

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

Please identify the top 5 HATF recommendations that you support, and rationale / comments	
1.	Set a goal of building 1.5 million new homes in ten years.
2.	Improve funding for colleges, trade schools, and apprenticeships, encourage and incentivize municipalities, unions and employers to provide more on-the-job training.
3.	Modernize the Building Code and other policies to remove any barriers to affordable construction and to ensure meaningful implementation (e.g., allow single-staircase construction for up to four storeys, allow single egress, etc.)
4.	Permit “as of right” secondary suites, garden suites, and laneway houses province-wide.
5.	Develop and legislate a clear, province-wide definition of “affordable housing” to create certainty and predictability.

HATF Recommendation (Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use) Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented		Support or Oppose (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an ‘X’ as appropriate)			
1.	1) Set a goal of building 1.5 million new homes in ten years.*	X	Support		Oppose
2.	2) Amending the Planning Act, Provincial Policy Statement, and Growth Plans to set “growth in the full spectrum of housing supply” and “intensification within existing built-up areas” of municipalities as the most important residential housing priorities in the mandate and purpose.	X	Support		Oppose
3.	3) a) Limit exclusionary zoning in municipalities through binding provincial action: allow “as of right” residential housing up to four units and up to four storeys on a single residential lot.*  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Province has already implemented permissions for up to 3 housing units per single residential lot. "As of right" 4 storey developments on individual lots may not be appropriate or feasible in all neighbourhoods. This determination should be made by local municipalities on the basis of careful analysis informed by public consultation.</b>		Support	X	Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
4.	3 b) Modernize the Building Code and other policies to remove any barriers to affordable construction and to ensure meaningful implementation (e.g., allow single-staircase construction for up to four storeys, allow single egress, etc.)  <b>Staff Comment:</b> <b>Town staff support based on OBC requirements that do not reduce the health and safety of residents, i.e. Local Fire can access four storeys, increased fire separation or protection ratings that do not greatly impact construction costs.</b>	X	Support		Oppose
5.	4) Permit “as of right” conversion of underutilized or redundant commercial properties to residential or mixed residential and commercial use.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>We generally support the conversion of underutilized or redundant commercial properties for residential or mixed use purposes along arterial roads, however, would suggest that this not be an automatic “as of right” conversion in areas that have not yet been subject to appropriate planning studies (e.g. Secondary Plans) at the local level.</b>	X	Support		Oppose
6.	5) Permit “as of right” secondary suites, garden suites, and laneway houses province-wide.*	X	Support		Oppose
7.	6) Permit “as of right” multi-tenant housing (renting rooms within a dwelling) province-wide.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>The Town’s By-law currently does not preclude a homeowner from renting out a bedroom within their house provided the dwelling continues to operate as one housekeeping unit. However, staff would want clarity to be provided in regards to the recommendation to ensure that any as of right permissions would not support the establishment of short term rentals within homes.</b>		Support	X	Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
8.	7) Encourage and incentivize municipalities to increase density in areas with excess school capacity to benefit families with children.	X	Support		Oppose
9.	8) Allow “as of right” zoning up to unlimited height and unlimited density in the immediate proximity of individual major transit stations within two years if municipal zoning remains insufficient to meet provincial density targets.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Local municipalities should be allowed to establish appropriate heights and densities within MTSAs through proper analysis that takes into account site specific factors and context. There is considerable variation in MTSAs across the GGH.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
10.	9) Allow “as of right” zoning of six to 11 storeys with no minimum parking requirements on any streets that have direct access to public transit (including streets on bus and streetcar routes).  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Staff suggest that this only apply along major arterial streets/corridors that are planned for mixed use/residential development. Staff are concerned with the potential elimination of minimum parking standards. Parking requirements will vary across municipalities and should take into account existing or planned transit service levels.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
11.	10) Designate or rezone as mixed commercial and residential use all land along transit corridors and re-designate all Residential Apartment to mixed commercial and residential zoning in Toronto.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>To the extent that this is referring to major transit corridors along arterial roads within urban areas, the recommendation has merit subject to local municipalities being able to first undertake and implement the recommendations contained in the appropriate planning studies. The sweeping nature of the recommendation is not considered appropriate in situations where transit routes traverse mature neighbourhoods.</b>	X	Support		Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)		
12.	11) Support responsible housing growth on undeveloped land, including outside existing municipal boundaries, by building necessary infrastructure to support higher density housing and complete communities and applying the recommendations of this report to all undeveloped land.  <b>Staff comments:</b> <b>Staff support responsible housing growth on undeveloped land, the provision of necessary infrastructure to support high density housing and complete communities. We are concerned that the building 'outside existing municipal boundaries' language will be used to justify further urban expansions. It should be noted that the Town's urban boundaries were recently expanded by the Province in 2022 to accommodate growth to the 2051 planning horizon. It should be noted that the Housing Affordability Task Force Report predates that decision.</b>	Support	X	Oppose
13.	12) a) Create a more permissive land use, planning, and approvals system: Repeal or override municipal policies, zoning, or plans that prioritize the preservation of physical character of neighbourhood.*  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Recommendation already implemented by the Province. Believe that only minimal change is necessary within established neighbourhoods in the context of an overall planned growth strategy.</b>	Support	X	Oppose
14.	12 b) Exempt from site plan approval and public consultation all projects of 10 units or less that conform to the Official Plan and require only minor variances.*  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>We have concerns with implementation issues such as grading, garbage collection, parking etc. however, note that the Province has already implemented this recommendation.</b>	Support	X	Oppose
15.	12 c) Establish provincewide zoning standards, or prohibitions, for minimum lot sizes, maximum building setbacks, minimum heights, angular planes, shadow rules, front doors, building depth, landscaping, floor space index, and heritage view cones, and planes; restore pre-2006 site plan exclusions (colour, texture, and type of materials, window details, etc.) to the Planning Act and reduce or eliminate minimum parking requirements.	Support	X	Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
	<b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Province-wide standards do not take into consideration the local context or varying needs of municipalities across the Province. Good urban design is a key consideration in delivering complete and vibrant communities. We would be receptive to best practice documents being prepared by the Province.</b>				
16.	12 d) Remove any floorplate (sic) restrictions to allow larger, more efficient high-density towers.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>We are concerned that this could allow smaller re-development lots to have buildings with much larger footprint and tower floorplates, which would have implications on shadow impact and sky views.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
17.	13) Limit municipalities from requesting or hosting additional public meetings beyond those that are required under the Planning Act.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Staff are not averse to some limitations around the number and type of public meetings depending on the file or project. Under Bill 109, the Town has introduced the expectation for pre-submission application open houses in addition to the statutory public meeting for a maximum of two meetings. Community-wide initiatives such as a major Official Plan Review or Secondary Plans do benefit from additional community consultation beyond minimum requirements.</b>	X	Support		Oppose
18.	14) Require that public consultations provide digital participation options.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Support, however clarification required if digital participation options are <i>in addition to</i> in person meetings, OR <i>instead of</i> in person meetings. Financial impacts to holding additional meetings that need to be considered.</b>	X	Support		Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
19.	15) Require mandatory delegation of site plan approvals and minor variances to staff or pre-approved qualified third-party technical consultants through a simplified review and approval process, without the ability to withdraw Council's delegation.*  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Site plan delegation to staff has been in place for two decades. Staff could support delegation of minor variances when associated with other <i>Planning Act</i> applications (i.e. site plan) which are being reviewed by staff.</b>	X	Support		Oppose
20.	16) a) Prevent abuse of the heritage preservation and designation process by: prohibiting the use of bulk listing on municipal heritage registers.*  <b>Staff comments:</b> <b>The recommendation has been implemented with amendments by the Province. The Town developed its Heritage Register through a multi-year, public process, allowing for property owner input and concerns through each stage of the project. The Town consistently used Ontario Regulation 9/06 criteria as a preliminary screening mechanism when determining whether a property warranted inclusion on the Heritage Register through its formal Heritage Register building process between 2007 and 2018. The Town has been pro-active in this approach and ahead of the legislation. Additionally, any property that has been added to the Heritage Register following the Town's formal Heritage Register process has been preliminarily evaluated and confirmed to meet at least one of the three prescribed criteria. The Town has been collaborative with property owners seeking removal of their properties from the Heritage Register due to issues of cultural heritage value, structural stability, or life safety.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
21.	16 b) Prohibiting reactive heritage designations after a Planning Act development application has been filed.*  <b>Staff Comments:</b> <b>This recommendation has been implemented by the Province. The amendment to prohibit the designation of any property following a prescribed event unless the property was included first on the Heritage Register should not significantly impact the Town of Halton Hills; as the</b>		Support	X	Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
	<b>Town's four-phase Heritage Register process was quite comprehensive, it is unlikely that a property with significant cultural heritage value has not yet been identified by the Town through this process.</b>				
22.	17) Requiring municipalities to compensate property owners for loss of property value as a result of heritage designations, based on the principle of best economic use of land.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Property values are not considered to be a bona fide land use planning issue. It should be noted that the Town offers a Heritage Property Tax Relief program for designated heritage properties.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
23.	18) Restore the right of developers to appeal Official Plans and Municipal Comprehensive Reviews.*  <b>Staff comments:</b> <b>Developers should not have rights that are not extended to the broader public and municipalities. For comprehensive Official Plan Reviews, the Minister would be the approval authority. Having these processes all end up at the OLT, is not an appropriate use of provincial and municipal time or resources and will not result in timely delivery of housing.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
24.	19) Legislate timelines at each stage of the provincial and municipal review process, including site plan, minor variance, and provincial reviews, and deem an application approved if the legislated response time is exceeded.*  <b>Staff comments:</b> <b>The review process is not solely controlled by the municipality, therefore automatic approvals would not take into consideration poor quality submissions from applicants or the delays in filing resubmissions that address municipal comments. The Planning Act sets out processing time frames after which non-decision appeals can be filed. In addition, through Bill 109, application fee rebates have been recently introduced for situations where decisions are not made within prescribed timelines.</b>		Support	X	Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
25.	20) Fund the creation of “approvals facilitators” with the authority to quickly resolve conflicts among municipal and/or provincial authorities and ensure timelines are met.*	X	Support		Oppose
26.	21) Require a pre-consultation with all relevant parties at which the municipality sets out a binding list that defines what constitutes a complete application; confirms the number of consultations established in the previous recommendations; and clarifies that if a member of a regulated profession such as a professional engineer has stamped an application, the municipality has no liability and no additional stamp is needed.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>The Town has a long established and effective pre-consultation system in place that flags key issues and the studies that are required to address the same and support a complete application. Studies are appropriately scoped based on application complexity. The last component of the recommendation is not clear and does raise concerns that municipalities must automatically accept the initial submission.</b>	X	Support		Oppose
27.	22) Simplify planning legislation and policy documents.	X	Support		Oppose
28.	23) Create a common, province-wide definition of plan of subdivision and standard set of conditions which clarify which may be included; require the use of standard province-wide legal agreements and, where feasible, plans of subdivision.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Province-wide standards do not take into consideration the local context or varying needs of municipalities across the Province.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
29.	24) Allow wood construction of up to 12 storeys.*  <b>Staff Comment:</b> <b>The Province has fully implemented this recommendation through changes to the Ontario</b>	X	Support		Oppose



<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
	<b>Building Code. Fire supports wood construction up to 12 storeys however the following must be in place:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within 4 min response time to a full time station with two fire apparatus</li> <li>• Fully addressable fire alarm system (this shows the exact location of the fire detection zone)</li> <li>• Fully sprinkler building</li> <li>• Wood must be protected with a fire rating of at least 2 hours</li> </ul> <b>Fire drill requirement for all occupants (supervisory staff and residents)</b>				
30.	25) Require municipalities to provide the option of pay on demand surety bonds and letters of credit.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Provincial guidelines/legislation welcomed to ensure all municipalities are allowing the same securities across the board.</b>	X	Support		Oppose
31.	26) Require appellants to promptly seek permission (“leave to appeal”) of the OLT and demonstrate that an appeal has merit, relying on evidence and expert reports, before it is accepted.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>We generally support the notion that appeals should have merit and raise clear and bona fide planning issues.</b>	X	Support		Oppose
32.	27) a) Prevent abuse of process: remove right of appeal for projects with at least 30% affordable housing in which units are guaranteed affordable for 40 years.	X	Support		Oppose
33.	27 b) Require a \$10,000 filing fee for third party appeals.*  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>The recommendation has been implemented with amendments by the Province, however it did not appear to include the recommended \$10,000 filing fee for third party appeals.</b>		Support	X	Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
34.	27 c) Provide discretion to adjudicators to award full costs to the successful party in any appeal brought by a third party or by a municipality where its council has overridden a recommended staff approval.		Support	X	Oppose
35.	28) Encourage greater use of oral decisions issued the day of the hearing, with written reasons to follow, and allow those decisions to become binding the day that they are issued.*	X	Support		Oppose
36.	29) Where it is found that a municipality has refused an application simply to avoid a deemed approval for lack of decision, allow the Tribunal to award punitive damages.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>It is not the Town's practice to arbitrarily refuse applications. All proposals are considered on their own merits and go through a careful review before a final recommendation is made. As such this recommendation is not considered appropriate.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
37.	30) Provide funding to increase staffing (adjudicators and case managers), provide market-competitive salaries, outsource more matters to mediators, and set shorter time targets.	X	Support		Oppose
38.	31) In clearing the existing backlog, encourage the Tribunal to prioritize projects close to the finish line that will support housing growth and intensification, as well as regional water or utility infrastructure decisions that will unlock significant housing capacity.	X	Support		Oppose
39.	32) Waive development charges and parkland cash-in-lieu and charge only modest connection fees for all infill residential projects up to 10 units or for any development where no new material infrastructure will be required.  <b>Staff Comment:</b> <b>This notion is contrary to the general principle that growth should pay for itself. Additional residential units within built up neighbourhoods puts pressure on existing municipal infrastructure and public service facilities. If this is the direction the Province intends to follow, municipalities will need to be made whole from a financial perspective.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
40.	33) Waive development charges on all forms of affordable housing guaranteed to be affordable for 40 years.		Support	X	Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
	<b>Staff comment:</b> <b>This notion is contrary to the general principle that growth should pay for itself. All forms of residential development put pressure on existing municipal infrastructure and public service facilities. It is recognized that there is a need for affordable housing, however, a final definition of the term is pending, and any waiver of development charges can only be considered if municipalities are made whole from a financial perspective.</b>				
41.	34) Prohibit interest rates on development charges higher than a municipality's borrowing rate.*	X	Support		Oppose
42.	35 a) Regarding cash in lieu of parkland, s.37, Community Benefit Charges, and development charges: Provincial review of reserve levels, collections and drawdowns annually to ensure funds are being used in a timely fashion and for the intended purpose, and, where review points to a significant concern, do not allow further collection until the situation has been corrected.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>The Town does not currently have sufficient funds in reserves to fully support our long-range capital program. It should also be noted that the Town collects funds over an extended timeframe to fund larger capital projects, such as arenas and community centres. To that end, this recommendation is not seen as necessary.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
43.	35 b) Except where allocated towards municipality-wide infrastructure projects, require municipalities to spend funds in the neighbourhoods where they were collected. However, where there's a significant community need in a priority area of the City, allow for specific ward to ward allocation of unspent and unallocated reserves.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>Without additional context and details on these limitations, we would be opposed to this restriction. The potential for lack of available lands or prohibitive costs for acquiring lands,</b>		Support	X	Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
	<b>within a specific neighbourhood, make this condition overly restrictive for the municipality. Administratively would be extremely cumbersome and almost impossible to accurately track and questionable whether this adds value to the Town.</b>				
44.	36) Recommend that the federal government and provincial governments update HST rebate to reflect current home prices and begin indexing, and that the federal government match the provincial 75% rebate and remove any clawback.	X	Support		Oppose
45.	37) Align property taxes for purpose-built rental with those of condos and low-rise homes.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>This is a tax policy issue that would be handled at the Regional level.</b>	X	Support		Oppose
46.	38) Amend the Planning Act and Perpetuities Act to extend the maximum period for land leases and restrictive covenants on land to 40 or more years.*	X	Support		Oppose
47.	39) Eliminate or reduce tax disincentives to housing growth.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>The tax system is set up such that there can be disincentives for purpose built rental units.</b>	X	Support		Oppose
48.	40) Call on the Federal Government to implement an Urban, Rural and Northern Indigenous Housing Strategy.*	X	Support		Oppose
49.	41) Funding for pilot projects that create innovative pathways to homeownership, for Black, Indigenous, and marginalized people and first-generation homeowners.	X	Support		Oppose
50.	42) Provide provincial and federal loan guarantees for purpose-built rental, affordable rental and affordable ownership projects.	X	Support		Oppose
51.	43) Enable municipalities, subject to adverse external economic events, to withdraw infrastructure allocations from any permitted projects where construction has not been initiated within three years of build permits being issued.	X	Support		Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
	<b>Staff comments:</b> <b>Allocation of the Town's ground based capacity is not governed by planning legislation. The Town currently only allocates SDEs to projects immediately prior to final planning approvals and anticipated construction. It is at the Town's discretion to withdraw allocation at any time should construction not commence in a timely manner. This recommendation would not affect this current process.</b>				
52.	44) Work with municipalities to develop and implement a municipal services corporation utility model for water and wastewater under which the municipal corporation would borrow and amortize costs among customers instead of using development charges.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>It is not clear what the impetus would be for advancing this initiative at this time. The Town maintains their position that growth must pay for growth. Water and wastewater are currently under the jurisdiction of the Region of Halton.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
53.	45) Improve funding for colleges, trade schools, and apprenticeships, encourage and incentivize municipalities, unions and employers to provide more on-the-job training.*	X	Support		Oppose
54.	46) Undertake multi-stakeholder education program to promote skilled trades.*	X	Support		Oppose
55.	47) Recommend that the federal and provincial government prioritize skilled trades and adjust the immigration points system to strongly favour needed trades and expedite immigration status for these workers and encourage the federal government to increase from 9,000 to 20,000 the number of immigrants admitted through Ontario's program.*	X	Support		Oppose
56.	48) The Ontario government should establish a large "Ontario Housing Delivery Fund" and encourage the federal government to match funding. This fund should reward: a) Annual housing growth that meets or exceeds provincial targets b) Reductions in total approval times for new housing c) The speedy removal of exclusionary zoning practices	X	Support		Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
	<b>Staff comments:</b> <b>Support in principle, however, we do have concerns that some of the identified variables are beyond municipal control. Federal and Provincial incentives are important for municipalities to advance these priorities. Current municipal property tax is insufficient to support the advancement of these targets.</b>				
57.	49) Reductions in funding to municipalities that fail to meet provincial housing growth and approval timeline targets  <b>Staff comments:</b> <b>The necessary lake based infrastructure to support the Town's residential growth will not be available until the end of 2025, which puts the municipality at a substantial disadvantage in being able to access the \$1.2 billion Building Faster Fund and potentially secure the \$2.4 million annual funding amount the Town could be eligible for.</b>		Support	X	Oppose
58.	50) Fund the adoption of consistent municipal e-permitting systems and encourage the federal government to match funding. Fund the development of a common data architecture standard, supported by an external expert committee, across municipalities and provincial agencies/ministries and require municipalities to provide their zoning bylaws with open data standards. Set an implementation goal of 2025 and make funding conditional on established targets.  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>E-permitting is necessary for growth and increased efficiency and consistency of permit submissions and communications. Funding should be expanded to include records management (storage and access) to help applicants with the preparation of documents to support applications. Support in principle but note that the 2025 implementation date is considered to be an aggressive target.</b>	X	Support		Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
59.	51) Require municipalities and the provincial government to use the Ministry of Finance population projections as the basis for housing need analysis and related land use requirements.	X	Support		Oppose
60.	52) Resume reporting on housing data and require consistent municipal reporting, enforcing compliance as a requirement for accessing programs under the Ontario Housing Delivery Fund.*	X	Support		Oppose
61.	53) Report each year at the municipal and provincial level on any gap between demand and supply by housing type and location, and make underlying data freely available to the public.	X	Support		Oppose
62.	54) Empower the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to lead an all of government committee that meets weekly to ensure our remaining recommendations and any other productive ideas are implemented.	X	Support		Oppose
63.	55) Commit to evaluate these recommendations for the next three years with public reporting on progress.*	X	Support		Oppose
64.	B-1) Call upon the federal government to provide equitable affordable housing funding to Ontario.*	X	Support		Oppose
65.	B-2) Develop and legislate a clear, province-wide definition of “affordable housing” to create certainty and predictability.	X	Support		Oppose
66.	B-3) Create an Affordable Housing Trust from a portion of Land Transfer Tax Revenue (i.e., the windfall resulting from property price appreciation) to be used in partnership with developers, non-profits, and municipalities in the creation of more affordable housing units. This Trust should create incentives for projects serving and brought forward by Black- and Indigenous-led developers and marginalized groups.	X	Support		Oppose
67.	B-4) Amend legislation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow cash-in-lieu payments for Inclusionary Zoning units at the discretion of the municipality.</li> <li>• Require that municipalities utilize density bonusing or other incentives in all Inclusionary Zoning and Affordable Housing policies that apply to market housing.</li> </ul>	X	Support		Oppose

<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Permit municipalities that have not passed Inclusionary Zoning policies to offer incentives and bonuses for affordable housing units.</li> </ul> <p><b>Staff comment:</b> This would appear to require re-establishment of Planning Act Section 37 height and density bonusing provisions.</p>				
68.	B-5) Encourage government to closely monitor the effectiveness of Inclusionary Zoning policy in creating new affordable housing and to explore alternative funding methods that are predictable, consistent and transparent as a more viable alternative option to Inclusionary Zoning policies in the provision of affordable housing.	X	Support		Oppose
69.	B-6) Rebate MPAC market rate property tax assessment on below-market affordable homes.		Support	X	Oppose
	<p><b>Staff comment:</b> Need a better understanding of what this means. Potential for avoidance in Property Taxes by misusing this principle.</p>				
70.	C-1) Review surplus lands and accelerate the sale and development through RFP of surplus government land and surrounding land by provincially pre-zoning for density, affordable housing, and mixed or residential use.	X	Support		Oppose
	<p><b>Staff comment:</b> This can be supported with the caveats that the responsibility to identify surplus lands remain at the municipal level and that the province does not initiate provincial pre-zoning of municipally-owned lands.</p>				
71.	C-2) All future government land sales, whether commercial or residential, should have an affordable housing component of at least 20%.		Support	X	Oppose
	<p><b>Staff comment:</b></p>				



<b>HATF Recommendation</b> <i>(Note: Bracketed numbers are per the numbering in the original Task Force report; numbering in the first column is for Ministry use)</i> <i>Recommendations with an asterisk * have been implemented</i>		<b>Support or Oppose</b> (Mandatory Field – Please only mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
	<b>The reference to “All” future sales is the point of contention. This should be re-stated to say where appropriate or feasible.</b>				
72.	C-3) Purposefully upzone underdeveloped or underutilized Crown property (e.g., LCBO).  <b>Staff comment:</b> <b>No concerns with this suggestion provided these Crown property holdings are within areas or corridors where future planned growth has been contemplated locally.</b>	X	Support		Oppose
73.	C-4) Sell Crown land and reoccupy as a tenant in a higher density building or relocate services outside of major population centres where land is considerably less expensive.		Support	X	Oppose
74.	C-5) The policy priority of adding to the housing supply, including affordable units, should be reflected in the way surplus land is offered for sale, allowing bidders to structure their proposals accordingly.	X	Support		Oppose