

**Growth Plan Implementation & Increasing   
Alignment with Climate Action Plans   
  
Workshop Discussion & Summary**

**Friday, October 20, 2017**

**Section 1: Presentations**

# Katherine Morton, Ministry of Municipal Affairs: 2017 Growth Plan Update

* The Growth Plan primarily deals with the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) area of Ontario, which spans from Simcoe to Lake Erie from Waterloo to Peterborough. This area experiences a population growth of 2,000 people/week.
* A Coordinated Review of the various Growth Plans was undertaken. There was also the additional goal of better integrating the Growth Plan with the Climate Change Action Plan. It is understood that land use management regarding buildings and transportation is fundamental to addressing Climate Change.
* Policy 4.4.10 in the Climate Change Action Plan addresses the multidimensional aspect of Climate Change. It requires municipalities to incorporate Climate Change policies in their Official Plans and develop municipal GHG inventories with an intent to decrease emissions.
* MOECC is currently in the process to develop guidelines to help municipalities in above-mentioned goals.

**The Growth Plan**

* Issue that the updated GP tries to address: Increasing connection between land use and transit accessibility. Areas have been prioritized to increase density and promote mixed used hubs. To increase alignment between the land use plan and regional Transit plans.
* Solutions promoted by GP: complete communities as defined in the CCAP, decrease travel distances and increase walkability, increase mix-use areas, and increase density.
* Definitions were expanded regarding climate change adaptation and mitigation: Low-impact development, green infrastructure, active transportation, complete streets, and transportation asset management strategy.

**There are two overarching land use classifications used in the GP:**

* Strategic Growth Area: focuses on intensification in areas where services, transit and relating infrastructure already exist in built-up areas with the goal to use existing infrastructure to the greatest extent possible and limit land expansion.
  + Municipal roles include delineating these areas within their own boundaries, meet minimum density targets for transit areas.
  + Intensification targets: 40% in 2017, 50% in 2031, and 60% in 2041.
* Designated Greenfield Area focuses on non-urban areas to increase intensification efforts in order to limit growth in land requirements.
  + Municipalities focus on intensifying the built environment and services in these areas.
  + Intensification targets: going from 50 ppl/jobs/hectare to 80 ppl/jobs/hectare by 2030. The minimum number to allocate transit service into the area is 80 ppl jobs/hectare.

**Next Steps**

* GP provides an additional sustainability lens as it encourages life cycle analysis, asset management plans, vulnerability and risk assessment, low impact development, stormwater management and increase in green infrastructure within municipalities.
* GP acknowledges and supports the relationship between natural heritage sites and water management: protection needs to happen now, enforces consistency between the GP and the Green Belt Plan, and watershed/sub-watershed management plans are endorsed
* Implementation support: contact MOECC for support on GHG inventories, Climate Change Action Plans, and Storm Water Plans. Contact the Ministry of Municipal Affairs regarding Growth Plan monitoring mechanisms being developed.

**Discussion**

**What type of feedback is the Ministry of Municipal Affairs interested in regarding monitoring and reporting?** It is informal at the moment, but a more formal process will be undertaken some time in early 2018.

**Is there guidance provided for delineating Strategic Growth Areas?** There is a work being undertaken to develop that and MMA will be looking for opportunities to gather input on that guidance.

The issue of limits on growth have come up. What about where the growth exceeds the targets? What about the possibility of negative implications (i.e. when densities surpass service capacity). Has there been any thought to setting limits on growth or service level requirements to ensure that growth does not exceed infrastructure’s ability to support it? There has not been plans to set service levels as that is under the municipalities’ authority and decision making.

**What is implied by the GP when they promote “green infrastructure” in urban areas?** Municipalities are responsible for defining what they consider green infrastructure to be. This is one area where the MOECC guidelines would be able to assist municipalities—they will focus on providing guidelines as to what low impact development would look like, but it is not likely to be mandatory for municipalities to have specific targets.

**In the GP, is there some reference to emphasizing the value of the natural environment?**

The David Suzuki Foundation released a report on the value of the Green Belt in 2008 that can be a useful reference if municipalities are interested in creating a case to preserve natural areas. It is important to educate and spread awareness to the value of natural habitat (health and mental health benefits), but placing an economic value on these natural assets is an emerging and important field.

There has been a lot of research regarding the importance of natural capital and its benefits to stormwater management—keep an eye out because additional resources will be released soon.

**How does the GP address public reluctance to intensification i.e. “not in my neighbourhood”?**

The Smart Growth secretariat is working on public education and outreach strategies because this is seen as the best solution to promote the case and value for intensification. There is an increased understanding that public education on the rationale and need of the Growth Plan needs to be increased. Ian McVey, Improving Growth Implementation—Feedback from Summer 2016 Workshop

* The goal of the July 2016 workshop was to find ways to increase alignment between the Climate Change Action Plan and the Growth Plan and to limit the negative environmental implications of sprawl.
* It is understood that: adaptation measures to Climate change are more complex to deal with because climate change impacts do not take into account municipal boundaries but rather align with larger geographical regions ex. Those associated with hydrological processes.
* Issue: CCAP has increased recognition of the need for the creation of municipal climate action plans, however, there has not been much movement in regards to plan implementation and reporting and monitoring.

**Breakout Group #1: Education and Outreach**

* There needs to be more engagement and education on the value proposition (both environmental, economic and social) of the Growth Plan.
* To better enable municipalities to reach their ghg reduction targets (and contribute to the provincial and federal targets) resources need to be made available to build leadership with a focus on municipalities.
* There needs to be more engagement from municipalities, province and the feds to the public regarding climate change.
* Solution: promote visualization tools to address trade-offs in regards to different planning decisions and forecast what the future might look like with the decisions in the discussion. This is the most useful when implicating adaptation and mitigation approaches (low carbon communities, resilient communities)

**Group #2: Monitoring and data availability**

* Emphasized the importance of having a regional level governing body, which has become an emerging practice (potential to support a Pan-GGH Regional framework?)
* This will assist in increasing flow from upper to lower tier land budgeting strategies, increasing transparency, addressing limitations in power at the County level.
* Marcy’s presentation this afternoon will speak more to this topic.

**Group #3: Land use and energy**

* Discussed the Building Code and the B.C. example where the Province has a minimum required level of energy efficiency threshold but there is an opportunity for municipalities to advance higher than mandated levels for their jurisdiction.
* Ontario would be able to achieve the same best practice if that mechanism was put in place for Ontario in the update to the Ontario Building Code. The direction that municipalities have the authority to enact a higher step than mandated in the OBC was a key recommendation that the Clean Air Council put into their OBC consultation submission.
* Advance tools used to promote effective energy efficiency policies/programs: LICs (Local Improvement Charges), pressure province and utilities to consider renewable procurement policies, increase data accessibility and sharing opportunities, and engage planning/development community stakeholders during the early stages of development plans

**Group #4: Low carbon transportation planning**

* Focused on solving how to reduce negative perceptions from the resident community through leveraging visualization tools (ex. NEPTIS Geoweb; Case studies of communities that meet/exceed targets and how they are very much sought after places to live).
* There is the need to consider where food deserts exists or are being created as this is an accessibility and a public health issue that can be addressed with land use planning. Solution: increase local food hubs within transportation hubs, consider freight village hub pilots, which would decrease congestion off of article roads. Example: Pembina ongoing Pilot in DUKE heights to further understand municipal role in supporting freight hubs.

**Group #5: Watershed Management**

* The stronger need for watershed management plans was raised. With increased guidance for ensuring adaptation planning and watershed planning are connected to ensure synergies and implementation are advanced.
* There should be an increased emphasis on the role of green infrastructure and its role in being a key supporter of grey infrastructure. Not an either/or thing but rather a way to make the best use of existing infrastructure and a cost prudent way to ensure ecological services and other co-benefits. Recommendation: increased guidance in roles within upper and lower tier governments and the role Conservation Authorities play.

**Group #6: Integrated Planning and Infrastructure**

* Need to better explore the economic mechanisms in place and how they support or undermine growth plan and climate goals. Gaby’s presentation coming up will speak more to that topic.

**Group #7: Land Use Planning**

* Lack/limited access to data is an issue that needs to be addressed
* Province should consider vulnerability assessment grants as mandatory on all provincial infrastructure developments, there should be more guidance on how vulnerability assessments should be done, could potentially fall under Asset Management
* Be watchful for the Adaptation Plan to be released soon from the Province.
* Risk assessment implementation guidance is needed from the province.
* Resource: Jobs for Prosperity Act found within the Ministry of Infrastructure website that provides further information on asset planning and infrastructure vulnerabilities. Feedback on consultation feedback available [here](https://www.ontario.ca/page/consultation-potential-municipal-asset-management-planning-regulation).

# Gabriella Kalapos, Clean Air Partnership: Increasing Alignment between Development Charges and Growth Plan Implementation

* The Growth Plan doesn’t speak strongly enough to the fact that the Growth Plan is set within an economic framework and misalignments between the two can undermine implementation. There is the need to explore price signals related to Growth. Where does the economic signals align with policy goals and where doesn’t it? Ex. Development charges, property taxes, utility costs, transit & road investments/costs, etc.
* The Growth Plan should be viewed as an economic policy just as much (if not more than) an environmental policy. We did not end up with an infrastructure deficit by accident. It’s as simple as our costs exceeding our revenue. How can costs be better align with revenues? How can we account for externalities and subsidies that skew the market at present?
* Identifying and correcting market failures: A price mechanism can allocate more of the total/true costs of producing or using that good or service to those buying or using that good or service. Laws or regulations can change behaviour or more accurately account for total/true costs. In the majority of cases of market failure, a combination of remedies is most likely to succeed.
* Climate Change is a market failure problem due to a misaalocation associated with the true costs of fossil fuel use (ex. Air pollution, environmental costs, health care, impacts of climate change, etc).
* Studies exploring the economics of urban form have found that the costs of growth can vary based on the following factors: If the growth can use existing infrastructure; if it requires upgrades to existing infrastructure; if it requires new infrastructure (greenfield); How far the development is from existing infrastructure; and/or the growth scenario in terms of land area and density.
* One: current development charges do not take into account urban form (land area and density). The denominator used to allocate total growth costs is population (population affects some costs but isn’t the only consideration affecting costs especially for the hard infrastructure costs.
* Development charges only account for upfront capital costs. Not operating costs and not rehabilitation costs. However, land use will have an impact on those operating and rehabilitation costs and greatly influence costs and revenues associated with those services.
* There are Gaps in the Research on the Economics of Urban Form. Most economics of urban form studies focus on the up-front capital costs. Increased knowledge of the implications of urban form on operations and rehabilitation costs of infrastructure and revenue would be of great value. These scenarios would better enable municipalities to understand the correlation between urban form and municipal costs and revenue on a longer term basis; especially when considering how best to ensure that the needed revenue is available to cover the costs for rehabilitation of infrastructure a few decades after installation.
* At present there are gaps in the development charge legislation that do not allow for the growth pays for growth policy to be put into practice. The denominator of growth costs needs to incorporate density, land area and other factors that impact actual growth costs.
* Implementation of the Growth Plan would likely be improved if Provincial infrastructure decisions were also required to conform to the Growth Plan.For example: if it is cheaper for the province to build a hospital in a less intensified area, but it becomes more expensive for the municipality because of the additional infrastructure required for servicing the hospital and this doesn’t support intensification targets? Hospital staff and residents also have to travel further for the service, which increases GHG emissions.
* Housing affordability is an issue but the Growth Plan is not the cause of our housing affordability problem. Nor are development costs. Development costs are acrtual costs that have to be paid. It is best to allocate it in the most appropriate manner to what is causing the costs. If growth doesn’t pay for those costs than everyone has to pay for those costs. As such**,** reducing development charges is not a solution, but increasing housing diversity & more accurate allocation of development costs could provide support for the housing affordability problem.
* Halifax Regional Municipality working with Pamela Blais from Metropole and the author of Perverse Cities (an amazing book that speaks to the subsidies that are provided to low density greenfield development) is undertaking a study of incorporating density and land area into development charge allocations. Bill 73 increases flexibility with development charges which can enables municipalities to allocate transit costs and to set zones for development costs but the legislation would need to be updated to factor in land are and density into division of growth costs. t

## Susan Swail, Environmental Defence Smart Communities Lab: Towards Improving Growth Plan Implementation

* Environmental Defense advocates for sustainability at the regional level and Smart Communities Lab aims to provide tools to increase implementation of the Growth Plan.
* Promotes: conversation regarding growth plan implementation procedures addressing challenges and opportunities. It is recognized that planning and communities are not static, as such the Smart Communities Report is a living document that will be updated on a regular basis.
* Methodology: engaging and working with community leaders, community members and a diverse network of stakeholders in order to showcase best practices.

**Recommended Actions from Smart Communities Lab**

* Role to develop the following tools: visual communication materials visualizing growth and showing how provincial policies affect each other and the municipal policies are connected; provide consistent and reliable data sharing strategies, and monitoring and reporting the effectiveness of policy implementation.
* Create a Legacy Trust (ex similar to the Greenbelt Foundation), focused on supporting research; building partnerships; and promoting comprehension of the growth plan.
* Transit revenue tools—The regional transportation plan is projected to cost 45 billion dollars. There is a significant gap between the budget and committed revenues.

Municipal Actions

* Focus on growth in already built up areas; better alignment with growth and transit opportunities. Update zoning to make intensification the predominant choice , provide incentives to intensify vs. on greenfield areas, incorporating active transportation, and improve transparency associated with the cost of growth.

Stakeholder Partners

* Developers continue to ask for incentives because they say it costs them more to develop where there is existing infrastructure and people.
* Developers and community residents should be Incorporate further in early discussions of development plans. There is the need to increase the dialogue of the value of the Growth Plan and the rationale for it.

Next Steps for Environmental Defense

* Focus on developing dialogue and knowledge sharing/ best practices through community workshops—there will be a workshop on January 22 regarding the benefits of density.
* Implement Climate Change literacy at the provincial, municipal and community level in a consistent manner (this helps with increased transparency). Interested residents will be reaching out to municipalities; they need to be literate.
* Find ways to implement Growth Plan policies 4.2.9 and 4.2.10 which relate to climate change actions.

## Marcy Burchfield, Neptis Foundation: Growth Plan Monitoring and Reporting

* The goal is to ensure an effieicnt and effective means of monitoring the implementation of the Growth Plan using indicators, municipal/provincial and other available data sets.
* We need to understand where growth is occurring, what type of growth it is and why it is occurring in that manner to extent that enables us to understand how we are progressing towards the outcomes that the Growth Plan was enacted to achieve.
* The new Growth Plan was developed through an iterative process between the provincial and municipal governments, this has been a good change as to how the previous growth plan was developed and implemented 10 years ago. Performance evaluation has been recognized as a key activity of the new Growth plan. It is in the new GP policy that allows the minister to ask for data sets from municipalities to strengthen a performance monitoring program, consultations will be held with municipalities to gather input.
* Focus: Which indicators would work best to showcase intersection between the Growth Plan and the Climate Change Action Plan, the next step would be to find the appropriate data; how often should data be collected over time in order to address inevitable changes in development?

Key Performance Indicators

* Lessons learned from Ministry of Municipal Affairs Indicators: aggregate data is limited, incorporating scale is essential to visualize what is being built over time, where, and for whom; using municipal data is the most accurate; consultation between municipalities and province is beneficial.
* Indicators used by Neptis for its evaluation of the Growth plan were based on the idea of compact communities. Census data highlighted the location of intensification areas in order to understand what services were provided within and surrounding it; number of new dwellings over time addressed population distribution patterns regarding population losses/gains within rural vs. urban settings; satellite imagery helped track greenfield areas and associated land consumption practices.
* New indicators should be considered to address GP implementation at both the upper tier level and the lower tier level—provides the ability to cross-reference between tiers and between different municipalities. This would increase the ability to compare across jurisdictions.
* Summary—suggested indicators used to track:
  + Areas of intensification
  + Population net loss and gain
  + Service nodes/ deserts
  + Land consumption patterns
  + Upper vs. Lower tier analysis
  + Successful education and awareness programs

Case Study: Metro Vancouver

* Metro Vancouver is a regional institutional body that uses a collaborative system of governance (not a government) responsible for research at the regional scale. It also consists of a board of mayors that sit together and participate in growth strategy best practices.
* Tool vs report approach: Metro Vancouver developed a website that is primarily used as a communication tool for the community at large to become aware of the region’s indicators and be informed about the successes of regional/municipal GP implementation (indicators).
* 54 indicators are linked to 5 key goals of the Plan. Indicators are mapped, charted, and available for download—Anyone is able to do this for any municipality within the region. The 5 key goals of Metro Vancouver Plan: Support a sustainable economy; create a compact urban area; develop complete communities; protect the environment & response to climate change impacts; and support sustainable transportation options
* Report is given to each municipality annually for most of the indicators and are posted on the website.
* Metro Vancouver’s tool is focused on impact data, dependent on municipal data (municipalities use the same methodology to maintain consistency).

**Group Discussion Feedback on Indicators Handout**

* Have province allocate some seed money to get similar tool (website)
* There needs to be a focus on methodology when collecting municipal data
* Use the BC example, not necessarily for their indicators, but as a case study for their criteria on establishing the indicators.
  + Need to be aware of outcome measures vs. input measures
  + Indicator suggestion: find a way for addressing planned vs. built, integrating growth plan and demographic changes (square footage/person)
* There needs to be a focus on alignment between monitoring and education

Next Step: Neptis and CAP to work together to gather municipal input to the Monitoring and Reporting approach. This will inform the discussion with the MMA when that is undertaken in early 2018.

**Section 2: Summary of Feedback from Group Discussions**

# Break Out #1: Increasing Alignment Break Out

**What questions do you still have on the new Growth Plan?**

* How are complete communities/low carbon communities being defined? Where are they the same, where are they different? Are we all talking about the same thing when we use those terms?
* Employment lands designation rules have changed but still don’t know if that change will be enough to deal with the barriers that municipalities have faced to protect employment lands?
* There are still exemptions possible for outer ring municipalities. There is the need for a rationale to be provided for the exemption. Minister still needs to sign off on it but the rationale needs to be apart of the MCRP. How will that work? And what impact will those possible exemptions result in?
* Still need more effort to help address NIMBYism. What will be done for education for residents to understand what the Growth Plan means to them and how it would impact them if the Growth Plan wasn’t implemented?
* Still need to understand how the targets will incorporate local circumstance: ex. Density Targets for employment, Warehousing will not enable you to achieve that target just due to the nature of that land use. The Growth Plan doesn’t allow any changes to existing development but in order to achieve the targets (especially around transit hubs) there will be the need to address already existing developments.
* What are the main barriers that were raised by municipalities and stakeholders that weren’t advanced in the new Growth Plan? What barriers haven’t yet been addressed that should be?
* Will the Stormwater guidance set standards that should be adhered to? It is likely to provide guidance but not set standards. There are standards in place for the Lake Simcoe WSP but that is because it is governed by the Lake Simcoe Protection Act which includes stricter protections. This example can provide some insights for what need to happen to protect other watersheds. Water quality and salt? How big a problem are jurisdictions and watersheds facing on that. That is a challenging one because of the required levels of service that roads have to adhere to.

**What actions need to be undertaken to increase alignment between the Growth Plan and the Climate Change Action Plan? And who needs to be involved?**

* There is the need to increase the recognition of green space and natural capital to provide ecological services. Need to advance natural capital inventories so municipal council recognize growth as a liquidation of their natural capital and are more willing to protect the ecological services those green spaces provide. This is also addressing the challenge of aggregating green spaces so they are of greater value to provide ecological services. Bringing that Natural capital valuation into decision making is necessary.
* Federal/Province need to help implement Net Zero buildings/Stormwater management/Building retrofits Municipality can’t finance this on their own. How will that coordination between all levels of government be advanced?
* Need to develop Indicators to track implementation and barrier identification.
* Province needs to provide climate data and consistency in how to use that data. Regions need to play a role in supporting their municipalities to be able to apply that data to decision making. Manty municipalities will not have the capacity to do that on their own.
* Storm water Management Plan/ Storm water quality (regional level at the watershed scale to be considered)
* Public health as a resource especially in regards to green space, physical activity and mental health
* Asset Management Plans (incorporating green infrastructure and climate change consideration and impacts vulnerability)
* Financial conversation/rational for the Growth Plan. This might help address the fact that it is often those opposed to intensification that make their voices heard. There aren’t easy opportunities for those who support it to have their voice heard. How can we better engage those folks in the decision making?
* Provincial policy should consider food resilient communities
* Conservation Authorities, regions, and local level—storm water management plans provides value for that alignment. How can that process inform other efforts that bring together climate change adaptation, mitigation and growth planning?
* Addressing jargon language and align them through a mapping illustration that highlight actions, outcomes, rationale, and how each plan are working together. Need to develop a map of the plans and how they interact and align with each other. Ex. Plan org chart.

# Break Out # 2: Land Use and Energy Planning - Planning for Net Zero Communities

**Where are we now?**

* **OP supportive policy in place in a good number of upper and lower-tier municipalities.** E.g. – district energy, energy efficiency, renewables. However, implementation of municipal-level community energy policies hasn’t advanced as much as the plan development has.
* **Pilot scale projects and feasibility studies have been advanced.** Net zero homes are being developed on a small scale in new developments, but not on the scale we need to transition towards low carbon/net zero communities. Typically developer-led initiatives, without policy/planning support from municipal or provincial government. District energy feasibility studies are occurring in some municipalities. Plans emerging to revitalize legacy DE facilities in university/college campuses near major population and employment centres. But lack of business case is constraining investment (i.e. low gas prices; complex governance models. Municipalities are looking to identify potential DE nodes through energy mapping. Increased understanding of financing structures available to community energy projects need to be advanced.
* **“Bottom-up” action from leading public, private and civil society sectors.** E.g. Sheridan college DE project in Brampton; small selection of private developers building net-zero homes; community energy co-ops. But a lack of top-down support and leadership in terms of policy requirements or financial capital investment is limiting the scaling up of innovative projects.
* At the municipal level, energy planning isn’t seen as a pressing issue relative to other local government issues, and so it is difficult to convince leadership that municipal government has a bigger role to play.

**Where do we want to go?**

* Comprehensive revitalization of existing thermal DE networks located near downtowns or major urban (re)development areas. Use provincial carbon fund revenues to make the business case, and develop multi-stakeholder governance models for project development AND operation of shared community energy systems.
* Workable financing, governance and operational models for community/district-scale thermal energy utilities that enable scale-up across the province.
* More municipal authority to implement tools that support low carbon net zero community development. Allow municipalities to go beyond minimum building code (like is the case with BC energy step code).
* Community energy financing models need to be better understood and municipalities and other stakeholders need to increase their ability to develop financing models that can advance community energy projects.

**What do we need to do to get there?**

* Comprehensive mapping of thermal heat demand across the municipality/region to identify priority nodes for DE infrastructure investment.
* Make use of financing mechanisms, like Community Improvement Plans (CIPs), Development charge (DC) rebates, and Local Improvement Charges (LICs) to support business case for innovative projects in new development, and existing community retrofits.
* Align municipal programs with utility and provincial incentives to create a holistic package for developers that includes carrots (incentives) and sticks (beyond code requirements for efficiency and generation, e.g. BC energy step code)
* Demonstrate the success of pilot initiative in financial terms (ROI, marketability of net zero, etc.)
* Better define the business model and role(s) for municipalities and LDCs in micro-utilities, and advance regulatory changes to support uptake of those models and roles.

# Break Out # 3: Increasing Alignment Between Growth Planning and Transit Planning

**What questions do people have re: The transit planning changes in the Growth Plan**

* What is the province’s role in supporting economic development, encouraging growth in urban centres outside of Toronto, to build out the Growth Plan?
* How can we attract investment, industry that wants mixed use?
* How do we get developers to shift their business model away from residential condos?
* How do we get people to get out of their cars and shop locally to support mixed use?

**What challenges do people see associated with the changes?**

* Two tier system with region responsible for transit, no control at local level where it goes- which stymies planning around transit.
* Lots of interest in residential development, harder for commercial – many developers don’t have experience doing mixed use, won’t build it. Elephant in room.
* Downzoning issue
* Challenge building density near arterial roadways, safety and health concerns
* Density targets aren’t enough, more support is needed for municipalities.
* Market isn’t interested in mixed use
* Cost, developers can build residential cheaply. New building code will help level costs.
* Not enough density to support the cost of operating transit
* Having sewer, water transit infrastructure in place to support growth
* Misalignment of provincial transit funding and municipal readiness
* $ for transit should be aligned with build out for growth
* Analysis and evidence should support transit decisions
* It’s a matter of timing – which comes first- transit or density? Municipalities that have development first find they have empty retail when they built mixed use- Brampton experience. In Richmond Hill challenges in getting intensification in place before transit, when will transit come- can’t answer developers.
* Return on investment- how to recoup transit costs when decision making includes health care costs of congestion, air pollution, accidents from cars.
* Governance needed for the Region to oversee transit and growth nexus
* Follow Crombie Report recommendations move transit and growth together
* Brampton challenges- LRT needed, local political decision- not focused on the regional interest, greater good. Conflicts between local and regional cost/benefits.
* Economic development challenges coordinating growth and transit- need to work with ED dept.
* How to make greyfields attractive? Turning Go Rail areas into vibrant mixed use.
* It’s 2017, we are still building commercial strip malls at the back of a parking lot.

**What can/should be done to address the changes?**

* Transform how people move from cars to transit. Use the cost of parking as a deterrent to driving. Find out what incentives, disincentives makes the modal shift viable? Stop subsidizing driving. Understand the full cost of driving.
* Update zoning, make it prescriptive – new OMB provides more power to municipalities -set out requirements , mixed use, minimum 4 stories on Main St with transit.
* Integrate office - employment areas with housing
* Create an intensification plan to align intensification with transit so developers, public and economic development depts. understand expectations, can work towards goals.
* Coordinate Growth Plan and RTP – provide transit $ only when planning and zoning in place
* Create a strategic economic development plan that aligns business, employment, transit and housing
* Build differently – pre-zone for transit areas, downtown areas – develop intensification plan specific for each town/city
* Educate developers on the benefits of mixed use
* Support work from home programs, at the municipal and provincial level
* No more free parking for govt employees and politicians, reduce parking downtown around transit stations
* Provide shuttles to events and from events to closest subway, transit station
* Engage engineers, find engineers to share knowledge about alternatives to roads
* Subsidize alternative transit in small towns, provide bikes at Go stations
* Change rules- don’t bundle parking with condo costs, make costs transparent to buyer.
* Make cost of growth transparent in tax bills
* Province needs to change the building code, increase energy efficiency
* Educate Councillors, Mayors, understand new plans, why development should change, why transit matters.