Orchard Heights
Homeowners' Association

November 29, 2023

Mississauga City Council
Attn: Development Assistant c/o Planning and Building Department
6th Floor 300 City Centre Drive
Mississauga, ON
L5B 3C1

**Regarding: Removal of Exclusionary Zoning for Residential Communities including Four Plexes**

To: Councillor Dasko Ward 1, Councillors of remaining wards, and the Office of the Mayor of Mississauga

This submission is to advise that the Orchard Heights Homeowners' Association (OHHA) is opposed to the changes that have been made under Bill 23 and the proposed change to include four plexes in the removal of exclusionary zoning in residential communities.

We believe that despite provincial interference in the City's Official Plan, and the imposed goal of building 120,000 new residential units over the next ten years, municipal leaders have options that can preserve and protect the type of lifestyle offered by detached single family residential communities.

**The presentation made to City Council on November 29, 2023 by Tonya Elmazi outlining our concerns follows.**

Good Evening

My name is Tonya Elmazi and I am proud to be representing the Orchard Heights Homeowners' Association as president. Orchard Heights is a quiet, peaceful residential community with engaged and active residents. It's a special place to call home, and that's not by accident. We care about the type of lifestyle we enjoy here and preserving the character of this community. It's why people choose to live here.

The issues facing us are complex and is impossible to address in a five-minute presentation, but I'll do my best. This evening I will focus on three key areas of concern in relation to the removal of exclusionary zoning in residential communities and the inclusion of four plexes as part of this change.

**First Area of Concern - A disjointed scattergun approach from all levels of government**
Residents want collaboration, vision, and well researched, data driven policies from our leaders at all levels of government to address this problem. Here's what we've experienced to date:

- Federal and provincial governments overstepping jurisdictional boundaries signalling a lack of trust – examples include:
    - Federal gov't bypassing provinces by offering a $120M housing accelerator fund to cities to encourage initiatives that increase housing supply --and noting that allowing four units as-of-right would enhance chances for funding approval
    - Provincial Bill 23 imposing policies on cities that dictate how they must achieve the provincial imposed housing targets with no regard to the city's vision and expertise

- Provincial MZO's that override the expertise of city planners and the city's official plans – an example - Lakeview Village – a well thought through plan - a decade in the making --- and with the stroke of a pen an EMZO doubled the density with no plan for increased infrastructure, transportation and community services

- Bill 23 -- has been widely criticized as ill-conceived and unlikely to achieve its 1.5 million new homes target in ten years. Some of the challenges cited by critics:
    - supply chain issues
    - shortage of skilled workers
    - high carrying costs
    - insufficient consideration for infrastructure, transportation, and city services requirements
    - does not address the affordability issue - increased supply won't help if people cannot afford to buy or rent.

Significant, profound change to our communities has been forced on the public with minimal to no consultation – yet we are asked to pay the bill through increased municipal taxes. This begs the question, if our leaders at all levels of government don't trust each other, then how can they ask the voting public to trust them?

**Second Area of Concern – Zoning changes to residential communities marks the beginning of the end of a chosen lifestyle for thousands of residents.**

As municipalities work on changing their Official Plans and coming to terms with the provisions and budget impact of Bill 23, they're also now being incentivized by the federal government's accelerator fund to change their Official Plan to include four plexes. Our quiet, suburban communities **matter** and are **highly valued** by families in all stages of life. These changes mean:

- The door is now opened to every single-family residential community to allow the building or conversion of homes into Additional Residential Units– with no requirement for public consultation, or consideration to the character of the community
- Steady erosion of a way of life as neighbourhoods begin to see – carparks on front lawns, laneways to garages in backyards
- Increased traffic, increased crime, and infrastructure strain.

Are all municipalities in Ontario being subjected to these overriding decisions by the province or is Mississauga being pressured to do more with less space?
We invested in homes in neighbourhoods that provide a lifestyle these types of communities offer. Will quiet communities on the outskirts of urban cities become a thing of the past?

**Third Area of Concern – Have all other options been explored? Do we need to remove exclusionary zoning for single family residential communities?**

I remember at the council meeting when the EMZO was about to occur on the Lakeview Village development, Mayor Crombie made a comment that inspired confidence. She made it clear that Mississauga already had a well thought out plan to reach their mandated target --- and provincial overrides using MZO's was not necessary to achieve that goal.

So, why do we need to include four-plexes, if we had a plan in place that did not include them? Why does the federal and provincial governments need to impose policy on municipal leaders who know and understand their constituent's needs? Why such a broad and permanent change to single family dwelling communities when other more viable alternatives are available?

In the spirit of transparency and a true desire to understand these changes, we ask if the following was considered in the plan to achieve 120,000 new residential units:

- How many residential units have already been approved where build has not yet begun? Why is there no deadline to begin and complete builds and penalties if deadlines are not met?
- How many residential unit applications are under review with high potential for approval?
- Has a study been done on the projected number of homes owned by baby boomers that will enter the market over the next 10 years when they move to assisted living homes or reach life expectancy?
- What other high-density areas near transit hubs could be considered as preferred development opportunities and how many units would that represent?

We hope you will answer these questions. It would be helpful for all of us to understand the plan and the progress, by developing a graphic that outlines how far we may already be towards the 120,000 units target.

And, **if** all other alternatives have been explored and zoning changes to residential communities are necessary, then ensure some controls are still in place. Consider ideas like:

- Limiting the number of ARUs within each community to preserve it's character
- Parking is limited to existing driveways or only allowing front yard parking pads if hidden from street view
- Infrastructure, transportation and public services must have a realistic funded plan prior to approval of applications.

In conclusion, I would like to declare on behalf of the members of the Orchard Heights Homeowners' Association, that preserving the character and nature of residential communities like ours **matters to us greatly.** Before these zoning changes are imposed on us -- changes that will impact our quality of life and our taxes -- we want to see that all other alternatives have been explored and are included in the plan.

We urge you to hear our concerns and act on our ideas. We have asked this presentation is on record and sent to all councillors and the Mayor's office. Thank you for your time this evening.

Regards,
Tonya Elmazi
President – Orchard Heights Homeowners' Association