The Regional Municipality of Durham
COUNCIL INFORMATION PACKAGE
October 20, 2017

Information Reports

2017-INFO-109 Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development – re: Recently distributed Agriculture and Rural Affairs E-Newsletter – October 2017

2017-INFO-110 Commissioner of Social Services – re: 2017 Annual Resident Quality Inspection for Lakeview Manor Conducted by Representatives of the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care

2017-INFO-111 Director, Emergency Management Office – re: The Region of Durham’s participation in emergency ‘Exercise Unified Control’, to be held on December 6 and 7, 2017

2017-INFO-112 Commissioner of Social Services – re: Ontario’s Renewed Early Years and Child Care Policy Framework 2017


2017-INFO-114 Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development – re: Monitoring of Growth Trends

Early Release Reports

There are no Early Release Reports

Staff Correspondence

There is no Staff Correspondence

Durham Municipalities Correspondence

1. Town of Whitby – re: Whitby Active Transportation Plan – Stakeholder Workshop #2 – October 24, 2017

2. City of Pickering – re: Resolution endorsed at their Council meeting held on October 10, 2017, regarding the Region of Durham’s correspondence with respect to Cannabis Legislation

If this information is required in an accessible format, please contact 1-800-372-1102 ext. 2097.
3. **City of Pickering** – re: Resolution adopted at their Council meeting held on October 10, 2017, regarding the Consultant Selection for the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Study

**Other Municipalities Correspondence/Resolutions**

1. **Municipality of Killarney** – Resolution passed at their Council meeting held on August 28, 2017, in support of the Town of Halton Hills resolution for Zero Tolerance Against Racism

**Miscellaneous Correspondence**

1. **Metrolinx** – re: Writing to inform Jim McGilton, Manager, Environmental Services, that Metrolinx and Hydro One have completed an Environmental Project Report (EPR) for the Go Rail Network Electrification Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP)

2. **Jennifer O’Connell, M.P. Pickering – Uxbridge and Mark Holland, M.P. Ajax** – re: Response to Durham's letter in regards to the protection of the automotive sector during negotiations for an improved North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and providing additional comments

**Advisory Committee Minutes**

1. **Energy From Waste** – Waste Management Advisory Committee (EFW-WMAC) minutes – **September 28, 2017**

2. **Durham Agricultural Advisory Committee** (DAAC) minutes – **October 3, 2017**

**Action Items from Council (For Information Only)**

**Action Items** from Committee of the Whole and Regional Council meetings

Members of Council – Please advise the Regional Clerk at clerks@durham.ca by 9:00 AM on the Monday one week prior to the next regular Committee of the Whole meeting, if you wish to add an item from this CIP to the Committee of the Whole agenda.
The Regional Municipality of Durham Information Report

From: Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development
Report: #2017-INFO-109
Date: October 16, 2017

Subject:
Agriculture and Rural Affairs E-Newsletter – October 2017

Recommendation:
Receive for information

Report:

1. Purpose

1.1 The Agriculture and Rural Affairs e-newsletter is a bi-monthly snapshot of the initiatives, activities and partnerships within the agricultural and rural areas across the Region of Durham. It serves as an environmentally-conscious, cost-effective tool to relay information regarding the latest agricultural and rural economic development activities in Durham Region.

2. Background

2.1 The Agriculture and Rural Affairs e-newsletter was distributed to 362 subscribers in October 2017 with a 46% open rate. It is also posted on the Region’s Economic Development website, and distributed via social media channels through the Corporate Communications office.

2.2 The Agriculture and Rural Affairs e-newsletter is produced in cooperation with Corporate Communications.

Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by

B.E. Bridgeman, MCIP, RPP
Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development
The Regional Municipality of Durham
Information Report

From: Commissioner of Social Services
Report: #2017-INFO-110
Date: October 20, 2017

Subject:

2017 Annual Resident Quality Inspection for Lakeview Manor Conducted by
Representatives of the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care

Recommendation:

Receive for information

Report:

1. Purpose

1.1 This report provides the results of the annual Resident Quality Inspections at
Lakeview Manor conducted by representatives of the Ministry of Health and Long-
Term Care (MOHLTC).

2. Background

2.1 The MOHLTC conducts Resident Quality Inspections (RQIs) of all Long-Term Care
(LTC) Homes under the Long-Term Care Homes Act, 2007 (LTCHA). These
comprehensive, unannounced inspections are conducted for the purpose of
ensuring compliance with the requirements under the Act and its regulations.

2.2 The LTC Home inspection process was completely redesigned under the
Compliance Transformation Project. Key features of the RQI include structured
interviews with 40 randomly selected residents and numerous family members and
staff, direct observation of how care is being delivered as well as specifically
targeted record reviews. In addition, the MOHLTC undertakes inspections of
Critical Incident (CI) Reports and complaints concurrent with the RQI and all issues
of non-compliance identified are included in the inspection report. There are over
900 regulations that homes are measured against during the inspections.

2.3 For each finding of non-compliance, a written notification (WN) is issued to the
Home and the inspector has the option to issue:
a. a written request for the Home to prepare a written plan of correction to be implemented voluntarily (VPC);
b. compliance order or a work and activity order;
c. a written notification to the Home and refer the matter to the Director at the MOHLTC.

2.4 Copies of the inspection report must be provided to Resident Council and Family Council and must be posted for public viewing in a conspicuous place within the Home. The report will also be published on the MOHLTC public reporting website at www.publicreporting.ltchomes.net.

3. Report

3.1 Three inspectors from the MOHLTC visited Lakeview Manor for 8 days, July 26-28, 31, August 1 – 4, 2017 to complete the RQI. In addition to the RQI, 10 Critical Incident (CI) Reports were reviewed concurrently. There were 3 written notifications (WN) of non-compliance. Two WNs included written requests for the Home to prepare voluntary plans of correction (VPC).

3.2 The VPCs for achieving compliance were issued in relation to 1 CI and are requested to:

a. ensure that the resident is reassessed and the plan of care reviewed and revised related to resident #25’s sexual behaviour, when the care set out in the plan has not been effective.
b. ensure that any person who has reasonable grounds to suspect that the abuse of a resident has occurred or may occur shall immediately report the suspicion and the information upon which it is based to the Director.

3.3 The level of sanction issued by the MOHLTC was determined using a judgement matrix based on severity, scope and compliance history. A VPC does not require the submission of a plan to the Ministry and there is no compliance date set out in the inspection report. The Ministry expects to see compliance on the next unannounced inspection of the Home.

3.4 The VPCs have been developed by Lakeview Manor staff as requested by the MOHLTC and Lakeview Manor has achieved compliance.

4. Provincial Annual Performance Data 2016 Compared with Region of Durham (ROD) LTCH Results - RQI

4.1 On September 14, 2017, the MOHLTC released annual performance data for 2016 RQIs. The following table provides information on the number of non-compliances issued in 2016 for the province along with averages from the 4 ROD LTC homes for 2016 and 3 ROD homes in 2017. Compared to the provincial averages in 2016, the ROD homes received fewer non-compliance citations for both written notifications (WNs) and compliance orders (CO).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Provincial Average 2016 (627 homes)</th>
<th>Region of Durham Average – 2016 (4 homes)</th>
<th>Region of Durham Average – 2017 (3 homes*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Notifications</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Orders</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hillsdale Terraces has not had its RQI for 2017.

5. **Conclusion**

5.1 As with the other regionally operated LTC homes, Lakeview Manor staff is committed to ensuring successful implementation of their action plans as part of their dedication to continuously improving the quality and safety of the residents entrusted to our care.

Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by:

Dr. Hugh Drouin
Commissioner of Social Services
Subject:

Recommendation:
Receive for information

Report:

1. Purpose

1.1 To provide an overview of the Region’s participation in the upcoming emergency nuclear Exercise Unified Control on December 6 and 7, 2017.

2. Background

2.1 Exercise Unified Control is an emergency preparedness exercise that will be conducted by OPG at the Pickering Nuclear Generating Station (PNGS) in December 2017. This multi-jurisdictional, nuclear emergency response exercise is an opportunity to validate emergency response plans and updated processes.

3. Discussion

3.1 Exercise Objectives

Exercise Unified Control (XUC) will test response plans for a simulated nuclear emergency at Pickering Nuclear Generating Station. During the exercise Ontario Power Generation, The Region of Durham, the City of Pickering, The City of Toronto, several Province of Ontario ministries and Government of Canada departments will examine the integration of response plans, with the goal of strengthening collective preparedness and ensuring a timely and effective emergency response to an accident at the nuclear plants.
3.2 Exercise Participants

The exercise is being hosted by Ontario Power Generation and will involve a number of participating organizations, including Federal Departments, Provincial Ministries, municipalities, and community partners. Regional participants include Durham Regional Police Service, Durham Transit, Durham District School Board, and staff from many divisions of the Region of Durham, CAO's Office including DEMO and Corporate Communications Office, Works, Health/RDPS, Social Services, Planning/Economic Development and Tourism, Finance and Corporate Services.

3.3 Exercise Design Structure

a. A Senior Alignment Committee has been established by OPG to ensure senior management is fully briefed on the scope and objectives of the overall exercise, and is committed to participate.

b. A Steering Committee has been established by OPG to oversee the exercise development and conduct, comprised of senior representation from participating organizations.

c. A Joint Exercise Planning Team (JEPT) has been established by the OPG consultant to ensure the overall objectives of the exercise are met; provide direction and oversight of the exercise planning and design; set priorities, and ensure alignment between organizations. The JEPT is the main forum to share information, resolve issues, make decisions, coordinate actions; plan, develop and conduct the exercise, and; is responsible for evaluation.

d. The Joint Exercise Planning Team is comprised of representatives from Ontario Power Generation (OPG), Region of Durham - Emergency Management Office (DEMO), City of Toronto, Ontario Fire Marshall & Emergency Management Ontario (OFMEM), Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC), and supported by International Safety Research (ISR), contracted by OPG.

3.4 Planning Sessions and Workshops

a. Conducting an exercise of this scope and scale is a significant undertaking and the process has been underway since December 2016. OPG has contracted International Safety Research (ISR) to develop, design and conduct the exercise.

b. Regional staff have been, and will be participating in the planning sessions, meetings and workshops that have been held, such as the Main Planning Conference June 28, 2017, and the Final Planning Conference, October 18, 2017, both held in Durham Region.
3.5 Scope of Regional Exercise Play
   a. Given the number of participating organizations and the complexity of the exercise, there will be many response activities that take place during the exercise. The scope of Regional participation is summarized below.
   b. Day 1: December 6 will consist of a simulated emergency that has an impact on the Pickering Nuclear Generating Station resulting in a major on-site response by OPG. The Regional participation on Day 1 will include notifications, event status updates, and partial activation of the Regional Emergency Operations Centre. At present the exercise play will take place between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.
   c. Day 2: December 7 will consist of a simulated escalating nuclear emergency at the Pickering Station resulting in a full activation of the Regional Emergency Operations Centre. Regional plans will be implemented as directed by the Provincial Emergency Operations Centre, determined by the scenario. At present, the exercise play will take place between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m.
   d. Day 3: December 8 will be held in for any potential expansion of the scenario or necessary deferments.

3.6 Communications
   a. Further to the exercise design structure, a Communications Sub-Committee was established in April 2017. Staff of Durham Region’s Corporate Communications Office (CCO) have been active participants on the sub-committee since its inception. The sub-committee consists of representatives from all levels of government and participating organizations. Together the members have developed a comprehensive Communications Plan which aims to co-ordinate public communications planning and activities related to Exercise Unified Control: throughout exercise planning; during the conduct of the exercise, and following the exercise.
   b. The communications activities related to the exercise provide an opportunity to inform the public of the collective efforts of the Canadian nuclear industry and the various levels of government to mitigate the effects of a nuclear emergency and to be better prepared to deal with consequences should one occur.
   c. Through the Communications Plan, participants are committed to notifying the public that stakeholders are dedicated to a safe nuclear industry and that the organizations participating in Exercise Unified Control are working together to create robust emergency plans, and to test their response to a nuclear emergency.
4. **Conclusion**

4.1 The Region will continue to be an active participant on the Joint Exercise Planning Team and Communications Sub-Committee; contribute to the remaining planning sessions and workshops, and; participate in the nuclear Exercise Unified Control to the described level of scope and scale.

4.2 It is recommended that this report be received for information.

Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by

Warren Leonard, M.Sc., CEM
Director, Emergency Management

Recommended for Presentation to Committee

Original signed by

G.H. Cubitt, MSW
Chief Administrative Officer
From: Commissioner of Social Services
Report: #2017-INFO-112
Date: October 20, 2017

Subject:
Ontario’s Renewed Early Years and Child Care Policy Framework 2017

Recommendation:
Receive for information

Report:

1. Purpose

1.1 This report outlines a high level overview of the Province of Ontario’s plan to transform Ontario’s early years and child care system.

   a. The initiatives described in the report will provide enhancements to the work already done to create a more seamless integrated system and provide for a continuum of learning for children.

2. Background

2.1 Since 2010, the Ministry of Education has been working towards modernizing early learning and child care across the province.

   a. Children’s Services Division is designated as the Consolidated Municipal Service Manager (CMSM) responsible for planning, managing and funding the early years and child care sector for Durham Region.

2.2 In the fall of 2016 – 2017 the Ministry of Education held public consultation sessions across the province to learn how they could enhance the early years and child care system. One session was held in Oshawa.

2.3 As a result of these sessions the Ministry heard about the strengths and challenges of the current system and received feedback on how the government might address them. The policy framework document outlines how the province will accomplish the objectives over the next five years.
3. Report

3.1 Ontario’s Renewed Early Years and Child Care Policy Framework outlines that the government will focus on the following seven key areas of action:

- Increasing access to early years and child care programs and services
- Ensuring a more affordable early years and child care system
- Establishing an early years workforce strategy
- Determining a provincial definition of quality in the early years
- Developing an approach to promoting inclusion in early years and child care settings
- Creating an outcomes and measurement strategy
- Increasing public awareness of Ontario’s early years and child care system

3.2 The following four pillars of: access, responsiveness, affordability and quality provide the foundation on which the early years and child care system will be built.

3.3 This past spring the Province of Ontario and the Federal Government provided increased funding to CMSM’s through two new financial streams: Child Care Expansion funding (Provincial) and the Early Learning and Child Care program (Federal & Provincial). Both of these initiatives will support the first two areas of focus designed to increase access and to promote affordable early learning and licensed child care programs for children birth to age twelve. There is a provincial commitment to continue to invest in early learning and child care over the next five years. Durham continues to have a high birth rate and will continue to benefit from the data based provincial funding formula.

3.4 In addition, the Financial Accountability and Data Analysis Branch of the Ministry of Education have launched a child care affordability study led by Dr. Gordon Cleveland from the University of Toronto. CMSM’s are able to contribute to the study through phone interviews, of which Durham’s Children’s Services staff have participated.

3.5 The creation of the Ontario Early Years Child and Family Centres, set to launch January 2018, provides another support service to families. Children’s Services staff will manage this portfolio.

3.6 The Ministry is also focusing on improving early learning and child care services for Indigenous children and families. The Journey Together initiative will provide local planning direction for CMSM’s to better serve Indigenous children and families.
3.7 Children’s Services staff will continue to work collaboratively with the Ministry, School Boards, Health Department and community partners to create the best possible early learning system for Durham’s children and families and will continue to provide Council with updates on accomplishments and successes.

Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by:

Dr. Hugh Drouin
Commissioner of Social Services
The Regional Municipality of Durham
Information Report

From: Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development
Report: #2017-INFO-113
Date: October 20, 2017

Subject:
Building Activity – January to June, 2017, File: D03-02

Recommendation:
Receive for information.

Report:

1. Purpose

1.1 This report summarizes building permit and construction activity for Durham Region for the period of January to June 2017, with comparisons to the same period in 2016. The report also compares Durham’s building activity with the other GTHA municipalities.

2. Background

2.1 The Planning and Economic Development Department conducts on-going monitoring activities to assess the effectiveness of the Durham Regional Official Plan (ROP) and other Regional policies. Building permit data is used to identify emerging issues and trends in regard to growth within our urban areas, the provincially defined built boundary, designated greenfield areas, and urban growth centres. It also helps to monitor regional policies that encourage a range of housing types and intensification within Regional centres and corridors.
2.2 Building activity is monitored on an on-going basis as an indicator of regional housing and employment activity, the level of local investment and economic performance. The appendices to this report provide a comprehensive source of data on residential construction activity including overall building activity from the start of the process (i.e. issuance of building permit), to the construction and ultimate sale of new residential units into the market.

3. Building Permit Activity in Durham

3.1 During the first six months of this year, the total value of building permits issued in Durham increased by 15.5% from $744.4 million in 2016, to $859.5 million in 2017 (refer to Figure 1).

![Figure 1](image)

Total Building Permit Value by Residential and Non-Residential Sector
Durham Region, January to June 2016 and 2017

Residential Building Activity in Durham

3.2 Durham’s residential building permit value in the first six months increased by 11.2% from $606.2 million in 2016, to $674 million in the first six months of 2017. Within Durham, Oshawa (34.7% or $234 million) had the greatest share followed by Clarington (21.8% or $147 million) and Pickering (17% or $114.4 million) (refer to Attachment 1, Table 3).
3.3 The total number of permits issued for new residential units in Durham increased 22% from 1,962 units in 2016 to 2,394 units in 2017. The majority of building permits issued for new residential units were located in Oshawa (864 units), Whitby (483), and Clarington (390 units). (refer to Attachment 1, Table 6).

3.4 ROP policies encourage the creation of a wide range of housing types and more intensification within urban areas. Through the first six months of 2017, townhomes accounted for the largest percentage of new residential units throughout the Region (38.9%). The share of single-detached, semi-detached and apartments was 30.3%, 3.1% and 27.7% respectively (refer to Figure 2).

Figure 2  
Share of Permits Issued for New Residential Units by Dwelling Type  
Durham Region, January to June 2016 and 2017

3.5 The Township of Brock experienced significant growth over the first six months of this year in the residential sector. Total residential building permit value increased from $4.1 million in the first 6 months of 2016 to $51.4 million in the first six months of 2017 (+1,168%). A total of 116 building permits issued for new residential units in 2017 compared to just 6 in 2016 (+1,833%). The majority of this development activity was located in Sunderland.
Non-Residential Building Activity in Durham

3.6 In the first six months of the year, non-residential building permit values increased by 34.3%. The institutional and commercial sectors accounted for the majority of non-residential building permit value, representing 47.3% ($87.8 million) and 41.1% ($76.2 million) respectively. Whitby accounted for the largest share of non-residential building permit activity (38.7% or $71.7 million), followed by Oshawa (28.8% or $53.5 million) (refer to Attachment 1, Table 9).

3.7 Major non-residential construction projects initiated in Durham between April and June of 2017 included:

- a new soccer facility in Whitby ($18.6 million);
- a new school in Oshawa ($10.5 million);
- a new commercial building in Whitby ($5.5 million);
- an addition to Claremont Public School in Pickering ($4.3 million);
- an addition to OUIT in Oshawa ($3.9 million); and
- a new commercial building in Ajax ($2.4 million).

4. Building Permit Activity in the GTHA

4.1 In the first six months of the year, the total value of building permits issued (residential and non-residential) in the GTHA increased by 32% from $8.5 billion in 2016, to $11.2 billion in 2017. Toronto had the greatest share of GTHA total value with 39.6%, followed by Halton (16.8%), York (16.1%), Peel (13.4%), Durham (7.7%) and Hamilton (6.3%). Halton had the greatest percentage increase from last year (92.7%), followed by Toronto (64.2%) (refer to Attachment 1, Table 12).

Residential Building Activity in the GTHA

4.2 The total value of residential building permits in the GTHA increased 22.3% from $5.7 billion in 2016, to $7 billion in 2017. The City of Toronto accounted for the largest share of GTHA residential building permit value with 32.5% of the total. Durham’s share of GTHA residential building permit value declined from 10.5% in 2016 to 9.6% in 2017 (refer to Attachment 1, Table 13).

4.3 In the first six months of 2017 there were 22,138 building permits issued for new residential units in the GTHA, compared to 16,707 units in 2016, which represents a 32.5% increase in permit activity. Apartments accounted for the greatest share of new units at 43.5%, followed by townhomes at 29.6%. Toronto had the greatest
share of new residential units (39.1%), followed by Halton (17.7%), York (15.4%), Durham (10.8%), Peel (10.7%) and Hamilton (6.3%) (refer to Attachment 1, Table 14).

Non-Residential Building Activity in the GTHA

4.4 Approximately $4.2 billion in non-residential building permits were issued in the GTHA during the first six months of this year, which represents an increase of 52.1% over the same period last year ($2.8 billion). Toronto had the largest share of non-residential building permit value (51.5% or $2.2 billion) (refer to Attachment 1, Table 15).

5. Other Housing Indicators

Housing Starts and Completions

5.1 While monitoring the number of building permits issued for new residential units provides an indication of the overall development climate, monitoring housing starts and completions also provides an indication of the pace of construction, and broad changes in the supply of housing.

5.2 There was a 23.2% increase in the number of housing starts in Durham Region in the first six months of the year, from 1,704 in 2016 to 2,099 in 2017. During the same period, there was also an increase in the number of completions, from 1,393 to 1,689 (+21.2%) (refer to Attachment 1, Table 16).

Housing Prices

5.3 For the first six months of the year, the average cost of a new single-detached dwelling in Durham Region increased 9.1% from $535,759 in 2016, to $584,618 in 2017. The comparative cost of a new single detached dwelling elsewhere in the GTHA ranged from $479,858 in Hamilton to $1,872,614 in Toronto (refer to Attachment 1, Table 22).

5.4 The average price of a resale dwelling (all dwelling types) in Durham increased 26.3% from $512,912 for the first six months of 2016, compared to $648,013 for the same period in 2017. The number of resale homes sold in Durham increased 19.7% from 6,735 in 2016 to 8,059 in 2017. At the same time, listings increased significantly from 8,452 to 15,222 (+80.1%) (refer to Attachment 1, Table 23).
6. **Conclusion**

6.1 During first six months of 2017, Durham's residential sector experienced an increase in the number and value of building permits for new residential units.

6.2 Consistent with ROP policies that encourage a mix of housing types, a greater proportion of permits issued for new residential units were townhomes and apartments. Additionally, the share of new units located within urban areas increased.

6.3 Non-residential building permits also increased in Durham compared to the first six months of last year.

6.4 A copy of this report will be forwarded to the area municipalities for information.

7. **Attachments**

   Attachment #1: Background Data and Analysis

Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by

B.E. Bridgeman, MCIP, RPP
Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development
Attachment 1

Building Permit Activity in Durham – January to June

Table 1
Total value of building permits by area municipality ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>$106.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>$59.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>-44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>$5.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$51.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>783.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarington</td>
<td>$177.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>$163.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>$173.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>$287.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>$94.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>$135.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>$46.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>$12.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>$134.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>$141.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$744.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$859.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Total value of building permits by type ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit type</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$606.2</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>$674.0</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>$138.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>$185.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All figures rounded
Source: Durham Region Planning Division Building Permit Summaries
Table 3
Value of residential permits by area municipality ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>$89.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>$40.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>$4.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$51.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1,168.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarington</td>
<td>$167.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>$147.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>-12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>$138.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>$234.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>$73.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>$114.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>$29.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>$8.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>$98.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>$69.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>-29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$606.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$674.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Total value of residential permits by construction type ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction type</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New residential units</td>
<td>$570.2</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>$612.7</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovations, additions and improvements</td>
<td>$36.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>$61.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All figures rounded
Source: Durham Region Planning Division Building Permit Summaries
## Table 5
Permits issued for new residential units by unit type (# of units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit type</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 6
Permits issued for new residential units by area municipality (# of units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2016 #</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017 #</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>-60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1,833.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarington</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>-35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>381*</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>141.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>116.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes 105 permits issued for new residential units within the Seaton community.

Note: All figures rounded
Source: Durham Region Planning Division Building Permit Summaries
Table 7
Permits issued for new residential units by urban/rural area (# of units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
Value of non-residential building permits by sector ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$63.7</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>$76.2</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$23.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>$15.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>$3.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$27.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>$87.8</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>219.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>$20.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$138.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$185.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All figures rounded
Source: Durham Region Planning Division Building Permit Summaries
Table 9
Value of non-residential building permits by area municipality ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>$16.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>$18.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarington</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>$16.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>$35.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>$53.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>$21.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>$21.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>$17.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>$3.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>$35.4</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>$71.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>102.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$138.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$185.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10
Non-residential floor space by sector (thousand sq. ft.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>250.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>-45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>316.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>-67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>195.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>102.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>288.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>175.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>826.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>725.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All figures rounded
Source: Durham Region Planning Division Building Permit Summaries
Table 11
Non-residential floor space by municipality (thousand sq. ft.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>-29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarington</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>116.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>-15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>264.5</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>313.4</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>826.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>725.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All figures rounded
Source: Durham Region Planning Division Building Permit Summaries
Table 12
Total value of building permits issued ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTHA</td>
<td>$8,508.6</td>
<td>$11,230.0</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>$744.4</td>
<td>$859.5</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>$977.3</td>
<td>$1,882.8</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>$1,348.6</td>
<td>$1,507.1</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>$2,709.4</td>
<td>$4,449.8</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>$2,194.0</td>
<td>$1,806.3</td>
<td>-17.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$534.8</td>
<td>$724.5</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
Total value of residential building permits issued ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTHA</td>
<td>$5,746.3</td>
<td>$7,028.3</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>$606.2</td>
<td>$674.0</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>$499.7</td>
<td>$1,418.4</td>
<td>183.8%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>$900.9</td>
<td>$875.0</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>$1,490.3</td>
<td>$2,286.4</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>$1,852.7</td>
<td>$1,325.4</td>
<td>-28.5%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$396.5</td>
<td>$449.1</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: May contain estimated values by Statistics Canada and are subject to change
Source: Statistics Canada (Halton, Peel, Toronto, York) and Durham Region Planning
Table 14
New residential units in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) by type (# of units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTHA</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,707</td>
<td>22,138</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTHA</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>5,388</td>
<td>5,307</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTHA</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTHA</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>6,563</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTHA</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>7,138</td>
<td>9,625</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>-11.6%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>3,918</td>
<td>135.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>257.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>304.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>436.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: May contain estimated values by Statistics Canada and are subject to change
Source: Statistics Canada (Halton, Peel, Toronto, York) and Durham Region Planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-55.2%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>-52.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>324.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,041</td>
<td>8,661</td>
<td>114.3%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>510.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>3,061</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>104.5%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,561</td>
<td>3,405</td>
<td>-38.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>-30.6%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-24.8%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>-89.4%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>-25.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>-28.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>1637.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: May contain estimated values by Statistics Canada and are subject to change
Source: Statistics Canada (Halton, Peel, Toronto, York) and Durham Region Planning
### Table 15
Total value of non-residential building permits issued ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTHA</td>
<td>$2,762.3</td>
<td>$4,201.6</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>$138.2</td>
<td>$185.5</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>$477.5</td>
<td>$464.4</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>$447.7</td>
<td>$632.0</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>$1,219.2</td>
<td>$2,163.4</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>$341.3</td>
<td>$480.9</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$138.4</td>
<td>$275.3</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: May contain estimated values by Statistics Canada and are subject to change
Source: Statistics Canada (Halton, Peel, Toronto, York) and Durham Region Planning
**Table 16**  
Housing supply (# of units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Indicator</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Supply</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starts</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorbed *</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17**  
Total supply by unit type (# of units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By unit type</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row/Town</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supply</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* An absorbed unit is a housing unit that has been sold and completed. Housing absorptions are a leading indicator, reflecting housing market demand.

Source: Canada Mortgage & Housing Corporation (CMHC),  
Local Housing Market Tables, 2016/17
Table 18
Total supply by area municipality (# of units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>149.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarington</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>-11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19
Absorptions by unit type (# of units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By unit type</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row/Town</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supply</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Canada Mortgage & Housing Corporation (CMHC), Local Housing Market Tables, 2016/17
Table 20
Absorptions by area municipality (# of units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2017 %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarington</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>-37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>102.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>117.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Canada Mortgage & Housing Corporation (CMHC), Local Housing Market Tables, 2016/17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional Mortgage Rates</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Term</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year Term</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year Term</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Rate (%)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 22
Average cost of a new single detached dwelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajax</td>
<td>$619,351</td>
<td>$640,742</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock *</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarington</td>
<td>$497,807</td>
<td>$497,397</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>$501,312</td>
<td>$534,799</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>$632,888</td>
<td>$850,804</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog *</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uxbridge</td>
<td>$477,943</td>
<td>$422,906</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>$604,549</td>
<td>$780,192</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Region</td>
<td>$535,759</td>
<td>$584,618</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto</td>
<td>$1,872,620</td>
<td>$1,872,614</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Region</td>
<td>$985,182</td>
<td>$1,228,195</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel Region</td>
<td>$756,866</td>
<td>$738,488</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton Region</td>
<td>$930,257</td>
<td>$1,190,191</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>$468,377</td>
<td>$479,858</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data can be suppressed where sales are relatively low due to privacy concerns.
Table 23
Resale housing market in Durham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Indicator</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sales</td>
<td>6,735</td>
<td>8,059</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of New Listings</td>
<td>8,452</td>
<td>15,222</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Price (all dwelling types)</td>
<td>$512,912</td>
<td>$648,013</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: May contain estimated values by Statistics Canada and are subject to change
Source: Statistics Canada (Halton, Peel, Toronto, York) and Durham Region Planning
Report:

1. Purpose

1.1 This report is the second of two biannual reports monitoring growth trends in Durham. It presents historical population and household data for the Region and local municipalities for the 2012 to 2017 period. It also includes short-term forecasts for the 2017 to 2022 period.

1.2 The data is provided for the end of May (to correspond with the timing of a Census) and for December (calendar year-end). Information presented in this report is intended for use in various Regional studies and programs including the upcoming Municipal Comprehensive Review (Regional Official Plan Update), Development Charges Studies, and the annual Five-year Servicing and Financing Study.


2.1 The population and household estimates presented in Attachments 1 and 2, are based on:
- Statistics Canada Census information for 2011 and 2016 including an estimate for net undercoverage\(^1\); and
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) monthly housing completion data for non-Census years.

2.2 The semi-annual population estimates presented in Attachment 1, indicate that the Region’s mid-year population growth increased by 6,820 persons from 2016 to 2017, representing a growth rate of 1.02%. Comparatively, the average annual population growth for the five-year period from 2012 to 2017 was 1.1%.

2.3 The semi-annual household estimates presented in Attachment 2, indicate that the Region’s mid-year household growth increased by 2,665 households from 2016 to 2017, representing a growth rate of 1.17%. Comparatively, the annual household growth for the five-year period from 2012 to 2017 was 1.24%.

2.4 The Region has not kept pace with the forecasted levels of population and households the Regional Official Plan (ROP). The ROP forecast for 2016 provided for a population of 729,030 and 265,115 households. This compares with an estimated year-end population of 673,035 (-7.7%) and 229,005 households (-13.6%). This is largely due to the pace of development in Seaton not proceeding as quickly as originally estimated (see Figure 1).

---

1. Net undercoverage refers to the net population counts that are missed during the Census enumeration due to persons with no usual residence, incorrect questionnaires, missed dwellings, away from home, etc.
3. **Short-term growth forecasts (2017-2022)**

3.1 The short-term growth forecasts for population and households presented in Attachments 3 and 4 are based on:

- housing production estimates provided by the area municipalities;
- an analysis of past trends; and
- estimates of the timing and anticipated annual housing occupancy across the Region.

3.2 The forecasts make no allowances for unpredictable factors such as changes in economic conditions affecting residential growth (e.g. significant increases in mortgage rates, building trade strikes, etc.).

3.3 The short-term forecasts indicate that Durham’s current population is expected to increase from 678,235 (2017) to 761,000 in 2022 (refer to Attachment 3). This represents an average annual growth rate of 2.33 per cent between 2017 and 2022.

3.4 Similarly, the current number of households in Durham is expected to increase from 230,530 (2017) to approximately 260,860 in 2022 (refer to Attachment 4). This represents an average annual growth rate of 2.5 per cent between 2017 and 2022.

3.5 These forecasts assume an increased rate of growth in Pickering towards the end of the period, adding approximately 5,700 households and 17,200 people in the last 4 years of the forecast as the Seaton community develops.

4. **Conclusion**

4.1 Regional Council will continue to be kept apprised of emerging population and household data and trends through regular updates of this information.

4.2 A copy of this report will be forwarded to the Area Municipalities, the Durham Regional Police Services, the Local Health Integration Network and the School Boards in Durham.
5. **Attachments**


Respectfully submitted,

Original signed by

B.E. Bridgeman, MCIP, RPP
Commissioner of Planning and
Economic Development
### Semi-annual Population Estimates, 2012-2017 (May and December)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ajax</th>
<th>Brock</th>
<th>Clarington</th>
<th>Oshawa</th>
<th>Pickering</th>
<th>Scugog</th>
<th>Uxbridge</th>
<th>Whitby</th>
<th>Durham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>117,570</td>
<td>11,890</td>
<td>90,940</td>
<td>158,195</td>
<td>93,925</td>
<td>22,440</td>
<td>21,620</td>
<td>130,250</td>
<td>646,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>118,460</td>
<td>11,925</td>
<td>91,330</td>
<td>158,915</td>
<td>93,810</td>
<td>22,525</td>
<td>21,650</td>
<td>130,705</td>
<td>649,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>119,645</td>
<td>11,955</td>
<td>92,380</td>
<td>160,175</td>
<td>94,510</td>
<td>22,380</td>
<td>21,665</td>
<td>131,425</td>
<td>654,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>120,290</td>
<td>11,970</td>
<td>92,580</td>
<td>160,760</td>
<td>94,245</td>
<td>22,505</td>
<td>21,740</td>
<td>131,610</td>
<td>655,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>121,670</td>
<td>12,020</td>
<td>93,805</td>
<td>161,840</td>
<td>94,780</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>21,785</td>
<td>132,365</td>
<td>660,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>122,890</td>
<td>12,030</td>
<td>94,210</td>
<td>162,730</td>
<td>94,810</td>
<td>22,475</td>
<td>21,830</td>
<td>132,370</td>
<td>663,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>124,230</td>
<td>12,085</td>
<td>95,515</td>
<td>165,525</td>
<td>95,265</td>
<td>22,440</td>
<td>21,980</td>
<td>133,265</td>
<td>670,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>124,805</td>
<td>12,065</td>
<td>96,490</td>
<td>166,535</td>
<td>95,220</td>
<td>22,370</td>
<td>22,045</td>
<td>133,515</td>
<td>673,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>125,505</td>
<td>12,050</td>
<td>97,395</td>
<td>167,430</td>
<td>95,765</td>
<td>22,320</td>
<td>22,265</td>
<td>134,400</td>
<td>677,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** All figures rounded  
Source: Statistics Canada 2016 Census and CMHC monthly housing completions data.
Semi-annual Household Estimates, 2012-2017 (May and December)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ajax</th>
<th>Brock</th>
<th>Clarington</th>
<th>Oshawa</th>
<th>Pickering</th>
<th>Scugog</th>
<th>Uxbridge</th>
<th>Whitby</th>
<th>Durham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 (Dec)</td>
<td>35,920</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>30,995</td>
<td>59,750</td>
<td>30,030</td>
<td>8,040</td>
<td>7,440</td>
<td>42,210</td>
<td>218,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (May)</td>
<td>36,135</td>
<td>4,425</td>
<td>31,160</td>
<td>59,985</td>
<td>30,145</td>
<td>8,050</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>42,435</td>
<td>219,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 (Dec)</td>
<td>36,440</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>31,565</td>
<td>60,520</td>
<td>30,350</td>
<td>8,070</td>
<td>7,485</td>
<td>42,690</td>
<td>221,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (May)</td>
<td>36,590</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>31,700</td>
<td>60,680</td>
<td>30,390</td>
<td>8,095</td>
<td>7,510</td>
<td>42,815</td>
<td>222,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (Dec)</td>
<td>36,940</td>
<td>4,490</td>
<td>32,135</td>
<td>61,170</td>
<td>30,570</td>
<td>8,130</td>
<td>7,555</td>
<td>43,095</td>
<td>224,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (May)</td>
<td>37,225</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>32,335</td>
<td>61,470</td>
<td>30,690</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>43,175</td>
<td>225,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (Dec)</td>
<td>37,450</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>32,580</td>
<td>61,980</td>
<td>30,815</td>
<td>8,175</td>
<td>7,635</td>
<td>43,325</td>
<td>226,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (May)</td>
<td>37,550</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td>32,840</td>
<td>62,595</td>
<td>30,920</td>
<td>8,220</td>
<td>7,665</td>
<td>43,530</td>
<td>227,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (Dec)</td>
<td>37,655</td>
<td>4,550</td>
<td>33,225</td>
<td>62,990</td>
<td>30,985</td>
<td>8,225</td>
<td>7,705</td>
<td>43,670</td>
<td>229,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (May)</td>
<td>37,815</td>
<td>4,555</td>
<td>33,570</td>
<td>63,340</td>
<td>31,220</td>
<td>8,230</td>
<td>7,795</td>
<td>44,005</td>
<td>230,530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All figures rounded
Source: Statistics Canada Census and CMHC monthly housing completions data.
### Semi-annual Population Estimates, 2017-2022 (May and December)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ajax</th>
<th>Brock</th>
<th>Clarington</th>
<th>Oshawa</th>
<th>Pickering</th>
<th>Scugog</th>
<th>Uxbridge</th>
<th>Whitby</th>
<th>Durham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>127,400</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>98,100</td>
<td>170,500</td>
<td>97,300</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>22,100</td>
<td>134,800</td>
<td>685,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dec)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>128,600</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>171,100</td>
<td>98,400</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>22,100</td>
<td>135,400</td>
<td>689,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>130,700</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>100,800</td>
<td>172,200</td>
<td>100,300</td>
<td>22,700</td>
<td>22,100</td>
<td>136,500</td>
<td>697,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dec)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>132,100</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>101,600</td>
<td>173,100</td>
<td>102,400</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>137,300</td>
<td>703,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>134,500</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>103,100</td>
<td>174,800</td>
<td>106,400</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>138,800</td>
<td>715,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dec)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>136,200</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>103,900</td>
<td>175,900</td>
<td>108,500</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>22,200</td>
<td>139,700</td>
<td>721,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>139,200</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>105,500</td>
<td>178,100</td>
<td>112,300</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>141,300</td>
<td>734,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dec)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>140,800</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>106,300</td>
<td>179,200</td>
<td>114,600</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>142,400</td>
<td>741,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>143,700</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>107,900</td>
<td>181,300</td>
<td>118,800</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>144,400</td>
<td>753,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dec)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>145,500</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>108,800</td>
<td>182,400</td>
<td>121,200</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>145,600</td>
<td>761,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(May)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** All figures rounded

**Source:** Statistics Canada 2016 Census and CMHC monthly housing completions data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ajax</th>
<th>Brock</th>
<th>Clarington</th>
<th>Oshawa</th>
<th>Pickering</th>
<th>Scugog</th>
<th>Uxbridge</th>
<th>Whitby</th>
<th>Durham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 (Dec)</td>
<td>38,320</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>33,850</td>
<td>64,500</td>
<td>31,820</td>
<td>8,260</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>44,200</td>
<td>233,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (May)</td>
<td>38,630</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>34,220</td>
<td>64,750</td>
<td>32,220</td>
<td>8,330</td>
<td>7,770</td>
<td>44,430</td>
<td>235,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (Dec)</td>
<td>39,190</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>34,880</td>
<td>65,180</td>
<td>32,920</td>
<td>8,460</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>44,840</td>
<td>238,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 (Dec)</td>
<td>40,200</td>
<td>4,830</td>
<td>35,760</td>
<td>66,170</td>
<td>35,080</td>
<td>8,680</td>
<td>7,860</td>
<td>45,720</td>
<td>244,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 (May)</td>
<td>40,660</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>36,100</td>
<td>66,360</td>
<td>35,850</td>
<td>8,730</td>
<td>7,880</td>
<td>46,060</td>
<td>246,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 (Dec)</td>
<td>41,490</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>36,700</td>
<td>67,450</td>
<td>37,210</td>
<td>8,820</td>
<td>7,910</td>
<td>46,670</td>
<td>251,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 (May)</td>
<td>41,920</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>37,040</td>
<td>67,890</td>
<td>38,050</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>7,930</td>
<td>47,070</td>
<td>253,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 (Dec)</td>
<td>42,680</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>37,640</td>
<td>68,690</td>
<td>39,550</td>
<td>8,950</td>
<td>7,960</td>
<td>47,800</td>
<td>258,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 (May)</td>
<td>43,160</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>69,130</td>
<td>40,420</td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td>7,980</td>
<td>48,220</td>
<td>260,860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All figures rounded
Source: Statistics Canada Census and CMHC monthly housing completions data.
Dear Stakeholders,

Since February 2017, the Town of Whitby has been working with a consulting team from WSP to prepare a Town-wide active transportation plan (ATP). The strategy build upon the Town’s original Cycling Strategy developed in 2013 and other relevant policies, plans and initiatives and is being developed and designed as a long-term guide / blueprint for the planning, design, implementation and maintenance of active transportation routes, facilities, programs and initiatives.

The plan is being developed using a three phase process. The figure below illustrates the phases and anticipated timeline of the ATP.

The consultant team, in collaboration with the Town has completed phases 1 and 2 of the process and has undertaken numerous consultation and engagement activities including public open house session, stakeholder workshop, project website and promotion.

The information and input provided through these activities has been integrated into the key project outcomes and continue to help shape the development of the ATP report. Since the first round of engagement / stakeholder workshop, WSP has completed the following work:

- Refined the proposed active transportation routes to identify a continuous and preferred active transportation network;
Identified preliminary facility types for the proposed routes i.e. bike lanes, multi-use trails, signed bicycle routes, etc. based on the Ontario Traffic Manual Book 18 facility selection process; and

Prepare preliminary content for the draft active transportation plan.

Because of your past involvement and interest in the Town’s ATP, we are inviting you to participate in an upcoming stakeholder workshop on Tuesday October 24th, 2017 from 2:30 – 4:30 p.m. The workshop will be used to:

- Review the proposed AT network and identify preliminary phasing and priorities for consideration by the Town;
- Discuss recommendations and strategies which can be used to support active transportation within the Town; and
- Identify opportunities for partnerships and coordination to facilitate the implementation of the ATP moving forward.

If you could please email the project team (Claire.basinski@wsp.com) by Monday October 23rd, 2017 to indicate whether you are able to attend that would be very much appreciated. If you do not feel that you are the appropriate person to attend this meeting, we would ask that you email the team and identify someone who you think would be better suited for this workshop and ongoing discussions about active transportation in Whitby.

If you are unable to attend the workshop, please indicate this to the project team and we will provide you with the materials which will be presented at the session for your review and consideration.

We thank you again for your ongoing interest and participation in this important study.

Please do not hesitate to contact either of the undersigned below should you have additional questions about the workshop or the Whitby Active Transportation Plan.

Best Regards,

David McLaughlin
(WSP | MMM Project Manager)
100 Commerce Valley Drive West
Thornhill, ON, L3T 0A1
Dave.mclaughlin@wsp.com
905-882-7306

For additional information and updates visit the Town’s web page. If you require this information in an alternate format please contact the Town of Whitby representative noted above or the project email address to provide you with additional information.
communication car vous faites partie des contacts de WSP. Si vous avez des questions concernant la politique de communications électroniques de WSP, veuillez consulter notre Engagement anti-pourriel au www.wsp.com/cap. Pour toute question ou si vous croyez que vous ne devriez pas recevoir ce message, prière de le transférer au conformitecap@wsp.com afin que nous puissions rapidement traiter votre demande. Notez que ce ne sont pas tous les messages transmis par WSP qui constituent des messages électroniques commerciaux.
October 12, 2017

Ralph Walton  
Regional Clerk/Director of Legislative Services  
Regional Municipality of Durham  
605 Rossland Road East  
P O Box 623  
Whitby, ON  L1N 6A3

Subject: Cannabis Legislation  
File: A-1400-001-17

The Council of the Corporation of the City of Pickering considered the above matter at a meeting held on October 10, 2017 and endorsed your correspondence.

Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at 905.420.4660 extension 2153.

Yours truly

Debbie Shields  
City Clerk
The Council of the Corporation of the City of Pickering considered the above matter at a meeting held on October 10, 2017 and the following recommendations were adopted:

1. That the proposal submitted by SvN Architects + Planners Inc., in association with AECOM, and 360 Collective, dated August 1, 2017, to undertake an Intensification Study for the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node, as Phase 2 of the South Pickering Intensification Study in the amount of $211,078.34 (including HST) be accepted, utilizing the City funding identified for this project in the approved 2017 Current Budget for the City Development Department, Consulting and Professional, Phases 2 & 3 South Pickering Intensification Study (Account 2611.2392.0000);

2. That the total gross project cost of $248,075.00 (HST included), including the RFP amount and contingency costs, and the total net project cost of $223,399.00 (inclusive of HST rebate) be approved;

3. That Council authorize the Director, Finance & Treasurer to finance the net project cost as follows:
   a) The sum of $60,318.00 as provided for in the 2017 Current Budget Planning & Design to be funded from property taxes;
   b) The sum of $163,081.00 as provided for in the 2017 Current Budget Planning & Design to be funded by a transfer from the Development Charges Reserve Fund – Growth Studies;
4. That the appropriate City of Pickering staff be authorized to enter into any agreements to give effect hereto; and

5. That the City Clerk forward a copy of Report Number PLN 16-17 to the Region of Durham.

Please find attached a copy of Report PLN 16-17. Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at 905.420.4660 extension 2019.

Yours truly

\[\text{Debbie Shields}\\text{City Clerk}\\text{DS/Ir}\]

Copy: Director, City Development & CBO
Report to
Planning & Development Committee

Report Number: PLN 16-17
Date: October 2, 2017

From: Kyle Bentley
Director, City Development & CBO

Subject: Consultant Selection for the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Study
File: D-2000-016

Recommendation:

1. That the proposal submitted by SvN Architects + Planners Inc., in association with AECOM, and 360 Collective, dated August 1, 2017, to undertake an Intensification Study for the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node, as Phase 2 of the South Pickering Intensification Study in the amount of $211,078.34 (including HST) be accepted, utilizing the City funding identified for this project in the approved 2017 Current Budget for the City Development Department, Consulting and Professional, Phases 2 & 3 South Pickering Intensification Study (Account 2611.2392.0000);

2. That the total gross project cost of $248,075.00 (HST included), including the RFP amount and contingency costs, and the total net project cost of $223,399.00 (inclusive of HST rebate) be approved;

3. That Council authorize the Director, Finance & Treasurer to finance the net project cost as follows:
   a) The sum of $60,318.00 as provided for in the 2017 Current Budget Planning & Design to be funded from property taxes;
   b) The sum of $163,081.00 as provided for in the 2017 Current Budget Planning & Design to be funded by a transfer from the Development Charges Reserve Fund – Growth Studies;

4. That the appropriate City of Pickering staff be authorized to enter into any agreements to give effect hereto; and

5. That the City Clerk forward a copy of Report Number PLN 16-17 to the Region of Durham.

Executive Summary: The City’s Growth Strategy Program is one of the key components of the Pickering Official Plan comprehensive review process. It consists of two components: the City Centre Intensification Study, which concluded with new Official Plan policies, urban design guidelines and zoning; and the South Pickering Intensification Study, focusing on intensification outside the City Centre.
Phase 1 of the South Pickering Intensification Study began in January 2015 with a community engagement exercise regarding where and to what extent growth should occur in South Pickering. In March 2016, Report PLN 04-16 was presented to Council which outlined the results of Phase 1 of the study and offered direction for moving forward with Phase 2 of the study, focusing on the Kingston Road Corridor. Accordingly, Council authorized staff to prepare and release a Request for Proposal (RFP) to retain consulting services to develop a new vision and strategy for intensification for the Kingston Road Corridor.

On July 5, 2017, a RFP was issued, calling for proposals by consultants to undertake the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Study.

The RFP closed on August 1, 2017. The City received three proposals from the following multi-disciplinary consulting teams: SGL Planning & Design Inc. et al; Urban Strategies Inc. et al; and SvN Architects + Planners Inc. et al.

The Evaluation Committee reviewed the proposals against the criteria outlined in the RFP, and found that the submission by SvN Architects + Planners Inc. et al best met the City’s requirements in completing project deliverables, considering their team’s strengths relative to the scope of work required, and value for the money.

Financial Implications:

1. Proposal Amount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal No. RFP-6-2017</th>
<th>$186,794.99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HST (13%)</td>
<td>24,283.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Project Amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>$211,078.34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Estimated Project Costing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal No. RFP-6-2017</th>
<th>$186,795.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingency – Additional meetings with staff, public or Council, or additional reports, requested by Committee and/or Council</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Service Item: Land Use Modelling</td>
<td>17,740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>219,535.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST (13%)</td>
<td>28,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Project Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$248,075.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST Rebate (11.24%)</td>
<td>(24,676.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Project Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$223,399.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Approved Source of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Code</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2611.2392.0000</td>
<td>Development Charges Reserve</td>
<td>$164,250.00</td>
<td>$163,081.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund – Growth Studies (73%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property Taxes (27%)</td>
<td>60,750.00</td>
<td>60,318.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$225,000.00</td>
<td>$223,399.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Costs Under Approved Funds By $1,601.00

Staff will be recommending appropriate funds in the 2019 or 2020 Current Budget to implement a zoning strategy for the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node.

1.0 Discussion:

1.1 In 2009, the City initiated a Growth Strategy Program as part of the comprehensive review of the Pickering Official Plan

The Growth Strategy Program is intended to implement the strategic growth area objectives of the Provincial Growth Plan and the corridor objectives of the Durham Regional Official Plan within the South Pickering urban area (lands south of the Canadian Pacific Rail line).

The first component of the program focused on the City Centre, identified as an Urban Growth Centre in the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. On March 4, 2015, the Ontario Municipal Board approved Amendment 26 to the Pickering Official Plan, a planning framework for the redevelopment and intensification of the City Centre. Council adopted urban design guidelines and a new zoning by-law for the City Centre in April 2017. The new zoning by-law has been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board.

The second component of the program focuses on examining intensification opportunities on the remaining lands in South Pickering. In 2015, the first phase of the South Pickering Intensification Study started with a community engagement exercise regarding where and to what extent growth should occur in South Pickering. The key themes that emerged throughout the community engagement exercise included focusing intensification and higher density development in the City Centre and along corridors such as Kingston Road, maintaining stable neighbourhoods, and creating vibrant, mixed-use, well designed, transit supportive communities.
Following the consideration of Report PLN 04-16 on March 7, 2016, which outlined the results of the community engagement exercise and the work program for the South Pickering Intensification Study, Council authorized staff to prepare and release a RFP to retain external urban design consultants to assist staff with Phase 2 of the South Pickering Intensification Study: developing a new vision and strategy for the intensification of the Kingston Road Corridor.

1.2 **Revisions were made to the scope of Phase 2 of the South Pickering Intensification Study**

Through the preparation of the RFP for the development of a new vision and strategy for the intensification of the Kingston Road Corridor, which included a detailed review of current Official Plan policies, urban design guidelines and zoning regulations, staff concluded that the study requires a broader multi-disciplinary approach, extending beyond the initial scope of an urban design study.

A more holistic planning exercise seemed appropriate, similar to what was done for the City Centre, to also address matters such as: intensification scenarios; a land use framework; mobility and parking provisions; infrastructure; built form and streetscape principles; and draft urban design guidelines. Accordingly, staff expanded the initial scope of work from an urban design study to a more in-depth planning and urban design intensification study.

Furthermore, during the preparation of the RFP, SMARTREIT, the land development consultants for the owners of the Smart Centre development located within the designated “Specialty Retailing Node” east of Brock Road and north of Highway 401, contacted staff, requesting that the Smart Centre lands be added to the Kingston Road Corridor Intensification Study.

SMARTREIT’s request stems from the realization that the big box district has entered its next phase of evolution; that its lands have a prime location adjacent to Highway 401 and two major public transit routes (Kingston and Brock Roads); and that its lands have a mixed-use designation in the Pickering Official Plan (which encourages intensification of the Node over time). Subsequently, staff expanded the scope of the Kingston Road Corridor Intensification Study to also include the lands currently designated “Specialty Retailing Node” (see the Kingston Corridor & Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Study Areas Map, Attachment #1).

1.3 **The new Provincial Growth Plan that took effect on July 1, 2017 does not alter the need for, or timing of, Phase 2 of the South Pickering Intensification Study**

Although there have been changes to terminology and intensification targets from the previous Growth Plan to the new Growth Plan, the core objectives remain the same, with more emphasis being put on housing affordability and climate change in the revised Plan. The work to be conducted through this study will assist the City in meeting the policy objectives of both the Durham Regional Official Plan (ROP) and the new Growth Plan.
Until such time as the ROP has been updated to conform to the new Growth Plan, the Pickering Official Plan must conform to the current ROP. Nothing however, prevents the City from adopting density targets through this study that are higher than those set in the current ROP, as long as they conform to the principles and objectives of the new Growth Plan.

1.4 A Request for Proposal for Consulting Services for the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Study was issued

On July 5, 2017, the City issued a RFP for consulting services for the next phase of the City's Growth Strategy Program (Phase 2 of the South Pickering Intensification Study) at an upset limit of $225,000.00 excluding HST. The scope of work is provided in Attachment #2. The RFP was an open proposal call. A notice of the RFP was placed on the City's website. In addition, eight qualified consulting firms were also notified of the RFP based on their experience with similar projects in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The RFP closed on August 1, 2017.

Three proposals were received from the following multi-disciplinary consulting teams:
- SvN Architects + Planners Inc.
- SGL Planning & Design Inc.
- Urban Strategies Inc.

1.5 SvN Architects + Planners Inc., in associated with AECOM and 360 Collective is recommended for selection

During August 2017, the Evaluation Committee consisting of the Chief Planner, the Manager, Policy & Geomatics, the Principal Planner, Policy, and the Buyer, Supply and Services reviewed the proposals against the criteria, as outlined in the RFP.

The consultant that received the highest score through the review process was SvN Architects + Planners Inc. (SvN), in association with AECOM (engineering design firm), and 360 Collective (retail and commercial strategy consultancy).

SvN, previously known as Planning Alliance, has a proven track record in projects similar in scope to the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Study. SvN has put together a well-balanced and experienced team that includes strong skills in urban and streetscape design, land use and transportation planning, retail/commercial market trends, public consultation and graphic and written presentations.

SvN, as part of their proposal, also outlined several optional services that could be offered in addition to the submitted pricing. These optional services are value added products and would, if selected, be included in their scope of work. Subsequently the Evaluation Committee reviewed the optional service items and selected Land Use Modelling (computerized 3D demonstration models to facilitate understanding of land use and built form scenarios) at a cost of $17,740.00, excluding HST.
Further to the RFP bid price and the Land Use Modeling service, staff is recommending up to $15,000.00 be set aside as a contingency in the event additional meetings are required during the study process.

The Health & Safety Regulations form and the Accessibility Regulations for Contracted Services form signed and completed respectively by SvN have been reviewed by the (Acting) Coordinator, Health & Safety, and deemed acceptable. The Certificate of Insurance has been reviewed by the Manager, Budgets & Internal Audit, and is deemed acceptable. The list of sub-consultants as submitted by SvN for this project has been reviewed and deemed acceptable by the Director, City Development. The Director, Finance & Treasurer has confirmed funding is available for this Study, and the Senior Financial Analyst – Capital & Debt Management has reviewed the wording of the Recommendations and the Financial Implications section of this Report.

2.0 Recommendations

It is recommended that the team lead by SvN Architects + Planners Inc., in association with AECOM, and 360 Collective, be retained to undertake the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Study. It is further recommended that staff be authorized to enter into any agreements as required to give effect hereto.

Attachments

1. Kingston Corridor & Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Study Areas Map
2. Scope of Work – Excerpt of Appendix D from RFP-6-2017
5. Scope of Work

The following sections provide an overview of the scope and phases of the Study, but are not intended to be an exhaustive list of the work activities. The Consultant will be responsible for providing all the necessary personnel, mapping and resources necessary to complete the study, and making sure that every part of the study process is covered within the budget.

Prior to starting the Study, the Consultant shall submit a final work schedule for all portions of the Study, including a detailed description of all tasks to be performed, staff responsible for each task, activities, time tables, and cost estimates for completing the work, updated as required.

5.1 Phase 1 - Developing a Vision

The initial phase of the study process involves the development of a Vision and associated goals and objectives, to provide the basis for developing a planning framework to redevelop and intensify the Corridor and the Node. The vision and associated goals and objectives, developed, must reflect and support the planning directions presented in the Provincial Growth Plan, the Durham Region Official Plan, the City's Official Plan, Durham Region's Transportation Master Plan, and Metrolinx's Regional Transportation Plan.

The Consultant shall perform the following tasks in Phase 1:

- review the City's current plans, policies and objectives, in relation to best practices performed by other public agencies regarding intensification corridor and node studies, strategies, or plans;
- review the history of the Corridor and the Node, and analyse the current conditions within the study area such as, but not limited to: land use, intensity, built-form character, massing and height, population and employment profiles, housing type, tenure and affordability, infrastructure, vacant lands, undevelopable lands and transportation;
- determine and clarify the relationship of the Study to other initiatives such as, but not limited to: Hwy 2 Bus Rapid Transit Project and Pickering Transportation Master Plan;
- recommend and employ an appropriate and innovative method to engage focus groups in the community, including the youth and seniors, to:
  - better understand the issues, constraints and opportunities within the study area, specifically in relation to land use, built form, character, and functionality; and
  - obtain their view regarding the elements they wish to see in a future vision of the Corridor and the Node;
- develop a draft Vision and associated goals and objectives by using the findings and conclusions from the fore-mentioned tasks as a basis;
Excerpt of Appendix D (RFP-6-2017)

- present the draft Vision and associated goals and objectives to a Public Agency Advisory Forum (PAAF) – a forum to consult key agencies at key project intervals; The City’s Project Manager will chair every meeting of the PAAF;
- present the draft Community Vision and associated goals and objectives, as well as a Background Report regarding the Phase 1 findings, to the Planning & Development Committee of Council.

Phase 1 Deliverables:
The Consultant shall provide a report with a recommended Vision and associated goals and objectives for the redevelopment and intensification of the Kingston Road Corridor and the Specialty Retailing Node, for Council’s endorsement in principle.

5.2 Phase 2 - Developing a Preferred Intensification Scenario

Building on the planning and design work previously undertaken for the Kingston Road Corridor and the Specialty Retailing Node, a set of alternative intensification scenarios shall be developed through a community workshop in response to the Council endorsed community vision, goals and objectives. The Consultant shall evaluate the results from the community workshop, and prepare a Preferred Intensification Scenario.

The Consultant shall perform the following tasks in Phase 2:

- formulate key assumptions for the development of alternative intensification scenario’s, based on but not limited to Provincial Growth Plan and Region of Durham Official Plan policies;
- set criteria upon which each alternative intensification scenario is to be developed, which shall include, at a minimum: land uses; building form, location and height; parking provision; mobility and access; and natural heritage and open space;
- facilitate a community workshop to develop alternative intensification scenarios; The scenarios could be themed, for example, on different levels of intensification, or different focus of land use in different locations;
- analyse the various scenarios developed at the community workshop, and developing a Preferred Intensification Scenario, in accordance with the Strategic Goals of the study contained in Section 4 of this document, the endorsed vision, goal and objectives, and the criteria upon which the alternative intensification scenarios were developed;
- present the Preferred Intensification Scenario to the PAAF for comment/input;
- present the Preferred Intensification Scenario to the Planning & Development Committee of Council for endorsement and direction for moving to Phase 3;
  o The Consultant will assist the City’s Project Manager in hosting a Public Open House prior to the Public Meeting (the same evening).
Phase 2 Deliverables:
The Consultant shall provide a report with a Preferred Intensification Scenario for the redevelopment and intensification of the Kingston Road Corridor and the Specialty Retailing Node, for Council’s endorsement in principle.

5.3 Phase 3 – Developing an Intensification Plan and Draft Urban Design Guidelines

Based on the tasks and deliverables outlined in Phases 1 and 2 above, the Consultant will prepare a draft Intensification Plan and draft Urban Design Guidelines, and present them to key agencies and the community for comments. Following the review of all comments/submissions from public agencies and the community, the Consultant shall prepare and present the final Intensification Plan and draft Urban Design Guidelines to the Council, for endorsement in principle.

The Consultant shall perform the following tasks in this phase:

- prepare a draft Intensification Plan, in report format, that will include the following key themes/chapters:
  - Background and Context (to include a discussion on the study area, the historic context {synopsis}, current characteristics {strengths and weaknesses}, and the planning context);
  - Community Vision, goals and objectives (including a discussion on the associated public engagement process to arrive at the Vision);
  - Land Use Framework (to address matters such as the recommended land use categories {including community facilities such as schools, senior and/or youth centres and recreation facilities, housing type, tenure and affordability}, land use mix and transitions, with specific emphasis on how they meet the objectives of the Provincial Growth Plan and Regional Official Plan);
  - Built Form and Streetscape Objectives/Principles (to address matters such as building massing and orientation, height, street relation, built form transition, and sustainable design);
  - Transportation/Mobility and parking provision (to address matters such as the mobility network with the focus on public transit and walkability, transit stop design and improvements; site access, service lanes, connectivity between developments, parking standards and parking accessibility);
  - Public Open Spaces & Natural Heritage (addressing matters such active and passive recreation opportunities, with the focus on town squares and piazzas, improving connectivity {in terms of design, built form relation and human activity} to natural heritage features, improving the protection and management of natural heritage features, and increasing the urban tree canopy);
  - Infrastructure – key recommendations regarding water, sewage, and stormwater management, to identify what improvements and upgrades are necessary to support the recommended Land use Framework;
  - Implementation Tools – key recommendations regarding Official Plan policies, Zoning By-law regulations, Site Plan Control, potential development incentives, and the identification of priority areas for strategic capital investment and public
realm improvements to facilitate and complement the intensification and redevelopment of the Corridor and the Node.

- prepare draft Urban Design Guidelines, with the emphasis on Place-making and Sustainability, on a study area-wide scale. The draft guidelines document will consist of the following core components, supported by visual illustrations and/or images:
  - Built form (guidelines on urban structure {landmarks, gateways, vistas and edges}, building design, massing, height, siting arrangement, transitions; street relation, and green design);
  - Mobility (guidelines on “complete streets”, an integrated pedestrian and cycling network, transit stop designs and connectivity, an integrated street and laneway network; and streetscape design); and
  - Public Open Space and Natural Heritage (guidelines on public open spaces, town squares, piazzas, visual and function connectivity to and protection of natural heritage features);
- facilitate an Open House to present the draft Intensification Plan and draft Urban Design Guidelines to the community;
- present the draft Intensification Plan and draft Urban Design Guidelines to the PAAF;
- prepare and present the final Intensification Plan and draft Urban Design Guidelines to the Planning & Development Committee of Council, to obtain Council’s approval in principle.

**Phase 3 Deliverables:**

The Consultant shall provide a final Intensification Plan and draft Urban Design Guidelines, for Council’s approval in principle.
MOVED BY: Pierre Paquette

SECONDED BY: Nancy Wirtz

RESOLUTION NO. 17-382

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Municipality of Killarney support the resolution passed by the Town of Halton Hills at its meeting held on August 28, 2017 regarding Zero Tolerance Against Racism.

CARRIED

I, Candy K. Beauvais, Clerk Treasurer of the Municipality of Killarney do certify the foregoing to be a true copy of Resolution #17-382 passed in a Regular Council Meeting of The Corporation of the Municipality of Killarney on the 11th day of October, 2017.

Candy K. Beauvais
Clerk Treasurer
WHEREAS on August 12, 2017 a horrific, cowardly, and racially motivated act of violence took place in Charlottesville, Virginia that led to the death of a 32 year old woman, and injuries to at least 19 others;

AND WHEREAS this horrific and cowardly act took place during what has been described as one of the largest white supremacist events in U.S. history;

AND WHEREAS further incidents of racially motivated acts of violence have taken place both locally and abroad;

AND WHEREAS we must join together as a community, province, and nation to condemn this type of hatred and racism;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council for the Town of Halton Hills supports zero tolerance for racism of any kind, including nazi'ism and white supremacy;

AND FURTHER THAT Council for the Town of Halton Hills encourages all Ontario Municipalities to pass a resolution to support zero tolerance against racism and condemn all racism acts of violence;

AND FURTHER THAT a copy of this resolution be sent to Michael Chong, MP, Wellington Halton-Hills, Ted Arnott, MPP, Wellington Halton-Hills, FCM, AMO, Region of Halton, and Ontario municipalities.
Maria Flammia

From: Electrification <Electrification@metrolinx.com>
Sent: October-11-17 1:21 PM
To: Jim McGilton
Cc: Clerks; Anthony Caruso; Jason Ryan; patricia.staite@HydroOne.com;
ASaltarelli@morrisonhershfield.com; James Hartley
Subject: Notice of Completion GO Rail Network Electrification - Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP)
Attachments: GO Rail Network Electrification TPAP Notice of Completion_FINAL.pdf

Dear Mr. Jim McGilton,

We’re writing to inform you that Metrolinx and Hydro One have completed an Environmental Project Report (EPR) for the GO Rail Network Electrification Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP).

Metrolinx and Hydro One are co-proponents jointly carrying out the TPAP in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08 - Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings (made under the Environmental Assessment Act) to examine the environmental impacts of converting several GO rail corridors from diesel to electric propulsion.

Metrolinx started the GO Rail Network Electrification TPAP in early 2016. As part of the TPAP process Metrolinx has been consulting with stakeholders, and held public meetings during Spring and Fall 2016 across the region. The official Notice of Commencement for the formal 120-day TPAP period was issued June 14 2017, and a third round of public meetings were held. This Notice of Completion is to announce the conclusion of the 120-day TPAP period.

The EPR will be made available for a 30-day public review period (starting October 11, 2017 until November 9, 2017) on the project website (www.gotransit.com/electrification) and at several viewing locations. Please see the attached Notice of Completion for further details regarding the project, list of viewing locations, as well as a description of the process for submitting any comments you may have on the EPR.

In addition to the project website, an electronic copy of the EPR package has been made available via an FTP site for download. Please use the link and login details below to access the FTP site:

FTP link: https://mxftp.metrolinx.com
Username: JimM
Password: Rf3Sh_Pg

If you have any questions or comments, please contact us at 1-888-438-6646 or by email at electrification@metrolinx.com.

Sincerely,

James Hartley
Manager, Environmental Programs and Assessments
Metrolinx | 20 Bay St. | Toronto | Ontario | M5J 2W3
Notice of Completion
GO Rail Network Electrification
Transit Project Assessment Process

Metrolinx and Hydro One, as co-proponents, have completed an Environmental Project Report (EPR) in accordance with Ontario Regulation 231/08 for the GO Rail Network Electrification Project.

The Project
As part of Regional Express Rail, Metrolinx is proposing to electrify GO-owned corridors. The GO Rail Network Electrification project will entail the design and implementation of a traction power supply system and power distribution components including an Overhead Contact System (OCS) along the rail corridors, electrical feeder routes, and a number of Traction Power Substations located within the vicinity of the rail corridors.

The Study Area (see key map) includes six GO rail corridors, as well as proposed locations for the traction power facilities (i.e., Traction Power Substations, Paralleling Stations, Switching stations) and on-rail components:

- Union Station Rail Corridor - UP Express Union Stations
- Don Yard Layover - No Traction Power Facilities
- Lakeshore West Corridor - West of Bathurst St. (mile 1.20) to Burlington
- Including two (2) Tap locations, six (6) Traction Power Facilities, one (1) Traction Power Facility
- Barrie Corridor - Parkdale Junction to Allandale GO Station
- Including two (2) Tap locations, four (4) Traction Power Facilities, one (1) Traction Power Facility, one (1) Traction Power Facility
- Steeles Avenue Corridor - Steeles Avenue Junction to Lincolnville GO Station
- Including one (1) Tap location, three (3) Traction Power Facilities, one (1) Traction Power Facility
- Lakeshore East Corridor - Don River Layover to Oshawa GO Station
- Including one (1) Tap location, four (4) Traction Power Facilities, one (1) Traction Power Facility

20-Day Public Review - October 11 to November 9

The environmental impact of the transit project was assessed, and an EPR prepared in accordance with the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) as prescribed in Ontario Regulation 231/08 - Transit Projects and Metrolinx (undertakings) under the Environmental Assessment Act. The EPR for the GO Rail Network Electrification is now available for a 20-day public review (period starting October 11, 2017) on the project website (www.gotransit.com/electrification) and at the following locations:

- Metropolitan Library
  - Head Office: 97 Front Street, 2nd Floor Reception
  - Toronto, ON M5J 1E6
  - Tel: 416-874-0590
  - Monday to Friday: 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m.
- Newmarket Public Library
  - 439 Park Avenue
  - Newmarket, ON L3Y 1T7
  - Tel: 905-931-5110
  - Monday to Thursday: 10:30 a.m. - 9:00 p.m.
  - Friday & Saturday: 9:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
  - Sunday: 1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

- Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
  - Centennial Office
  - 1111 Florence Avenue West, 4th Floor
  - Toronto, ON M6K 3Z7
  - Tel: 416-368-4620
  - Monday to Thursday: 9:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
  - Friday: 9:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
  - Saturday: 9:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

- Scarborough Civic Centre Library
  - 150 Central Park Drive
  - Scarborough, ON M1P 4N7
  - Tel: 416-796-3999
  - Monday to Thursday: 9:00 a.m. - 8:30 p.m.
  - Friday & Saturday: 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
  - Sunday: 1:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

- Markham Public Library
  - 3990 Major Mackenzie Drive East
  - Markham, ON L6C 1P9
  - Tel: 905-513-7977
  - Monday to Thursday: 9:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
  - Friday: 9:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.
  - Tuesday: 1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Interested persons are encouraged to review this document and provide comments by November 9, 2017 to:

- Aqua Hartley
  - Manager, Environmental Programs and Assessment
  - Metrolinx-GO Transit
  - 20 Bay Street, Suite 600, Toronto, ON M5J 2W3
  - Tel: 1-888-479-4464
  - Email: aqua.hartley@metrolinx.com

- Patricia Sante
  - Environmental Planner
  - Hydro One Networks Inc.
  - 483 Bay Street, 12th Floor
  - Toronto, ON M5J 1E6
  - Tel: 416-314-8001 /toll-free: 1-800-461-6290
  - Email: patricia.sante@hydroone.com

There are circumstances where the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change has the authority to require further consideration of the transit project or impose conditions on it. These include if the Minister is of the opinion that:

- The transit project may have a significant impact on a matter of provincial importance that relates to the natural environment or has cultural heritage value or interest, or
- The transit project may have a negative impact on a traditionally protected Aboriginal cultural or treaty right.

Before accepting the authority referred to above, the Minister is required to consider any written objections to the transit project before or after the Notice of Completion is published. If you have submitted true reasons with the preponent(s) and you want to have your objection included in the EPR, you can provide a written submission to the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change by no later than November 9, 2017 to the address provided below.

- Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
  - The Esplanade S.
  - Toronto, ON M4V 1E6
  - Tel: 416-314-8001 /toll-free: 1-800-461-6290
  - Fax: 416-314-8513
  - Email: EAABGen@ontario.ca

All personal information included in a submission such as name, address, telephone number, email address, and property location is collected, maintained and disclosed by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change for the purpose of transparency and consultation. The information is collected under the authority of the Environmental Assessment Act or a collection maintained for the purpose of creating a record that is accessible to the general public. As described in s. 27 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, personal information you submit will become part of a public record that is available to the general public unless you request that your personal information be kept confidential. For more information, please contact the Project Officer or the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change Freedom of Information and Privacy Coordinator at 416-314-4015.

This Notice was issued October 11, 2017.

Poirier et de la rentrée, veuillez contacter le 416-874-0590 ou le 1-800-GO-ON-GO (439-6646).
October 3, 2017

Mr. Ralph Walton
Regional Clerk/Director of Legislative Services
The Regional Municipality of Durham
605 Rossland Road East
Whitby, ON L1N 6A3

Dear Mr. Walton,

Thank you for your letter in regards to the protection of the automotive sector during negotiations for an improved North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). I appreciate the Region of Durham’s commitment to protecting a thriving automotive industry that is crucial to the success of our local communities.

As you know, the creation of NAFTA has had a tremendous impact on our national and regional economy and has contributed to the creation of jobs and prosperity for Canadians. The Government of Canada recognizes the negative impacts of cancelling NAFTA. That’s why the Minister of Global Affairs, the Honourable Chrystia Freeland and our team of expert negotiators are taking every possible step to protect NAFTA’s record as an engine of job creation and economic growth.

Our objectives are clear: We must uphold the elements of NAFTA that are vital to our national economic interest, including the automotive sector. We must also cut red tape to make life easier for small and medium sized businesses and ensure that NAFTA is more progressive by strengthening labour and environmental protections and by integrating gender and Indigenous rights.

Minister Freeland and her cabinet colleagues have been listening to Canadians from across the country and from all sectors and backgrounds. She has met with both union and business leaders in the automotive industry to hear their ideas and priorities for the renegotiation of NAFTA. Her message has been clear: Canada will fight hard at the NAFTA negotiating table for Canadian workers employed in the automotive sector.

Your letter mentions the 2016 Memorandum of Understanding between the State of Michigan and the Province of Ontario which calls for increased cooperation between our respective automotive sectors. I am proud that the Government of Canada and provincial governments across the country are working together in a concerted effort to protect our economic interests. As you may know, Premiers, cabinet ministers and many Members of Parliament have
highlighted the benefits of greater trade and partnership directly to their U.S counterparts. This includes the fact that thirty-five states count Canada as their number one customer and that our two countries engage in $2.4 billion in trade every single day.

We have a tremendous opportunity to make a good agreement even greater by bringing NAFTA into the 21st century and upholding Canadian values. This renegotiation offers an opportunity to modernize and strengthen this important trilateral free trade agreement, in support of growth for the middle class and all those working hard to join it.

Yours Sincerely,

Jennifer O'Connell

M.P. Pickering-Uxbridge

M.P. Ajax

Mark Holland
A meeting of the Energy From Waste – Waste Management Advisory Committee was held on Thursday, September 28, 2017 in the Lower Level Boardroom (LL-C), Regional Headquarters, 605 Rossland Road East, Whitby, at 7:00 PM.

Present: P. Ankrett, Scugog, Vice-Chair
T. Baker, Pickering
W. Bracken, Clarington
A. Burrows, Ajax
E. Collis, Clarington
J. Hicks, Clarington
P. Nelson, Brock
J. Vinson, Clarington

Absent: G. Rocoski, Oshawa, Chair

Non-Voting Members
Present: P. Dunn, Senior Environmental Officer, York Durham District Office, Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
K. Gorman, Environmental Health, Health Department, Durham Region,
Councillor Joe Neal, Regional Councillor, Clarington, attended the meeting at 7:06 PM

Staff
Present: G.H. Cubitt, Chief Administrative Officer, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer
G. Anello, Manager, Waste Planning and Technical Services, Works Department, Durham Region
S. Siopis, Commissioner of Works, left the meeting at meeting 8:54 PM
C. Tennisco, Committee Clerk, Corporate Services – Legislative Services, Durham Region

Also
Present: Councillor John Neal, Regional Councillor, City of Oshawa
M. Cant, Principle, Solid Waste, GHD
D. Constable, President & CEO, Full Cycle Material Solution
R. Oldfield, Vice President of Operations, Full Cycle Material Solution
J. Turner, Business Manager, Covanta Durham York Renewable Energy
In the absence of the Chair, P. Ankrett, Vice-Chair, assumed the Chair.

1. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

2. **Adoption of Minutes**

W. Bracken referenced the resolution regarding the recording of the EFW-WMAC meetings, as noted that on page 6, of the April 20, 2017 minutes, under Item 7. A) Administration Matters. She questioned when staff will provide Committee with an update.

S. Siopis advised that she would check with the Commissioner of Corporate Services regarding the recording of the EFW-WMAC meetings and will provide, via email to the members, an update on when a report will be brought forward.

G. Cubitt also responded to questions regarding whether the other Regional Advisory Committee meetings are recorded or live-streamed.

Moved by P. Nelson, Seconded by T. Baker,

That the minutes of the EFW-WMAC meeting held on Thursday, April 20, 2017, be adopted.

CARRIED

3. **Announcements**

There were no announcements made.

4. **Presentations**

A) Don Constable, President and CEO, Vice President of Operations, Greenpath Eco Group Inc. – Full Cycle Material Solutions, re: Environmentally Beneficial Use of Bottom Ash

D. Constable presented on the topic of the Environmentally Beneficial Use of Bottom Ash. R. Oldfield, Vice- President of Operations, Greenpath Eco Group Inc., was also in attendance.

D. Constable stated that the company was taking bottom ash from the Region of Peel’s incinerator commencing 2012 in order to operate a pilot factory, Greenpath Eco Group Inc., in the City of Mississauga.
D. Constable highlighted the environmentally beneficial uses for the bottom and fly ash discharged from solid waste incinerators; and the by-products being produced including concrete patio stones, aggregate and a hot asphalt mixture for materials used in road construction. He stated the facility is looking at opportunities to utilize the asphalt mixture for road projects within Durham Region. He also noted the mixture is non-shrinkable and suited to Canadian winters. Samples of the materials were provided to the Committee to observe.

D. Constable advised they are in the process of finalizing negotiations for the purchase of a landfill site located in the Municipality of Clarington, to be utilized for a full cycle material solution processing and manufacturing plant. He stated that the site meets the zoning requirements necessary to build and operate a business of this type and size and would generate at a minimum 30 employment opportunities. Subject to privacy and patent matters, the exact site location could not be disclosed at the time.

Discussion ensued regarding the potential for by-products such as heavy metals (mercury) to leach into the ground; the requirements for the testing of hazardous materials such as dioxins and furans; the long term environmental impacts to the site; and, the need for the company’s studies to be peer reviewed by scientists, and whether the members will have access to those documents.

D. Constable responded to questions from the Committee.

G. Anello also responded to questions regarding whether bottom ash waste goes to a non-hazardous landfill site; and if a report on the full cycle material solutions project will be prepared for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole.

S. Siopis advised that she would follow-up with Regional staff and Covanta Durham York Renewable Energy on this matter and provide Committee with an update.


M. Cant, Principle, Solid Waste, GHD Ltd, provided a PowerPoint presentation on The Regional Municipality of Durham's Organic Management Strategy. A copy of his presentation was provided to the Committee prior to the meeting.

M. Cant provided an overview on the following 3 studies completed by GHD Ltd and Ernst & Young Orenda Corporate Finance Inc. in June 2017: Background Research, Technical and Options Analysis Report; Preliminary Business Case Financial Analysis; and the Preliminary Service Delivery Model Assessment.
Highlights of his presentation included:
- The Need for an Organics Strategy in Durham
- Why 2018 is the Benchmark Year
- Regulatory Issues
- Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Organics Strategy
- Current Material Flows – 55% Diversion
- Proposed Pre-Sort and Organics Processing
- Typical Mixed Waste Processing Facility
- Organics Processing
- Introduction to Anaerobic Digestion
- Anaerobic Digestion Facility
- Process Flow and Process of Anaerobic Digesters
- Drivers and Options Analysis for a Anaerobic Digestion Facility
- Why Status Quo of Organics Management is not Sustainable
- Business Case Options
- Business Opportunities
- Additional Funding Opportunities
- Considerations
- Next Steps

M. Cant reviewed the two types of organic processes: compost and anaerobic digestion. He explained that anaerobic digestion is a natural process in a controlled oxygen poor environment, and he outlined the bacteria breakdown and chemical process. He also provided an overview of the organic inputs and outputs produced at a mixed waste sorting facility; and the technology associated with the two types of digesters: the wet bio digester and dry bio digester.

Discussion ensued regarding the undertaking of the recommended Request for Information (RFI) process; the need for public input prior to determining a recommended process; the options to be analyzed and identified in the Preliminary Business Case; and making residents responsible for the separating and sorting of their waste.

M. Cant responded to questions from the Committee.

C) Gioseph Anello, Manager, Waste Planning and Technical Services, The Regional Municipality of Durham, re: Durham York Energy Centre (DYEC) May 2017 Voluntary Source Test Results

G. Anello provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Durham York Energy Centre May 2017 Voluntary Source Test Results. A copy of the Summary of Durham York Energy Centre Source Test Results and Info Report #2017-INFO-89: Durham Your Energy Centre Source Test Update was provided to the Committee prior to the meeting.
G. Anello advised that the AirZone One Ltd. evaluation of the Spring 2017 voluntary source testing results have not yet been completed. He also advised that the following two Source Testing documents prepared by Airzone One Ltd. are now available on the Durham York Waste website:

- Conclusion of the Spring 2016 Voluntary Source Testing

G. Anello provided an overview of the Summary of Durham York Energy Centre Source Test Results. He advised that the emissions dispersion modeling showed the concentrations of contaminants at the maximum point of impingement comply with Ontario Regulation 419/05 Air Pollution – Local Air Quality; and that the diagnostic and compliance source tests are within the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) limits.

G. Anello stated the Fall 2017 compliance source testing will be held the week of October 10, 2017.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the results outlined in the Summary of Durham York Energy Centre Source Test Results are reflective of the changes to the DYEC equipment as part of the Abatement Plan; the modification for a standard procedure to test the dioxins and furans; and the waste tonnage for the Regions of York and Durham.

5. Delegations

There were no delegations to be heard.

6. Correspondence

There were no items of correspondence items to be considered.

7. Administrative Matters

A) Discussion on the Next Term of the EFW-WMAC

P. Ankrett provided an update on the next term of the EFW-WMAC meetings. He advised that the current two year term for the membership ends November 2017.

Discussion ensued regarding options for the current term to be extended one year into 2018 to coincide with the term of Regional Council.

It was suggested that the Committee forward any comments on the options available for the next term of the EFW-WMAC and that staff report back at the November 23, 2017 meeting on these options.
8. **Other Business**

A) **Region of Durham Blue Box Program**

Discussion ensued regarding the future of the Region’s Blue Box program and the Organic Management Strategy for Durham Region, including the building of an anaerobic digestion facility.

The Committee asked that staff arrange a presentation on the future of Durham’s Blue Box Program in terms of the expectations and options for the handling of recyclables.

9. **Next Meeting**

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the EFW-WMAC will be Thursday, November 23, 2017 in the Lower Level Boardroom (LL-C), at 7:00 PM, Regional Headquarters, 605 Rossland Road East, Whitby.

10. **Adjournment**

Moved by T. Baker, Seconded by P. Nelson,
That the meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 9:07 PM.

P. Ankrett, Vice-Chair, Energy From Waste – Waste Management Advisory Committee

Cheryl Tennisco, Committee Clerk
A regular meeting of the Durham Agricultural Advisory Committee was held on Tuesday, October 3, 2017 in Boardroom 1-B, Regional Municipality of Durham Headquarters, 605 Rossland Road East, Whitby at 7:30 PM

Present:  
Z. Cohoon, Federation of Agriculture, Chair  
F. Puterbough, Member at Large, Vice-Chair, attended the meeting at 7:45 PM  
J. Henderson, Oshawa  
B. Howsam, Member at Large  
K. Kennedy, Member at Large  
G. O’Connor, Regional Councillor  
D. Risebrough, Member at Large  
H. Schillings, Whitby  
B. Smith, Uxbridge  
G. Taylor, Pickering  
B. Winter, Ajax

Absent:  
I. Bacon, Member at Large  
D. Bath, Member at Large  
E. Bowman, Clarington  
K. Kemp, Scugog  
T. Watpool, Brock, Vice-Chair

Staff Present:  
K. Allore, Senior Planner, Department of Planning and Economic Development  
K. Kilbourne, Project Planner, Department of Planning and Economic Development  
L. MacKenzie, Program Coordinator, Department of Planning and Economic Development  
N. Prasad, Committee Clerk, Corporate Services – Legislative Services

1. Adoption of Minutes

Moved by B. Winter, Seconded by B. Smith,  
That the minutes of the Durham Agricultural Advisory Committee meeting held on September 5, 2017 be adopted.  
CARRIED
2. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

3. **Presentation**

A) Chris Jones, Director of Planning and Regulation, Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority (CLOCA) Services and Programs, 2017 and 2018

C. Jones, Director of Planning and Regulation, Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority, provided a PowerPoint presentation with regards to an Overview of CLOCA’s Programs and Services.

C. Jones stated that CLOCA was established in 1958. He stated that CLOCA’s mandate is to establish and undertake programs to promote the conservation, restoration, development and management of natural resources.

C. Jones provided an overview of the following responsibilities of CLOCA:

- Map, forecast and monitor flood hazards;
- Own and manage over 2,500ha of conservation lands;
- Monitor environmental conditions;
- Prepare watershed plans and restoration activities;
- Education/outreach/stewardship;
- Source Water Protection planning; and
- Review planning documents and regulate development, interference and activities in certain areas.

C. Jones provided a review of the Section 28 Regulations of the Conservation Authorities Act as well as current initiatives of CLOCA.

C. Jones responded to questions of the Committee.

4. **Discussion Items**

A) DAAC Comments: Region of Durham Tree By-Law, Five Year Review

A list of comments received from Committee members regarding the Tree By-law was provided as Attachment #2 to the Agenda.

Discussion ensued with regards to the comments and it was the consensus of the Committee that the following consolidated comments be provided to staff with regards to the Region of Durham Tree By-law, Five Year Review:

- There needs to be more education for community members about what is permitted. This would reduce the number of complaints farmers get from neighbours;
• The requirement for a permit should continue to not apply to applications for less than 1 ha. Reducing it further will result in farmers avoiding the tree by-law process;
• Important to have a written report when clear cutting is done as part of good forestry practice; and
• Important to have a proper definition of “trees”.

B) Proposed DAAC Meeting Schedule 2018

A copy of the proposed meeting schedule for 2018 was provided as Attachment #3 to the Agenda.

Moved by D. Risebrough, Seconded by B. Howsam,
That the proposed DAAC meeting schedule for 2018 as provided, be adopted with the March meeting to be held on March 20, 2018 and with the addition of a December meeting to be held on December 11, 2018.

CARRIED

C) DAAC Annual Report and Workplan Reporting Schedule

K. Allore advised that the annual Report and Workplan will be presented to the Committee at the December meeting, and presented at the January 2018 Committee of the Whole and Regional Council meetings.

D) Joint Workshop with DEAC – Update

Z. Cohoon advised that the subcommittee met on September 14, 2017 and have decided on a target audience, venue and speakers for the joint Workshop with DEAC. He stated that the joint Workshop will be held on February 9, 2018 at the Scugog Library from 9AM to 3PM.

E) 2017 DAAC Farm Tour Update

A copy of the DAAC Farm Tour 2017 Survey Response Summary was provided as Attachment #4 to the Agenda.

Discussion ensued with regards to the 2017 DAAC Farm Tour and the following comments were made:

• The Farm Tour was excellent and very informative;
• Great meal provided by OLG Slots at Ajax Downs;
• Thanks to the Durham Dairy Producers for donating milk for the event;
• Approximately 75 people attended the event;
• Received 25 completed surveys with no negative feedback; and
• Important to brainstorm ways to get more Regional councillors to attend future farm tours.
F) Rural and Agricultural Economic Development Update

L. MacKenzie provided the following update:

- The fall Durham Region Farmers Market is scheduled for October 5, 2017 at regional headquarters from 9AM to 1:30PM.
- Committee members were encouraged to advise if they are not receiving the Agriculture and Rural Affairs e-newsletter.
- Staff is putting together a leadership team to launch a local Business Retention and Expansion (BR&E) project in October 2017. Committee members were asked to advise if they knew anyone that would be interested in being part of the leadership team.
- Durham Region has initiated a Broadband Strategy. The Broadband Strategy will be completed in two phases. Phase One focuses on gathering background and baseline information and is scheduled to be completed before the end of 2017. Phase Two focuses on the preparation of the Final Broadband Strategy document, and is scheduled for completion by July 1, 2018. Discussion ensued with regards to upcoming stakeholder consultations and different ways farms use broadband.

5. Information Items

A) Commissioner’s Report: DAAC Farm Tour Update

A copy of Report #2017-INF0-97 of the Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development re: Durham Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2017 Farm Tour was provided by email on September 29, 2017.


A copy of Report #2017-INF0-93 of the Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development re: Initiation of the Durham Region Broadband Strategy was provided by email on September 29, 2017.

C) Commissioner’s Report: Phase 1 Completion of the Carruthers Creek Watershed Plan Update

A copy of Report #2017-INF0-218 of the Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development re: Phase 1 Completion of the Carruthers Creek Watershed Plan Update was provided by email on September 29, 2017.

6. Other Business

There were no items of other business.
7. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of the Durham Agricultural Advisory Committee will be held on Tuesday, November 7, 2017 starting at 7:30 PM in Boardroom 1-B, Level 1, 605 Rossland Road East, Whitby.

8. **Adjournment**

Moved by H. Schillings, Seconded by Councillor O'Connor,
That the meeting be adjourned.
CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 8:46 PM

______________________________
Z. Cohoon, Chair, Durham
Agricultural Advisory Committee

______________________________
N. Prasad, Committee Clerk
# Action Items
## Committee of the Whole and Regional Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Assigned Department(s)</th>
<th>Anticipated Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 7, 2016</td>
<td>Staff was requested to provide information on the possibility of an educational campaign designed to encourage people to sign up for subsidized housing at the next Committee of the Whole meeting. (Region of Durham’s Program Delivery and Fiscal Plan for the 2016 Social Infrastructure Fund Program) (2016-COW-19)</td>
<td>Social Services / Economic Development</td>
<td>October 5, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7, 2016</td>
<td>Section 7 of Attachment #1 to Report #2016-COW-31, Draft Procedural By-law, as it relates to Appointment of Committees was referred back to staff to review the appointment process.</td>
<td>Legislative Services</td>
<td>First Quarter 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2016</td>
<td>That Correspondence (CC 65) from the Municipality of Clarington regarding the Durham York Energy Centre Stack Test Results be referred to staff for a report to Committee of the Whole</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7, 2016</td>
<td>Staff advised that an update on a policy regarding Public Art would be available by the Spring 2017.</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 11, 2017</td>
<td>Inquiry regarding when the road rationalization plan would be considered by Council. Staff advised a report would be brought forward in June.</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Assigned Department(s)</td>
<td>Anticipated Response Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2017</td>
<td>Staff was directed to invite the staff of Durham Region and Covanta to present on the Durham York Energy Facility at a future meeting of the Council of the Municipality of Clarington.</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2017</td>
<td>Staff was requested to advise Council on the number of Access Pass riders that use Specialized transit services.</td>
<td>Finance/DRT</td>
<td>March 8, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2017</td>
<td>A request for a report/policy regarding sharing documents with Council members.</td>
<td>Corporate Services - Administration</td>
<td>Prior to July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2017</td>
<td>Discussion ensued with respect to whether data is collected on how many beds are created through this funding; and, if staff could conduct an analysis of the Denise House funding allocation to determine whether an increase is warranted. H. Drouin advised staff would investigate this and bring forward this information in a future report.</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2017</td>
<td>Discussion ensued with respect to whether staff track the job loss vacancies in Durham Region, in particular the retail market. K. Weiss advised that staff will follow-up with the local area municipalities and will report back on this matter.</td>
<td>Economic Development &amp; Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Assigned Department(s)</td>
<td>Anticipated Response Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 2017</td>
<td>That staff be authorized to distribute the Draft Transportation Master Plan to the area municipalities and other stakeholders for their review and comment and report back to Regional staff by the end of September 2017.</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 2017</td>
<td>That the concerns raised from the John Howard Society of Durham Region be referred to Social Services staff to provide assistance or advice to the John Howard Society and that a report be brought back to Council in September, 2017.</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6, 2017</td>
<td>Staff was asked to provide Council the schedule for the upcoming consultations meetings with the local business community and stakeholder regarding the Vacant Unit Rebate and Vacant/Excess Land Property Tax Policy</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6, 2017</td>
<td>The following motion was moved by Councillor Parish and Councillor Collier: That the delegation of Greg Milosh regarding cost payment for unused sick days be referred to staff for a report to be brought back to Committee of the Whole by December 31, 2017.</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>By Dec 31/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Assigned Department(s)</td>
<td>Anticipated Response Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6, 2017</td>
<td>The following motion was moved by Councillor O’Connor and Councillor Ryan: That the Commissioner of Finance review the reporting requirements for over-expenditures that will utilize the contingency provisions of a project and report back on potential modifications to the October Committee of the Whole.</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>October 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4, 2017</td>
<td>Harm Reduction Program Enhancement: Staff agreed to provide details of the distribution of money among the public health units.</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4, 2017</td>
<td>2017 Allocations for the Community Homelessness Prevention Initiative: Staff agreed to provide more information regarding how many households have been redirected out of the Region for services.</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4, 2017</td>
<td>The following Motion was passed regarding the Cannabis Legislation Bill C-45; Bill C-46</td>
<td>Health/Legal/Finance/Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Assigned Department(s)</td>
<td>Anticipated Response Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4, 2017</td>
<td>Update on Simcoe Street Construction from Rossland Road to Robert Street: S. Siopis. S. Siopis advised she would look into this and follow up with Councillor Carter directly.</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4, 2017</td>
<td>Councillor Collier questioned whether staff could provide quarterly reports on future Boiler outages in regards to the shutdown times and the reasons for the outages. S. Siopis was asked to provide a response prior to the November Committee of the Whole meeting.</td>
<td>Works</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 2017</td>
<td>The following motion was referred back to staff for clarification: That the Commissioner of Finance review the reporting requirements for over-expenditures that will utilize the contingency provisions of a project and report back on potential modifications to the October Committee of the Whole.</td>
<td>CAO/Finance</td>
<td>December 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>