

August 4th, 2023

MGP File: 17-2666

Provincial Land Use Plans Branch
13th Floor, 777 Bay St
Toronto, ON M7A 2J3

via email: growthplanning@ontario.ca

**RE: ERO 019-6813
Comments on behalf of the Brooklin North Landowners Group**

Malone Given Parsons Ltd. (“MGP”) is the planning consultant for the Brooklin North Landowners Group (“BNLG”), which represents the participating owners in the northern part of the Brooklin Community Secondary Plan area in the Town of Whitby. We are writing this letter on behalf of BNLG to provide comments on ERO #019-6813, “Review of proposed policies adapted from A Place to Grow and Provincial Policy Statement to form a new provincial planning policy instrument.”

BNLG generally agrees with the policy direction of the new Provincial Planning Statement and the rescinding of A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Many of the policies from the former Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan unnecessarily limited appropriate development opportunities and increased complexity, time and cost for municipalities and developers in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. While the policies of the Growth Plan were generally helpful in promoting transit-supportive densities in strategic areas, many of the policies of the plan limited implementation of the plan’s overall policy goals and objectives, unnecessarily restricting the supply of housing and land available for development that was required to meet its growth targets.

BNLG has reviewed the proposed PPS and generally believes the simplified and consolidated policy framework is appropriate and will encourage the delivery of more housing faster while protecting other important provincial priorities. We are pleased to provide the following additional comments.

Generate an Appropriate Housing Supply

The proposal to differentiate between large and fast-growing municipalities and other municipalities is appropriate. The differentiation of policy is effective in providing one planning statement that can be applied province-wide without placing unnecessary or onerous requirements on smaller or slower-growing municipalities. We encourage the province to consider whether the proposed Schedule 1 appropriately includes all large and fast-growing municipalities to ensure the policy goals of the province are being met.

The new PPS will be effective in generating new housing supply. In particular, the policies for large and fast-growing municipalities that require minimum densities in major transit station areas and other strategic growth areas will ensure that opportunities for higher-density housing forms can be realized in areas that benefit from existing or planned transit.

In addition, the measured permission of additional housing opportunities in rural areas where site conditions are suitable and appropriately serviced can release a significant supply of housing in areas peripheral to urban areas that complement the more compact and urban forms of housing that will be realized in urban areas.

To ensure that large and fast-growing municipalities appropriately plan for their share of growth, we strongly encourage the province to continue to prepare forecasted minimum population and housing targets for these municipalities and require that these municipalities demonstrate in their official plans how these targets will be met within the timeframes of the PPS.

We support the approach of the PPS in providing general support for intensification throughout a settlement area boundary. This is essential to provide policy support for gentle-density forms of intensification in existing areas which would otherwise be prevented by anti-growth special interests.

It is important for the province to provide clarity respecting the delivery of affordable and attainable housing. While recent changes to the *Development Charges Act* and *Planning Act* have provided additional guidance as to what constitutes affordable and attainable housing and where and how inclusionary zoning may be implemented, municipalities continue to impose their own form of “affordable housing” requirements which often do not reflect and conflict with provincial requirements.

The PPS should clarify that additional residential units are encouraged in all single, semi-detached and townhouse units (like the permissions under the *Planning Act*) and that these units can provide a supply of purpose-built affordable rental housing.

The delivery of housing is often held up by the need to prepare secondary plans prior to the receipt of development applications, even when lands have been designated for housing and where servicing is available. The PPS should expressly permit privately initiated secondary plan official plan amendments subject to criteria such as municipalities remaining involved in the public consultation process. This would allow development proponents to proceed with the required work to prepare a secondary plan concurrent with the preparation of development applications, which can lead to both better planning that is more linked to implementation, as well as expediting the delivery of new housing.

In addition, the protection of non-400 series Provincial highways in settlement areas under the current Ministry of Transportation corridor protection policies (which require a 14.0 m building setback and intersection spacing of more than 400 metres to a nearest intersection) will frustrate the delivery of urban communities and housing. In the case of the Brooklin Community Secondary Plan Area, the current 14.0 m setback requirement for Highway 7/12 (Baldwin Street North) undermines the implementation of the Brooklin Community Secondary Plan for the delivery of high and medium-density housing, which contributes to meeting Provincial, Regional, and Municipal density and housing targets. This corridor is planned as

part of an intensification corridor and is intended for mixed-uses and transit-supportive developments. To require the implementation of these setbacks within an area planned for intensification would limit the efficiency of land uses due to the loss of potential area that could contribute to parking or other uses.

We request that the province clarify that within settlement areas, the requirements for Provincial Highways must align with the local intent for community building in local official plans, where generally the maximum road requirements and intersection spacing requirements should be no larger than arterial road standards in the local official plan.

Make Land Available for New Housing and Employment Opportunities

BNLG strongly supports the broadening of opportunities to make areas available for new housing and employment opportunities, particularly the new tools and options provided to municipalities to accommodate growth.

We strongly support the change for municipalities to plan to a minimum 25-year horizon; given that most new communities will take 25 years to be substantially built, this time horizon is appropriate as a planning horizon. We note, however, that along with the planning for this horizon, municipalities must be required to demonstrate how necessary infrastructure is to be provided to accommodate and foster this planned growth, including updated master plans and development charge by-laws.

We strongly support the requirement to maintain a 15-year residential land supply, and the province's recognition that not all lands designated for growth are necessarily "available," and the requirements to maintain land with servicing capacity for a 3-year supply of residential units. We believe these policies would be more effective if it clarified that the supply of land and units is to be maintained for a market-based supply of units and be specific to unit type. It is equally important to forecast for the right composition of housing (by housing type) as well as the overall quantity of housing.

The provision for a simplified settlement area boundary expansion process and the removal of the requirement for municipal comprehensive reviews are positive policy changes that should allow municipalities to both create new settlement areas and expand existing ones as needed. In order to ensure that the policy direction of the PPS can be implemented, the province must also ensure the *Planning Act* is amended to allow first-party appeals of requests to alter a settlement area boundary or establish a new settlement area. Without the ability to appeal applications respecting same, it is anticipated that this important policy direction will only be implemented by municipalities with a growth mindset, regardless of the urgent need to do so in other areas.

We support the definition of employment areas in the PPS (which reflects that contained in Bill 97), and the focus on protecting these areas for a concentration of more intensive industrial and manufacturing type uses, while allowing a broader range of mixed-use development on lands for employment outside of employment areas. The province should prepare an update to the D-series guidelines to update the separation requirements for sensitive uses in keeping with the updated definition from the PPS.

Provide Infrastructure to Support New Housing and Employment Opportunities

The policies of the PPS should provide direction to utility providers (e.g., electricity, natural gas, telecommunications etc.) to integrate their planning with the growth planning of municipalities and to demonstrate the ability to support these plans with required infrastructure in a timely manner in their future service planning. Moreover, utilities should be strongly encouraged to ensure that sufficient service is available in accordance with planning to support planned growth and the delivery of housing. Where required, the province should consider legislative and policy changes to ensure that both utilities and regulators provide sufficient services for both existing and future housing to achieve municipal growth plans.

In the case of the BNLG, we have been working with Elexicon Energy as of 2020 to bring electricity service to the Community of North Brooklin. Elexicon and Whitby Hydro (Elexicon's predecessor) did not anticipate the need for additional service in North Brooklin and had not undertaken pre-planning to ensure service would be provided to meet forecasted growth in Brooklin. BNLG anticipated energizing first home construction as early as 2019, but due to unanticipated delays and lack of planning, energization for first homes is now anticipated for 2025-2026 or later. Currently, there is no commitment or solution to deliver electricity to North Brooklin.

Floodplain mapping and associated modelling in urban areas should be prepared to account for proposed growth, including stormwater management facilities and flood mitigation work in these areas. It is not appropriate to assume a no-mitigation approach to floodplain modelling in an urbanizing area. This approach should be incorporated into the policies of the new PPS and in related guidance materials from the Province.

Policies supporting the location of trails and other passive recreational activities within hydro and gas corridors should be added to the PPS. Moreover, when trails and/or recreational opportunities can be provided in these corridors, such areas should be eligible for parkland contribution under the *Planning Act*.

We strongly support the policy direction to require school boards to integrate planning for schools and growth; the policies should specifically speak to the minimization of school site sizes when collocated with parks and should strongly encourage the provision of schools in mixed-use formats, including within multi-storey residential buildings.

Balance Housing with Resources

To minimize potential conflicts with agricultural uses and existing or new residential areas, guidance should be given that generally encourages municipalities to designate lands rural abutting residential areas and settlement area boundaries. This can serve as a transitional area between urban and prime agricultural areas, providing uses that can serve both areas.

The proposed environmental protection policies should be provided in the context of a 'Housing First' policy goal and objective, which should be added to the PPS for development within settlement areas. An urban lens should be provided for environmental protection in settlement areas, generally directing that the natural function of environmental features should be preserved through green infrastructure in urban areas. Such policies would support

the provision of housing through the efficient use of land and is to ensure housing in settlement areas takes priority over other competing policy objectives.

We believe it is important to implement modifications to the natural heritage policies to enable our industry to create healthier communities more efficiently and effectively. We will continue to work with our municipal partners to create communities that enable citizens to interact with nature in respectful and sustainable ways. To achieve these ambitious and positive outcomes, we require a degree of smart flexibility in the natural heritage policies and their implementation.

Smart flexibility will best be achieved through the two following distinct, but related changes:

- 1) Shift from the no negative impact test to a **no net** negative impact test for natural heritage features and associated functions; and
- 2) Formally adopt an ecological **offsetting** approach to allow for the selective removal of generally smaller and degraded natural heritage areas with limited functions. The removed features would be replaced, achieving a net ecological gain (i.e., nature positive outcomes).

The current test under the PPS related to natural heritage features and functions (excluding fish habitat) is the no negative impact test. That test specifies that a “... *negative impact is degradation that threatens the health and integrity of the natural features or ecological functions*”. Health and integrity are not defined terms in the PPS.

Requirements to achieve no negative impact on any aspect of natural heritage features or functions have proven to be challenging and impractical. It is likely that any development or site alteration activity will have some, often minor or immeasurable impact on one or more aspects of natural heritage features or functions.

The definition of “functions” further complicates the use of the no negative impact test. The PPS defines ecological function as follows “... *means the natural processes, products or services that living and non-living environments provide or perform within or between species, ecosystems and landscapes. These may include biological, physical, and socio-economic interactions.*” The complexity of the term ecological function includes undefined biological, physical, and socio-economic interactions.

The implementation of a slightly modified test, a **no net** negative impact test, will allow for minor adjustments to natural heritage features and associated functions. This approach would encourage, not discourage, more innovative forms of mitigation, with simpler impact assessment considerations and with net positive outcomes for nature.

Where a development or site alteration could impact larger and more overtly important natural heritage features and associated functions, the no net negative impact test would involve a special form of compensatory mitigation, commonly referred to as offsetting.

The province’s release of the Discussion Paper, Conserving Ontario’s Natural Heritage, presents an important, forward-looking approach that could significantly improve the use of, and outcomes associated with, natural heritage policies in Ontario,

Ecological biodiversity (aka biodiversity offsetting) is an impact assessment tool used globally in over 100 countries. These offset programs allow for the compensation of impacts to the natural environment in ways that restore or improve the quality and/or quantity of the impacted natural heritage features. Unlike a no net negative impact test, which minimizes and neutralizes impacts, offsetting programs require achieving net positive or nature positive outcomes. This approach could be used when predicted impacts surpass what might be the most minor immeasurable predicted impacts addressed above.

The primary reference related to the natural heritage policies is the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (2010), which is now dated, and was specific to the 2005 PPS. Since its publication 13 years ago, much has been learned about natural heritage in southern Ontario, in particular. Important technical information, references, and scientific literature have been produced since 2010. That manual requires updating that would better explain the determination of significance, current landscape ecology practices, and the most current best practices related to Impact Assessment, including the use of offsetting. Substantial updates to the appendices of the manual will also be required.

The environmental policies could acknowledge that should municipalities choose to preserve other environmental features, such features should be treated as social elements that offer passive recreational opportunities to residents and that they would need to form part of the parkland dedication requirements under the *Planning Act*.

Implementation and Interpretation

Including general policies for the implementation and interpretation of the PPS is critical to ensuring the policy direction of the province is met. As the *Planning Act* currently requires that all decisions be consistent with the PPS, the purpose of policy 6.1.7 and the province's direction to municipalities respecting updates to their official plans is unclear.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Proposed PPS. We ask that you please consider our comments and amend the PPS accordingly.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,
Malone Given Parsons Ltd.



Matthew Cory, MCIP, RPP, PLE, PMP

Principal, Planner, Land Economist, Project Manager

cc: Brooklin Landowners Group Inc.