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Purpose of workshop

- Look at ways to build a Comprehensive Land Needs Methodology (CLNM) (i.e. “best practices”)
- Assessing how the provisions in the Province’s proposed methodology relate to best practices
- Discussing economic and market impacts resulting from the more limited scope of the Province’s methodology
- Discussing ways to make the Province’s proposed methodology more cognizance of economic and market realities, minimize undesirable negative impacts and still achieve Growth Plan objectives
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“It does not take an economist to realize that keeping housing demand and supply in reasonable balance is optimal. Achieving a better balance is possible with the development and maintenance of a sound land monitoring system.”

“Too little containment encourages sprawl and too much containment causes land and housing price inflation.”

Components of CLNM the same whether the purpose of land needs analysis is:

- To ensure serviced sites available when needed in sufficient quality to meet market demand and keep real estate affordable and economy growing

- To achieve policy objectives like intensification, encourage transit usage, reduce sprawl

- A combination of the two previous objectives
Components of a land needs analysis same regardless of purpose

- New housing demand forecast
- Land supply analysis
- Infrastructure analysis
- Relate demand to serviced land supply
- Allowance for contingencies – infrastructure delays, competition, demand uncertainty, unavailability of lands
- Quantify need for more land (greenfield, built-up areas)
- Regular monitoring and updating mechanism to ensure serviced sites available on a timely basis to meet demand
Common features of a land needs analysis

- Various timelines: short-term, medium-term and long-term
- Marketable buildable land (sites) in built-up urban areas and greenfields
- Servicing plans synchronized with land availability (concurrency)
- Demand disaggregated (housing by unit type, employment by sector/type)
- Alternative future market demand scenarios (useful but not necessary)

Additional feature of a policy-focused land needs analysis

- A business-as-usual scenario (BAUS) – also called market-based or current trends scenario
- Policy-focused scenario(s)
Why a business-as-usual base scenario in a policy-focused land needs analysis?

- To document what policies are intended to achieve over and above BAUS scenario
- To facilitate analysis of unintended consequences
- To mitigate undesirable unintended consequences
Best practices: forecasting BAUS regional/sub-regional housing demand

GTAH Forecast Method

POPULATION

Fertility ↔ BIRTHS ↔ DEATHS ↔ Mortality

NATURAL INCREASE ↔ NET MIGRATION ↔ Immigration Policy

GTAH POPULATION FORECAST

Age Structure & Headship Rates ↔

GTAH HOUSEHOLD FORECAST

Occupancy Patterns ↔

UNIT TYPE PROJECTIONS

SINGLES ↔ SEMIS ↔ ROWS ↔ APTS.

Regional & Local Share ↔ Regional & Local Share ↔ Regional & Local Share

Average HH Size ↔ REGIONAL & LOCAL POPULATION

Source: Hemson, 2005.
Best practices: forecasting BAUS regional/ sub-regional employment growth

GTAH Forecast Method

Source: Hemson, 2005.
### Average Annual Growth by Type of Unit, Current Trends

Scenario - GTAH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
<th>Singles</th>
<th>Semis</th>
<th>Rows</th>
<th>Apts</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ground-Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2021</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2031</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Compact Less Current Trends (Units)

| 2001-2011 | (100) | (600) | (500) | 700  | (500) | (1200) |
| 2011-2021 | (3300) | 1000  | 0     | 2500 | 200   | (2300) |
| 2021-2031 | (4200) | 1200  | 1700  | 2100 | 800   | (1300) |

#### More Compact Less Current Trends (Units)

| 2001-2011 | (100) | 0     | (500) | 600  | 0     | (600) |
| 2011-2021 | (3700) | 600   | 200   | 3000 | 100   | (2900) |
| 2021-2031 | (10500)| 600   | 2200  | 7800 | 100   | (7700) |

Source: Hemson, 2005.
Hemson (2005) forecasts of BAUS and policy scenarios: regional employment by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Major Office</th>
<th>Population Related</th>
<th>Employment Land</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Distribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2021</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2031</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |                |                    |                |       |
| **Compact Less Current Trends (Jobs)** |                |                    |                |       |
| 2001-2011      | (100)         | (100)              | 0              | (200) |
| 2011-2021      | 200           | 200                | 0              | 400   |
| 2021-2031      | (100)         | (200)              | 0              | (300) |

|                |                |                    |                |       |
| **More Compact Less Current Trends (Jobs)** |                |                    |                |       |
| 2001-2011      | 0             | 100                | 100            | 200   |
| 2011-2021      | (100)         | 0                  | (100)          | (200) |
| 2021-2031      | 100           | (100)              | 0              | 0     |

Source: Hemson, 2005.
Land supply – general

- Greenfield lands without infrastructure cannot be built on (concurrency)
- Building in build-up areas often requires infrastructure improvements
- Types of housing built on greenfields vs. built-up areas typically differ:
  - Greenfields – mostly singles, semis, and townhouses – some apartments
  - Built-up areas – mostly apartments – some townhouses
- Not all serviced sites financially viable for development (especially in built-up areas)
- Buildable supply should be monitored and replenished regularly to prevent shortages
Conventional tabulation of vacant land supply by planning status and unit types – missing: availability and timing of infrastructure by planning status

Table 2
York Region designated residential unit supply by planning status as of mid-year 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singles</th>
<th>Semis</th>
<th>Rows</th>
<th>Apartments</th>
<th>All types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered¹</td>
<td>5,080</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>7,960</td>
<td>15,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Approved²</td>
<td>12,790</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>5,580</td>
<td>7,330</td>
<td>26,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>12,220</td>
<td>33,610</td>
<td>53,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Application³</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>20,510</td>
<td>39,490</td>
<td>91,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Designated Supply</td>
<td>52,100</td>
<td>5,970</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>88,390</td>
<td>187,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Site Plans with executed agreements have been classified as registered
2. Site Plans that have been endorsed or approved in principle have been classified as draft approved
3. No application apartments include estimates for secondary plan areas and the Regional Centres only and does not reflect the Region's full infill and intensification potential.
4. Figures are rounded to the nearest ten

Land supply – built-up areas

- Not just a matter of potential sites for redevelopment or infill
- Need to consider status of planning permissions:
  - “Shovel ready”
  - In rezoning process
  - In OPA process
  - No application
- Also marketability of sites for redevelopment
Built-up areas – assessing redevelopment potential (marketability)

- “Research has shown that neighbourhoods’ residential property redevelopment potential can be projected through analysis of ratios of property value to the capital improved value (land value plus the value of buildings) and mapped for spatial analysis.” (City of Edmonton study)

- “In practice, however, redevelopment potential has, up to now, been gauged largely by using data on land values and assessment improvements.” (Knapp)

- “For parcels less than one acre, Metro [Portland] compared improvement values to the improvement values of surrounding properties. Metro considered properties redevelopable if the improvement value of the parcel was 50 to 70% of the mean improvement value of surrounding values.” (Knapp)
Built-up areas – assessing intensification potential – sage advice from the past

- Establish target for the portion of new housing need that will be met through intensification
- To ensure the target is reasonable estimate the number of units likely to be created by considering:
  - Technical feasibility factors (site size, configuration, ownership pattern)
  - Market factors (range and affordability of housing, household size vs smaller unit size, availability of greenfield housing, consumer willing to move into existing neighbourhoods)
  - Planning/political factors (OP policies, commitment to infrastructure, NIMBYISM, DCs/fees)
- If analysis concludes target unlikely to be met then municipalities should consider measures to increase intensification like:
  - Creating a more favourable planning environment
  - Reducing cost of building new homes in existing built-up areas
- Monitor to make sure on track – if not, consider additional measures

Estimating the years’ supply of residential lands by broad unit type

Figure 1:
Years’ Supply of Short-Term Land by Type of Housing Unit, City of Hamilton, 2006-2015

Assessing the adequacy of the supply of land – in this case, the short-term supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Rating of Adequacy</th>
<th>Years’ Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singles/Semis</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>4.0 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>5.8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ground-Related</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>4.7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>5.9 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Market Contingency Factor

“Finally, events not captured by a household projection can affect the supply of and demand for additional housing. Examples include:

- Swings in the housing market could cause temporary decreases (or increases) in the supply of new housing outside the average trend reflected in the projections.

- Changes in the economy and lifestyles could produce a greater (or lesser) demand for housing than projected using constant household headship rates.

- Landowners might be unwilling or unable to develop their lands in accordance with the schedule assumed for purposes of the official plan.

It may be prudent in certain circumstances to include a cushion in the projection of housing need to offset the risk of shortages developing from unanticipated events. This can be referred to as a ‘market contingency factor.’”

“Many factors can arise that may lead to either greater or lesser need for housing than is projected. Therefore, the projections and affordability analysis should be monitored on a regular basis to ensure that plans for future growth continue to meet the goals of the Housing Policies.

In particular, the short-term projection of need must be monitored against the supply of draft-approved and registered land. If housing production significantly exceeds the projected volume of need in one or more of the dwelling types and/or if the supply of draft-approved or registered land is not maintained at three years supply, shortages could occur which would result in rising prices and deterioration in affordability.”

1.4 Housing

“1.4.1 To provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing types and densities required to meet projected requirements of current and future residents of the regional market area, planning authorities shall:

a) Maintain at all times the ability to accommodate residential growth for a minimum of 10 years through residential intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, lands which are designated and available for residential development; and

b) Maintain at all times where new development is to occur, land with servicing capacity sufficient to provide at least a three-year supply of residential units available through lands suitably zoned to facilitate residential intensification and redevelopment, and land in draft approved and registered plans.”
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Overview

- A policy-driven approach – an exercise in arithmetic not forecasting
- Unrealistic on housing market front:
  - Unit types don’t matter
  - Current and future market context doesn’t matter
- More realistic on employment front:
  - Types of employment matter
  - Current and future market context matters
- Oriented to meeting longer-term land needs to achieve policy goals – not the short- and medium-term needs for serviced sites to be available to accommodate expected demands in the real estate marketplaces
• No guidance on the need for concurrency of infrastructure and land availability planning in all time periods

• No recognition of the differing roles of built-up areas and greenfields in providing new housing by unit type

• No recognition given to the potential availability of redevelopment sites and the timing of their actual availability and marketability for new housing

• No ongoing monitoring and replenishing land supply provisions

• No consideration of uncertainty – need for contingency allowances

• Needlessly complicated by moving to 2016 base while Growth Plan forecasts based on 2011 Census – and by not providing municipalities with their municipal-wide forecasts per Hemson (2012/13)
A policy-driven approach – an exercise in arithmetic not forecasting

Proposed Methodology (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step R1</th>
<th>Establish Population Growth by Planning Period</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step R2</td>
<td>Determine Total Number of Housing Units Needed to Accommodate Population Growth in Each Planning Period</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step R3</td>
<td>Determine Allocation of Housing Units by Policy Area and Planning Period</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step R4</td>
<td>Determine Population of Policy Areas</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step R5</td>
<td>Determine Policy-based Capacity of Community Areas to Accommodate Planned Growth</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step R6</td>
<td>Determine Community Area Land Need in Designated Greenfield Area</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“Support a range and mix of housing options, including second units and affordable housing, to serve all sizes, incomes and ages of households” (Section 1.2.1 Guiding Principles)

“Identifying a diverse range and mix of housing options and densities, including second units and affordable housing to meet projected needs of current and future residents.” (Policy 2.2.6)

Definition of Complete Communities: “Places such as mixed-use neighbourhoods or other areas within cities, towns, and settlement areas that offer and support … a full range of housing…” (p. 69)

“Support diversification of the total range and mix of housing options in delineated built-up areas to the horizon of this Plan, while considering anticipated demand” (Policy 2.2.2 5.f)
Yet the Proposed Methodology ignores housing types when considering residential growth by policy area and planning period.

Figure 3: Residential growth by policy area and planning period

In contrast, four land-use based categories of employment are recognized

• Major office employment – jobs in free-standing office buildings of 20,000 sq. ft. or more
• Population-related employment – jobs that primarily serve a resident population
• Employment land employment – jobs accommodated primarily in industrial-type buildings
• Rural-based employment – jobs dispersed throughout rural areas
In contrast, four land-use based categories of employment are recognized cont’d…

**Figure 7: Employment by land-use based categories**

- **Total Employment in Municipality in Planning Horizon (2041)**
  - Other Rural-Based
  - Population-Related
  - Employment Land Employment
  - Major Office

Unlike housing and total employment, growth by type of job is to considered through a market prism

“The establishment of the growth shares by type in the analysis is an important part of the analysis that will be completed as part of the municipal comprehensive review. These shares embody many aspects of anticipated economic change in the GGH and locally as well municipal expectations for economic development and how local expectations relate to similar expectations in the region as further described Explanation Box 10.” (p. 76)

“However, there is not that much new office space to be accommodated in most communities and it is important for municipalities to be realistic about the potential to attract major office growth.” (pp. 77-78)

“It is important that these shares recognize reasonable expectations for growth in the community. Where a municipality may have some aspirational economic development goals, these should not supersede an on-the-ground understanding of the nature of recent and expected growth.” (p. 81)

“An approach to land needs assessment driven primarily by historic-based assumptions about market demand for specific types of housing, and how much land it might require, would likely be more land consumptive and not effectively implement the policies of the Growth Plan, 2017.” (p. 16)

“It is the Province’s intent that, by basing the land needs assessment on meeting the targets in the Growth Plan, municipalities will plan to accommodate forecasted population growth differently than in the past. There will be increasing proportions of people living in denser housing forms (like townhouses, row houses and apartments, including larger family sized apartments). This is a necessary shift in order to achieve key policy objectives of the Growth Plan.” (p. 16)
“The first step in assessing community area land need will be to identify the policy-based capacity to accommodate forecasted growth in the existing designated greenfield area in the upper- or single-tier municipality.” (p. 59)

“The gross developable land area will be determined through municipal land supply information. All designated greenfield area lands must be included with the exception of those that meet the criteria specified in policy 2.2.7.3 of the Growth Plan, which specifies how to measure the minimum density target, including allowable net outs.” (p. 59)

“Depending on municipal circumstances, this simple subtraction of capacity from the long term need (expressed as population and employment), could potentially result in one of two scenarios.” (p. 62)
“It is important to optimize the use of the existing urban land supply as well as the existing building and housing stock in order to avoid over designating land for urban development. In recognition of this, the Growth Plan places an emphasis on optimizing the use of the existing land supply and establishes an intensification first approach to development and community building, one which requires municipalities to first demonstrate that they are optimizing existing urban land, infrastructure and public service facilities, before they expand the urban area to accommodate population and employment growth.” (p. 2)

“The housing forecast by unit type is then distributed to the upper- and single-tier municipalities within the GGH based on historical patterns, the effects of planning policies, the land available to support development, and the capacity (environmental and infrastructure) of each municipality to accommodate the forecast growth.”

“As well as considering recent housing market trends within the Sub-Forecast Areas, the distribution method accounts for the effect of planning policies – primarily ‘Growth Plan’ policies that seek to encourage higher density housing forms and intensification – on the future housing mix.”

Proposed Methodology ignores all the background forecasts done by Hemson 2012/2013 yet instructs municipalities to use total population and employment forecast by Hemson for 2041.

The Macroeconomic Consequences of Inadequate Land Needs Assessment
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Nothing is likely to change

GTA Household Growth versus New Construction by Housing Type (Average Annual Change in Units, 2011 to 2016)

Source: CUR based on data from Statistics Canada, Hemson, CMHC and The Ontario Growth Plan.
Surprise was in income – not household growth

Change in Tax Filing Economic Families and Single Households between 2011 and 2015, 000's

Source: CUR based on Statistics Canada Taxfiler Data
Textbook symptoms

- Volatile/high land and home prices
  - Shortages and speculation can be tied to land-use policy
- High household debt/wealth transfers
- Uncompetitive economy
- Stunt the filtering process – make it harder to provide housing to low/medium income households
- Introduce a new layer of complexity. Make it harder to implement municipal urban planning objectives (fitting an oversized square into a small sized circle)
Impact on home prices: What economic theory tells us

Price of Housing

Quantity Supplied

D
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Q
Impact on home prices: What economic theory tells us cont’d…

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{Price of Housing/Land} & \text{Quantity Supplied} \\
\hline
P_1 & Q_1 \\
P_2 & Q_2 \\
\end{array}
\]
Impact on home prices: What economic theory tells us cont’d…

Price of Housing vs Quantity Supplied

- S1: Supply Curve
- S2: Supply Curve
- D1: Demand Curve
- D2: Demand Curve

Price Points:
- P1
- P2
- P3

Quantity Points:
- Q1
- Q2
Impact on home prices: What economic theory tells us cont’d…
What the literature tells us

- Paul Cheshire on land restrictions in the United Kingdom:
  - “It is nothing to do with foreign speculators but decades of planning policies that constrain the supply of houses and land and turn them into something like gold or artworks” (Cheshire 2014)

- New Zealand Experience:
  - “Supply has not met demand: The resulting scarcity has driven a protracted land and house price spiral that has been socially and economically harmful.” (pg. 3)
  - Land-use planning accounted for 56% of rise in home price

- CMHC on Toronto:
  - Elasticity of supply to home prices lowest in Vancouver and Toronto
  - Real home prices rose 40% between 2010 and 2016: 60% of which is attributable to geography and regulation.
New Zealand’s experience with land-use planning

Residential land

New Zealand’s experience with land-use planning cont’d…

**Figure 1** Land use regulation could cost 56 percent of an Auckland home

2015 estimates of the cost of land use regulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Land use regulation impact</th>
<th>Pre-development land value</th>
<th>Construction costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>$949,429</td>
<td>$787,994</td>
<td>$633,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenstown</td>
<td>$552,578</td>
<td>$524,605</td>
<td>$464,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>$464,053</td>
<td>$345,105</td>
<td>$15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauranga</td>
<td>$633,151</td>
<td>$524,605</td>
<td>$464,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>$552,578</td>
<td>$524,605</td>
<td>$464,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>$552,578</td>
<td>$524,605</td>
<td>$464,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmerston North</td>
<td>$345,105</td>
<td>$524,605</td>
<td>$464,053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Land use regulation impact**
- **Pre-development land value**
- **Construction costs**
Figure 1:
Real land and house price indices

Note: House and land data for war years are interpolated.
GTA’s experience with land-use planning

GTA Single Detached Market, Indexed at 2005=1

Source: CUR based on data from MCAP
Text book symptoms cont’d…

- Volatile/high land and home prices
  - Shortages and speculation can be tied to land-use planning policy

- High household debt/wealth transfers
- Uncompetitive economy
- Stunt the filtering process – make it harder to provide housing to low/medium income households
- Introduce a new layer of complexity. Make it harder to implement municipal urban planning objectives (fitting an oversized square into a small sized circle)
Do the benefits outweigh the costs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>% change, Unless Otherwise Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Home Prices (GTA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singles</td>
<td>362,938</td>
<td>936,625</td>
<td>158.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semis</td>
<td>298,625</td>
<td>739,750</td>
<td>147.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhomes</td>
<td>254,250</td>
<td>617,700</td>
<td>142.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>214,375</td>
<td>448,444</td>
<td>109.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rents (GTA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 1 bedroom</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 2 bedroom</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GDP (Economic Activity)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>471,080</td>
<td>531,940</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Canada</td>
<td>768,229</td>
<td>881,316</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Value of New Mortgage Loans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>401,728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Average</td>
<td>271,895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some Growth Plan Metrics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of households who's main mode of transportation is car, van or truck in the GGH</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-2 basis point change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Mix in the GGH (Apartment starts as a % of total)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17 basis point change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households living in ground related housing (GTA)</td>
<td>1,042,940</td>
<td>1,206,765</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households living in apartments (GTA)</td>
<td>757,820</td>
<td>928,580</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Ontario)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>-18.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CUR Estimates based on data from CMHC/Equifax, Statistics Canada, CREA, Environment Canada
Making the Proposed Methodology More Cognizance of Economic and Market Realities and Still Achieve Growth Plan Objectives
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Introducing more economic and market reality

- Incorporate housing types into the residential land needs analysis
- Recognize the differing new housing mixes - built-up areas vs. greenfields
- Bring land supply into the needs framework – short, medium and longer term
- Cross tab land supply by planning status with infrastructure by timing
- Introduce criteria of availability and marketability into intensification land supply
- Institute ongoing monitoring and updating procedures for short- and medium-term land needs and mechanisms for countering pending shortages
Incorporating housing types into the needs analysis

Conventional (CMHC/Statistics Canada/Hemson (2005) and Hemson (2012)):

- Single-detached
- Semi-detached
- Row (townhouse)
- Apartment and other (includes stacked townhouses)

Growth Plan requisites

- Apartments split into more categories (e.g. Census of Canada):
  - Less than 5 storeys
  - 5+ storeys (perhaps 5-9, 10+)
- Ground-related: singles + semis + townhouses
Differing housing mixes – built-up areas and greenfields

- Forecast total demand for new housing by unit type (policy-focused scenario)
- Forecast shares of total demand for unit types anticipated to be built in the built-up area (subject to availability and marketability criteria – see below)
- Residual is the demand by unit type needed to be satisfied on greenfield lands
Ensuring supply of serviced sites available to meet demand by unit type

- **For greenfields:**
  - Inventory of approved lands (registered, draft approved) serviced or readily serviceable, other lands in approval process (with concomitant servicing) plus longer-term lands
  - PPS – at least 3 years continuous supply of short term land and at least 10-year continuous supply of medium-term land

- **For intensification lands:**
  - Approvals in place when needed
  - Availability and marketability is key here (assumptions/criteria about take-up)
Annual monitoring and updating of serviced residential land supply availability

- Focusing on the requirements of PPS Policies 1.4 – at least continuous 3-year and 10-year supplies of land by unit type (unencumbered with 2017 Growth Plan caveat re: complete communities)

- GTHA wide reporting by municipality modelled on the land inventory reports commissioned by Province/CMHC, various years 1993-2003

- Explicit consideration of servicing availability status of lands in approval process
Dealing with employment lands (broadly defined)

- Deal with major office employment separately from population-related
- Ensure Inventory of available serviced lands/sites – available and marketable – esp. to meet short-term demands and uncertainty
- Launch a GTHA-wide annual employment survey to ensure consistent region-wide results
- Monitor demands and land supply for by employment type regularly
Simplifying the municipal land needs analysis process

Proposed Methodology:

- Accepts population/employment forecasts from Hemson (2012/2013) but ignores Hemson forecasts of new housing demand by unit type and employment type.
- Instructs municipalities to generate their own forecasts of total new housing demand and employment by type but does not provide base data sources.
Suggested alternative approach:

- Instruct single- and upper-tier municipalities to utilize Hemson (2012/2013) new housing forecasts (totals and unit types) and employment by unit type by 10-year period with 2011 as base year

- To take 2011-2016 activity into account Province should provide the 2016 data to municipalities

- Municipalities then assess how they are going to achieve these forecasts (2011-2041 or 2016-2041) within their boundaries (local municipalities and built-up areas/greenfields)
Consistency with intensification and density targets of the Growth Plan

- Calculating and comparing the anticipated intensification and density ratios against the Growth Plan minimum targets

- Assess reasonableness of achieving the minimum ratios

- Formulate realistic alternative targets for the municipality to apply and request the Minister to permit alternative targets as required (per Policy 5.2.4)
Bottom line of recommendations

- Substantial movement towards achieving the goals of the Growth Plan
- Moderating currently egregious negative market impacts and wealth transfers
Contact

Centre for Urban Research and Land Development (CUR)  
Ryerson University

416-979-5000 ext. 3348  
cur@ryerson.ca

@RyersonCUR  
www.ryerson.ca/cur