

Proposed Planning Act, City of Toronto Act, 2006, Building Code Act, 1992 and Municipal Act, 2001 Changes (Schedules 1, 2 and 7 of Bill 98, the Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026)

ERO (Environmental Registry of Ontario) number	026-0300
Notice type	Act
Act	Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990
Posted by	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Notice stage	Proposal
Proposal posted	March 30, 2026
Comment period	March 30, 2026 - April 29, 2026 (30 days) Open
Last updated	March 30, 2026

This consultation closes at 11:59 p.m.

on:

April 29, 2026

Proposal summary

The government is seeking feedback on proposed legislative changes to the Planning Act, City of Toronto Act, 2006, Building Code Act, 1992 and Municipal Act, 2001 through Bill 98, the proposed Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026.

Proposal details

The government is seeking public feedback on proposed legislative changes under the proposed *Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026* and related regulatory changes to further support

housing, economic, and infrastructure development, and advance key transportation and transit priorities.

We welcome your thoughts on the following changes proposed under Bill 98, the proposed Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026.

Proposed Planning Act, City of Toronto Act, 2006, Building Code Act, 1992 and Municipal Act, 2001 changes

Schedules 1, 2 and 7 of Bill 98 propose a number of amendments to the Planning Act and City of Toronto Act, 2006. If passed, proposed changes would:

Streamlining and Standardizing Official Plans

- Changes are proposed to the Planning Act to streamline and standardize municipal official plans by:
 - Including the details of a standardized structure for local (lower- and single-tier municipality and planning board) official plans through a table of contents and schedules as follows:
 - Introduction and How to Use this Plan
 - Strategic Planning Framework
 - Indigenous Engagement
 - Settlement Area Structure and Growth Needs and Management
 - Residential and Mixed Uses
 - Economy and Employment Areas
 - Rural Areas and Agricultural System
 - Infrastructure, Facilities and Community Services
 - Local Landscape and Resource Management
 - Implementation and Interpretation
 - Schedules;
 - A1 Settlement Boundaries, Urban/Rural Structure and Provincial Plans
 - A2 Strategic Growth Areas and Intensification Areas
 - A3 Land Use Designations
 - B1 Transportation and Corridors
 - B2 Infrastructure
 - B3 Public Service Facilities, Parks and Open Space
 - C1 Natural Environment
 - C2 Water Resources

- C3 Resource Potential
- C4 Natural and Human-made Hazards
- Including the details of a standardized set of land use designations to be used in local official plans (lower- and single-tier municipality and planning board) as follows:
 - **Neighbourhoods**, permitting residential uses, small-scale commercial uses, institutional uses (including cemeteries), and other uses as prescribed.
 - **Mixed-Use Areas**, permitting residential uses, commercial uses, institutional uses (including cemeteries), industrial, manufacturing and small-scale warehousing uses that could be located adjacent to sensitive land uses without adverse effects, and other uses as prescribed.
 - **Mixed-Use Commercial Areas**, permitting industrial, manufacturing and small-scale warehousing uses and other uses as prescribed. Commercial and institutional uses are permitted only if they are not sensitive land uses.
 - **Employment Areas**, permitting the uses permitted in areas of employment, as defined in the Planning Act.
 - **Major Facilities**, permitting manufacturing uses, industrial uses, infrastructure uses, and other uses as prescribed.
 - **Parks and Open Spaces**, permitting recreational uses, cemetery uses, and other uses as prescribed.
 - **Natural Environment and Water Resource Areas**, permitting conservation uses and other uses as prescribed.
 - **Resource Areas**, permitting resource extraction uses.
 - **Rural Lands**, permitting residential uses, small-scale commercial uses, small-scale industrial uses, agricultural and agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses, resource management uses, resource-based recreational uses, cemetery uses, and other uses as prescribed.
 - **Prime Agricultural Areas**, permitting agricultural and agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses and other uses as prescribed.
 - **Specialty Crop Areas**, permitting agricultural and agriculture-related uses, on-farm diversified uses and other uses as prescribed.

- **Shoreline Areas**, permitting marina uses, recreational uses, residential uses, and other uses as prescribed.
 - The Minister may also set out further direction on implementing any of these designations, including using two or more sub-designations.
- Providing for proposed changes coming into force January 1, 2028 for the 29 large and fast-growing municipalities, and January 1, 2029 for all other municipalities.
- The government intends to bring these changes into force once additional consultation on secondary plans and upper-tier official plan content is complete, and any final refinements are made to the framework.

Complementary Changes to Support Implementation of Streamlining and Standardizing Official Plans

- Changes are proposed to the Planning Act to support implementation of the proposed new official plan framework, including:
 - Removing redundant requirement for municipalities to include climate change policies in their official plans,
 - Providing that for an already approved protected major transit station area (PMTSA), only official plan amendments changing the boundaries of the PMTSA or the planned population and jobs for the area would require the Minister's approval, and
 - Providing the Minister with authority to exempt lower-tier municipalities from requirement to conform with upper-tier official plan to facilitate implementation of testing for the proposed official plan framework.

Site Plan: Prohibit Mandatory Municipal Enhanced Development Standards and Green Building Standards

- Changes are proposed to the Planning Act, Municipal Act, 2001, Building Code Act, 1992, and City of Toronto Act, 2006 that would have the effect of:
 - removing municipal authority to require certain mandatory Enhanced Development Standards (EDS) at the lot level, outside of buildings (e.g., green development standards), that are not specifically required for health or safety (e.g., stormwater management)

- providing even greater clarity that green building/construction standards are voluntary and cannot be imposed by municipalities.
- Specifically, the proposed changes would:
 - remove references to “sustainable design” from site plan control
 - clarify zoning cannot be used to require sustainable elements,
 - expressly provide that mandatory green building/construction standards are not permitted, including as part of site plan control, and
 - remove provisions that would have authorized municipalities to require green building standards, if the government had made enabling regulatory amendments (i.e., a green pick list).
- Changes are also proposed that would create regulation-making authority under the Planning Act and the City of Toronto Act, 2006 which could be used to explicitly prohibit municipalities from requiring specific Enhanced Development Standard elements as part of a site plan approval, if required.

Additional changes related to Enhanced Development Standards are proposed under **ERO #026-0309 (<https://ero.ontario.ca/index.php/notice/026-0309>)**. The proposed regulation would prohibit mandatory enhanced development standards as a condition of land division approvals

Minimum Lot Sizes

- Changes are proposed to the Planning Act to create a regulation-making authority to allow the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to set a minimum lot size on parcels of urban residential land, outside the Greenbelt Area.
 - A parcel of urban residential land is defined in the Planning Act as a parcel within the settlement area of a municipality that is zoned for residential use (other than ancillary residential use) and is fully serviced by public sewage and water.
 - Any municipal zoning requirement for minimum frontage and/or minimum depth that would not allow for the minimum lot size standard to be met would be inapplicable.
 - A regulation under this authority would not apply directly to the subdivision or consent process, but could be relevant to such applications

- Consequential changes are proposed to the City of Toronto Act, 2006 to ensure a regulation establishing minimum residential lot area requirements under the Planning Act would apply in the City of Toronto.

ERO 025-1100 Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes

(<https://ero.ontario.ca/index.php/notice/025-1100>)

Minister's Zoning Orders

- Changes are proposed to the Planning Act that would remove the legislative requirement for the Minister to provide notice on proposed amendments to or revocations of Minister's Zoning Orders (MZOs).

Upper-tier Planning Responsibilities in Simcoe County

- The More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 (Bill 23) and the Cutting Red Tape to Build More Homes Act, 2024 (Bill 185) made changes to the Planning Act that, once brought into force, remove planning responsibilities under the Planning Act from 7 upper-tier municipalities identified in the legislation: Durham, Halton, Niagara, Peel, Simcoe, Waterloo, and York. Planning responsibilities have been removed from all the identified municipalities except for Simcoe.
- Changes are proposed to the Planning Act to provide flexibility for removing Simcoe County's planning responsibilities in up to three separate phases, based on municipal readiness:
 - The Town of Innisfil, the Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury, and the Town of New Tecumseth,
 - Specific prescribed lower-tier municipalities within Simcoe, and
 - All other municipalities in Simcoe.

Encumbered Parkland and Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS)

- Bill 23, the *More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022*, added subsections 42 (4.30) to (4.39) to the *Planning Act*, which, once brought into force, would provide for:
 - developer-identified lands, including those with encumbrances and privately owned public spaces (POPS), to count towards any municipal parkland dedication requirement,
 - the landowner to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) in cases where the municipality rejects developer-identified land, with the OLT

required to order the land to be conveyed to the municipality if it meets prescribed criteria.

- Changes are proposed to the *Planning Act* to facilitate easements for POPS, authorize municipalities to require agreements for encumbered land (i.e., strata lands) that can be registered on title, provide for a credit system whereby encumbered land and POPS arrangements would receive a minimum credit of 70%, and establish a timeframe of 90 days for municipal decisions after which a developer could appeal a non-decision to the OLT.

Impact on the Environment

The proposed legislative changes which standardize and streamline the structure of official plans and establish a standardized set of land use designations are anticipated to have a neutral impact on the environment as municipal decisions must still be consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement and conform or not conflict with provincial plans. Proposed changes that would remove legislative provisions regarding including climate change policies in official plans would not change the requirement in the Provincial Planning Statement for municipalities to plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and prepare for the impacts of a changing climate through a variety of approaches.

The proposed changes related to encumbered parkland and POPS could increase the conveyance of suitable parkland, especially in urban areas. The ministry will monitor implementation to ensure residents continue to benefit from high-quality local parks.

Analysis of Regulatory Impact

Building on previous legislative and regulatory changes, the initiatives are anticipated to further support streamlining land use planning processes; building more homes faster; and creating more certainty in the development approvals processes.

Costs

Any costs incurred by municipalities in updating their official plan at the time of their required review and update are considered part of normal business and assumed to be included in the municipal budget. The proposed legislative

changes would result in additional costs related to municipal staff learning about the changes and transitioning their official plan to a new standard format.

The proposed legislative changes for enhanced development standards and minimum lot size would result in additional costs related to municipal staff learning about the changes.

The proposed legislative changes for encumbered parkland and POPS are expected to result in additional costs related to municipal staff learning about the changes. There could also be additional costs to municipalities related to legal costs associated with entering into agreements with landowners in respect of encumbered lands and POPS arrangements as part of municipal parkland dedication requirements. These legal costs are expected to increase because developers could meet all parkland requirements using encumbered lands or POPS arrangements, which municipalities would likely seek to secure through agreements.

There are no direct compliance cost implications to other parties because of these proposed legislative changes, including consumers, businesses, and the government.

Benefits

The changes would benefit Ontarians broadly, as they are intended to simplify and streamline official plans and land use designations, making them more predictable and consistent for approvers and applicants. This could result in time and cost savings on a project-by-project basis for applicants, homeowners and others. Municipalities would benefit in the long term from simpler official plan updates and fewer site-specific amendments, while applicants gain clarity and consistency that could result in reduced application needs and therefore related costs.

The proposed legislative changes for developer-identified parkland, including encumbered parkland and POPS, would make land use more efficient, standardize parkland requirements, and reduce costs for homebuilders, especially in urban areas.

Proposed Regulation to Prohibit Mandatory Enhanced Development Standards as a Condition of Land Division Approvals

ERO (Environmental Registry of Ontario) number	026-0309
Notice type	Regulation
Act	Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990
Posted by	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Notice stage	Proposal
Proposal posted	March 30, 2026
Comment period	March 30, 2026 - May 14, 2026 (45 days) Open
Last updated	March 30, 2026

This consultation closes at 11:59 p.m.

on:

May 14, 2026

Proposal summary

The government is seeking feedback on a proposed Minister's regulation that would have the effect of removing authority to require certain mandatory Enhanced Development Standards or sustainability measures as a condition of land division approval.

Proposal details

The government is seeking public feedback on proposed legislative changes under the proposed *Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026* and related regulatory changes to further support housing, economic, and infrastructure development, and advance key transportation and transit priorities.

The government is seeking feedback on a proposed Minister's regulation that would have the effect of removing authority to require, as a condition of land division approvals, mandatory enhanced development standards at the lot level (outside of buildings), that are not specifically required for health, safety, accessibility or protection of adjoining lands (e.g., stormwater management).

Enhanced development standards (EDS) at the lot level vary across jurisdictions, which results in inconsistent requirements, added complexity, and may add to project costs for some developments.

Consultation was undertaken as part of Bill 60 initiatives to help identify understand the issue and explore solutions ([Consultation on Enhanced Development Standards – Lot Level \(outside of buildings\) | Environmental Registry of Ontario \(https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/025-1101\)](https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/025-1101)).

To address the above, a regulation would be created under the Planning Act to prohibit “sustainability” conditions as part of land division approvals.

Related legislative amendments are proposed that, if passed, would involve changes to the Planning Act, Municipal Act, Building Code Act, and City of Toronto Act. Information about this proposal can be found under ERO (insert broader PA changes [ERO #026-0300 \(https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/026-0300\)](https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/026-0300)).

Taken together, the proposed legislative and regulatory changes would help to create a more consistent approach to development standards across Ontario municipalities by scoping and limiting municipal authority to require certain enhanced development standards elements in connection with development approvals.

The changes would create a shift from a mandatory to a voluntary approach for enhanced development elements (i.e. green development standards) that are not required for purposes of health and safety or environmental functionality (i.e. stormwater management).

Analysis of Regulatory Impact

Building on previous legislative and regulatory changes, the initiative is anticipated to further support streamlining land use planning processes; building more homes faster; and creating more certainty in the development approvals processes.

Costs

The proposed regulation would result in additional costs related to municipal staff learning about the regulatory change. There could also be additional costs to municipalities related to the proposal as a result of limits being placed on what municipalities can compel of developers as a condition land division, thus shifting burden from the development sector to municipalities for sustainability measures and/or for addressing unintended environmental impacts.

There are no direct compliance cost implications to other parties, including consumers, businesses, and the government, because of the proposed regulation.

Benefits

The proposed regulatory change would create the conditions for improved transparency and clearer expectations. Moving to a voluntary approach for enhanced design standards will aid in shifting from a patchwork system of requirements across municipalities to a predictable, province-wide approach.

Supporting materials

Related links

[Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13 | ontario.ca](https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13#BK83)
(<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13#BK83>)

[City of Toronto Act, 2006, S.O. 2006, c. 11, Sched. A | ontario.ca](https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/06c11)
(<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/06c11>)

Related ERO (Environmental Registry of Ontario) notices

[Consultation on Enhanced Development Standards – Lot Level \(outside of buildings\) \(/notice/025-1101\)](/notice/025-1101)

[Proposed Planning Act, City of Toronto Act, 2006, Building Code Act, 1992 and Municipal Act, 2001 Changes \(Schedules 1, 2 and 7 of Bill 98, the Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026\) \(/notice/026-0300\)](/notice/026-0300)

Proposal to reform site plan control under the Planning Act and the City of Toronto Act, 2006

ERO (Environmental Registry of Ontario) number	026-0310
Notice type	Policy
Act	Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990
Posted by	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Notice stage	Proposal
Proposal posted	March 30, 2026
Comment period	March 30, 2026 - May 14, 2026 (45 days) Open
Last updated	March 30, 2026

This consultation closes at 11:59 p.m. on:

May 14, 2026

Proposal summary

Government is seeking feedback on bold and transformational changes to site plan control under the *Planning Act* and the *City of Toronto Act, 2006*.

Proposal details

The government is seeking public feedback on proposed legislative changes under the proposed *Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026* and related regulatory changes to further support housing, economic, and infrastructure development, and advance key transportation and transit priorities.

Site plan control is not working as it was intended and can take years instead of the 60-day legislated timeline set out in the *Planning Act* and *City of Toronto Act, 2006*.

In connection with the proposed *Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026*, the government is seeking feedback from the public and impacted stakeholders on bold and transformational reforms with the goal of enabling a faster, more predictable, cost effective and coordinated municipal site plan process.

Background

Site plan control is an optional land use planning tool under section 41 of the *Planning Act* and section 114 of the *City of Toronto Act, 2006*.

It is primarily intended as an administrative, technical tool municipalities may use to help ensure that health and safety as well as functional aspects of a proposed development are addressed, prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Through the site plan process, proponents are required to submit plans and drawings displaying matters such as building placement, access for pedestrians and vehicles, walkways, lighting, waste facilities, drainage and publicly accessible open spaces.

Municipalities can apply conditions to a site plan approval and require the owner to enter into one or more agreements to provide and maintain facilities. This could include widenings of roads that border the subject land, providing access to the property, and ensuring sufficient off-street parking and loading facilities (e.g. for waste management).

Site plan control is not meant as a means to revisit the principle of development. Allowable land uses, height, density, setbacks and other matters pertaining to built form would already have been addressed at the zoning stage and should be considered as of right.

A site plan approval is not a public process, meaning sections 41 and 114 do not include public notification, public meeting or hearing requirements. In addition, council must delegate the decision to approve a site plan application to an officer, employee or agent of the municipality.

The *Planning Act* and the *City of Toronto Act, 2006* include a timeframe whereby if a municipality fails to approve a site plan application within 60 days, a proponent may appeal this non-decision to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT).

What We've Heard

Stakeholders involved in building housing and other development have expressed that the municipal site plan approvals process is taking too long – sometimes years.

Stakeholders ascribe this to a lack of internal coordination across municipal departments and a lack of consistency and certainty across municipal departments and between municipalities. Past stakeholder feedback suggests site plan comments can be uncoordinated, unfocused, general rather than being solution oriented and received late in the site plan approvals process. This can lead to more circulations, delayed approvals and increased costs.

In 2013, the Ontario Association of Architects (OAA) commissioned the Altus Group to track and analyze municipal site plan approval timelines through a series of commissioned studies. These reports highlight the economic impact of lengthy site plan approvals on housing supply and affordability in Ontario.

According to the most recent [2024 Altus/OAA report \(https://oaa.on.ca/Assets/Common/Shared_Documents/Government%20Relations/2024%2012%2019%20-%20Altus%20Report%20-%20Cost%20of%20Site%20Plan%20Delay.pdf\)](https://oaa.on.ca/Assets/Common/Shared_Documents/Government%20Relations/2024%2012%2019%20-%20Altus%20Report%20-%20Cost%20of%20Site%20Plan%20Delay.pdf), municipalities across Ontario take an average of 23 months to review site plan applications, up from an estimated 6 months at the time of the 2018 edition of the report, exceeding the government's 60-day timeline.

The 2024 Altus/OAA report documents site plan approval timelines by development type and notes that residential projects averaged 16 months, mixed-use projects averaged 23 months, and non-residential developments averaged 35 months.

These results were weighted against the timeline found in the [2024 BILD GTA Municipal Benchmarking Report \(https://www.bildgta.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/2024-GTA-Municipal-Benchmarking-Study-Our-number-7147-Final.pdf\)](https://www.bildgta.ca/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/2024-GTA-Municipal-Benchmarking-Study-Our-number-7147-Final.pdf) results and the CHBA Canada-Wide Municipal Benchmarking Report results which provide data on the length of time it takes to review site plan applications in some of Ontario's larger municipalities. The results of these two reports also show that a site plan application can take between 18 and 23 months to review, not including the pre-consultation period.

The 2024 Altus/OAA report also examines indirect monthly and annual costs associated with the lengthy site plan approvals process. For example, the report highlights that for a 100-unit apartment building, delays in site plan approvals are resulting in additional monthly costs ranging from \$230,000 to \$299,000. The calculation of additional monthly costs factors in costs such as additional property taxes paid each month, opportunity/financing costs per month and the cost of inflation on construction materials and labour. The report also considers costs to a municipality through lost property tax revenue, as land remains vacant or underutilized.

The [2013 OAA/Bousfields/Altus report](https://www.oaa.on.ca/OAA/Assets/Documents/Gov.%20Initiatives/oa_report_report_-_final.pdf)

(https://www.oaa.on.ca/OAA/Assets/Documents/Gov.%20Initiatives/oa_report_report_-_final.pdf) identifies the following barriers that may be leading to these delays:

- Incomplete applications and delayed applicant response with approximately 50 per cent of applications requiring three or more resubmission cycles, each adding two to four weeks.
- Administrative and agency-related factors like delays in circulations between departments, in consistent and conflicting comments from departments and external agencies.
- The integration of design review panels or other types of committees that contribute to longer approval timelines.

Overall, the government continues to hear that section 41 of the *Planning Act* and section 114 of the *City of Toronto Act, 2006* are not being implemented consistently and effectively across municipalities and that a reform of site plan is required to speed up the approvals process and reduce overall associated costs.

Steps Taken to Date

Legislative and process-based challenges expressed by stakeholders regarding the site plan approvals process are not new. Over the last several years and through multiple bills, the government has made changes to the planning system that directly impact site plan control, with a goal of streamlining the site plan approvals process, speeding up approvals and reducing costs. These changes include:

Bill 60

As part of Bill 60, the government consulted on municipal requirements for enhanced development standards (EDS) at the lot level, with a goal of streamlining policies and prohibiting municipalities from requiring these standards, while continuing to ensure, health, safety, accessibility and protection of adjoining lands (e.g. environmental functionality). This work impacts the site plan approvals process **ERO #026-0309** (<https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/026-0309>).

Bill 17

As part of Bill 17, the government made changes to scope complete application requirements that will provide more consistent rules across all municipalities on the information and studies that may be needed for planning applications, including those related to site plan control; and greater recognition of planning reports prepared by certified professionals **ERO #026-0314** (<https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/026-0314>).

This work is ongoing and would be applicable to all municipalities across Ontario.

Bill 17 also clarified that municipalities are not permitted to require building standards that exceed the Building Code.

Bill 185

As part of Bill 185, changes were made to the *Planning Act* and *City of Toronto Act, 2006* to create a discretionary authority to apply a lapsing condition (i.e., “use it or lose it” deadline placed on a site plan approval) when approving a new site plan application, and/or adding a lapsing condition for site plans they have previously approved.

Bill 185 also removed the ability of a municipality to require a pre-consultation meeting; however, when a proponent requests one, the municipality must accommodate the request.

Bill 23

Bill 23 made changes to the *Planning Act* and *City of Toronto Act, 2006* to restrict the ability for municipalities to use site plan control for most residential developments with 10 or fewer units.

Changes were also made to remove municipal ability to regulate exterior architectural design (also called “architectural control”) and to limit their ability to regulate aesthetic aspects of landscape design.

Bill 109

As part of Bill 109, changes streamlined requirements and approval processes to incent timely municipal decisions by:

- Extending the timeline for municipalities to review site plan control applications from 30 to 60 days to incent timely municipal decisions,
- Applying complete application requirements to site plan, and
- Requiring that site plan control decisions are made by staff (instead of municipal councils or committees of council).

Site Plan – Current State

MMAH reviewed site plan control by-laws, guidance, official plans, and web pages of the 29 large and fast-growing municipalities to determine the implementation status of these legislative changes. This review suggests that changes are not being consistently implemented by municipalities. In many instances, these documents are out of date and only some municipalities are applying all of the *Planning Act* changes from the past few years. It is not uncommon to have to read a site plan control by-law, site plan guideline, an official plan and a municipal webpage to piece together the full site plan approvals process.

This review found instances where municipalities are continuing to require elements of site plan control that the *Planning Act* has removed. This includes exterior architectural design and aesthetic aspects of landscape design and exempting residential developments of ten units or less from site plan approval. Other municipalities have exempted these developments from site plan control but have created a separate process under other municipal by-laws that effectively replicates the site plan review process. It should be noted that whatever the case may be the requirements of the *Planning Act* for site plan control still apply.

There are also many examples of where site plan is being used as a key municipal tool for implementing urban design policies.

Potential Reforms to Municipal Site Plan Approvals

The following potential reforms to municipal site plan approvals reflect both Provincial and stakeholder concerns that the site plan process is taking too long. These potential reforms are intended to generate discussion on these challenges and work towards solutions that would enable a faster, more predictable, cost effective and coordinated site plan approval process.

Proposed reforms include:

1. Remove site plan control as a land use planning tool in the *Planning Act* and the *City of Toronto Act, 2006*.
2. Require municipalities to have a maximum of three circulations after which a mandatory meeting is triggered with all relevant municipal department representatives and the applicant to work through and resolve all outstanding issues.
3. Further scope the site plan review process to a standard site plan approval checklist of functional aspects of a site (e.g., those related to health and safety), with use of certified professionals for acceptance and approval of reports and studies. A municipality is not permitted to request additional studies and plans beyond what is included in the standard site plan approval checklist. If technical and drawing requirements identified in the checklist are met, site plan approval is issued.
4. Establish or require a municipal arbitration process / site plan review panel for site plan applications that have exceeded the government's 60-day timeline and a specified number of circulations. Participants in this process would include the applicant and the municipal development review team. This would be an alternative to a hearing at the OLT with a goal of speeding up approvals and cutting down on associated costs. An arbitration process / site plan review panel decision-making timeline could be applied to ensure timely decisions on approvals.
5. Establish or require municipalities to establish different site plan approval streams for different kinds of proposed development, with corresponding scope of matters that may be controlled. This would mean that a "full" site plan process would only be permitted for larger, complex development initiatives resulting in fewer matters being regulated through site plan control. Less complex development would be triaged to a more expedited stream or could be exempted from site plan control completely.

Potential Outcomes

The government intends to pursue significant reform to site plan control. Feedback received through this consultation will inform future changes to site plan.

Impact on the Environment

This consultation is being undertaken to gather input and does not propose any immediate changes to legislation, regulation or policy. As such, there are no direct environmental impacts associated with this posting at this time.

Analysis of Regulatory Impact

No legislative, regulatory or policy changes are being proposed as part of this consultation. The Ministry intends to engage stakeholders to explore reforms to the site plan approvals process. Should any changes be considered in the future because of this consultation, a Regulatory Impact Assessment will be prepared in accordance with government decision-making processes.

Provide Feedback

We welcome your thoughts on these suggested reforms and/or other reforms you feel will speed up site plan approvals.

1. Have questions? Get in touch at the email provided below. Please include the ERO number for this notice in your email or letter to the contact.

Related links

[Planning Act \(https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13\)](https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13)

[City of Toronto Act, 2006, S.O. 2006](https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/06c11)

[\(https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/06c11\)](https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/06c11)

View materials in person

Some supporting materials may not be available online. If this is the case, you can request to view the materials in person.

Supporting materials

Proposed Regulatory Approach to Establish a Minimum Residential Lot Size in Urban Areas

ERO (Environmental Registry of Ontario) number	026-0311
Notice type	Regulation
Act	Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990
Posted by	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Notice stage	Proposal
Proposal posted	March 30, 2026
Comment period	March 30, 2026 - May 14, 2026 (45 days) Open
Last updated	March 30, 2026

This consultation closes at 11:59 p.m. on:

May 14, 2026

Proposal summary

The government is seeking feedback on a potential regulation under the *Planning Act* to establish a minimum lot size of 175 square metres on urban residential lands in Ontario.

Proposal details

The government is seeking public feedback on proposed legislative changes under the proposed *Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026* and related regulatory changes to further support housing, economic, and infrastructure development, and advance key transportation and transit priorities.

As part of this initiative, the government is seeking public feedback on a proposed regulation under the *Planning Act*, if Bill 98 *Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026* is passed, to set a minimum lot size of 175 square metres (approximately 1900 square feet) on parcels of urban residential land outside the Greenbelt Area. A parcel of urban residential

land is defined in the *Planning Act* as a parcel within the settlement area of a municipality that is zoned for residential use (other than as an ancillary use) and is fully serviced by public sewage and water.

This regulation would foster conditions for increased housing supply and affordability in urban areas by helping facilitate the creation of smaller lots over time. This could lead to increased opportunities for home ownership in urban areas as smaller lots are generally more affordable.

Other considerations would continue to apply to decisions on land division applications, such as policies in the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS), 2024 that prohibit development (including lot creation) in certain circumstances. In addition, the regulation-making authority would be scoped to zoning and would not apply to subdivision control, and any municipal zoning requirement for minimum frontage and/or minimum depth that would not allow for the minimum lot size standard to be met would be inapplicable. Land owners would retain the ability to apply for the creation of larger or smaller lots through the land division process.

The authority for this proposal regulation is being consulted on concurrently as part of Bill 98 proposed *Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026* that proposes changes to the *Planning Act* **ERO #026-0300** (<https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/026-0300>).

Previous public consultation on the matter of minimum residential lot size in urban settings was held for 30 days from October, 23, 2025 – November, 22, 2025 in connection with the *Fighting Delays, Building Faster Act, 2025* **ERO #025-1100** (<https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/025-1100>).

Impact on the Environment

The proposed regulatory changes are anticipated to have a neutral impact on the environment as municipal decisions must still be consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement and conform or not conflict with provincial plans. These documents set out provincial policy direction on matters including the protection of the environment. As part of this consultation, the government is interested in hearing perspectives on the proposed regulation that could lead to any unintended impacts on the environment.

Analysis of Regulatory Impact

Costs

The proposed regulation would result in one-time administration costs for municipalities related to learning about the proposed regulation.

The direct compliance cost for all 444 municipalities is estimated at approximately \$472,856 and an average annual direct compliance cost of approximately \$46,600. These one-time administrative impacts reflect staff familiarization and minor updates to internal planning guidance and workflows to apply the provincial minimum lot size.

No reporting, filing, fee, capital, or ongoing operational requirements are introduced, as the regulation is assumed to be self-executing (i.e., municipalities do not need to pass implementing zoning by-law amendments).

Benefits

The proposed regulation would create the conditions to enable more affordable housing by providing opportunities to reduce the up-front cost of land. It would also improve predictability and consistency in minimum lot size requirements in urban residential areas across municipalities, supporting more efficient approvals and enabling additional housing supply within serviced areas. It would provide greater clarity for developers and landowners while creating opportunities for gentle density and infill. No ongoing regulatory burden on municipalities is anticipated.

Supporting materials

Related links

[Planning Act \(https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13\)](https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13)

[Bill 98, Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026 \(https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/bills/parliament-44/session-1/bill-98\)](https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/bills/parliament-44/session-1/bill-98)

Related ERO (Environmental Registry of Ontario) notices

[Consultation on Minimum Lot Sizes \(/notice/025-1100\)](/notice/025-1100)

Proposed Changes to Support Standardizing of Parkland Requirements Under the Planning Act

ERO (Environmental Registry of Ontario) number	026-0312
Notice type	Regulation
Act	Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990
Posted by	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Notice stage	Proposal
Proposal posted	March 30, 2026
Comment period	March 30, 2026 - May 14, 2026 (45 days) Open
Last updated	March 30, 2026

This consultation closes at 11:59 p.m.
on:

May 14, 2026

Proposal summary

The government is seeking public feedback on a Minister's regulation under the *Planning Act* to standardize parkland dedication requirements in Ontario in respect of the conveyance of developer-identified parkland, including encumbered lands and privately owned public spaces (POPS) arrangements, to implement Bill 23 provisions.

Proposal details

The government is seeking public feedback on proposed legislative changes under the proposed *Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026* and related regulatory changes to further support housing, economic, and infrastructure development, and advance key transportation and transit priorities.

The government is seeking public feedback on a Minister's regulation under the *Planning Act* to prescribe criteria for developer-identified parkland and related implementation matters for the conveyance of developer-identified lands for

municipal parkland dedication, to implement provisions in Bill 23, the *More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022*, that are not yet in force.

Bill 23 added provisions to the *Planning Act* which, once in force, would provide for:

- developer-identified lands, including land with encumbrances and POPS arrangements, to count towards municipal parkland dedication requirements,
- the landowner to be able to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) in cases where the municipality rejects developer-identified land, with the OLT required to order the land to be conveyed to the municipality if it meets prescribed criteria.

The land suitability criteria that are proposed to be prescribed in regulation would include the following:

1. **Ineligible Land** – land with any of the following conditions cannot be required to be conveyed to municipalities for park and recreational purposes:
 - Contaminated lands – lands that have in or on them any contaminants from industrial or other uses that pose a public health risk
 - Natural and human-made hazard lands – hazardous lands and hazardous sites as described in section 5.2 of the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024 (PPS 2024) as well as lands affected by human-made hazards as described in section 5.3 of the PPS 2024.
 - Lands within and adjacent to natural heritage features and areas are eligible on the condition that a park would not interfere with or compromise the natural heritage features and areas.
- Lands in the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt Plan or in the Natural Core or Natural Linkage Areas of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan or unless in accordance with policies of the Niagara Escarpment Plan.
 - Lands that would not support park use – lands that would not accommodate fill and/or soil depths to accommodate structural footings as per the Ontario Building Code or support tree planting.
 - Lands with financial encumbrances – lands with liens, charges, etc. registered on title.

- Lands that are privately-owned and not accessible to public at all times.
2. **Land Accessibility/Comfort for Use** – parkland must be accessible, visible and comfortable to facilitate public use of it and, in particular, must be:
- Accessible by all users directly from the public realm and readily visible from the public realm.
 - Land must be of a size and shape that is capable of serving park or public recreational purposes.

Supporting Implementation Matters

1. Documents to Support Identification of Land

- Documentation of specified lands and boundaries, through a Plan of Survey and Topographic Plan.
- Attestation from the owner of the land or an authorized representative, to confirm that the land and/or POPS arrangement is not considered to be ineligible land.

2. Notice to Owners

- The municipality shall provide notice to the owner of the land within 20 days of the municipality making its decision to refuse, by personal service, fax, mail or email.
- Notice shall contain the following information:
 - A statement that the council of the municipality has refused to accept the conveyance of land identified in accordance with its parkland by-law.
 - An explanation of the reason(s) for the refusal.
 - A statement that the owner of the land may appeal the refusal, within 20 days of the notice being given, to the Ontario Land Tribunal by filing with the clerk of the municipality a notice of appeal.
 - The last day on which the refusal may be appealed.
 - A description of the lands to which the refusal applies.

3. Record to the Ontario Land Tribunal

- The landowner can appeal to the OLT a municipality's refusal or, as proposed in the related legislative changes, a non-decision by filing with the clerk of the municipality. The municipal clerk would then have 15

days to forward a record to the OLT that would include the following proposed elements:

- a copy of the materials submitted by the landowner (including the identification of land documentation), and
- the notice of the municipality's refusal, if applicable, as well as any staff report that the municipality considered in its decision to refuse the acceptance of the land.

We welcome your thoughts on the proposed regulatory changes.

Impact on the Environment

The proposed changes to the regulation could increase conveyance for suitable parkland, especially in urban areas, both because of the 70% credit potentially prompting a greater amount of lands being conveyed to satisfy the full parkland dedication requirement and because of the submission of lands not previously accepted by some municipalities instead of cash-in-lieu contributions. Alternatively, unencumbered fee simple lands that may otherwise have been conveyed may not be conveyed under the proposed changes. The Minister's regulation proposes prescribed criteria related to the suitability of land that are intended to mitigate any negative impacts. Further, the Ministry will monitor implementation of these changes to ensure residents continue to have access to high quality local parks.

Analysis of Regulatory Impact

The proposed changes are expected to result in additional costs related to municipal staff learning about the changes. There could also be additional costs to municipalities related to legal costs associated with entering into agreements with landowners in respect of encumbered lands and POPS arrangements as part of municipal parkland dedication requirements. These legal costs are expected to increase because developers could meet all parkland requirements using encumbered lands or POPS arrangements, which municipalities would likely seek to secure through agreements. Overall, these proposed regulatory changes, along with the related proposed legislative changes, could increase direct compliance cost and administrative time across municipalities that impose parkland dedication requirements under section 42 of the *Planning Act* on a development or redevelopment. These changes, would ensure clarity to eventual challenges at the OLT, potentially speeding up approvals.

Streamlining the information and material that planning authorities can require as part of a complete application

ERO (Environmental Registry of Ontario) number	026-0313
Notice type	Regulation
Act	Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990
Posted by	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Notice stage	Proposal
Proposal posted	March 30, 2026
Comment period	March 30, 2026 - May 14, 2026 (45 days) Open
Last updated	March 30, 2026

This consultation closes at 11:59 p.m.

on:

May 14, 2026

Proposal summary

We are seeking feedback on a proposal for a regulation(s) under the Planning Act that would identify the only information and material that planning authorities could require as part of a complete application, to provide more certainty and predictability for applicants and support faster planning approvals.

Proposal details

The government is seeking public feedback on proposed legislative changes under the proposed *Building Homes and Improving Transportation Infrastructure Act, 2026* and related regulatory changes to further support housing, economic, and infrastructure development, and advance key transportation and transit priorities.

As part of this initiative, the government is seeking feedback on potential regulatory changes to support faster planning approvals by streamlining the complete application process to improve certainty and predictability for applicants. MMAH is seeking feedback on a proposed standardized list of information that planning authorities can require for complete applications.

Complete Application Requirements

The *Planning Act*, *City of Toronto Act, 2006*, and their regulations set out minimum requirements for information that must be submitted for various planning applications. Currently, planning authorities can also require other information or materials for most of these application types (i.e., official plan amendments, zoning by-law amendments, plans of subdivision, plans of condominium, site plan control and consents) as long as these requirements are set out in their official plans.

A planning application is considered “complete” when it contains all the information required by the relevant sections of the *Planning Act* or *City of Toronto Act, 2006*, the related regulations, and any additional information or materials required by the applicable official plan.

Across Ontario, planning authorities vary widely in the type, number, and scope of studies they require from applicants before a planning application is considered complete. This wide variation across the province adds unpredictability to the application process, can increase costs for applicants, and can contribute to delays in the development process.

Proposed Contents of Regulation(s)

The government is proposing amendments to achieve greater clarity and predictability regarding complete application requirements across the province. This will ensure that applicants and planning authorities understand what information may be required at the outset.

Currently, there is also variation in naming and scoping of information and material required by planning authorities across the province. The proposed provincial list identifies the types of information and material that planning authorities can require and is intended to be comprehensive enough so that proposals can be effectively evaluated to ensure that provincial interests in land use planning are upheld. The proposed list that includes the types of information and material that municipalities may require is not a mandatory

list of information and material that would be required for every planning application. Rather, municipalities can determine from that list what types of information or material are required depending on the specific circumstances.

The Ministry is seeking feedback on a proposed list of information and material that has been categorized into two types of studies and when they could be required:

1. **Core Studies:** Core studies are those that could always be required since planning authorities typically require these to assess most planning application types (i.e., official plan amendments, zoning by-law amendments, plans of subdivision/plans of condominium, site plan control, and/or consents). These studies address fundamental planning and engineering matters such as environmental impacts, existing servicing capacity, transportation impacts, and public health and safety.
2. **Contingent Studies:** Contingent studies could only be required when a specific on-site or surrounding condition exists in the local municipality that makes the study relevant for the consideration of the planning application. For example, certain studies may only be needed if a subject property is located on or near airports, rail corridors, significant natural hazards, or major facilities, or when the property contains particular environmental, cultural, or resource-based features on site.

Proposed list of the only information and material planning authorities may require as part of a complete application:

1. Core Studies:

Type of Study	Objective
Environmental Impact Statement	Assesses potential impacts on natural heritage and the environment, with recommendations as to how to avoid, minimize or mitigate negative impacts, ensuring compliance with applicable legislation, and consistency/conformity with applicable environmental policies and requirements.

Environmental Site Assessment	Identifies the existing or potential environmental contamination on a property, assesses the risks and outlines measures to ensure compliance with legislative/regulatory requirements.
Functional Servicing Report	Reviews servicing needs for water, wastewater, stormwater, and other municipal infrastructure, identifies required new or improved services and mitigation measures, ensuring compliance with applicable legislation/regulations and standards, and consistency/conformity with applicable policies.
Geotechnical Report	Evaluates geological, soil, and subsurface conditions to assess site stability and suitability for development, in compliance with applicable legislation/regulations, and conforming with geotechnical standards.
Hydrogeological Report	Analyzes potential impacts on surface and groundwater resources, ensuring compliance with applicable legislation/regulations and hydrological standards, and consistency/conformity with applicable policies.
Planning Justification Report	Provides detailed planning rationale demonstrating consistency/conformity with provincial policies and plans, and conformity with applicable municipal and regional plans.
Transportation Impact Study	Assesses the proposed development's impact on the transportation network for all modes of travel, ensuring compliance with applicable legislation/regulations and standards, consistency/conformity with provincial plans and policies, and conformity with municipal policies.

2. Contingent Studies:

Type of Study	Where required to assess the following objectives:
----------------------	---

Aeronautical Report	Critical for aviation safety and compliance with applicable legislation/regulations for proposed development in the vicinity of airports/aerodromes, and for consistency with applicable provincial, federal policies and guidelines (PPS policies 3.4.1 and 3.4.2)
Aggregate/Minerals/Petroleum Resource Impact Assessment	Protects residents from adverse effects of development and protects significant resources from development that would preclude or hinder access to these resources, ensuring compliance with applicable legislation/regulations and consistency with applicable policies (PPS policies 4.4 and 4.5)
Agricultural Impact Assessment	Identifies and evaluates potential impacts of agricultural development on agricultural operations and the Agricultural System, and recommends ways to avoid, minimize, or reduce adverse impacts (PPS policies 2.3.2.1.f and 2.3.2.1.g)
Air Quality/Odour Study	Assesses potential adverse effects to human health and the natural environment from odours or airborne contaminants associated with proposed development and recommends measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential adverse effects (PPS policies 2.9.1e and 3.5)
Arborist Report	Inventories all trees on a site, identifies potential impacts of a proposed development and recommends measures to protect and preserve trees before, during and after construction ensuring consistency with provincial policies, municipal policies and by-laws (PPS Policies 2.9.1.d, 2.9.1, and 3.9.1)
Archaeological Assessment	Determines or confirms archaeological potential and the presence of resources of archaeological significance, for lands located on or adjacent to a known or potential archaeological site (PPS policies 4.6.2 and 4.6.4.a)

Contaminant Management Plan

Demonstrates the safety measures that will be included in proposals involving the manufacture, handling and/or storage of bulk fuels or chemicals (activities prescribed under the *Clean Water Act, 2006*) in order to help prevent contamination of groundwater or surface water (PPS policies 4.6.1 and 5.3.2)

Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment

Determines a property's cultural heritage value, identifies impacts from proposed development, and outlines mitigation or conservation plans (PPS policies 4.6.1 and 5.3.2)

Economic Viability Assessment

Assesses potential impacts of a proposed development on the long-term economic viability of employment uses adjacent to employment areas, and identifies measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate these impacts in conformity with applicable legislation and consistent with provincial policies (PPS policies 2.8.1.3, 3.5.1 and 3.5.2)

Electromagnetic Field Management Plan

Demonstrates how development proposal or abutting a hydro corridor will manage and minimize exposure to electromagnetic fields conforming with applicable legislation and standards, demonstrating consistency with provincial policies and ensuring protection of public health and safety (PPS policy 3.8.1)

Financial Impact Analysis

For proposals to expand a settlement area boundary, assesses the growth-related financial impacts of a proposed settlement area boundary expansion, including potential impacts to municipal capital and operating budgets, and planning for capital infrastructure development and improvement to support growth (PPS policies 2.8.1.3, 3.5.1 and 3.5.2)

Human-made Hazard Impact Study/ Assessment

Assesses potential human-made hazards (mine hazards, oil, gas and salt hazards; for mineral mining operations, mineral aggregate operations or petroleum resource operations) impacting the proposed site, assesses the potential for the proposed development to create new or amplify existing hazards, and identify measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate these impacts, consistent with provincial policies and conformity with municipal policies (PPS policies 5.3.1)

Impact Assessment for Waste Disposal Sites / Former Landfill Sites

Determines potential adverse effects to human health, safety, and impacts to the environment associated with a proposed landfill/waste disposal site or a former landfill and identifies avoidance, mitigation or remediation measures to address those potential adverse effects and impacts (PPS policies 3.5.1 and 3.5.2)

Lakeshore Capacity Assessment / Water Quality Impact Assessment

Assesses impacts of proposed shoreline development on water quality and include measures to remove or mitigate potential impacts to water quality, in compliance with applicable legislation and standards, and consistent with provincial and municipal policies (PPS policies 4.2.2)

Land Use Compatibility Study

Assesses potential adverse effects of a proposed major facility on adjacent sensitive land uses and identifies measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate these effects, in compliance with applicable legislation and consistent with provincial and municipal policies. Can include assessment of the potential negative impacts of the long-term operational and economic activities of major facilities associated with a proposed development in proximity to major facilities and identify ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate these potential impacts (PPS policies 2.8.2, 2.8.3, and 3.5)

**Minimum Distance Separation
Formulae Assessment**

Minimizes land use conflicts in agricultural by establishing setback distances between livestock facilities and surrounding residential uses, minimizing conflicts and nuisances related to odour, in compliance with applicable legislation and consistent with provincial policies (PPS policies 4.3.2 and 4.3.5)

**Natural Hazard Impact Study /
Assessment**

Assesses potential natural hazards impact on the proposed site, assesses the potential for the proposed development to create new or aggravate existing hazards, and identifies measures to minimize or mitigate these impacts, consistent with provincial policies and in conformity with municipal policies (PPS policies 5.1.1 and 5.1.2)

Noise/Vibration Study

Assesses potential noise and vibration impacts from a proposed development on surrounding land uses, and the potential noise and vibration impacts from an existing land use on a proposed adjacent development, identifying measures to avoid, mitigate and minimize these impacts in compliance with applicable legislation and consistent with provincial and municipal policies (PPS policies 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.5.1 and 3.5.2)

**Rail Safety and Risk Mitigation
Report**

Evaluates potential safety risks associated with development proposed in proximity to rail corridors and outlines mitigation measures to support safe and compatible site design, in compliance with applicable legislation and consistent with provincial policies and applicable rail safety guideline (PPS policies 3.3.3 and 3.3.4)

Servicing Options Report

Evaluates the proximity of municipal and communal servicing and potential for future connections to serve a proposed development where there is no municipal planning for sewer and water services in an official plan, reviews environmental and site constraints and implements servicing options to serve the proposed development, and provides the rationale for the recommended option, in compliance with applicable legislation and guidelines, and consistent with provincial policies (PPS policies 3.5 and 3.6).

Wildland Fire Assessment

Determines hazardous forest types and assesses wildland fire risk and identifies avoidance and mitigation measures to ensure conformity with provincial policies and standards (PPS policies 3.5 and 3.6).

Wind Study

Predicts and assesses potential wind impacts generated by development proposals of various storeys in height and provides mitigation measures to maintain safe and comfortable pedestrian and public spaces (PPS policies 3.5 and 3.6).

The Ministry welcomes all feedback on the proposed approach, and is particularly seeking feedback on the following:

1. Is the list of the types of information and material identified in this proposal comprehensive enough for planning authorities to effectively evaluate all planning applications they may receive?
 1. If not, why? What information or material is missing from the proposed list?
 2. Should any of the types of studies identified in this proposal be removed from the proposed list?
2. Do you have any feedback on the objectives identified for each of the types of studies listed in this proposal? Are they broad enough to support planning authorities in obtaining sufficient information to evaluate applications, comply with applicable legislation, and determine consistency with provincial policies or conformity with provincial and municipal plans? Is there anything missing?

3. Should the list identify the types of applications that the information and material could be required for (i.e., official plan amendment, zoning by-law amendment, site plan control, plans of subdivision/condominium, consents)? If so, why?
4. Are there studies listed that should only be required for certain types of applications? If so, which ones and why?
5. Should planning authorities maintain the ability to develop terms of reference to specify the breadth of information required for each of the types of studies included in the provincial list? Please elaborate on your response.
6. Do you have any other input or suggestions of relevance to this proposal?

Analysis of Regulatory Impact

By identifying a list of the only information and material municipalities could require as part of a complete application, this proposal is intended to provide greater certainty and predictability for applicants proposing land use changes, while ensuring municipalities continue to have the information they need to effectively evaluate proposals. The proposed regulation(s) are intended to reduce regulatory and financial burden for the development sector and others proposing land use changes by providing more certainty and predictability to the application process. While there are no new administrative costs associated with the changes, municipalities who include lists of studies that are required through complete applications in their official plans may experience some one-time administrative burden should they be required to update their official plans to align with the provincial regulations.

Supporting materials

Related links

[Planning Act \(https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13\)](https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13)

[City of Toronto Act, 2006, S.O. 2006, c. 11, Sched. A | ontario.ca](https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/06c11)

[<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/06c11?highlight=false&lang=en&option=%7B%22selection%22%3A%5B%22current>](https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/06c11?highlight=false&lang=en&option=%7B%22selection%22%3A%5B%22current</u></p></div><div data-bbox=)