

Attachment: List of 74 Housing Affordability Task Force (HATF) Recommendations for Response

Please identify the top 5 HATF recommendations that you support, and rationale / comments	
1.	36) Recommend that the federal government and provincial governments update HST rebate to reflect current home prices and begin indexing, and that the federal government match the provincial 75% rebate and remove any clawback. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga support recent announcements by the Federal and Provincial government to remove their portion of HST for rental construction and support indexing of the thresholds to reflect current home prices for ownership units.</i>
2.	C-2) All future government land sales, whether commercial or residential, should have an affordable housing component of at least 20%. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga urges the Province and Federal government to engage with municipalities on all future government land sales and include an affordable housing component of at least 20% as well as including provisions for any needed community infrastructure and parkland.</i>
3.	42) Provide provincial and federal loan guarantees for purpose-built rental, affordable rental and affordable ownership projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: The need for loan guarantees has been consistently identified as an issue for purpose-built rental and non-profit housing development. Subsidizing lower interest rates would also help.</i>
4.	B-3) Create an Affordable Housing Trust from a portion of Land Transfer Tax Revenue (i.e., the windfall resulting from property price appreciation) to be used in partnership with developers, non-profits, and municipalities in the creation of more affordable housing units. This Trust should create incentives for projects serving and brought forward by Black- and Indigenous-led developers and marginalized groups. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga assumes that this applies to Provincial Land Transfer Tax revenue. Mississauga supports opportunities to increase housing affordability and the development of incentives to build more housing, particularly targeting incentives for projects brought forward by BIPOC and marginalized groups.</i>
5.	43) Enable municipalities, subject to adverse external economic events, to withdraw infrastructure allocations from any permitted projects where construction has not been initiated within three years of build permits being issued. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: There has been a growing trend of landowners seeking additional zoning permissions not necessarily to build but rather to increase the value of the land for resale, long-term asset management or leveraging for other projects. Mississauga suggests the province look at infrastructure allocations for inactive rezonings in addition to building permits.</i>

HATF Recommendation <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		Support or Oppose <i>(Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)</i>		
1.	1) Set a goal of building 1.5 million new homes in ten years.* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga supports the delivery of a range of housing; through the Growing Mississauga action plan, Council has identified planned areas to accommodate and</i> 	X	Support	Oppose

	<i>exceed the 120,000 unit target to 2031 set for the City. This target, however, might be difficult to achieve based only on land use permissions and planning approvals alone. i.e. We are unsure the development industry has the current capacity for that scale of construction given labour shortages and construction costs etc. The investments required for electrical, hospital, transit, water, wastewater and community infrastructure would need to be increased significantly for that scale of development.</i>				
2.	2) Amending the Planning Act, Provincial Policy Statement, and Growth Plans to set “growth in the full spectrum of housing supply” and “intensification within existing built-up areas” of municipalities as the most important residential housing priorities in the mandate and purpose. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga’s comment: Aligns with Official Plan Review, Growing Mississauga, Major Transit Station Areas and the City’s Increasing Housing Choices in Neighbourhoods Study.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
3.	3) a) Limit exclusionary zoning in municipalities through binding provincial action: allow “as of right” residential housing up to four units and up to four storeys on a single residential lot.* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga’s comment: The City’s Increasing Housing Choices in Neighbourhoods Study is looking into adding more residential infill in neighbourhoods, including four unit structures, which could be accommodated in 2 or 3 storeys. However, allowing “as of right” up to four storeys on a single residential lot might not be an appropriate solution for all areas/neighbourhoods throughout Ontario. Municipalities should be permitted to determine associated performance zone regulations for intensification (i.e. height of storeys, setbacks, parking requirements, # of units).</i> 	X	Support	X	Oppose
4.	3 b) Modernize the Building Code and other policies to remove any barriers to affordable construction and to ensure meaningful implementation (e.g., allow single-staircase construction for up to four storeys, allow single egress, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga’s comment: Mississauga agrees that the Ontario Building Code (OBC) needs to be updated to reflect recent building trends, address climate change, and to facilitate housing affordability. However, the Province should engage with the Ontario’s Building Officials and Ontario Association of Fire Chiefs in order to update the OBC in a way that still warrants the safety of residents and occupants. Single egress stairwells in four storey buildings is a safety concern for building occupants.</i> 	X	Support	X	Oppose
5.	4) Permit “as of right” conversion of underutilized or redundant commercial properties to residential or mixed residential and commercial use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga’s comment: Intensification of greyfield sites is proposed through the current Official Plan Review and through the approved Reimagining the Mall study. However, “as of right” conversions should be avoided. Without controls to permit measured changes, this</i> 	X	Support	X	Oppose

	<p><i>could facilitate incompatibilities between commercial and residential uses (noise/odour) and commercial sites in employments areas may not be suitable for residential uses.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, consideration has to be given to the role of these commercial centres in the community – as they serve as important contributors to walkable complete communities.</i></p>				
6.	<p>5) Permit “as of right” secondary suites, garden suites, and laneway houses province-wide.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga’s comment: The city is updating its zoning by-law to be compliant with these prior Planning Act changes.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
7.	<p>6) Permit “as of right” multi-tenant housing (renting rooms within a dwelling) province-wide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga’s comment: Mississauga supports home share and other methods of renting out rooms within a dwelling as affordable housing options for students and the workforce. Licensing and inspections of dwellings must still occur to ensure life safety of occupants.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
8.	<p>7) Encourage and incentivize municipalities to increase density in areas with excess school capacity to benefit families with children.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga’s comment: The City’s Increasing Housing Choices in Neighbourhoods Study is looking into adding more residential infill in neighbourhoods. Similarly, the Province should require and/or incentivize school boards to develop more urban school models in intensification areas.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
9.	<p>8) Allow “as of right” zoning up to unlimited height and unlimited density in the immediate proximity of individual major transit stations within two years if municipal zoning remains insufficient to meet provincial density targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga’s comment: Mississauga’s experience with unlimited height and density in our Downtown Core has not resulted in affordable housing while increasing land values. This recommendation is not needed in Mississauga to achieve the provincial density and housing targets. This recommendation presupposes adequacy of other municipal infrastructure and community services to accommodate additional density. More pre-zoned lands may increase land values, speculation and unreasonable requests for densities higher than can be adequately serviced by the municipality without significant costs.</i> 		Support	X	Oppose
10.	<p>9) Allow “as of right” zoning of six to 11 storeys with no minimum parking requirements on any streets that have direct access to public transit (including streets on bus and streetcar routes).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga’s comment: This recommendation may be suited for streets with rapid and higher order transit that require significant public sector investment, but even that would require detailed study to determine the appropriate building height and density. Broad sweeping changes like this would be very problematic; a bus route is simply not sufficient justification to</i> 	X	Support	X	Oppose

	<i>greatly vary the permitted density and built form. This would significantly jeopardize the capacity of our Neighbourhood Collector streets and lead to significant conflict between pedestrian and vehicles. There is no regard for the cumulative impacts of such a change for other infrastructure or compatibility with existing context.</i>				
11.	10) Designate or rezone as mixed commercial and residential use all land along transit corridors and re-designate all Residential Apartment to mixed commercial and residential zoning in Toronto. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Could be done in some proposed Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) but may take some time to implement effectively. Municipalities should be permitted to determine where mixed uses and residential uses are located as not all lands along transit corridors are suitable for residential uses (e.g., within industrial areas or the airport operating area).</i> 	X	Support	X	Oppose
12.	11) Support responsible housing growth on undeveloped land, including outside existing municipal boundaries, by building necessary infrastructure to support higher density housing and complete communities and applying the recommendations of this report to all undeveloped land. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Not applicable, as Mississauga is mostly built out. Mississauga's Official Plan has policies supporting responsible housing growth in underdeveloped lands (e.g., Ninth Line) and brownfield sites (e.g., Brightwater and Lakeview Major Node).</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
13.	12) a) Create a more permissive land use, planning, and approvals system: Repeal or override municipal policies, zoning, or plans that prioritize the preservation of physical character of neighbourhood.* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Already implemented by the Province. Mississauga will review applicable policies, if any, as part of the Official Plan Review.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
14.	12 b) Exempt from site plan approval and public consultation all projects of 10 units or less that conform to the Official Plan and require only minor variances.* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Already implemented by the Province and Mississauga has updated its review process to conform to the new legislation.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
15.	12 c) Establish province-wide zoning standards, or prohibitions, for minimum lot sizes, maximum building setbacks, minimum heights, angular planes, shadow rules, front doors, building depth, landscaping, floor space index, and heritage view cones, and planes; restore pre-2006 site plan exclusions (colour, texture, and type of materials, window details, etc.) to the Planning Act and reduce or eliminate minimum parking requirements.		Support	X	Oppose

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Introducing Province-wide zoning standards is inconsistent with local planning and does not take into consideration local context. This recommendation will be very difficult to implement and will create uncountable non-conforming uses Province-wide.</i> 				
16.	<p>12 d) Remove any floorplate (sic) restrictions to allow larger, more efficient high-density towers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: This would impact tower separation and sunlight to the public realm. There is no guarantee bigger floor plates make more affordable units. However, larger floor plates do make larger unit layouts thereby increasing the ability to provide 2 and 3 bedrooms units. Best to leave to municipalities so they can create unique communities within a city.</i> 	X	Support	X	Oppose
17.	<p>13) Limit municipalities from requesting or hosting additional public meetings beyond those that are required under the Planning Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: The tight timelines implemented through Bill 109 already limits the ability of requesting or hosting additional public meetings. This significantly impacts the public involvement in the planning process, which typically encourages better development. Community meetings saves time at statutory meetings by allowing community input at smaller format, development specific, ward meetings.</i> 	X	Support	X	Oppose
18.	<p>14) Require that public consultations provide digital participation options.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga has implemented digital participation options through the pandemic and will continue to do so. Blended in person/virtual meetings maximize public participation.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
19.	<p>15) Require mandatory delegation of site plan approvals and minor variances to staff or pre-approved qualified third-party technical consultants through a simplified review and approval process, without the ability to withdraw Council's delegation.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Already partially implemented by the Province. Mississauga has already delegated authority for site plan approval. Since site plan approval was delegated to staff, Council has not rescinded its delegated authority. However, the proposed delegated authority for minor variances is not supported. The proposed delegated authority would not have any significant impact on delivering more affordable housing. The COA process provides autonomy from elected officials and planning staff.</i> 	X	Support	X	Oppose
20.	<p>16) a) Prevent abuse of the heritage preservation and designation process by: prohibiting the use of bulk listing on municipal heritage registers.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Already implemented by the Province and Mississauga will support existing legislation.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose

21.	<p>16 b) Prohibiting reactive heritage designations after a Planning Act development application has been filed.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mississauga's comment: Already implemented by the Province and Mississauga will support existing legislation. 	X	Support		Oppose
22.	<p>17) Requiring municipalities to compensate property owners for loss of property value as a result of heritage designations, based on the principle of best economic use of land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mississauga's comment: Heritage property value has been a key focus of Heritage Planning as the City works through its affordable housing strategies. Studies have proven that heritage properties increase in value over time after designation. The City further supports heritage property owners through a Heritage Property Grants program, which continues a record of success year after year. Heritage properties can be integrated into modern developments to add space for affordable housing and provide continuity in a community. Several heritage buildings have been successfully modified into multiple unit dwellings and serve as incubators for affordable housing. 		Support	X	Oppose
23.	<p>18) Restore the right of developers to appeal Official Plans and Municipal Comprehensive Reviews.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mississauga's comment: Already implemented by the Province. However, this will most likely delay implementation of affordable housing. City's priorities would remain the same but restoring the right of developers to appeal Official Plan and Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) processes will lead to lengthy appeal periods and delay implementing updated policies and zoning. This recommendation will have negative impacts and contradicts the Task Force's narrative to make processes quicker. Developers will have the right to appeal City policies which are largely intended to implement provincial legislation and mandates. 		Support	X	Oppose
24.	<p>19) Legislate timelines at each stage of the provincial and municipal review process, including site plan, minor variance, and provincial reviews, and deem an application approved if the legislated response time is exceeded.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mississauga's comment: Already partially implemented by the Province (legislative timelines) and Mississauga will support existing legislation. However, the City does not support deeming an application approved (automatically) if the legislated response time is exceeded. With this stated, the shorter the timeline, the less opportunity for municipalities to work with applicants and stakeholders (including private sector partners) to resolve site specific challenges pertaining to planning, design, engineering, and overall feasibility. City of Mississauga advises a need for increased applicant accountability in adherence to the application submission requirements, including providing timely responses to staff comments, within the 	X	Support	X	Oppose

	<i>mandated timeframe. A ‘stop the clock’ mechanism has been proposed, and would allow applicants to work towards completing an application correctly and timely.</i>				
25.	20) Fund the creation of “approvals facilitators” with the authority to quickly resolve conflicts among municipal and/or provincial authorities and ensure timelines are met.* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mississauga’s comment: Already implemented by the Province.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
26.	21) Require a pre-consultation with all relevant parties at which the municipality sets out a binding list that defines what constitutes a complete application; confirms the number of consultations established in the previous recommendations; and clarifies that if a member of a regulated profession such as a professional engineer has stamped an application, the municipality has no liability and no additional stamp is needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mississauga’s comment: This is already operationalized as in Mississauga developers are required to attend DARC (Development Application Review Committee) meeting, where relevant Departments and outside agencies provide complete application requirements (plans, studies, etc.) Additionally, stamped engineering drawings and sometimes letter of reliance are accepted. However, in the absence of legislated amendments to ‘joint and several’ liability and ‘duty of care’ requirements for municipalities, the receipt of certification from a regulated professional would not protect municipalities from being exposed to liability.</i> 	X	Support	X	Oppose
27.	22) Simplify planning legislation and policy documents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mississauga’s comment: Planning Act legislation could be clearer. Suggest that Province create an advisory group of municipal/consulting planners/lawyers to review and recommend changes.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
28.	23) Create a common, province-wide definition of plan of subdivision and standard set of conditions which clarify which may be included; require the use of standard province-wide legal agreements and, where feasible, plans of subdivision. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mississauga’s comment: Generally supported. However, most municipalities have a standard set of subdivision conditions and agreements. There will be limited benefit from standardizing these province wide. Many conditions of draft plan approval are specific to the development. It would take a long time to coordinate requirements among all municipalities (similar to trying to standardize zoning across the province). Municipalities should be permitted to customize agreements as needed to respond to development’s complexities.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
29.	24) Allow wood construction of up to 12 storeys.*	X	Support		Oppose

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga supports what the Ontario Building Code (OBC) allows. This will be in the National Building Code in the updates this year and most likely in the next version of the OBC.</i> 				
30.	<p>25) Require municipalities to provide the option of pay on demand surety bonds and letters of credit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: This needs further discussion. Mississauga staff have previously investigated the merits of accepting surety bonds in place of a traditional letters of credit that are required under the City's subdivision site servicing agreements. Research, along with Legal and Banking Industry advice, concluded that surety bonds represent a financial risk to the City. A letter of credit provides the best mechanism to ensure that the municipality will receive its money if a builder defaults in performing its obligations.</i> 	X	Support	X	Oppose
31.	<p>26) Require appellants to promptly seek permission ("leave to appeal") of the OLT and demonstrate that an appeal has merit, relying on evidence and expert reports, before it is accepted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Could possibly reduce or expedite Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) appeals involving affordable housing leading to earlier development. The legislation will need to clarify the precise standard of review to be used by the OLT in determining (up front) if an appeal has merit.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
32.	<p>27) a) Prevent abuse of process: remove right of appeal for projects with at least 30% affordable housing in which units are guaranteed affordable for 40 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga would be supportive of limiting appeal rights where there's a guarantee of 30% housing units will be affordable.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
33.	<p>27 b) Require a \$10,000 filing fee for third party appeals.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: For landowners seeking to launch a third party appeal, this would create a significant financial obstacle with a \$10,000 filing fee.</i> 		Support	X	Oppose
34.	<p>27 c) Provide discretion to adjudicators to award full costs to the successful party in any appeal brought by a third party or by a municipality where its council has overridden a recommended staff approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: This is already allowed within the legislation.</i> 		Support		Oppose
35.	<p>28) Encourage greater use of oral decisions issued the day of the hearing, with written reasons to follow, and allow those decisions to become binding the day that they are issued.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: The planning appeal process would be less transparent and accountable as few individuals would be made aware of oral decisions. Oral decisions typically do not contain well thought out reasons. In lieu of oral decisions, the better approach is to reform the manner in which Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) functions (including addressing</i> 		Support	X	Oppose

	<i>its resource needs) so that the responsibility will be with OLT to issue written decisions promptly, within a defined period of time.</i>				
36.	<p>29) Where it is found that a municipality has refused an application simply to avoid a deemed approval for lack of decision, allow the Tribunal to award punitive damages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Will create unreasonable and unrealistic pressures to process planning applications, compelling decision-making to occur prematurely. The award of punitive damages may negatively impact the City's financial and resource capacity limits, which could lead to an increase in planning fees to address the unintended consequences. Punitive damages could be hefty and significantly exceed a costs award. Further, it appears that the recommendation contemplates OLT could order both costs against a municipality as well as payment of punitive damages.</i> 		Support	X	Oppose
37.	<p>30) Provide funding to increase staffing (adjudicators and case managers), provide market-competitive salaries, outsource more matters to mediators, and set shorter time targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: This Funding would allow disputes to be resolved more quickly, and reduce/mitigate delay and uncertainty with respect to City-led initiatives. Timeliness and efficiency of the adjudicative system would benefit all stakeholders. In addition, attracting Members with strong credentials, both technical and mediation, would provide greater comfort in terms of the quality of the process and its outcomes.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
38.	<p>31) In clearing the existing backlog, encourage the Tribunal to prioritize projects close to the finish line that will support housing growth and intensification, as well as regional water or utility infrastructure decisions that will unlock significant housing capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Priority should be given to municipal initiated amendments that are appealed in addition to development applications. It is unclear how the Tribunal would be equipped to decide which applications should be "fast-tracked" over others. Most applications "support housing growth and intensification". There may be some procedural unfairness to some applicants and/or municipalities whose projects or initiatives are stalled.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
39.	<p>32) Waive development charges and parkland cash-in-lieu and charge only modest connection fees for all infill residential projects up to 10 units or for any development where no new material infrastructure will be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga supports opportunities to increase housing affordability. However, cumulative effects need to be studied before this is considered. This should not apply to larger developments being phased into small 10-unit developments at a time in order to avoid payments. Could be focused on rental infill such as plexes which are more affordable.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose

40.	<p>33) Waive development charges on all forms of affordable housing guaranteed to be affordable for 40 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga support the concept that all levels of governments must work together in the provision of financial incentives to secure the construction of affordable housing. City of Mississauga advises development related costs on affordable housing will need to be recovered from elsewhere, and the Province should make municipalities "whole" and contribute to addressing the financing gap.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
41.	<p>34) Prohibit interest rates on development charges higher than a municipality's borrowing rate.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Already implemented by the Province. City's view is that deferral agreements are not "borrowing" they are advancing the point in time for which the charge applies, having a higher rate attributes to "inflation" costs to recover the lost revenue.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
42.	<p>35 a) Regarding cash in lieu of parkland, s.37, Community Benefit Charges, and development charges: Provincial review of reserve levels, collections and drawdowns annually to ensure funds are being used in a timely fashion and for the intended purpose, and, where review points to a significant concern, do not allow further collection until the situation has been corrected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Already implemented by the Province through the audit to Mississauga's reserve funds.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
43.	<p>35 b) Except where allocated towards municipality-wide infrastructure projects, require municipalities to spend funds in the neighbourhoods where they were collected. However, where there's a significant community need in a priority area of the City, allow for specific ward to ward allocation of unspent and unallocated reserves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: The premise of growth development charges is that all new development helps to fund, and benefits from, the emplacement of growth-related infrastructure. City services are based on master planning documents which examine the growth of the City as a whole, and not necessarily one specific area or ward. Further, most major infrastructure serve a much broader population and allows for more servicing capacity throughout the system. Finally, a requirement to spend monies in the areas in which it was collected does not lend itself well to the current DC Act legislation due to the historic service level limitations.</i> 		Support	X	Oppose
44.	<p>36) Recommend that the federal government and provincial governments update HST rebate to reflect current home prices and begin indexing, and that the federal government match the provincial 75% rebate and remove any clawback.</p>	X	Support		Oppose

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga support recent announcements by the Federal and Provincial government to remove their portion of HST for rental construction and support indexing of the thresholds to reflect current home prices for ownership units.</i> 				
45.	<p>37) Align property taxes for purpose-built rental with those of condos and low-rise homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga has the same tax rate for both Residential and New Multi-Residential categories (includes new rental). Support this recommendation as long as savings for older buildings are required to be passed onto tenants and there is adequate phasing.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
46.	<p>38) Amend the Planning Act and Perpetuities Act to extend the maximum period for land leases and restrictive covenants on land to 40 or more years.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Extending the maximum period for land leases may facilitate some forms of affordable housing development (e.g. Community Land Trusts). Could allow for the extension of restrictive covenants requiring affordable housing beyond the current limit to 40 or more years.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
47.	<p>39) Eliminate or reduce tax disincentives to housing growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga supports opportunities to improve housing affordability and the Federal and Provincial governments have more taxation flexibility than municipalities to incentivize housing growth.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
48.	<p>40) Call on the Federal Government to implement an Urban, Rural and Northern Indigenous Housing Strategy.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga supports this recommendation.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
49.	<p>41) Funding for pilot projects that create innovative pathways to homeownership, for Black, Indigenous, and marginalized people and first-generation homeowners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: The Province should provide funding for affordable housing pilot projects such as those listed.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
50.	<p>42) Provide provincial and federal loan guarantees for purpose-built rental, affordable rental and affordable ownership projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: The need for loan guarantees has been consistently identified as an issue for purpose-built rental and non-profit housing development. Subsidizing lower interest rates would also help.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
51.	<p>43) Enable municipalities, subject to adverse external economic events, to withdraw infrastructure allocations from any permitted projects where construction has not been initiated within three years of build permits being issued.</p>	X	Support		Oppose

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: There has been a growing trend of landowners seeking additional zoning permissions not necessarily to build but rather to increase the value of the land for resale, long-term asset management or leveraging for other projects. Mississauga suggests the province look at infrastructure allocations for inactive rezonings in addition to building permits.</i> 				
52.	<p>44) Work with municipalities to develop and implement a municipal services corporation utility model for water and wastewater under which the municipal corporation would borrow and amortize costs among customers instead of using development charges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: More information is required to fully address this recommendation and the city would be pleased to engage in discussions with the Province.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
53.	<p>45) Improve funding for colleges, trade schools, and apprenticeships, encourage and incentivize municipalities, unions and employers to provide more on-the-job training.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Increasing the talent pool of skilled trades people will, in theory, help to ensure that projects are completed in a timelier manner.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
54.	<p>46) Undertake multi-stakeholder education program to promote skilled trades.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: City of Mississauga's Economic Development Office (EDO) is promoting advanced manufacturing and the skilled trades to under-represented groups in the trades, including the Women in Mississauga Manufacturing Initiative.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
55.	<p>47) Recommend that the federal and provincial government prioritize skilled trades and adjust the immigration points system to strongly favour needed trades and expedite immigration status for these workers and encourage the federal government to increase from 9,000 to 20,000 the number of immigrants admitted through Ontario's program.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: The Mississauga Economic Development Office (EDO) acts as a referral partner for the Federal Government's Global Skills Strategy Program.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
56.	<p>48) The Ontario government should establish a large "Ontario Housing Delivery Fund" and encourage the federal government to match funding. This fund should reward:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Annual housing growth that meets or exceeds provincial targets Reductions in total approval times for new housing The speedy removal of exclusionary zoning practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: The City welcomes a subsidy from the Province to facilitate more affordable housing. It is suggested that it would be best to measure against Growth Plan / Official Plan targets.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose

57.	<p>49) Reductions in funding to municipalities that fail to meet provincial housing growth and approval timeline targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Housing is market driven, it would not be realistic to penalize a municipality when the decision to build rest with a private developer. For example, the City has 23,000 approved but unbuilt dwelling units that are part of phased developments and cannot control when those units will be constructed.</i> 		Support	X	Oppose
58.	<p>50) Fund the adoption of consistent municipal e-permitting systems and encourage the federal government to match funding. Fund the development of a common data architecture standard, supported by an external expert committee, across municipalities and provincial agencies/ministries and require municipalities to provide their zoning bylaws with open data standards. Set an implementation goal of 2025 and make funding conditional on established targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga already utilizes an e-permitting system. Mississauga's ePlans is an end to end online/digital application submission, review and approval system that has been in place since 2016.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
59.	<p>51) Require municipalities and the provincial government to use the Ministry of Finance population projections as the basis for housing need analysis and related land use requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Relying solely on Ministry of Finance (MOF) population projections will likely have higher estimates, which are not informed by Growth Plan policies (e.g. do not consider achieving density targets). Clarity required on whether the Task Force has considered implications of relying only on provincial population projections.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
60.	<p>52) Resume reporting on housing data and require consistent municipal reporting, enforcing compliance as a requirement for accessing programs under the Ontario Housing Delivery Fund.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga is already reporting housing and development data and has recently launched the Mississauga Development Data Dashboard.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
61.	<p>53) Report each year at the municipal and provincial level on any gap between demand and supply by housing type and location, and make underlying data freely available to the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: This is currently being conducted by the Region of Peel through its role as Housing Service Manager. Any reporting on the gap between supply and demand should include income information and ability to pay for market units by municipality and by dwelling type.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
62.	<p>54) Empower the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to lead an all of government committee that meets weekly to ensure our remaining recommendations and any other productive ideas are implemented.</p>	X	Support		Oppose

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga supports the creation of an all government committee to focus on delivering affordable housing.</i> 				
63.	<p>55) Commit to evaluate these recommendations for the next three years with public reporting on progress.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga urges the Province to engage with municipalities in order to review, refine and improve the Housing Task Force recommendations and have the municipalities as partners working together in supporting the delivery of affordable housing and needed infrastructure to support growth.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
64.	<p>B-1) Call upon the federal government to provide equitable affordable housing funding to Ontario.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga supports opportunities to increase housing affordability and the development of incentives to build more housing.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
65.	<p>B-2) Develop and legislate a clear, province-wide definition of "affordable housing" to create certainty and predictability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga supports utilizing the PPS (2020) definition of affordable housing or similar. Staff would welcome participation in any working groups revising the existing PPS (2020) definition and creating the framework to be used for the assumptions such as income levels and average market value.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
66.	<p>B-3) Create an Affordable Housing Trust from a portion of Land Transfer Tax Revenue (i.e., the windfall resulting from property price appreciation) to be used in partnership with developers, non-profits, and municipalities in the creation of more affordable housing units. This Trust should create incentives for projects serving and brought forward by Black- and Indigenous-led developers and marginalized groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga assumes that this applies to Provincial Land Transfer Tax revenue. Mississauga supports opportunities to increase housing affordability and the development of incentives to build more housing, particularly targeting incentives for projects brought forward by BIPOC and marginalized groups.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
67.	<p>B-4) Amend legislation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow cash-in-lieu payments for Inclusionary Zoning units at the discretion of the municipality. Require that municipalities utilize density bonusing or other incentives in all Inclusionary Zoning and Affordable Housing policies that apply to market housing. Permit municipalities that have not passed Inclusionary Zoning policies to offer incentives and bonuses for affordable housing units. 	X	Support	X	Oppose

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga supports allowing cash-in-lieu for Inclusionary Zoning (IZ). The City recommends amending legislation to allow IZ in other areas of growth (e.g., Major Nodes and malls redevelopment). The province recently moved away from a density bonusing (s.37) regime and it is recommended that it not be recreated for inclusionary zoning. Recent changes to the Planning Act that require DC, CBC and parkland exemptions for IZ units already provide a significant financial offset for the affordable units.</i> 				
68.	<p>B-5) Encourage government to closely monitor the effectiveness of Inclusionary Zoning policy in creating new affordable housing and to explore alternative funding methods that are predictable, consistent and transparent as a more viable alternative option to Inclusionary Zoning policies in the provision of affordable housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga supports monitoring the effectiveness of Inclusionary Zoning and more opportunities to increase housing affordability with the development of incentives to build more housing.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
69.	<p>B-6) Rebate MPAC market rate property tax assessment on below-market affordable homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga supports opportunities to increase housing affordability and the development of incentives to build more housing. Any rebate should be applied to the units that fit under a clear definition of "affordable housing". This should only apply to affordable rental developments.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
70.	<p>C-1) Review surplus lands and accelerate the sale and development through RFP of surplus government land and surrounding land by provincially pre-zoning for density, affordable housing, and mixed or residential use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga urges the Province and Federal governments to engage with municipalities on all future government land sales and include an affordable housing component of at least 20% as well as including provisions for any needed community infrastructure and parkland. The City encourages the Province to have municipalities as partners working together in supporting the delivery of affordable housing and needed infrastructure.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
71.	<p>C-2) All future government land sales, whether commercial or residential, should have an affordable housing component of at least 20%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga urges the Province and Federal governments to engage with municipalities on all future government land sales and include an affordable housing component of at least 20% as well as including provisions for any needed community infrastructure and parkland. The City encourages the Province to have municipalities as</i> 	X	Support		Oppose

	<i>partners working together supporting the delivery of affordable housing and needed infrastructure.</i>				
72.	<p>C-3) Purposefully upzone underdeveloped or underutilized Crown property (e.g., LCBO).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga urges the Province and Federal governments to engage with municipalities on all future government land sales and include an affordable housing component of at least 20% as well as including provisions for any needed community infrastructure and parkland. The City encourages the Province to have municipalities as partners working together supporting the delivery of affordable housing and needed infrastructure.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
73.	<p>C-4) Sell Crown land and reoccupy as a tenant in a higher density building or relocate services outside of major population centres where land is considerably less expensive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga urges the Province to include an affordable housing component of at least 20% in any Crown and surplus land sale as well as including provisions for any needed community infrastructure and parkland. When/if relocating services, consider maintaining them within or near the existing communities, particularly in downtowns, main streets and nodes, in order to have services in walkable/transit distance from the existing population.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose
74.	<p>C-5) The policy priority of adding to the housing supply, including affordable units, should be reflected in the way surplus land is offered for sale, allowing bidders to structure their proposals accordingly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Mississauga's comment: Mississauga urges the Province to include an affordable housing component of at least 20% in any surplus land sale as well as including provisions for any needed community infrastructure and parkland.</i> 	X	Support		Oppose