



[November 6, 2025]

The Honourable Rob Flack  
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing  
777 Bay Street, 17th Floor  
Toronto, ON M7A 2J3

**The Regional  
Municipality of  
Durham**  
Office of the Chief  
Administrative Officer

605 Rossland Rd. E.  
Level 5  
PO Box 623  
Whitby, ON L1N 6A3  
Canada

905-668-7711  
1-800-372-1102

[durham.ca](http://durham.ca)

**Elaine Baxter-Trahair**  
**B.M. Edu, MBA**  
Chief Administrative  
Officer

Dear Minister Flack:

**RE: Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 (Bill 60)**

---

The Regional Municipality of Durham shares the Province's goal of increasing housing supply, and we are committed to working together to find collaborative solutions to address housing affordability. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed legislation and have enclosed a comprehensive set of remarks prepared by Regional staff which will be recommended for endorsement at the Regional Council meeting on November 26, 2025.

Please find the attached comments from Regional staff in response to the Province's consultations on proposed changes under the *Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025* (Bill 60).

**Changes to the Development Charges Act – Key Messages**

- **Improving Transparency:** We welcome proposed changes to that strengthen clarity in Development Charge calculations, including the creation of a new service class for land acquisition and requirements to disclose Benefit to Existing (BTE) methodologies.
- **Land Acquisition:** Establishing land as its own service class will require municipalities to manage separate reserve funds, which may impact financial planning and cash flow.
- **Local Service Policies & DC Credits:** Staff support granting municipalities independence to define local service policies and discretion to merge service areas for DC credits. This flexibility will allow local solutions while continuing to advance growth-related infrastructure.

### **Changes related to the Planning Act – Key Messages**

- **Municipal Autonomy:** It is important to continue to allow the municipalities to determine the designation types, structure, schedules and length of official plans to allow for local planners to best respond to the needs of the community. Each municipality in the province has unique challenges, and planning documents should be allowed to reflect and react to local circumstances.
- **Development Standards:** Staff encourage the province to maintain broad-based standards within OPs, along with maintaining secondary plans and allowing for enhanced development standards. Removing these standards may lead to uncoordinated development, increased stakeholder conflicts, and significant infrastructure challenges (e.g., overload/underutilization of servicing infrastructure), which all extend development timelines.
- **Community Improvement Plans (CIP):** Staff welcome the proposed changes to the Planning Act allowing the Region to continue to administer the Regional Revitalization Program (RRP) to assist in funding lower-tier CIP projects to help support much needed housing and rental units throughout the Region.
- **Minister's Zoning Orders:** Staff recommend that any changes to the MZO process respect municipal oversight and allow for meaningful Indigenous engagement.
- **Streamlining Municipal Planning Processes:** Staff are supportive, in principle, of streamlining the tracking of planning data. For infrastructure and service planning purposes, the Region relies on standardization and consistency of data and have committed to working with the area municipalities to achieve standardization in Durham.

### **Changes related to the Municipal Act – Key Messages**

- **Municipal Service Corporations:** Municipalities should decide if a public utility model fits their unique context considering local costs, risks, efficiencies, and housing affordability. Future policy should be informed by practical lessons, such as those from Peel Region, to avoid unintended impacts.

### **Changes related to the Highway Traffic Act – Key Messages**

- **Balanced Transportation Planning:** Staff recommend that the Province reconsider the full prohibition on reducing vehicle lanes for new bicycle lanes, advocating for a case-by-case approval process and clear criteria to allow municipalities flexibility in

achieving climate, safety, and mobility goals while collaborating with the Province to advance active transportation infrastructure.

**Changes related to GO Station Funding Act and Transit-Oriented Communities Act – Key Messages**

- **Flexibility in Transit-Oriented Development and Funding:**  
Staff support legislative changes that enhance municipal flexibility in transit station funding and project reporting, while emphasizing the need for clear guidance on charge collection timing, advisory panel roles, and reporting responsibilities, especially within two-tier municipal frameworks, to ensure effective, locally responsive implementation.

Housing is the foundation of our communities. Delivering a strong supply of new homes requires well-aligned processes and a shared commitment to collaboration across many sectors. To support this growth, our communities must be thoughtfully planned, properly financed, and fully serviced, with impacts carefully managed.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss the recommendations outlined in this letter and the detailed comments provided in the attached documents, as we work together towards our shared goal of increasing housing supply across Ontario.

Sincerely,

*Elaine Baxter-Trahair*

Elaine Baxter-Trahair, Chief Administrative Officer

Attachment 1: Comments on 25-MMAH018 (Development Charges Act)

Attachment 2: Comments on 25-MTO0019 and 025-1071 (Highway Traffic Act)

Attachment 3: Comments on 025-1140 (Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act)

Attachment 4: Comments on 025-1098 (Municipal Act)

Attachment 5: Comments on 025-1097 (Planning Act)

Attachment 6: Comments on 025-1099 (Planning Act)

Attachment 7: Comments on 025-1035 (Building Transit Faster Act)

Attachment 8: Comments on 025-0900 and 025-0899 (Ontario Water Resources Act)

Attachment 9: Comments on 025-0872 (Environmental Protection Act)

Attachment 10: Comments on 025-1182 (GO Transit Stations Funding Act, Transit-Oriented Communities Act)

Attachment 11: Comments on 025-1100 (Planning Act)

Attachment 12: Comments on 025-1101 (Planning Act)

Attachment 13: Comments on 25-MMAH030 (Development Charges Act)

## Attachment 1 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (25-MMAH018)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60.

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought on November 26, 2025)
<p>25-MMAH018 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Changes to the Development Charges Act, 1997 to Enhance Standardization and Streamlining of the Development Charge (DC) Framework   regulatoryregistry.gov.on.ca</a></p>	<p><b>(1) Land acquisition costs for most DC-eligible services must be included in a new service class, exempt from historic service level limits, to better reflect their impact on development charges.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Staff support the proposed approach to enhance transparency by introducing a new land acquisition service class and removing historical level of service restrictions.</li><li>• While the 10-year forecast limitation will apply to most services, it does not apply to water, wastewater, stormwater, roads, transit and police services. Since these are primarily regional services, the overall impact on the Region is expected to be limited.</li><li>• Since land acquisition costs will become its own service class, municipalities will need to manage separate reserve funds for land costs, which could affect financial planning and cashflow.</li></ul>
<p>25-MMAH018 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Changes to the Development Charges Act, 1997 to Enhance Standardization and Streamlining of the Development Charge (DC) Framework   regulatoryregistry.gov.on.ca</a></p>	<p><b>(2) Municipalities must establish Local Service Policies (LSPs) for each Development Charges Act service partially provided as a local service to clarify cost eligibility and reduce development delays.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Staff support the proposal to require municipalities to establish Local Service Policies (LSPs) and support allowing municipalities to define what constitutes a local service.</li><li>• If a LSP removes certain projects, the DC Background Study and by-law would need to be amended. In cases where this amendment results in a lower DC rate, it is recommended that the simplified process for reducing charges under s. 19(3.1) of the <i>Development Charges Act (DCA)</i>, 1997 be applied.</li></ul>

<p>25-MMAH018 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Changes to the Development Charges Act, 1997 to Enhance Standardization and Streamlining of the Development Charge (DC) Framework   regulatoryregistry.gov.on.ca</a></p>	<p><b>(3) Municipalities must submit DC financial statements to council by June 30 and to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing by July 15 to improve transparency.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff support the proposed approach to enhance transparency by requiring timely submission of DC financial statements and related documents.</li> <li>• The Region already publishes the Treasurer’s Statements through a Council Information Package (CIP), and it is posted on the Region’s DC webpage (<a href="https://www.durham.ca/en/doing-business/development-charges.aspx#Annual-Treasurers-Statement">https://www.durham.ca/en/doing-business/development-charges.aspx#Annual-Treasurers-Statement</a>). We support the requirement provided that a publicly available information report continues to be recognized as the formal submission to Council to ensure flexibility in reporting requirements and avoid unnecessary administrative burdens while maintaining transparency.</li> </ul>
--	---

## Attachment 2 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (25-MTO0019 and 025-1071)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought on November 26, 2025)
<p data-bbox="86 378 716 443">25-MTO0019 and 025-1071 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p data-bbox="86 483 716 621"><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 - Modern Transportation - Prohibiting Vehicle Lane Reduction for New Bicycle Lanes   regulatoryregistry.gov.on.ca</a></p> <p data-bbox="86 662 716 800"><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 – Modern Transportation – Prohibiting Vehicle Lane Reduction for New Bicycle Lanes   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p data-bbox="716 378 1995 443"><b>(1) Amendments to the Highway Traffic Act (HTA) that would prohibit municipalities from reducing motor vehicle lanes when installing, implementing or marking new bicycle lanes.</b></p> <p data-bbox="716 483 934 516"><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="779 524 1995 1365" style="list-style-type: none"><li>As an upper-tier municipality, the proposed amendment has limited direct impact on the Region. Most of the cycling infrastructure on Regional roads is planned as part of road widening or reconstruction projects, which do not require reducing the number of marked lanes. There are also standalone cycling projects not tied to road widening or reconstruction that address gaps in the network, and these projects are not currently planned to reduce the number of marked lanes either. However, we are concerned that this policy direction would have broader implications for advancing active transportation and achieving broader provincial and municipal climate, safety and mobility goals. It also limits design alternatives for a future road widening or reconstruction project, as a conversion from a general purpose lane to a bicycle lane could be evaluated as a feasible alternative in a corridor study but would have to be precluded with this legislation in place.</li><li>While we acknowledge the intent to maintain efficient vehicle movement, a balanced approach is necessary. Municipalities should retain the ability to determine how best to allocate road space based on local needs, traffic conditions and long-term planning objectives.</li><li>We respectfully recommend that the Province reconsider Section 195.3 (1) as it places a full prohibition on installing bicycle lanes through a reduction in the number of marked lanes. Preferably, the Region would prefer this and related sections to be removed altogether, but if such as policy were to remain in principle, it should be revised to address the following considerations:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Maintain a case-by-case approval or exemption process under the Highway Traffic Act.</li><li>Provide clear criteria for when lane reductions may be permitted to support active transportation objectives.</li><li>Continue collaboration with municipalities to achieve both mobility efficiency and safety for all road users.</li></ul></li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The above alternative approaches would better support both the Region’s goals of advancing active and sustainable transportation infrastructure and achieving mode share targets, along with the Province’s stated goals of keeping people moving regardless of travel mode.</li> </ul>
<p>25-MTO0019 and 025-1071 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 - Modern Transportation - Prohibiting Vehicle Lane Reduction for New Bicycle Lanes   regulatoryregistry.gov.on.ca</a></p> <p><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 – Modern Transportation – Prohibiting Vehicle Lane Reduction for New Bicycle Lanes   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(2) Create regulation-making authorities to allow the Minister to prescribe additional prohibited activities and to provide exemptions from the prohibition.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term “[a]ny other prescribed purpose” is not defined in Section 193 (1).</li> <li>This could include activities such as converting general-purpose motor vehicle lanes to dedicated bus-only lanes, on-street parking, or High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes.</li> <li>The Durham Transportation Master Plan (TMP) and the Region’s Capital Budget Forecast have identified several corridors where road widening from 4/5 lanes to 6/7 lanes is identified for curbside HOV lanes. The Durham TMP also recommends that these HOV lanes could be converted to bus only lanes in future depending on future transit levels of service. These are allowed under this section.</li> <li>The proposed section, however, precludes the option for the Region to widen a road to have general purpose lanes initially, and then converting one of those lanes per direction to HOV or bus only lanes.</li> <li>Presumably, the proposed section also limits the potential for municipalities to convert a general purpose lane into on-street parking, which may be desirable within an Urban Growth Centre, Major Transit Station Area or other Strategic Growth Area. While the Region does not currently plan to add on-street parking on Regional roads, this section would preclude it to do so in future if deemed necessary.</li> <li>The Region would welcome participation in any working groups formed to determine what the “any other prescribed purpose” would entail for additional prohibited activities, as well as review potential exemptions from the prohibition.</li> </ul>
<p>25-MTO0019 and 025-1071 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 - Modern Transportation - Prohibiting Vehicle Lane</a></p>	<p><b>(3) Amendments would provide the Minister with greater discretion when determining municipal reimbursement for the existing bicycle lane review framework (related to requested information and support).</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p>



<p><a href="#">Reduction for New Bicycle Lanes   regulatoryregistry.gov.on.ca</a></p> <p><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 – Modern Transportation – Prohibiting Vehicle Lane Reduction for New Bicycle Lanes   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>
--	---

### Attachment 3 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (ERO 025-1140)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought on November 26, 2025)
<p data-bbox="86 363 716 435">ERO 025-1140 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p data-bbox="86 472 716 618"><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 – Supporting the Harmonization of Municipal Road Construction Standards   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p data-bbox="716 363 2003 435"><b>(1) Proposed amendments to the PTHIA, if passed, would allow the Minister to require technical, industry, and municipal input regarding standards and construction and design matters upon request.</b></p> <p data-bbox="716 472 2003 505"><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="716 505 2003 618" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="716 505 2003 618">• No comments.</li></ul>
<p data-bbox="86 618 716 690">ERO 025-1140 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p data-bbox="86 727 716 873"><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 – Supporting the Harmonization of Municipal Road Construction Standards   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p data-bbox="716 618 2003 760"><b>(2) Proposed amendments would also allow the Minister to make a regulation to govern contracts pertaining to road and bridge construction (including contracts between municipalities and third-party contractors), establish reporting requirements, and establish a process for requesting an exemption from a standard.</b></p> <p data-bbox="716 797 2003 829"><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="716 829 2003 901" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="716 829 2003 901">• No comments.</li></ul>

#### Attachment 4 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (ERO 025-1098)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought on November 26, 2025)
<p data-bbox="100 370 701 435">ERO 025-1098 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p data-bbox="100 477 701 685"><a href="#">Proposed amendments to the Municipal Act, 2001 to transfer jurisdiction over water and wastewater to the lower-tier municipalities in Peel Region and a standalone statute to authorize the establishment of water and wastewater public corporations   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p data-bbox="730 370 1988 470"><b>(1) Legislative amendments to the <i>Municipal Act, 2001</i> to transfer jurisdiction over water and wastewater to the lower-tier municipalities in Peel Region and the introduction of a new standalone statute to authorize the establishment of water and wastewater corporations</b></p> <p data-bbox="730 513 936 540"><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="779 548 1988 1040" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="779 548 1988 651">• Municipalities are best positioned to determine whether a public corporate utility model is appropriate for their unique circumstances. Decisions should consider local costs, risks, efficiencies, and household affordability rather than applying a uniform provincial approach.</li><li data-bbox="779 659 1988 761">• The province should use lessons learned from the changes in Peel Region to inform any future work. This approach ensures that regulatory changes are based on practical experience and data, minimizing unintended impacts.</li><li data-bbox="779 769 1988 902">• While corporate utility models may offer benefits in certain contexts, they can also introduce additional regulatory costs and risk higher household rates. Existing municipal and regional systems have already achieved significant efficiencies and accountability through local governance and public input processes.</li><li data-bbox="779 911 1988 1040">• While MSCs may enhance financial flexibility, especially for smaller municipalities, the benefits are likely more limited for large regional systems like Durham, which already achieve economies of scale, and include multi-regional partnerships which further increase broader system efficiencies.</li></ul>

## Attachment 5 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (ERO 025-1097)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought on November 26, 2025)
<p>ERO 025-1097 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Proposed Changes to the Planning Act (Schedule 10 of Bill 60 - the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025)   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(1) Minor Variances (As-of-right Variations from Performance Standards)</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As per our submission on Bill 17 (June 4, 2025), while the Region is not primarily responsible for reviewing or commenting on minor variances, the associated development may have the potential to impact Regional infrastructure.</li><li>• There may be instances where setback requirements are established based on recommendations from technical studies in order to accommodate the Region’s ability to plan for, provide, and assess the impacts to municipal water and wastewater servicing, Regional transportation networks, waste management, and/or source water protection.</li><li>• Therefore, the Region requests that minor variance applications that impact Regional infrastructure be exempt from the proposed as-of-right provisions.</li></ul>
<p>ERO 025-1097 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Proposed Changes to the Planning Act (Schedule 10 of Bill 60 - the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025)   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(2) Policy Statements and Minister’s Decisions</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As per the Region’s submission on Bill 17 (June 4, 2025), the rationale for allowing the Minister’s decisions to supersede provincial policy tests is to allow for a faster, more predictable approvals process for new housing development. This change could allow development in areas that are not currently available for housing development under provincial policy, such as certain environmental features and/or employment areas. It could also result in potential alterations to provincial policy around settlement area boundary expansions, delineated MTSA boundaries, etc.</li><li>• Regional staff are concerned that the potential to forego provincial policy direction would result in non-conforming land uses for area municipal official plans and could lead to a loss of local autonomy related to planning decisions, or a reduction in environmental or community impact safeguards as set out in provincial policy.</li><li>• This could impact growth forecasting and infrastructure planning efforts if sizable areas of land are added into settlement areas or approved for development without paying heed to long range infrastructure and land use planning based on forecast land needs.</li></ul>

<p>ERO 025-1097 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Proposed Changes to the Planning Act (Schedule 10 of Bill 60 - the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025)   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(1) Minister's Zoning Orders</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through Report #2020-P-30, which was a response to the November 25, 2020, Notice of Motion regarding Minister's Zoning Orders, the Region previously expressed concerns about how MZO's have been implemented and the lack of municipal oversight resulting from these provincial decisions.</li> <li>• These concerns include: conformity to provincial policy; effects on the surrounding area; the completion of technical studies; environmental impact of the development; and, the impact on Regional infrastructure.</li> <li>• It is imperative that any changes to the MZO process respect municipal oversight and allow for meaningful Indigenous engagement including, not limited to Duty to Consult taking into consideration of the potential impacts on municipalities and Indigenous communities and treaty rights of Indigenous communities.</li> </ul>
<p>ERO 025-1097 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Proposed Changes to the Planning Act (Schedule 10 of Bill 60 - the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025)   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(1) Protected Major Transit Station Areas (PMTSA)</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional staff are generally supportive and do not have any concerns with this proposed change.</li> </ul>
<p>ERO 025-1097 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Proposed Changes to the Planning Act (Schedule 10 of Bill 60 - the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025)   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(1) Community Improvement Plans (CIPs)</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since 2008, the Region of Durham has administered its Regional Revitalization Program (RRP), which is a partnership between the Region and participating area municipalities that aims to strategically target Regional investment towards key areas that advance the goals of achieving positive economic and community objectives and support development that would not otherwise proceed without municipal financial assistance.</li> <li>• Pursuant to Bill 23, upper-tier municipalities without planning responsibilities (such as Durham Region) no longer had the legislative authority under s. 28(7.2) of the Planning Act to provide</li> </ul>

	<p>grants and loans that assist in funding the programs of the lower-tier municipalities' CIPs. This appears to have been an unintended consequence of Bill 23.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Therefore, Regional staff welcome these proposed changes to resolve the above noted issue, which will allow the Region to continue to administer the RRP and help fund much needed housing and rental units throughout the Region.</li><li>• It is important that <a href="#">O. Reg. 550/06</a> continue to allow for upper-tier community improvement plans to deal with matters of regional interest such as transit corridors and active transportation networks.</li></ul>
--	---

## Attachment 6 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (ERO 025-1099)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought on November 26, 2025)
<p data-bbox="86 376 716 441">ERO 025-1099 October 23, 2025 – December 22, 2025 (60 days)</p> <p data-bbox="86 483 716 548"><a href="#">Consultation on simplifying and standardizing official plans   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p data-bbox="716 376 2007 409"><b>(1) Official Plan Structure and Contents</b></p> <p data-bbox="716 448 2007 513">What is your perspective on the changes being considered to simplify and standardize the structure and contents of official plans?</p> <p data-bbox="716 552 2007 584"><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="779 591 2007 1019" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As per the Region’s <a href="#">comments on Bill 17</a>, submitted on June 11 2025, while consistency and certainty in the development process are important, municipal interests differ across the province. This proposal will result in a loss of municipal autonomy and control related to specific development-related concerns.</li><li>• It is important to continue to allow municipalities to determine what designation, structure and studies may be necessary to allow for local planners to best respond to the needs of the community.</li><li>• In terms of specific changes to the proposed structure, the Natural Heritage/Water Resources should be a standalone chapter. By including this topic with Agriculture and Mineral Resources, as proposed, the importance of environmental protection/conservation is diluted.</li><li>• Lastly, the climate change and sustainability policies should be included within the ‘General Policies’ section because they are applicable to all other policy sections.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="716 1058 2007 1162"><b>What distinctions should be made between the content of upper and lower-tier official plans? What considerations should apply in municipalities where the upper-tier official plan acts as the lower-tier official plan?</b></p> <p data-bbox="716 1201 2007 1234"><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="779 1240 2007 1450" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Where lower-tier official plans (OPs) are in place, upper-tier OPs could be scoped to matters that are cross-jurisdictional, impacting multiple lower-tiers and/or neighbouring municipalities to the upper-tier municipality. For example, cross-jurisdictional matters of upper-tier interest would include, but not limited to:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Transportation networks, including Transit, TOD, and Regional ROW requirements;</li><li>○ Water and wastewater (sewage) servicing;</li></ul></li></ul>

- Growth modelling to support regional infrastructure and service planning, such as the above noted long-term transportation and water/wastewater needs;
- Assisted housing, where the upper-tier is the Service Manager under the Housing Services Act, 2011; and
- Broad-based regional systems planning, such as Natural Heritage and Agricultural Systems. This should include provincial systems planning, such as the Greenbelt Plan Area and Oak Ridges Moraine.

**What is your perspective on limiting development standards in official plans? To what extent should development standards be set out in official plans vs in zoning by-laws?**

**Staff Comments:**

- The hierarchical nature of OPs and zoning by-laws (ZBL) is a foundational concept in land use planning in Ontario. OPs should continue to provide development standards, where required to either conform to a provincial plan or policy, or where that standard applies across an OP designation or multiple designations, examples may include setbacks established within the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan; requirements for noise or vibration studies; etc.
- Maintaining broad-based standards within OPs and not transferring all development standards to the detailed level of the ZBL, will help maintain [or reduce] the amount of duplication that would be necessary within a zoning by-law.

**What is your perspective on the changes being considered regarding secondary plans and site-specific policies? Are there other ways to address these policies?**

**Staff Comments:**

- Secondary plans are used to coordinate multiple stakeholders within a plan area, align growth with infrastructure, and engage residents on the specifics of how their communities will change.
- Prohibiting the use of secondary plans could lead to uncoordinated development, increased stakeholder conflicts, and significant infrastructure challenges (e.g., overload/underutilization), which all extend development timelines.

**What is your perspective on the number and types of standardized schedules, overlays and data proposed to be required? Should any be removed, or are there any other schedules that could help improve official plans?**



**Staff Comments:**

- Additional information is needed on what is intended by an “Estimate of Market Need” in Schedule A1, including clarification on the format (i.e. data table, mapping, etc.). In general, market “need” may not represent a practical or achievable development scenario. As a result, this information is better suited to technical background study that help inform the OP’s policies.
- Schedule C3 should not be titled ‘human made hazards’, rather it should simply be aggregate resource mapping. Additionally, individual pits and quarries should not be included as these sites are licensed and surrendered faster than OP mapping can be updated. Alternatively, OP readers should be directed to the Ministry of Natural Resources' [Pits and Quarries Online](#) website for information about individual licenses.
- Schedule C4 should explicitly map prime agricultural areas, along with other elements of the agricultural system. It is important to protect prime agricultural areas separately from other uses considered as part of the agricultural system in order to maintain a productive land base for primary agricultural production and to discourage land uses that would sterilize prime agricultural lands.
- Schedule D1 should not be mapped within OPs. These are sensitive areas, and the data should be protected, not publicized. These areas could contain Indigenous cultural heritage places or objects, and are vulnerable to damage and theft.
- Some of the datasets required to build the environmental/water resources maps are vast and, if layered on a single map, are confusing to interpret. It is recommended that multiple maps be used to display this information.

**Other Staff Comments:**

- To support the province’s stated initiative of streamlining municipal application processes by leveraging platforms and municipal data tracking IT solutions to improve the efficiency of land use planning, efforts should include the digitization of the proposed standardized schedules, overlays and data to increase usability by a wide range of audiences.
- In relation to the proposed Chapter 4, as per the Region’s submission on changes to the Provincial Planning Statement (Report #2023-P-13), it is recommended that the province require that settlement area boundary expansions be permitted only at the time of a comprehensive official plan review or update, informed by a standardized methodology. Within a regional context, the implications of infrastructure and servicing on settlement area boundary expansions collectively, should rest with upper-tier municipalities as the jurisdiction responsible for the infrastructure and servicing, regardless of planning approval responsibility.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additionally, it is recommended that the province require municipalities to develop population and employment forecasts to a common 25 or 30-year time horizon based on a standard methodology provided by the province</li> </ul>
<p>ERO 025-1099 October 23, 2025 – December 22, 2025 (60 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Consultation on simplifying and standardizing official plans   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(2) Limiting the Length of Official Plans</b></p> <p><b>Discussion Questions:</b></p> <p><b>What is your perspective on the changes being considered to limit the length of official plans?</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language within the Provincial Planning Statement states that the policies of the PPS represent minimum standards. Planning authorities may go beyond these minimum standards to address matters of importance to a specific community. Municipalities should therefore be granted the flexibility to do just that without being constrained by page/word limits.</li> <li>Rather than broadly limiting the length of all OPs through page and word limits, if there are instances where the province can work collaboratively with a municipality to reduce the size or redundancy within its specific OP, that would be a preferable approach.</li> <li>Accessibility must remain a priority. Visual elements—such as maps, charts, and graphics—should not be excluded/reduced solely to limit page count, as they are essential for effectively conveying spatial and conceptual information to diverse audiences.</li> </ul> <p><b>Should there be different limits placed on different types of municipalities (e.g., based on population size)?</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Southern Ontario municipalities are regulated by a high volume of complex, overlapping provincial land use planning legislation, policy and plans, such as the PPS, Greenbelt Plan, ORMCP, Niagara Escarpment Plan, etc. These plans often take precedence over OPs, wherein the OPs need to reflect and conform to these provincial requirements. As a result, the OPs for these geographies are naturally going to be larger, more complex documents.</li> </ul> <p><b>Are there other approaches that could be used to limit the length of official plans?</b></p>

	<p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standardizing official plan chapters, as proposed in ERO 025-1099, may help to align official plan lengths across the province.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Official plans set out the long-term goals and policies for land use and growth in a municipality. They are intended to reflect both best practices in planning, as well as the community's collective vision for their community. A document of this scope, scale and importance should not be capped by relatively arbitrary page or word limitations. Furthermore, reduced length does not translate to a more efficient or effective guidance document.</li> </ul>
<p>ERO 025-1099 October 23, 2025 – December 22, 2025 (60 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Consultation on simplifying and standardizing official plans</a>   <a href="#">Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(3) Creating Permissive Land Use Designations</b></p> <p><b>Discussion Questions:</b></p> <p><b>What is your perspective on the changes being considered to standardize the number and type of land use designations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Staff Comments:</b> The proposed change to standardize the number and type of land use designation does not take into account the differences and complexities between municipalities in Ontario. By creating boilerplate designations, it reduces autonomy and the ability for municipalities to be responsive to the development needs in their community. For example, the flexibility needed to encourage growth in downtown Oshawa is vastly different than supporting more rural areas of Durham Region. Municipalities must be able to have the autonomy to create official plans that work for their communities in order to recognize local priorities while still supporting housing goals.</li> </ul> <p><b>Would standardized land use designations between upper-tier and lower-tier official plan improve clarity? Where are the opportunities to reduce duplication between the upper and lower-tier official plans in land use designations?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Staff Comments:</b> Prior to Bill 23, there was already substantial coordination and clarity between Durham's upper-tier and lower-tier official plans; the upper-tier official plan set broad land use permissions and overarching policies for a broad set of land uses (e.g. Community Areas, Employment Areas, Major Open Space), and these were implemented locally and refined into</li> </ul>

locally-appropriate, more specific designations such as Medium Density Residential, Mixed Use, Major Commercial, etc.

**Are there additional designations that would be required? Are there opportunities to streamline or further combine some of the proposed designations (e.g. Residential I and II, and Mixed Use I and II)?**

- No Comment

**Are there implications to making land use designations more streamlined and permissive?**

- **Staff Comments:** The Region supports efforts to streamline the approvals process in Ontario when it does not come at the expense of safeguarding against environmental and community impacts (as noted in Report #2025-CG-07 on May 28, 2025).
- **Staff Comments:** There will inevitably be local factors that require several site-specific restrictions and permissions. Therefore, it is important that municipalities retain the ability to control area-specific land use permissions based on local needs.

**Are there land use designation terminology or descriptions that would be easier to understand?**

- **Staff Comments:** If the intent is to standardize land uses within each designation, explicitly defining terms/uses will be required to support consistency in OP interpretation and implementation.

**Other Staff Comments:**

- Having separate official plans for each lower-tier municipality without a unified, overarching upper-tier official plan is bound to result in different policy directions and interpretations between adjacent municipalities.
- The “Agricultural Areas” designation should be changed to “Prime Agricultural Areas”. The basis for mapping in the rural area should be preservation of Prime Agricultural lands, and the relevant permissions associated with them. As such, the “Rural Areas” designation being established here should clarify that it is only available on lands not considered Prime Agriculture by provincial mapping.
- Based on the proposed changes, it is unclear where major recreational uses (e.g., golf courses) will be permitted.
- The Natural Heritage designation should be for the protection, restoration and enhancement of ecological features and functions. Permissions should not be expanded within this designation.

ERO 025-1099 October 23, 2025 – December 22, 2025 (60 days)

[Consultation on simplifying and standardizing official plans | Environmental Registry of Ontario](#)

#### **(4) Transitioning to a New Framework**

##### **Discussion Questions:**

**What is your perspective on the changes being considered to transition to a standardized official plan framework?**

##### **Staff Comments:**

- The land use planning system in Ontario has been in a near-constant state of flux for several years, largely a result of several omnibus bills, such as Bill 23, Bill 185, this Bill 60, etc., each proposing sweeping changes to the Planning Act.
- These changes create uncertainty and require municipalities to continually adapt their planning frameworks, often amid an OP review/update, zoning by-law consolidation, or other major initiative. As a result, both upper- and lower-tier municipalities are in a continuous cycle of pivoting their efforts and "catching up" to major legislative changes. This has resulted in the inability for local municipalities to focus efforts on zoning by-law updates.
- In the near term, these proposed changes would continue to perpetuate this cycle of changes; over the mid to longer term, there is little evidence that these changes would help alleviate or resolve this cycle.

**What is a realistic implementation timeline for your municipality to update its official plan to comply with a standardized framework (e.g., structure, land use designations, page/word limits), and why? Please consider staffing, council cycles, data/mapping updates, public engagement, and statutory review requirements in your response.**

##### **Staff Comments:**

- Pursuant to Bill 23, the Region of Durham no longer has the responsibility of preparing an official plan. However, given our recent experience with Envision Durham – the municipal comprehensive review of the former Regional OP, creating a new OP is a highly consultative, time- and resource-intensive undertaking.
- Furthermore, several of the Region's lower-tier municipalities are already in advanced stages of their respective OP Reviews, which include integrating Envision Durham and provincial conformity exercises (i.e. PPS 2024).
- While it's reasonable to assume that considerable amounts of the work completed to date could be incorporated into the proposed new framework – pivoting efforts, resources and re-engaging stakeholders and the public, as well as other matters such as educating councils and interested

	<p>parties on the changes being proposed, would most likely take the average municipality over two years to execute.</p> <p><b>How can the province best support municipalities in transitioning to a simplified and harmonized official plan framework?</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be helpful for the Province to provide guidance and recommendations for data modeling and workflows. Specifically, the Region of Durham would like clarification on the recommended naming conventions for field names, attributes and coded values.</li> </ul>
<p>ERO 025-1099 October 23, 2025 – December 22, 2025 (60 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Consultation on simplifying and standardizing official plans   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(5) Submission of Official Plans through Online Portal</b></p> <p><b>Discussion Questions:</b></p> <p><b>Do you support the move toward allowing submission of official plan information and documents through an online portal? Why or why not?</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional staff support the proposed transition towards an online portal.</li> <li>• Currently, submissions must be made in both hard copy and in digital form. The use of an online portal would expedite this process, reducing hard copy printing, delivery and longer-term storage costs.</li> </ul> <p><b>What benefits and/or risks do you foresee from transitioning to submission through an online portal?</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The primary benefits include speed, cost and ease of delivery.</li> <li>• There may be an opportunity to combine spatial information (i.e. Official Plan Schedules) into a combined land use mapping dashboard for greater collaboration between municipalities and other stakeholders.</li> <li>• There is a risk that, without a recommended approach to online portals and data continuity, bringing datasets together from multiple sources could have obstacles.</li> <li>• If there is an expectation of creating/submitting interactive web maps, then data sharing agreements and available resources (programs/staff) need to be considered.</li> </ul>

<p>October 23, 2025 – Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing – Technical Briefing – Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025</p>	<p><b>MMAH – Technical Briefing – Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As per The Region’s comments on Bill 17 (June 4, 2025), the Region is supportive, in principle, of streamlining the tracking of planning data. For infrastructure and service planning purposes, the Region relies on standardization and consistency of data and have committed to working with the area municipalities to achieve standardization in Durham.</li> <li>• However, relying on AI to conduct planning reviews may not be appropriate at this time. Development applications are complex in nature, and present unique challenges in relation to the underlying conditions. Achieving positive results in the development review process requires collaboration between a multitude of professionals and stakeholders, which cannot be achieved solely through the use of AI.</li> <li>• Standardized application data is currently being reported to the province by prescribed single-tier and lower-tier municipalities as per the Municipal Planning Data Reporting requirements under <a href="#">O. Reg. 73/23</a>. However, this data is also required by upper-tier municipalities to supplement development tracking for growth management and infrastructure planning purposes. The province should use this as a starting point for consulting with municipalities on ways to improve data coordination and standardization.</li> <li>• Standardizing development planning application requirements and supporting coordinated online application submission platforms may improve coordination, transparency, and efficiency, as well as reduce the amount of municipal staff time required for data entry; this, in turn, helps allow more time for quality control, analysis, and review of the merits of applications.</li> </ul>
---	--

## Attachment 7 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (ERO 025-1035)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought November 26, 2025)
<p>ERO 025-1035 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 – Amendments to the Building Transit Faster Act, 2020   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(1) Reducing notice periods for Obstruction Removal and Preview Inspections: The notice period for Obstruction Removal and Preview Inspections to third-party land owners will be reduced from 30 days to 15 days.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>
<p>ERO 025-1035 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 – Amendments to the Building Transit Faster Act, 2020   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(2) Expanding Corridor Control and Municipal Service and Right of Way Access: Parts II (Corridor Control) and V (Municipal Service and Right of Way Access) of the BTFA will apply not only to construction but also to operations and maintenance of transit projects.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>
<p>ERO 025-1035 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 – Amendments to the Building Transit Faster Act, 2020   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(3) Expanding the application of Municipal Service and Right of Way Access to other municipal infrastructure: The scope of municipal service and right of way access orders under Part V of the Act will be broadened to include “buildings, bridges, tunnels and life safety systems” which are required for project delivery.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>
<p>ERO 025-1035 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 – Amendments to the Building Transit Faster Act, 2020   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(4) Expanding Municipal Service and Right of Way Access to add relocation and alteration of, and connections to municipal services, right of way, and infrastructure: Currently Part V of the Act is limited to use, access to and modification of the same.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>



<p>ERO 025-1035 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 – Amendments to the Building Transit Faster Act, 2020   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(5) Providing the Minister the option to delegate its powers under Part V: The Minister will be able to delegate authority to issue municipal service and right of way access orders to Metrolinx, or an MTO official through regulation, upon such delegation conditions as the Minister deems appropriate and depending on the circumstances of the project.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ministry currently issues municipal service and right-of-way access orders, which require consultation with municipalities. If this authority is delegated, municipal input could be significantly reduced, raising concerns that local issues may not be adequately considered.</li> </ul>
--	---

## Attachment 8 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (ERO 025-0900 and 025-0899)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought November 26, 2025)
<p>ERO 025-0900 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Proposal to amend the Ontario Water Resources Act to enable the regulation of additional sewage systems under the Building Code to support construction of on-farm worker housing   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(1) Proposing amendments to the <i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i> to allow multiple Building Code sewage systems on a single agricultural property with on-farm housing for workers, up to a cumulative limit of 50,000 litres per day.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments.</li> </ul>
<p>ERO 025-0899 October 23, 2025 – December 7, 2025 (45 Days)</p> <p><a href="#">Policy proposal to regulate additional sewage systems under the Building Code to support construction of on-farm worker housing   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(2) Pre-Consultation: Possible criteria for additional sewage systems to be Building Code regulated</b></p> <p><b>Discussion Questions:</b></p> <p><b>1. Does the proposed 10 acre (4 hectare) circular clearance from sensitive features, including property lines, greenhouses, etc. strike a reasonable balance between enabling agricultural worker housing and protecting human health, the environment, and neighbouring property values?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. If warranted, for example to account for higher strength sewage or consistency with other land use planning processes, what would be a practical approach to further protecting human health, the environment, and neighbouring property values? Examples could include a hydrogeological assessment; expanding the size of the circular clearance areas from 10 acres to 40 acres for example; or reducing the size of additional individual sewage systems to 2,500 L/d each for example.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff Comment: A hydrogeological report would be a good approach but could be a timely and costly requirement and may impede the approvals which these changes are hoping to alleviate. A better approach would be to complete studies prior to updating the Ontario Building Code and establish a conservative measure (either land area or Daily Sewage Flow) that could be prescribed in the Code. This would also assist regulators to ensure there was a timely and consistent approach across the province.</li> </ul> <p><b>3. What maintenance requirements should the proposal consider?</b></p>

- Staff Comment: The OBC contains maintenance requirements for all sewage systems and requirements for sampling and more stringent maintenance requirements for advanced treatment systems/units. Perhaps requiring advanced treatment for these types of uses/volumes would be helpful to ensure regular maintenance is a requirement.

**4. What new or updated guidance could be beneficial towards implementation for applicants; principal authorities; and technical professionals?**

**Staff Comments:**

1. Clear descriptions to ensure a consistent approach to approving these types of applications across the province.
  - What constitutes a migrant farmhouse? Who determines this classification?
  - Are there certain designations a property must have to be subject to this change (e.g. Designated agricultural, currently participating in agricultural activities etc)
2. Guidelines that outline when this new part of the OBC is applicable and when the existing limit of 10000 litres/day on one lot is applicable and if there are limitations on future uses on the lot if this new section of the Code was used for approvals.

**Examples:**

- If there is an existing use (e.g. dwelling, farm store) does that negate the use of this new change for any migrant farm housing and the existing OBC/OWRA limits apply?
- How do regulators approach an application if there are two migrant farmhouses existing totalling >10 000 litres/day approved under proposed OBC requirements, and the property owner is now proposing another use (e.g. farm store)?

**5. What other measures could be taken to protect human health, the environment, and neighbouring property values?**

- No comments.

## Attachment 9 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (ERO 025-0872)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought November 26, 2025)
ERO 025-0872 October 23, 2025 – December 7, 2025 (45 days)  <a href="#">Streamlining environmental permissions for sewage works servicing on-farm worker housing   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a>	<b>(1) New regulation made under <i>the Environmental Protection Act</i></b>  <b>Staff Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No comments.</li></ul>
ERO 025-0872 October 23, 2025 – December 7, 2025 (45 days)  <a href="#">Streamlining environmental permissions for sewage works servicing on-farm worker housing   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a>	<b>(2) Proposed amendments to <i>Ontario Regulation 287/07</i> made under the <i>Clean Water Act, 2006</i></b>  <b>Staff Comments:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No comments.</li></ul>

## Attachment 10 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (ERO 025-1182)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought November 26, 2025)
<p>ERO 025-1182 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Proposed Changes to the GO Transit Station Funding Act, Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation Act and Transit-Oriented Communities Act (Schedule 4, 13 and 15 of Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025)   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(1) Proposed amendments to the <i>GO Transit Station Funding Act, 2023</i> to provide municipalities with greater flexibility in determining when Transit Station Charges are to be paid</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Region of Durham has formally expressed its intent to the province to establish a Transit Station Charge (TSC) by-law, enabled through the GO Transit Station Funding Act, 2023, as a funding tool to contribute towards four new stations along the GO Lakeshore East Extension to Bowmanville. Upon formal confirmation from the province, the Region will be embarking on a TSC Background Study to conduct the analysis and make recommendations on the charge.</li> <li>• The Region of Durham generally supports the proposed changes to align the GO Transit Station Funding Act, 2023 with the Development Charges Act, 1997, to allow for greater flexibility on the timing of the collection of the TSC, and will incorporate accordingly an analysis of charge collection and financial security in the Background Study.</li> <li>• The proposed Section 7.2 in the GO Transit Station Funding Act, 2023, provides that the TSC to be collected at occupancy would be determined at an earlier phase, such as site plan approval, zoning by-law amendment approval, or at building permit issuance. It is recommended that provisions similar to subsection 26.2(5)(a) and (b) of the Development Charges Act (DCA), 1997 apply to Section 7.2 of the GO Transit Station Funding Act, 2023 to align with the language in the DCA.</li> </ul>
<p>ERO 025-1182 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Proposed Changes to the GO Transit Station Funding Act, Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation Act and Transit-Oriented Communities Act (Schedule 4, 13 and 15 of Bill 60 -</a></p>	<p><b>(2) Proposed changes to the <i>Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation Act, 2002 (TWRCa)</i> to extend WT’s mandate from 2028 to 2035 with an option to extend up to an additional 5 years and make minor administrative amendments</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable.</li> </ul>

<a href="#">Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025)   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a>	
<p>ERO 025-1182 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Proposed Changes to the GO Transit Station Funding Act, Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation Act and Transit-Oriented Communities Act (Schedule 4, 13 and 15 of Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025)   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(3) Proposed amendments to the <i>Transit-Oriented Communities Act, 2020</i> to enable the establishment of a TOC Advisory Panel</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Region is generally supportive of the proposed changes to the Transit-Oriented Communities Act, 2020, to enable the establishment of a Transit-Oriented Communities (TOC) Advisory Panel for the purposes of dispute resolution. However, additional information is requested around the membership of the advisory panel, and clarity on the nature of the types of specific matters that the TOC Advisory Panel would address.</li> <li>• In the event that the Minister requires a landowner to enter into an agreement with the municipality to address any matters the Minister considers necessary for the appropriate development of the transit-oriented community land, further clarity is requested in the case of a two-tier municipal framework, whether either the upper- or lower-tier municipality, or both, are required to enter into such an agreement.</li> </ul>
<p>ERO 025-1182 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Proposed Changes to the GO Transit Station Funding Act, Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation Act and Transit-Oriented Communities Act (Schedule 4, 13 and 15 of Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025)   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p><b>(4) Proposed changes to the <i>Transit-Oriented Communities Act, 2020</i> to give the Minister of Infrastructure authority to require a senior municipal official to provide regular reporting to the Minister on the progress of TOC projects.</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Region of Durham generally supports the requirement for municipalities to designate a municipal officer to share information on the implementation of transit-oriented community projects within their jurisdiction. Further clarity is requested in the case of a two-tier municipal framework, on whether a municipal officer should be designated from either the upper- or lower-tier municipality, or both.</li> <li>• Additional clarity is also requested on the nature and type of information that will be required from municipalities as part of the regular reporting on the progress of TOC projects.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 11 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (ERO 025-1100)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought November 26, 2025)
<p data-bbox="86 370 716 435">025-1100 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p data-bbox="86 475 520 508"><a href="#">Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes</a></p>	<p data-bbox="716 370 1203 402"><b>(1) Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes</b></p> <p data-bbox="716 475 2007 581"><b>What are your thoughts on the benefits and/or risks associated with reducing or removing minimum lot size requirements in low-density urban residential areas to encourage gentle density, increase housing supply, broaden housing options and encourage home ownership?</b></p> <ul data-bbox="779 586 2007 683" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Staff Comment:</b> Reducing or removing minimum lot sizes may allow less expensive housing to be developed. This should help provide more affordable housing options, including microhomes/tiny homes.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="716 727 2007 760"><b>What are best practices observed in other jurisdictions that have introduced minimum lot size reforms?</b></p> <ul data-bbox="779 764 1003 797" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="716 841 2007 938"><b>Are there any circumstances where having established minimum lot sizes in municipal zoning by-laws for low-density urban residential parcels are absolutely necessary with respect to the provision of transportation, infrastructure, or upholding public health and safety?</b></p> <ul data-bbox="779 943 2007 1040" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Staff Comment:</b> Sufficient space may be required for emergency access to rear yards or accessory structures; however, this should not result in artificially inflated minimum frontage or setbacks if other means exist to access rear yards, such as laneways, walkways, or shared corridors, etc.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="716 1084 2007 1222"><b>Given the Ontario context and the government’s permissions for additional residential units, what do you suggest should be the smallest size urban residential lot in terms of lot area, frontage or depth (i.e. six metre frontage, 200 square metre area, etc.) What would be the opportunities and limitations? How would these standards work together?</b></p> <ul data-bbox="779 1227 1003 1260" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="716 1304 2007 1401"><b>What other zoning requirements or performance standards could be needed to support any reduction or removal of minimum lot size requirements on low-density urban residential parcels (i.e., additional residential units, multiplexes, parking requirements, lot coverage, height and density etc.)?</b></p> <ul data-bbox="779 1406 1812 1438" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Staff Comment:</b> Allowing up to four units as of right in residential neighbourhoods.</li> </ul>

## Attachment 12 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (ERO 025-1101)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought November 26, 2025)
<p data-bbox="86 365 716 430">025-1101 October 23, 2025 – November 22, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p data-bbox="86 479 716 576"><a href="#">Consultation on Enhanced Development Standards – Lot Level (outside of buildings)   Environmental Registry of Ontario</a></p>	<p data-bbox="716 365 2007 397"><b>(1) Use of enhanced development standards at the lot level (outside of buildings)</b></p> <p data-bbox="716 438 2007 544"><b>What is your interest in and/or experience with the implementation of enhanced development standards at the lot level (outside of buildings)? For example, are you a municipal staff member, homebuilder, planner, Indigenous representative, or member of the public?</b></p> <ul data-bbox="777 544 2007 657" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Staff Comment:</b> Durham Region staff work with local area municipalities who have green development standards (i.e. Whitby, Ajax, Pickering) that include lot level measures. As an upper-tier government, Durham does not have authority in this area.</li></ul> <p data-bbox="716 690 2007 755"><b>In your experience, are enhanced development standards applied consistently across municipalities? Please provide examples where possible.</b></p> <ul data-bbox="777 755 2007 909" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Staff Comment:</b> Enhanced development standards do vary in their criteria and approaches across the province.</li><li>• <b>Staff Comment:</b> Many enhanced development standards are modeled off best practices (i.e., Toronto Green Standard).</li></ul> <p data-bbox="716 941 2007 1015"><b>What types of standards, should municipalities be allowed to apply outside of buildings and how do these requirements maintain the health and safety of the site if at all?</b></p> <p data-bbox="716 1047 2007 1079"><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="777 1079 2007 1445" style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Green development standards are utilized by municipalities to reduce GHG emissions; manage demand on energy and water resources; improve water management; increase greenspace; and improve air quality. They also increase climate resilience; can lower utility costs for residents; create economic opportunities in the green building sector; reduce strain on infrastructure; and improve public health. Municipalities should have the autonomy to apply green development standards that support the implementation of policies and priorities set out within their OPs.</li><li>• Municipalities should be able to apply outdoor green development standards that reduce key climate risks in their jurisdiction (i.e. flood risk, heat stress, severe wind in Durham Region). Example standards include grading, landscaping/trees, downspout disconnection, waterproofing, permeable pavement. These standards improve housing durability and affordability, by reducing</li></ul>



	<p>costly future repairs that will be incurred by the homeowner and reduce overall burden on the municipal water infrastructure systems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bicycle parking, transit stops, and publicly-accessible spaces and pathways are important for strategic growth areas to support intensification of existing urban areas into complete communities where there may not be sufficient road width or publicly-owned land available to provide these amenities. It should be up to municipal planning staff to work with their communities and stakeholders to identify local needs and develop locally-appropriate strategies to fulfill those needs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Do you / your organization have information about the short- and long-term costs of enhanced development standards at the lot level?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Staff Comment:</b> The following tool helps provide more context on the costs of enhanced development standards, specifically around low impact development - Low Impact Development Life Cycle Costing Tool, Sustainable Technologies Evaluation Program (STEP) - <a href="https://sustainabletechnologies.ca/lid-lcct/">https://sustainabletechnologies.ca/lid-lcct/</a></li> </ul> <p><b>Do you have any additional comments or suggestions relating to site plan control or other related subjects?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Staff Comment:</b> The province could adopt or endorse a consistent set of low impact development standards based on best practice (e.g. the STEP manuals) that could be consistently used for tailored application across the province.</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are several well-known technical guides that provide consistent design, installation, and inspection guidance for outdoor low impact development that are well-used by municipalities and developers across the province. For example, Sustainable Technology Evaluation Program (STEP) has developed guides and training - <a href="https://sustainabletechnologies.ca/resource-library/water/">https://sustainabletechnologies.ca/resource-library/water/</a></li> <li>• The selection of outdoor measures used needs to be tailored to the local municipal and site context - they are not a one size fits all solution. Different standards will need to be applied in dense urban, suburban and rural settings, where there are different issues to manage (e.g. water quality, urban flooding, urban heat, lack of permeable surfaces, high ground water, etc.)</li> <li>• Green standards can support the implementation of energy efficiency measures that can help to reduce energy demand across the province.</li> </ul>
--	---

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Some green development standards include low-cost, passive design measures that could be easily integrated into regular practices while improving stormwater management, energy efficiency, and mitigating heat island effect (i.e. swales, cool roofs, trees for shading, etc.)</li></ul> |
|--|--|

### Attachment 13 – Region of Durham Submission on Bill 60 (25-MMAH030)

Summary and Comments in Support of the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 through Bill 60 (“An Act to amend various Acts and to enact the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025”)

ERO/RR Posting and Comment Period	Durham Region Staff Comments (Council endorsement to be sought November 26, 2025)
<p>25-MMAH030 October 24, 2025 – November 23, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Implementing Reforms to the Development Charges Framework   regulatoryregistry.gov.on.ca</a></p>	<p><b>(1) Merge water supply services and wastewater services for the purpose of DC credits</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Merging water supply and wastewater services for the purposes of DC credits could impact municipal cashflow by drawing from reserves allocated to other services. This reallocation could delay capital projects or increase financing costs if the Region needs to borrow funds to proceed with projects in areas where reserves were transferred to another area.</li> <li>To mitigate these risks, it is recommended that municipalities retain flexibility to determine whether service categories should be merged for DC credit purposes. Allowing this to remain as an optional decision ensures that municipalities can merge reserves while supporting growth-related infrastructure.</li> </ul>
<p>25-MMAH030 October 24, 2025 – November 23, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Implementing Reforms to the Development Charges Framework   regulatoryregistry.gov.on.ca</a></p>	<p><b>(2) Make benefit to existing allocations more transparent in DC Background Studies</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff support this proposed change, as providing clear descriptions of the methodology and assumptions for Benefit to Existing (BTE) allocations in DC Background Studies will improve transparency and help stakeholders better understand how costs are shared between new and existing development.</li> </ul>
<p>25-MMAH030 October 24, 2025 – November 23, 2025 (30 days)</p> <p><a href="#">Implementing Reforms to the Development Charges Framework   regulatoryregistry.gov.on.ca</a></p>	<p><b>(3) Details on land acquisition costs to be set out for each service in DC background studies</b></p> <p><b>Staff Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff support the proposed amendment to O. Reg 82/98 to enhance transparency in the DC Background Study and support the new service class for land acquisition costs.</li> <li>Since land acquisition costs will become its own service class, municipalities will need to manage separate reserve funds for land costs, which could affect financial planning and cashflow.</li> </ul>
<p>25-MMAH030 October 24, 2025 – November 23, 2025 (30 days)</p>	<p><b>(4) Make information in financial statements relating to DCs more transparent and easily accessible</b></p>

**Staff Comments:**

- **Identify the amount from each reserve fund that was committed to a project, but had not been spent, as of the end of the year;**
  - The Treasurer’s Statement currently requires reporting of the funding associated with a capital asset. This proposed change would introduce a spending element in the report and complicate the preparation and readability of the report, especially where the report is already detailing hundreds of active projects. Rather than present the commitments on a project-by-project basis, this information could be presented as part of the statement of continuity of the reserve funds on an aggregate basis. This presentation would then align the Treasurer’s Statement with the public sector accounting standards used in the audited financial statements of a municipality.
  
- **The amount of debt that had been issued for a project as of the end of the year; and**
  - It is not clear if this proposal is intended to apply to just debt to be repaid from development charges or all debt. Currently debt is already included in the “Other Financing” for a project in the Treasurer’s Statement, without distinguishing between the debt that is to be repaid from development charges and other sources. An annual schedule of debt issued and to be repaid from future development charges collected by DC type (e.g. Residential, Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional) may be a preferred approach.
  - There is a potential timing difference between project spending & debenture issuance – a municipality may choose to upfront debenture financing, issue debt on project completion, finance over multiple debt issues, or finance only a portion of the project from debentures. This timing difference could lead to situations where debt is listed under other financing with no other financing showing on the report.
  
- **Identify where in the DC background study the project’s capital costs were estimated. (This would not apply in circumstances where a municipality uses a unique identifier in both background studies and treasurer’s statements to identify each project.)**
  - Linking projects in the background study to those in the Treasurer’s statement through use of a unique identifier is a positive addition to the report. It should be recognized that multiple projects / phases may be undertaken to deliver the infrastructure anticipated in the background study, resulting in the same identifier being used multiple times and over multiple years for some items in the background study.