

## STAFF REPORT:



**REPORT TO:** Council  
**MEETING DATE:** February 8, 2010  
**REPORT NO.:** SPS.10.01  
**SUBJECT:** Bill 198-An Act to amend *the Planning Act* with respect to inclusionary housing.  
**PREPARED BY:** Peter Tollefsen, Director of Special Projects (Sustainability)

### A. Recommendations

THAT Council receive the Staff Report SPS.10.01 titled "Bill 198-An Act to amend *the Planning Act* with respect to inclusionary housing".

### B. Background

The Town has commenced a Housing Needs Study. A Workshop was held December 2, 2009. The consultants are preparing the first draft of the Study and we will be approaching Council and the public in the near future with the completed document. It will contain a Housing Strategy including Policy for our Official Plan with such tools as Inclusionary Housing requirements (ie; to require the provision of affordable housing as part of residential development.).

Only the Cities of Ottawa and Toronto currently have similar policies in effect. The City of Toronto's policies, which require development sites over 5.0 ha in size to dedicate 20 per cent to affordable housing, recently withstood a challenge at the Ontario Municipal Board. However some back up in Provincial legislation would certainly secure municipal delivery of Inclusionary Housing.

Our consultants have been investigating the legal framework for a strong tool for affordable housing requirements through the municipal vehicle of official plans and zoning by-laws. They have brought to our attention a private members Bill:

Bill 198 (attached as Appendix A) is an Act to amend the Planning Act with respect to inclusionary housing. It proposes to amend the Act to include the adequate provision of a full range of housing, including housing that is affordable to low and moderate income households, as a matter of provincial interest.

It proposes to amend Section 34 to allow the councils of local municipalities to pass zoning by-laws requiring inclusionary housing in the municipality and regulating the required percentage of affordable housing units in new housing developments in the municipality.

A new section 37.1 of the Act proposes to allow municipalities to pass by-laws requiring that a specified percentage of housing units in all new housing developments in the municipality to be affordable to low and moderate income households.

It proposes to amend Section 51 to allow the approval authority to impose as a condition to the approval of subdivision a requirement that a specified percentage of housing units in all new housing developments in the subdivision be affordable to low and moderate income households.

Bill 198 got first reading June 4, 2009 and 2nd reading Sept. 24, where it was referred to the Standing Committee on General Government. Bill 198 is still at the Standing Committee. Attached as Appendix B –is an excerpt of the discussions that Took Place in the Ontario Legislature June 4 and Sept. 24, 2009 on Bill 198.

There are a number of other bills on the agenda and the Committee has not yet reviewed Bill 198. Staff believe we should make a submission or presentation to the Standing Committee perhaps on a regional level.

Our consultants have been meeting with the City of Toronto staff on this. Toronto is anxious for us to join the effort as they feel that this issue is being viewed as a Toronto issue only. Support from another municipality, especially a non GTA community to show this is a provincial wide issue would be welcome.

This would be of interest to area municipalities in the Georgian Triangle Area and staff will be contacting adjacent Town and County Planning Depts. We are meeting with our consultants next week to plan a joint strategy for a submission to the Provincial Standing Committee.

The purpose of this report is to introduce the matter to Council and staff will be reporting back with an action plan on Inclusionary Housing.

### **C. The Blue Mountains' Strategic Plan**

Supporting legislative tools that will assist the Town in requiring affordable housing meets the Goal of ; *Managing Growth to ensure the ongoing health and prosperity of the community.*

### **D. Environmental Impacts**

To address housing issues within the Town in a manner which protects the environment and is consistent with Smart Growth planning principals lessens the negative impacts.

## **E. Budget Impact**

Not significant yet..

## **F. Attached**

Appendix A – Bill 198, an Act to amend the Planning Act with respect to inclusionary housing.

Appendix B – Excerpts of discussions that took place in the Ontario Legislature June 4, and September 24, 2009 on Bill 198.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Peter Tollefsen, Director of Special Projects (Sustainability)

For more information, please contact:

Peter Tollefsen

[ptollefsen@thebluemountains.ca](mailto:ptollefsen@thebluemountains.ca)

519 599 3131 ext.247

# Appendix A



1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION, 39<sup>TH</sup> LEGISLATURE, ONTARIO  
58 ELIZABETH II, 2009

1<sup>RE</sup> SESSION, 39<sup>E</sup> LÉGISLATURE, ONTARIO  
58 ELIZABETH II, 2009

## Bill 198

## Projet de loi 198

**An Act to amend the  
Planning Act with respect to  
inclusionary housing**

**Loi modifiant la  
Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire  
à l'égard de l'inclusion  
de logements abordables**

**Ms DiNovo**

**M<sup>me</sup> DiNovo**

**Private Member's Bill**

**Projet de loi de député**

1st Reading     June 4, 2009  
2nd Reading  
3rd Reading  
Royal Assent

1<sup>re</sup> lecture     4 juin 2009  
2<sup>e</sup> lecture  
3<sup>e</sup> lecture  
Sanction royale

Printed by the Legislative Assembly  
of Ontario

Imprimé par l'Assemblée législative  
de l'Ontario



## EXPLANATORY NOTE

The *Planning Act* is amended to include the adequate provision of a full range of housing, including housing that is affordable to low and moderate income households, as a matter of provincial interest.

Section 34 of the Act is amended to allow the councils of local municipalities to pass zoning by-laws requiring inclusionary housing in the municipality and regulating the required percentage of affordable housing units in new housing developments in the municipality.

The new section 37.1 of the Act allows municipalities to pass by-laws requiring that a specified percentage of housing units in all new housing developments in the municipality to be affordable to low and moderate income households.

Section 51 of the Act is amended to allow the approval authority to impose as a condition to the approval of a plan of subdivision a requirement that a specified percentage of housing units in all new housing developments in the subdivision be affordable to low and moderate income households.

## NOTE EXPLICATIVE

La *Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire* est modifiée afin d'inclure dans les questions d'intérêt provincial la mise en place adéquate d'une gamme complète de logements, notamment des logements abordables pour les ménages à revenu faible et modéré.

L'article 34 de la Loi est modifié pour permettre au conseil d'une municipalité locale d'adopter des règlements municipaux de zonage exigeant l'inclusion de logements abordables dans la municipalité et réglementant le pourcentage obligatoire de logements abordables dans les nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires.

Le nouvel article 37.1 de la Loi permet à une municipalité d'adopter des règlements municipaux qui exigent qu'un pourcentage précisé de logements dans tous les nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires de la municipalité soit constitué de logements abordables pour les ménages à revenu faible et modéré.

L'article 51 de la Loi est modifié pour permettre à l'autorité approuvatrice d'imposer comme condition d'approbation d'un plan de lotissement une exigence voulant qu'un pourcentage précisé de logements dans tous les nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires du lotissement soit constitué de logements abordables pour les ménages à revenu faible et modéré.

**An Act to amend the  
Planning Act with respect to  
inclusionary housing**

**Loi modifiant la  
Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire  
à l'égard de l'inclusion  
de logements abordables**

Note: This Act amends the *Planning Act*. For the legislative history of the Act, see the Table of Consolidated Public Statutes – Detailed Legislative History at [www.e-Laws.gov.on.ca](http://www.e-Laws.gov.on.ca).

Remarque : La présente loi modifie la *Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire*, dont l'historique législatif figure à la page pertinente de l'Historique législatif détaillé des lois d'intérêt public codifiées sur le site [www.lois-en-ligne.gouv.on.ca](http://www.lois-en-ligne.gouv.on.ca).

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, enacts as follows:

Sa Majesté, sur l'avis et avec le consentement de l'Assemblée législative de la province de l'Ontario, édicte :

**1. Subsection 1 (1) of the *Planning Act* is amended by adding the following definitions:**

**1. Le paragraphe 1 (1) de la *Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire* est modifié par adjonction des définitions suivantes :**

“affordable” has the same meaning as in the Provincial Policy Statement published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and which is available from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing; (“abordable”)

«abordable» S'entend au sens de la Déclaration de principes provinciale publiée par le ministère des Affaires municipales et du Logement et que l'on peut se procurer auprès de celui-ci. («affordable»)

“inclusionary housing” means the provision of housing that is affordable to low and moderate income households in accordance with a by-law made under section 37.1 of this Act; (“inclusion de logements abordables”)

«inclusion de logements abordables» Fourniture de logements abordables pour les ménages à revenu faible et modéré conformément à un règlement municipal adopté en vertu de l'article 37.1 de la présente loi. («inclusionary housing»)

“low and moderate income households” has the same meaning as in the Provincial Policy Statement published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and which is available from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing; (“ménages à revenu faible et modéré”)

«ménages à revenu faible et modéré» S'entend au sens de la Déclaration de principes provinciale publiée par le ministère des Affaires municipales et du Logement et que l'on peut se procurer auprès de celui-ci. («low and moderate income households»)

“new housing development” means a new housing development of 20 or more units; (“nouvel ensemble domiciliaire”)

«nouvel ensemble domiciliaire» Nouvel ensemble domiciliaire de 20 logements ou plus. («new housing development»)

**2. Clause 2 (j) of the Act is repealed and the following substituted:**

**2. L'alinéa 2 j) de la Loi est abrogé et remplacé par ce qui suit :**

(j) the adequate provision of a full range of housing, including housing that is affordable to low and moderate income households;

j) la mise en place adéquate d'une gamme complète de logements, notamment des logements abordables pour les ménages à revenu faible et modéré;

**3. Subsection 34 (1) of the Act is amended by adding the following paragraph:**

**3. Le paragraphe 34 (1) de la Loi est modifié par adjonction de la disposition suivante :**

**Inclusionary housing**

**Inclusion de logements abordables**

4.1 For requiring inclusionary housing in the municipality and, more specifically, for regulating the required percentage of affordable housing units in all new housing developments in the municipality.

4.1 Exiger l'inclusion de logements abordables dans la municipalité et, plus précisément, réglementer le pourcentage obligatoire de logements abordables dans tous les nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires.

**4. The Act is amended by adding the following section:**

**Inclusionary housing by-law**

37.1 (1) The council of a local municipality may, in a by-law passed under section 34, require that a specified percentage of housing units in all new housing developments in the municipality be affordable to low and moderate income households.

**By-law applies to all developments**

(2) A by-law described in subsection (1) applies regardless of whether a new housing development requires amendments to an existing by-law or not.

**Incentives**

(3) Where a municipality has passed a by-law described in subsection (1), the municipality is not required to provide any financial assistance or other incentives to developers.

**Condition**

(4) A by-law shall not contain the provisions mentioned in subsection (1) unless there is an official plan in effect in the local municipality that contains provisions relating to inclusionary housing requirements.

**Agreements**

(5) Where a municipality has passed a by-law described in subsection (1), the municipality may require a developer to enter into one or more agreements with the municipality dealing with the affordable housing requirements.

**Agreement re: affordability**

(6) Without restricting the generality of subsection (5), an agreement entered into under that subsection may require that the affordability of units be maintained and may restrict the purchase and sale of units to eligible persons as determined in accordance with the regulations.

**Registration of agreement**

(7) Any agreement entered into under subsection (5) may be registered against the land to which it applies and the municipality is entitled to enforce the provisions thereof against the developer and, subject to the provisions of the *Registry Act* and the *Land Titles Act*, any and all subsequent owners of the land.

**Regulations**

(8) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations governing municipalities that pass by-laws described in subsection (1) and dealing with the following matters:

1. The number of bedrooms in the affordable units in new housing developments.
2. The size of affordable units in new housing developments.

**4. La Loi est modifiée par adjonction de l'article suivant :**

**Règlement municipal d'inclusion**

37.1 (1) Le conseil de la municipalité locale peut, par règlement municipal adopté en vertu de l'article 34, exiger qu'un pourcentage précisé de logements dans tous les nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires de la municipalité soit constitué de logements abordables pour les ménages à revenu faible et modéré.

**Application du règlement municipal à tous les ensembles**

(2) Le règlement municipal visé au paragraphe (1) s'applique peu importe si un nouvel ensemble domiciliaire exige ou non la modification d'un règlement municipal existant.

**Incitatifs**

(3) La municipalité qui a adopté un règlement municipal visé au paragraphe (1) n'est pas tenue de fournir une aide financière ou d'autres incitatifs aux promoteurs.

**Condition**

(4) Le règlement municipal ne contient les dispositions visées au paragraphe (1) que si un plan officiel est en vigueur dans la municipalité locale et contient des dispositions concernant les exigences en matière d'inclusion de logements abordables.

**Conventions**

(5) La municipalité qui a adopté un règlement municipal visé au paragraphe (1) peut exiger qu'un promoteur conclue avec elle une ou plusieurs conventions traitant des exigences en matière de logement abordable.

**Convention : abordabilité**

(6) Sans préjudice de la portée générale du paragraphe (5), une convention conclue en vertu de ce paragraphe peut exiger le maintien de l'abordabilité des logements et réserver l'achat et la vente de logements aux personnes qui remplissent les conditions prévues par les règlements.

**Enregistrement de la convention**

(7) La convention conclue en vertu du paragraphe (5) peut être enregistrée à l'égard du terrain auquel elle s'applique. La municipalité a le droit d'en faire respecter les conditions par le promoteur et, sous réserve de la *Loi sur l'enregistrement des actes* et de la *Loi sur l'enregistrement des droits immobiliers*, par les propriétaires subséquents du terrain.

**Règlements**

(8) Le lieutenant-gouverneur en conseil peut, par règlement, régir les municipalités qui adoptent des règlements municipaux visés au paragraphe (1) et traiter des questions suivantes :

1. Le nombre de chambres à coucher dans les logements abordables des nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires.
2. Les dimensions des logements abordables des nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires.

3. The timing of the construction of the affordable units in new housing developments.
4. The location and distribution of the affordable units within new housing developments.
5. The design and construction standards required for the affordable units in new housing developments.
6. The eligibility requirements for ownership and occupancy of affordable units in new housing developments.
7. Alternative methods for satisfying inclusionary housing requirements, including but not limited to payment of fees in lieu and the provision of land.
8. Such other matters as the Lieutenant Governor in Council considers necessary or advisable for the provision of inclusionary housing.

**5. Subsection 51 (25) of the Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (c) and by adding the following clause:**

- (c.1) that a specified percentage of housing units in all new housing developments in the subdivision be affordable to low and moderate income households; and

**Commencement**

**6. This Act comes into force six months after the day it receives Royal Assent.**

**Short title**

**7. The short title of this Act is the *Planning Amendment Act (Enabling Municipalities to Require Inclusionary Housing), 2009.***

3. L'échéancier de construction des logements abordables des nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires.
4. L'emplacement et la distribution des logements abordables dans les nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires.
5. Les normes de conception et de construction à respecter pour les logements abordables des nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires.
6. Les conditions à remplir pour pouvoir être propriétaire d'un logement abordable dans les nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires ou pour pouvoir occuper un tel logement.
7. Les autres moyens de satisfaire aux exigences en matière d'inclusion de logements abordables, notamment le versement de sommes compensatoires et la fourniture de biens-fonds.
8. Les autres questions que le lieutenant-gouverneur en conseil estime nécessaires ou souhaitables pour l'inclusion de logements abordables.

**5. Le paragraphe 51 (25) de la Loi est modifié par adjonction de l'alinéa suivant :**

- c.1) qu'un pourcentage précisé de logements dans tous les nouveaux ensembles domiciliaires du lotissement soit constitué de logements abordables pour les ménages à revenu faible et modéré;

**Entrée en vigueur**

**6. La présente loi entre en vigueur six mois après le jour où elle reçoit la sanction royale.**

**Titre abrégé**

**7. Le titre abrégé de la présente loi est *Loi de 2009 modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire (inclusion de logements abordables par les municipalités).***

**Appendix B – Excerpts of discussions that took place in the  
Ontario Legislature June 4, and Sept. 24, 2009 on Bill 198.**

**June 4, 2009**

PLANNING AMENDMENT ACT (ENABLING MUNICIPALITIES TO REQUIRE  
INCLUSIONARY HOUSING), 2009 /  
LOI DE 2009 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT DU TERRITOIRE (INCLUSION DE LOGEMENTS  
ABORDABLES PAR LES MUNICIPALITÉS)

Ms. DiNovo moved first reading of the following bill:

Bill 198, An Act to amend the Planning Act with respect to inclusionary housing / Projet  
de loi 198, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire à l'égard de l'inclusion de  
logements abordables.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion  
carry? Carried.

*First reading agreed to.*

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** The member for a short statement.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** The Planning Act is amended to include the adequate provision of a  
full range of housing with this bill, including housing that is affordable to low- and  
moderate-income households, as a matter of provincial interest.

Section 34 of the act is amended to allow the councils of local municipalities to pass  
zoning bylaws requiring inclusionary housing and regulating the required percentage of  
affordable housing units in new housing developments in the municipality.

The new section 37.1 of the act allows municipalities to pass bylaws requiring that a  
specified percentage of housing units in all new housing developments in the  
municipality be affordable to low- and moderate-income households.

Section 51 of the act is amended to allow the approval authority to impose, as a  
condition to the approval of a plan of subdivision, a requirement that a specified  
percentage of housing units in all new housing developments in the subdivision be  
affordable to low- and moderate-income households.

## **MOTIONS**

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS**

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I believe we have unanimous consent to put forward a motion without notice regarding private members' public business.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Agreed? Agreed.

**Hon. Brad Duguid:** I move that, notwithstanding standing order 98(g), the requirement for notice be waived with respect to ballot items 25, 26, and 27.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? Carried.

*Motion agreed to.*

**September 24, 2009**

**PRIVATE MEMBERS'  
PUBLIC BUSINESS**

PLANNING AMENDMENT ACT (ENABLING MUNICIPALITIES TO REQUIRE INCLUSIONARY HOUSING), 2009 /  
LOI DE 2009 MODIFIANT LA LOI  
SUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT DU TERRITOIRE  
(INCLUSION DE LOGEMENTS  
ABORDABLES PAR LES MUNICIPALITÉS)

Ms. DiNovo moved second reading of the following bill:

Bill 198, An Act to amend the Planning Act with respect to inclusionary housing / Projet de loi 198, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire à l'égard de l'inclusion de logements abordables.

**The Speaker (Hon. Steve Peters):** Pursuant to standing order 98, the member has 12 minutes for her presentation.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** First of all, I want to thank all the folks who were involved in writing this bill: certainly the Wellesley Institute, Richard Drdla and Brian Eng, who are here; Kenneth Hale and Mary Todorow from the Advocacy Centre for Tenants; and also councillors Adam Vaughan, Paula Fletcher, Gord Perks, many in the city of Toronto planning, and even Hazel McCallion at lunchtime suggested that, yes, this would be a good thing. She didn't have the powers to do this right, as the law stands.

**1330**

It's a very simple little bill, and I quite frankly would assert that it is non-partisan. This is a piece of the puzzle that will address the nightmare of housing in Ontario, and the piece of the puzzle is this: that right now, if a municipality or a city wanted to bring in inclusionary zoning bylaws, that is to say if they wish to demand of developers that developers set aside 10% of any developed units, for example, as affordable housing, it would allow them the ability to do it. This bill does not mandate that they do it, it does not demand that they do it; it simply gets rid of the roadblocks so they can do it if they so choose. It is a piece of the puzzle, but it's a critical piece of the puzzle. Over 200 municipalities across North America already have inclusionary zoning and a number of states have brought in legislation very similar to this one so that roadblocks are removed.

I was speaking to the housing minister and he suggested that we already have that ability as municipalities in Ontario. I would point him to legal counsel here who say-and this is from them; there's a generally accepted view among municipal lawyers-most of

whom, I might point out, work for developers-that municipalities in Ontario don't have the explicit authority to enact mandatory inclusionary practices. As you know, the general constitutional rule is that municipalities can only do those things for which they have explicit legal authority.

There is a growing number of planners. I've heard from them. They've been part of this bill, including senior staff in Toronto and Ottawa who want to have mandatory zoning tools available to them, but they're worried about sticking their necks out too far because developers will inevitably take this to the OMB and win, and they have.

What is inclusionary zoning, just so folks know? And by the way, it's worked extremely effectively. Maryland and Boston were some of the first to enact it back in the 1970s. Since the 1970s, because of inclusionary zoning bylaws, they have over 10,000 units of affordable housing they wouldn't otherwise have. I did a little straw poll, and based on the number of units that were developed and built, in one year alone, from 2007 to 2008, we would have had 4,000 affordable housing units built as part of our housing unit mix if Toronto, for example, or any of our municipalities, had had the ability to bring in this bylaw.

What is the context? The context is 130,000 households waiting for affordable housing in the province of Ontario-waiting an average of 10 to 12 years. We're talking about, in the greater Toronto area alone, 70,000 households. We have in Ontario the worst record of any of the provinces in per capita investment in affordable housing. Saskatchewan, to take an example, invests four times as much as we do-four times as much. So as much as we in the New Democratic Party would like to see new bills, we would like to see more robust investment on behalf of our friends across the aisle. Certainly, this is still a piece of the puzzle and the lovely aspect of inclusionary zoning-this will appeal to my friends to the right here-is that it doesn't cost one tax dollar, yet it provides affordable housing negotiated by the municipality. For those who may have friends in the development industry who say, "This is anti-development"-no, it's not. In fact, developers in many of the municipalities across the States support inclusionary zoning, particularly in a down market. This allows them in fact, in their own jargon, to get rid of some unwanted units because they can't sell them and somebody out there needs them.

I remember very well my personal introduction to those who were seeking housing and couldn't get it. That was as a United Church minister, when a family pulled into our parking lot in an RV and asked if they could park there and live there. We had a family living in our parking lot at the church that I presided over for about year. Their children went to school from the RV in the parking lot and came home every day. They used the church as their address. Why? Because they couldn't find housing.

That's what those statistics mean. Those statistics all bear a face, and the face is the face of a child. There are children and single parents out there living in RVs, living in their cars, living in shelters and surfing from couch to couch in their friends' homes. They don't have housing, and anybody can tell you that housing is a major determinant

of health. If you don't have a house, you don't have a job. If you don't have a house, you don't live long. That's the reality.

Who else supports inclusionary zoning implementation? Well, just about everybody in the housing advocacy community; 134 different groups have come out with various recommendations around inclusionary zoning. Certainly the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association has brought out a specific report talking about implementing an inclusionary policy to facilitate affordable housing development in Ontario.

Again, it's a very simple little bill. All it does is change the wording of one small piece of the Planning Act so that municipalities can do what only some might want to do. Not all might want to do it, but at least some can move forward on this file. I certainly have assurances from some of the bigger municipalities that they would do just that if they were given the tools to do so. That's what this bill is about.

I know there's not a member here who isn't touched by the issue of homelessness and the demand for housing in their riding, and I know that the government is doing ongoing consultations as we speak about the issue of housing. So it is certainly in the government's best interests to have this piece of the puzzle put in place; it's in the best interests of lawyers who are trying to work for advocates for housing; it's certainly in the best interests of housing advocates; and ultimately, it's in the best interests of children like the ones I just described, who live in RVs and go to school from there, because it would free up units.

The other aspect of this that is wonderful is that it really fights against NIMBYism. Instead of having a housing development over here and nothing but people on social assistance living there, it mixes it up. So you have a high-range condo that has 10% set aside for affordable housing and could be rent-to-own.

I know that in my own riding I have a large group of Tibetans who came as refugees. They're finding their way and making their way, and they want housing. But they want to own their own house, eventually; they don't want to rent. This would be an opportunity for a developer to offer 10% affordable units, for example, to those who don't have a down payment but can make the monthly payments and do want housing. Again, it would answer many of our needs.

The Star editorial two days ago talked about the huge bureaucratic nightmare that goes into trying to get a housing project up and running in this province. It's true. It's a nightmare to try to get a housing build. Ask any church that's trying to get involved in this. Here's a very simple, direct way-again, up to the municipalities.

There are as many ways to do inclusionary zoning as there are municipalities. Different municipalities do it differently: some more aggressively, like London, England, where up to 30%-in fact 50%, depending on how you read affordable housing-has to be set aside, to localities like Florida and others, where 10% to 20% seems to be the general rule. Australia, for example, has this nationwide. Belgium and European countries have it in

place. We really are behind the curve on this, and this little bill—all I ask is that it be let go on a voice vote and go to committee so we can discuss it, so it can begin—just begin—to confront the problem of homelessness.

One of my favourite ads ever about homelessness was done by Covenant House. I don't know if members remember this ad; it was in bus shelters etc. It was a picture of about a two-year-old in a bus shelter, and it said, "How young do they have to be before we give a damn?" That's what it has come down to, particularly in our big cities. Unfortunately, we're used to—we've unfortunately become inured to—stepping over bodies on our streets. What kind of moral society is that? What kind of ethical reality is that, when we're used to people lying, sleeping on grates on the sidewalk, some 5,000 of them in Toronto alone?

**1340**

We need every tool in the toolbox to confront this. We need new bills; we need rent supplements; we need money, as I know has been forthcoming, at least to some extent, to Toronto Community Housing Corp.; and we need inclusionary zoning. We need all of this. All of this will go towards the mix that will take us from worst to first. Right now, we're at worst in Canada. We are worse than progressive states. It's not every day I get to stand up and say Ontario is worse at this than Florida when we're talking about progressive states, but we are.

Again, I ask that this be treated as a non-partisan issue, something that we can all get behind, a simple little change. Section 37, by the way, which is what's in place now, is hit or miss at best. It's up to the councillors to negotiate with the developers. Sometimes they get a fountain; sometimes they get nothing. We don't need that anymore. We need housing, and we need it desperately. The era of downloads, I hope, is at an end. The era when this government steps up and takes responsibility, I hope, is at its very inception.

Think of that child in the bus shelter. Think of the family that lived in my church parking lot for a year. Think of all of those in your ridings who really need access to affordable housing, and yet there are not the tax dollars there to build all the housing we need. Even think of the developers who, in a down market, sit on empty units that could be filled. Think of all of Ontario when you decide about this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate.

**Mr. Lou Rinaldi:** I'm delighted to take part in this debate on Bill 198, which will allow some inclusionary zoning permission for affordable housing.

I commend the member for bringing this bill forward. I just want to make a couple of points. We, in this House and outside this House, are all Ontarians and Canadians. We have the social fabric to look after our fellow man and the needy, and whenever there's an opportunity to improve that situation, we need to do all we can.

So a couple of points: As a government-through the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing-we're in a position to do some consultation across the province as to how we can look at all options to bring the affordable housing issue to the table and come up with a strategy so that we can move this forward.

We could point fingers here at different governments at different times. I think we all try to do the best we can on a piecemeal basis, and in the last few years we have made some advances. This consultation process to come up with a strategy, as the minister has indicated, will give us some kind of road map.

I believe the ministry is in its final stages-I know that I personally attended a consultation in Brampton to see what the feel of the land was in a more urban setting. There wasn't one in my riding. The closest one was Lindsay. So I had two of my own, one in Colborne, which is the centre of my riding, and one in the city of Quinte West, which is part of my riding. Virtually, we didn't have the numbers that we had in Brampton. We have fewer people because of the population density and the makeup, but I would say that the suggestions and the comments mirrored what I heard in Brampton. Was inclusionary zoning part of the discussion? Absolutely-amongst an array of other baskets.

I would say that it could be part of that mix as we come out with the strategy, but I'd also like to point out that municipalities do have some tools. I'm not saying it's black and white. I just want to point out that in our provincial policy statements there are provisions for municipalities, through intensification numbers, to provide that type of guidance to developers.

For example, if I remember back to my municipal days, when they're approving a plan of subdivision-although there are not as many as there are in large urban centres-municipalities can dictate what that subdivision should look like, whether it's through store management, whether it's through size of lots that they would approve based on a whole number of criteria. That's prior to the provincial policy. So municipalities do have some tools. To say that they don't have any tools-they do.

I'm going to be supporting this, on a personal note-this is private members' hour, I'm not sure what the other members do-because I believe this could be part of that toolbox. I would also like to encourage the rest of the House to think of the strategy we're going to be putting in place, and could this be part of it? I think passing this bill today would help make this part of it. To what format? I wouldn't want to prejudge what the strategy will be that the minister will come out with, hopefully sometime at the beginning of the year.

So as we debate this, I think we need to talk about some of the advancements we've made as a government the last four or five years, and there's a whole list, and the federal government has been a part of it-unfortunately, where we find ourselves in a difficult situation. Being part of a municipal government of the day when public housing was divulged to the lower-tier municipalities, I remember sitting around a county council table, which is the same as regional government, scratching our heads as to how we

could absorb all this housing that in many cases needed a huge amount of repair. So we've tried to accommodate some of that. I think we've made some progress, but do we have a long way to go? Absolutely. So we must not lose sight of the investments that we've made.

I look forward to the rest of the debate on this bill. I would encourage all members to also keep in mind, and I know a lot have taken part in, the public meetings that the minister has had across the province. I believe there were 13. I know some of them have, from all sides of the House. So I very much look forward to that, to have a complete toolbox, not just to deal on a piecemeal basis, because although this will hopefully make some advances, I think we need to look at the broader and really long-range effects. So as I mentioned, I will personally support this, but I would encourage that we need to look at the bigger picture.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Norm Miller:** I'm pleased to have the opportunity to speak to this private member's bill today, Bill 198, An Act to amend the Planning Act with respect to inclusionary housing. The bill plans to amend the Planning Act. I'll just read from the explanatory note.

"The Planning Act is amended to include the adequate provision of a full range of housing, including housing that is affordable to low and moderate income households, as a matter of provincial interest.

"Section 34 of the Act is amended to allow the councils of local municipalities to pass zoning by-laws requiring inclusionary housing in the municipality and regulating the required percentage of affordable housing units in new housing developments in the municipality."

I think the important word in all that is "to allow the councils," so I do believe it's important that it become a local decision.

Inclusionary housing is something that certainly has been going on a long time in the United States. For those who are unaware of what it is, inclusionary housing refers to municipal and county planning ordinances that require a given share of new construction to be affordable by people with low to moderate incomes. In practice, these policies involve placing deed restrictions on 10% to 30% of new houses or apartments in order to make the cost of housing affordable to lower-income households. As I say, it's been quite common across the United States for quite a long time. The thing that I like about this approach is that you have mixed-income neighbourhoods, which I think is a positive thing, versus creating ghettos in some cases.

In the United States there are more than 200 communities that have some sort of inclusionary zoning provision. To give a few examples, Maryland is thought to be a pioneer in establishing inclusionary zoning policies. It's the sixth-wealthiest county in the

United States, yet it has built more than 10,000 units of affordable housing since 1974. In Massachusetts, they have a state law. In New Jersey, there is a judicially imposed inclusionary zoning. In California, a 2006 study found that 170 jurisdictions in California had some form of inclusionary housing; that's a 59% increase from 2003. So we can see that it's quite common across the United States.

## **1350**

I would say, from my perspective from Parry Sound-Muskoka, that certainly we do have a challenge of needing more affordable housing. In Muskoka, the wait time for an affordable housing unit is at least a couple of years, and it has been that way quite consistently the last number of years. It hasn't been improving. In Ontario, a quarter of tenants are paying more than 50% of their total household income in rent, and that is neither affordable nor sustainable.

I recognize that municipalities sometimes do get pushback from neighbours when it comes to affordable housing units.

I'd like to highlight some of the recent events that happened in Parry Sound particularly:

"Parry Sound councillors approved tax exemptions for three more developers planning to apply for upper-level government subsidies to add low-income housing in Parry Sound-projects that could create more than 85 new apartment units in town." That's a lot of units for the town of Parry Sound.

Under this affordable housing program, "applicants can receive up to \$150,000 per apartment for new rental units, provided they are rented at an amount that is only 80% of the average rents paid in the area."

I would, however, point out that there was a story about that building going ahead, and I did have some local landlords who complained to me that they would be unfairly having to compete against this subsidized rental housing.

"To qualify, developers must have the support of their municipal government...."

In the case of Parry Sound, Parry Sound council members recently agreed to forgive property tax reduction for 63 apartments at the former St. Joseph's hospital site. They also endorsed a proposal for a new 20-unit seniors' complex attached to an existing apartment building on Isabella Street, across from the high school.

There are lots of different approaches. I believe that rent-geared-to-income is one that makes a lot of sense, where people are given financial assistance and they look for accommodations in the marketplace.

I'll use this opportunity to promote the fact that I will be holding my own affordable housing consultation on October 14 at the friendship centre in Parry Sound. That's

being assisted by the poverty reduction network in Parry Sound. We're hoping to set up and invite people to participate in that forum. So I look forward to that at the friendship centre on October 14 in Parry Sound.

I would like to point out, in the short time I have left, that some of the actions this government has taken have actually made things worse. Their changes to the tenant protection act, which really change the balance to favour tenants, have the result of making it so landlords get out of the business of renting apartments. I have had many cases where landlords are dealing with what they call "professional tenants" and go through a long, drawn-out process by these people who really know the process, and they end up losing thousands and thousands of dollars and have damaged apartments and, in the long run, end up deciding not to rent units anymore.

I'm pretty much out of time because I know that the member from Oxford would like to add his comments, as well. But generally, I support this approach, where you support mixed-income types of accommodation versus having separate buildings or separate areas created.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** It is indeed a privilege and an honour to stand here and talk about Bill 198.

This is a very simple bill. It's not a very complex one. It's contained on a couple of pieces of paper. What it does is it allows a municipality the ability to pass zoning bylaws to lead to inclusionary housing and allows them the option of setting the percentage of affordable housing that might be built.

Some would say that municipalities already have that authority. I go back to my own time when I was the mayor of East York. Did we have that authority? I'm not sure. But we did have a policy that said that 10% of the apartment buildings that were going to be built in any large-scale development that wasn't for individual occupancy use had to be affordable. But I know that the developers, with their lawyers, were often very circumspect about our ability to enforce that. Although I do not remember any actually going before the Ontario Municipal Board, there were many statements that we could not enforce that policy.

I believe, in my heart of hearts, that this needs to be done, if only to end that argument, if only to state categorically for the Ontario Municipal Board and anyone else, any courts that might be involved, that yes, we, the province of Ontario, want to grant that right to municipalities, and that they have it so that when they set policies, as we had in East York, they are set on a firm foundation of law that cannot easily be challenged.

The second thing the bill does is it also allows for the approval of the plan of subdivision. This may not take place in most of the built-up cities-I'm thinking here about downtown Ottawa or Toronto or Hamilton-but certainly is a key factor in the areas that

surround them-in the case of the GTA, the rural parts of Ottawa or Hamilton-where there are still opportunities for plans of subdivision, where the subdivision will come in and where it is important to say to the developers who are building homes or apartments or condominiums in those plans of subdivision that a certain percentage must be affordable.

I applaud the writer of the bill. I applaud my colleague sitting next to me for what she has brought forward.

My own experience as a mayor was-and I told you that we had a 10% requirement. I remember the developers or the people who wanted to build condominium units, who wanted to build townhome developments, who wanted to build apartments, being very, very reluctant to allow what we wanted to go forward.

I remember, in fact, one particular case where the developer thought he was much smarter than I. He came forward with a plan. He wanted to build five apartment buildings. It was an ideal location on Eglinton Avenue for five apartment buildings. The council was favourably impressed with the design and everything else, and we were proceeding merrily on our way till it came to the meeting. He proposed to build the five apartment buildings in several stages. The first stage would involve two smaller towers, and then the next two, which were the larger towers, and then the last one. He said it was a project that was going to take approximately 10 years. We all applauded that-here were some new apartment units coming into East York, some better assessment for the municipality; all the things that one wants to see-until I asked him the very thorny question about our 10% policy: "Where were the 10% of the apartments going to be?" He looked red-faced because, in the end, the apartment building that was going to contain all of the 10% was the last building, the building he was unlikely ever to build, the last one to be done, 10 years down the road, if he made a profit on the first four.

I remember asking that question and turning to the planner, whose name was Mr. Tomascevic in those days, and asking him how he could have agreed to allow it all in the final building. He looked a little red-faced too, not realizing that the building might never be built and that we would end up having absolutely no affordable housing built in this unit.

I know for a fact that the buildings were never built. I don't know what happened to the developer, but we imposed that condition upon him. I think he felt a little red-faced in not wanting to go to the Ontario Municipal Board because he got everything he asked for, save and except that we wanted 10% in each of the buildings as they were being built to ensure that it happened. In the end, he did not build it.

This is just one of the key things that one has to look for and to understand that developers will not build affordable housing, which makes less profit or no profit at all, in the space of those buildings where they can charge higher amounts.

There is also the second issue of the reluctance of neighbours. I know, as a 13-year municipal politician, how reluctant neighbours are to have affordable housing sometimes in their neighbourhoods. I must state, though, that they were always reluctant before it's built and they usually looked ashamed and red-faced after it's built because, really, sometimes what it replaces-it's a whole lot better in the second instance than what it replaced. In any event, they're often reluctant. This will give the municipalities the power to set it by statute. You deal with it once. Anyone can come out to complain, but once it's there, it's as of right, and it will be very difficult for neighbours to complain about as-of-right zoning legislation to allow the poor to live amongst them.

**1400**

I also have to be a little bit critical of governments. Somebody asked me today how long I've been here in this Legislature, and this marks eight years and three days. I was elected nine days after 9/11, so I remember that very well.

**Hon. Kathleen O. Wynne:** Congratulations.

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Okay. I guess I'm one of the veterans of the House now, after eight years, but I remember the first two years-I was the housing critic-and going down to Quebec City when the first announcements were being made. I think some of the people who are witnessing this today went down to Quebec City to try to get all the provinces on board-and to see, right there in front of my eyes, a place like Nunavut actually sign up. They were only two years old; they were only a territory for two years on their own and they signed on the dotted line at Quebec City. Ontario, for two years, did not sign at all. We had no housing policy.

I watched as the new government came in, six years ago, and although I will state that there has been some action on this file, it has been excruciatingly slow and it need not be excruciatingly slow.

So today we have an opportunity, along with this bill, to empower municipalities-a combination of infrastructure funds, which seem to have started flowing both from the federal and provincial governments. We have an opportunity with the budget that's going to come forward this March, if the government members opposite are intent upon doing more for housing-I know there's a whole lot of discussion going on-if they're actually intent on building affordable housing. We have an opportunity to change the archaic laws around brownfield sites.

I specifically want to talk about one that is no longer in my riding but was, prior to redistribution. It's just west of Coxwell on Eastern Avenue, and it's a financial co-op that's trying to build a housing development on the land. They keep being rebuffed because the land down there, close to the lakeshore, was at one point industrial and it is considered brownfield. After years and years of constantly trying to get something built there, they're still going nowhere. I think that if we remove that barrier, there would be some decent and good housing for 40 or 50 families. That needs to be looked at too.

In conclusion, I'd just like to state that we have about 70,000 families in the Toronto area on the waiting list for affordable housing; 70,000 families that cannot be properly housed, and there's a lot more across the province of Ontario. I dare say it's probably double at least.

We have an increasing wait time for seniors. In my office, we tell people to come and apply for seniors' housing as soon as they turn 59 years of age so that hopefully, by the time that they're 70, they can get the kind of housing that they want. The wait times are enormous. We tell them to apply early and often and to spread out where they're going. We need to understand that as the population greys, we're going to need more and more seniors' housing, and it needs to be built quickly.

We need to look at the lack of supportive housing for those people with addictions and for those people with mental health issues. It needs to be built and it needs to be supportive, along with social workers and job seekers and others who can live in or be in close proximity to them to provide the services they need.

And last but not least-and I cannot leave this out-we need to look after our First Nations communities. Any of you who have travelled into First Nations communities, particularly in north and northwestern Ontario, will know the abysmal state of housing. Some might argue that this is a federal responsibility, but I would argue, as well as a federal responsibility, it is our responsibility. They are citizens of Ontario. We have an Ontario housing policy. They need to be included. There is no reason that people need to live 15 or 20 to a home, live in substandard conditions, live in towns with no roads or sewers, live in places with mould on the walls. The time has come for us to include First Nations communities in all of the housing and to give them, perhaps-and I hope this might happen in committee-the same authorities that we would grant to any city in terms of how it's built, where it's built and who is included.

So I would like to conclude with that and just say that I support Bill 198. It's an idea whose time has come, and I commend my colleague the member from Parkdale for bringing it forward.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Khalil Ramal:** I'm pleased to stand and comment on Bill 198, An Act to amend the Planning Act with respect to inclusionary housing, introduced by the member from Parkdale-High Park, which seeks to amend section 34 to allow municipalities to rezone and pass rezoning; to amend section 37.1 to specify the percentage; and also to amend section 51 to put conditions on approvals to specify the percentage of affordable units.

I want to thank the member from Parkdale-High Park for bringing such an important issue to this House to be discussed. No doubt about it: It has been a concern for all the people across the province of Ontario, especially our government since we got elected in 2003. As the member from Parkdale-High Park knows very well, up till 2003,

affordable homes were out of the question in the past government, so when we came, we were trying to introduce it step by step.

I want to thank our government for investing heavily in affordable homes. To date, we've invested more than \$1.2 billion to reconstruct and refurbish many homes we have across the province of Ontario. Even though I'm talking about refurbishing almost 76,000 homes and trying to build 4,500 new homes, I still think it's not going to solve the problem across Ontario. I know that in my riding of London-Fanshawe we have almost 4,000 people on the waiting list. So people are looking forward to seeing some improvements on this front.

I want to congratulate my colleague and seatmate, the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, for his comments on this file. I know he's working with the minister, Jim Watson, to conduct a study across the province of Ontario to seek the opinion of the people of Ontario on this file, how we can tackle it and how we can deal with it. I know it's huge. As the member from Beaches-East York said, Toronto has almost 72,000 people on the waiting list.

The investment of \$1.2 billion is a great investment. It's an incredible investment in the history of this province. But we still need more investment to continue, and also partners-different community leaders like Habitat for Humanity, churches, mosques, synagogues, temples, whomever-who work in that regard to help us, as a community, as a government, as a province, to deal with this issue.

I think that adjustment to the Planning Act might help when we are trying to convince developers and municipalities and many different communities across the province of Ontario to include affordable homes in their planning, whether it's 10% or 5% or whatever percentage they agree on. I think it's a very important step toward putting all the pieces together.

I want to congratulate the member for Parkdale-High Park. Also, like my colleague and seatmate, I'm going to support the bill. I think it's an important step toward reforming the Planning Act and the Municipal Act to allow municipalities some kind of free movement to deal with this issue. I know that many of our colleagues, members in this place, have served as municipal councillors. Some of them were mayors, like the member from Beaches-East York and my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. All these talented people who serve in this place can offer a solution to this crucial problem we are facing in the province of Ontario.

It's sad when you drive, whether in Toronto or in any big city, and see people sleeping on the street. I think it's our obligation and duty as citizens of this province, as the people elected to serve all people-weak, rich, poor, vulnerable-to apply the kind of support they need. It's our responsibility, as elected officials, to create infrastructure to house those people who sleep on the street with no way to manage their daily lives. So I think it's an important step.

As my colleague the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing said, the ministry at the present time is conducting studies across the province of Ontario, and part of those studies is to see whether inclusionary housing is an important step or not. Hopefully, as a result of the study, it is supported by the people of Ontario and we can also proceed with it and go further to addressing this important issue.

**1410**

I had the chance to attend a round-table meeting in London in the presence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and I listened to many different stakeholders who came to talk to the minister and to see how he's going to deal with this issue, and especially about our investment. As you know, we did round one and we have round two and round three, and many, many people came and placed submissions to be able to build affordable homes. I see the content and the people and the stakeholders, but as I mentioned at the beginning, it's a deep problem in the province of Ontario that's going to take us years and years in order to deal with it totally. I think we are taking the right step in the right direction in order to address this issue.

This bill, I think, would be a complementary bill to allow municipalities to participate in the solution in conjunction with the provincial government and the federal government. But still, I believe strongly that it should be a national strategy to deal with affordable homes across the province of Ontario and across the nation because this is a problem not concerned just with municipalities or with provinces; it concerns every citizen who lives in Canada. I think our obligation and duty is to continue pursuing all the avenues and whatever we can to solve that issue.

I want to congratulate the member from Parkdale-High Park, and I'm going to support the bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Further debate?

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** I'm pleased to rise and speak for a little bit on this Bill 198, introduced by the member from Parkdale-High Park, to make it more expedient to create more public housing or housing for people of low incomes who need help to find accommodations.

I guess I support the principle. Her presentation was very good to the extent that this is just a very small piece of the puzzle and it will not have a major impact on the shortage of housing. I think it has an opportunity to help, but it's just a small part. The reason I say that is, I think it's very important to look at what the municipalities can do today. It relates more to the areas that I represent in rural and small-town Ontario as opposed to downtown Toronto because it goes more to the subdivisions. We have very little development of great amounts of housing on anything but greenfield development.

When a municipality gets an application for a plan of subdivision, there are a number of things that they can ask for in that plan of subdivision, including the number of multiple family units they want on the site. So they can have all single-family residences and then some rental units as part of it. Multi-residential: They can demand that that be in there. They can also demand 20% of the land area for parkland, but what happens is they put that in, and that's their given; they can do that in the plan of subdivision. But then, as they negotiate the plan of subdivision, because it's their rule that allows them to do that, they can barter it away for things that the municipality wants: "We want slightly more contributions toward the infrastructure for this development as opposed to the parkland." Or they can negotiate the value of that parkland. The act says that it must be 20% of the price of the land before development, on the day of approval. So they say, "Okay, so we can't charge you the developable price-just the farmland price. Then just give us the land and then we will sell it, after the subdivision is built, for its true value." I think we need to be careful that we don't get in a situation where it just gives more tools to bargain with as opposed to actually doing what needs to be done.

The other thing that I really would like to touch on is that we talk-and this is in every case-about affordable housing and building affordable housing. Where I come from, the people at the lumberyard never ask what type of housing the lumber is for. The price to build is exactly the same regardless of what you're going to use the house for. What is different is somebody putting in money to subsidize or to help reduce the cost of the building so the rent that's required to cover the cost of the infrastructure can be lower. That, in most cases, of course, is not based on the person's ability to pay but the amount that it costs to build the infrastructure that they're renting. So I think it becomes very important that the government makes sure-in this case the member said that there was no cost to government because the developer would pay that.

*Interjection.*

**Mr. Ernie Hardeman:** Yes, well, somebody has to pay it. So to me, rather than negotiate how much the developer can make on it, it makes more sense that the municipality look at having the right type of housing built or that governments look at having the right type of housing built and then subsidize the people who have to pay the rent and who can't pay the rent. Rather than owning the bricks and mortar, the answer is to help people pay the bills so that they can live in a quality home and have a roof over their head and a place to raise their families. I just caution that we look at that, that we're not getting into it further than we really want to be and in fact giving municipalities powers that in the end are not going to help the people that we're targeting to help.

In my community, we have a number of public housing units being built, with all the efforts from the provincial government and with the federal government money going in. None of those are in residential areas, but they are all being built based on the money coming in going to help cover the infrastructure cost of the units which are going to be rented for less than the going rate for the rest of the units. That will be inclusionary, because in fact most of the units in the development are going to be rented at the full rent, and the subsidized units are those that the tax dollars help subsidize, which they

have to do for the next 25 or 30 years. By then, they will need some remodelling or something, and I suppose we can then put another deal in place.

But I think putting the money in to help people pay the rent is likely going to work better for us than trying to own the buildings, whether it's the municipality or the government. Governments are never good managers of property. Governments are there to help people in need, but don't help the people who necessarily own the property and who have to provide these facilities for us.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the time, and I want to commend the member for bringing this forward. We will be supporting the bill as it comes forward.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** Thank you.

Ms. DiNovo, you have up to two minutes for your response.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Thank you to the members from Northumberland-Quinte West, Parry Sound-Muskoka, Beaches-East York, London-Fanshawe, and, finally, my good friend from Oxford.

I just wanted to mention that the member from Parry Sound-Muskoka emphasized a very critical point, and that is that this "allows" municipalities-it does not demand; it does not make municipalities do anything. It simply clears the way so that they can do something. That's all we're trying to do. That's an essential piece that needs to be done so that they are able to move forward.

Certainly dollars, some inclusive zoning-municipalities have done dollars in lieu of units, so that answers, I think, the member from Oxford's concerns. And there are many, many ways of doing inclusionary zoning, as many as there are municipalities, and so tailoring that kind of bylaw production is, of course, really critical. I have utter confidence in our municipalities, particularly our larger ones, that they will do everything to the utmost to try to produce affordable housing, which we desperately need. Unfortunately, we're worst in the number of provinces in investing in it, and this might get us a little way towards first.

*Interjection.*

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Another two minutes?

**Mr. Michael Prue:** Yes.

**Ms. Cheri DiNovo:** Oh, that's magic, fabulous, because I did want to answer the member from London-Fanshawe on a couple of issues. I mean, really what I'm trying to do here, folks, in terms of affordable housing, among other things, is to get the cabinet to give more money to our Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. I think his budget should be a lot bigger. Unfortunately, in the 2009 budget, the budget for housing was

cut; it wasn't increased. Per capita, we put \$64 towards housing, whereas, for example, the provincial average is \$115. What that means is that these costs are still downloaded to the city in a way that really should be reversed. We need to help our cities. The cities are bearing the brunt of this. We need to step up to the plate both in terms of actual dollars flowing from the province and also in terms of the legislation that we pass here today. So I would simply caution the member from London-Fanshawe that there is, in fact, more that we could do in actual, real dollar terms as well as inclusionary zoning.

But inclusionary zoning is the order of the day. I'm delighted that so many people support this bill. I'm hoping that it will go to committee and get full committee hearings, because it's important. Although it's a small piece of the puzzle, in one year alone-let's say it was 10% across Ontario-it would have produced 4,000 units of housing; the government has produced about 16,000 units of affordable housing in six years. So this would produce, in one year, a quarter of what we've had in six years. So although it's small-true enough-it's still a substantial chunk of housing units if it was really brought in in every municipality. It does have a real possibility of changing the affordable housing scheme and outlook in Ontario.

**1420**

Thank you for supporting this. I look forward to your input on committee, and I again thank all of those housing advocates across Ontario who've really been the people on the ground, working hard to make this pass.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Jim Wilson):** This concludes the time for this ballot item. For those watching at home and those in the galleries today, we'll vote on this item in about 100 minutes.