



# Corporate Report

Clerk's Files

Originator's  
Files

LA.07.PRO

---

**DATE:** December 13, 2005

**TO:** Chair and Members of Planning and Development Committee  
Meeting Date: January 9, 2006

**FROM:** Edward R. Sajecki  
Commissioner of Planning and Building

**SUBJECT:** **Places To Grow - Better Choices. Brighter Future -  
Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe**

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

1. That the recommendations of the report titled "Places To Grow – Better Choices. Brighter Future – Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe" dated December 13, 2005 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building be adopted.
2. That the report titled "Places To Grow – Better Choices. Brighter Future – Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe" dated December 13, 2005 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building be forwarded, by the City Clerk, to the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Region of Peel.

**BACKGROUND:** On November 24, 2005, the Province released the "Places To Grow – Better Choices. Brighter Future – Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe", hereafter referred to as "the Proposed Growth Plan". The study area for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) is shown in Appendix 1.

Mississauga previously commented on the Discussion Paper titled "Places To Grow – Better Choices. Brighter Future – A Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe" in a report dated August 17, 2004 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building. In addition,

Mississauga commented on Bill 136 (*Places To Grow Act*) in a report dated November 16, 2004 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building (Bill 136 received Royal Assent on June 13, 2005).

Earlier this year, on February 16, 2005, the Province released “Places To Grow – Better Choices. Brighter Future - Draft Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe”, hereafter referred to as “the Draft Growth Plan”. On April 13, 2005, City Council considered a report titled “Summary Report - Places To Grow – Better Choices. Brighter Future – Draft Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe” dated April 6, 2005 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building and adopted the following:

“Resolution 0085-2005:

1. That the report titled “Summary Report-Places To Grow – Better Choices. Brighter Future – Draft Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe” dated April 6, 2005 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building be adopted and forwarded, by the City Clerk, to the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
2. That the recommendations of the report titled “Places To Grow – Better Choices. Brighter Future – Draft Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe” dated March 15, 2005 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building be amended as follows:

That Recommendation 17 be revised to read “That the City of Mississauga supports secondary suites as a component of affordable housing and an intensification strategy subject to:

- a. adequate engineering and community services;
  - b. satisfactory financial impact;
  - c. compatibility with surrounding land uses;
  - d. sufficient off street parking; and
  - e. compliance with the building code.
3. That the Draft Report titled “Places To Grow – Better Choices. Brighter Future – Draft Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe” from the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal be amended to include a waste management strategy.”

All of the foregoing reports were forwarded to the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing as input to the development of the Proposed Growth Plan.

The Proposed Growth Plan contains a set of policies for managing growth and development to 2031. It should be considered in conjunction with the Niagara Escarpment Plan, the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, the Greenbelt Plan and the new Provincial Policy Statement. The Proposed Growth Plan does not replace existing municipal official plans, but works within the existing planning framework to provide growth management policy direction for the GGH.

Appendix 2 provides a summary of the legislative framework for the Proposed Growth Plan, *The Places to Grow Act*, and an overview of the “Places To Grow – Better Choices. Brighter Future – Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe”, November, 2005.

Appendix 3 summarizes the response of the Proposed Growth Plan to the previous recommendations adopted by City Council on April 13, 2005 which specifically requested changes to the Draft Growth Plan, or other actions by the Federal and Provincial Governments.

Appendix 4 is an evaluation of new issues and policies contained in the Proposed Growth Plan that are relevant to Mississauga. Appendix 5 compares the planning responsibilities among the Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal, upper and single-tier municipalities and local (lower-tier) municipalities.

**PRESENT STATUS:** The Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal have requested comments by January 27, 2006.

**COMMENTS:** The policy leadership of the Provincial Government in land use planning is encouraged and supported. Although the City of Mississauga has concerns with some of the policies of the Proposed Growth Plan, the overall vision, structure and major policies of the Plan are supported as they address future growth and infrastructure in a comprehensive manner.

“The Plan is intended to guide decisions on a wide range of issues – transportation, infrastructure planning, land use planning, urban form, housing, natural heritage and resource protection – in the interest of promoting economic prosperity.” While Mississauga supports the direction of the Plan, it must be acknowledged that successful implementation, in terms of linking the Plan with the appropriate infrastructure investment decisions, will only occur with financial commitments from the Federal and Provincial Governments.

### **Major Changes to the Draft Growth Plan**

The vision, structure, and major policies of the Proposed Growth Plan are similar to the Draft Growth Plan released in February, 2005, except for the following key changes:

(a) Changes to the Policy Direction

The policy direction of the Proposed Growth Plan has been amended to include a new vision statement - “plan for community infrastructure to support growth”. “Community infrastructure” refers to land, buildings and structures that provide public services for health, education, recreation, socio-cultural activities, security, safety, and affordable housing.

This new policy direction is incorporated in the general growth management policies, the policies for the designation of greenfield areas and settlement area boundary expansions and infrastructure planning policies. This change is consistent with Mississauga’s previous comments that the impact on human services should be a condition of expanding a settlement area. A new Section, 3.2.6, Community Infrastructure, has been added to the Plan. Policies require, among other matters, that community infrastructure planning be integrated with land use planning, however, the intensification policies do not specifically refer to provision of sufficient community infrastructure in intensification areas.

(b) Sub –Area Growth Strategies (SAGS) and Planning Responsibilities

The Draft Growth Plan, February, 2005 recognized that successful planning requires development and infrastructure decisions must take place across municipal boundaries. At the same time, policies in one part of the GGH may not be applicable to others. Consequently, it proposed to link the work of upper and single-tier municipalities through an intermediary framework referred to as a sub-area growth strategy (SAGS).

The role of the SAGS was to provide broad-level policies generally applicable throughout the GGH with specific targets for implementation. SAGS were to be prepared jointly by the Province with municipalities and other stakeholders to meet the specific needs of the sub-areas.

It was intended that SAGS would establish the foundation for intra- and inter-regional planning. They would be approved and incorporated as amendments to the Plan. The proposed sub-areas, for SAGS were:

1. GTA and Hamilton;
2. North of Proposed Greenbelt;
3. West of Proposed Greenbelt;
4. Niagara Peninsula; and
5. East of Durham.

SAGS have been removed from the Proposed Growth Plan. As shown in Appendix 5, many of the issues they were to address, such as delineation of the built boundary and the designated growth area (now referred to as the designated greenfield area), and determination of the scope and scale of urban growth centres (UGC) have now been delegated to the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal, in consultation with upper and single-tier municipalities. Local (lower-tier) municipalities are not involved.

Other responsibilities, shown in Appendix 5, including distribution of growth to local municipalities, identification of intensification areas and intensification/density targets, and affordable housing targets, have also been delegated by the Proposed Growth Plan to upper and single-tier municipalities.

Finally, regional economic assessment, the review of transportation, water and wastewater infrastructure, identification of natural systems, prime agricultural and rural areas will now be addressed through the preparation of “sub-area assessments” by the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal, in consultation with upper and single-tier municipalities, for areas similar to the sub-areas noted above. Mississauga is within the sub-area consisting of the Greater Toronto Area and Hamilton.

Mississauga, in its comments on the Draft Growth Plan, supported the role of SAGS, but stressed the need for the City to be at the table as a full and active participant in the preparation and implementation of the GTA and Hamilton SAGS. Further, it questioned the future role of planning by the Region of Peel since SAGS were to address issues related to both intra- and inter-regional planning. In this regard, Mississauga commented that:

*“Mississauga must actively participate in the determination of such elements as growth allocations, areas of intensification, affordable housing, intensification targets and infrastructure requirements for the sub-area. Therefore, the term “municipalities” should be defined for the purpose of determining the role of upper-tier and lower-tier municipalities in the preparation of SAGS.”*

Although SAGS have been eliminated, their functions will be addressed through other processes, including sub-area assessments. The Proposed Growth Plan has clarified and strengthened the roles of the provincial and regional governments in local land use planning. Mississauga’s concerns, however, remain the same as previously enunciated. Mississauga should be a full and active participant in the preparation of sub-area assessments. While it acknowledged that it would be unwieldy for the Province to invite the participation of all local municipalities, Mississauga is larger than the City of Hamilton and the Regions of Halton and Durham. Consequently, large local municipalities, such as Mississauga, should be **at the table** as a full

and active participant in the preparation and implementation of the sub-area assessments, the review of growth forecasts, the delineation of the built boundary, and refining the scale and scope of its UGC.

With respect to the planning responsibilities assigned to the Region, in consultation with local municipalities, the upper-tier municipalities should be granted the authority to delegate these functions to local municipalities. Failing this delegation, it is anticipated that, due to the collaborative working relationship now well established between staff of the Region of Peel and local municipalities, Mississauga will, hopefully, be involved in the preparation and determination of these matters.

It is important to note that SAGS were to have formed part of the Growth Plan and, as such, be approved by the Minister, the decision of which is final. Since the matters which would have been dealt with by SAGS will now be implemented in regional and local official plans, appeal rights to the OMB are retained, except for the refusal of settlement area expansions. Thus, the implementation of major building blocks of the Proposed Growth Plan may be subject to OMB appeals. This means that Mississauga's interests will be protected, to a certain degree, by their appeal rights; on the other hand, Mississauga may be facing appeals by developers, landowners and residents of official plan amendments to implement the Proposed Growth Plan.

(c) Intensification

The main concern is that the Proposed Growth Plan has deleted the exclusion of "stable residential neighbourhoods" from the definition of "intensification area".

In addition, the intensification policies and the roles of upper-tier and lower-tier municipalities have been refined. Instead of a minimum intensification target of 200 residents and jobs per ha (80 residents and jobs per acre), municipalities will identify the appropriate type and scale of development in intensification areas, the definition of which has been expanded to include areas around major transit station areas. This satisfies Mississauga's concerns that the target of 200 residents and jobs per ha (80 residents and jobs per acre) should only apply to UGCs.

Mississauga's other concern, that development in intensification areas should be based on land use compatibility and design consideration, has been partially addressed by a new policy which states that all intensification areas will be planned "to ensure an appropriate transition of built-form to adjacent areas". This policy should be expanded to also include an appropriate transition of density.

A significant new policy requires that minimum density targets for intensification areas be consistent with planned transit service levels. This recognition of the need to tie intensification to transit service is welcomed, as it underscores the need for significantly more funding for transit infrastructure by all levels of government. This will require the Province to make changes to the *Development Charges Act* to allow for the collection of charges at a higher rate than historic transit service levels permit, to eliminate the property tax component for GO Transit's Capital Growth Budget, and to make strategic investment in major transit projects across the Greater Toronto Area, such as the GO BRT project. In addition, the existing deficit in infrastructure funding cannot wait until the completion of this Plan or the development of sub-area assessments. It is essential for the Provincial Government to proceed with an interim infrastructure plan for projects already justified by existing needs.

(d) Employment Lands

The Proposed Growth Plan contains stronger, more detailed policies to prevent the conversion of employment lands to non-employment uses. The reference to "non-employment uses" has been expanded to include "major retail uses". Further, it is noted that conversions may occur only through a "municipal comprehensive review" which has been defined to mean an official plan review or an official plan amendment initiated by a municipality. Consequently, this will prohibit official plan amendment applications to convert employment lands to major retail uses and other non-employment uses.

(e) Infrastructure To Support Growth

The Proposed Growth Plan identifies that the Province is "exploring options for establishing a Greater Toronto Transportation Authority (GTTA)" whereas, the Draft Growth Plan went much farther by identifying that the GTTA would "plan, coordinate and finance

transportation activities in the GTA”. In addition, the Draft Growth Plan identified that a Greater Golden Horseshoe Transportation Strategy was being prepared that would establish specific objectives, including co-ordinating transportation investment. The Transportation Strategy is no longer identified in this Proposed Growth Plan. While progress on these areas might still be underway, City Council should be aware of the limited or removed references to these components in this Plan.

Schedule 5, Moving People, has been amended in the Proposed Growth Plan to identify a “Proposed Higher-Order Transit to 2031” along Hurontario Street, linking Mississauga City Centre with Brampton City Centre. While this amendment is supported, the higher-order transit should be extended to Port Credit, as shown in Mississauga Plan, which designates a “Major Transit Corridor” along the entire length of Hurontario Street from Lakeshore Road, north to the Brampton/Mississauga municipal boundary.

In addition, within the lifetime of this Plan, designating Dundas Street East from Hurontario Street to the Kipling Centre as “Proposed Higher-Order Transit to 2031” would also prove beneficial as it would offer potential for future intensification, and would provide a valuable connection between the TTC subway terminus at Kipling and the proposed Hurontario transit corridor.

(f) Waste Management

City Council recommended that the Draft Growth Plan be amended to include a waste management strategy. This was to have been addressed in the SAGS as proposed in the previous Draft Growth Plan. Since SAGS have been deleted, a new section, (4.2.4, (d)) requires that municipalities develop and implement official plan policies for integrated waste management, including the disposal of waste that cannot be recycled or otherwise diverted from disposal.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:** Mississauga has clearly established that it does not have the financial resources to offer effective implementation tools and mechanisms to facilitate intensification. The Federal and Provincial Governments must provide financial incentives and pay for services, particularly higher-order transit (GO BRT) and community services required to meet the demands of intensification.

**CONCLUSION:** The Proposed Growth Plan builds upon, and refines the vision and policy directions established in the Draft Growth Plan released earlier this year. The Proposed Growth Plan, if adopted and implemented, will direct growth to built-up areas, promote transit-supportive development, preserve employment lands and natural areas, link urban centres, and ensure community services and physical infrastructure are available to support growth. Successful implementation of the Proposed Growth Plan policies will only occur with the financial commitment of the Federal and Provincial Governments.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

APPENDIX 1: Context Map: Location of the Greater Golden Horseshoe within Ontario, excerpt from the Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, November 2005.

APPENDIX 2: Summary of *The Places to Grow Act*, and “Places To Grow – Better Choices. Brighter Future – Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe”, November, 2005.

APPENDIX 3: Response of Proposed Growth Plan Growth to Recommendations Adopted by City Council April 13, 2005.

APPENDIX 4: New Recommendations – Proposed growth Plan For the Greater Golden Horseshoe, November 2005.

APPENDIX 5: Comparison of Planning Responsibilities – Proposed Growth Plan.

*Original Signed By:*

---

Edward R. Sajecki  
Commissioner of Planning and Building

**APPENDIX 2**

**SUMMARY OF THE *PLACES TO GROW ACT* AND PLACES TO GROW – BETTER CHOICES. BRIGHTER FUTURE – PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN FOR THE GREATER GOLDEN HORSESHOE, NOVEMBER, 2005**

---

The legislative framework for the Proposed Growth Plan is provided by Bill 136, *Places To Grow Act*, which received Royal Assent on June 13, 2005. The Act provides the legal framework necessary for the Provincial government to designate any geographic area of the Province as a Growth Plan Area and develop a Growth Plan following a consultation process with local officials and stakeholders.

Bill 136 enables the Provincial government to plan for population growth, economic expansion and the protection of the environment, agricultural lands and other valuable resources in a co-ordinated approach to land use planning. Further, it permits the government to link infrastructure development with capital spending and financing, and co-ordinates this with planning and development among municipalities.

The legislation allows for a Growth Plan to be developed for any part of Ontario. The first Growth Plan under Bill 136 is the Proposed Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Bill 136 requires that when a Growth Plan has been prepared, public notice be provided, inviting written submissions, within a period specified by the Minister. Each municipality within and abutting a Growth Plan Area will also be invited to make written submissions.

The Minister may appoint hearing officers to conduct hearings regarding the proposed plan or any proposed modification to it. The Minister, after receiving submissions and any recommendations of the hearing officer, may give further notice of any proposed modifications and provide an opportunity to the public and municipalities to provide submissions.

Cabinet may approve a plan in whole, or in part, modify it or refuse to approve it. A plan comes into effect on the day specified by Cabinet, the decision of which is final, and not subject to appeal. Only the Minister has the authority to prepare and propose an amendment to a plan, which is subject to the same approval process required for a Growth Plan, as described above. If the proposed amendment is not significant, it need not be submitted to Cabinet for approval, and the Minister's decision is final.

Bill 136 requires that any decision made under the *Planning Act* or *Condominium Act*, including those by the Provincial Government, and the Ontario Municipal Board, shall conform to a Growth Plan.

## **OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN, NOVEMBER, 2005**

The Proposed Growth Plan builds upon, and refines the vision and policy directions established in the Draft Growth Plan released earlier this year. The Proposed Growth Plan provides policy directions that:

- direct growth to built-up areas where the capacity exists to best accommodate the expected population, household and employment growth while providing strict criteria for settlement area boundary expansions;
- promote transit-supportive densities and a mix of residential and employment land uses;
- preserve employment lands for future economic opportunities;
- identify and support a transportation network that links urban growth centres through a multi-modal system anchored by both efficient public transit and highway systems for moving people and goods;
- plan for community infrastructure to support growth;
- ensure sustainable water and wastewater services are available to support future growth; and
- identify a natural system and prime agricultural areas, and enhance the conservation of these valuable resources.

The Proposed Growth Plan comprises four major components. A summary of the relevant policies are as follows:

(a) Where and How to Grow

- Growth Forecasts are provided for all upper and single-tier municipalities to be used as the basis for planning;

- Intensification policies direct a significant amount of new growth to built-up areas through the establishment of intensification targets and increased densities;
- Urban Growth Centres (UGC), delineated by municipalities, to provide a focus for high density mixed use development and major transit infrastructure;
- Major Transit Station Areas and Intensification Corridors to be designated in official plans;
- Employment lands policies to ensure an adequate supply of employment lands and to prevent their conversion to non employment uses, including retail commercial;
- Designated Greenfield area policies to achieve a minimum density target, the development of complete communities that support transit services; and
- Settlement area boundary policies establish criteria to be met prior to allowing an urban expansion, which can only be initiated by a municipality.

(b) Infrastructure To Support Growth

- Infrastructure planning policies to integrate and co-ordinate infrastructure, which includes community services, and land use planning with infrastructure investment;
- Transportation policies for a multi-modal transportation system, co-ordinated with land use planning and transportation investment, with a priority on transit and goods movement;
- Public transit policies to shape growth, support intensification, and link urban growth centres;
- Goods movement to be the first priority of highway investment to link inter-modal facilities, international gateways and communities within the GGH;
- Water and wastewater system policies to recover the full cost of these services and coordinate them with planning for growth; and

- Community infrastructure, which includes a broad range of public services and affordable housing, to be co-ordinated with land use planning and community infrastructure investment.

(c) Protecting What Is Valuable

- Natural system policies to protect natural heritage features and linkages, vulnerable surface and ground water features and the development of an urban open space system;
- Prime agricultural area policies to identify and protect prime agricultural areas, including specialty crop areas;
- Mineral aggregate policies to develop a long term strategy for their use, conservation and management; and
- Culture of Conservation policies for water, energy and cultural heritage conservation, air quality protection and integrated waste management.

(d) Implementation

- The Province, in consultation with upper and single-tier municipalities, will review growth forecasts; establish built boundaries and Greenfield areas, and the scope and scale of UGCs. It will also undertake sub-area assessments of regional economics, transportation, water/wastewater, the natural system, and prime agricultural and rural areas;
- Monitoring and performance measurement policies for both the Province and municipalities; and
- Public engagement policies to require ongoing consultation with the public and stakeholders on the implementation of the Plan.

**APPENDIX 3**

**RESPONSE OF PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN TO RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL APRIL 13, 2005**

<p><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p><b>1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u></b></p> <p>1. That the City of Mississauga supports the Draft Growth Plan (February, 2005) subject to the provision of adequate financial resources and appropriate legislative authority to ensure its implementation.(Previously Recommendation 1).</p> <p>2. That the City of Mississauga supports the requirement that all Provincial and municipal planning decisions and official plans conform with the Growth Plan providing that Mississauga has a full and active role in preparation and implementation of the Sub-Area Growth Strategy (SAGS) for the GTA and Hamilton.(Previously Recommendation 2).</p>	<p><i>The Places to Grow Act, 2005</i>, provides the appropriate legislative authority to implement the Proposed Growth Plan. The Proposed Growth Plan does not address financial resources for its implementation.</p> <p>The requirement for the completion of a Sub-Area Growth Strategy (SAGS) has been deleted and replaced with “sub-area assessments” to be undertaken by the Province, in consultation with upper and single- tier municipalities, to guide water, wastewater, transportation, economic, natural system and agricultural plans. Nonetheless, Mississauga’s concern, to be a full and active participant in the preparation of these assessments, remains valid.</p>	<p>1. That the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to address the provision of adequate financial resources to ensure its implementation.</p> <p>2. That Mississauga be provided a full and active role in the preparation of sub-area assessments which affect Mississauga.</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p><b>2. <u>WHERE AND HOW TO GROW</u></b></p> <p>3. That the City of Mississauga supports the objective of intensification and compact development, where appropriate, and consistent with local municipal official plans, subject to intensification areas not including stable neighbourhoods. (Previously Recommendation 3).</p>	<p>By Resolution 0217-2004, Mississauga recommended that the City of Mississauga supports <i>“the objective of intensification and compact development, where appropriate, and consistent with local municipal official plans, and further, that the Growth Plan recognize that it is not always feasible to have high density development near higher order transportation systems”</i>.</p> <p>The Draft Growth Plan, February, 2005 defined “intensification areas” to not typically include “stable neighbourhoods”. This definition has been amended in the Proposed Growth Plan to delete the exclusion of stable residential neighbourhoods, and include major transit station areas, brownfield and greyfield sites. The policies require minimum density targets for these areas, consistent with the transit service levels, which are generally higher than surrounding areas. A strict interpretation of this definition and the definition of intensification, together with related policies would, therefore,</p>	<p>3. That the definition of “Intensification Areas” in the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to indicate that they do not typically include stable residential neighbourhoods.</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>4. That the City of Mississauga be recognized as an urbanized area and be entirely included in the “built-up boundary”. (Previously Recommendation 4).</p>	<p>require redevelopment, at higher densities, for stable residential neighbourhoods surrounding such GO Stations as Port Credit, and Streetsville.</p> <p>The Draft and Proposed Growth Plans require a phased increase in the yearly percentage of intensification so that by year 2015, a minimum of 40% of all residential development occurring annually within each upper or single-tier municipality will be within built-up areas. In comments on the Draft Growth Plan, it was noted that Mississauga should achieve the 40% figure providing the entire City is considered to be a built-up area, including such areas as Churchill Meadows and Meadowvale Village. It appears that the Proposed Growth Plan identifies only a small part of Churchill Meadows and Meadowvale Business Park outside the Built-Up Area. Consequently, by 2015, all development in Mississauga will be intensification; consequently, this requirement will be satisfied.</p>	<p>4. That the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to recognize the City of Mississauga as an urbanized area and be entirely included in the “built-up boundary”.</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>5. That the City of Mississauga requests the Provincial Government to underwrite an insurance program to address the legal liability associated with brownfield and greyfield sites. (Previously Recommendation 9).</p>	<p>Further, it may be expected that Mississauga will absorb a higher proportion of Peel's intensification. This would be consistent with the principles of the compact scenario where a larger share of growth is directed to urban centres and to make better use of brownfields, greyfields and urban corridors. Therefore, it is important that Mississauga be an active participant in the preparation of sub-area assessments as per Recommendation 2.</p> <p>Mississauga supports the redevelopment of brownfield sites. However, as noted in the City's previous submission, this support is subject to <i>“the reduction or elimination of risk to human and ecological health”</i>.</p> <p>In addition, the submission also stated that <i>“some sort of insurance program to address legal liability underwritten by the Provincial Government would be appreciated”</i>. This suggestion has not been addressed by the Provincial Government.</p>	<p>5. That the Provincial Government be requested to underwrite an insurance program to address the legal liability associated with brownfield and greyfield sites.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>6. That the City of Mississauga requests that the 200 residents and jobs per hectare (80 residents and jobs per acre) target apply only to Urban Growth Centres (UGCs ) and that density targets for intensification areas and corridors be identified during the preparation of the SAGS. (Previously Recommendation 10).</p> <p>7. That the City of Mississauga requests that the term “target” be defined by the Growth Plan. (Previously Recommendation 11).</p> <p>8. That the City of Mississauga requests the strategies to determine the appropriate amount and scale of development in intensification areas should be based on land use compatibility design considerations and local circumstances as well as household and employment forecasts</p>	<p>The Proposed Growth Plan applies the intensification target of 200 residents and jobs per hectare (80 residents and jobs per acre) only to certain UGCs, including Mississauga City Centre, and requires that density targets for other intensification areas be consistent with planned transit service levels and any transit-supportive land use guidelines established by the Province. The definition of “planned transit service levels” should be clarified”.</p> <p>In previous comments, and in Resolution 0217-2004, the concept of “<i>targets</i>” was questioned: How are they defined; how they are enforced, tracked and monitored. These questions, which apply to parts of the Proposed Growth Plan, have not been addressed.</p> <p>The Draft Growth Plan, February, 2005 required municipalities to develop and implement strategies to realize an appropriate amount and scale of development in intensification areas, based on the household and employment forecasts and intensification targets. The Proposed Growth Plan continues to require</p>	<p>6. That the Proposed Growth Plan clarify the term “planned transit service levels”.</p> <p>7. That the term “<i>target</i>” be defined by the Proposed Growth Plan.</p> <p>8. That Policy 2.2.3.7 (f) of the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to include reference to density to read “ensure an appropriate transition of built-form and <b><i>density</i></b> to adjacent areas”.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>and intensification targets. (Previously Recommendation 12).</p> <p>9. That the City of Mississauga requests the Draft Growth Plan be amended to require that municipalities provide opportunities and policies for the development of a range and mix of housing types, including affordable housing. (Previously Recommendation 15).</p>	<p>municipalities to identify the appropriate type and scale of development in intensification areas to attract a significant proportion of forecast growth. It recognizes land use compatibility design considerations by a new policy which requires that intensification areas will be planned to achieve an appropriate transition of built-form to adjacent areas. While this new policy partially recognizes Mississauga’s concern, it should also make reference to an appropriate transition of density to adjacent areas.</p> <p>The previous comments on the Draft Growth Plan, February, 2005 noted that, with respect to affordable housing targets, municipalities can only provide for opportunities by designations and policies in official plans. The actual development and long term affordability of housing is a function of the market and Peel Housing. This request was not addressed in the Proposed Growth Plan.</p>	<p>9. That the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to require that municipalities provide <i>opportunities</i> and policies for the development of a range and mix of housing types, including affordable housing.</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>10. That the City of Mississauga requests that the Federal and Provincial Governments provide financial incentives and pay for services associated with intensification. (Previously Recommendation 13).</p> <p>11. That the City of Mississauga requests a further consideration of the role of the Lester B. Pearson International Airport (LBPIA) as an UGC and further that specific nodal developments (Gateway, Meadowvale Business Park and Airport Corporate Centre) be considered as part of complementary economic strategies from an infrastructure and transit funding perspective. (Previously Recommendation 19).</p>	<p>The Draft Growth Plan, February, 2005 indicated that the Province and municipalities will use infrastructure investment and other implementation tools and mechanisms to facilitate intensification. In previous comments on the Draft Growth Plan Mississauga clearly established that it does not have the financial resources to offer effective <i>"implementation tools and mechanisms to facilitate intensification"</i>.</p> <p>Mississauga previously requested that Lester B. Pearson International Airport (LBPIA) be considered as a Priority Centre (defined by the February, 2005 Draft Growth Plan or an UGC and that <i>"specific nodal developments (Gateway, Meadowvale Business Park and Airport Corporate Centre) be considered as part of complementary economic strategies from an infrastructure and transit funding perspective"</i>. These recommendations have not been addressed. However, this could be reviewed as part of the Regional Economic Assessment to be undertaken for the GTA and Hamilton sub-area.</p>	<p>10. That the City of Mississauga requests that the Federal and Provincial Governments provide financial incentives and pay for services associated with intensification.</p> <p>11. That the Regional Economic Assessment to be undertaken for the GTA and Hamilton consider the role of Lester B. Pearson International Airport (LBPIA) as an UGC and specific nodal developments (Gateway, Meadowvale Business Park and Airport Corporate Centre) from an infrastructure and transit funding perspective.</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>12. That the City of Mississauga supports the process and criteria for expanding settlement areas subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarification of “intensification target”; and</li> <li>• reference to the impact on human services and the preservation and enhancement of existing communities as conditions of expanding a settlement area. (Previously Recommendation 21).</li> </ul> <p>13. That the City of Mississauga supports the intent that the SAGS be carried out by a combination of the Provincial Government with full and active participation by the City of Mississauga in the absence of a Growth Plan Implementation Board. The Region of Peel should only be involved where it is responsible for a specific service, such as water supply</p>	<p>By Resolution 0217-2004, Mississauga previously requested that the criteria for expanding settlement areas include reference to human services and the preservation and enhancement of existing communities. The Proposed Growth Plan includes impacts on “community infrastructure” as one of the criteria to be addressed in settlement area boundary expansions. “Community Infrastructure” includes land, buildings and structures for providing public services for health, education, socio-cultural activities, security and safety, and affordable housing. However, it does not refer to the provision of the service itself.</p> <p>In previous submissions, Mississauga commented that <i>“in the absence of a Growth Plan Implementation Board, the strategies should be carried out by the Provincial Government and lower-tier municipalities.</i></p> <p><i>The upper-tier municipalities should be involved only to the extent that the upper-tier services (e.g. water supply, sanitary sewers, and regional roads) are involved.</i></p>	<p>12. That the definition of “Community Infrastructure” in the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to read “Community Infrastructure refers to the provision of public services for health, education, recreation, socio-cultural activities, safety and security, and affordable housing”.</p> <p>13. That the City of Mississauga supports the intent that the sub-area assessments, which impact Mississauga, be carried out by a combination of the Provincial Government and upper-tier municipalities provided that there is a full and active participation by the City of Mississauga. The Region of Peel should only be involved where it is</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>and sanitary services. (Previously Recommendation 22).</p>	<p><i>For example, the preparation and allocation of population and growth projections should be carried out by area municipalities and co-ordinated by the Provincial Government; similarly, all matters concerning intensification, environmental assessment, infrastructure and phasing. The area of the Draft Growth Plan in the GGH which extends beyond the current boundaries of the Regions and requires the Provincial Government to co-ordinate and oversee. Regional municipalities, as they currently exist, are too small to carry out the requirements of the Plan. The Provincial Government has the necessary legislative authority and, together with the Federal Government, the financial resources to ensure the future growth policies of the plan are approved and implemented appropriately. Lower-tier municipalities have the expertise and knowledge to carry out the detailed requirements of growth projections, infill and intensification and other matters associated with future growth areas”.</i></p>	<p>responsible for a specific service, such as water supply and wastewater services.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
	<p><i>It is very important that Mississauga be a full and active member of the organization assigned to prepare and administer the SAGS to ensure that Mississauga has input to any proposed changes to intensification targets for Mississauga or urban boundary expansion that may affect existing intensification targets.</i></p> <p>Although SAGs have been replaced, to a certain extent by sub-area assessments, the principle - that upper-tier municipalities should be involved only to the extent that the upper-tier services (e.g. water supply, sanitary sewers, and regional roads) are involved remains valid.</p>	
<p><b>3. <u>INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT GROWTH</u></b></p> <p>14. That the City of Mississauga requests the Provincial Government support development of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and programs by participating in the existing Smart Commute Association to coordinate development of TDM strategies in the</p>	<p>Mississauga's previous comments remain valid: <i>"The Draft Growth Plan does not identify the Provincial role in Transportation Demand Management (TDM) although they are currently developing a high occupancy vehicle network on selected Provincial highway facilities. Mississauga is already a partner in the Smart Commute Initiative to</i></p>	<p>14. That the Provincial Government be requested to support development of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and programs by participating in the existing Smart Commute Association to coordinate development of TDM strategies in the GTA and Hamilton Sub-Area.</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>GTA and Hamilton Sub-Area. (Previously Recommendation 25).</p> <p>15. That the City of Mississauga requests the Province to review Schedule 5, Moving People, with respect to the absence of links to connect Mississauga Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) segment to the Highway 407 network east of Renforth Drive to complete the GO Bus Rapid Transit (GO BRT) spine as endorsed by GO Transit. (Previously Recommendation 26).</p>	<p><i>promote TDM strategies, which is receiving Federal subsidies but the Province has declined to participate.”</i></p> <p>Mississauga’s previous submission on the Draft Growth Plan remains valid:</p> <p><i>“The conceptual linkages to the east of Mississauga only provide for a connection along Eglinton Avenue to the subway network/mid-town Toronto UGC. Of concern is the absence of links to connect this Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) segment to the Highway 407 network east of Renforth Drive, to complete the GO Bus Rapid Transit (GO BRT) spine as originally identified by the former Greater Toronto Services Board (GTSB) and subsequently endorsed by GO Transit. Without these critical links, the GO BRT spine network becomes fragmented and could result in individual segments competing for funding.</i></p> <p><i>This definition could include the proposed GO BRT network but would not seem to include proposals with buses operating in high occupancy vehicle lanes or using other transit priority treatment”.</i></p>	<p>15. That the Province be requested to review Schedule 5, Moving People, with respect to the absence of links to connect Mississauga Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) segment to the Highway 407 network east of Renforth Drive to complete the GO Bus Rapid Transit (GO BRT) spine as endorsed by GO Transit.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>16. That the City of Mississauga requests the Provincial Government to provide a more detailed description of the higher-order transit corridors identified on Schedule 5, Moving People, and include the alignment identified for the proposed GO BRT spine network, which includes a link from the BRT segment in Mississauga at Renforth Drive to the Highway 407 corridor and a connection to the Kipling Centre. (Previously Recommendation 27).</p>	<p>Schedule 5, Moving People has been revised to provide a more detailed description of the higher-order transit corridors. Mississauga's previous submission on the Draft Growth Plan remains valid. The provision of a link between Renforth Drive to Highway 407 is covered in Recommendation 15, the link from Renforth Drive to Kipling Centre need not be shown as it does not conform to the definition of higher order transit</p> <p><i>“Schedule 5, Moving People, is intended to be conceptual but it becomes difficult to adequately discern some of the proposed higher-order transit corridors, especially in the GTA. It would be beneficial for the Province to include a table of the specific higher-order transit links proposed. In addition, there may be a conflict between proposals to develop higher-order transit and the new introduced concept of developing intensification corridors, as many higher-order transit systems use technology such as rail that is more conducive to nodal development instead of corridor development.</i></p>	<p>16. This recommendation has been satisfied. No action required.</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>17. That the City of Mississauga requests that Policy 2 under Subsection 3.3.2 of the Draft Growth Plan be modified to include source water protection costs. (Previously Recommendation 29).</p> <p>18. That the City of Mississauga requests that Policy 3 under Subsection 3.3.2 be revised by adding the word "only" so that it reads "<i>Water and wastewater systems should <u>only</u> be expanded as required .....</i>". (Previously Recommendation 30).</p>	<p>This recommendation has been satisfied since source water protection costs have now been included in the definition of "Full Cost".</p> <p>This is covered in Section 4.2.2 (2).</p>	<p>17. This recommendation has been satisfied. No action required.</p> <p>18. This recommendation has been satisfied. No action required.</p>
<p><b>4. <u>PROTECTING WHAT IS VALUABLE</u></b></p> <p>19. That the City of Mississauga requests that Section 4.1, Context, last paragraph, be amended to make reference to the Nutrient Management Plan. (Previously Recommendation 31).</p> <p>20. That the City of Mississauga requests that Section 4.2, The Natural System, be amended by adding Section 4.6, A Culture of Conservation, which</p>	<p>This covered in Section 4.2.2 (2), Prime Agricultural Areas.</p> <p>Ontario's increased greenhouse gas emissions have increased since 1990 and the environmental, health and economic effects of global warming are becoming more acute in the future due to population</p>	<p>19. This recommendation has been satisfied. No action required.</p> <p>20. That Section 4.2.4 (c), A Culture of Conservation, of the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to "Air Quality and Climate Protection" and to refer to "air pollutant" emissions and expanded to</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>addresses air as a resource. (Previously Recommendation 34).</p> <p>21. That the City of Mississauga requests that Section 4.6, A Culture of Conservation, of the Draft Growth Plan make reference to clean air strategies and initiatives implemented by the Provincial Government. (Previously Recommendation 35).</p> <p>22. That the City of Mississauga request that Section 4.6, A Culture of Conservation, make reference to existing watershed plans or to the Ministry of Environment's Storm water Planning and Design Manual and/or the use of new technologies. (Previously Recommendation 36).</p>	<p>and urban growth. Section 4.2.4 (c) simply identifies air quality protection as an objective municipalities are to address in their official plans. This section is limited in scope in that it refers only to emissions from municipal and residential sources.</p> <p>This was covered in Section 4.2.4.1 (c).</p> <p>This is covered in Sections 3.2.5, Water and Wastewater Systems and 4.2.4.1 (b) (iv), A Culture of Conservation.</p>	<p>address all sources of emissions. This section should also be amended to include an additional item: <i>"Development proposals requiring large volumes of water should consider and implement water conservation measures".</i></p> <p>21. This recommendation has been satisfied. No action required.</p> <p>22. This recommendation has been satisfied. No action required.</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>23. That the City of Mississauga requests that references to innovative technologies and approaches such as green buildings and green roofs be included in Section 4.6.2, Policies. (Previously Recommendation 37).</p>	<p>References to innovative technologies and approaches such as green buildings, green roofs, etc. appear absent throughout the Draft Growth Plan report and should be included under Subsection 4.2.4, A Culture of Conservation.</p>	<p>23. That Section 4.2.4, A Culture of Conservation, of the proposed Growth Plan be amended to include references to innovative technologies and approaches such as green buildings and green roofs.</p>
<p><b>5. <u>SUB-AREA GROWTH STRATEGIES</u></b></p> <p>24. That the City of Mississauga requests the term "<i>municipalities</i>" be defined for the purposes of determining participation in the preparation of SAGS. (Previously Recommendation 40).</p> <p>25. That the City of Mississauga requests the term "<i>inter-regional planning</i>" be defined in the context of preparing SAGS and that "<i>sub-area economic analysis</i>" be clarified. (Previously Recommendation 41).</p> <p>26. That the City of Mississauga requests the phrase "<i>not intended to duplicate municipal efforts</i>" be amended to read "<i>will not duplicate municipal plans</i>". (Previously Recommendation 42).</p>	<p>This recommendation is no longer relevant as SAGS have been deleted from the Proposed Growth Plan. The term "municipalities" has been largely been clarified in the Proposed Growth Plan, where necessary.</p> <p>This recommendation is no longer relevant as SAGS have been deleted from the Proposed Growth Plan.</p> <p>This recommendation is no longer relevant as SAGS have been deleted from the Proposed Growth Plan.</p>	<p>24. This recommendation has been satisfied. No action required.</p> <p>25. This recommendation has been satisfied. No action required.</p> <p>26. This recommendation has been satisfied. No action required.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p><b>6. <u>IMPLEMENTATION</u></b></p> <p>27. That the City of Mississauga requests the Provincial Government consider establishing a Growth Plan Implementation Board which would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• implement the policies of the Plan;</li> <li>• co-ordinate land use planning with the Plan;</li> <li>• provide strategic advice to the Provincial Government; and</li> <li>• address all aspects of growth, such as waste management and energy. (Previously Recommendation 43).</li> </ul>	<p>The following comment on the Draft Growth Plan remains valid:</p> <p><i>“By Resolution 0217-2004, Mississauga previously commented that consideration should be given to establishing a Growth Plan Implementation Board, composed of elected officials from all levels of government.</i></p> <p><i>The board would:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>implement the policies of the Plan;</i></li> <li>• <i>co-ordinate land use planning with the Plan;</i></li> <li>• <i>provide strategic advice to the Provincial Government; and</i></li> <li>• <i>address all aspects of growth, such as waste management and energy.”</i></li> </ul>	<p>27. That the City of Mississauga requests the Provincial Government consider establishing a Growth Plan Implementation Board which would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• implement the policies of the Plan;</li> <li>• co-ordinate land use planning with the Plan;</li> <li>• provide strategic advice to the Provincial Government; and</li> <li>• address all aspects of growth, such as waste management and energy.</li> </ul>
<p>28. That the City of Mississauga requests the process for amending the Growth Plan and SAGS clearly establish that municipalities may request the Provincial Government to amend the Plan and SAGS as circumstances warrant. (Previously Recommendation 45).</p>	<p>Only the Minister can initiate an amendment to the Growth Plan, and review of the Growth Plan at least every 10 years.</p> <p>In comments on the Draft Growth Plan, and by Resolution 0217-2004, Mississauga previously commented that there should be</p>	<p>28. That the process for amending the Proposed Growth Plan clearly establish that municipalities may request the Provincial Government to amend the Plan as circumstances warrant.</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
	<p>a process for amending a Growth Plan. The potential to amend Mississauga Plan may be restricted if the Minister does not initiate an amendment to the Growth Plan.</p> <p>There should, however, be a process that would allow a request to the Minister to amend the Growth Plan.</p>	
<p>29. That the City of Mississauga request the Provincial Government to provide municipalities an opportunity to review and comment on draft regulations proposed pursuant to the proposed <i>Places to Grow Act</i>. (Previously Recommendation 46).</p> <p>30. That the City of Mississauga requests the preparation and approval of any guidelines to implement the goals and policies of the Growth Plan should be carried out in consultation with lower-tier municipalities to avoid duplication. (Previously Recommendation 48).</p>	<p>Regulations, which have yet to be prepared, to deal with transitional matters will provide administrative certainty in the processing of applications. Municipalities should be provided with an opportunity to comment on draft regulations before they are approved.</p> <p>This section, which states "<i>To assist municipalities and other agencies, the Province will develop guidelines to show how tools can be used to implement the goals and policies of the Growth Plan</i>", has been deleted from the Proposed Growth Plan.</p>	<p>29. That the City of Mississauga request the Provincial Government to provide municipalities an opportunity to review and comment on any draft regulations proposed pursuant to the <i>Places to Grow Act</i>.</p> <p>30. This recommendation has been satisfied. No action required.</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p><b>7. <u>PROVINCIAL MULTI-YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY</u></b></p> <p>31. That the City of Mississauga requests the Provincial Government proceed with an interim infrastructure plan for projects which are justified by existing needs, have received Environmental Assessment approval, and support designated UGC. (Previously Recommendation 54).</p>	<p>This section of the Draft Growth Plan, proposing a Multi Year Infrastructure Strategy, has been removed from the Proposed Growth Plan but should be maintained. Further, the Province needs to make changes to the <i>Development Charges Act</i> to allow for the collection of charges at a higher rate than historic transit service levels permit, to eliminate the property tax component for GO Transit's Capital Growth Budget, and make strategic investment in major transit projects across the Greater Toronto Area, such as the GO BRT project.</p>	<p>31. That the City of Mississauga requests the Provincial Government proceed with an interim infrastructure plan for projects which are justified by existing needs, have received Environmental Assessment approval, and support designated UGC. Further, the <i>Development Charges Act</i> should be amended to allow for the collection of charges at a higher rate than historic transit service levels permit, to eliminate the property tax component for GO Transit's Capital Growth Budget, and make strategic investment in major transit projects across the Greater Toronto Area, such as the GO BRT project.</p>
<p><b>8. <u>WASTE MANAGEMENT</u></b></p> <p>32. That the Draft Growth Plan be amended to include a waste management strategy. (Previously Recommendation 3, report titled "Summary Report-Places To Grow-Better Choices. Brighter Future-Draft</p>	<p>The Proposed Growth Plan does not include a waste management strategy but requires that official plans contain policies and strategies for integrated waste management.</p>	<p>32. That the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to include a waste management strategy.</p>

<p align="center"><b>DRAFT GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION ADOPTED APRIL 13, 2005</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p>Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe dated April 6, 2005 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building).</p>		

K:\PLAN\POLICY\GROUP\2005 Provincial\Growth Plan\Growth Plan Report Jan 9 2006\rm nov2005 growth plan table 1.doc

**NEW RECOMMENDATIONS  
 PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN FOR THE GREATER GOLDEN HORSESHOE, NOVEMBER 2005**

<b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b>
<p><b>2. <u>WHERE AND HOW TO GROW</u></b></p> <p><b>2.2.1 Growth Forecasts (page 11)</b></p> <p>The Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal will review and amend growth forecasts in consultation with upper and single-tier municipalities.</p> <p><b>2.2.3 General Intensification (pages 12-13)</b></p> <p>The Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal will verify and delineate the built boundary in consultation with upper and single-tier municipalities.</p> <p>Upper and single-tier municipalities, in consultation with lower-tier municipalities will develop and implement official plan policies and a strategy to achieve the intensification target.</p>	<p>Since Mississauga is larger than the City of Hamilton and the Regions of Halton and Durham, Mississauga should be a full and active participant in the preparation of revised growth forecasts, and the delineation of the built boundary.</p> <p>The Region of Peel should be granted the authority to delegate the development and implementation of official plan policies and strategies to achieve the intensification targets to local municipalities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That Mississauga be a full and active participant in the preparation of revised growth forecasts and the delineation of the built boundary.</li>   <li>2. That the Region of Peel be granted the authority to delegate the development and implementation of official plan policies and strategies to achieve the intensification targets to local municipalities.</li> </ol>

<b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b>
<p>Official plan policies and implementation will encourage intensification generally throughout the built-up area.</p> <p><b>2.2.4 Urban Growth Centres (page 14)</b></p> <p>The Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal will refine the scope and scale of urban growth centres in consultation with upper and single-tier municipalities.</p> <p>Mississauga City Centre will be planned to achieve a minimum density target of 200 residents and jobs per ha (80 residents and jobs per acre).</p> <p><b>2.2.6 Employment Lands (pages 15-16)</b></p> <p>In planning for employment lands, municipalities will minimize surface parking.</p>	<p>Encouraging intensification throughout the built-up area could dilute any new transportation infrastructure investment. There should be a priority on strategic intensification, with an emphasis on intensifying along major transit corridors and major transit station areas.</p> <p>Since Mississauga is larger than the City of Hamilton and the Regions of Halton and Durham, with one of the largest UGC's outside Toronto, Mississauga should be a full and active participant in determining the scope and scale of Mississauga City Centre.</p> <p>Mississauga City Centre can easily achieve a higher density target provided that it receive commitments for the necessary infrastructure funding, especially for the GO BRT project.</p> <p>Development of employment lands for labour extensive uses often requires extensive surface parking.</p>	<p>3. That the Proposed Growth Plan be amended by deleting section 2.2.3 6 (b) and replacing it with a policy to emphasize intensification along major transit corridors and near major transit station areas.</p> <p>4. That Mississauga be a full and active participant in determining the scope and scale of Mississauga City Centre.</p> <p>5. That, if commitments are made for the necessary infrastructure funding especially for the GO BRT project, Mississauga City Centre be assigned a higher density target, as determined by Mississauga.</p> <p>6. That the Proposed Growth Plan be amended by deleting policy 2.2.6.8.</p>

<b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b>
<p><b>3. <u>INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT GROWTH</u></b></p> <p><b>3.2.3 Moving People (pages 21–22)</b></p> <p>Schedule 5, Moving People, has been amended in the Proposed Growth Plan to identify a “Proposed Higher-Order Transit to 2031” along Hurontario Street linking Mississauga City Centre with Brampton City Centre.</p> <p><b>3.2.4 Moving Goods (pages 22-23)</b></p> <p>Section 3.2.4, Moving Goods, does not contain a schedule to identify priority highway investment. In addition, 3.2.4.5 calls for municipalities to establish priority truck routes.</p>	<p>Higher-order transit should be extended to Port Credit, as shown in Mississauga Plan, which designates a “Major Transit Corridor” along the entire length of Hurontario Street from Lakeshore Road, north to the Brampton/Mississauga municipal boundary. In addition, designating the Dundas Street West link from Hurontario Street to the Kipling Centre as “Proposed Higher-Order Transit to 2031” would also offer potential for future intensification, and would provide a connection between the TTC subway terminus at Kipling and the proposed Hurontario transit corridor.</p> <p>Municipalities generally have the authority to impose restrictions to limit truck movements but it is unclear what mechanisms are intended to give priority to truck movements.</p>	<p>7. That Schedule 5, Moving People, be amended to extend the “Proposed Higher-Order Transit to 2031” designation along Hurontario Street to Port Credit, and by designating Dundas Street East, between the TTC subway terminus at Kipling and the proposed Hurontario transit corridor, as “Proposed Higher-Order Transit to 2031”.</p> <p>8. That the Proposed Growth Plan clarify what mechanisms are intended to give priority to truck movements.</p>

<p><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN</b></p>	<p><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p><b>3.2.5 Community Infrastructure (pages 24-25)</b></p> <p>Upper and single-tier municipalities, in consultation with lower-tier municipalities, will develop a housing strategy.</p>	<p>The Region of Peel should be granted the authority to delegate the development of a housing strategy to local municipalities.</p>	<p>9. That the Region of Peel be granted the authority to delegate the development of a housing strategy to local municipalities.</p>
<p><b>4. <u>PROTECTING WHAT IS VALUABLE</u></b></p> <p><b>4.2 Policies for Protecting What is Valuable (pages 26-27)</b></p> <p>Section 4.2.1.5 states that <i>“municipalities, conservation authorities, non-governmental organizations and other interested parties are encouraged to develop a system of publicly accessible parkland, open space and trails including shoreline areas within the GGH”</i>.</p> <p>An urban open space system may include roof top gardens and communal courtyards.</p>	<p>The Proposed Growth Plan encourages the acquisition of natural areas but does not outline or propose changes to the <i>Planning Act</i> or the <i>Expropriations Act</i> to allow for further acquisition of these natural areas by the municipality or conservation authorities.</p> <p>While roof top gardens and communal courtyards are supported as private open space, they are not open to the public, and should not be considered as part of an urban open space system.</p>	<p>10. That Section 5.1.2, Implementation Analysis of the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to include a review of the <i>Planning Act</i> and <i>Expropriation Act</i> policies to allow a municipality or the conservation authority additional funding and/or expropriation authority to acquire natural areas.</p> <p>11. That the Proposed Growth Plan be amended by deleting reference to roof top gardens and communal courtyards as part of an open space system.</p>

<p><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN</b></p>	<p><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p><b>5. <u>IMPLEMENTATION AND INTERPRETATION</u></b></p> <p>The implementation of the Proposed Growth Plan could result in appeals to the OMB.</p> <p><b>5.1.2 Implementation Analysis (page 30)</b></p> <p>The Minister of Public Infrastructure Renewal, in consultation with upper and single-tier municipalities, will undertake sub-area assessments of regional economics, transportation, water and wastewater capacity and requirements; identification of natural areas and prime agricultural areas.</p>	<p>Since the implementation of the Proposed Growth Plan could result in appeals to the OMB, thereby giving an unelected body the authority to make decisions on the implementation of the Proposed Growth Plan, the Province should consider the implementation of the Proposed Growth Plan in their review of OMB reform.</p> <p>Since Mississauga is larger than the City of Hamilton and the Regions of Halton and Durham, with one of the largest UGC outside Toronto, Mississauga should be a full and active participant in sub-area assessments which impact Mississauga.</p>	<p>12. That the Province of Ontario consider the implementation of the Proposed Growth Plan in their review of OMB reform.</p> <p>13. That Mississauga be a full and active participant in sub-area assessments which impact Mississauga. (Similar to Recommendation 2 in Appendix 3.)</p>

<p><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN</b></p>	<p><b>COMMENTS</b></p>	<p><b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b></p>
<p><b>6. <u>DEFINITIONS</u> (pages 33-43)</b></p> <p>The policy direction of the Draft Growth Plan has been amended to include a new vision statement “plan for community infrastructure to support growth”, “Community Infrastructure” is defined to include land, buildings and structures for providing public services for health, education, socio-cultural activities, security and safety, and affordable housing.</p> <p>Higher-Order Transit has been defined as transit operating in its own right-of-way, outside of mixed traffic and, therefore, can achieve a frequency of service greater than mixed-traffic transit.</p>	<p>The definition does not refer to the provision of the community service itself.</p> <p>This definition requires clarification as to whether it is intended to apply to semi-exclusive Rights-of-Way (ROW) such as transit operating down the centre median of a roadway, which is required to share the ROW with other traffic at intersections or whether the ROW has to be totally exclusive. Streetcars have been identified as an example, which generally operate in mixed flow or semi-exclusive rights-of-way. Clarification is recommended as the development of urban transit corridors within Mississauga such as Hurontario Street are more likely to require a semi-exclusive right-of-way. This would avoid the recent problems associated with planning for the St. Clair LRT proposal.</p>	<p>14. That the definition of “Community Infrastructure” in the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to read “Community Infrastructure refers to the provision of public services for health, education, recreation, socio-cultural activities, safety and security, and affordable housing”.</p> <p>15. That the definition of Higher-Order Transit in the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to clarify whether it is intended to apply to semi-exclusive Rights-Of-Way (ROW) such as transit operating down the centre median of a roadway, which is required to share the ROW with other traffic at intersections, or whether the ROW has to be totally exclusive.</p>

<b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN RECOMMENDATION</b>
<p>“Alternative Energy Generation” is not defined.</p> <p>“Water Demand Management” and “Energy Demand Management” are not defined.</p>	<p>Clarification is required as to the meaning of alternative energy generation.</p> <p>Clarification of terms “Water Demand Management” and “Energy Demand Management” is required.</p>	<p>16. That the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to include a definition of alternative energy generation.</p> <p>17. That the Proposed Growth Plan be amended to include definitions of the terms “Water Demand Management” and “Energy Demand Management”.</p>

## APPENDIX 5

## COMPARISON OF PLANNING RESPONSIBILITIES- PROPOSED GROWTH PLAN

<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal</b>	<b>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal in Consultation with Upper and Single-Tier Municipalities</b>	<b>Upper and Single-Tier Municipalities in consultation with Local Municipalities</b>	<b>Local Municipalities</b>
<b>Growth Forecasts</b>	-----	Review and amend growth forecasts at least every 5 years (2.2.1.1)	-----	-----
<b>Intensification</b>	-----	Verify and delineate built boundary (2.2.3.5)	Develop and implement official plan policies to achieve intensification target (2.2.3.6)	-----
<b>Urban Growth Centres (UGC)</b>	-----	Refine scope and scale of growth centres (2.2.4.2)	-----	Delineate and designate boundaries of urban growth centres (2.2.4.4)

<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal</b>	<b>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal in Consultation with Upper and Single-Tier Municipalities</b>	<b>Upper and Single-Tier Municipalities in consultation with Local Municipalities</b>	<b>Local Municipalities</b>
<b>Employment Lands</b>	-----	Through sub-area assessments: identify economic clusters; assess demand for land for economic growth; define and identify provincially significant employment areas (2.2.6.6)	-----	-----
<b>Designated Greenfield Areas</b>	-----	-----	Official plan policies for designated greenfield areas to achieve intensification and density targets (2.2.7.2)	-----
<b>Settlement Area Boundary Expansions</b>	-----	Determine the need for and maximum amount of additional designated greenfiled area (2.2.8.2)	-----	Initiate review of possible boundary area expansions 2.2.8.3

<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal</b>	<b>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal in Consultation with Upper and Single-Tier Municipalities</b>	<b>Upper and Single-Tier Municipalities in consultation with Local Municipalities</b>	<b>Local Municipalities</b>
<b>Infrastructure Planning</b>	Identify strategic infrastructure needs through multi-year infrastructure planning, and sub-areas assessments of transportation and transit, and water and wastewater systems (3.2.1.1)	-----	-----	-----
<b>Transportation Planning</b>	-----	Refine and address phasing and coordination of transportation infrastructure planning and investment (3.2.2.4)	Develop and implement transportation demand strategies (3.2.2.5)	-----
<b>Water and Wastewater Systems</b>	-----	Through sub-area assessment, undertake an analysis of water and wastewater capacity and requirements (3.2.5.6)	-----	-----
<b>Community Infrastructure</b>	-----	-----	Develop a Housing Strategy (3.2.6.6)	Establish and implement Affordable Housing Targets (3.2.6.5)

<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal</b>	<b>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal in Consultation with Upper and Single-Tier Municipalities</b>	<b>Upper and Single-Tier Municipalities in consultation with Local Municipalities</b>	<b>Local Municipalities</b>
<b>Natural System</b>	-----	Through sub-area assessment, identify a natural system and policies (4.2.1.1)	-----	-----
<b>Prime Agricultural Areas</b>	-----	Through sub-area assessment, identify prime agricultural areas and policies for protection (4.2.2.1)	-----	-----
<b>Mineral Aggregate Resources</b>	Develop a long-term strategy for use, conservation, availability and management of mineral aggregate services (4.2.3.1)	-----	-----	-----
<b>Culture of Conservation</b>	-----	-----	-----	Develop and implement official plan policies for water and energy conservation, air quality protection, waste management,

<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal</b>	<b>Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal in Consultation with Upper and Single-Tier Municipalities</b>	<b>Upper and Single-Tier Municipalities in consultation with Local Municipalities</b>	<b>Local Municipalities</b>
				heritage conservation (4.2.4.1)
<b>Implementation Analysis</b>	-----	Undertake sub-area assessments of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• economic assessment</li> <li>• transportation network</li> <li>• water/wastewater capacity and requirements</li> <li>• natural system</li> <li>• prime agricultural and rural areas (5.1.2)</li> </ul>	-----	-----
<b>Monitoring/Performance Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• develop indicators to measure implementation of growth plan (5.2.2.1)</li> <li>• monitor implementation of plan (5.2.2.2)</li> </ul>	-----	-----	-----