

DORSAY

MANAGEMENT CORPORATION

February 28, 2019

Sent via email: growthplanning@ontario.ca

Mr. Charles O'Hara
Director, Growth Policy, Planning and Analysis
Ontario Growth Secretariat
Ministry of Municipal Affairs
777 Bay Street
c/o Business Management Division, 17th Floor
Toronto, ON M5G 2E5

Dear Mr. O'Hara

RE: Comments on Amendment 1 to the Growth Plan (the "Amendment")
EBR Registry Number: 013-4504
Dorsay (Pickering) Ltd.

Dorsay (Pickering) Ltd. ("Dorsay"), owns significant land holdings in the City of Pickering, located in Northeast Pickering near the planned Pickering airport (the "Subject Lands").

Comments and Proposed Revisions to the Amendment

We thank the Province for putting forward the Amendment and for this opportunity to provide our comments. We support the Province's initiative and commitment to increasing available housing supply, streamlining the process for transit growth, attracting investment and fostering job creation, and improving the planning process, while continuing to protect the Greenbelt, agricultural lands, the agri-food sector, and natural heritage systems in Ontario.

Our specific comments are respectfully provided below:

1. We support the revisions to Policies 2.2.8.4 and 2.2.8.5 regarding the adjustment and expansion of settlement area boundaries, but Policy 2.2.8.5 should be modified to remove any specific size limitations to settlement area boundary expansions that may occur in advance of a municipal comprehensive review ("MCR") and rather provide a requirement that any expansion contribute towards the creation of complete communities.
2. To recognize infrastructure challenges and limitations related to the costs associated with servicing lands, we propose that Policies 2.2.8.4 and 2.2.8.5 be revised to remove the requirement for existing servicing where it can be demonstrated that existing servicing can be extended to lands.
3. Settlement area boundary expansions occurring outside of an MCR should be permitted on the basis of achieving complete communities.
4. The minimum intensification rate for Durham should be maintained at 40%; and, if increased be no higher than 45%. This is appropriate given the relatively small size of Durham Region's Built Up Area, the limited higher order transit in the Region, and the actual current rates of intensification which are generally below 40%. Durham Region and its local municipalities, including Pickering, have yet to demonstrate that the 40% intensification rate can be maintained for a prolonged period of time. Moreover, adopting a higher target prior to completing a MCR may

inadvertently preclude an appropriate housing mix from meeting market and demographic needs of existing and future residents. To-date, Durham Region has only had to comply with the 40% intensification rate since 2015 and lacks sufficient transit investment required to rationalize additional intensification. Moreover, the 60% rate imposed in 2017 on Hamilton, Peel, York and Waterloo was not derived from observed or achievable rates but taken from the Pembina Institute's report "Driving Down Carbon" which was not informed by land use planning, observed facts, or economic/market realities. As such, it is not good planning nor appropriate to rely on this intensification rate. Intensification rates should be kept lower in the Growth Plan to allow Upper and Single Tier municipalities the flexibility to provide an appropriate housing mix, and if appropriate, increase the rate of intensification in their own Official Plans, as needed.

5. The Designated Greenfield Area density target of 50 residents and jobs per hectare should be maintained in Durham Region.
6. The Built-Up Area should be updated from 2006 to 2018 to reflect growth that has occurred since the adoption of the Growth Plan.
7. The forecasts of the Growth Plan should be updated to 2051, with direction that upper and single-tier municipalities plan to this horizon when implementing the Growth Plan.
8. The timeframe for completion of the MCR by a municipality should be two years.
9. The agricultural and rural areas within the inner-ring of the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area should be identified as a Future Greenfield Area to accommodate long-term growth needs.
10. Transition policies should be included in the Growth Plan which recognize communities which have been envisioned in past planning processes and that would allow for the achievement of complete communities. The inclusion of transition policies within the Growth Plan to allow the Subject Lands to be brought into settlement area would allow for completion of the area as planned and continue the implementation of ROPA 114 and 128.
11. Concurrently with the above, Policy 2.2.8.6 should allow for settlement area boundary expansions occurring outside of an MCR to be linked to achieving complete communities. The Subject Lands were arbitrarily excluded from a settlement expansion, creating an incomplete community with respect to infrastructure, community facilities, and circulation. The Subject Lands represent an appropriate location for a future settlement boundary expansion that can provide a greater supply and choice of housing within the larger GTHA market area, and can provide employment opportunities along the 407 extension, where significant Provincial infrastructure investment has been made.
12. The Amendment sets a density target of 50 residents and jobs per hectare for the Designated Greenfield Areas in Durham. This target is supportable and will aid in the creation of compact and complete communities that allow for a diverse range of housing that meets the needs of the residents of the Region. As with the intensification target, the target in the Growth Plan should allow upper and single-tier municipalities the time to assess through their MCR whether a higher rate may be appropriate.
13. We support the amendments aimed to streamline the process for determining major transit station areas, in order to speed up the process for development and zoning.
14. Lastly, we ask for the opportunity to review and comment on the full text of the proposed regulations in order to properly evaluate the intended and actual impact.

History of Northeast Pickering and the Subject Lands

The Subject Lands are located within a Study Area as defined by the Region of Durham Official Plan, and should be considered as a future urban area boundary expansions subject to specific requirements for Northeast Pickering. Northeast Pickering as a future area was adopted into the settlement area boundary in 2006, however the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe was released prior to Durham Regional Council approving the settlement expansion. This area should be treated as a transitional area for immediate consideration for inclusion into the settlement area boundary.

In 2000 the Region began planning for the development of Northeast Pickering. A comprehensive review was undertaken and key background reports were prepared to form the basis for proposed amendments to the Official Plan, which contemplated both the need for and location of new growth areas in Durham Region. In early 2006, the Region recommended that most of the 'whitebelt' in southern Durham Region be included within the settlement area boundary to accommodate growth needs to 2031. This included the Subject Lands.

Following the release of the Growth Plan in June of 2006 and upon request from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, the Region withheld its decision on new growth areas until a new growth management exercise could be completed. The revised amendment adopted in ROPA 114 added a new Schedule 'F' that identified areas for future growth, including all of northeast Pickering (again including the Subject Lands), as shown in the figure below.

Figure 1: Region of Durham Official Plan – Future Growth Areas Excerpt



Source: Region of Durham Official Plan, ROPA 114 (2006) – Schedule 'F'

In 2007, the Region initiated its Growth Plan conformity exercise, known as Growing Durham. Growing Durham formed the basis of ROPA 128. ROPA 128 built on the direction provided by Growing Durham, designating the Subject Lands as a Regional Centre with Living Areas and Employment Areas land use designations.

ROPA 128 was forwarded to the Province for approval, however the then Provincial government refused the proposed urban boundary expansion in Northeast Pickering, primarily on the basis that growth in the Seaton community should be achieved prior to considering growth in Northeast Pickering. A settlement was reached between the Region, the Province and other key stakeholders which adding site-specific policies, outlining the requirements for any future urban area boundary expansions, including specific requirements for Northeast Pickering (Policy 7.3.11p). The policy was intended to provide direction that this area should be planned for the next round of growth and as such should be considered for the next settlement boundary expansion.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the proposed Amendment and look forward to working with you and your staff. We would appreciate being added to the circulation list for any new information with respect to the Amendment.

If you have any questions, or would like to meet to discuss this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Dorsay (Pickering) Ltd.



Geoffrey Grayhurst, President

Copy: Mr. Matthew Cory, Malone Given Parsons
 Mrs. Katarzyna Sliwa, Dentons Canada LLP