

SUBJECT: City of Markham Comments on Proposed Amendment 1 to A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019 and Proposed Land Needs Assessment Methodology

PREPARED BY: Liliana da Silva, R.P.P., M.C.I.P., Senior Planner, Policy & Research (x. 3115)

REVIEWED BY: Darryl Lyons, R.P.P., M.C.I.P., Manager, Policy, Policy & Research (x. 2459)
Marg Wouters, R.P.P., M.C.I.P., Senior Manager, Policy & Research (x. 2909)

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1) That the report entitled, “City of Markham Comments on Proposed Amendment 1 to A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019, and Proposed Land Needs Assessment Methodology”, dated July 13, 2020, be received;
- 2) That this report be forwarded to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and York Region, as the City of Markham’s comments on proposed Amendment 1 to A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019 and proposed Land Needs Assessment Methodology;
- 3) That the Province reconsider the extension of the Growth Plan forecasts to 2051 or provide municipalities with the ability to carefully phase urban boundary expansions to ensure that development happens in a comprehensive, logical manner;
- 4) That the Province be advised that in order to maintain the integrity of the Growth Plan as a comprehensive framework for sustainable growth management, the City does not support the proposed changes to policies 2.2.1 and 5.1.4 which would allow the use of higher growth forecasts than those contained in Growth Plan Schedule 3;
- 5) That the Province be advised that the City does not support the proposed changes to policy 2.2.5.10 c) that would allow the conversion of employment lands in a Provincially Significant Employment Zone located within a Major Transit Station Area until the next Municipal Comprehensive Review;
- 6) That the Province clarify that employment area conversions that can be undertaken “until the next Municipal Comprehensive Review” includes a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) that is in-process (e.g. York Region’s 2041 MCR). An alternate solution is to include a specific date for when the policy is no longer operative such as the date of conformity for upper- and single-tier municipalities (July 1, 2022);
- 7) That the Province provide specific guidance and support to municipalities regarding required engagement with indigenous communities;
- 8) That the City work with the Province and the Region to improve coordination of development approvals and identify tools and strategies to support the provision of affordable housing, through measures such as:
 - a) expand inclusionary zoning to apply more broadly throughout the municipality;
 - and

- b) clarify or revise the Community Benefit Charge framework so it that it does not apply to 'affordable units' but continues to apply to 'market units' within a proposed development that is subject to inclusionary zoning;
- 9) And further that staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to the resolution.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Province is consulting on proposed changes to A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019, (Growth Plan) through Amendment 1 and on a proposed Land Needs Assessment Methodology (LNA). Comments are due by July 31, 2020.

Amendment 1 proposes to:

- update Growth Plan Schedule 3 population and employment forecasts by extending the planning horizon from 2041 to 2051 for upper- and single-tier municipalities;
- maintain current Growth Plan Schedule 3 population and employment forecasts for 2031 and 2041;
- allow upper- and single-tier municipalities through an MCR to determine higher growth forecasts than those provided in Growth Plan Schedule 3;
- allow conversions of employment areas identified as Provincially Significant Employment Zones (PSEZs) that are located within Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) until the next municipal comprehensive review (MCR);
- change text of the Growth Plan, including definitions, to align with the Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (PPS 2020) and in particular, stronger language around engagement with indigenous communities; and,
- remove the prohibition on new mineral aggregate operations, wayside pits and quarries from habitats of endangered species and threatened species within the Natural Heritage System for the Growth Plan.

The deadline for the Region to conform to the Growth Plan is July 1, 2022, and Amendment 1 does not propose to change this date.

Staff is generally supportive of proposed changes that would harmonize definitions and policy language between the Growth Plan and Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 as well as providing greater engagement with indigenous communities. Staff is concerned with proposed policies that would allow upper- and single-tier municipalities to plan for growth that is higher than the Schedule 3 forecasts in the Growth Plan, as it is anticipated that this will create pressure for urban boundary expansions and run counter to the purpose of the Growth Plan, which is to provide a sustainable, comprehensive, long-term framework for where and how growth should occur across the Greater Golden Horseshoe since 2006. In addition, there is concern with allowing conversion of employment lands in Provincially Significant Employment Zones within Major Transit Station Areas until the next Municipal Comprehensive Review, as these lands have been identified by both the Province and City as critical employment areas that should be protected. Policy

revisions are also recommended to clarify that employment area conversions that can be undertaken “until the next Municipal Comprehensive Review” includes a MCR that is in-process. More specifically, it is not clear if “the next MCR” refers to York Region’s current MCR to be completed by July 2022, or if it could be interpreted to apply to a subsequent MCR after July 2022. This revision would support comprehensive planning to ensure that employment areas are appropriately protected and to ensure that once the Region has completed its current MCR that no further employment conversions could be undertaken outside of a MCR.

The Province is also proposing a new Land Needs Assessment Methodology (LNA) that is required by the Growth Plan to be used by upper- and single-tier municipalities when determining land needs. According to the Province, the proposed LNA provides a streamlined approach in comparison to a previous draft released by the Province after the previous Growth Plan 2017 came into effect. Staff notes that the extension of the Growth Plan forecast horizon to 2051 and the revised LNA methodology appear to be based on increasing residential land supply (bringing lands to development faster) in efforts to ease price (affordability) pressure on market housing, which is a main tenet in the Province’s 2019 Housing Supply Action Plan. Markham staff is concerned that the proposed consideration of ‘market demand’ in the LNA may be used by proponents to justify more ground-related housing which would result in additional or more extensive urban boundary expansions. Staff defers to York Region for comments on the LNA, given that they are required to use the methodology to allocate growth to the area municipalities.

Although beyond the review of Amendment 1 and the LNA, the policy outcomes being proposed to the Growth Plan will affect the provision of affordable housing. Markham staff therefore recommend that the City continue to work with the Province and Region to identify additional tools and strategies, including key changes to the planning process and streamlining of provincial approvals to support the provision of affordable housing, through measures such as: expand inclusionary zoning to apply more broadly throughout the municipality; and clarify or revise the Community Benefit Charge framework so that it does not apply to the ‘affordable units’ but continues to apply to ‘market units’ within a proposed development that is subject to inclusionary zoning.

PURPOSE:

This report provides the City of Markham’s comments on the Province’s proposed Amendment 1 to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019, and proposed Land Needs Assessment Methodology.

BACKGROUND:

On June 16, 2020, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing released proposed Amendment 1 to the Growth Plan (ERO number: 019-1680) and a proposed LNA (ERO number: 019-1679). The Province has provided a 45-day commenting period that ends on July 31, 2020. The Growth Plan outlines the Province’s long-term framework for comprehensively managing growth for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH). York

Region is currently undertaking a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) to 2041, which is the Region's conformity exercise to the Growth Plan. The deadline for the Region to conform to the Growth Plan is July 1, 2022 and Amendment 1 does not propose to change this date.

DISCUSSION:

Amendment 1 proposes to extend the planning horizon and growth forecasts to 2051

Amendment 1 proposes to:

- Maintain current Growth Plan Schedule 3, "Distribution of Population and Employment for the Greater Golden Horseshoe", for 2031 and 2041
- Extend Growth Plan Schedule 3 population and employment forecasts to 2051 (Policies 1.2.3, 2.1, Schedule 3)
- Allow upper- and single-tier municipalities through an MCR to determine higher growth forecasts than those provided in Schedule 3 (Policies 2.2.1, 5.2.4)

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

Proposed Amendment 1 includes three forecast scenarios for comment: a reference growth forecast that represents the most likely future growth outlook based on extensive modelling and analysis, as well as high and low growth scenarios based on different assumptions for comparative purposes. When Amendment 1 is finalized, only one set of forecasts would be included in Schedule 3 (refer to Appendix 'A': Proposed Growth Forecast Comparison' for details).

The proposed York Region population and employment forecasts for 2051 in each of the draft scenarios is as follows:

- Reference scenario: approximately 2 million people and 990,000 jobs;
- Low growth scenario: approximately 1.9 million people and 950,000 jobs; and
- High growth scenario: approximately 2.1 million people and 1 million jobs.

The difference between the 2051 low and high growth scenarios for York Region is 180,000 people and 90,000 jobs. The current 2041 forecast for York Region is 1,790,000 people and 900,000 jobs.

YORK REGION POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT FORECASTS COMPARISON						
	2031	2041	2051			
	No differences between all 3 scenarios		Reference Scenario	Low Scenario	High Scenario	Difference between High/Low Scenarios
Population	1,590,000	1,790,000	2,020,000	1,930,000	2,110,000	180,000
Employment	790,000	900,000	990,000	950,000	1,040,000	90,000

Table 1: York Region Population and Employment Forecasts for 2031, 2041 and 2051 (Reference, low and high scenarios)

Notwithstanding the final Schedule 3 forecast to 2051 to be chosen by the Province, Amendment 1 also proposes to allow upper- and single-tier municipalities to plan for higher growth forecasts than those provided in Schedule 3 through an MCR.

The Region is responsible for distributing the Schedule 3 population and employment forecasts to the local municipalities through its MCR. Preliminary comments by regional staff on proposed Amendment 1 went to Regional Council on June 25, 2020 and advised that the proposed forecasts for York Region assume growth between 23,000 and 29,100 people annually to 2051, compared with past growth rates of approximately 17,200 people per year over the past 10 years, and 24,800 people per year on average since 1986. Regional staff commented that the Province should consider these historical growth rates in York Region when finalizing the forecasts. Regional staff also noted that the employment forecasts to 2051 would require average annual growth between 5,000 and 14,000 jobs per year, which appeared to be achievable. As of 2019, the Region was generally on track to achieve its employment forecast by averaging employment growth of approximately 15,000 jobs annually since 2008. They also noted, however, that potential short and medium term impacts of COVID-19 should be considered by the Province when finalizing the forecasts.

The extension of the Schedule 3 forecasts to 2051 extends the MCR planning horizon from 20 years to 30 years. The Province states that this is an attempt to have sufficient land in an effort to support the fostering of complete communities, economic development, job creation and housing affordability in the GGH. Markham staff is of the opinion that the proposed extension of the planning horizon to 2051 will create pressure for an extensive urban boundary expansion in Markham. Markham is one of three York Region municipalities (others being Vaughan and East Gwillimbury) with potential for substantial settlement area expansion. Regional Council, in 2019 endorsed the principle of aligning growth to optimize existing transit and servicing investments before triggering investments in new infrastructure. To the extent that Markham is better positioned with respect to existing servicing capacity compared with the other municipalities, staff anticipates that if there is a demonstrated need for urban expansion to 2051 to accommodate the growth forecasts, lands in Markham would be considered favourably by the Region.

If the forecasts are extended to 2051, staff recommends that the Province provide municipalities with the ability to carefully phase the designation of any urban expansion lands to ensure that development happens in a comprehensive, logical manner.

Staff is also concerned that allowing upper- and single-tier municipalities to plan for growth that is higher than the Schedule 3 forecasts runs counter to the purpose of the Growth Plan, which is to provide a sustainable, comprehensive, long-term framework for where and how growth should occur across the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The Growth Plan 2019 policy allowing urban expansions of up to 40 hectares outside of an MCR

process already compromises the ability of the Growth Plan to provide this long term comprehensive growth management framework, and staff is concerned that the proposed changes noted above weakens the Growth Plan even further. Staff therefore recommends that the Province not permit the use of higher growth forecasts than contained in Schedule 3.

Recommendation 1: That the Province reconsider the extension of the forecasts to 2051, or provide municipalities with the ability to carefully phase the designation of any urban boundary expansion lands to ensure that development happens in a comprehensive, logical manner.

Recommendation 2: That the Province be advised that in order to maintain the integrity of the Growth Plan as a comprehensive framework for sustainable growth management, the City does not support the proposed changes to policies 2.2.1 and 5.1.4 which would allow the use of higher growth forecasts than those contained in Growth Plan Schedule 3.

Employment Conversions in Provincially Significant Employment Zones and Major Transit Station Areas are proposed to be permitted until the next Municipal Comprehensive Review

Amendment 1 proposes to:

- Allow conversions of employment areas identified as Provincially Significant Employment Zones (PSEZs) and located within Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) until the next municipal comprehensive review (MCR). (2.2.5.10)

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

As outlined in a June 22, 2020, staff report to Development Services Committee, the Region is required to delineate MTSAs (generally defined as the area within a 500-800 metre radius or 10-minute walk of a transit station) as well as associated minimum density targets in the Regional Official Plan. The Province introduced Provincially Significant Employment Zones (PSEZs) during the update to the Growth Plan in 2019. These zones were identified for the purposes of long-term planning for job creation and economic development, and consist of employment areas as well as mixed-use areas that contain a significant number of jobs. PSEZs are comprised of employment areas that are considered critical to the local and provincial economy and cannot be converted to non-employment uses outside of a Municipal Comprehensive Review. In December 2019, after initial consultation, the Province released a revised version of the PSEZ mapping. The Province will be conducting a review of PSEZs to examine how they can support post COVID-19 economic recovery, and this is expected to be completed by early fall 2020.

The Growth Plan currently does not allow lands within PSEZs to be converted to non-employment uses outside of an MCR. Amendment 1 proposes to allow lands within a PSEZ to be converted to non-employment uses until the next MCR if they are located within a delineated MTSA. The stated intent of the proposed change, according to the Province, is to allow for mixed-use development to be initiated faster around MTSAs. It

should also be noted that MTSAs can be delineated at any time in the Region's Official Plan outside of an MCR.

Of the twenty-four (24) proposed MTSAs in Markham, nine (9) are located within PSEZs mainly along the strategic Hwy 404/Hwy 7 employment corridor, such as, among others, East Beaver Creek, Commerce Valley, and Allstate Parkway. (See Appendix 'B' for a map illustrating proposed MTSAs and current PSEZ mapping in Markham).

Staff notes that the stated purpose of the introduction of the PSEZ mapping by the Province in 2019 was to identify and protect provincially significant employment lands, and to afford these lands stronger protection against conversion to non-employment uses than other employment areas not identified as PSEZs. Staff also notes that the minimum density targets for MTSAs along the Hwy 7/Hwy 404 corridor can be achieved through intensive employment uses (e.g., office development), as is evident in the West Beaver Creek BRT station which has an existing density exceeding 250 people and jobs per hectare compared with the prescribed 160 people and jobs/hectare.

If there is merit in considering conversions, staff has consistently held the view that employment area conversions must be evaluated in a comprehensive manner, which is best undertaken through the MCR process. Without strong conversion policies to protect employment lands within MTSAs, it is anticipated that the proposed policy will make it increasingly difficult to maintain these areas along the Hwy 7/Hwy 404 Corridor as viable, successful employment areas, in the face of anticipated increased pressure for residential development.

Staff also recommends that the proposed policy language that would enable employment area conversions in MTSAs "until the next MCR" be clarified to mean a MCR that is in-process. More specifically, it is not clear if "the next MCR" refers to York Region's current MCR to be completed by July 2022, or if it could be interpreted to apply to a subsequent MCR after July 2022. This revision would support comprehensive planning to ensure that employment areas are appropriately protected and to ensure that once the Region has completed its current MCR that no further employment conversions could be undertaken outside of a MCR. It is noted that Council requested similar clarification from the Province during consultation for the Growth Plan 2019 with respect to the original policy regarding employment conversions outside of PSEZs, but the ambiguity was not addressed, and is proposed to be included in the policy that would allow employment conversions within MTSAs and PSEZs "until the next MCR".

Recommendation 3: That the Province be advised that the City does not support the proposed changes to policy 2.2.5.10 c) that would allow the conversion of employment lands in a Provincially Significant Employment Zone located within a Major Transit Station Area until the next Municipal Comprehensive Review.

Recommendation 4: That the Province clarify that employment area conversions that can be undertaken “until the next Municipal Comprehensive Review” includes a Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) that is in-process (e.g. York Region’s 2041 MCR). An alternate solution is to include a specific date for when the policy is no longer operative such as the date of conformity for upper- and single-tier municipalities (July 1, 2022).

Amendment 1 proposes to harmonize policies and definitions between the Growth Plan and Provincial Policy Statement 2020

Amendment 1 proposes:

- Changes to the text of the Growth Plan, including definitions, to align with the Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (PPS 2020) and in particular, stronger language around engagement with indigenous communities. (Policies 1.1, 2.1, 2.2.1.4, 2.2.6.1, 4.2.10.2, 5.2.3.4, 5.2.3.7, definitions)

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

The proposed changes, which are mostly technical in nature, are intended to ensure that the Growth Plan reflects up to date policy references and provincial direction from the PPS 2020 that came into effect on May 1, 2020. In addition, Amendment 1 proposes to include a reference to the housing policy statement in policy 2.2.6.1, which would now read, “Upper- and single-tier municipalities, in consultation with lower-tier municipalities, the Province, and other appropriate stakeholders, will: c) address housing needs in accordance with provincial policy statements such as the Policy Statement: Service Manager Housing and Homelessness Plans;”. Policies 5.2.3.4 and 5.2.3.7 would also be updated so that municipalities “shall” engage with indigenous communities, instead of “are encouraged to”.

Definitions in the Growth Plan would also be harmonized with the PPS, 2020, including: cultural heritage landscape, ecological function, habitat of endangered species and threatened species, impacts of a changing climate, municipal water and wastewater system, on-farm diversified uses, and public service facilities.

Staff is generally supportive of the proposed changes to harmonize certain policies and definitions between the Growth Plan and PPS 2020 to aid in interpretation and implementation of these policy documents, in particular, the stronger language around engagement with Indigenous communities.

With respect to indigenous engagement, the City currently engages with indigenous communities on high level planning matters such as the Official Plan Review, and also consulted during the master planning for the Future Urban Area. Other planning processes, such as archaeological assessments initiated under the Ontario Heritage Act, and Environmental Assessment Act, may also prompt engagement with indigenous communities. Staff requires further guidance on what required ‘engagement’ entails. The Association of Municipalities in Ontario (AMO) published in April 2019 recommending that the Province provide clear protocols, ongoing facilitation support, appropriate training and guidance, information-sharing and adequate financial resources to ensure any delegated duty to consult is implemented properly and respectfully. Staff supports the

efforts of AMO and encourage further guidance from the Province in this area. Staff recommends that the Province provide more specific guidance and support on expectations regarding continued engagement with indigenous communities.

Recommendation 5 That the Province provide specific guidance and support to municipalities regarding required engagement with indigenous communities.

Amendment 1 proposes more permissive policies to allow new mineral aggregate operations within the Natural Heritage System for the Growth Plan

Amendment 1 proposes to:

- Remove the prohibition on new mineral aggregate operations, wayside pits and quarries from habitats of endangered species and threatened species within the Natural Heritage System for the Growth Plan (4.2.8.2)

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

The proposed policy change would eliminate the requirement of “habitats of endangered species and threatened species” from policy 4.2.8.2 which would read as, “no new mineral aggregate operation and no new wayside pits and quarries, or any ancillary or accessory use thereto, will be permitted in i) significant wetlands; ii) significant woodlands unless the woodland is occupied by young plantation or early successional habitat, as defined by the Province, in which case, the application must demonstrate that policies 4.2.8.4 b) and c) and 4.2.8.5 c) have been addressed and that they will be met by the operation;”.

Staff does not have any comments as the proposed amendment to Growth Plan policy 4.2.8.2 does not affect Markham as there are no mineral aggregate operations, wayside pits and quarries within the Natural Heritage System.

A Land Needs Assessment Methodology is proposed that the Region would have to use in determining land needs under the Growth Plan

The Province is consulting on a land needs assessment methodology (LNA) that is required to be used by upper- and single-tier municipalities in implementing the Growth Plan. The LNA determines how the population and employment forecasts assigned to upper- and single-tier municipalities through Growth Plan Schedule 3 should be allocated to local municipalities. It considers intensification and density targets, infrastructure requirements and policies in the Growth Plan.

The proposed LNA provides a streamlined approach in comparison to a previous draft released by the Province after the previous Growth Plan 2017 came into effect. The stated intent of the revised, more flexible LNA, is to:

- accommodate all housing market segments;
- avoid housing shortages;
- consider market demand;
- accommodate all employment types, including those that are evolving; and
- plan for all infrastructure services that are needed to meet complete community objectives to the horizon of the Plan.

The proposed LNA adds consideration of ‘market demand’ as a criteria in determining land needs, consistent with recent changes to the PPS 2020 which also referenced “market demand” in planning for future growth.

Staff Comments and Recommendations:

Markham staff defers to Regional Staff on detailed comments and recommendations relating to the revised LNA as it is the Region, rather than the City, that applies the LNA through the MCR.

However, it is noted that both the extension of the Growth Plan forecast horizon to 2051 and the revised LNA methodology are based on increasing residential land supply (bringing lands to development faster), in efforts to ease price (affordability) pressure on market housing, which is a main tenet in the Province’s 2019 Housing Supply Action Plan. Markham staff is concerned that the consideration of market demand may be used by proponents to justify more ground-related housing which would result in additional or more extensive urban boundary expansions.

The increasingly unaffordable nature of market housing in the GTAH has complex root causes, of which land supply may be a small component. The beneficial impact on affordability, if any, of increasing land supply needs to be balanced against the potential for increased costs in market housing to the extent that new and more extensive infrastructure (e.g., hard services and transit) is needed to service urban expansion lands, at the expense of maximizing existing infrastructure in the more compact existing urban area. This consideration of appropriate balance between planning and market forces is reflected in Regional Staff’s preliminary comments to Regional Council on June 25, 2020, in which it was noted that clear Provincial direction is needed on how the market is to be balanced with other Growth Plan objectives towards higher density, transit supportive and walkable communities focused on producing a variety of affordable housing forms.

Although beyond the review of Amendment 1 and the LNA, the policy outcomes being proposed to the Growth Plan will affect the provision of affordable housing. Therefore, staff has considered some potential solutions where the Province could assist with the provision of affordable housing including the expansion of inclusionary zoning permissions throughout the City, as was initially the case when inclusionary zoning was first introduced in 2018. Changes to the Planning Act in 2019 now restrict the application of inclusionary zoning to MTSAs.

In addition, through Bill 108, a CBC cannot be collected where inclusionary zoning is applied which leaves municipalities having to choose between affordable housing, and other community benefits (e.g. parkland acquisition, childcare, etc.). It is recommended that the CBC framework be revised or clarified so that it does not apply to the ‘affordable

units' but continues to apply to 'market units' within a proposed development that is subject to inclusionary zoning. Alternatively, the Province could explore how CBC would only be applied to some or all of the 'market units' in a proposed development that includes required affordable housing under inclusionary zoning. For context, the City's draft inclusionary zoning framework that was presented to Development Services Committee in February 2020 proposes to apply inclusionary zoning within all MTSAs to residential development proposals over 100 units and require 10% residential Gross Floor Area (GFA) for ownership units to be provided as affordable housing, or 5% GFA for condominium units rented out at affordable rents. Based on staff's understanding of the CBC framework, this means that none of the development would be subject to CBC, including 90% of the 'market' GFA for ownership, or 95% of the 'rental' GFA in rented condominiums. Without a clarification or change to the CBC framework, it will be challenging for the City to achieve its affordable housing objectives and provide for amenities (e.g. parkland) that would be funded through CBC.

Recommendation 6: That the City work with the Province and the Region to improve coordination of development approvals and identify tools and strategies to support the provision of affordable housing, through measures such as:

- a) expand inclusionary zoning to apply more broadly throughout the municipality; and
- b) clarify or revise the Community Benefit Charge framework so it that it does not apply to 'affordable units' but continues to apply to 'market units' within a proposed development that is subject to inclusionary zoning.

NEXT STEPS:

Staff recommends that this report be forwarded to the Province and York Region as Markham's comments on proposed Amendment 1 and on the proposed LNA Methodology prior to the July 31, 2020 deadline.

Staff will report back to Development Services Committee on the final Amendment 1 and LNA once a Provincial decision has been made.

HUMAN RESOURCES CONSIDERATIONS:

Not applicable.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PRIORITIES:

The comments in this report on proposed Amendment 1 to the Growth Plan and the proposed LNA support Goal 3 – Safe, Sustainable and Complete Community of Building Markham's Future Together, 2020-2023.

BUSINESS UNITS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:

Comments from the Finance and Planning Departments are included in this report.

RECOMMENDED BY:

Arvin Prasad, R.P.P., M.C.I.P.
Commissioner of Development Services

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 'A': Amendment 1 Proposed Growth Forecast Comparison

Appendix 'B': Proposed Major Transit Station Areas and Provincially Significant
Employment Zones in Markham