

Clarington

November 22, 2025

Ministry of Municipal Affairs
and Housing
Provincial Planning Branch
777 Bay Street, 13th Floor
Toronto ON M7A 2J3

By email: PlanningConsultation@ontario.ca

Re: Bill 60 - *the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025*) and Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes and Enhanced Development Standards – Lot Level (outside of buildings); Comments; Environmental Registry of Ontario Postings: [025-1097](#), [025-1182](#), [025-1182](#), [025-1100](#), and [025-1101](#)

File No: PLN 1.1.36

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed legislative changes introduced by *Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025* (Bill 60), and the consultation documents for Minimum Lot Sizes and Enhanced Development Standards.

Clarington staff supports the Province's efforts to facilitate increasing Ontario's housing supply and associated infrastructure in an environmentally, socially, and fiscally responsible way.

Staff also supports the proposed changes that would:

- Enable municipal councils to approve policies relating to the use of land, buildings or structures within PMTSAs. This would remove an additional layer of approval and speed up implementation in critical strategic growth areas; and
- Reinstate upper-tier municipalities' ability to adopt and implement CIPs, and to provide funding support for community development initiatives.

Staff does not support additional as-of-right variances to zoning by-laws or provincially standardized minimum lot sizes and zoning requirements. Staff has concerns about the cumulative impacts of as-of-right variances on the function of the neighbourhood and supportive infrastructure in the absence of a review process. These changes reduce municipalities' ability to establish minimum lot sizes that properly consider local context and service levels.

Staff requests the Province to maintain municipalities' use of available tools, such as site plan control, to implement development standards that align with strategic policy directions relating to energy conservation, air quality, and climate change that are also consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024.

For consideration, please find enclosed as **Attachment 1**: Draft staff comments on Bill 60 - *Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025* and consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes and Enhanced Development Standards.

The Corporation of the Municipality of Clarington, 40 Temperance Street, Bowmanville, ON L1C 3A6
1-800-563-1195 | Local: 905-623-3379 | info@clarington.net | www.clarington.net

Please note these draft comments are subject to Council's ratification at its upcoming meeting on December 15, 2025.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Lisa", is positioned below the closing. The signature is fluid and cursive.

For:

Lisa Backus, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Community Planning, Planning and Infrastructure Services

Attachment 1: DRAFT Staff Comments on Bill 60 - *Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025*, Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes, and Consultation on Enhanced Development Standards

						Comments on Bill 60
Item Number	ERO/ORR Number	Title of ERO/ORR Post	Section	Overview of Proposed Change	Staff Supports Change?	Staff Comments
1	025-1097	Changes to the Planning Act (Schedule 10)	3 Policy Statements	Currently, Minister's decisions (e.g. on official plans) are required to be consistent with the provincial planning statements and conform to provincial plans. New subsections 3(5.1) and 3(5.2) provide greater authority to the Minister to make other planning decisions to advance provincial priorities without being required to be consistent with provincial planning statements or provincial plans, similar to the flexibility previously granted to Minister's Zoning Orders (MZOs). It is noted this would not apply to lands within the Greenbelt Plan Area.	No	The Province is requested to provide additional information as to the types of circumstances in which this type of decision might occur.
2			16 Contents of Official Plan – Protected Major Transit Station Areas	Currently, official plan policies or amendments affecting Protected Major Transit Station Areas (PMTSAs) must be approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and are not subject to appeal. A new subsection 16(18.1) would remove the requirement for Ministry approval of official plan policies or amendments to policies that identify the authorized uses of land, buildings or structures in the PMTSA, provided residential uses would be authorized on all of the lands within the PMTSA that are subject to the amendment. It is noted decisions of Council are subject to appeal, whereas decisions by the Minister are not. Amendments to PMTSA policies related to the people and jobs per hectare minimum target, and minimum densities would continue to be subject to approval by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.	Yes	Staff generally supports the proposed change to enable Council to approve policies or amendments to policies relating to the use of lands within PMTSAs. This would remove an additional layer of approval and speed up implementation of in these critical strategic growth areas.
3			28 Community Improvement Plans	Currently, only prescribed upper-tier municipalities can establish Community Improvement Plans (CIPs), and upper tier municipalities that lost planning responsibilities, such as Durham Region, are no longer able to establish, implement, or continue to provide funding support to lower-tier CIPs. New subsections 28(2.1) and 28(14) would enable any upper-tier municipality to adopt a CIP would and restore previously existing CIPs of upper-tier municipalities that lost planning responsibilities, such as Durham Region.	Yes	Staff supports the reinstatement of upper-tier municipalities' ability to adopt and implement CIPs and welcomes the opportunity to work with the Region of Durham in this capacity to support CIP programs and funding towards community development initiatives in Clarington.
4			34 Zoning By-laws (Minimum and Maximum Standards)	Recently, the Protect Ontario by Building Faster and Smarter Act, 2025 (Bill 17) amended the Planning Act to allow as-of-right variances to minimum setback requirements within a prescribed percentage range (e.g. 10 percent) on urban residential lands. Currently, this as-of right variance only applies to setback requirements. Bill 60 proposes new subsections 34(1.3.1), (1.3.2) and (1.3.3) and that would enable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing authority to enact regulations to allow additional variances from minimum and maximum zoning provisions to be	No	Staff does not support additional as-of-right variances to zoning by-law requirements and has concerns about the cumulative impacts of permitting variances from neighbourhood specific development standards without a review process to consider context. Municipal zoning standards are established based on technical requirements and local characteristics, and levels of servicing. Each standard interacts with others to

						Comments on Bill 60
Item Number	ERO/ARR Number	Title of ERO/ARR Post	Section	Overview of Proposed Change	Staff Supports Change?	Staff Comments
				permitted as-of-right, in accordance with prescribed performance standards (e.g. height) on specified lands (e.g. urban residential lands).		<p>create a functional building lot. For example, lot coverage and hard surface considerations for stormwater management, and minimum functional space between walls of buildings on neighbouring properties (drainage, rear yard access etc.). Under the minor variance process, these area- or parcel-specific considerations are assessed to determine whether the requested variance is appropriate in that context.</p> <p>The Province is requested to pause on enacting regulations to allow as-right-variances from additional zoning standards until municipalities have an opportunity to work collaboratively with the Province to monitor local impacts of the previous amendment to allow as-of-right variances from minimum setbacks.</p>
5	025-1182	Proposed Changes to the GO Transit Station Funding Act, (Schedule 4)		<p>Bill 60 proposes 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. Under the proposed changes, municipalities may choose to collect the charge either at the time of permit issuance or at building occupancy for new residential developments near future GO Transit stations.</p> <p>These changes are consistent with recent amendments to the Development Charges Act, 1997 introduced through Bill 17, which similarly provide flexibility in the timing of development charge payments.</p>	Neutral	Staff does not object to a change that would provide municipalities flexibility to determine the optimal time for the transit station charge to be paid based upon local context.
6	25-MMAH018	Changes to the Development Charges Act, 1997 to Enhance Standardization and Streamlining of the Development Charge (DC) Framework		<p>The proposed changes will increase transparency for the land costs associated with the DC rate and capital projects. This will be addressed through removing land from existing service area to a land specific service area, with no historical service level but limited to the needs in the next ten years.</p> <p>Local service policies, not currently a requirement, will be a requirement to ensure transparency on what is or is not a DC-eligible project.</p> <p>A proposal to require municipalities to provide the annual treasurer statements to Council by June 30 each year and to the Minister no later than July 15. Further, a proposed requirement to provide a</p>	Yes	<p>Transparency of putting land costs into a separate service category will reduce questions from stakeholders. By not restricting land to the service history, it reflects the fact that land values increase over time and needs in the next ten years may exceed historical spends.</p> <p>Local service policies are already a part of Clarington's DC process.</p> <p>The Municipality provides the Treasurer statement already prior to June 30, and the added requirement to provide copies to the Minister within the timeframes are manageable.</p>

						Comments on Bill 60
Item Number	ERO/ARR Number	Title of ERO/ARR Post	Section	Overview of Proposed Change	Staff Supports Change?	Staff Comments
				copy of the DC background study and by-law to the Minister on request.		
7	25-MMAH030	Implementing Reforms to the Development Charges Framework		<p>Proposal would merge water supply services and wastewater services for the purpose of DC credits.</p> <p>Proposal to make benefit to existing allocations more transparent in DC background studies. The proposal would require the DC background studies to include descriptions of the methodology used for benefit to existing calculations including assumptions.</p> <p>Proposal to require land costs to be in a new service class, see item 10.</p> <p>Proposal to make financial statements relating to DCs more transparent and easily accessible. This would include a requirement to identify the amount from each reserve fund that was committed to a project, but not yet spent, at the end of each year; the amount of debt that had been issued for a project; and identify where in the background study the capital costs were estimated.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Changes to water and wastewater service DCs are not applicable for the Municipality.</p> <p>Staff do not have an issue with providing the methodology. This provide stakeholders with additional information and provide for clarity on cost drivers.</p> <p>See comments for #10 above</p> <p>While this may require additional work in reporting, the process is already undertaken as part of annual reconciliations. Staff support changes that provide additional clarity and transparency which will reduce misinformation or concerns from stakeholders on the use of DC funds for growth purposes.</p>

Staff Comments on Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes

						Comments on Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes
Item Number	ERO/ARR Number	Title of ERO/ARR Post	Section	Overview of Proposed Change	Staff Supports Change?	Staff Comments
1	025-1100	Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes		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?	No	Staff does not support reducing or removing minimum lot sizes or imposing standardized reductions to minimum lot size requirements in low density urban residential areas. Each municipality and neighbourhoods within urban areas have different characteristics and are equipped with varying levels of infrastructure, services, and amenities (stormwater management, transit service, nearby parkland etc.) that are considered when establishing minimum lot sizes and determining what needs to be accommodated on each urban residential lot. For example, smaller urban communities that are not serviced by transit, or in close proximity to parks or would require space for parking and private amenity area as part of each lot, whereas a more urbanized city may not. A one size fits all lot size minimum across Ontario does not recognize the differences in service levels

						Comments on Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes
Item Number	ERO/ORR Number	Title of ERO/ORR Post	Section	Overview of Proposed Change	Staff Supports Change?	Staff Comments
						<p>across municipalities, communities, and neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Municipalities should maintain autonomy to implement appropriate minimum lot sizes based on local context to ensure proper function of the site and neighbourhood.</p>
2				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?	No	<p>In older neighbourhoods where servicing and stormwater management infrastructure may not be present or sufficient to support widespread changes to density, pervious surface, or drainage patterns.</p> <p>In areas that are not sufficiently serviced with efficient local and regional transit, thereby making it necessary to provide sufficient area on each lot for vehicle parking. It is also noted minimum lot and frontage requirements can help manage on street parking by maintaining sufficient distances between driveways to accommodate vehicles parking on streets where neighbourhoods have experienced gentle intensification through additional residential units.</p> <p>In areas that are subject to conservation under the Ontario Heritage Act, particularly where the lot fabric is identified as an attribute that contributes to the cultural heritage value or interest of the heritage resource.</p>
3				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 metres area, etc.) What would be the opportunities and limitations? How would these standards work together?	No	<p>The smallest sized urban residential lot, as specified by lot area, frontage, or depth depends on the municipality's individual context (e.g. presence of natural heritage features, grades, level of servicing), and permitted built form. In order to ensure proper lot function, an urban residential lot for a single detached dwelling with an additional residential unit in the basement, and a residential unit in an accessory structure would require a different minimum lot area and frontage than a lot for a townhouse unit with or without an additional residential unit.</p> <p>Municipal zoning standards are established based on technical requirements, local characteristics, and levels of servicing. Each minimum standard interacts with others to create a functional building lot. A one size fits</p>

						Comments on Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes
Item Number	ERO/ORR Number	Title of ERO/ORR Post	Section	Overview of Proposed Change	Staff Supports Change?	Staff Comments
4				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.)?		all approach will make it challenging for municipalities to maintain proper lot and neighbourhood function. Zoning standards including lot coverage maximums, opens space minimums, minimum setback requirements, parking requirements, height, among others, would be required to enable municipalities to ensure lots continue to be developed in a way that will function properly and appropriately both in the context of the lot itself, and the surrounding neighbourhood.

Draft Staff Comments on Consultation on Enhanced Development Standards

						Comments on Consultation on Enhanced Development Standards
Item Number	ERO/ORR Number	Title of ERO/ORR Post	Section	Overview of Proposed Change	Staff Supports Change?	Staff Comments
1				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?	N/A	Comments have been prepared by municipal planning staff.
2				In your experience, are enhanced development standards applied consistently across municipalities? Please provide examples where possible.	N/A	Enhanced development standards are not necessarily applied consistently across Ontario. However, each municipality uses development standards, and site plan control, as appropriate, to implement strategic policy directions, such as those relating to energy conservation, air quality, and climate change that are also consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024.
3				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?	N/A	Standards relating to accessibility, climate resiliency and sustainability, improving visibility and public safety within neighbourhoods, and low impact development measures that reduce strain on or complement conventional infrastructure should be among the types of standards municipalities are able to consider outside of buildings.