

### Appendix 4: Options Analysis – ‘Pros’ and ‘Cons’

Option	Pros <sup>(1)</sup>	Cons <sup>(1)</sup>	Addresses Root Cause
<b>Option 1: Status Quo</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- None identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not avoid grading and drainage issues from arising</li> <li>- Does not address issues such as complaints about negative drainage impacts caused by the construction of infill homes</li> <li>- Does not address gaps in existing processes, practices and by-laws as identified through this review</li> </ul>	No
<b>Option 2: New Comprehensive By-Law (i.e. Site alteration By-Law) and Associated Permit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Could regulate site alteration for any residential, commercial and industrial development happening outside the Planning Act and Building Permit applications</li> <li>- Could capture additional erosion and sediment controls (beyond scope of existing Erosion and Sediment Control By-Law)</li> <li>- Could capture the requirements for maintenance (or prohibition on the removal) of drainage features</li> <li>- Could capture environmental requirements for fill material quality, including the new Excess Soil Regulations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generates additional staff requirements for the implementation of a new permitting system to control works performed on private property (review, inspection and enforcement costs)</li> <li>- Generates additional costs to residents that desire to undertake minor works within their properties by requesting certified grading drawings and permit application fee as part of a site alteration process approval</li> <li>- Future costs generated to the City to have geospatial survey data of all properties to identify if a site grade has been altered outside a permitting process</li> <li>- Does not address the issues that could arise from the alteration of existing grades, from the elimination or alteration of existing drainage features or from the creation of additional run-off as result of a site alteration; either through work happening outside the permit process or after a permit has been issued and securities released (as documented in those municipalities with other processes or by-laws in place) <sup>(2)</sup></li> </ul>	No
<b>Option 3: Improve Existing Processes, Permits/Approvals, Guidance and By-Laws</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education component could reduce the number of homeowners who perform works that could cause negative impacts to own property and neighbouring properties</li> <li>- Proactive approach vs. reactive approach</li> <li>- Minor amendments required to existing by-laws and guidance documents to capture recommendations from this process review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Time required to implement all the recommendations</li> </ul>	Yes

(1) As identified through the findings of this research and based on City of Mississauga existing processes, permits and by-laws in place

(2) Based on similar by-laws available in other Municipalities (grading and fill volume tolerances does not address common works performed on residential property)