**Ontario’s Bill 66 Citizen’s Toolkit**

**Bill 66 Impacts on the Greenbelt and other land protection laws**

Bill 66 is regressive, it puts the health of drinking water at risk, opens up the Greenbelt, Oak Ridges Moraine, Lake Simcoe Protection Act to development.

Proposed MMAH/Planning Act changes in [Bill 66](https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/bills/parliament-42/session-1/bill-66), Restoring Ontario's Competitiveness Act allows municipalities, with ministerial approval, to pass “Open For Business” bylaws that allow municipalities to bypass various planning laws, including the Greenbelt Act, which Ford had promised to leave intact.

 Bill 66 is a threat to drinking water, the Greenbelt, silences community participation and undermines the provincial affordable housing consultation. This Bill and the [provincial housing consultation](http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page20903.aspx) work together to move us away from a land use planning system with clear province wide rules to a municipal led planning framework.

The legislation exempts municipalities from complying to the Clean Water Act, Greenbelt Act, the Planning Act, Lake Simcoe Protection Act, Great Lakes Protection Act, the PPS (Provincial Policy Statement), key sections of the Planning Act and other environmental legislation implemented over the last 30 years. Under the Act, major economic development projects, major employment uses and other commercial and residential developments would be exempt from planning and environmental laws, with no public notice or public meetings, and after approval by the Provincial government, would not be appealable.

Employment uses are normally located in an urban or town boundary close to infrastructure that supports business like water, sewers, internet and a good road network. Allowing employment uses (like big box stores) anywhere in the province as the open for business bylaw puts a huge burden on municipalities and utilities to provide services and upgrade roads in addition to the potential loss of farmland, and environmental impacts. These services are expensive and more sprawl will cause property tax increases and thwart public transit development.

As part of the [housing consultation](http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page20902.aspx) the province is asking whether there should be more flexibility regarding the conversion of employment lands to residential. This is because Municipalities have identified surplus lands for new employment uses and want to do something else with them. If conversion of employment lands proceeds as part of the housing reforms that come out of the current consultation, municipalities may be permitted to rezone employment uses approved under the Open for Business bylaw to residential.

The province already has the power to override local planning rules to support local economic development called the [Minister’s zoning order](http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=5426) (MZO). By proposing the open for business bylaw implemented by municipalities the province is distancing itself from the scrutiny, criticism and accountability that would normally be directed at the province had they used the MZO. It also increases the number of likely development proposals that will come forward as the development industry is very influential and often funds election campaigns at the municipal level.

Breaking the promise not to open up the Greenbelt shows a disrespect to voters. It also puts the health of farmers and rural landowners at risk. The health of our region depends on valuing our farms, forests, clean water sources and nature and building robust and vibrant communities.

Submissions on the regulation are to be made by January 20th and can be sent to the Environmental Registry of Ontario, <https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/013-4239>

**How to talk to your MPP or Municipal Councillor about Bill 66**

**(*with thanks from the David Suzuki Foundation)***

**General Tips:**

* Introduce yourself (i.e., I am a mother, student, new Canadian, teacher, farmer, etc.).
* Make a personal connection by explaining why the Greenbelt, source water protection, Oak Ridges Moraine is important to you. Consider sharing your fears, hopes or vision. Some of these values may be shared.
* Make your concerns local. Why is this important for your community in particular? Is it a farming community? How does your family/community benefit, or what is the threat? A sprawling city is a shrinking Greenbelt. If you live in a municipality that wants growth beyond its boundaries talk about how low density growth doesn’t pay its way. More sprawl means higher taxes and more municipal debt.
* **Ask your MPP** to vote against Bill 66. **Ask your municipal councillor** to adopt the resolution to stop Bill 66 and not use the open for business planning bylaw.(See below)

**Talking Points for Phone Calls and Meetings with MPPs on The Greenbelt :**

* **Ontarians care deeply about the Greenbelt and the Oak Ridges Moraine.** It is home to farmland, forests, watersheds and wetlands. The Oak Ridges Moraine is the rainbarrel of Ontario providing drinking water to over 250,000 Ontarians and feeding many river and streams that flow into Lake Ontario and Lake Simcoe.
* **The Greenbelt is also economically important.** Agriculture in the Greater Golden Horseshoe employes 38,000 people and gross output of farms is $11 billion, that’s $1.7 billion in tax revenue for all three levels of government. The Greenbelt provides $3.2B annually in services to the region, such as recreational activities and flood protection. It was created in 2005 to deliberately limit the rapid urban sprawl that was encroaching on land that is both environmentally *and* economically significant.
* The Greenbelt has the capacity to store as much carbon dioxide as would be emitted by 33 million cars a year. Interfering with that crucial ecosystem means missing out on **a chance to reduce our emissions and meet climate targets**.
* **Greenbelt development is** **unnecessary for economic development**. A recent [Neptis Foundation study](http://www.neptis.org/publications/update-total-land-supply-even-more-land-available-homes-and-jobs-greater-golden) found more than 125,000 hectares of land in the GTA is currently available to accommodate growth through to 2031 and beyond. If the province wants to allow a new business in Ontario they already have a tool for that, The Minister’s zoning order, they don’t need to allow municipalities to bypass environmental and health rules meant to protect us.
* **Bill 66 exempts developers from rules that are crucial to protecting human health.**
 For example, it undermines the Clean Water Act, which protects people from tragedies like the one that happened in Walkerton, where water contamination led to 7 deaths and thousands of cases of severe illness. The bill threatens vital water sources for Ontarians, including Lake Simcoe and the Great Lakes. It also repeals the Toxics Reduction Act meant to reduce pollution by preventing industrial uses of certain toxic chemicals.
* **Your government did not get elected on this platform.** After hearing from Ontarians that they did not want to see the Greenbelt threatened by development, your government wisely promised not to touch that land. Now, Ontarians want to see that commitment fulfilled.
* According to a 2016 Nanos poll, 9 out of 10 Ontarians believe the province has a responsibility to ensure a healthy environment for all.By threatening both air and water quality, Bill 66 clearly violates that right.
* As a municipal councillor, you have the power to stop the provincial government from interfering in local decision-making. Bill 66 imposes the provincial government’s political agenda on municipal decisions. By adopting a resolution not to use the Open for Business planning bylaw your municipality can send a clear message to your constituents and the province that you support business development but not at the expense of the environment.

**Rebuttal to MPP canned response:**

This note provides responses (in bold italics) to assertions being made by Government MPPs (Christine Elliott in the example below) to letters and emails about people concerned about Bill 66 impact on the Greenbelt. Please make use of it in reply letters and in discussions with your MPP.

Hi XXX

Thank you very much for contacting the Constituency Office of MPP Christine Elliott. I am the case worker in the office. This is to confirm we have received this email. We appreciate your having taken the time to share and voice your thoughts and concerns with us. We take constituent concerns very seriously and approach them with the utmost respect and dignity they deserve. Without you taking the time out of your busy schedule to provide us with this information we would not be able to with the best of our abilities serve our constituents, voters and stakeholders.

 Restoring Ontario’s Competitiveness

Our plan for the people was rooted in five core commitments to Ontario families, letting people know that Ontario is Open for Business.Under the previous Liberal government, the cost of doing business was oppressive, including massive amounts red tape and delays due to extreme regulatory burdens.

The Liberals never saw a piece of red tape they didn’t like, and as a result, we are facing a troubling reality – Ontario is no longer the economic engine of Canada.The truth of the matter is, we have to make changes in order to regain our competitive advantage. That includes being able to attract new economic investment in Ontario.We are seeing a troubling trend of businesses looking outside of Ontario, and into other competitive jurisdictions. These are good jobs leaving our province. But our government is putting an end to this.

We brought forward a comprehensive package of regulatory and legislative changes that target unnecessary, duplicative and outdated regulations that do nothing to protect the environment, health or safety.

***Calling legislation enacted to protect farmland, drinking water and natural areas unnecessary and outdated is not reasonable****.*

We heard loud and clear from municipalities and job creators - there is too much red tape and it can take years for businesses to navigate the development approvals process.

***The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing already has a tool to bypass municipal legislation and allow development anywhere in Ontario, it is called the Minister’s zoning order. Why create a new tool when you already have one that has the same effect.***

***Municipal government and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs data show that there is currently a surplus of employment land within existing city boundaries to develop new businesses. In fact, many municipalities are seeking to convert these lands to other uses, like residential because of the lack of demand from industry to develop these lands. Many of these lands are near highways and or transit which is very attractive to new businesses.***

***Development approvals have been held up by sprawl developers who in the past appealed all regional official plans to the Ontario Municipal Board. They did this in order to secure more land for subdivisions than needed, but they were unsuccessful as there was more than enough land for development purposes. These appeals slowed Official Plan implementation by an average of over 3 years.***

***Research by the Neptis Foundation also shows there is over 100,000 ha. of land available within existing urban boundaries for housing development. This is an area the size of Mississauga and Toronto combined and will meet regional population growth projections for decades to come.***

The ‘Open for Business’ planning tool is going to help municipalities attract new jobs and investment to their communities. Municipalities interested in using this tool, would need to receive endorsement, which could include conditions and requirements for implementation, from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to be able to use the bylaw.

***Schedule 10 of Bill 66 makes it clear that the prohibitions against development contained in the Greenbelt Act, Clean Water Act ,Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act, the Lake Simcoe Protection Act, the Great Lakes Protection Act, and the Places to Grow Act will not apply to “Open for Business By-Laws”. These by-laws can be initiated and passed by any municipal government without public notice. They are then forwarded to the Ontario government for approval. They cannot be appealed to the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal.***

***While the development that can be approved by the by-law is to be primarily focused on employment uses (which includes big box stores), it can also include housing development. Employment uses are normally located in a urban or town boundary close to infrastructure that supports business like water, sewers, internet and a good road network. Allowing employment uses anywhere in the province as the Open For Business Bylaw allows puts a huge burden on municipalities and utilities to provide services and upgrade roads in addition to the potential loss of farmland, and environmental impacts. As part of the housing consultation the province is asking about whether there should be more flexibility regarding the conversion of employment lands to residential. If conversion of employment lands proceeds as part of the housing reforms that come out of the housing consultation, municipalities may be permitted to rezone employment uses approved under the Open For Business Bylaw to residential.***

***This change could open the flood gates of multiple municipalities opening protected areas to development at the behest of developers, who are large election campaign contributors at the municipal level. Many of the costs of development will be borne by local taxpayers for the additional infrastructure required.***

Every project we endorse will live up to our commitments outlined in our Made-in-Ontario Environment Plan, which promises strong enforcement action to protect our lakes, waterways and groundwater from pollution.

***Promises are not a replacement for the legislation that will be compromised by Bill 66.***

For the past 15 years, the Liberals carved into the Greenbelt over 17 times, and told municipalities what projects they were going to have in their communities.

***This is false. Every 10 years the Greenbelt Plan is reviewed to assess the effectiveness of the policies and make amendments. In 2015 as part of the 10 year review, the Greenbelt and Growth Plan underwent an extensive two year public review led by an expert inter-disciplinary panel headed by David Crombie. The 17 boundary changes referred to were minor adjustments to the Greenbelt boundary to correct mapping errors that occurred when the GB was established over 10 years ago. These changes were very small. You can check these at:***

[***https://web.archive.org/web/20180622185822/http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page15175.aspx***](https://web.archive.org/web/20180622185822/http%3A//www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page15175.aspx)

***Unlike the Liberals and NDP, we believe in taking our marching orders directly from the people, not the insiders. That’s why we are empowering municipalities to use this tool when they see a project that will create good jobs for their communities. We have been clear that we will protect the Greenbelt, and will not support proposals in contrast with that commitment.***

***But I am a person, your constituent coming to tell you this Bill is not in the public interest. The development insiders are influencing municipalities and the province. Elections Ontario recently revealed that the development industry spent over $400 thousand dollars bankrolling “Ontario Proud”, an on-line website that strongly spread alt-right messaging and criticized climate action, immigrants, and environmental protection. This was the vast majority of the budget of Ontario Proud during the provincial election. The developers involved have publicly admitted they were seeking action to support their desired policies by providing this money. Bill 66 will provide these same developers with opportunities to make large sums of money on land that they bought as farmland but will be able to have re-zoned for development.***

On June 7th, the people set a clear agenda for our government – they elected a government that believes in transparency and accountability for the people, fiscal responsibility, and committed to cleaning up the regulatory mess left behind by Kathleen Wynne.

***I sincerely hope your government will listen to the people when we ask you to stop Bill 66. Because the proposed “Open for Business By-Law” enabled by Bill 66 doesn’t require public input, it shuts us out. There is no public notice or consultation required. And the bylaw cannot be appealed. Farmland, natural areas and water protection zones, areas which protect our health and safety, and provide food security, put off limits by governments over the past 30 years can be opened to development.***

We’re getting government out of the way of our job creators, because we believe Ontario is worth fighting for.

**The Greenbelt protects Ontario’s farmers livelihoods and the thousands of related agricultural jobs and many others. Other jobs are very welcome within our towns and cities where there are roads, sewers, water supplies and employees to help them thrive.**

We will make Ontario open for business.

If you need any further assistance or have questions, concerns or general inquiries do not hesitate to reach out either by phone or email using the contact information below. I am available Monday to Friday 8:30 am to 4:30 pm.

**Facts and Myths: Bill 66- Restoring Ontario’s Competitiveness**

Under Schedule 10 the Bill authorizes the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to approve employment uses throughout Ontario and exempts significant environment, health and safety regulations like the Greenbelt Act, Oak Ridges Moraine Act, Lake Simcoe Protection Act, the Great Lakes Protection Act, and the Clean Water Act, adopted in response to the Walkerton tragedy. Municipalities would apply to the Minister for an open for business planning bylaw.

Fact: Toronto and other cities in the region have a housing affordability problem. Rents are high and so are condo and house prices.

Myth: Sprawl developers are trying to use this problem to convince you and the Ontario government that these high costs are caused by a lack of single family houses available for sale in the suburbs, and the solution is to rapidly expand cities onto farmland and let urban sprawl eat up the Greenbelt. But we know this is not true - see the facts below.

Provincial Action: They are succeeding. Just last week, the province launched its fast moving [“Increasing Housing Supply” consultations](http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page20902.aspx) with an aim to gutting the recently approved Growth Plan which directs where developers can and cannot build in southern Ontario. They are also considering opening up the whitebelt the land just south of the Greenbelt that is generally prime agricultural land.

Myth: Sprawl developers have three false claims: government red tape means it takes too long for housing to be approved;

Fact: Data from municipal plans show that over the last 10 years, the delays in getting houses on the market are mainly due to developer spawned legal challenges. In fact, regional municipalities developed their official plans and the province approved them quite quickly, at an average of 1.5 years. In every case, implementation of these plans was blocked by developers through appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). They appealed because they did not want to build within cities and towns but rather wanted to build subdivisions on farmland. These appeals delayed plan implementation by an average of another 3.5 years, thus slowing the development of lands that were actually ready for development.

The previous provincial government decided to get rid of OMB-imposed delays and replaced it with the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal, which no longer permits the appeal of official plans. It comes as no surprise that sprawl developers now want the OMB back. They caused the delays. They control housing supply and they benefit when prices are high.

Myth: the requirements to build within existing urban boundaries means not enough land is available for single family homes

Fact: The Neptis Foundation[[1]](#footnote-1) and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs have demonstrated that there is over **125,000 hectares** (greater than the size of Mississauga and Toronto combined) of developable land within existing urban boundaries. That is more than enough land to develop for our needs past 2031 without needing to expand city boundaries or pave over an inch of the Greenbelt. If sprawl developers get their way, and willy-nilly expansions of city boundaries are adopted (without the now required studies of population, transit and employment), we can expect to see the rest of the prime farmland and natural areas around our cities gobbled up, and arguments made to open-up the Greenbelt.

Myth: The requirements to build mid-rise densities are too restrictive and don’t provide housing people want.

Fact: On the density issue, subways, Light Rail Transit (LRTs), bus routes, bike lanes and walking trails need relatively compact settlements to be viable. Creating new GO train stations in cornfields, away from where most people live, makes people ever more reliant on cars, with long commute times and gridlock as the result. But it’s the outdated highway led transportation model that sprawl developers prefer because they make less money building-up around transit stations where people want to live, than building on farmland in near-rural areas.

Low density sprawl also means longer sewer and water pipes, more school bus routes, and more municipal roads and highways. Denser cities have lower taxes because more people share these services. Right now, developers must pay fees to cities to support these services and are pushing hard to have them rolled back and the debt put on taxpayers. Unleashing even more sprawl in places like Vaughan will make existing residents’ high taxes even worse.

Finally, despite sprawl developer’s claims, there is actually no house and condo shortage there is a rental housing shortage. October 2018 data from Altus Group shows that there were 16,283 houses and condos for sale in the GTA, up 30 per cent from last year[[2]](#footnote-2). In addition, recent sales data shows price increases of detached home lags that of condos, semis, and townhomes, showing demand is stronger for smaller more affordable home types.[[3]](#footnote-3) In addition there are also over 700,000 resale homes coming on the market over the next 25 years as baby boomers move on. These homes can house close to 2 million people, adding substantially to the single family housing on the market.

Long term price increases are being driven by other factors including the large number of people moving to the region, foreign investment and high demand for housing in places where people can walk or transit to work. Lack of land for subdivisions is not a factor.

We do need to address housing affordability in this region. Doing so requires creating a greater variety of housing types in downtown cores and existing neighbourhoods. For example, building stacked townhouses, three bedroom apartments, row houses and mid-rise homes can add many more affordable units, create places for older people seeking to stay in their communities while freeing up single family homes. A [study by Ryerson’s CBI group](https://www.citybuildinginstitute.ca/2018/10/01/found-the-missing-middle/) identified all the growth needed for Mississauga could be accommodate through infill. Municipal government to use evidence and follow a public process to develop housing as quickly and efficiently as possible and pair this “gentle density” with funding for public transit, walking and cycling.

But sprawl developers don’t want this. They want the world of the 1970s where they can buy-up cheap farmland, build expansive subdivisions, and dump all of the social, economic and environmental costs of their profit-taking on the backs of taxpayers and residents. Flooding the market with sprawl type housing will not address the real housing challenges. If they succeed in convincing the Ontario government to do their bidding, we can look forward to more sprawl, more gridlocked highways, less productivity, less farmland and natural areas, higher taxes and a lower quality of life. A future we should avoid at all costs.

**Housing Delays:**

Issue: Belief that municipal and provincial planning approval delays are leading to slowdowns in getting housing to market.

*Recommendation:* Keep policies that prohibit industry appeals of Growth Plan conformity amendments, provincial plan conformity amendments and new/revised official plans where the Province has issued an approval, secondary plans and a 5 year restriction on Community Planning Permit System by-laws. Keep the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal(LPAT) as it is a quicker, less expensive dispute resolution process compared to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).

*Background and Context:* MMAH data shows that developers taking official plans and approvals to the OMB took up to 3 years delaying housing starts. Compared to the OMB, the LPAT is likely to be a quicker, less expensive process.

The development industry continues its efforts to blame government policy and the Greenbelt and Growth Plans for limiting the supply of housing but data indicates otherwise. The appeal of Official Plans to the OMB by industry resulted in an average additional delay of 3 years/5 months. These appeals were all aimed at seeking more land for ground related housing (single family homes) and all were dismissed by the OMB given data that confirms abundant existing land supply.

The OMB appeals in turn delayed all the lower tier conformity exercises within these upper tiers – which were in turn further delayed by even more industry appeals to the OMB. The overall cost to municipalities was in the tens of millions of dollars in legal and planning costs. It is these industry driven delays which directly led to the recent OMB/LPAT streamlining reforms prohibiting industry appeals of Growth Plan conformity amendments, provincial plan conformity amendments and new/revised official plans where the Province has issued an approval. These reforms also provide a 2 year restriction on appeals of new secondary plans (unless supported by a municipal council) and a 5 year restriction on Community Planning Permit System by-laws as it was clear that industry was launching appeals before new municipal policies and by-laws were adopted.

Almost all 110 municipalities in the GGH have amended their official plans to conform with the Growth Plan. As the chart below shows, the six largest upper tiers in the region and the City of Hamilton approved their conformity exercises within provincial timeframes while the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing issued approvals within an average of 1 year and 5 months.

Reducing “red tape” by seeking efficiencies in land use planning approval and permitting processes is a valid and worthy goal. It is important to continue such efforts while keeping in mind that land use planning should be a transparent and accountable public process.

|  |
| --- |
| Timelines of Municipal Growth Plan Conformity Exercises |
| Region | Council Adoption | Ministry Approval | Date of OMB Approval(Time at OMB) | **Delay caused by industry appeals to OMB** | Total Time between adoption and OMB Approval |
| Niagara | May 28, 2009 | N/A (Exempt from MMAH approval) | Aug 8, 2014 | **5 yrs/3 mths** | 5 yrs/3mths |
| Durham | Jun 3, 2009 | Oct 27, 2010(1yr/4 mths) | Jan 2013  | **2 yrs/3 mths** | 3 yrs/7 mths |
| Waterloo | Jun 16, 2009 | Dec 22, 2010(1 yr/6 mths) | Jun 18, 2015 | **4 yrs/6 mths** | 6 yrs/2 mths |
| Hamilton | Jul 9, 2009 | Mar 16, 2011(1 yr/8 mths | Aug 16, 2013 | **2 yrs/5 mths** | 4 yrs/1 mth |
| York | Dec 16, 2009 | Sept 7, 2010(9 mths) | Apr 1, 2014 | **3 yrs/7 months** | 4 yrs/4 mths |
| Halton | Dec 16, 2009 | Nov 24, 2011(1 yr/11 mths) | Aug 24, 2016 | **4 years/9 months** | 6 years/8 mths |
| Peel\* | Apr 22, 2010 | Sep 23, 2011(1 yr/5mths) | Nov 30, 2012 | **1 yr/2 mths** | 2 yrs/7 mths |
| Average Time |   | 1 yr/5 months |   | **3 yrs/5 mths** | 4 yrs/7 mths |

\*Peel was much shorter since it did not include any urban expansions. Subsequent urban expansions amendments in Peel were all appealed to the OMB by industry.

**Municipal Resolution- Greenbelt Municipalities**

**Keeping XX open for business without jeopardizing the Greenbelt and other environmental protections.**

**WHEREAS, the Government of Ontario has introduced Bill 66, An Act to restore Ontario’s competitiveness by amending or repealing certain Acts; and**

**WHEREAS, Schedule 10 of the proposed legislation would amend the Planning Act to allow municipalities to pass “open-for-business planning by-laws”; and**

**WHEREAS the Bill would allow open-for-business planning by-laws to override important planning, water, agricultural and environmental protections contained in the Clean Water Act, 2006, and the Greenbelt Act, 2005; the Places to Grow Act, and other provincial legislation; and**

**WHEREAS, the content of this Bill was never discussed with XX residents in either the recent provincial or municipal elections; and**

**WHEREAS no notice or public hearing is required prior to the passing of an open-for-business planning by-law nor any appeals rights thereafter; and**

**WHEREAS the Greenbelt is an integral component of land use planning that complements the Growth Plan to encourage smart planning, the reduction of sprawl, protection of natural and hydrological features and agricultural lands; and**

**WHEREAS, the Greenbelt has protected 1.8 million acres of farmland, local food supplies, the headwaters of our rivers and important forests and wildlife habitat for over 12 years; and**

**WHEREAS, a permanent Greenbelt is an important part of the planning for sustainable communities; and**

**WHEREAS, there is a tremendous amount of land, including employment lands, already planned and available in excess of the development needs of the GTHA which has undergone environmental and infrastructure assessments without weakening the protections provided by the Greenbelt or effectively removing land from it; and**

**WHEREAS, protections like those included in the Clean Water Act are critical to the health of XX residents;**

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,**

**THAT the Town of XX opposes Schedule 10 of Bill 66, An Act to restore Ontario’s competitiveness by amending or repealing certain Acts and calls for its removal from the Bill; and**

**THAT notwithstanding the future adoption of Bill 66, the Town of XX will not exercise the powers granted to it in Schedule 10 or any successor sections or schedules to pass open-for-business planning by-laws for the duration of this term of office; and**

**THAT this resolution be distributed to: the leaders of all parties represented in the Legislature; the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks; all Greater Golden Horseshoe municipalities, and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario.**

**THAT this Bill does not represent how the people of XX want to do business.**

**Municipal Resolution - Clean Water Act**

**Keeping XX open for business without jeopardizing safe drinking water, the Greenbelt and other environmental protections.**

**WHEREAS, the Government of Ontario has introduced Bill 66, An Act to restore Ontario’s competitiveness by amending or repealing certain Acts; and**

**WHEREAS, Schedule 10 of Bill 66 would amend the *Planning Act* to allow municipalities to pass “open-for-business planning by-laws”; and**

**WHEREAS Bill 66 would allow open-for-business planning by-laws to override important planning, drinking water, agricultural and other environmental protections contained in the *Clean Water Act, 2006*, the *Greenbelt Act, 2005*, the *Places to Grow Act, 2005*, and other provincial legislation; and**

**WHEREAS, the content Bill 66 was never discussed with XX residents in either the recent provincial or municipal elections; and**

**WHEREAS no notice or public hearing is required prior to the passing of an open-for-business planning by-law nor any appeals rights thereafter; and**

**WHEREAS, protections included in the *Clean Water Act, 2006* are critical to the health of XX residents; and**

**WHEREAS the Greenbelt is an integral component of land use planning that complements the Growth Plan to encourage smart planning, the reduction of sprawl, protection of natural and hydrological features and agricultural lands; and**

**WHEREAS, the Greenbelt has protected 1.8 million acres of farmland, local food supplies, the headwaters of our rivers and important forests and wildlife habitat for over 12 years; and**

**WHEREAS, a permanent Greenbelt is an important part of the planning for sustainable communities; and**

**WHEREAS, there is a tremendous amount of land, including employment lands, already planned and available in excess of the development needs which has undergone environmental and infrastructure assessments without weakening the protections provided by the Greenbelt or effectively removing land from it;**

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,**

**THAT the Town/City of XX opposes Schedule 10 of Bill 66, An Act to restore Ontario’s competitiveness by amending or repealing certain Acts and calls for its removal from the Bill; and**

**THAT notwithstanding any future enactment of Bill 66, the Town/City of XX will not exercise the powers granted to it in Schedule 10 or any successor sections or schedules to pass open-for-business planning by-laws for the duration of this term of office; and**

**THAT this resolution be distributed to: the leaders of all parties represented in the Legislature; the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing; the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks; all Greater Golden Horseshoe municipalities , and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario.**

**THAT Bill 66 does not represent how the people of XX want to do business.**

1. <http://www.neptis.org/publications/update-total-land-supply-even-more-land-available-homes-and-jobs-greater-golden> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://betterdwelling.com/city/toronto/toronto-new-condo-sales-drop-over-43-inventory-rises-nearly-18/?utm_source=Better+Dwelling+Website+Signup&utm_campaign=3934ffc0b7-fras_jan_112018-3094981_COPY_01&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_bde8feedee-3934ffc0b7-309119909> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/business/article-toronto-area-home-sales-fell-34-per-cent-in-november-compared-to-last/> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)