



Report to: Development Services Committee Meeting Date: December 9, 2025

SUBJECT: Comments on Bill 60 – Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025

PREPARED BY: Jessie Huang, Senior Planner, Policy and Research (ext. 3286)

REVIEWED BY: Duran Wedderburn, Manager, Policy and Research (ext. 2109)
John Yeh, Senior Manager, Policy and Research (ext. 7922)

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1) That the report dated December 9, 2025 entitled “Comments on Bill 60 – Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025” be received;

Amendments to the Planning Act

- 2) That Council not support the change granting the Minister authority to set prescribed percentages, permitting as-of-right variances;
- 3) That the Province add a provision to prohibit as-of-right variances in zones designated for environmental protection and natural hazards;
- 4) That the Province consider authorization of as-of-right variances to be granted at the municipal-staff level for detailed technical review prior to the approval of the minor variance;
- 5) That Council not support the change that would allow the Minister to override key policy direction outlined in the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024
- 6) That Council recommend for municipalities to be granted a formal opportunity to consult with the Minister on Minister’s Zoning Order agreements;
- 7) That Council requests the Province to consider implementing a mediation conflict resolution process to resolve disagreements prior to the Minister referring to the Ontario Land Tribunal;
- 8) That Council not support the requirement for Ministerial approval of official plan amendments that permit residential uses on all lands within Protected Major Transit Station Areas be removed;
- 9) That Council support the expansion of Community Improvement Plans to include all upper-tier municipalities;

Consultation on simplifying and standardizing official plans

- 10) That Council not support the proposal to standardize and simplify official plans across the province;
- 11) That the Province continue to allow secondary plans and site-specific policies as part of official plans;
- 12) That the Province issue supporting regulation to operationalize conditional zoning under the Planning Act.
- 13) That the Province undertake further consultation with municipalities on the proposal to streamline Official Plans;
- 14) That if implemented, the Province add “Urban Design” as a key policy heading to the proposed standard chapters for official plans;
- 15) That if implemented, the Province will provide municipalities with clear direction on how to proceed with these initiatives and clarify whether any previous Provincial directives on development standards would be withdrawn;
- 16) That the Province undertake further consultation with municipalities on the proposed standardized designations, to further refine the criteria for each designation;
- 17) That the Province provide timely guidance materials to municipalities on the implementation/transition process;
- 18) That Council support the change to submit official plan information and documents be moved to an online portal;

Harmonization of road construction standards

- 19) That the Province provide additional funding to municipalities if harmonized construction standards result in higher costs compared to current municipal standards
- 20) That the Province further consult and/or collaborate with municipalities in establishing contracts between municipalities and third-party contractors that does not conflict with local municipal authority and decision-making;
- 21) That the Province provide clarity on if the Minister would be allowed to make a regulation to govern contracts pertaining to road and bridge construction beyond the technical aspects;
- 22) That the Province conduct training sessions for municipal staff or provide municipalities with extra funding for training for municipal staff, regarding the new standards and protocols;
- 23) That Council not support change to allow Provincial involvement in a municipality’s decision-making to need an exemption from a standard;
- 24) That the Province alternatively considers implementing a yearly audit to ensure municipal compliance with harmonized standards, investigating logged exemptions;
- 25) That the Province further consult and work closely with municipalities to establish a process of requesting an exemption to ensure timely approvals;

Amendments to the Highway Traffic Act (Bill 60, Schedule 5)

- 26) That the Province consult with municipalities and other stakeholders on what “any other prescribed purpose” entails and scenarios in which an exemption from this change may be necessary;
- 27) That the Province further consult and/or collaborate with municipalities to develop criteria for when vehicle traffic lanes can or cannot be reduced to ensure road safety measures are adhered to;

Consultation on Enhanced Development Standards- Lot Level (outside of buildings)

- 28) That Council not support the change to limit or remove the requirement to meet enhanced development standards;
- 29) That the Province provide guidance in consultation with municipalities to promote consistency across municipalities rather than removing enhanced development standards;
- 30) That the Province alternatively provide a clear definition for “enhanced development standards” for municipalities to align their respective plans, policies and guideline accordingly;

Consultation Minimum Lot Sizes

- 31) That Council not support the reduction or removal of minimum lot size requirements;
- 32) That the Province alternatively consider standardized zoning options and definitions that municipalities can adopt without being subject to appeal;

Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025

- 33) That Council does not support the implementation of a new legislative framework to authorize the establishment of water and wastewater public corporations;
- 34) That if implemented, the Province establish clear governance frameworks ensuring municipal participation and ratepayer oversight in water and wastewater public corporation decision making;
- 35) That if implemented, the Province add explicit ratepayer affordability protections for low-and-moderate income households, local oversight mechanisms, and safeguards to prevent excessive or sudden rate increases;
- 36) That the Province further consult with municipalities to ensure financial neutrality between water and wastewater public corporation -served and non- water and wastewater public corporation serviced municipalities.
- 37) That the Province add a provision for water and wastewater public corporation investment plans be mandated to integrate with municipal and

-
- regional master plans, to ensure aligned priorities between growth planning and infrastructure delivery;
- 38) That the Province include an additional provision be added to require joint servicing investment frameworks reviewed by municipalities and the Province;
- 39) That the Province include a provision in the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act to define accountability in relation to infrastructure delivery when rate revenues are insufficient;
- 40) That Council not support the proposal that would allow the Minister to use broad discretion to approve, reject or modify water and wastewater public corporation rate plans;
- 41) That the Province establish independent oversight or audit mechanisms to prevent infrastructure deferral, ensure proper maintenance, infrastructure replacement or fiscal responsibilities of water and wastewater public corporations;
- 42) That if implemented, the Province will ensure that funding for growth-related water and wastewater infrastructure to avoid placing undue financial burden on existing ratepayers;
- 43) That if implemented, the Province include provisions to protect high-performing municipalities from being required to subsidize underperforming municipalities or share debt and reserves in a manner that penalizes fiscal prudence and operational efficiency;

Amendments to the Development Charges Act, 1997

- 44) That the Province provide more clarity to municipalities on how development charges recovery under the new land service category will operate;
- 45) That Council support the introduction of mandatory local service policies;
- 46) That Council support the provision of the background study and by-laws to be submitted to the Minister upon request;
- 47) That the Province should preserve municipal flexibility to allocate projects based on service categories rather than requiring project-specific allocations;
- 48) That this report be forwarded to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Ministry of Transportation, as the City of Markham comments on Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 and the associated Registry Postings; and
- 49) That Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.

PURPOSE:

This report provides an assessment of impacts to the City of Markham arising

from Bill 60, Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 and the associated ERO posts and Staff comments and recommendations to the Province.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed amendments in the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 (Bill 60) and associated Environmental Registry of Ontario/ Ontario Regulatory Registry postings will have significant impact on municipal finance, infrastructure and servicing delivery, and the planning and development approval framework. Based on the assessment by City staff, the potential impacts of Bill 60 include, but are not limited to:

- Removing a layer of ministerial oversight for residential use policy amendments in Protected Major Transit Station Areas which risks an increase in official plan amendment appeals;
- Greater flexibility given to the Minister in deciding planning matters for lands outside of Minister Zoning Orders;
- An absence of design excellence and quality within the public realm, if the Province sets parameters for official plans; and
- Compromised secondary-plan related work, including implementation of community planning objectives and infrastructure planning, invalidating earlier efforts and adversely affecting project timelines and resource planning of recently completed and existing secondary plan projects.

Overall, staff are recommending that Council not support the majority of the proposed changes, with some exceptions related to proposed changes to the *Planning Act* and *Development Charges Act*. The Province has provided 30 days for the review of the proposed legislative changes. Staff recommend that the Province engage in further consultation with municipalities and explore alternative approaches to achieve Bill 60's objectives of streamlining the construction of new homes and infrastructure, alleviating gridlock, and improving community safety.

To meet the provincial public commenting deadline, City staff prepared and submitted detailed comments on Bill 60 and related regulatory and policy proposals (Appendix A) to the provincial government on November 21, 2025. Staff will submit any supplementary information to the relevant Ministries, including any resolutions from Development Services Committee.

BACKGROUND:

On October 23, 2025, the province introduced [Bill 60, Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act](#), an omnibus bill that amends 15 separate statutes and introduces 1 new legislative framework, all of which are intended to streamline the construction of new homes and infrastructure (e.g., water, wastewater, roads, transit), reduce gridlock, and enhance community safety.

Bill 60 is comprised of more than 40 initiatives which according to the province are intended to create the conditions for accelerated development of housing and transportation infrastructure and cut red tape under three major themes:

- 1) **Building Homes and Communities**, which focuses on streamlining approval processes and implementing tools to accelerate housing development.
- 2) **Fighting Delays at the Landlord and Tenant Board (LTB)**, which focuses on implementing changes to resolve LTB cases faster and encourage increased supply of rental housing.
- 3) **Keeping People Moving**, which proposes implementing changes to build roads faster, fight gridlock, keep traffic moving, and improving road safety.

The Bill impacts key legislation including but not limited to:

- Planning Act (to be amended)
- Development Charges Act, 1997 (to be amended)
- Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act (to be amended)
- Highway Traffic Act (to be amended)
- Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act (new legislative framework)

As part of its Bill 60 announcement, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing also released a [Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 Technical Briefing](#) which describes the proposed legislative, as well as related actions that do not require legislative change.

The Province undertook consultation on Bill 60 and other measures, posting 12 items on the Environmental Registry of Ontario (ERO). Of the 12 items, 10 had a commenting deadline of November 22, 2025 and 2 had a commenting deadline of December 7, 2025. 1 additional item was posted on the Ontario Regulatory Registry (ORR) with a commenting deadline of November 23, 2025.

At the time of this report, Bill 60 has been ordered for third reading in the Ontario legislature.

DISCUSSION:

The following discussion on the proposed changes introduced through Bill 60 is organized based on the impacts of specific acts or proposals of direct interest to the City of Markham.

Amendments to the Planning Act

Schedule 10 of Bill 60 amends the Planning Act, with the intention to streamline the construction of new homes and infrastructure. If passed, the proposed legislative amendments would make changes to address the following matters:

Minor Variances (As-of-right Variations from Performance Standards)

As-of-right variances will be permitted up to a percentage (not yet determined by the Minister) of existing zoning standards, minimizing the need for minor variance applications.

Recommendation: That Council not support the change granting the Minister authority to set prescribed percentages, permitting as-of-right variances, as it would bypass the municipal approval process.

Recommendation: That the Province add a provision to prohibit as-of-right variances in zones designated for environmental protection and natural hazards.

Recommendation: That the Province continue permitting municipal authority to approve minor variances of this nature, which would allow more detailed technical review.

Policy Statements and Minister's Decisions

Proposed legislative amendments would extend an exemption to all ministerial decisions on land use would no longer be required to demonstrate consistency with the *Provincial Planning Statement, 2024* (PPS). Previously, only ministerial decisions on Minister Zoning Order's could be exempted.

Staff are not supportive of this change as it risks inconsistent planning outcomes by removing the consideration of growth management, the efficient delivery and coordination of infrastructure, protection of employment lands and land use compatibility from future decisions. It would enable the Minister to potentially override environmental protections in the PPS for hazardous lands, agriculture, natural heritage, and water resources. Further, this could have retroactive effects on previous decisions that may have potentially been inconsistent with the PPS or its predecessors.

Recommendation: That the Province remove the provision that would allow the Minister to override key policy direction intended to support good planning and protect public health and safety.

Minister's Zoning Orders (MZOs)

MZOs will no longer be passed as regulations unless it is an amendment or revocation of an existing MZO but would retain the same legal effect. In relation to the MZO agreements that the Minister may require between an owner and the City, the Minister is proposing additional powers to set timelines for entering into

MZO agreements, and to make certain orders if the agreement is not satisfied or to require any disagreements over the agreement be referred to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) for a final determination.

Staff are not supportive of this change as the City has no input regarding the Minister's decision on the agreement that is mandated to be made between the City and the landowner.

Recommendation: That municipalities be afforded a formal opportunity to consult with the Minister on MZO agreements, as the municipality is a party to the agreement.

Recommendation: That the Province consider permitting, rather than requiring the parties, the landowner or the City, to refer any disagreements to the OLT given the sophisticated nature of the parties. At any such OLT proceedings, the Minister should be a party as the reasons to require a MZO agreement would assist the OLT in making a final determination.

Protected Major Transit Station Areas (PMTSA)

Official plan amendments that permit residential uses for all lands within a PMTSA would no longer require ministerial approval.

Staff are not supportive of this change as removing ministerial approval may introduce potential uncertainty and delay, which may undermine the intended benefits of streamlining the approval process. Official plan amendments that are exempted from ministerial approval would likely be subject to appeals to the Ontario Land Tribunal unless the municipality has delegated authority to make a final determination.

Recommendation: That official plan amendments within PMTSAs, including those that would permit residential uses, should continue to be subject to ministerial approvals.

Community Improvement Plans (CIPs)

The Province is proposing changes to make it easier for municipalities to use Community Improvement Plans, a tool under section 28 of the Planning Act that helps municipalities support housing, infrastructure and revitalization projects. Currently, only some upper-tier municipalities can create regional CIPs, and only if their official plans allow it. The proposed changes would allow all upper-tier municipalities to create CIPs, and make it easier to provide funding for the CIP to its respective lower-tier municipality.

Recommendation: Staff support the expansion of CIPs to include all upper-tier municipalities.

Consultation on simplifying and standardizing official plans

Under Bill 60, the Province is considering setting parameters for official plans so that they are more consistent across municipalities, with standardized structure and contents, limited development standards, and potentially be limited to one comprehensive document which prohibits secondary or site-specific plans/policies. The proposal included mandated uniform land use designations and permissions, chapters, schedules, and overlays. It sought feedback on limiting the length of official plans by setting a page (e.g., 250 pages) or word limit (65,000 words). The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing was also seeking feedback on a new process for submitting official plan information and documents through an online portal.

Staff do not support the proposal to standardize and simplify official plans, as these changes could hinder a municipality's ability to properly address critical land use planning matters within the local context. Additionally, removing or shifting critical development standards (prescribed heights and densities) from Official Plans to zoning by-laws may limit upfront clarity on design direction at the Official Plan stage, while also contradicting the policy direction in Major Transit Station Areas currently required by the Provincial Planning Statement. Proposing to shift the timing of design decisions increases reliance on later stage tools (like site plan, subdivision etc.) and may increase the overall timing of planning approvals. Limiting design direction at the earlier stages of development review would simply move the bottleneck from the official plan stage to future detailed design review stages, which could impact staff resources.

The City's Official Plan Review is in its early stages with work focused on ensuring conformity with provincial and regional plans, policies and directives (e.g., Provincial Planning Statement, 2024). Consultants have been successfully retained to assist with updating the Official Plan. The City of Markham is well-positioned to respond, should this provincial proposal come into effect. However, the proposed changes, specifically the major restructuring of content and mapping, will likely impact the City's project timelines and may require adjustments to the scope and sequencing of the Official Plan Review.

With this proposal, the Province sought feedback on potentially prohibiting the use of secondary or site-specific plans, requiring the official plan to be a singular, comprehensive document for the entire municipality. The Province is also exploring the possibility of requiring existing development standards in official plans, such as site-specific policies be incorporated into zoning by-laws instead. Staff would not be supportive of this change. Secondary plans are a tool used to implement municipal official plans, provincial and regional plans and policies within specific geographic areas at a local level. Secondary plans are informed by comprehensive planning processes that usually cannot be completed at the

same time as an official plan review due to complex unique and local circumstances (e.g., hard and soft infrastructure needs), particularly in rapidly urbanizing municipalities, and provide detailed direction to support the development of complete communities including further articulation of urban design policies for a particular area and staging the provision of infrastructure and services that's captured outside an official plan review process.

Markham, like many other municipalities, has invested in undertaking detailed planning for its Key Development and Heritage Areas. There are currently 6 Secondary Plans at varying stages of completion. This proposal may undermine the process and investment made in developing these plans, weakening long-term planning objectives. The proposed changes provide uncertainty in the approval process for secondary plans underway.

In Markham, site specific policies are primarily a result of amendments to provide exceptions to land uses and/or development standards. Municipalities should retain the ability to include some site-specific policies in official plans for exceptional or unanticipated circumstances such as implementing OLT orders. If site specific policies are removed from official plans, the Province would need to establish more statutory tools to ensure that the remaining plans and policies retain the same enforceability and authority.

It is unclear how the Province will implement these changes would be structured to work across all municipalities in Ontario.

Recommendation That municipalities should be able to continue to determine the structure, length and content in their respective official plans based on local context, which ultimately informs the official plan's goals and policy areas.

Recommendation: That the Province remove the proposed change, allowing the use of secondary plans and site-specific policies to remain within official plans. This proposal may undermine a municipality's secondary plan process and investment made in developing these plans, weakening long-term planning objectives. The proposed changes also provide uncertainty in the approval process for secondary plans underway.

Recommendation: That if implemented, the Province provide a standardized data schema and metadata requirements (e.g., field names, coordinate system, version control protocols, etc.) to ensure official plan mapping layers and standardized schedules can integrate seamlessly with the Regional data hub, the Province's online portal, and the City's internal monitoring systems.

Recommendation: That, if implemented, request that the Province undertake further consultation with municipalities on the proposed mandated Official Plan structure. Specifically, staff note that "Urban Design" is a critical policy area missing from the proposed chapter framework. The proposed "Community Design and Complete Communities" chapter does not capture the full breadth of

urban design matters. Adding an Urban Design chapter would ensure municipalities retain the ability to establish fundamental policy directions, principles, and guidance to achieve desirable, high-quality urban form and public realm objectives.

Recommendation: Request that the Province should provide municipalities with clear direction on how to proceed with these initiatives and clarify whether any previous Provincial directives on development standards (e.g., prescribed heights and densities in Secondary Plans or Inclusionary Zoning initiatives) would be withdrawn.

Recommendation: That the Province issue supporting regulation to operationalize conditional zoning under the Planning Act. This would provide municipalities with more local control, managing site specific issues and meeting local objectives.

Recommendation: Request that the Province undertake further consultation with municipalities on the proposed standardized designations, to further refine the criteria for each designation. For example, consider adding parks and small-scale retail to the Residential I and II designations.

Recommendation: The Province should be providing timely guidance materials to municipalities on the implementation/transition process

Recommendation: Staff support moving the submission of official plan information and documents to an online portal to reduce delays caused by manual handling, fax transmission, and courier service challenges.

Harmonization of road construction standards

Proposed legislative amendments to the *Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act* (PTHIA) would set mandatory standards for highways, including for municipal roads, including how these roads are designed or built. The proposed amendments would also authorize the Minister to establish regulations governing road and bridge construction contracts, including those between municipalities and third-party contractors along with establishing a process for requesting an exemption from a standard.

Staff are not supportive of this change as the City could face administrative and financial impacts depending on the direction of provincial harmonization efforts. Standardization may require adjustments to the City's existing design standards, technical review procedures and procurement practices.

Recommendation: The Province should provide additional funding to municipalities if the harmonized standards yield higher costs than the City's currently used standards for construction.

Recommendation: That the Province consult and/or collaborate with municipalities in establishing contracts between municipalities and third-party contractors that does not conflict with local municipal authority and decision-making.

Recommendation: That the scope in which the Minister should be allowed to make a regulation to govern contracts pertaining to road and bridge construction should only be in regard to the technical aspects of the contracts.

Recommendation: That the Province should conduct training sessions for municipal staff or provide municipalities with extra funding for training for municipal staff, regarding the new standards and protocols.

Recommendation: That municipalities should continue to have autonomy in deciding on its needed exemption from a standard without Provincial involvement.

Recommendation: The Province consider implementing a yearly audit to ensure municipal compliance with harmonized standards, investigating logged exemptions instead.

Recommendation: That the Province further consult and work closely with municipalities to establish a process of requesting an exemption to ensure timely approvals.

Amendments to the Highway Traffic Act (Bill 60, Schedule 5)

Proposed legislative amendments to the *Highway Traffic Act* primarily involve placing new prohibitions on municipalities from reducing motor vehicle lanes when installing, implementing or marking new bicycle lanes. Further amendments would also allow the Minister to prescribe additional prohibited activities and to provide exemptions from prohibition.

Staff are not supportive of the proposed changes to the *Highway Traffic Act*, taking the position that each individual municipality is best positioned to balance their own local transportation needs, safety priorities and community objectives in conjunction with adjacent municipalities and regional levels of government. The proposed amendments would remove local authority to implement evidence-based transportation and road safety measures.

Recommendation: That the Province consult with municipalities and other stakeholders on what “any other prescribed purpose” entails and scenarios in which an exemption from this change may be necessary.

Recommendation: That the Province further consult and/or collaborate with municipalities to develop criteria for when vehicle traffic lanes can or cannot be reduced to ensure road safety measures are adhered to.

Consultation on Enhanced Development Standards- Lot Level (outside of buildings)

The Province has sought feedback, reviewing municipal use of enhanced/green development standards at the lot level outside of buildings. The intent of this proposal would be to standardize or limit requirements not tied to health and safety to reduce costs and create consistency across municipalities, and reduce complexity for builders working in multiple municipalities. Currently, there is no definition of enhanced development standards in the *Planning Act* or the Provincial Planning Statement 2024 but the Province has listed features for consideration such as bioswales, permeable pavement, soil volumized. With this proposal, municipalities would lose the authority to require enhanced development standards, including but not limited to green development standards, with the intent to reduce construction costs and cut red tape. Currently, municipalities use planning tools (zoning, site plan control, conditions, etc.) to require these standards, which may vary across municipalities.

Staff are not supportive of this change as enhanced development standards are tools to implement and support provincial legislation and the City’s Official Plan. Key lot-level standards such as tree canopy protection, minimum soil volume and permeable paving are integral climate-resilient features. Enhanced development standards are also a tool for municipalities to ensure CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) principles are captured in development review through physical design which aims to reduce criminal opportunities, promote natural surveillance, and improve overall public safety.

Municipalities should continue to require design features that affect public safety, accessibility and sustainability. The City has worked with developers to implement zoning standards that address drainage and stormwater management while supporting compact development. Markham’s Sustainability Metrics Program was developed in partnership with other municipalities to ensure consistency across the Greater Toronto Area municipalities. Staff are not aware of any cases where enhanced development standards proposed or implemented

through the City's Sustainability Metrics Program have been a regulatory burden or caused a delay in the approval process.

Recommendation: The Province should continue to provide municipalities with the authority to meet their own community health, safety, accessibility (AODA) and sustainability objectives.

Recommendation: The Province, in consultation with other municipalities, should provide guidance to promote consistency across municipalities rather than removing enhanced development standards. This includes developing technical standards or minimum baselines for matters such as soil volume and tree health to improve consistency and provide predictability for the development industry.

Recommendation: The Province should establish a clear definition of "enhanced development standards" for municipalities to align their respective plans, policies and guidelines accordingly.

Consultation Minimum Lot Sizes

The Province is seeking feedback on the potential reduction or removal of minimum lot size requirements in low-density urban residential areas. The *Planning Act* generally defines parcels of urban residential land as serviced parcels with residential uses in a settlement area. The Province is considering whether the setting of minimum lot sizes in urban residential areas unnecessarily inhibits residential development.

Staff would not be supportive of this change, as the City has developed these requirements based on post-development challenges such as emergency access to Additional Residential units with walkout or rear yard egress, maintaining garage functionality, etc.

Recommendation: The Province should consider standardized zoning options and definitions that municipalities can adopt without being subject to appeal, rather than eliminating minimum lot size requirements.

Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act, 2025

Under Bill 60, the Province has proposed a new act which will allow the Minister to designate, through regulation, a corporation as a water and wastewater public corporation which shall provide prescribed lower-tier municipalities with water and sewage services. Once a water and wastewater public corporation is designated for specified lower-tier municipalities, those municipalities must deliver water and sewage services exclusively through that corporation. The

corporation may impose and collect fees or charges, and any unpaid amounts can be added to the property tax roll. Rates for these services are set by the corporation. However, regulations may require that rates be included in a rate plan, which must be submitted to the Minister for approval. The Minister may approve, refuse, or require amendments to the rate plan. Additionally, regulations may authorize the transfer of ownership and operation of water and sewage services (including employees, assets, and liabilities) from a municipality to the water and wastewater public corporation.

Staff would not be supportive of this new legislation. Local municipalities and ratepayers would have no direct voice or oversight in the water and wastewater public corporation's (WWPC) decision making. There is a risk that infrastructure decisions will prioritize short-term financial return over public interest, including safe, sustainable, and equitable service delivery. Moreover, there is concern that ratepayers would be continuing to pay for actual water consumption and infrastructure related to growth, without any influence over rates or investment priorities.

Recommendation: The Province should establish clear governance frameworks ensuring municipal participation and ratepayer oversight in WWPC decision making.

Recommendation: The new legislation should include explicit ratepayer affordability protections for low-and-moderate income households, and local oversight mechanisms to ensure transparency, affordability, and accountability. It is unclear if there are safeguards to prevent excessive or sudden rate increases.

Recommendation: The Province should consult further with municipalities to ensure financial neutrality between WWPC-serviced and non-WWPC serviced municipalities. There should be clarity on how WWPCs may fund growth infrastructure or if the corporations are restricted from collecting development charges while other municipalities retain them.

Recommendation: That WWPC investment plans be mandated to integrate with municipal and regional master plans, to ensure aligned priorities between growth planning and infrastructure delivery. Parameters to ensure WWPC growth funding decisions are coordinated with provincial and municipal growth policies.

Recommendation: That an additional provision requiring joint servicing investment frameworks reviewed by municipalities and the Province.

Recommendation: The WWPC act should define accountability in relation to infrastructure delivery when rate revenues are insufficient.

Recommendation: The Province should consider adding a provision requiring structured consultation with municipalities and stakeholders before approving

rate plans. The Minister should not be able to use broad discretion to approve, reject or modify WWPC rate plans.

Recommendation: The Province should establish independent oversight or audit mechanisms to ensure proper maintenance, infrastructure replacement or fiscal responsibilities of WWPCs.

Recommendation: That if implemented, the Province establish mechanisms to prevent infrastructure deferral and ensure timely maintenance and replacement of water and wastewater systems to protect public health and long-term ratepayer interests.

Recommendation: That if implemented, the Province ensure that funding for growth-related water and wastewater infrastructure follows the principle that growth pays for growth, including appropriate use of development charges, to avoid placing undue financial burden on existing ratepayers.

Recommendation: That if implemented, the Province include provisions to protect high-performing municipalities from being required to subsidize underperforming municipalities or share debt and reserves in a manner that penalizes fiscal prudence and operational efficiency.

Recommendation: That if implemented, the Province include explicit affordability protections for low- and moderate-income households, to mitigate potential social and economic impacts from higher water and wastewater rates.

Amendments to the Development Charges Act, 1997

The Province is proposing amendments to the Development Charges Act, to standardize the rules associated with development charges and also to enhance cost predictability for new developments. The proposed changes include the following:

Addition of a Class of Service for Land Acquisition

The proposed changes would group all anticipated land acquisition capital needs under a separate class of service for the purposes of calculating development charges. Therefore, land would be removed from the historical service level for other service categories such as indoor recreation, library, public works and waste management.

Land acquisition capital costs will be exempt from the historic service level calculation, and would be limited to amounts that would be incurred over 10 years except for the following:

- Water supply services
- Wastewater services

- Stormwater
- Roads
- Electrical power services
- Transit services
- Policing
- Fire

The removal of land values from the level of service calculations will result in a decrease in the DC eligible amount and lead to a reduction in the availability of DC funding for future capital projects across the impacted services.

Recommendation: That Staff continue to assess, the inclusion of a separate class of service for land and how it will work in practice.

Requirements for Local Service Policies

Municipalities must adopt a local service policy for each service subject to DCs where some costs are borne by developers.

Recommendation: Staff anticipate no impact to the City, as the City already has a local service policy in the DC Background Study, which will need to be reassessed and enhanced as required.

Recommendation: The Province should preserve municipal flexibility to allocate projects based on service categories rather than requiring project-specific allocations.

Timelines for the Delivery of the Annual Treasurers Statement

At present, the Annual Treasurer's Statement is required to be provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing upon request. The proposed amendment would change this requirement to be submitted to Council by June 30 and submitted to the Minister by July 15 of each year.

Recommendation: Staff are supportive of this change, as the City's current practice already aligns with the proposed timelines. Staff anticipate no impacts to the City.

Requirements to provide documents to the Minister

Upon the Minister's request, municipalities must provide the DC Background Study, DC By-laws and Local Service Policy.

Recommendation: Staff are supportive of this change as the DC Background Study and associated By-laws are already posted on the City's website and publicly available. Staff anticipate no impacts to the City.

NEXT STEPS

Staff will continue to monitor updates by the Province in relation to Bill 60. Following the December 9, 2025 Development Services Committee meeting, the resolutions will be forwarded to the applicable Ministry.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

This report has no immediate or direct financial impact to the Operating Budget or Life Cycle Reserve Study.

However, it is worth noting the potential long-term financial impact of the:

Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act.

- Loss of control over maintaining financial sustainability for future capital investment for water and wastewater services.
- Loss of control and flexibility for maintaining consistent & stable water rate increases year over year.
- Impact of infrastructure decisions on service delivery including water quality and sustainability.

Development Charges Act Amendments

- Removal of land values from historic service level calculations will reduce development charge revenue for services such as indoor recreation and library.
- Reduced ability to fund growth-related facilities will lead to reliance on Non-DC funding sources in order to maintain service levels.

Construction Act Holdback

- Budgeting: Accelerated holdback release may necessitate revising cash flow forecasts and contingency reserves.
- Contractual Adjustments: Large-scale projects require careful review to apply transitional provisions correctly.
- Cash Flow Impact: Project managers plan for earlier holdback releases, which could affect project financial schedules and overall liquidity.
- Risk of Penalties: Missing the 60–74 day compliance window may result in disputes, interest charges, or litigation.

HUMAN RESOURCES CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

Bill 60 limits the ability to meet some of the objectives of Goal 3.2. of Building Markham's Future Together, 2020-2026 Strategic Plan: Build complete communities that offer a range of housing and employment opportunities, transportation options and outstanding community amenities. The Provincial efforts to increase and accelerate the supply of housing are at the cost of undertaking comprehensive planning to support the development of complete community (e.g., employment, infrastructure, community amenities, affordable housing, etc.)

BUSINESS UNITS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:

Key impacted City departments including Planning, Economic Development, Financial Services, Building Standards, Engineering and Legal staff were consulted on this report.

RECOMMENDED BY:

Giulio Cescato, MCIP, RPP
Director, Planning & Urban Design

Trinela Cane
Acting Commissioner, Development Services

APPENDICES:

Appendix A – Detailed Comments on the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 (Bill 60)

APPENDIX A
Detailed Comments on Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025 (Bill 60)

Item #	ERO/ORR #	Title of ERO/ORR Post	Staff Comments
1	ERO 025-1140	Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025- Supporting the Harmonization of Municipal Road Construction Standards	The Province should provide further clarity on what aspects of contracts pertaining to road and bridge construction the Minister is allowed to govern. The scope is currently unclear and if the Minister is able to govern beyond the technical aspect of contracts.
2			Staff recommends that municipalities should retain the ability to decide on exemptions from standards. Staff would not be supportive of having to go through a process to request an exemption as it would add complexity to a project and cause delays. If implemented, staff suggests implementing a yearly audit to ensure municipal compliance with harmonized standards and logged exemptions could be investigated by the Province.
3			The Province should consult and collaborate closely with municipalities to establish an efficient process for requesting an exemption from a standard.
4			The Province should provide training or provide municipalities with funding for training to municipal staff on the new standards to follow.
5			The Province should provide additional funding to municipalities if the standardizations yields higher costs of construction than the ones currently used by a municipality.
6	ERO 025-1071	Bill 60 - Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025- Modern Transportation- Prohibiting Vehicle Lane	Staff are not supportive of the proposed change, as municipalities should continue to make decisions regarding the allocation of road space and continue to balance local transportation needs, safety priorities and community objectives. Municipalities must retain the ability to make context-sensitive decisions about roadway design and implement their own evidence-based transportation and road safety measures.
7			The Province should further consult and/or collaborate closely with municipalities to develop guidelines/criteria for when vehicle traffic lanes can or cannot be reduced to ensure road safety measures are adhered to.
8			The Province should provide a clear definition of what “any other prescribed purpose” entails and provide scenarios in which an exemption from this change may be necessary.

9		Reduction for New Bicycle Lanes	The Province should consult further with municipalities to understand why a municipality may need to remove a lane of traffic (e.g., traffic calming scenario vs. reduction of a needed travel lane to implement a bike lane). The current proposal does not include this distinction, which should be further clarified.
10	ERO 025-1097	Proposed Changes to the Planning Act (Schedule 10 of Bill 60 - the Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025)	<p>Minor Variances (as-of-right variances from performance standards)- Staff are not supportive of the as-of-right reduction in established development standards. Staff would not be supportive of granting the Minister authority to set prescribed percentages, automatically permitting as-of-right variances, as it would bypass the municipal approval process.</p> <p>Amendments to the Planning Act should instead delegate the authorization to grant the proposed deviation to a municipal staff level which would allow a more detailed technical review prior to the minor variance(s) approval.</p>
11			<p>Minor Variances (as-of-right variances from performance standards)- As-or-right variances should be avoided in zone categories intended for environmental protection and natural hazards</p>
12			<p>Protected Major Transit Areas (PMTSAs)- Staff are unsupportive of this change, as these official plan amendments would then be subject to appeals which may cause issues in staff resourcing, extend approval timelines, etc.</p>
13			<p>Minister’s Zoning Orders (MZOs)- Staff are unsupportive of the proposed change that allows the Minister to defer unresolved agreements to the Ontario Land Tribunal without input from a municipality. As a party to the agreement, municipalities should be afforded a formal opportunity to consult with the Minister on MZO agreements, as the municipality is a party to the agreement.</p>
14			<p>Policy Statements and Minister’s Decisions- Staff are unsupportive of this change, as it allows decisions that could override key policy direction intended to support good planning and protect public health and safety. The change risks inconsistent planning outcomes by removing the consideration for managing growth, the efficient delivery and coordination of infrastructure, protection of employment lands and land use compatibility from future decisions. With this change, the Minister would be able to enable decisions that may</p>

			override environmental protections in the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024 regarding hazardous lands, agriculture, natural heritage and water resources.
15			Community Improvement Plans (CIPs) -Staff are supportive of this change extending CIPs as a tool that can be used by all upper-tier municipalities.
16	ERO 025-1099	Consultation on simplifying and standardizing official plans	<p>Official Plan Structure and Contents- Staff are not supportive of this change. Official Plans vary in complexity and length because the policy framework details the unique and local context/characteristics possessed by each individual municipality.</p> <p>Municipalities should be able to continue determining the structure and content in their respective official plans based on the local context (i.e., urban, sub-urban and rural or in Markham's case a mix of them) which ultimately informs the official plan's goals and policy areas.</p> <p>The Province should consider providing minimum chapter/content requirements municipalities should include in their official plans, but allowing municipalities to determine how the information is organized.</p>
17			<p>Official Plan Structure and Contents- Urban Design is not identified as a critical heading in the proposed contents and must be included as urban design policies typically articulate a municipality's vision and direction on desirable urban form and public realm objectives for intensifying mixed-use urban centres, corridors, MTSA's, transit supportive/oriented communities, etc. Removing Urban Design as a distinct chapter heading from the proposed standardized contents would dilute a municipality's emphasis on its design excellence objectives that ultimately promotes distinctiveness, local identity and character. The Province is requested to add Urban Design to the proposed standardized OP structure.</p>
18			<p>Official Plan Structure and Contents- The proposed OP chapter on "Community Design and Complete Communities" does not adequately capture all urban design matters, such as policies on the public realm, built form, transition, etc.</p>
19			<p>Prohibiting the use of Secondary Plans and Site-Specific Policies- Staff are not supportive of removing secondary plans and/or site-specific policies out of OPs as these tools would have limited weight in formal decision-making processes (e.g., the Ontario Land Tribunal).</p>

20			<p>Prohibiting the use of Secondary Plans and Site-Specific Policies- Secondary plans should be retained as a tool to help manage and direct growth responsibly, allowing for distinctiveness and place defining approaches through policy direction, driving principles and objectives. By removing Secondary plans out of OPS, it becomes a challenge to articulate the city pattern, hierarchy of urban/built form, approach to special character areas and differentiation with areas of the City that will remain generally stable.</p>
21			<p>Prohibiting the use of Secondary Plans and Site-Specific Policies- The use of Secondary Plans and Site specific policies enable municipalities to respond to and address public input and concerns. They also help to identify specific requirements (e.g., servicing, transportation, environmental studies or improvements) to be addressed prior to development.</p>
22			<p>Limiting development/zoning standards- Staff are unsupportive of this change as removing or limiting building heights, lot sizes and densities in official plans.</p> <p>This change would oppose the direction given by the Province for Markham’s ongoing projects such as inclusionary zoning and/or secondary plan initiatives in which the City was directed to prescribe heights and densities.</p> <p>The Province will need to provide municipalities with clear direction on how to proceed with these initiatives and clarify whether any previous Provincial directives on development standards would be withdrawn.</p>
23			<p>Limiting development/zoning standards- Removing or shifting critical development standards from Official Plans to Zoning By-laws may limit upfront clarity on design direction at the Official Plan stage of a development application. Shifting the timing of design decisions increases reliance on later stage tools (e.g. site plan, subdivision, etc.) and will increase the overall timing of planning approvals. Limiting design direction at the earlier stages of development review would simply move the bottleneck from OPs to future detailed design review stages, which could impact staff resources.</p>
24			<p>Limiting development/zoning standards- There is increased risk that municipal design controls would be weakened by removing these standards out of the Official Plan. For example, design guidelines and manuals can provide detailed design direction; however,</p>

		they are not policy and therefore have limited weight in formal decision-making processes (e.g., at the Ontario Land Tribunal).
25		Limiting the length of official plans- Staff are not supportive of this change. The length of a municipality’s official plan reflects its role in covering all necessary aspects to ensure clarity, completeness and usability. Removing non-essential content and/or redundancy is already built into the Official plan review process. Imposing a page limit or word limit could lead to misinterpretation and gaps in understanding.
26		Creating Permissive Land Use Designations- Staff would be unsupportive of reducing the number of land use designations as it may negatively impact a municipality’s ability to track growth. For example, data on residential and job growth may be loss once consolidated affecting growth forecasting.
27		Creating Permissive Land Use Designations- The number and type of land use designations in a municipality’s official plan are based on the city’s local context. There may be opportunities to streamline the land use designations through an official plan review, however this should be confirmed through technical analysis instead of applying a standardized approach that does not consider unique or complex local circumstances.
28		Creating Permissive Land Use Designations- the proposed criteria for Mixed Use I and II currently allows too many permitted uses within those designations and are not distinct enough from the Residential I and II designation. The Province should revisit the proposed standardized designations and consult further with municipalities to further refine the criteria for each designation, if implemented. For example, consider adding parks and small-scale retail to the Residential I and II designations.
29		Creating Permissive Land Use Designations- The Province should provide municipalities with additional tools to secure certain amenities/implement conditional zoning as this is already a challenge in designated mixed-use areas.
30		Creating Permissive Land Use Designations- Will the Province be providing a clear definition for “low/mid/high-rise” as the Province is also proposing to limiting development standards out of OPs and this can be interpreted differently across municipalities?

31			<p>Creating Permissive Land Use Designations- The Province should consult further and work closely with municipalities, as additional tools (e.g. minimum standards, criteria or holds in implementing zoning by-laws for non-residential uses) will be needed to help municipalities acquire/secure and achieve a true mix of residential and non-residential land uses if more permissive land use designations are contemplated. There is no guarantee that certain land uses required to support the growth and creation of complete communities on lands designated for residential or mixed-use development will be achieved in practice.</p>
32			<p>Transitioning to a New Framework/ General -Staff are generally unsupportive of transitioning to a standardized official plan framework as it does not consider the unique and local context of each municipality.</p> <p>The Province should be providing timely guidance materials to municipalities on the implementation/transition process, if implemented. It would be preferable for this transition process to be clearly established at the provincial level before implementation externally, as introducing new protocols in real time creates challenges and uncertainty both at the Provincial staff level and municipal staff level.</p>
33			<p>Submission of Official Plans through Online Portal- Staff would be supportive of this change to reduce delays caused by manual handling, fax transmission and to by-pass any courier service challenges.</p>
34			<p>The City of Markham’s Sustainability Metrics Program was developed in partnership with other municipalities (e.g., Vaughan, Richmond Hill and Brampton) to promote consistency across the Greater Toronto Area municipalities.</p> <p>While consistency is desirable, it is not necessary that metrics or standards are identical as each municipality may have different capacities, contexts and requirements. For example, the standards developed for Markham provide metrics for both existing urban and greenfield areas which address a range of standards that wouldn’t be needed in the City of Toronto which is fully built out.</p>
35			<p>Staff would be generally unsupportive of streamlining, standardize and prohibiting the mandatory use of enhanced development standards. City Staff have not encountered cases where the enhanced standards proposed or implemented through the City’s Sustainability</p>

	ERO 025-1101	Consultation on Enhanced Development Standards- Lot Level (outside of buildings)	Metrics Program has been a regulatory burden or caused a delay in the approval process for applicants.
36			Municipalities use local green standards to mitigate the local impacts of climate change (e.g., managing stormwater, flooding, etc.) and to meet local environmental targets. Removing this ability would limit a municipality’s autonomy and decision-making. It would create a challenge for municipalities to ensure new development aligns with local values, environmental protection and sustainable design.
37			The Province's proposed prohibition of enhanced development standards at the lot level has potential unintended consequences and should be reconsidered. The ability of municipalities to implement enhanced development standards through land use tools such as zoning, site plan control, agreements and conditions of approval should be retained with provincial guidance that promotes consistency of standards across municipalities.
38			The City uses local green standards to mitigate the local impacts of climate change (i.e., managing stormwater, flooding, green roofs etc.) and to meet local environmental targets. This proposal may eliminate local democratic control over land use, making it harder for municipalities to ensure new development aligns with local values, environmental protection, and sustainable design.
39			This proposal prioritizes the speed of construction, however, may inadvertently undercut the tools that municipalities rely on to implement locally tailored, climate-conscious development and transportation infrastructure.
40			The City requests clarification on the definition of “enhanced development standards” and matters included as part of the definition. The proposal details include a broad list of examples that could be considered enhanced development standards including native tree planting, soil volume and bike racks, while noting that the definition is not limited to such items. For example, does the inclusion of “vegetative elements” on the list of examples of enhanced development standards include requirements from municipalities to protect and replace tree canopy on development sites?
41			Health, safety, and accessibility are stated as Provincial Interests in the Planning Act R.S.O 1990, Section 2 (h)(h.1),(o), which are matters to be carried out for local municipalities. Enhanced development standards are tools to implement and support provincial legislation and the City’s Official Plan, which are directly tied to maintaining health and safety.

			<p>The Province should continue to allow municipalities to implement and enforce lot-level standards for climate-resilient design (such as tree canopy protection, minimum soil volume and permeable paving) through the development review process, as they are tied directly to public health and safety.</p>
42			<p>Enhanced development standards including but not limited to soil volume, native tree planting and increasing tree canopy relate to ensuring healthy trees grow to the fullest potential and reach maturity. Healthy trees directly relate to the improvement of public health by creating comfortable, safe, and accessible spaces that provide relief from extreme weather. In addition, the inclusion of vegetative elements as enhanced development standards support mitigating environmental impacts of heat island effect, slow down storm runoff, improve air and water quality, increase biodiversity and many other environmental, social and economic benefits. Prohibiting lot-level soil volume, on-lot tree planting and tree protection would impact the long-term viability of trees, reduce canopy and increase future maintenance/removal costs, affecting canopy targets, urban heat island mitigation, and biodiversity goals.</p> <p>The Province should, in consultation with municipalities, consider developing provincial technical standards or minimum baselines for soil volumes and tree health (in consultation with municipalities) to improve consistency and provide predictability to developers. Equal or stronger standards should reside at the local level.</p>
44	ERO 025-1100	Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes	<p>Staff are generally unresponsive of this change as Markham has already undergone review of various lot fabric situations in the City, establishing lot minimums that address former post development issues that the City has encountered. This includes emergency access to as-of-right units with a walkout or rear yard egress, snow storage, garage functionality, etc.</p>
45			<p>If implemented, the Province should consider standardized zones that would not be appealable.</p>
46			<p>Staff would not be supportive of the Water and Wastewater Public Corporations Act as the proposed legislative framework raises serious concerns regarding accountability and governance, ratepayer protection, equity between municipalities, alignment with regional growth planning and financial sustainability.</p>

47	ERO 025-1098	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	The Province should establish clear governance frameworks ensuring municipal participation and ratepayer oversight in WWPC decision-making. There are no mechanisms for ratepayer representation or municipal input currently outlined in the WWPC proposal.
48			It is unclear if there will be safeguards or mechanisms to prevent excessive or sudden rate increases for ratepayers. The Province should include explicit ratepayer protections and local oversight mechanisms to ensure transparency, affordability and accountability.
49			The Province should provide explicit direction and transparency on cost recovery for infrastructure related to new development. Staff are concerned if WWPCs are restricted from collecting development charges while other municipalities retain them that developers may preferentially locate in WWPC-serviced areas, creating unfair competition. Municipalities retaining DCs may face slower growth, despite financial prudence and sustainability.
50			The proposed WWPC act does not specify whether WWPC's must align investment decisions with municipal water and wastewater master plans, potentially resulting in misaligned priorities between growth planning and infrastructure delivery, delays or deferrals of essential servicing projects, and inefficient use of public funds. If implemented, Staff recommend the Province establish a clear framework to coordinate WWPC capital investment with local municipal planning.
51			The Province should add a requirement to the proposed WWPC act to require joint servicing investment frameworks reviewed by municipalities and the Province.
52			The Province should consult further with municipalities to define accountability for infrastructure delivery when rate revenues are insufficient.
53			The Province should establish transparent mechanisms for prioritizing and financing growth infrastructure.
54			The Province should consider limited or super-regional models focused on high-level infrastructure (e.g., treatment and transmission), while leaving distribution and collection under local management. Staff are concerned that high-performing municipalities could be pushed to subsidize underperforming municipalities, as a centralized WWPC model(s) risk penalizing municipalities with well-managed, efficient systems by pooling reserves and debt.

55			<p>Staff do not support giving the Minister legislative authority to use broad discretion to approve, reject or modify WWPC rate plans without mandatory consultation with municipalities or ratepayers. It is unclear if there is a mechanism to limit or phase rate increases or if there would be affordability safeguards established which may affect low-to-moderate income households.</p>
56			<p>Water and wastewater are essential public services. Staff are concerned about rate increases due to WWPC growth funding could double water bills in some areas, exacerbating financial stress on households already facing high food, housing, and utility costs, and creating regional inequities, particularly for municipalities that purchase water from other regions (e.g., York Region buying water from Peel or Toronto).</p> <p>The Province should conduct a thorough affordability and social impact assessment before implementing WPCs and ensure that cost allocation reflects service levels and geography</p>
57			<p>The Province should establish independent audit and reporting requirements</p>
58			<p>It is unclear in the proposal the accountability for infrastructure failures and ratepayer protection. Staff are concerned that the financial burden of deferred or poorly maintained infrastructure may fall on future ratepayers, with no local accountability.</p>
59	<p>ORR-25-MMAH 30</p>	<p>Implementing Reforms to the Development Charges Framework</p>	<p>The proposed legislative framework requires all land acquisition costs to be grouped into its own separate class of service. Land will therefore be removed from the historic service level calculations for services such as indoor recreation, library, public works and fire services. Land acquisition costs, with the exception of engineering services (water, wastewater, stormwater, roads, electricity), fire, police, and transit, will be limited to a 10-year period.</p> <p>Municipalities may still fund land purchases from existing service-specific reserves (e.g. library) as long as those land costs are not double-counted in both the land acquisition and service-specific funds.</p> <p>The removal of land when determining historic service levels will result in a reduction in the amount of development charges that can be recovered for services such as indoor recreation. This will reduce the City's ability to fund future growth-related facilities and may</p>

			<p>result in a reduction in service levels, delay in the provision of the service or, funding from non-DC sources.</p> <p>New subsection 7(3.1) The Province should provide more clarity on how DC recovery under the new land service category will operate.</p>
60			The City supports the introduction of mandatory local service policies.
61			The City supports the provision of the background study and by-laws to the minister, upon request
62			Section 43- Regulations should maintain the flexibility of municipalities to account for projects based on their service category, as opposed to being project-specific