



Corporate Report

Clerk's Files

Originator's
Files

LA.07.PRO
(Province)

DATE: March 15, 2005

TO: Chairman and Members of Planning and Development Committee
Meeting Date: April 4, 2005

FROM: Edward R. Sajecki
Commissioner of Planning and Building

SUBJECT: **Provincial Policy Statement**

ORIGIN: Planning and Building Department

BACKGROUND: The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) came into effect on March 1, 2005 (see Exhibit 1 under separate cover). The previous PPS came into effect May 22, 1996 and was amended in 1997.

Mississauga previously commented on the Draft Provincial Policy Statement in a report titled "Planning Reform Initiatives – June 2004" dated July 13, 2004 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building. That report was forwarded to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing as input to the final version of the PPS.

COMMENTS: The Provincial Policy Statement sets out the Provincial Government's interests in land use planning and development and provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest. The PPS is the complementary policy document to the *Planning Act* and is issued under Section 3 of the Act. The PPS applies to all applications, matters or proceedings commenced on or after March 1, 2005.

Section 3 of the *Planning Act* requires that decisions affecting planning matters "shall be consistent with" policy statements issued under the *Planning Act*. Previously, planning decisions were required "to have regard to" the PPS. As a result of this legislative change, the City will review and, if appropriate, update relevant policies of Mississauga Plan.

A comparison by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing of selected proposed policies in key areas is contained in Exhibit 2.

Previous Comments on the Draft PPS

Exhibit 3 summarizes previous comments by Mississauga on the Draft PPS and whether or not they were incorporated into the final version. Generally, the previous comments were recognized and incorporated into the approved PPS. There are, however, certain significant areas of concern, namely, the role of the Region of Peel (see below), the requirement for a long-term supply of land for housing for a mature municipality, such as Mississauga, and the need to clarify targets for intensification.

Role of the Region of Peel

A concern identified in the previous report was the policy that would allow the Region of Peel much greater involvement in local land use planning. Although the policies have been revised the intent, however, has been strengthened by the change in the draft PPS of "will" to "shall" regarding this policy. Section 1.2.2 now is as follows:

"1.2.2 Where planning is conducted by an upper-tier municipality, the upper tier municipality in consultation with lower-tier municipalities shall:

- a) identify, coordinate and allocate population, housing and employment projections for lower-tier municipalities. Allocations and projections by upper-tier municipalities shall be based on and reflect provincial plans where these exist;*

- b) identify areas where growth will be directed, including the identification of nodes and the corridors linking these nodes;*
- c) identify targets for intensification and redevelopment within all or any of the lower-tier municipalities, including minimum targets that should be met before expansion of the boundaries of settlement areas is permitted in accordance with policy 1.1.3.9;*
- d) where transit corridors exist or are to be developed, identify density targets for areas adjacent or in proximity to these corridors, including minimum targets that should be met before expansion of the boundaries of settlement areas is permitted in accordance with policy 1.1.3.9; and*
- e) identify and provide policy direction for the lower-tier municipalities on matters that cross municipal boundaries."*

Notwithstanding the foregoing policies, staff have been advised that the current informal practice of delegating growth projections and allocations by the Region of Peel to the area municipalities through a consultative process may continue.

What's New in the Approved PPS

A new section, 1.5, Public Spaces, Parks and Open Space, states:

"1.5.1 Healthy, active communities should be promoted by:

- a) planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, and facilitate pedestrian and non-motorized movement, including but not limited to, walking and cycling;*
- b) providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publicly-accessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, open space areas, trails and , where practical, water-based resources;*

- c) providing opportunities for public access to shorelines; and*
- d) considering the impacts of planning decisions on provincial parks, conservation reserves and conservation areas."*

This section will assist municipalities in preserving parkland and developing an extensive multi-use trail network.

Another new section, 1.8, Energy and Air Quality, states:

"1.8.1 Planning authorities shall support energy efficiency and improved air quality through land use and development patterns which:

- a) promote compact form and a structure of nodes and corridors;*
- b) promote the use of public transit and other alternative transportation modes in and between residential, employment (including commercial, industrial and institutional uses) and other areas where these exist or are to be developed;*
- c) focus major employment, commercial and other travel-intensive land uses on sites which are well served by public transit where this exists or is to be developed, or designing these to facilitate the establishment of public transit in the future;*
- d) improve the mix of employment and housing uses to shorten commute journeys and decrease transportation congestion; and*
- e) promote design and orientation which maximize the use of alternative or renewable energy, such as solar and wind energy, and the mitigating effects of vegetation.*

1.8.2 Increased energy supply should be promoted by providing opportunities for energy generation facilities to accommodate current and projected needs and the use of renewable energy systems and alternative energy systems, where feasible.

1.8.3 Alternative energy systems and renewable energy systems shall be permitted in settlement areas, rural areas and prime agricultural areas in accordance with provincial and federal

requirements. In rural areas and prime agricultural areas, systems should be designed and constructed to minimize impacts on agricultural operations."

The intent of this section is to improve air quality through appropriate land use and development patterns and to provide opportunities for alternative energy systems. Staff will be reviewing the implications of the above statements for Mississauga Plan and the Zoning By-law and will be reporting further on this to Council.

The new PPS also provides greater support for intensification and more compact, higher density development to encourage transit-friendly land use patterns.

Finally, the PPS has strengthened the policies to protect employment lands from conversions to other uses, such as, residential or retail commercial development. With the new PPS, a municipality may permit the conversion of employment land only when it is demonstrated through a comprehensive review that the land is not required for long-term employment purposes and that there is a need for the conversion.

CONCLUSION:

On March 1, 2005 a new Provincial Policy Statement came into effect that sets out the Provincial Government's interests in land use planning and development and provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest. It also requires that all planning matters "shall be consistent with" policy statements issued under the *Planning Act*.

RECOMMENDATION: That the report titled "*Provincial Policy Statement*" dated March 15, 2005 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building, be received for information.

Original Signed By:

Edward R. Sajecki,
Commissioner of Planning and Building

Previous Comments on the Draft Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
1.0 Building Strong Communities		
<p>1.1 Efficient Settlement Patterns</p> <p>1.1.1 Settlement Areas</p> <p>1.1.1.1 Settlement Areas will be the focus of growth</p>	<p>Mississauga endorses the policy of focusing growth in settlement areas.</p> <p>With respect to efficient settlement patterns a more appropriate approach is for the Ontario Government to prepare a Growth Management Strategy for the Province and the Greater Toronto Area (GTA).</p>	<p>These policies have been retained. The province released the “Draft Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe” on February 16, 2005 for comment. This addresses our previous comment.</p>
<p>1.1.1.2 Opportunities to sustain and enhance the vitality and regeneration of built up areas within settlement areas through intensification and redevelopment should be utilized before extending development into designated growth areas.</p>	<p>Does this imply that intensification and redevelopment should be utilized before development in Churchill Meadows and Meadowvale Village continues?</p> <p>This policy requires clarification.</p>	<p>This policy section has been deleted and replaced with:</p> <p>1.1.3.2 Land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on:</p> <p>a) densities and a mix of land uses which:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. efficiently use land and resources; 2. are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion; and

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
		<p>3. minimize negative impacts to air quality and climate change, and promote energy efficiency in accordance with policy 1.8; and</p> <p>b) a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment in accordance with the criteria in policy 1.1.3.3. The deletion of Section 1.1.1.2 addresses Mississauga's previous concern.</p>
<p>1.1.1.4 Alteration of Boundaries of Settlement Areas</p>	<p>Mississauga endorses the requirement for a comprehensive review, as defined by the glossary, in support of altering a settlement boundary or creating a new settlement area.</p> <p>This suggests, however, that sufficient land for intensification and redevelopment in Mississauga must be exhausted before the Region expands an urban boundary.</p> <p>When read in conjunction with Section 1.3.3 and the determination of land requirements pursuant to Section 1.2, it provides the Region with a major role in local land use planning.</p>	<p>This has been deleted and replaced with Section 1.1.3.9.</p> <p>1.1.3.9 A planning authority may identify a settlement area or allow the expansion of a settlement area boundary only at the time of a comprehensive review and only when it has been demonstrated that:</p> <p>a) sufficient opportunities for growth are not available through intensification, redevelopment and designated growth areas to accommodate the projected needs over the identified planning horizon;</p> <p>b) the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available and suitable for the development over the long term and protect public health and safety;</p>

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
		<p>c) in prime agricultural areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the lands do not comprise specialty crop areas; 2. there are no reasonable alternatives which avoid prime agricultural areas and 3. there are no reasonable alternatives on lower priority agricultural lands in prime agricultural areas; and <p>d) impacts from new or expanding settlement areas on agricultural operations which are adjacent or close to the settlement area are mitigated to the extent feasible.</p> <p>In determining the most appropriate direction for expansions to the boundaries of settlement areas or the identification of a settlement area by a planning authority, a planning authority shall apply the policies of Section 2: Wise Use and Management of Resources and Section 3: Protecting Public Health and Safety.</p> <p>The approved PPS retains the requirement or a comprehensive review prior to the expansion of a settlement area boundary. In addition, it must be demonstrated, among other matters, that sufficient opportunities for growth are not available through intensification, redevelopment and</p>

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
		designated growth areas to accommodate the projected needs. This policy is supported by the City of Mississauga and addresses the previous comment.
1.1.2 Rural Areas 1.1.2.1	This section includes the term “resource-based recreational activities”. This term should be defined.	The province did not define “resource-based recreational activities” in the approved PPS.
1.2 Efficient Development and Land Use Patterns for Employment, Residential and Other Uses 1.2.1 and 1.2.2	That the general direction established by Section 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 be endorsed.	<p>This section has been deleted and the policy has been relocated to Section 1.1.1 as follows:</p> <p>Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) promoting efficient development and land use patterns which sustain the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term; b) accommodating an appropriate range and mix of residential, employment (including industrial, commercial and institutional uses), recreational and open spaces uses to meet long-term needs; c) avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns;

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
		<p>d) avoiding development and land use patterns that would prevent the efficient expansion of settlement areas in those areas which are adjacent or close to settlement areas;</p> <p>e) promoting cost-effective development standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs;</p> <p>f) improving accessibility for persons with disabilities and the elderly by removing and/or preventing land use barriers which restrict their full participation in society; and</p> <p>g) ensuring that necessary infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to meet current and projected needs.</p> <p>Section 1.1.1 in the approved PPS addresses Mississauga's previous comments.</p>
1.2.3(a) Land Requirements	Section 1.2.3 describing policies for land requirements and land use patterns requires clarification. It is difficult to provide sufficient land for projected growth since projected growth is a function of land supply. Also, it is difficult for a mature municipality such as Mississauga to identify a land supply for a 20-year planning horizon.	<p>This section has been deleted. The policy has been revised and relocated to Section 1.1.2.</p> <p>1.1.2 Sufficient land shall be made available through intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary,</p>

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
	<p>That land requirement and land use patterns be based on a Growth Management Strategy for both the Province and the Greater Toronto Area (GTA).</p>	<p>designated growth areas, to accommodate an appropriate range and mix of employment opportunities, housing and other land uses to meet projected needs for a time horizon of up to 20 years.</p> <p>However, where an alternate time period has been established for specific areas of the Province as a result of a provincial planning exercise or a provincial plan, that time frame may be used for municipalities within the area.</p> <p>The difficulty for a mature municipality such as Mississauga to identify a land supply for 20 years remains.</p>
1.2.3 (b) Densities	<p>That the phrase “and environmentally significant areas” be added after “vegetated areas” in subsection (v).</p>	<p>This section has been deleted.</p>
1.2.4 Separation of Major Facilities and Sensitive Land Uses	<p>This policy is not new. However, it is a difficult policy to implement at the local level when a potential conflict arises. The D-6 Guidelines of the Ministry of the Environment are difficult to work with, leaving uncertainty as to what studies are needed to address land use conflict issues with respect to noise, dust and odour. Dust and odour studies are difficult to scope with respect to their requirements for development review purposes.</p> <p>Clarification is required.</p>	<p>This section has been relocated to section 1.7 Long-Term Economic Prosperity. No changes have been made to this policy. The comments by Mississauga still apply.</p>

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
1.2.5 Development and Land Use Patterns	<p>That Section 1.2.5 be deleted and a new goal be added to the PPS to address avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns.</p> <p>If the policy is retained, the word “concerns” needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>This section has been relocated to Section 1.1 Managing and Directing Land Use to Achieve Efficient Development and Land Use Patterns.</p> <p>The word "concerns" was not clarified. The comment by Mississauga still applies.</p>
<p>1.3 Coordination Within and Between Municipalities</p> <p>1.3.1 Planning matters which cross municipal boundaries</p>	<p>Section 1.3.1 should be refined to eliminate duplication and reorganized to keep similar topics together. Mississauga endorses the need for a coordinated and integrated approach in dealing with planning matters which cross municipal boundaries. As mentioned, what is needed is a GTA-wide Growth Management Strategy administered by a GTA-wide Coordinating Agency or Board.</p>	<p>This section has been relocated to Section 1.2 Coordination.</p> <p>The Province released the "Draft Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe" on February 16, 2005 for comment. The Sub-Area Growth Strategies will address concerns for planning matters that cross municipal boundaries.</p>
1.3.3 Role of the Region (Upper Tier)	<p>Mississauga (Lower-Tier) should continue to be responsible for the identification of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority growth areas; • Population, housing and employment projections; • Intensification and redevelopment targets; • Minimum densities for transit corridors and other significant corridors and areas; and • Policies for matters that cross municipal boundaries. <p>The allocation of growth projections, identification of targets for intensification and redevelopment, the establishment of minimum densities and policy direction for cross border planning matters will provide the Region</p>	<p>Policy 1.3.3 has been relocated to Section 1.2.2 as follows:</p> <p>1.2.2 Where planning is conducted by an upper-tier municipality, the upper-tier municipality in consultation with lower-tier municipalities shall:</p> <p>a) identify, coordinate and allocate population, housing and employment projections for lower-tier municipalities. Allocations and projections by upper-tier</p>

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
	<p>with significant influence over local planning matters.</p> <p>That Policy 1.3.3 be deleted.</p> <p>These responsibilities should be addressed in the context of a Provincial Growth Management Strategy and the Provincial Policy Statement.</p>	<p>municipalities shall be based on and reflect provincial plans where these exist;</p> <p>b) identify areas where growth will be directed, including the identification of nodes and the corridors linking these nodes;</p> <p>c) identify targets for intensification and redevelopment within all or any of the lower-tier municipalities, including minimum targets that should be met before expansion of the boundaries of settlement areas is permitted in accordance with policy 1.1.3.9;</p> <p>d) where transit corridors exist or are to be developed, identify density targets for adjacent or in proximity to these corridors, including minimum targets that should be met before expansion of the boundaries of settlement areas is permitted in accordance with policy 1.1.3.9; and</p> <p>e) identify and provide policy direction for the lower-tier municipalities on matters that cross municipal boundaries.</p>

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
		<p>Mississauga's concerns that Section 1.3.3 in the Draft PPS will provide the Region with significant influence over local planning matters was not accepted. In fact, the role of the Region has been strengthened in Section 1.2.2 from "will" in the draft PPS to "shall" in the approved PPS.</p>
<p>1.4 Housing 1.4.1 Minimum Residential Land Inventories</p>	<p>That Section 1.4.1 be deleted.</p> <p>That if Section 1.4.1.b is retained it be amended by replacing "zoned" with "designated".</p>	<p>Section 1.4.1 has been modified as follows:</p> <p>To provide for an appropriate range of housing types and densities required to meet projected requirements of current and future residents of the regional market area identified in policy 1.4.3, planning authorities shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) maintain at all times the ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of 10 years through residential intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, lands which are designated and available for residential development; and b) maintain at all times where new development is to occur, land with servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a 3 year supply of residential units available through lands suitably

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
		<p>zoned to facilitate residential intensification and redevelopment, and land in draft approved and registered plans.</p> <p>Neither of Mississauga's comments were accepted. The comments by Mississauga still apply.</p>
<p>1.4.2 In meeting the land and unit supply requirements in policy 1.4.1, residential intensification and redevelopment will be considered first. Land in designated growth areas will be utilized only where residential intensification and redevelopment are not sufficient to meet the requirements</p>	<p>That Section 1.4.2 be amended to clarify that the development of available lands designated residential by area municipal plans, should not be dependent on identifying and meeting intensification targets in other parts of the municipality.</p>	<p>Section 1.4.2 has been deleted. This addresses Mississauga's previous comments.</p>
<p>1.4.3 Maintenance of land and unit supply/role of upper tier level of Government</p>	<p>The projection of population and units should be prepared on a GTA-wide basis and administered accordingly. This represents a true planning region, not a "political" region.</p>	<p>This policy has been retained, although Mississauga's previous comment was not accepted, it still applies.</p>
<p>1.4.4 Providing for a full range of housing types and densities</p>	<p>The requirement for a "full range of housing types" may provide justification for redesignating lands from high density to low density when the supply of land designated for detached and semi-detached dwellings is built out.</p>	<p>The reference to "full" has been replaced with "appropriate". This addresses Mississauga's previous comments.</p>

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
	<p>That the reference to “full” should be deleted or, alternately, it should be deleted or, alternatively, it should be clarified that this is not the basis for redesignating residential land.</p> <p>That the Provincial Policy Statement provide clarification of the use of the word “target” in Section 1.4.4(a).</p> <p>Part (d) refers to “establishing development standards for residential intensification, redevelopment and new residential development which minimize the cost of housing....”. This statement is contradictory that municipality is also to maintain a range and supply of housing. All new development should not be geared to lower costs.</p> <p>Clarification of what “development standards” refers to is needed.</p>	<p>The reference to "minimum targets" has been retained and no clarification given. Mississauga's comment was not accepted. Mississauga's previous comment still applies.</p> <p>This policy has been retained.</p> <p>Reference to "development standards" has been retained and no clarification has been given.</p> <p>Neither of Mississauga's previous comments were accepted. The comments by Mississauga still apply.</p>
<p>1.5 Infrastructure 1.5.7 Airports will be protected by from incompatible land uses and development</p>	<p>That the appropriate contour maps for planning purposes and the approval authority be identified.</p> <p>That Section 1.5.7.1(b) be revised to refer to “no negative cumulative impacts”.</p> <p>That Section 1.5.7.1 (b) be revised to refer to the social impact of aircraft noise on the occupants of the sensitive land uses</p>	<p>There is no reference to contour maps in the approved PPS.</p> <p>This section has been retained with no changes. However, a new section has been added as follows:</p> <p>1.6.7.1 Planning for land uses in the vicinity of airports shall be undertaken so that:</p>

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
	That the Provincial Policy Statement provide a definition of “infill” and “redevelopment” separate and distinct from the definition of “development”.	<p>a) the long-term operation and economic role of airports is protected; and</p> <p>b) airports and sensitive land uses are appropriately designed, buffered and/or separated from each other to prevent adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants.</p> <p>A definition for “redevelopment” has been included in the approved PPS. No definition for “infill” was included.</p>
1.6 Long Term Prosperity and Social Well-Being	That the policies in Section 1.6 be endorsed, especially subsection (c) referring to “maintaining a range and choice of available employment lands”. (Subject to recommendation in Section 1.6 (e)).	The heading of this section has changes from “Long-Term Prosperity and Social Well-Being” to “Long-Term Economic Prosperity”. The policies in this section have been retained This addresses Mississauga's previous comment.
<p>1.6 (e) Long Term Prosperity and Social Well-Being</p> <p>Providing for a full range of publicly-accessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, open space areas, trails and water-based resources</p>	<p>The term “full range” of publicly accessible built and natural settings for recreation is a concern and in some natural areas, it may be appropriate to restrict the public.</p> <p>Suggest that a qualifier, such as, subject to land, funding resources and sensitivity of the natural setting. Also, suggest that “woodlands” be added to the list as they contribute greatly to passive recreational opportunities.</p>	<p>Although Section 1.6.1.e of the Draft PPS has been deleted, in the new version, a new Section 1.5 Public Spaces, Parks and Open Space has been added.</p> <p>Mississauga’s previous comments were not accepted.</p>

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
2.0 Wise Use and Management of Resources		
<p>2.1 Natural Heritage 2.1.2 Natural Heritage Features and Areas 2.1.22 Development and site Alterations</p>	<p>The area where “development or site alteration will not be permitted within significant wetlands” has expanded northward and captures a larger area. This does not affect Mississauga as we have always been subject to the provisions of 2.1.2.2.</p> <p>Section 2.1.2.2 be endorsed.</p>	<p>This section has been retained. This addresses Mississauga's previous comment.</p>
<p>2.1.2.4 Fish Habitat</p>	<p>Section 2.1.2.4 dealing with fish habitat is new within the PPS. However, as a result of existing Federal and Provincial legislation, the protection of fish habitat has been on-going in conjunction with the local conservation authorities as a normal practice in the planning application review process.</p> <p>This is covered in Section 3.12.3.2.c of Mississauga Plan.</p> <p>Section 2.1.2.4 should be endorsed.</p>	<p>This section has been retained. This addresses Mississauga's previous comment.</p>
<p>2.1.2.5 Development and Site Alterations</p>	<p>There is concern with “no negative impacts” because any disturbance of a natural area could be considered an impact.</p> <p>There should be an opportunity to demonstrate that the proposed negative impact can be mitigated such that the function of the resource is maintained and enhanced.</p>	<p>Although this section has been revised, the intent has been maintained. Mississauga’s previous comment, although not accepted, still applies.</p>
<p>2.2 Water 2.2.1 (a) Watershed Planning</p>	<p>Section 2.2 Water is new. These policies are linked to many of the other provincial initiatives to protect water resources, including the “Watershed-Based Source</p>	<p>Although this section has been revised, the intent has been maintained. Mississauga’s previous comment, although not accepted,</p>

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
	<p>Protection White Paper”. Section 2.2.1 (a), of the PPS is proposing using the watershed as an ecologically meaningful scale for planning. We rely on the Conservation Authorities to provide a watershed perspective on planning matters.</p> <p>That Section 2.2.1 (a) be clarified as to whether or not the Province is anticipating a different jurisdictional approach to planning with the proposed policy.</p>	still applies.
<p>2.2 Water 2.2.2 Mitigation measures and/or alternative development approaches</p>	<p>That the second paragraph of Section 2.2.2 be deleted and relocated to the Implementation section.</p>	<p>This section has been retained. Mississauga’s previous comment, although not accepted, still applies.</p>
<p>2.5 Mineral Aggregates 2.5.2.3 Protection of Long Term Resource Supply</p>	<p>While this is a good practice, conservation of mineral aggregates resources through recovery of the resources is not necessarily a land use policy that can be implemented through a municipal official plan. However, this could lead to encouraging more asphalt plants such as the one in Dixie District at Loreland Drive which has considerable outside storage or raw asphalt and other materials awaiting recycling.</p> <p>That Section 2.5.2.3 be deleted..</p>	<p>This section has been retained. Mississauga’s previous comment, although not accepted, still applies.</p>
<p>2.5.3.1 Rehabilitation</p>	<p>This section requires that “Final rehabilitation will take surrounding land use approved land use designation into consideration”. This is a good policy in light of the Jannock hearing.</p> <p>That Section 2.5.3.1 be endorsed.</p>	<p>This section has been retained. This addresses Mississauga’s previous comment.</p>

Draft PPS	Previous Comments and/or Recommendations	Approved PPS
Definitions		
Minor Variance	<p>There is concern that a minor variance should not be considered a change to a Zoning By-law but an exception to a portion of the Zoning By-law. The definition proposed by the province would give the Committee of Adjustment power to change the by-law without a by-law amendment. If this is the intent, the criteria should be established for amending Zoning By-laws.</p> <p>That the definition of “minor variance” be clarified.</p>	<p>A definition of "minor variance" has not been added to the new PPS. Mississauga's previous comment, although not accepted, still applies.</p>
Significant Built Heritage and Conserved	<p>These definitions are unclear and leave no flexibility other than protection given its inclusive definition.</p> <p>Perhaps, the policy should be revised to state that the resource “should be conserved in an appropriate manner through removal and documentation or preservation on site”. The definition of “conserved” should be revised to “....mean the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage....”</p>	<p>Although this section has been revised, the intent has been maintained. Mississauga's previous comment, although not accepted, still applies.</p>

Provincial Policy Statement 2005: Comparison of Selected New Policies to Former Policies in Key Areas

This chart compares the former PPS policies to the new policies in key areas. The new policies shown in the right-hand column build upon the former policies – changes shown in the right hand column represent new policies which are in addition to the former policies.

The new PPS is issued under Section 3 of the Planning Act and is in effect March 1, 2005. It replaces the PPS issued May 22, 1996 and amended February 1, 1997.

Policy Areas	Former PPS Policies ("shall have regard to")	New PPS Policies ("shall be consistent with")
Revitalizing Brownfields / Intensification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide opportunities for intensification and redevelopment in areas with sufficient infrastructure, but this is not required prior to boundary expansions ▪ Brownfields not specifically recognized ▪ Contaminated lands viewed mainly as hazards to human health ▪ No targets for intensification / density <p>Current Situation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Many communities developed at low densities ➤ Brownfield sites, such as industrial lands, often remain unused <p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inefficient use of land within settlement areas linked to sprawl, inefficient travel patterns, gridlock, inefficient use of infrastructure and public service facilities ➤ Valuable potential of brownfields not recognized. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify brownfields as opportunities for redevelopment ▪ Intensification of existing built-up areas and brownfields development required prior to expanding into greenfield areas, including requirement for intensification targets ▪ Need to ensure that intensification targets are met prior to or at the same time as greenfield development ▪ Upper-tier municipality to set targets for intensification / minimum densities <p>Expected Results of New Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ More compact development and infill ➤ More brownfield sites expected to be redeveloped / remediated in our communities <p>Expected Benefits of New Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Increase in assessment to municipalities ➤ Saving of public tax dollars by making the best use of existing public investment in infrastructure like roads and schools ➤ Wiser use of our land and resources by making better use of undeveloped or underdeveloped lands ➤ Reduced need to expand onto farmland ➤ Reduced need to commute long distances
Employment Lands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Long-term (20-year) planning horizon to include sufficient land for industrial, commercial and other uses to promote employment opportunities ▪ Ensure adequate supply of land and opportunities to accommodate range/mix 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain diversified economic base and range and choice of employment lands ▪ Need to preserve planned employment areas for current and future use ▪ Remove land from planned employment areas only through comprehensive municipal review and if need is demonstrated

	<p>of industrial, commercial and other employment uses to meet long-term needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well-being of downtowns and mainstreets to be maintained <p>Current Situation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little direction provided for employment lands No specific policies guiding employment land conversions to other uses Employment lands were under increasing pressure in many municipalities for conversions to other uses, such as residential uses <p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversions of these lands threaten the long-term economic prosperity of communities by reducing the ability to accommodate future economic activities Employment areas are being pushed further from the heart of communities causing long commutes Growing imbalance between commercial and residential tax base occurring in some communities as fewer employment areas exist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support jobs / housing balance in communities <p>Expected Results of New Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment lands expected to be better planned and preserved for the long-term Expected decrease in number of conversions of employment lands due to more strict criteria <p>Expected Benefits of New Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better maintain diversified economic base Better preserve options for future economic activities Better opportunities to locate jobs within our communities Could assist municipalities by preserving employment lands as a long-term source of financial revenue for these communities
<p>Transit-Supportive Land Use Patterns</p>	<p>Support transit-supportive densities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support multi-modal transportation systems <p>Current Situation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only general support for public transit and other alternatives to the car 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote transit-supportive land use patterns including density / intensification targets Direct new development to areas well-served by transit Provide housing / jobs in close proximity to one another Focus land uses with high-travel demand (such as employment and commercial uses) along public transit corridors Link transportation and growth planning Upper-tiers to set minimum densities for transit corridors <p>Expected Results of New Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased density for new development in our communities, which

	<p>➤ Settlement patterns are often not transit-supportive.</p> <p>Concerns</p> <p>➤ Land use patterns are often insufficient to support frequent transit service</p> <p>➤ Traffic congestion / gridlock has increased</p> <p>➤ More time is spent commuting due to gridlock</p>	<p>➤ is expected to reduce congestion</p> <p>➤ Increased mix of housing and employment, which can reduce the need for travel</p> <p>Expected Benefits of New Policies</p> <p>➤ Higher densities support better / more frequent transit service</p> <p>➤ Increased economic benefits by facilitating the movement of people and goods and easing transportation congestion</p> <p>➤ Potentially cleaner air and a cleaner environment</p>
Air Quality / Energy	<p>▪ No policies on air quality</p> <p>▪ Support energy conservation</p>	<p>▪ Clearly recognized link between land use patterns and air quality/energy consumption</p> <p>▪ Promote transit-supportive land use patterns</p> <p>▪ Promote compact form and structure of nodes and corridors</p> <p>▪ Promote use of public transit and other alternative transportation modes</p> <p>▪ Provide housing / jobs in close proximity</p> <p>▪ Focus land uses with high-travel demand (such as employment and commercial uses) along public transit corridors</p> <p>▪ Promote increased energy supply through opportunities for energy generation facilities and promoting use of renewable and alternative energy systems</p> <p>▪ Promote development design / orientation which maximizes use of alternative / renewable energy (such as solar/wind energy) and promote using vegetation to help mitigate temperature extremes</p>
	<p>Current Situation</p> <p>➤ No policies relating to cleaner air</p> <p>➤ Little direction on how to achieve the goal of energy conservation</p> <p>Concerns</p> <p>➤ Air quality in Ontario has continued to deteriorate</p> <p>➤ Development and land use patterns that do not effectively support energy conservation are common</p>	<p>Expected Results of New Policies</p> <p>➤ Opportunities for cleaner air</p> <p>➤ Increased energy conservation</p> <p>➤ More opportunities for renewable / alternative energy</p> <p>Expected Benefits of New Policies</p> <p>➤ Cleaner air is linked to better human health</p> <p>➤ Increased energy conservation promotes a cleaner environment</p> <p>➤ Increased opportunities for renewable / alternative energy would lessen our dependence on fossil fuels</p> <p>➤ Greener communities that make for better places to live</p>