

Aug/69



BUREAU OF  
MUNICIPAL  
RESEARCH

*A bulletin issued by the Bureau of Municipal Research*

---

CIVIC AFFAIRS

---

AUGUST 1969

TORONTO

4 RICHMOND ST. E.

---

*Mini-Metros:  
Proposals to Shape  
Future Growth*



## *This Bulletin in Brief—*

In the Government's White Paper *Design for Development — Phase Two*, released in 1968, the Province announced its intention to begin a major programme of municipal reorganization. The area surrounding Metropolitan Toronto was cited as one of those most in need of structural reform. Metro, as the rapidly expanding economic centre of the region, has generated considerable development pressure on those areas just beyond its borders\*. The need to guide and control this development was recognized by the Province in 1953 with the establishment of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board, a joint planning board with Metro as the designated municipality for planning purposes. The planning area was composed of Metro Toronto and the townships of Pickering, Markham, Vaughan, Toronto Gore, and Mississauga and the eight towns and villages within them.

While this structure was generally successful in providing for the planned growth in Metro itself, it has proved to be inadequate for the fringe area. The weaknesses in the present structure have centred on two main elements — the planning and implementing authorities are separate, and co-operation and co-ordination have been noticeably lacking between municipal governments and Provincial authorities. It is presumably in an attempt to correct the inadequacies of the present system that the Province has proposed reorganization of the area around Metropolitan Toronto into three "mini-metros", or regional governments, to be immediately adjacent to Metro's current boundaries. While agreeing that some form of reorganization in the area is essential, the Bureau disagrees that the "mini-metros", as outlined, will achieve the desired result.

### *Recommendations*

1. The present boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto should be expanded to the north and east to include the areas now bounded by the townships of Pickering, Markham, and Vaughan and the towns and villages within them.
2. Provincial plans and policies regarding development should be co-ordinated and consolidated prior to the formulation of official plans by any new regional governments.
3. The Province should undertake a major organizational study of Provincial departments and agencies with a view toward streamlining that part of the administrative structure involved in development programmes and indicating a suitable agency to be charged with the responsibility of the on-going co-ordination of Provincial and regional development plans and policies.
4. The Province should formulate a comprehensive Provincial development plan designed to encourage growth in various urban centres and lessen the pressures on Metropolitan Toronto.
5. Provision should be made to formally include relevant Federal agencies at some point in the formulation of regional plans.
6. The present planning legislation should be amended where necessary so that regional official plans, once approved by the Province, will be binding on Provincial departments and agencies as well as local authorities.

\*Bureau Honorary Chairman E. A. Jarrett, F.C.A., refrained from normal participation in the review of this Bulletin since he is a Commissioner of the Hamilton-Burlington-Wentworth Local Government Review.



## Mini-Metros: Proposals to Shape Future Growth

With the release of *Design for Development — Phase Two* in late 1968, the Province announced its intentions to reorganize municipal government in south-central Ontario into several, large regional municipalities<sup>1</sup>. Eight basic criteria were developed as guidelines for designing the regional governments, drawn in part from the Report of the Ontario Committee on Taxation:

1. a sense of community identity,
2. an adequate financial base,
3. a large enough size to benefit from economies of scale, while still assuring adequate access,
4. boundaries should facilitate maximum interregional co-operation.
5. community participation and, where possible accessibility,
6. boundaries should be usable by other institutions, either individually or in combination to form larger areas,
7. boundaries should reflect the urban-centred concept by including urban centres and their surrounding rural areas within the same region,
8. in cases of a two-tiered government, both tiers should be designed with the same criteria.

The regional government proposals have been justified, in part, by the failure of multiple units of local government to effectively plan and implement programmes for an orderly and rational urban development. Metropolitan Toronto and its immediate environs, an area of rapid development generating increas-

<sup>1</sup>The Bureau has many times advocated the need for municipal reorganization—see in particular *Regional Government — The Key to Genuine Local Autonomy*, May, 1968, and *The 101 Governments of Metro Toronto*, October, 1968.

ing urban pressures, was cited in the Government's White Paper as being one of the key areas of the Province in need of municipal structural reform. Preliminary proposals indicate that Metro's present area (240 sq. m.) would remain the same while the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area (covering 720 sq. m. and including, besides Metro, the townships of Pickering, Markham, Vaughan, Toronto Gore, and Mississauga and the villages and towns within them) would be reduced in size and made co-terminous with Metro's jurisdiction. Surrounding Metropolitan Toronto would be three "mini-metros", organized along regional government lines. Although exact boundaries have not yet been determined, the area to the west will include the counties of Peel and Halton; to the north, all of York County; and to the east, an Oshawa region located in the southern portion of Ontario and Durham counties. The subsequent effects on planning and development for Metropolitan Toronto and the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area, as well as the extent to which these proposals correspond to the Province's own criteria for regional government, are the subjects of this bulletin.

### METRO'S FORMATION AND BOUNDARIES

The present boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto were established by the 1953 Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act. At that time, a servicing crisis had developed in the suburbs surrounding the City of Toronto<sup>2</sup>, resulting from the rapid population increases after the Second World War. The municipalities around

<sup>2</sup>For a more complete discussion see: *Report of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto*, H. Carl Goldenberg, Commissioner, June 1965, pp. 20-25.

the City acted as dormitory suburbs, with little or no commercial/industrial assessment base. With increased development and population, heavy demands were placed on these municipalities to provide those services in the "hard" category (roads, water, sewage disposal, etc.,) requiring capital expenditure. The financial base of the suburbs, with each one borrowing independently from the others and on its own credit, was insufficient to raise the necessary funds to provide the needed services. At the same time, the City's inner core was deteriorating as the younger and more affluent moved to the suburbs, where housing policies had discouraged the building of low- and moderate-income housing. The City was left generally with lower income and older groups. Expanded welfare and other "soft", or socially-oriented, services had to be provided while motorized commuters from the suburbs generated demands that traffic congestion be relieved and extensive street improvements be undertaken.

Until the Second World War, the City exercised planning powers within its borders and had the power to approve subdivision development within five miles of the corporate limit. The five-mile limit was statutory and bore no necessary relationship to the area beyond the City's border that was actually exposed to urban pressures from the City. Moreover, the City's powers did not go beyond subdivision approval and some zoning authority. In 1946, the establishment of the Toronto and Suburban Planning Board recognized the necessity for co-ordinating planning and development beyond a five-mile limit. It was replaced in 1948 by the Toronto and York Planning Board, a conventional joint planning board responsible for all of York County. As with most joint planning boards, its success in formulating a viable plan to guide development was noticeably lacking. In short, the servicing crisis in the Toronto area arose as the direct result of the lack of adequate planning and development controls and of a local authority large enough to implement

needed programmes. The establishment of Metro, with an expanded planning area, was intended to overcome the problem.

### THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO PLANNING AREA

Contrary to general opinion, Metropolitan Toronto does not have extra-territorial planning powers in the planning area that extends beyond the Metropolitan corporation. The Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board (MTPB) is a joint planning board and the Metro Council charged with the responsibility of approving a proposed plan to make it "official" within the meaning of the Planning Act. However, if Metro fails to do so within 90 days of the time the plan is brought before Council, any of the other local councils in the planning area may approve the plan and forward it to the Province for final consideration.

Confusion has arisen over the fact that the fringe municipalities in the planning area are represented collectively, rather than as individual local units, on the Planning Board. In addition, the City and five boroughs that are individually represented on the MTPB, also sit on the Metro Council that must approve the plan. The practical effect, so the argument goes, is that Metro, with its member municipalities is planning for areas beyond its corporate jurisdiction with only secondary participation by the fringe municipalities — extra-territorial planning. The argument overlooks the right of all the participating municipalities to approve the proposed plan in the absence of Metro Council doing so; or, conversely, if the plan had been approved and forwarded to the Province, their right to file objections to the plan and reasons why it should not be finally approved. In the practical sphere, however, Metro's dominant influence in the area cannot be overlooked. It would be reasonable to assume that, in the absence of very strong opposition, Metro's judgment and opinion would prevail.

Although Metro does not have extra-territorial planning powers, the



Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area as a whole demonstrates an in-built problem of structure — it cuts across the political jurisdictions of neighbouring counties for planning purposes, yet provides no single implementing authority. Planning in the Metropolitan area is done from the Metro viewpoint outward — not from the perspective of Ontario, York or Peel counties — yet the counties, not Metro, are financially responsible for implementing the plan in conjunction with the municipalities within their jurisdictions which are also part of the Metro Planning Area. In addition, the counties are not represented on the Metro Planning Board and do not participate in the formulation of plans. This factor has created development difficulties throughout Metro's fringe. The difficulties inherent in the planning body whose boundaries are not co-terminous with a single governmental administration were recognized by the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he stated:

... our view [is] that planning must be an integral part of government operations and, to be really effective, the area of planning jurisdiction and political jurisdiction should be the same. . . .<sup>3</sup>

We propose to make planning . . . a direct function of the regional government . . . in the Niagara Peninsula and we expect that this . . . will be a general pattern for other regional governments as they are formed<sup>4</sup>.

At the present time, there is no Official Plan within the meaning of the Planning Act for the MTPA. Proposed official plans have been presented to Council and in 1966 Council approved a draft plan "as a statement of the policy of the Metropolitan Corporation for the planning of future Metropolitan works and services and as a guide for future devel-

<sup>3</sup>Speech, Hon. W. Darcy McKeough, Minister of Municipal Affairs, County of York, April 1, 1969.

<sup>4</sup>Speech, Hon. W. Darcy McKeough, Urban Development Institute, March 28, 1969.

opment in the Metropolitan Planning Area."<sup>5</sup> Council did not, however, approve the draft plan as an official plan and forward it to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for final approval. Although the plan has never received ministerial approval and is not official, it has been used as the basis for supporting or denying changes in land use, subdivision applications, and so on, for the MTPA — closely resembling the use to which a proper official plan would be put.

For the first decade or so of Metro's existence, the lack of an official plan did not appear to present any problems. Growth within the Metro Planning Area substantially took place within Metro Toronto where a co-ordinated administration was able to implement planning and development policies. Now, however, development is taking place and development pressures are being felt outside Metro's limits. In 1958, 190 sq. m. of land were required for urban purposes in and around Metro; in 1968, 280 sq. m. were required. It is estimated that the Metro Area is expanding in terms of land required for urban purposes, at a rate of 6,000 acres per year with an additional 12,000 acres per year within the category of "outer suburbs".<sup>6</sup> With no single authority to guide urban growth, the degree of co-ordination experienced within Metro has not been matched in the rest of the MTPA.

#### The Northern Fringe

When Metro was formed in 1953, the areas beyond its borders were truly "fringe municipalities". Little or no development or land assembly had taken place and no immediate pressures from Metro were being exerted on this area. The development crisis that existed in the Toronto area was considerable but did not really extend beyond what is today Etobicoke, North York, and Scar-

<sup>5</sup>Report No. 1 of the Official Plan Committee, December 15, 1966, Executive Committee Recommendation No. 3.

<sup>6</sup>Central Ontario Regional Development Council, *Regional Development Review, 1968*, pp. 23-24.

borough. The main concern of the Metropolitan Council and the Planning Board was focussed upon the area within Metro's jurisdiction. The immediate problem at hand was the provision of water and sewer services, particularly in the North York area. A complete servicing system for the area would require large capital outlays initially and, if proven inadequate, would be extremely difficult and costly to duplicate. This would be particularly true for the municipalities north of Metro. All drainage within the Metro Planning Area flows toward Lake Ontario which is also the primary source of water for urban density development. Unlike the western and eastern fringe, the northern municipalities do not have direct access to the Lake. All sewage and Lake water supply must pass through Metro, to and from the lake and the northern fringe.

Since water and sewer services are basic needs of any urban development, the location and design of the Metro system would have considerable impact on pattern and extent of future development in the Metro Planning Area. Yet in spite of its importance to the area, the Bureau has found no evidence to suggest that the northern boundary of Metro's water and sewer system was set with reference to land use analysis, population projections, and so on, in the fringe municipalities to the north, which would normally serve as indicators of future servicing needs. Instead the line appears to have been arbitrarily drawn just beyond Metro's northern limit and a system constructed that would serve only Metro's needs.

In terms of Metro's unofficial plan, this fact does not at first appear to present any problem. Metro has made arrangements to service a few small municipalities immediately adjacent to its border. For the rest, the unofficial plan indicates a few areas of urban development with the major portion of the land devoted to rural use. The areas to be developed would be small enough so that the supply of well water might meet water demands. Upstream sewage treat-

ment plants<sup>7</sup>would solve the problem of waste disposal, presumably without polluting the rivers and streams that would carry the effluent through Metro and into the Lake. In short, the unofficial plan sees the area as basically stable and rural with a few scattered pockets of development. The northern municipalities, however, are no longer a "fringe" in the sense of a stable, rural area. They are now more properly classified as "outer suburbs"<sup>8</sup> which have fallen well within Metro's urban shadow and are now an unstable area under heavy pressure to develop.

There are three major failings in this plan for the north:

1. As noted above, the unofficial plan provides for limited development only, yet the development pressures and intentions in the northern fringe, particularly Vaughan Township, do not appear to coincide with the Metro plan. Considerable land assembly has taken place and at least three proposals have already been outlined for major developments in Vaughan, one of which has received provincial approval.<sup>9</sup> The Township itself has indicated a definite desire to develop and has submitted to the Province a proposed amendment to its official plan permitting the minimum size of estate lots to be decreased from two acres to one acre. If septic tanks are used to accommodate these, and other higher density developments, there is the risk of polluting the underground water supply and of having raw sewage appear in storm drains when heavy rains saturate the area. If upstream sewage treatment plants are used instead, the amount of effluent

<sup>7</sup>It is interesting to note that Metro has a policy of prohibiting upstream sewage treatment plants within its borders due to the water pollution they often create.

<sup>8</sup>Frederic A. Dahms and Norman Pearson, *A Study of the Fringe Area North of Metropolitan Toronto*, Central Ontario Regional Development Council, May, 1969.

<sup>9</sup>Baif Associates' proposal for a 400 acre development near Richmond Hill has been approved. The other two are "Centennial City" and "Vaughan City" proposed by Milani Developments, Ltd., and Consolidated Building Corporation, respectively.



treated is likely to exceed the amount the river flow can safely accommodate without pollution.

2. The area to the north of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area has long been used as a cottage area with increasing numbers of summer homes being winterized for year-round living and/or recreation purposes. Both Metro and the Province have carried out ambitious north-south highway and road improvements that facilitate and encourage development to the north.

3. The Ontario Water Resources Commission has carried Metro's policy of no upstream sewage treatment plants within Metropolitan Toronto (see footnote No. 7) one step further and applied it to all areas around Metro. Since the OWRC is generally asked to approve sewage facilities before the Province will approve subdivision applications, Metro's plan for upstream plants would not likely be implemented anyway, regardless of the extent of development. This means that development to the north would eventually have to be accommodated through either major additions to the Metro system (such as large collection tanks to regulate the flow entering the Metro lines) or a separate trunk sewer directly to the Lake that would bypass Metro to the east, probably built and administered by the OWRC. In either case, the cost is considerable and it is doubtful that such expense would be incurred without ensuring extensive development in the areas the system is intended to serve.

#### The Western Fringe

The situation in the western fringe, the townships of Mississauga and Toronto Gore, differs considerably from the north. Although the political jurisdiction of Peel County has been divided, a 1967 study<sup>10</sup> indicated that the western fringe was in a relatively strong financial position, with an assessment base reasonably balanced between residential and commercial-industrial. Unlike the unofficial plan for the northern fringe, the western area was

<sup>10</sup>Wallace Beaton, *Beyond the Boroughs: The Exurban Round of Municipal Changes*, W. R. Kellough and Associates, Toronto, 1967.

expected to undertake a fair amount of urban growth in proportion to its strong financial base and position adjacent to Metro. Independent water and sewer systems could be established without excessive cost since the area to be developed, Mississauga, had direct access to Lake Ontario. Metro's early decision on servicing, so critical to the north, was of minor significance for development in the western fringe. Controlling the growth, however, was a key element in the plan, which also provided for large rural areas in Toronto Gore and the northern part of Mississauga. Development intentions in southern Peel County did not coincide with Metro's plan.

Despite strong objection from the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board, a large urban subdivision, Bramalea, was approved by the Province and built 66 feet from the border of the Metro Planning Area in the Township of Chingacousy, just north of Mississauga. Subsequent extensions in the area have been approved and built, creating a population centre which was unwanted and unplanned for, in terms of subsequent pressures on transportation routes, etc., within the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area. Although Bramalea was permitted to grow, inadequate provision had been made for the necessary water and sewer services, resulting in a minor servicing crisis. In response to this difficulty that arose as the result of strong westerly and northwesterly development, the South Peel Water and Sewer Scheme was undertaken by the Ontario Water Resources Commission and the agreement signed in December, 1968. The agreement permitted the OWRC to administer existing water and pollution services on a wholesale basis in June, 1969, and to undertake the building of a major trunk line north from Lake Ontario to Chingacousy Township. The South Peel Scheme is designed to provide services for nearly 2,000,000 people in South Peel<sup>11</sup> — the equivalent of a second Metro in Mississauga and the southern part of Chingua-

<sup>11</sup>Dahms and Pearson, *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

cousy. This major decision by a Provincial agency affecting development on Metro's fringe was made in the absence of any regional plan from the Province, and contradicts the intended development in the area indicated in Metro's unofficial plan.

While the development problems in the west may be attributed in part to the separation of planning and implementing authorities, the major difficulty was the lack of a comprehensive regional plan co-ordinating the MTPA with the rest of Peel County, and the failure of the Province to co-operate with Metro in guiding development in the area.

#### The Eastern Fringe

The eastern fringe of the MTPA, Pickering Township, has developed almost exclusively as a dormitory suburb for Metro. In 1965, 90% of Pickering's development was residential and an estimated 87% of its residents derived their income from commerce and industry in Metro<sup>12</sup>. Similar to the western fringe, Metro's unofficial plan provided for controlled urban residential and industrial development for the eastern sector. This development has not taken place. With a high percentage of the assessment base being residential, Pickering Township lacks the fiscal capability to underwrite the necessary water and sewer system construction to service any new development. In recognition of this difficulty, the Ontario Municipal Board limited the number of building permits Pickering could issue to 100 dwelling units in 1968<sup>13</sup>. The limitation has helped forestall the sort of financial problems involved in providing water and sewer services that faced the City of Toronto's suburbs prior to the formation of Metro in 1953. Solution of the problem, however, will only be achieved through municipal reorganization to permit Pickering to tap the financial resources of a larger and more stable area. The pattern

<sup>12</sup>Goldenberg, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 166 and 169.

<sup>13</sup>Order of the Ontario Municipal Board, G 3148-67, January 2, 1968.

in which Pickering develops under such reorganization is of particular concern to Metro. Traffic from Pickering into the Metro area which must be planned for, and the rate at which land is released for development in the east may well affect the development pressures felt in the north. The major obstacle in implementing Metro's unofficial plan is the separation of the planning and implementing authorities. In this case, however, provincial authorities decided to limit, rather than encourage, urban development.

#### DEVELOPMENT CONFLICTS IN METRO'S FRINGE

In an effort to combat some of the problems of rapid development in the greater Metro area, the Province has proposed three regional governments to border Metropolitan Toronto. Each of these governments will be charged with the responsibility of formulating and implementing an official plan for the region. Large enough to provide a stable financial base, the regions will include both rural and urban lands so that future urban growth may be planned for and guided in the region.

As development extends beyond the urban centre, the old relationship and distinction between rural and urban municipalities begins to disappear . . . we must ensure that municipal boundaries will no longer act as an artificial barrier to orderly growth<sup>14</sup>.

The mixing of urban and rural is based on the concept that the urban centre, the cause and source of development pressures in the fringe, should be permitted to control the growth it is responsible for. This principle was recognized by the Ontario Municipal Board in 1960<sup>15</sup>. The Board had recommended an extension of the Metro Planning Area to encompass Brampton and its surrounding area (including Bramalea) which was under

<sup>14</sup>Speech, Hon. W. Darcy McKeough, The Association of Ontario Counties, Stratford Ontario, October 28, 1968.

<sup>15</sup>Goldenberg, *Op. Cit.*, p. 75.



pressure to develop as the result of its proximity to Metro. The recommendation was never implemented.

By mixing urban and rural areas in its regional governments, the Province has avoided repeating the mistake of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board which, while including both urban and rural, lacked authority to implement any plan. At the same time the limits of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area are to become co-terminous with the existing boundaries of the Metropolitan Corporation. The obvious defect in the scheme, however, is that Metropolitan Toronto, the economic core of the region, is left with no control over the growth in its rural developing fringe.

Related to this problem is the question of how Metro's fringe will develop under the jurisdiction of the three regional governments. In Peel-Halton, the decision has already been made with the signing of the South Peel Water and Sewer Scheme. Even if Metro's boundaries were now extended to include Mississauga and Chinguacousy, the development would continue as intended. Little justification exists, therefore, for extending Metro to the west. This situation in Peel-Halton highlights a basic element in planning; the desirability of any given development pattern is a reflection of the authority controlling growth. For Peel County, extensive urban development in Chinguacousy and Mississauga was desirable in terms of growth for the county as a whole. From Metro's viewpoint, a more contained and less intensive development was preferable to meet Metro's expansion needs. In Peel County, the development decision went against Metro.

Determination of which local government is responsible for the fringe area in York and Ontario counties is extremely important since, unlike Peel County, the critical decisions for development have not yet been made. The northern fringe has developed in primarily two directions — as a residential suburb and as a recreation area for residents of Metropolitan Toronto. The predominant development feature in the area is the

Yonge Street corridor — six miles of piecemeal development done with spot zoning, limited services, and a heavily residential assessment base. At present, the rest of the area is essentially rural but development pressures are increasing. Farms are being converted into country estates and non-farming residential communities, and intense speculative activity is underway, resulting in large subdivision holdings. Three major holdings in Vaughan alone have already resulted in development proposals (see p. 6).

There is little question that increased growth in the southern part of York County would be beneficial to the County as a whole. A recent study of Metro's extended fringe area to the north (which included King and Whitchurch Townships in addition to Markham and Vaughan which are normally considered to be Metro's northern fringe) estimated that "40% of the Study Area's urbanization, and local tax revenue depends directly upon the income generated by commuters to Metro."<sup>16</sup> This economic dependency was found to increase sharply with proximity to Metro, and decrease further from its boundary. Additional development in Markham and Vaughan would be comprised predominantly of commuters to Metro. Because the area is divided into several municipal units, strong competition exists to attract this additional development. Referring to a 900 lot residential subdivision in Markham, the chairman of the Vaughan Planning Board observed, at an April, 1969 meeting, that:<sup>17</sup>

some municipalities within the County [are] apparently of the opinion that the only way to "beat . . ." educational costs peculiar to residential development is to develop the most residential the fastest and let other municipalities in the system pick up most of the cost.

A member of the public at a later

<sup>16</sup>Dahms and Pearson, *Op. Cit.*, p. 47, emphasis in original text.

<sup>17</sup>Minutes of the 10th Meeting of the Vaughan Planning Board for 1969, April 3, 1969.

meeting cited the rising educational costs to Vaughan and said:<sup>18</sup>

the people [of Vaughan] . . . must join the development race if they ever wish to swing Vaughan's balance of costs of education per pupil to Vaughan's favour.

An initial step in this direction had already been taken with the proposed Amendment No. 15 to the Vaughan Official Plan. As previously explained, this amendment would reduce the minimum size of estate lots from two acres to one acre. A key restraining element for development in both Vaughan and Markham is the availability of water and sewer services. Two acre estate lots had partly overcome this restraint in that the land parcel was considered to be large enough to be serviced with well water and septic tanks. The intention of Amendment No. 15 was to increase development while continuing to rely on well water and septic tanks. The difficulty is that one acre lots would double the load on the septic tanks and approach a level of urban density development for which septic tanks are unacceptable. Under a York County regional government, the major investment in servicing facilities, necessary to accommodate development, would likely be undertaken by the Ontario Water Resources Commission. The OWRC has already commissioned an engineering feasibility study to consider a trunk sewer to go from Lake Ontario, through Pickering, to service the north. Since such projects are ultimately paid for through service charges to the users, it is doubtful that construction would begin without assurance that sufficient development would occur to offset the cost.

Under a Metro administration, priorities for development would be quite different. Metro has no need to develop the area to increase its financial base. Instead, a lower level of growth in Markham and Vaughan is particularly import-

ant to Metro, whose residents rely on the rural areas to provide fresh air and serve recreation needs. This is not to suggest that the northern fringe would not develop under Metro at all, or, conversely, that wild and uncontrolled development will take place if the area is administered by a York County regional government. It must nevertheless be recognized that, on the basis of all available evidence, a considerable difference will exist in the pattern, rate, and extent of urban growth. Because of the differing interests of York County and Metropolitan Toronto, it must also be recognized that the decision on boundaries carries with it *de facto* approval for one of the plans for growth.

The situation in Pickering to the east very nearly reverses the roles played in the north. Metro's unofficial plan calls for increased development to the east which has so far not occurred. The development that has taken place has been residential, in the western section, and primarily accommodating people earning their incomes in Metro. Future growth will similarly move from Metropolitan Toronto on the west toward the east along major transportation routes that will facilitate the home to work journey between Metro and Pickering. With direct access to the Lake, water and sewer services could be easily provided. Metro's strong financial position would overcome Pickering's difficulties in underwriting the cost of these services.

Oshawa, on the other hand, is not likely to be as interested in developing Pickering's western section. A report comparing the effects of consolidation with Oshawa versus Metro concluded that it was to Pickering's economic advantage to be joined with Metro<sup>19</sup>. Pickering has traditionally allied itself with Metro — it is part of the Metro Planning Area, residential development has been oriented toward Metro rather than Oshawa, a majority of residents earn their income in

<sup>19</sup>Submission to the Minister of Municipal Affairs from the Corporation of the Township of Pickering, January 28, 1969.

<sup>18</sup>Minutes of the 13th Meeting of the Vaughan Planning Board for 1969, May 1, 1969.



Metro and, on July 4, 1969, the Pickering area municipalities appeared before the Metro Executive Committee to discuss annexation. At the same time, the Oshawa area has also considered Pickering to be a part of Metro. In 1956 when the Oshawa Regional Planning Association was formed, municipalities in the area sent representatives to discuss common interests such as subdivision development and water resources. The Pickering area was not included since, as part of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area, it was considered to have separate interests. When the Central Ontario Planning Board (the Association's successor) first conceived of the Oshawa Planning and Development Study for the Oshawa region, Pickering was again not included. It was not until the Province finally required it that Pickering agreed to participate in the study which is expected to form the basis for legislation establishing the Oshawa region.

Development in Pickering would create costs for the Oshawa region in terms of the provision of services and transportation routes which would further link Pickering with Metro rather than Oshawa. There would be little benefit to Oshawa in terms of an increased economic activity and labour force since development would only further encourage the existing pattern in which Pickering residents tend to earn their incomes in Metro. It is far more likely that the Oshawa region will give priority to developing the areas surrounding the City of Oshawa to stimulate economic activity in the region's urban centre. Here, as in the north, the decision on regional boundaries will greatly affect the pattern of development in the area.

#### Co-ordination of Regional Plans

Regardless of where the regional government boundaries are drawn, co-ordinating the plans of the several areas will be extremely important. It was the lack of co-ordination and co-operation between municipal authorities, Provincial agencies, and the Province and municipalities that permitted such things as:

1. the servicing crisis that precipitated the formation of Metro,
2. Metro's water and sewer system ending at Steeles Avenue,
3. the development of Bramalea,
4. the South Peel Water and Sewer Scheme providing for a second Metro west of the Etobicoke Creek,
5. a 400 acre subdivision outside Richmond Hill with an upstream sewage treatment plant the OWRC had opposed,
6. OWRC plans for a sewage treatment plant at the mouth of Petticoat Creek where Metro has parklands, and so on.

The importance of co-ordination was recognized by the Province with the statement:

The regional official plans shall be consistent with physical and economic guidelines prepared under the Province's regional development program.

Provincial staffs will maintain close contact with regional municipalities when plans are being prepared to ensure adequate communication between regional municipalities, Provincial departments and other agencies. Before the plans are approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs they will be compared with Provincial policies and with the plans and opinions of adjacent regional municipalities. Co-ordination of the planning carried out by the regional municipalities is an extremely important Provincial function.<sup>20</sup>

Several questions have arisen regarding the co-ordination of plans that are outlined in the above statement. The first relates to the Province's apparent intention to rely on the guidelines prepared by the regional development councils. The Bureau would seriously question the advisability of doing so, particularly in

<sup>20</sup>Speech, Hon. W. Darcy McKeough, County of York, April 1, 1969.

light of the history of the Central Ontario Regional Development Council (CORDC). CORDC encompasses the counties of Ontario, York, Peel, and Halton — essentially the area being considered for Metro and its three surrounding regional governments. For the Metro area, then, it will be CORDC's physical and economic guidelines the regional official plans will have to conform to. Because participation in the council is voluntary, several municipalities have declined to participate in CORDC. On the basis of 1967 Ontario population statistics, however, the situation is extreme. Municipalities not participating in CORDC account for 92% of the region's population — a figure which includes the 74% of the region's population that lives in Metro. It would be incongruous for a development council of this scope to determine the economic and physical guidelines for development in the Central Ontario region. A critical evaluation of CORDC, with specific recommendations to change or replace it, should be completed prior to any reliance on the guidelines established for Central Ontario by the regional development program.

A second question relates to the manner in which the Province intends to co-ordinate planning for the region. The statement suggests that Provincial and regional representatives will maintain adequate communication while the regional plans are being formulated. Communication, however, is not co-ordination — simply knowing where someone else intends to go is not the same as joining hands to move forward together. Two governmental units rarely view development in any given area in the same way; a point amply illustrated during the discussion on development of Metro's fringe areas. Co-ordination will often involve arbitration between conflicting development plans, and, in this sense, should be a function of the Provincial government. In order to perform this function properly, there must be some Provincial context against which to measure the plans. One of the first steps in this direction should be co-ordination and consolida-

tion of the plans and activities of the Province's own departments and agencies. This would aid in clarifying Provincial development intentions and provide an initial framework for the regional plans. Though partly implied in the section referring to a comparison of proposed plans and Provincial policies, the Province's responsibility in this area should be clearly affirmed and carried out as soon as possible. In addition to inter-departmental co-ordination, once a regional official plan has been approved, it should be binding on Provincial departments and agencies as well as the regional government and its member municipalities.

Another question, not yet examined, is whether or not an additional governmental authority will have to be established to permit the Province to carry out its function of co-ordination described above. In its 1968 *Regional Development Review*, CORDC recommended the establishment of a new regional planning authority for the Central Ontario area. In essence, the authority would be a greatly strengthened CORDC, and presumably would replace the development council. Its duties would include the familiar preparation and review of regional development plans, but it would also be given important new power to regulate and adjudicate on matters affecting the adopted plan. Representation on the authority would include Provincial departments and agencies, local governments, and appointed representatives from business and industry. Presumably, local government participation would be compulsory. CORDC also recommended that a suitable Provincial agency be responsible for the co-ordination of the many development plans and programs of the Province, and that this agency be the one to which the planning authority reports.

CORDC's recommendation is similar in many ways to the suggestions outlined above: (a) by definition it highlights the structural failings of the present CORDC, (b) it recognizes the need for co-ordinating Provincial policies, and (c) it offers a specific form for the channels of com-



munication between the Province and the regional governments. Aside from the question of whether business and industry should be specifically represented on a planning authority, the proposal differs from the other suggestions, and fails, in four important aspects:

1. by spanning several regional governments, the proposal repeats the mistake of separating the planning authority from the implementing authority,
2. again because it includes several regional governments, it becomes a joint planning board (none of which have been particularly successful),
3. the regional governments and their area municipalities are left with negligible independent planning powers, and
4. by virtue of being a super planning agency, an additional layer of government is created between the local unit and the Province.

While the Bureau would agree that some Provincial department or agency will have to accept the responsibility for planning and development co-ordination, it appears neither necessary nor desirable to encourage the proliferation of yet another unit of government. A complete study of the existing Provincial administrative organization, aimed at streamlining present structures as well as identifying a suitable co-ordinating agency, should be undertaken. The impending municipal reorganizations afford the opportunity for a closer examination of Provincial administrative structure.

Many of the planning and development decisions involve the Federal government as well as the Province. Decisions regarding the Toronto International Airport, the Waterfront Plan, CN and CP railway systems, among others, will greatly affect growth in the region. Some provision should be made for Federal participation in plan formulation, even if only in an advisory capacity. Suggesting methods through which Federal plans could be

co-ordinated with regional and Provincial plans is beyond the scope of this study. An initial step, however, might be to include the Federal government when designing for an adequate communication flow regarding development.

#### DETERMINATION OF METRO'S BOUNDARIES

Provincial proposals for Metro's boundaries have been to retain the present limits. The Province has given no justification for the retention—either in terms of planning and development or in relation to the Province's eight criteria for regional government. Justification on the basis of planning and development would require the Province to indicate the pattern of growth it prefers for the area. The critical development decisions have already been made in the west, therefore further consideration of a boundary extension in that direction is unnecessary. These decisions have not been made to the north or east, and a second look at Metro's borders in these directions is desirable. As previously noted, the position of Metro's borders to the north and east will have a great impact on the growth patterns of these areas. The Province should first determine the type of development it prefers, then allow the boundaries of the regional governments to emerge from there, rather than vice versa. If the development indicated in Metro's unofficial plan were to be found preferable, as the Bureau's analysis indicated it is, little rationale would exist for not extending Metro to include Vaughan, Markham, and Pickering.

If Metro were to be expanded this way, to what extent would the new Metropolitan Toronto fulfill the criteria for regional government?

*urban centred*—All three townships to be included in Metro have a great deal of rural land providing both a balance of interests and a relatively undeveloped fringe where growth can be controlled by Metro.

*adequate financial base*—Metro, as the economic core of the region and one

of the financially strongest municipalities in the nation, more than meets this criterion.

*community identity*—There are several socio-economic links between Metro and its fringe. The 1969 study by Dahms and Pearson indicated that 39.8% of households in Metro's extended northern fringe came from Metro, and the majority of these have settled in Markham and Vaughan. In addition, 41.8% of the total labour force of the area is employed in Metro, with the percentages again higher in Markham and Vaughan. An analysis of expenditures for entertainment and comparison goods (furniture, major appliances, etc.) showed that a high proportion of the area's purchases were made in Metro. The northern fringe also provides an important recreation area for Metro residents. Much the same economic situation exists in Pickering where the sense of identity with Metro has even resulted in a request for annexation.

*inter-regional co-operation*—While co-operation between regions will depend to a large extent on the role the Province intends to play, permitting Metro to control development in its fringe will avoid the conflict that is very likely to appear if the York and Oshawa regions are established as planned.

*community participation and acceptance*—Although Markham and Vaughan appear to favour the York region, Pickering has actively campaigned for consolidation with Metro, both in submissions to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and deputations to the Metro Executive Committee.

*size*—The Peel-Halton region is expected to encompass 900 square miles. With provision for a population of 2,000,000 in the south of Peel alone, the area appears to have a long range growth potential greater than that of Metro.

With the addition of Markham, Vaughan, and Pickering, Metro's area would only be increased from 240 to 540 sq. miles—less than  $\frac{2}{3}$  the size of Peel-Halton. The proposed borough of Markham and Vaughan would have a population of 45,250 and Pickering would bring an added 42,085; a combined increase of 4.7% of the 1967 population in Metro. The size and population of the area would seem to be well within reasonable limits for a regional government.

*political considerations*—In every case the enlarged Metropolitan Toronto satisfies the criteria for regional government. The Bureau recognizes, however, that the decisions on municipal reorganization are being made by politicians, in a political context, with consideration for the political effects. The Bureau is also aware that Metro Toronto's "region" extends far beyond the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area—witness the extensive study area of the Metropolitan Toronto Area and Region Transportation Study. At present, it has been suggested that the political input and desire to avoid the power of a "Super Metro" opposite the Province may be the justification for retaining Metro's boundaries, despite the fact that all quantifiable, empirical data points in the opposite direction. The pattern of future urban growth and the quality of development surrounding Metropolitan Toronto should not be left to a situation in which political consideration may overwhelm all others. A more equal weighting of decision inputs would be preferable. In the Bureau's opinion, the suggestion to extend Metro's borders to the northern and eastern limits of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area provides a reasonable balance of the various considerations. This in no way lessens the need for a comprehensive Provincial development plan which must be formulated to shape future growth regardless of where regional government boundaries are drawn.





## BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

---

Founded in 1914 by a group of public-spirited citizens — operating since then under provincial charter as a non-partisan, non-profit research agency — staffed full time by well qualified personnel—the Bureau of Municipal Research keeps local government operations in Greater Toronto under constant scrutiny.

The Bureau has gained wide recognition as an effective proponent of good government through its bulletin *Civic Affairs*, through the publicity given its statements, through its information and advisory services, and through the participation of the staff in the public discussion of municipal issues.

The Bureau is financed entirely by voluntary annual subscriptions from non-governmental sources. Its members include business and professional firms, organizations and individuals.

---

*your inquiries are invited:*

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

Suite 406, 4 RICHMOND ST. E., Toronto 1, 363-9265

---