner Consultation (Major) | \$50.00 | \$1,000.00 |
| MNR Application for Work Permit | \$150.00 | No deposit |
| Proposed Plan of Subdivision for Review | \$1,000.00 | \$5,000.00 |
| Review \& Execution of a Proposed Subdivision Agreement | \$1,000.00 | \$10,000.00 |
|  | Resident | Non-Resident |
| Business Board Signs subject to Municipal Approval | No-Charge | \$75.00 |

FIRE SERVICES
[A description of the circumstances under which these fees may be charged is included in the Fire Department Establish and Regulate By-law]

| Equipment \& Staffing | Fee |
| :--- | :---: |
| Apparatus (First Hour Full \& Then Every Half Thereafter) | $\$ 500.00$ per hour |
| Administration Costs | Fee |
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| Third Party Inspection | $\$ 50.00$ per inspection |
| :--- | :---: |
| Fire Inspection | $\$ 100.00$ per inspection |
| File Search | $\$ 100.00$ per search |
| Fire Report | $\$ 100.00$ per report |

## Equipment Damage

All equipment that is owned or contracted by the fire department that is damaged while the fire department is performing its duties will be billed at the replacement or repaired cost including all applicable taxes.
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TRANSPORTATION

| Fee Description | Fee | Deposit |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Entrance Permit | $\$ 100.00$ | $\$ 500.00$ |
| Civic Address Sign, Post \& Measurement | $\$ 100.00$ | No deposit |
| Replacement Civic Address Sign | $\$ 20.00$ | No deposit |
| Letter of Suitable Location for Entrance | $\$ 50.00$ | No deposit |
| Unassumed Road Allowance Improvement Agreement | $\$ 250.00$ | $\$ 1,000.00$ |
| Inquiries/Records Search (Road Access, Maintenance, Services) | $\$ 30.00$ per hour | No deposit |
| Road Use Permit | $\$ 0.00-500.00$ | At the discretion of the <br> Public works <br> Superintendent |
| Damage to Municipal Property | Time and Material for <br> replacement costs | No deposit |
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# THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN 

## BY-LAW NO. 2022 - <br> BEING A BY-LAW TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE NORTH BAY AND DISTRICT HUMANE SOCIETY TO PROVIDE POUND KEEPING SERVICES TO THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN

WHEREAS Section 5(3) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, requires a municipal Council to exercise a municipal power, including a municipality's capacity, rights, powers and privileges under Section 9, by by-law unless the municipality is specifically authorized to do otherwise;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Magnetawan enacts as follows:

1. THAT the Corporation of the Municipality of Magnetawan is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with the North Bay and District Human Society, hereinafter referred to as the "ND\&DHS", to provide pound keeping services to the Municipality, attached hereto as Schedule ' A ' and forming part of this By-law;
2. THAT the Society is hereby named Pound Keeper for the Municipality of Magnetawan effective November 16, 2022;
3. THAT nothing in this By-law shall restrict the Municipality from entering into similar agreements with other providers of pound keeping services;
4. THAT the Mayor and Clerk-Administrator are hereby authorized to execute the Agreement on behalf of the Corporation.
5. THAT By-law 2018-38 and any previously conflicting by-laws are hereby repealed

READ A FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD TIME, passed, signed and the Seal of the Corporation affixed hereto, this $16^{\text {h }}$ day of July 2022

THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN

Mayor

CAO/Clerk

# SERVICE CONTRACT AGREEMENT BETWEEN: THE NORTH BAY AND DISTRICT HUMANE SOCIETY <br> AND THE <br> MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN 

The following outlines an agreement for the North Bay and District Humane Society to provide pound keeping services for the Municipality of Magnetawan.

## 1. DEFINITIONS:

For the purpose of this Agreement, the term "animal" shall refer to domestic dogs and cats.

For the purpose of this Agreement, the North Bay and District Humane Society will be referred to as "NB\&DHS".

For the purpose of this Agreement, the Municipality of Magnetawan will be referred to as "the Municipality".

## 2. THE HUMANE SOCIETY AGREES:

## Shelter:

To provide an animal shelter capable of providing adequate accommodations, food and water, daily housekeeping and veterinary care (when deemed necessary) for animals impounded, and of meeting the requirements set for this type of building by the NB\&DHS, and of meeting the requirements of all applicable provincial legislation.

## General Service Provision:

a) To provide pound services up to an annual limit of 15 animals. Any decision relating to animals above the annual limit will be made at the discretion of the NB\&DHS.
b) To hold for claiming by owners, any stray animal delivered to the NB\&DHS shelter or any animal received or impounded by the Animal Control Officer of the Municipality, and, if not claimed by the owner, to dispose of such animal by sale or euthanasia. Owners of licensed and/or microchipped dogs and cats will be contacted, whenever possible.
c) To provide an animal shelter capable of providing adequate accommodations, food and water, daily housekeeping and veterinary care (when deemed necessary) for animals impounded.
d) To meet the requirements set for this type of building by the NB\&DHS and Provincial legislation.
e) To install in the animal shelter all the equipment necessary for the proper operation of the animal shelter, and, in particular, to supply the methods and equipment necessary to humanely euthanize unwanted or unclaimed animals, if necessary. Such methods and equipment must meet the standards and comply with the applicable Provincial legislation.
f) NB\&DHS will only receive stray dogs as defined in the Municipality's by-laws. NB\&DHS will not take seized, removed or aggressive dogs in relation to the Dog Owners' Liability Act or any other piece of legislation outside of the Municipality's by-laws.

## Hours of Operation:

The NB\&DHS shelter will be open to the public and in operation between 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday to Friday (exclusive of statutory holidays), between 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Saturdays, and between 12:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. Sundays. Hours of Operation may change at the discretion of the NB\&DHS.

It is understood by the Municipality and the NB\&DHS that ALL calls reporting complaints or concerns from residents of the Municipality will be forwarded to the Animal Control Officer of the Municipality.

## Licenses:

The NB\&DHS will NOT issue licenses for cats and dogs within the Municipality of Magnetawan jurisdiction.

## Invoicing:

The NB\&DHS will invoice the Municipality $\$ 100.00$ per animal.

## Indemnity:

To indemnify and save harmless the Municipality in respect to all charges, costs, expenses, suits, and damages, and claims for loss or accident or injury of any nature or kind whatsoever in connection with the carrying out of this agreement and in connection with the shelter.

## Insurance:

To insure and keep insured the shelter building for fire and any other hazards and to provide, if required, the Municipality a proof of insurance.

Such liability policy shall provide for the indemnification of the Municipality and the NB\&DHS against the loss arising from claims of damage, injury or otherwise in connection with the carrying out of the terms of this agreement.

The NB\&DHS shall maintain the policy of insurance in force during this agreement. The limits of such policy shall not be less than One Million Dollars ( $\$ 1,000,000.00$ ) inclusive for public liability and property damage and for liability coverage for injury to animals caused by an accident and resulting in the death or destruction while in the care, custody and control of the NB\&DHS.

Such policy shall include the names of the Municipality and the NB\&DHS as the insured.

The Humane Society shall pay the premium on the policy.

## 3. THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN AGREES:

a) To appoint the NB\&DHS as Pound Keeper.
b) To grant the NB\&DHS the right to dispose of all animals impounded by the Humane Society in accordance with the By-laws.
c) To grant the NB\&DHS the right to dispose of the carcasses of all animals lawfully impounded and lawfully euthanized or found dead in accordance with the Bylaws.
d) To grant the NB\&DHS the right to collect impound fees, fines, destruction, and disposal fees levied by the Humane Society in accordance with the scale of fees and penalties authorized by the NB\&DHS.

## 4. DURATION OF AGREEMENT:

The duration of the contract will be for three (3) years from the date of signing.
This agreement may be terminated by either party upon three (3) months written notice of intention to terminate, delivered to the other party by prepaid registered mail.

This agreement is made on the $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 20 $\qquad$ .

## FOR THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN:

Name: $\qquad$

Title:
Signature: $\qquad$

Name: $\qquad$
Title: $\qquad$
Signature: $\qquad$

FOR THE NORTH BAY AND DISTRICT HUMANE SOCIETY:

Jeff Beaudoin
President of the Board of Directors

Liam Cullin
Executive Director

# THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN 

BY-LAW NO. 2022-

Being a By-law to confirm the proceedings of Council December 07, 2022

WHEREAS Section 5(3) of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25, as amended, requires a municipal Council to exercise a municipal power, including a municipality's capacity, rights, powers and privileges under Section 9, by by-law unless the municipality is specifically authorized to do otherwise;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan deems it desirable to confirm the proceedings of Council and to ratify decisions made at its meeting hereinafter set out;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the Corporation of the Municipality of Magnetawan enacts as follows:

## 1. Ratification and Confirmation

THAT the action of the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan at its meeting for the aforementioned date(s) with respect to each motion, resolution and other action passed and taken by this Council at its meetings, except where otherwise required, is hereby adopted, ratified and confirmed as if such proceedings and actions were expressly adopted and confirmed by its separate By-law.

## 2. Execution of all Documents

THAT the Mayor of the Council of the Municipality of Magnetawan and the proper officers of the Municipality of Magnetawan are hereby authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to the said action or to obtain approvals where required, except where otherwise provided, and the Mayor and Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to execute all necessary documents and to affix the Corporate Seal of the Municipality to such documents.

READ A FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD TIME, passed, signed and the Seal of the Corporation affixed hereto, this 7th day of December 2022.

THE CORPORATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF MAGNETAWAN

Mayor

Municipality of
Magnetawan

# LIST OF CURRENT COMMITTEES/BOARD/ORGANIZATIONS 2022 

Magnetawan Community Centre Board (1 Council appointee)<br>Magnetawan Cemetery Board (1 Council appointee)<br>Magnetawan Public Library Board (1 Council appointee)<br>Magnetawan Property Standards Committee (1 Council appointee)<br>Local Boards and Committees:<br>Almaguin Highlands Health Centre Committee (1 Council appointee)

District-level Agencies, Boards, and Committees:
North Bay Parry Sound District Health Unit
Ryerson Beverly Abbott
Township of Strong Marianne Strickland

Parry Sound District Emergency Medical Service Advisory Committee Ryerson Glenn Miller

Eastholme Home for the Aged, Board of Directors
Township of Strong Marianne Strickland

Village of Sundridge Sharon Smith
Village of South River Teri Brandt

District of Parry Sound Municipal Association Machar Township Lynda Carleton
Township of Strong Tim Bryson

# Village of South River DSSAB Nomination Support 

Date: November 28, 2022
Motion Number: $316-2022$.
Moved By:


Seconded By:
 $A<$ $+2$

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Village of South River does hereby support the nomination of Teri Brandt and Sharon Smith to represent Township of Joly, the Township of Machar, the Township of Strong, the Village of Sundridge, the Township of Magnetawan and the Village of South River on the District of Parry Sound Social Services Administration Board.


Lost By:

| Name of Council Member | Yeas | Nays | Abstention | Pecuniary <br> Interest | Recorded <br> Vote |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mayor Coleman |  |  |  |  |  |
| Councillor Brandt |  |  |  |  |  |
| Councillor Brooks |  |  |  |  |  |
| Councillor O'Hallarn |  |  |  |  |  |
| Councillor Scott |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

P.O. Box 129, 110 Main Street, Sundridge, Ontario, P0A 1 Z0

Village of Sundridge Council Resolution
November 23, 2022
Item (9.4)

District of Parry Sound Municipal Association Representative Appointment
Resolution \#202-384

## Moved By Shawn Jackson Seconded By Sharon Smith

THAT the Council for the Corporation of the Village of Sundridge supports the appointment of Tim Bryson as Ward \#5 Representative to the Executive of the DPSMA representing the municipalities of Joly, Machar, Magnetawan, South River, Strong and Sundridge.

| Recorded Vote | For | Against |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jackson, Shawn | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |
| MacLachlan, Jim | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |
| Smith, Sharon | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |
| Williamson, Fraser | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |
| Leveque, Justine | $\mathbf{x}$ |  |
| Carried |  |  |

## THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF STRONG

Date: November 22, 2022
Resolution \# R2022 千11

Moved by: Jeff McLaren
Kevin Noaik Jim Ronholm Marianne Stickland

| $\square$ | Seconded by: Jeff McLaren |
| :--- | :--- |
| Kevin Noaik | $\square$ |
| $\square$ | Jim Ronholm <br> Marianne Stickland |
| $\square$ |  |

Be it resolved that the Council for the Township of Strong hereby support the appointment of Tim Bryson to represent the Township of Strong and the Ward \#5 on the Executive of the District of Parry Sound Municipal Association.


Conflict of Interest Declared and Seat (s)
Vacated: $\qquad$

## THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF STRONG

COUNCIL RESOLUTION
Resolution \# R2022 410
Date: November 22, 2022
Moved by: Jeff McLaren
Kevin Noaik
Jim Ronholm
Marianne Stickland


Seconded by: Jeff McLaren
Kevin Noaik Jim Ronholm Marianne Stickland


Be it resolved that the Council for the Township of Strong hereby support the appointment of Lynda Carleton to represent the Township of Strong and the Ward \#5 on the Executive of the District of Parry Sound Municipal Association.


Mayor Tim Bryson
$\qquad$ Carried

Recorded Vote: For

Against
Tim Bryson
Jeff McLaren
Kevin Noaik
Jim Ronholm
Marianne Stickland
Conflict of Interest Declared and Seat (s)
Vacated: $\qquad$

## Pg 3

The Council shall consist of municipal representation, community advocates, and healthcare professionals. This may include, but not be limited to, physicians / nurses / nurse practitioners, healthcare administrators, healthcare management, senior care services, patient advocates, and economic development representatives. Health Council participation is a voluntary position. In addition to the Council members, the Village of Burk's Falls will appoint one (1) person to act as the Administrator / Secretary for the Council (non-voting).

## Replace with:

The Council shall consist of municipal representation, community advocates, and healthcare professionals. This may include, but not be limited to, physicians / nurses / nurse practitioners, healthcare administrators, healthcare management, senior care services, patient advocates, and economic development representatives. Health Council participation is a voluntary position. In addition to the Council members, an Administrator/ secretary for the council (non-voting) shall be appointed from a public or a municipal member and agreed upon by all members of the AHHC.

## Pg 5

Municipal representation on the Almaguin Highlands Health Council will align with the four-year municipal term.

## Replace with:

Municipal representation on the Almaguin Highlands Health Council will be appointed by their respective councils and will align with the four-year municipal term and until such time that new appointments are made.

## Pg 6

Municipal elected officials will be appointed by their respective municipal Council for a four-year term.

## Replace with:

remove altogether as it is covered by previous Pg 5 change.

## Pg 7

The Village of Burks's Falls will be accountable for the maintenance and repair of the Almaguin Highlands Health Centre Building, located at 150 Huston Street in Burk's Falls, Ontario. As representatives of their respective Municipal Councils, AHHC members will also consider requests for additional funding from the Village of Burks's Falls to cover occasional operating deficits related to the Almaguin Highlands Health Centre building. All requests will first be brought forward to the Health Council by the Village for discussion and transparency. Funding requests to member municipalities, however, will be made directly by the Village of Burk's Falls. Each Municipal Council must agree, by their own resolution, to assist.

## Replace with:

The Village of Burks's Falls will be accountable for the maintenance and repair of the Almaguin Highlands Health Centre Building, located at 150 Huston Street in Burk's Falls, Ontario. As
representatives of their respective Municipal Councils, AHHC members will consider requests for additional funding for the improvement of all Health Care Services and to be first brought forward to the Health Council by the Village for discussion and transparency. Funding requests to member municipalities, however, will be made directly by the Village of Burk's Falls. Each Municipal Council must agree, by their own resolution, to assist.

## Pg 7

As the Village of Burk's Falls maintains ownership of the properties located at 150 Huston Street and 162 Huston, the day-to-day operations of these buildings, including tenant relations is under the care and control of the Village of Burk's Falls. It is anticipated, however, that due its mandate, the Almaguin Highlands Health Council will provide input and assistance with respect to the addition of healthcare services at the building.

## Replace with:

As the village of Burks Falls maintains ownership of the properties located at 150 and 162 Huston Street, the day-to-day operations of these buildings, including tenant relations is under the care and control of the Village of Burks Falls. It is anticipated however, that due it's mandate, the Almaguin Highlands Health Council will provide input and assistance with respect to the addition of Health Care Services and available spaces in all member Municipalities.

## Final Note:

Another item that will be brought forward at the next AHHC meeting will be the idea of having a separate budget and financial records for the AHHC.

From:
Sent:
Subject:
Attachments:

Lindsay Raftis <lraftis@orangeville,ca>
December 2, 2022 10:52 AM
Town of Orangeville Response to Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act
Bill 23 - Mayors Letter.pdf

Good morning,

Please see attached correspondence with respect to Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act. Please be advised that this matter was considered by Council at its meeting held on November 28, 2022 and Council adopted the following resolution:

Whereas there is a housing crisis in Ontario and delivering more housing that is affordable for all income levels is a priority for the Provincial Government shared by the Town of Orangeville;

And whereas Bill 23, the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022, will make substantial changes to multiple pieces of legislation and supporting regulations aimed at increasing housing supply and improving housing affordability as part of Ontario's Housing Supply Action Plan for 2022-2023;

And whereas it is unclear how Bill 23 will improve housing supply and affordability since, as presented, Bill 23 will reduce environmental protection, heritage conservation, and quality urban design considerations in all development approval matters beyond such that is strictly related to housing;

And whereas there are measures included in Bill 23 that will significantly reduce development charge recoveries for growth-necessitated infrastructure and service improvements and it is unclear how such measures will translate directly to improving housing affordability for residents;

And whereas there are other challenges facing municipalities that affect housing supply beyond simply development costs and timelines, which will require further strategies by the Province to achieve its objectives of significantly increasing housing supply and affordability, including funding and accelerated implementation and approval support for significant municipal infrastructure expansions and upgrades;

And whereas while Council for the Town of Orangeville generally supports many of the revisions to provincial legislation where there is a clear connection to increasing housing supply and affordability, the Town of Orangeville concurs with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario's (AMO) recent submission to the Standing Committee for Bill 23 stating in-part that "the province has offered no evidence that the radical elements of the Bill will improve housing affordability (and) it is more likely that the bill will enhance the profitability of the development industry at the expense of taxpayers and the natural environment;

Therefore be it resolved that Council for the Town of Orangeville hereby requests the Province repeal Bill 23 until such time as further analysis, consideration of consultation feedback and meaningful engagement has occurred with municipalities and stakeholders;

And further that the Mayor be authorized to submit a letter to the Provincial Government which further addresses the comments and concerns of the Town of Orangeville with respect to Bill 23, generally as described in this Resolution;

And further that a copy of the Mayor's letter and a copy of this resolution be submitted through the Provincial commenting window for the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022;

And further that it be circulated to The Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, The Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, The Honourable Michael Parsa, Associate Minister of Housing, The Honourable Sylvia Jones, Dufferin-Caledon Member of Provincial Parliament, all MPPs in the Province of Ontario, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), and all Ontario municipalities.

Thank you,
Lindsay Raftis | Assistant Clerk | Corporate Services
Town of Orangeville | 87 Broadway | Orangeville, ON L9W 1K1
519-941-0440 Ext. 2242 | Toll Free 1-866-941-0440 Ext. 2215
Iraftis@orangeville.ca | www.orangeville.ca
Office of the Mayor
Lisa Post

November 30, 2022
Hon. Steve Clark
Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
777 Bay Street, $17^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Toronto, ON M7A 2J3
Via Email: minister.mah@ontario.ca

## Re: Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act

Dear Minister Clark,

Town of Orangeville acknowledges Bill 23, titled the More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 is part of a long-term strategy to provide attainable housing options for families across Ontario. We at the Town understand that Bill 23 is focused on the provincial government's stated goal of having 1.5 million homes built over the next 10 years and aims to do so by reducing bureaucratic costs and delays in construction. While the Province's goals to resolve the housing crisis in the next decade is ambitious and necessary, it could potentially have unintended long-term financial and planning related consequences on municipalities, such as the Town of Orangeville.

On behalf of the Town of Orangeville Council, I put forward a list of concerns of potential unintended consequences arising from Bill 23:

1. Bill 23 could have a direct impact on the state of good repair mandate rolled out by the province in their recent legislation, O.Reg. 588/17. If growth is no longer paying for growth, that means we may have to reallocate some of our lifecycle asset management dollars, as required by the same legislation, towards growth related infrastructure.
2. Although we support the overarching message and intention of Bill 23 as it relates to housing affordability, we do question whether overall quality of life and affordability of our citizens would be severely impacted due to higher taxes and user fees. The Town of Orangeville has limited cost-recovery avenues, meaning Bill 23 may require cost-recovery within the recent Asset Management plan, resulting in a more significant infrastructure funding gap. This situation will be further exasperated if specific provisions of Bill 23 dilute our ability to cover infrastructure improvements through Development Charges.
3. Town of Orangeville is a fast-growing community with a comprehensive economic outlook for Industrial and Commercial developments. This could be compromised if we find ourselves having to levy higher development charges for industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) developments to mitigate loss of Residential Development Charges.
4. Under the current climate of impending global inflation, the Town is already struggling to keep its service levels affordable. Without any direct financial incentive from the province such as interest-free loans from Infrastructure Ontario, we will lose our ability to build capacity for growth in service areas like Water and Wastewater.
5. Improving residential development efficiencies and costs by limiting the role and scope of Conservation Authorities (CA) in the planning approval process is unclear. Like many municipalities, Orangeville relies on Conservation Authority support to provide guidance on natural hazard avoidance and ecological protection to ensure that the provincial policy framework around these issues is upheld in our planning decisions. If CAs are removed from this advisory role, we must find alternative means in assuring such policies remain adhered-to. It is unclear how this would improve approval timing efficiencies or save costs to residential developments. It could inevitably shoulder more costs to development in subsidizing municipal costs and/or consultant peer review support.
6. Orangeville supports the province's objectives of lowering costs and improving efficiency for residential development to deliver more housing to Ontarians; However, like many municipalities, our challenges for facilitating more housing within our community are not simply costs and process inefficiencies for developments. Instead, we are challenged by our limited municipal land availability and servicing capacity constraints. We ask that the province explore actionable measures and tangible resource deployment to support our efforts to increase our land supply and infrastructure servicing capacity.

According to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario's (AMO) recent submission to the Steering Committee of Bill 23, it states "The province has offered no evidence that the radical elements of the bill will improve housing affordability. It is more likely that the bill will enhance the profitability of the development industry at the expense of taxpayers and the natural environment." As the frontline level of government, municipalities are also eager to resolve the housing crisis and are the most informed on what is needed to create complete communities that Ontarians want and expect. We ask that the province view us as one of the strategic partners in further refining the More Homes Built Faster Act, and open more robust channels of communication and consultation.

## Sincerely,



Lisa Post
Mayor
CC Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario
The Honourable Michael Parsa, Associate Minister of Housing
The Hounourable Sylvia Jones, Dufferin-Caledon Member of Provincial Parliament Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) All Ontario Municipalities


[^0]:    Kevin Hawley, P.Eng.
    Branch Manager
    khawley@greergalloway.com

[^1]:    
    
    myimerithatmi. (a

[^2]:    ${ }^{[1]}$ Based on 2020 Financial Information Return data.

[^3]:    ${ }^{[1]}$ A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Land Needs Assessment Methodology for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. August 2020.

[^4]:    ${ }^{[1]}$ Low-rise and high-rise developments with sites larger than 5 ha would only be marginally better under the proposed changes, at $30 \%$ and $15 \%$ of land conveyance and $50 \%$ and $25 \%$ P.I.L., respectively.

[^5]:    2233 Argentia Rd.
    Suite 301 Mississauga, Ontario

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ This assumes that the DC By-law would need to be updated upon its expiry in 2027 and that land is removed as a DC eligible cost for each City service, as part of that exercise.

[^7]:    ${ }^{2}$ This assumes that the DC By-law would need to be updated upon its expiry in 2027 and that land is removed as a DC eligible cost for each City service, as part of that exercise.

[^8]:    ${ }^{3}$ Technical Memo: Mississauga's City Structure and Residential Growth Accommodation. File: CD.02-MIS can be accessed here (see April 19, 2022, PDC Agenda, Item 5.2)

[^9]:    ${ }^{4} 2019$ Development Costs Review - The Effect of Development-Related Costs on Housing Affordability can be accessed here (see May 1, 2019, General Committee Agenda, Item 8.2,)

[^10]:    ${ }^{5}$ Based on Toronto Region Real Estate Board (TRREB) data from Q3, 2022.

[^11]:    SPP = Special Priority Applicant

