Report to County Council

From: Mat Vaughan, Director of Planning and Development
Nicholas Loeb, Director of Legal Services

Date: June 10, 2025

Subject: Update on Bill 5, Bill 17 and Bill 30

Recommendation(s):

THAT the report titled "Update on Bill 5, Bill 17 and Bill 30" from the Director of Planning and Development dated June 10, 2025 be received and filed.

AND THAT the report titled "Update on Bill 5, Bill 17 and Bill 30" from the Director of Planning and Development dated June 10, 2025 be circulated to the County's Local Municipal Partners for information.

Introduction:

On April 17, 2025 the Province of Ontario introduced Bill 5 – Protect Ontario by Unleashing our Economy Act. Additionally, on May 12, 2025, the Province introduced Bill 17 – Protect Ontario by Building Faster and Smarter Act. Furthermore, on May 28th, 2025, the Ontario government tabled its seventh Working for Workers Act (Bill 30).

This information report provides Council with information about these three new Bills, how they may shape the planning process in Ontario and notes the other significant shifts in municipal operation(s) that could potentially occur pursuant to the proposed legislation.

Background and Discussion:

Review of Bill 5: Protect Ontario by Unleashing Our Economy Act, 2025

Bill 5 introduces a number of significant structural and procedural changes that could undermine core principles of sound planning practice and municipal autonomy. While the Province's stated intent is to accelerate economic development, Bill 5 represents a marked shift in the relationship between local and provincial planning authority.

Special Economic Zones (SEZs): Implications for Local Planning Frameworks

The most consequential feature of Bill 5 is Schedule 9, which would enact standalone legislation entitled the *Special Economic Zones Act, 2025.* Special Econmic Zones ("SEZs") will be geographic areas designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council (i.e. Cabinet). Cabinet is authorized to create criteria that can be used by the Minister of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade to designate trusted projects or trusted proponents within a SEZ. Cabinet can then exempt trusted projects or proponents from the application of any law or regulation, including Municipal by-laws, over which the Province has jurisdiction. As it relates to municipal spheres of jurisdiction, the Province is proposing to override municipal planning instruments—such as Official Plans, Secondary Plans, Zoning By-Laws, site plan control, and even environmental review mechanisms—in order to expedite development. From a planning perspective, this raises several areas of concern including:

- Disregard for Comprehensive Planning: Years of community-driven planning work—often backed by environmental assessments, traffic studies, and public consultation—can be bypassed by ministerial decision.
- Unclear Criteria & Process: The legislation does not define the criteria for SEZ designation or require consultation with affected municipalities. This introduces unpredictability and undermines the principle of transparency in land use decision-making.
- Local Services & Infrastructure Capacity: Developments approved outside the planning system could outpace municipal infrastructure readiness, resulting in capacity shortfalls for water, wastewater, roads, and community services.

In effect, this provision introduces a parallel planning track that circumvents local accountability while offloading service delivery risks to municipalities.

Environmental Oversight: Loss of Evidence-Based Safeguards

Bill 5 would repeal and replace the *Endangered Species Act* with the proposed *Species at Risk Protection Act*, consolidating key decision-making under the purview of Cabinet. This transition away from science-based conservation assessments weakens a key planning pillar: environmental due diligence.

Municipalities are obligated under the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and other frameworks to protect significant natural heritage features and species at risk. If those provincial policies are weakened or waived within SEZs, municipalities will be forced to process applications that may directly conflict with local environmental objectives, such as:

- Protection of wetlands, woodlots, and wildlife corridors
- Sustainable stormwater and watershed planning
- Climate adaptation and carbon sequestration strategies

The exclusion of environmental review mechanisms in SEZ-designated projects could lead to irreversible ecological loss and long-term cost burdens associated with habitat destruction, flood vulnerability, or water contamination.

Financial Risks and Municipal Accountability

Bill 5 may unintentionally create financial liabilities for municipalities, particularly if large-scale developments are fast-tracked without alignment to local capital budgets or development charge frameworks. For example:

Infrastructure Deficit: Rapid, unplanned growth will increase demands on roads, utilities, and transit services without the benefit of coordinated cost recovery mechanisms.

Servicing Without Predictability: Bypassing site plan control and subdivision agreements limits our ability to plan phasing of infrastructure and assess cost implications for growth-related capital.

Disrupted Revenue Models: If development is approved without local control over development charges or community benefit contributions, municipalities may be left with an unsustainable funding gap.

Property Taxes: If projects are exempted from the requirement to pay property taxes then the cost of municipal infrastructure that is required for operating the project, not merely the development, will be borne by the local ratepayers.

This decoupling of planning authority from financial responsibility runs counter to the planning principle of "growth pays for growth."

Beyond the planning process, there are other areas of municipal jurisdiction that may be impacted. Trusted proponents or projects could be exempted from the requirement to pay fees, including development charges, permits or connection fees. This will have the effect of shifting the cost of development from the trusted project or proponent to the local rate-payers. Exemptions from woodlands conservation by-laws could see the removal of significant woodlands. Exemptions from various nuisance by-laws could permit conflicting levels of noise and odour.

The proposed legislation does not provide detail in how Cabinet or the Minister will make decisions regarding where SEZs will be enacted, which projects or proponents should be trusted, or, what exemptions are likely to be afforded to them. While significant attention has been given to the proposed legislation, it has largely focused on mining in Northern Ontario, in part because the introduction of the legislation was through the Minister of Energy and the presentation of Bill 5 focused on mining. There is nothing in the proposed legislation that would limit SEZs to mining projects. Rather, it is reasonable to infer from the authority being granted to Cabinet and MEDCJT that it is intended to be used more broadly than mining projects.

Undermining Public Engagement and Democratic Process

Municipalities are tasked not only with technical land use analysis, but with engaging communities in shaping the places where they live and work. Bill 5 removes several mechanisms for public input—such as environmental assessments, planning hearings, and appeal rights—especially within SEZs.

This lack of public accountability raises some democratic concerns. Local residents, Indigenous communities, conservation authorities, and other stakeholders may be left without a formal venue to express concerns or advocate for changes. This risks further eroding public trust in planning institutions.

Additionally, if municipalities are not provided with information about the trusted projects then the ability of the municipality to respond to public concerns about the impact of the project will be muted.

Inclusionary Zoning Amendments: Mixed Impact
The proposed cap on inclusionary zoning—5% set-aside and a 25-year affordability duration—has mixed implications. On one hand, it may improve project viability in high-cost areas and encourage development around Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs), (not in effect in Elgin County), However:

- These limits may not reflect local affordability needs or real estate market conditions.
- It reduces municipal flexibility to require deeper affordability or longer durations.
- In areas relying on MTSAs to deliver mixed-income housing, this cap could undercut strategic housing policy.
- A one-size-fits-all cap on IZ fails to reflect the varied housing needs across municipalities.

<u>Review of Bill 17 (Protect Ontario by Building Faster and Smarter Act, 2025)</u>

A key objective identified by the Province for the proposed Bill is the simplification and streamlining of the development process, along with the reduction of associated barriers such as development fees. To support this objective, the proposed Bill includes amendments to several pieces of legislation, with the overarching aim of accelerating home construction across Ontario in response to the ongoing housing crisis.
Among the Acts targeted for amendment are:

- *Building Code Act, 1992*
- *Building Transit Faster Act, 2020*
- *City of Toronto Act, 2006*
- *Metrolinx Act, 2006*
- *Ministry of Infrastructure Act, 2011*
- *Planning Act*
- *Transit-oriented Communities Act, 2020*

Beyond legislative amendments, the Province has also indicated an intention to explore alternative models for service delivery. One such model under consideration is the public utility framework, which could involve the creation of municipal service corporations dedicated to managing water and wastewater systems.

Should this approach be implemented, substantial impacts may be seen in both the cost structure and the delivery mechanisms for water and wastewater services. Although such a shift could ease the financial burden currently placed on development charges (D.C.s), redistributing these costs across the broader base of existing ratepayers is anticipated by industry professionals to lead to increases in water and wastewater rates.

Overview of Proposed Amendments to the Development Charges Act

The following outlines the proposed amendments to the Development Charges Act (D.C.A.), accompanied by insights into their potential implications.

Exemption for Long-Term Care Homes

Under current legislation, long-term care homes are subject to annual development charge (D.C.) instalments. The proposed amendment would fully exempt these developments from D.C. payments moving forward, including outstanding instalments. According to industry professionals, since the D.C.A. prohibits shifting these costs to other types of development, the resulting financial shortfall would need to be addressed through alternative municipal funding mechanisms.

Capital Costs Definition

An amendment to Section 5(3) of the D.C.A. would introduce the phrase “subject to the regulations,” thereby expanding the Province’s regulatory authority to restrict what constitutes eligible capital costs. This builds on the existing ability to limit land cost inclusions and signals an intent to collaborate with stakeholders on further refinements. There are indications that the scope of these regulations may not be confined to land costs alone. Municipalities would need to rapidly adjust funding strategies for capital projects in response to regulatory changes, as such amendments would bypass the legislative process. Any reduction in D.C.-eligible costs would need to be offset through other revenue sources.

Simplified Amendment Process for Reducing D.C. By-law Charges

A new provision in Section 19(1.1) of the D.C.A. would allow municipalities to use a simplified procedure to amend D.C. by-laws in specific scenarios—such as changing the expiry date, removing indexing provisions, or reducing charges for certain development types. This streamlined approach would bypass the requirements for background studies, public consultation, or tribunal appeals. While efficient, this could limit public engagement and reduce transparency.

Deferral of D.C. Payments to Occupancy for Residential Developments

Changes to Section 26.1 would defer residential D.C. payments (excluding rental housing, which remains on an instalment plan) to the point of occupancy—either when a permit is issued or the building is occupied. Municipalities would be limited in their ability to require financial securities unless explicitly permitted by regulation. Interest charges on deferred payments would be disallowed, and existing practices for early payment of specific service charges under Section 26(2) may no longer apply. This shift could impact municipal cash flow, increasing administrative overhead and financing costs.

Elimination of Interest on Legislated Instalments
The amendment would remove the option for municipalities to charge interest on D.C. instalments for rental housing and institutional developments. It would also eliminate the ability to demand full repayment of the development changes.

Early Payment of D.C.s
Currently, early payment of D.C.s requires a formal agreement under Section 27. The proposed revision would permit early payment without such an agreement, giving developers flexibility to pay charges before they are due. While this increases developer autonomy, it may create challenges for municipalities—particularly in cases where developers seek to pay before an anticipated rate increase or before indexing is applied.

Application of the Lower Rate for D.C. Freezes
When D.C.s are frozen at the time of a planning application, situations may arise where the applicable rate at building permit issuance is lower. The proposed amendment would mandate that the lower of the two rates be used, though interest charges from the original frozen rate may still apply. This is generally seen as a favourable development for the building sector, as it avoids overcharging and aligns cost certainty with timely project advancement.

Grouping of Services for Credit Application
Section 38 of the D.C.A. allows credits to be issued when developers undertake growth-related infrastructure projects. The new provision would enable the Province to group multiple services through regulation, affecting how and where credits can be applied. This change may override municipal discretion and could lead to a reallocation of reserve funds, potentially delaying capital works for services not directly linked to the original agreement.

Definition of Local Services via Regulation
The Province is proposing to define local services through regulation under Section 59 of the D.C.A. This could standardize what constitutes a local service across municipalities, potentially overriding local policies developed during D.C. background studies. Depending on the breadth of the definition, outcomes may vary: a broader definition could reduce D.C. rates while increasing direct developer obligations, whereas a narrower one might expand D.C. coverage and raise rates. The variation in service definitions between municipalities—based on factors such as density, development type, and geography—adds further complexity.

<u>Changes to the Planning Act</u>

Amendments to the Planning Act included in Bill 17 impact the following:

- Limiting requirements for complete application – the Province is consulting on proposed regulations that would prescribe a list of subject matters and identify which reports and studies are required as part of a complete application. The current draft regulations would apply to OPAs, ZBAs, site plan, subdivision and consent applications. The list of subject matter that is currently being contemplated for exclusion from complete applications are sun/shadow information, wind information, urban design and lighting.

- Deeming material provided by prescribed professionals to be complete
- Requiring any amendment in an official plan that alters the criteria for a complete application to be approved by the Minister
- Although not an amendment that affects upper-tier planning authority, as-of-right set-back variations are proposed. As drafted, set-back variation within 10% of the set-back regulation will not require a minor variance.
- New MZO powers – a new section 47(1.0.1) would permit the Minister to impose conditions relating to the use of land or erection, location or use of buildings or structures, if in the Minister's opinion the conditions are reasonable. A new section 47(1.0.2.) further provides that the Minister can require such conditions to be secured through an agreement that may be registered on title. This is, notably, similar language to that which appears in sections 51(25)(26), related to subdivision conditions and subdivision agreements.

Updates to the Growth Management Framework

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) is initiating a realignment of municipal growth planning processes in response to the Ministry of Finance's (MOF) updated population projections released in October 2024. This initiative involves assessing Official Plans from Ontario's 50 most populous and fastest-growing municipalities to determine alignment with the latest forecasts.

Where discrepancies are found—specifically where municipal population forecasts fall short of either the updated MOF projections or the corresponding upper-tier projections—the MMAH intends to engage directly with the affected municipalities. In such cases, municipalities will be mandated to revise their Official Plans to reflect the higher of the two forecast figures.

These revisions are expected to follow an upcoming update to the *Projection Methodology Guideline*, marking its first revision since 1995. The intent is to create greater consistency in growth planning across jurisdictions, enabling more accurate alignment between projected land needs, servicing strategies, and infrastructure investment with long-term provincial growth objectives.

To support this shift, the Province is exploring enhancements to planning-related data infrastructure, including the standardization of land use tracking and permitting data across municipalities. This digital modernization is anticipated to improve forecasting accuracy, support implementation monitoring, and strengthen transparency.

The directive to update Official Plans based on MOF projections presents several implementation challenges. MOF forecasts are currently only available at the Census Division level—typically corresponding with upper-tier or single-tier municipalities—raising coordination issues for lower-tier municipalities that must interpret and allocate these broader figures locally. Additionally, the annual release and inherent variability of the MOF projections could complicate the statutory timing of Official Plan Reviews, which operate on five- and ten-year cycles. This dynamic raises uncertainty about the frequency and extent to which municipalities will be required to amend not only their

Official Plans but also associated technical studies, such as needs assessments and financial strategies.

Given these complexities, municipalities will likely require new tools and adaptive processes to more effectively monitor, update, and align long-term planning documents with evolving population data. To date, the current amended and adopted Elgin County Official Plan (which is presently with MMAH for review), uses the MOF projections.

Concurrently, proposed amendments to inclusionary zoning regulations could further influence municipal planning. The legislation proposes to cap affordable housing requirements in protected major transit station areas at 5% and to limit affordability durations to 25 years. While these changes may improve the financial viability of residential projects near transit, they also risk reducing the long-term availability of affordable housing in these areas. Municipalities will need to re-evaluate how these limits affect their broader housing affordability objectives, particularly where inclusionary zoning is a key strategy for delivering mixed-income communities.

Review of Bill 30 (Working for Workers Act, 2025)

Bill 30, the Working for Workers Seven Act, 2025, introduced by the Ontario government on May 28, 2025, proposes 18 measures to enhance worker protections, workplace safety, and economic resilience in response to challenges like U.S. tariffs. It amends key employment-related statutes, including the Employment Standards Act, 2000 (ESA), Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA), and Workplace Safety and Insurance Act, 1997 (WSIA). The bill’s implications intersect with urban development, workforce dynamics, and municipal governance, particularly in how it affects construction, economic development, and municipal authority. This summary will focus solely on the areas of the Bill that affect the planning process, and only briefly list the other attributes of the bill.

Below is an analysis and summary of the bill’s key provisions and their relevance to community planning:

Key Provisions of Bill 30
Skills Development Fund (SDF) Capital Stream Exemptions:

The bill proposes exemptions from the Planning Act and Municipal Act for projects funded through the SDF Capital Stream, allowing private entities to bypass municipal land use planning requirements and bylaws (e.g., development charges) to expedite development. The SDF Capital Stream is a broad program with an applicant pool comprised of employers in Ontario, non-college apprenticeship programs, non-profit organizations, professional, industry or employer associations, trade unions or union-affiliated organizations, municipalities, hospitals, DSSABs and CMSMs. As a result, there is a wide array of public and private entities that could receive SDF Capital Stream Funds with the consequence that they may be exempt from planning and other municipal by-laws.

These exemptions reduce municipal control over land use and development, potentially undermining local planning frameworks. Planners rely on the Planning Act to ensure development aligns with Official Plans, zoning bylaws, and community needs. Bypassing these could lead to projects that conflict with long-term urban goals, such as sustainable growth or equitable access to infrastructure.

While expediting projects may attract investment and create jobs, it risks uncoordinated development, straining infrastructure (e.g., transit, water systems) or creating land use conflicts. Municipalities may face challenges ensuring developments align with community visions or environmental goals.

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) has raised concerns about the lack of robust accountability for private entities receiving these exemptions, increasing the risk of unintended consequences, such as developments that prioritize profit over public interest. The exemptions from the Planning Act and Municipal Act pose significant challenges. While aimed at cutting red tape, they could lead to developments that bypass community input or environmental assessments, risking unsustainable urban sprawl or infrastructure deficits.

Other impacts of the bill include

- Workplace safety enhancements,
- Job posting fraud protections,
- Layoff and termination provisions,
- Ontario immigrant nominee program (OINP) flexibility

Comment Periods

- Proposed *Planning Act* and *City of Toronto Act, 2006* Changes (Schedules 3 and 7 of Bill 17* – *Protect Ontario by Building Faster and Smarter Act, 2025*) | ERO Number 025-0461 (comment period closes June 11, 2025);
- Bill 17*: *Protect Ontario by Building Faster and Smarter Act, 2025* – Amendment to the *Building Transit Faster Act, 2020* | ERO Number 025-0450 (comment period closes June 11, 2025);
- Bill 17* – *Protect Ontario by Building Faster and Smarter Act, 2025* – Accelerating Delivery of Transit-Oriented Communities | ERO Number 025-0504 (comment period closes June 12, 2025);
- Proposed Regulation – As-of-right Variations from Setback Requirements | ERO Number 025-0463 (comment period closes June 26, 2025); and
- Proposed Regulations – Complete Application | ERO Number 025-0462 (comment period closes June 26, 2025).

*While the commenting period appears to remain open for Bill 17 at the ERO links for Regulations, the vote following third reading was passed on June 3, 2025.

Financial Implications:

Bill 5 (Protect Ontario by Unleashing our Economy Act, 2025) and Bill 17 (Protect Ontario by Building Faster and Smarter Act, 2025) have significant financial implications for municipalities in Ontario, particularly in the areas of revenue, compliance costs, infrastructure funding, and potential economic impacts. Financial implications for municipalities may include:

Loss of Municipal Revenue from Development Charges and Fees
Municipalities rely on development charges, permit fees, and other levies to fund infrastructure and services related to new developments. By exempting projects in SEZs from municipal by-laws, Bill 5 could reduce or eliminate these revenue streams for affected municipalities. There is also potential that municipal property taxes could be exempted.

Increased Infrastructure Costs Without Compensation
SEZs may lead to rapid development increasing demand for municipal infrastructure such as roads, water, and waste management. However, exemptions from municipal by-laws could mean municipalities bear these costs without corresponding development charges or provincial funding.

Reduced Control Over Local Planning and Associated Costs
By overriding municipal by-laws, Bill 5 limits municipalities' ability to enforce local planning standards, potentially leading to unplanned or unmitigated development impacts. This could result in long-term costs for municipalities, such as environmental remediation or infrastructure maintenance, without the ability to impose conditions or collect fees to offset these expenses.

Administrative and Legal Costs
Municipalities may incur costs to adapt to SEZ regulations, including legal challenges or administrative adjustments to comply with provincial directives. There are proposed statutory liability protections to inure against third-party claims.

Potential Reduction in Development Charge Revenue
Deferring development charge payments to the occupancy permit stage could delay municipal revenue collection, impacting cash flow for infrastructure projects. While no interest is payable on deferred charges, municipalities may face short-term budget constraints, especially for rapidly growing communities.

Reduced Administrative Costs for Planning
Streamlining planning processes, such as allowing as-of-right minor variances and limiting complete application requirements, could reduce municipal administrative costs by decreasing the need for committee of adjustment hearings or extensive application reviews.

Consultation and Compliance Costs
The bill includes consultations with municipalities on population projections and planning regulations, which may require municipalities to allocate resources for engagement with the province.Municipalities may also face costs to update official plans or by-laws to comply with new provincial regulations, particularly if the Minister imposes conditions or limits study requirements for planning applications.

Advancement of the Strategic Plan:

Ontario's Bill 5 (Protect Ontario by Unleashing our Economy Act, 2025), Bill 17 (Protect Ontario by Building Faster and Smarter Act, 2025) and Bill 30 (Working for workers Act, 2025) advance Elgin County's 2024-2026 Strategic Plan by bolstering its priorities of economic vitality, infrastructure development, and sustainable growth. While there are concerns about the loss of municipal land use control, Bill 5 streamlines approvals for major infrastructure projects and introduces special economic zones, potentially attracting investment and creating jobs in Elgin County, which aligns with the County's goal of fostering economic development. Similarly, Bill 17 accelerates housing and infrastructure development by reducing regulatory barriers and expediting approvals, supporting Elgin's focus on addressing housing needs and upgrading critical infrastructure like roads and water systems. It should be noted that there are potential misalignments that could challenge the County's goals of environmental stewardship, social equity, and good governance.

Local Municipal Partner Impact:

All LMPs will be affected by the changes of Bill 5, Bill 17 and Bill 30.

Communication Requirements:

N/A

Conclusion:

Conclusion on Bill 5

Bill 5 proposes sweeping reforms that may accelerate development, but in doing so, it creates significant risks for municipalities tasked with delivering livable, resilient, and well-serviced communities. In relation to sound planning process, the most pressing issues are:

1. The potential bypassing of integrated local planning frameworks,
2. The removal of environmental safeguards that guide sustainable growth,
3. The erosion of fiscal tools and planning processes critical to managing growth responsibly, and
4. The loss of public voice in development decisions

Municipalities are partners in economic development. The Province should look to empowering municipalities to participate meaningfully—rather than circumventing their role. Doing so will lead to more durable, efficient, and community-aligned growth outcomes.

Conclusion on Bill 17

Bill 17 represents a significant step by the Province of Ontario to accelerate housing development and streamline municipal processes amid the ongoing housing affordability crisis. By amending a wide range of legislative frameworks and proposing new models for service delivery, the Province aims to reduce barriers and enhance the efficiency of development approvals and infrastructure financing.

The proposed changes to the Development Charges Act reflect a strong emphasis on flexibility and simplification, such as deferring charges until occupancy and enabling streamlined by-law amendments. However, these changes may pose challenges for municipal cash flow, financial planning, and transparency, potentially shifting costs away from developers and onto existing ratepayers or alternative funding sources. The exemptions for certain development types, including long-term care homes, further complicate municipal revenue models and underscore the need for innovative fiscal strategies.

Future amendments, including adjustments to indexing methods and standardized approaches to benefit to existing deductions, highlight ongoing provincial efforts to balance regional equity with the diverse realities of municipal infrastructure needs. Expanded reporting requirements may increase administrative burdens but could also improve fiscal accountability and project delivery oversight.

The growth management framework revision, driven by updated provincial population forecasts, signals a renewed focus on consistency and long-term alignment between municipal planning and provincial growth objectives. While this approach promises better coordination and data-driven decision-making, it also raises practical challenges for municipalities—especially lower-tier jurisdictions—in applying broad census division forecasts to local contexts and adapting Official Plans in a timely manner.

Lastly, proposed changes to inclusionary zoning policies reflect a tension between improving market feasibility for new developments near transit hubs and preserving the long-term supply of affordable housing. Municipalities will need to carefully navigate these policy shifts to continue promoting inclusive and sustainable communities.

In summary, Bill 17 and the associated growth management initiatives mark a substantial recalibration of Ontario's housing and infrastructure policy landscape. Municipalities will require enhanced tools, data systems, and financial strategies to adapt effectively to these reforms while ensuring balanced growth and equitable service delivery for their residents.

Conclusion on Bill 30

Bill 30 aims to protect Ontario's workforce and economy through workplace safety enhancements, job scam protections, flexible layoffs, and streamlined immigration for skilled workers. In reference to community planning, the bill presents both opportunities and challenges:

It may lead to safer construction sites, a more reliable workforce, and economic stability support urban development goals, particularly for infrastructure and housing projects. However, exemptions from municipal planning laws and other local regulation threaten local control, potentially leading to misaligned developments.

At the time of writing of this report, Bill 17 passed third reading, Bill 5 has been ordered for third reading and Bill 30 has been ordered for second reading.

All of which is Respectfully Submitted	Approved for Submission
Mat Vaughan Director of Planning and Development	Blaine Parkin Chief Administrative Officer/Clerk
Nicolas Loeb Director of Legal Services	