



The Corporation of the Town of Tecumseh

Development Services

To: Mayor and Members of Council

From: Brian Hillman, Director Development Services

Date to Council: May 28, 2024

Report Number: DS-2024-13

Subject: Bill 185, Cutting Red Tape to Build More Homes Act, 2024 and
Draft 2024 Provincial Planning Statement
Summary Report
OUR FILE: L11 BILL185

Recommendations

It is recommended:

That DS-2024-13, Bill 185, *Cutting Red Tape to Build More Homes Act, 2024* and Draft 2024 Provincial Policy Statement, Summary Report, **be received**;

And that DS-2024-13 **be submitted** to the Province through the Environmental Registry of Ontario as comments from the Town of Tecumseh with respect to Bill 185 and the Draft 2024 Provincial Planning Statement.

Executive Summary

The province recently released proposed changes to the *Planning Act* and the *Development Charges Act*, by way of Bill 185, along with a draft of the new Provincial Planning Statement, 2024 for review and comment. This report summarizes the changes that may have an impact on the Town, including changes to planning processes, land development and the collection of municipal Development Charges (DC).

Background

On April 10, 2024, the Ontario government proposed legislative changes aimed at its goal of building an additional 1.5 million homes in the province by 2031 through its passage of Bill 185, “*Cutting Red Tape to Build More Homes Act, 2024*”.

That same day, the Province also released for further public comment an updated Draft Provincial Planning Statement 2024 (Draft 2024 PPS) that is proposed to replace the existing 2020 PPS.

Fundamentally, Bill 185 includes changes to the *Planning Act* and *Development Charges Act* that are aimed at:

- Building homes faster and at lower cost;
- Prioritizing infrastructure for ready-to-go housing projects with a new “use it or lose it” approach with respect to allocated sewage capacity to address stalled developments that have received approval;
- Improving consultation and providing municipalities and builders with greater certainty to get homes built faster, including the limiting of third-party appeals to the Ontario Land Tribunal; and
- Building more types of homes for more people by streamlining approvals.

The Province is seeking feedback from municipalities on Bill 185 and the Draft 2024 PPS.

Below is an itemized summary of the key changes being proposed by Bill 185 and the Draft 2024 PPS that may impact the Town, along with Administration’s comments.

As supplementary information and commentary, please find attached a letter dated April 11, 2024 from Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. (“Watson & Associates”) that focuses on proposed changes to the *Development Charges Act* (see Attachment 1). This detailed letter has been provided to all their clients, including the Town of Tecumseh. Watson has prepared multiple development charge background studies and by-laws for the Town, along with various water, wastewater and stormwater rate studies.

Proposed Changes to the <i>Planning Act</i> (“PA”)		
Item	Issue /Topic	Summary/Comments
PA1	Elimination of Third-Party Appeal Rights	<p>The <i>PA</i> currently defines a “specified person” which is defined to mean a list of entities that includes utilities, pipeline and rail operators, and other similar public/private entities.</p> <p>Past revisions to the <i>PA</i> limited the right to appeal the approval of a minor variance, a draft plan of subdivision, or a consent to sever to the applicant, the municipal authority, the Minister or a “specified person.” In doing so, the Province eliminated appeals by third-party landowners, ratepayers and other members of the public.</p> <p>Bill 185 proposes to extend the same limitation on appeal rights to municipally-approved official plans, official plan amendments, zoning by-laws and zoning by-law amendments.</p> <p>The proposed changes would limit third-party appellants to “specified persons” only, provided they made written or oral submissions and public bodies who made written or oral submissions.</p> <p>This proposed change is like a previous proposal to amend the <i>PA</i> that was ultimately scaled back. The proposed changes should result in less time and money being spent at the OLT and provide streamlined approvals. Local planning review and public consultation processes will continue to play an important role in instilling confidence in the community that issues raised are being heard and adequately addressed, even in the absence of third-party appeal rights. The proposed changes are appropriate and supported.</p>

<p>PA2</p>	<p>Elimination of mandatory pre-consultation requirements for <i>PA</i> applications and municipal requirements for application fee refunds.</p>	<p>The ability to appeal and/or get a refund was tied to the timeframes starting once an application was deemed complete by the Town. Accordingly, some municipalities, including Tecumseh, front-ended their pre-consultation and complete application requirements so that they could be able to meet the <i>PA</i> timelines.</p> <p>Bill 185 proposes to remove a municipality's ability to require mandatory pre-consultation for applications for official plan amendments, zoning by-law amendments, site plan approval and draft plans of subdivision. In its place, the <i>PA</i> would be amended to simply permit applicants to seek pre-consultation.</p> <p>Further, currently, after a municipality has deemed a planning application to be incomplete, the applicant has 30 days to make a motion to the Ontario Land Tribunal to dispute the determination. Bill 185 proposes to remove this deadline, instead allowing applicants to bring a motion to determine the requirements for a complete application at any time after the application fee has been paid or pre-consultation has begun.</p> <p>Finally, Bill 185 proposes to amend the <i>PA</i> to remove the fee refund requirements.</p> <p>Collectively, the changes proposed are supported by Administration. There will continue to be emphasis placed on ensuring the proper information and analysis is undertaken in support of applications. The deletion of the mandatory fee refunds is a positive change for the Town.</p>
<p>PA3</p>	<p>New Appeal Rights for Settlement Area Expansion Applications</p>	<p>The <i>PA</i> currently provides that an applicant cannot appeal an official plan amendment or a zoning by-law amendment application that would expand or alter an in-force settlement area boundary. Bill 185 proposes a change that would</p>

		<p>allow a private applicant to appeal the approval authority’s refusal or non-decision so long as the proposed boundary expansion does not include any lands within the Greenbelt area.</p> <p>This new appeal right is linked to the new criteria for the assessment of proposals for settlement area boundary expansions being proposed in the Draft 2024 PPS.</p> <p>Establishing settlement area boundaries and directing growth to areas within those boundaries is a fundamental first step in a municipality’s growth management strategy. These strategies ensure that valuable farmland and natural heritage areas are protected and do not prematurely come under development pressure from sprawl-like development; that urban land and expensive municipal services are more efficiently used; and that communities develop in a more compact form such that they are more walkable and transit-supportive. These decisions should continue to be made by local Councils.</p> <p>The proposed change is not supported.</p>
PA4	Broadening of Regulations for Additional Residential Units	<p>Currently the <i>PA</i> authorizes the Minister to make regulations establishing requirements and standards with respect to a second or third residential unit in a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse and with respect to a residential unit in a building or structure accessory to such a house. These are often referred to as additional residential units (“ARUs”).</p> <p>Bill 185 proposes to re-enact regulations establishing requirements and standards with respect to any ARUs. These regulations would widen the scope of the Minister’s ability to regulate not only a second or third residential unit but any ARUs in a house, as well as the</p>

		<p>land on which such ARUs are located and the building or structure within which such ARUs are located. The proposed changes would allow the Minister to remove zoning barriers for small multi-unit residential developments.</p> <p>The Town planning documents permit ARUs as contemplated by Provincial legislation and Administration does not believe the changes proposed by Bill 185 are necessary.</p> <p>The proposed change is not supported.</p>
PA5	Exempting ARUs from Planning Act Requirements	<p>The <i>PA</i> contains the basic tools to control land use including zoning by-laws, minor variances, site plan control, community benefits charge, parkland conveyance, among others.</p> <p>Bill 185 proposes to add a new provision which would authorize regulations that provide for the non-application of any provision of the <i>PA</i> that sets out restrictions or limitations with respect to its application to ARUs that meet prescribed criteria.</p> <p>The aim is to remove zoning barriers that discourage owners from building additional residential units, such as provisions dictating maximum lot coverage and the number of bedrooms permitted per unit.</p> <p>Administration believes that existing planning controls in the <i>PA</i> controls are valuable tools and serve a good purpose, including with respect to the regulation of ARUs.</p> <p>The proposed change is not supported.</p>

<p>PA6</p>	<p>Exempt Community Service Facilities from PA Requirements</p>	<p>Bill 185 proposes to add a new provision to authorize regulations that provide for the non-application of any provision of the <i>PA</i> to prescribed classes of community service facilities that meet prescribed requirements. Community service facilities currently being contemplated for such exemptions include schools, hospitals and long-term care homes.</p> <p>These facilities are an important part of the community fabric and ensuring their appropriate integration into these neighbourhoods should continue to be guided by municipal decision making through the local planning approval process.</p> <p>The proposed change is not supported.</p>
<p>PA7</p>	<p>Municipal Servicing Capacity “Use it or Lose it” Provision</p>	<p>Bill 185 proposes to expand on the existing municipal authority to attach lapsing provisions to approved site plans and draft plans of subdivision. The “use it or lose it” tool would be new for site plan approvals and the change for draft plan of subdivision approvals is that it would become a mandatory clause.</p> <p>Approval authorities would provide for the lapsing of a site plan or a draft plan of subdivision at the end of a specified time period. The prescribed time period shall not “be less than” or “exceed such” a time period as “may be applicable to the development” or be less than three years.</p> <p>In instances where there is an appeal, the lapsing of the approval would not begin until the Ontario Land Tribunal has issued its decision.</p> <p>This change will assist in reallocating approvals and associated sewage allocation in cases where lands approved for development are not proceeding in a timely manner. There would be</p>

		<p>an incentive for developers to move forward on an approved application. From a growth management perspective, this change would potentially provide more certainty when determining housing and land supply potential to accommodate growth with the short term.</p> <p>The proposed change is appropriate and supported.</p>
<p>Proposed Changes to the Development Charges Act (“DCA”) (Refer to Attachment 1 for additional information)</p>		
Item	Issue / Topic	Summary / Comments
DCA1	Revision of Eligible Capital Costs	<p>The <i>DCA</i> establishes rules that must be followed when calculating a proposed development charge. One of those rules (Rule 7) provides that “the capital costs necessary to provide the increased services must be estimated.” What may be included as a “capital cost” is then set out.</p> <p>In 2022, the <i>DCA</i> was amended to exclude certain study costs, as well as the cost of undertaking the development charge background study itself, from the list of eligible capital costs.</p> <p>Bill 185 proposes to reverse that deletion, thereby allowing municipal authorities to include study costs in the calculation of their development charge rates. This is a positive change for the Town.</p> <p>The proposed change is supported.</p>

<p>DCA2</p>	<p>Removal of the mandatory phase-in of development charges.</p>	<p>The <i>DCA</i> currently requires a reduction in the maximum development charge that could be imposed in the first four years that a new development charge by-law is in force. Specifically, any development charge imposed during the first, second, third and fourth years that the development charge by-law is in force could be no more than 80, 85, 90 and 95 per cent of the charge imposed. This mandatory “phase in” applied to all development charge by-laws passed on or after January 1, 2022.</p> <p>Bill 185 proposes to delete the “phase in” requirement. This is a positive change for the Town as it provides for the full collection of DCs, which thereby better supports the ability to construct the works required to support new development.</p> <p>The proposed change is supported.</p>
<p>DCA3</p>	<p>Reduction of DC Rate Freeze Timeframe.</p>	<p>The <i>DCA</i> currently allows for an applicant’s development charge rate to be “frozen” as at the date a complete application for zoning by-law amendment or site plan approval (whichever occurs later) is filed. This “freeze” would apply notwithstanding that the relevant development charge by-law for which the rates are frozen is no longer in effect.</p> <p>Currently, the freeze applies so long as building permits are pulled (and relevant development charges are paid) within the “prescribed amount of time,” which is set at two years from the approval of the relevant planning application. Bill 185 proposes to reduce the “prescribed amount of time” to 18 months.</p> <p>It would be preferred that the freeze timeframe be removed from the <i>DCA</i>. Implementing the freeze timeframe is onerous for municipalities to apply and results in a funding loss.</p>

DCA4	Revises process for minor amendments to DC by-law.	<p>Bill 185 proposes to allow municipalities to undertake minor amendments to DC by-laws without adherence to the requirements for the passage of a new DC by-law.</p> <p>The changes are appropriate and supported.</p>
Draft Provincial Policy Statement, 2024 (“Draft 2024 PPS”)		
Item	Issue / Topic	Summary / Comments
PPS1	Flexible Growth Forecast Horizon	<p>A new policy provides a more flexible horizon for planning for growth by providing a planning horizon with a minimum of 20 years and a maximum of 30 years. In addition, there is opportunity to designate additional land beyond the 30-year time horizon for Employment Areas. The current policy restricts planning for growth over a 20-year horizon.</p> <p>This change allows municipalities to better plan for long term growth and align with infrastructure plans (particularly water and wastewater) that typically have extended implementation time horizons.</p> <p>The proposed change is appropriate and supported.</p>
PPS2	Complete Communities	<p>Policies that refer to the concept of “healthy, liveable and safe communities” have been revised to advise that planning authorities should support the development of “complete communities.”</p> <p>Rationale supporting this change is not provided. “Complete communities” is a term that can be interpreted in many ways. The need to achieve</p>

		<p>“healthy, liveable and safe communities” provides appropriate clarity and this change is therefore not supported.</p> <p>Certain considerations for planning authorities such as “avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns” and “promoting development patterns that conserve biodiversity,” among others, are proposed to be removed.</p> <p>The removal of these considerations appears to be counter-intuitive to the fundamental goal of creating complete communities and sustainable communities.</p> <p>The proposed change is not supported.</p>
PPS3	Housing	<p>New policies that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • re-introduce the requirement that planning authorities establish and implement minimum targets for the provision of housing that is affordable to low- and moderate-income households. The draft Statement re-introduces low- and moderate-income households as a defined term. • continue to require planning authorities to permit and facilitate the development and redevelopment of underutilized commercial and institutional sites for residential development. The draft policy has been further revised to specifically identify underutilized shopping malls and plazas as potential commercial sites for redevelopment. The draft policy continues to promote the introduction of new housing options within previously developed areas and redevelopment which results in a net increase in residential units. <p>The proposed changes are appropriate and supported.</p>

<p>PPS4</p>	<p>Settlement Area / Settlement Area Boundary Expansions</p>	<p>Significant changes to the policies related to settlement areas are being proposed.</p> <p>New policies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encouraging (but not requiring) planning authorities to establish minimum targets for intensification and redevelopment in “built up areas” rather than settlement areas. • encouraging (but not requiring) planning authorities to establish density targets for designated growth areas (rather than settlement areas). • directing planning authorities to establish and implement phasing policies, where appropriate, to ensure that development within designated growth areas is orderly and aligns with the timely provision of infrastructure and public service facilities. • permitting planning authorities to identify a new settlement area or allow a settlement area boundary expansion at any time (i.e. outside of the Municipal Comprehensive Review process). • removing the current conditions required to be satisfied before settlement area additions or boundary expansions are permitted. Proposed conditions that planning authorities “shall consider” are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the need to designate and plan for additional land to accommodate an appropriate range and mix of land uses; ▪ if there is sufficient capacity in existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities;
-------------	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ whether the applicable lands comprise specialty crop areas;▪ the evaluation of alternative locations which avoid prime agricultural areas and, where avoidance is not possible, consider reasonable alternatives on lower priority agricultural lands in prime agricultural areas;▪ whether the new or expanded settlement area complies with the minimum distance separation formulae;▪ whether impacts on the agricultural system are avoided, or where avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated to the extent feasible as determined through an agricultural impact assessment or equivalent analysis, based on provincial guidance; and▪ the new or expanded settlement area provides for the phased progression of urban development. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• permitting planning authorities to identify a new settlement area only where it has been demonstrated that infrastructure and public service facilities to support development are planned or available. <p>The proposed changes are generally supported. It would be appropriate to also consider changes to the PPS 2024 that requires planning authorities to establish intensification and redevelopment targets within built-up areas that implementation of these targets be considered prior to identifying the need for new settlement areas.</p>
--	--	--

PPS5	Strategic Growth Areas	<p>Proposed policies provide that Strategic Growth Areas (SGA) include existing and emerging downtowns, under utilized shopping malls and plazas, lands along major roads, arterials or higher order transit corridors.</p> <p>All municipalities are encouraged to focus growth and development in SGAs to achieve higher density outcomes.</p> <p>The proposed change is appropriate and supported.</p>
PPS7	Employment Areas	<p>New policies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encouraging intensification of employment uses that are compatible with compact mixed-use development. • requiring planning authorities to promote economic development and competitiveness by addressing land use compatibility adjacent to employment areas by providing an appropriate transition to sensitive land uses. • for lands outside of employment areas, encouraging the development of industrial, manufacturing and small-scale warehousing uses that can be operated adjacent to sensitive land uses without causing adverse effects. This adjacency is encouraged within strategic growth areas and within other mixed-use areas where frequent transit service is available. • proposing that residential, employment, public service facilities and other institutional uses be permitted on certain employment lands (e.g. shopping plazas) to support the achievement of complete communities.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• removal of requirement for separation or mitigation from sensitive land uses within employment areas planned for industrial and manufacturing uses. Instead, the requirement will be that planning authorities “maintain land use compatibility between sensitive land uses and employment areas” in accordance with land use compatibility policies “to maintain the long-term operational and economic viability of the planned uses and function of these areas”.• modifying the existing employment conversion policies by permitting planning authorities to remove lands from employment areas at any time (rather than through a municipal comprehensive review), only where it can be demonstrated that:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ there is an identified need for the removal and the land is not required for employment area uses over the long term;▪ the proposed uses would not negatively impact the overall viability of the employment area by:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ avoiding, or where avoidance is not possible, minimizing and mitigating potential impacts to existing or planned employment area uses;○ maintaining access to major goods movement facilities and corridors;▪ existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities are available to accommodate the proposed uses; and▪ the municipality has sufficient employment lands to accommodate projected employment growth to the horizon of the approved official plan.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • would define employment areas as: “those areas designated in an official plan for clusters of business and economic activities including manufacturing, research and development in connection with manufacturing, warehousing, goods movement, associated retail and office, and ancillary facilities. <p>The proposed changes continue to promote the importance of protecting employment lands while allowing for some introduction of residential uses in certain cases (such as shopping malls and plazas).</p> <p>The proposed changes are appropriate and supported.</p>
<p>PPS8</p>	<p>Land Use Compatibility</p>	<p>New policies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • making it easier to establish sensitive land uses in the vicinity of existing or planned industrial, manufacturing “or other major facilities” that are vulnerable to encroachment. • eliminate current requirements to demonstrate: an identified need for the proposed use; that alternative locations have been evaluated and there are no reasonable alternative locations; and that adverse effects to the proposed sensitive land use are minimized and mitigated. Instead, where it is not possible for major facilities and sensitive land uses to avoid potential adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, proposed adjacent sensitive land uses would only be required to demonstrate that potential impacts to industrial, manufacturing or other major facilities are minimized and mitigated in accordance with provincial guidelines, standards and procedures.

		<p>These changes could result in increased conflicts between sensitive land uses and those generating potential adverse impacts.</p> <p>The proposed changes are not supported.</p>
PPS9	Municipal Services	<p>New policies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> requiring the consideration of opportunities to allocate and reallocate, if necessary, the unused system capacity of municipal water services and municipal sewage services to meet current and projected needs for an increased housing supply. <p>The proposed change is appropriate and supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> permitting that partial services may be permitted within rural settlement areas, where new development will be serviced by individual on site water services in combination with municipal sewage services or private communal sewage services. <p>The Town's current growth management strategy and servicing plan promotes new development in settlement areas being on full municipal services. It is not recommended that on-site water services be approved in settlement areas.</p> <p>The proposed change is not supported.</p>
PPS10	Agriculture	<p>Significant changes to policies related to the development of lands in prime agricultural areas are proposed.</p>

		<p>New policies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• encouraging a geographically continuous agricultural land base through an agricultural system approach but no longer requiring municipalities to use the provincially mapped Agricultural System. Municipalities will still be required to designate and protect prime agricultural areas for long-term use. However, as set out below, it will be easier to establish more housing within prime agricultural lands.• permitting a principal dwelling associated with an agricultural operation to be located in prime agricultural areas as an agricultural use, except where prohibited by policy 4.3.3 (lot creation and adjustments).• permitting that where a residential dwelling is permitted on a lot in a prime agricultural area, up to two additional residential units shall be permitted in accordance with provincial guidance, provided that specified criteria are met. These criteria include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ compliance with the minimum distance separation formulae;▪ compatibility with surrounding agricultural operations;▪ the appropriate provision of sewage and water services;▪ the ability to address public health and safety concerns; and▪ the requirement for additional units to be of a limited scale and located within, attached or in close proximity to the principal dwelling or farm building cluster and minimizing land taken out of agricultural production.
--	--	---

		<p>The stated intent of this policy is to permit more housing on farms for farmers, farm families and farm workers, without creating new lots.</p> <p>Growth should continue to be directed to settlement areas where the full range of community facilities and infrastructure is provided (in a sustainable manner). Permitting additional housing in the agricultural area will undermine this objective while creating opportunities for conflicts between non-farm residents and agricultural operations and potential increase in demand for urban-type services.</p> <p>The proposed changes are not supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• revising lot creation in prime agricultural areas slightly, but continuing to discourage lot creation and only permitting lot creation for agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, infrastructure (where the facility or corridor cannot be accommodated through the use of easements or rights of way) and for up to one residence surplus to an agricultural operation, provided certain criteria are met, including:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ limiting the new lot to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use;▪ the availability of appropriate sewage and water services; and▪ requiring that new dwellings and additional residential units be prohibited on any remnant parcel of farmland created by the severance.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requiring an agricultural impact assessment or equivalent analysis based on provincial guidance where it is not possible to avoid impacts from any new or expanding non-agricultural uses on surrounding agricultural lands and operations. <p>The lot creation and adjustment policies that had been initially proposed appeared to permit the creation of up to three residential lots from an existing lot. The draft PPS 2024, however, has largely reverted back to the lot creation and lot adjustment provisions of the PPS 2020 which permit the creation of one additional lot from an existing lot but as noted above, only for lots containing a residence surplus to an agricultural operation.</p> <p>The proposed changes are appropriate and supported.</p>
PPS11	Natural Hazards	<p>Requires planning authorities to collaborate with conservation authorities to identify hazardous lands and hazardous sites and manage development in these areas in accordance with provincial guidance.</p> <p>The proposed change is appropriate and supported.</p>
PPS12	Implementation / Transition	<p>New policies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requiring planning authorities to keep their zoning by-laws and official plans up-to-date with PPS by establishing permitted uses, minimum densities, heights and other development standards to accommodate growth and development. • requiring that that where a planning authority must decide on a planning matter before its official plan has been updated to be

		<p>consistent with the PPS, or before other applicable planning instruments have been updated accordingly, it must still make a decision that is consistent with the PPS.</p> <p>The Province is proposing to release the final PPS 2024 to the public “for a short period of time” before they take effect. The Province proposes that official plans would be revised as necessary to implement the PPS 2024 at the time of their ordinary review cycle (i.e. every five years or every ten years after a new official plan).</p> <p>This proposed change is appropriate and supported.</p>
--	--	--

It is recommended that this Report be submitted to the Province through the Environmental Registry of Ontario as comments from the Town of Tecumseh on Bill 185 and the proposed Draft 2024 PPS.

Consultations

Watson & Associates Economists Ltd.

Financial Implications

As noted in Attachment 1, many of the changes to the *Development Charges Act* appear positive for municipalities by assisting in ensuring that growth pays for growth to the extent possible. This is improved by allowing for the inclusion of growth-related studies that will allow municipalities to appropriately plan for additional development.

Furthermore, the removal of the mandatory phase-in provisions ensures discounts to development charges are not provided to development and redevelopment that municipalities do not aim to incentivize. The reduction in the development charge rate freeze timeline helps to ensure development that is not proceeding quickly does not receive discounts. Ultimately, the removal of the mandatory phase-in provisions ensures the Town can collect the full development charges necessary to support the construction of the works required to support new development.

Link to Strategic Priorities

Applicable	2023-2026 Strategic Priorities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sustainable Growth: Achieve prosperity and a livable community through sustainable growth.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Community Health and Inclusion: Integrate community health and inclusion into our places and spaces and everything we do.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Service Experience: Enhance the experience of Team Tecumseh and our citizens through responsive and respectful service.

Communications

Not applicable

Website

Social Media

News Release

Local Newspaper

This report has been reviewed by Senior Administration as indicated below and recommended for submission by the Chief Administrative Officer.

Prepared by:

Enrico DeCecco, BA (Hons), MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner

Reviewed by:

Chad Jeffery, MA, MCIP, RPP
Manager Planning Services & Local Economic Development

Reviewed by:

Brian Hillman, MA, MCIP, RPP
Director Development Services

Recommended by:

Margaret Misek-Evans, MCIP, RPP
Chief Administrative Officer

Attachment Number	Attachment Name
1.	Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. Correspondence "Assessment of Bill 185, Cutting Red Tape to Build More Homes Act, 2024"