



Addendum to the Finance & Administration Committee Agenda

Council Chambers
Regional Headquarters Building
605 Rossland Road East, Whitby

Tuesday, December 8, 2020

9:30 AM

5. Delegations

- 5.2 Johnathan Schickedanz, President, Durham Region Home Builders' Association (DRHBA), re: Durham Region Roundtable on Climate Change – Green Development Standards in the Region of Durham [Item 9.1 A)]

8. Finance

8.1 Correspondence

- C) Correspondence from Fran Pelletier, Uxbridge resident
re: Water and Sewer User Rates Page 2
- Recommendation: Refer to consideration of Report #2020-F-25 [Item 8.2 D)]
- D) Correspondence from Rupert Cameron, Whitby resident
re: 2021 Water Supply and Sanitary Sewage User Fee Report Page 3
- Recommendation: Refer to consideration of Report #2020-F-25 [Item 8.2 D)]
- E) Correspondence from Don Bracey, Oshawa resident re:
2021 Water and Sewer Rates Pages 4 - 6
- Recommendation: Refer to consideration of Report #2020-F-25 [Item 8.2 D)]
- F) Correspondence from Stacey Hawkins, Executive
Officer, Durham Region Home Builders' Association re:
Green Development Standards in the Region of
Durham Pages 7 - 21
- Recommendation: Refer to consideration of Advisory
Committee Resolution re: Green Development Standards in
the Region of Durham [Item 9.1 A)]

From: [Kaitlin Smith](#)
To: [Clerks](#)
Subject: Water and Sewer Rates Increase
Date: December 7, 2020 11:38:00 AM

To: Finance & Administration Committee – December 8, 2020

Voicemail received on December 4, 2020 at 2:54 p.m.

Hi Kaitlin, my name is Fran Pelletier. I live in Uxbridge. I am calling regarding your notice in the paper about the water and sewer rates increase. Why I'm concerned is I'm already paying four and a half times more than what I use on a yearly basis and the service charges are so high and if they are going to increase these rates again it means that the minimum service charge rates go up again, its still well below what I use. Its certainly not fair to the seniors who live here who are on a very fixed income like myself and paying so much and I'm not even on sewer yet, I can't afford sewer, this is just water consumption. I certain would like that put into the meeting that you're having concerning your increases. Nothing wrong with getting increases but the increases are very hard on seniors like myself who don't use that amount of water and the service charges are so high so when I use \$11 I have to pay a \$65 service charge every 3 months. Well its certainly making most of us sell our homes. Can you pass this along to the meeting and let them have some concern about their increases. My phone number is [REDACTED] and it's Fran Pelletier in Uxbridge. Thank you.

From: [silverfox1](#)
To: [Clerks](#)
Subject: 2021 Water Supply and Sanitary Sewage User Fee Report
Date: December 6, 2020 9:10:08 PM

Our present Regional council that I voted for on offers of keeping taxes low has yet to show any sign of fulfilling those words. There is a pandemic happening and it's already round two and worsening by the hour and you people, seemingly oblivious to the effects on all citizens young and old and in so many ways, rent, food shortages lack of decent paying jobs, loss of life and sickness add nausea and all you can think of is once again repeating the last 15 or more years of raising water rates for all of us. What is wrong with you all? You're all appearing to be bereft of any compassion for your fellow citizens.

How about you make use of some of those billions you have in contingency fund investments and share it with those of us that pay your wages? Pensioners and all seniors are struggling to stay in their homes so as not to be a burden on society and our town mayor and you Region people just keep piling it on. Any help little or large would go a long way before the pandemic claims a few more thousand of us. Thank you for your time and attention.

Rupert Cameron

[REDACTED]

Whitby, Ontario

From: [Don Bracey](#)
To: [Clerks](#)
Subject: 2021 Water and Sewer Rates
Date: December 7, 2020 10:19:10 AM
Attachments: [DR Proposed Water Rates 12-07-2020.docx](#)

Find attached written comments regarding 2021 Water and Sewer Rates.

Regards,
Don Bracey
Oshawa

This message may include restricted, legally privileged, and/or confidential information. If you received this message by mistake please delete it immediately and inform us about it. This message will be considered as originated from Gerdau or its subsidiaries only when formally confirmed by its officers authorized for that.

Este mensaje puede contener informaciones de uso restringido y/o legalmente protegido. Si usted ha recibido este mensaje por error, por favor elimínelo e informe de tal situación al remitente. Este mensaje solamente será considerado como proveniente de Gerdau o de sus subsidiarias cuando sea confirmado formalmente a través de los representantes legales debidamente autorizados para tal fin.

Durham Region
Re : Water & Sewer User Rates & Other Related Fees & Charges

December 7, 2020

Please find below my comments regarding the proposed 2021 Water & Sewer User Rates and other related fees and charges, which I oppose.

I find it rather dishonest that Durham Region Finance and Administrative has not provide the details of the proposed rates and charges in their communications.

I am not clear how one is to comment without those details and the reasons behind the proposed 2021 rates, which I am going to presume are an increase to rates as that is not indicated in the communications the Region has placed in the local papers.

My comments are based on assumptions because the Region has provided no accurate details to the public regarding rates and the reasons.

I will presume this will not be the last of the rate increases since the Region approached industry to bankroll the infrastructure rebuilds. Industry turned down the multi-million dollars proposal which subsequently will require the Region to increase rates to the public.

I am not sure the Region has clearly outlined their long-range plan to the public in any communication or that the increase will take multiple years.

With holding information from the public is sneaky and lacks the transparency we expect from elected officials.

Perhaps the new treatment plant(s) are required to service the growing number of residential units in the Region. If so, then why are developers not footing the bill as they caused the demand and if I'm clear the various City governments within the Region approved of these projects that have put a strain of the water system.

Regardless my question is will there be a reduction in rates once the new infrastructure is rebuilt?

Remember industry was asked to foot a bill that was a one-time number of millions of dollars with no proposed impact to the public pockets. Seems only fair you inform the public of your intentions rather than hiding behind the details that got the Region to this point.

I am also not clear how the elderly or workers that will soon join the retiree population will be able to afford the increases. Let us be clear the Region is talking about increases over many years, just not 2021.

So now that we are in the middle of a pandemic with people out of work that previously were not and still require water, the Region is expecting who to carry the load? Our already strained unemployed and those that are barely making ends meet or perhaps our increasing senior population that would dearly love to remain in their homes. Yet the Region wishes to burden the public with increased rebuilds and infrastructure costs.

Please clarify and be up front with the public that the increases are designed over multiple years because frankly no details and inaccurate ones from the Region is misleading the public.

I'll conclude with my personal water statistics. Using a four-year period from 2016 to 2019 my personal **water usage/consumption has decreased by 27%** while my **billings have increased by 36%**.

Plainly stated that is a disgusting statistic and the second reason for opposing increases.

The Region has automatically turned to the public to foot a bill that is due to decades of mismanagement and minimal thought to the impact or with public discussion/forum. The Region had a discussion with industry regarding the millions you say you require. Seems to me the public is an easy money as you believe it will go un-noticed and/or unchallenged.

Don Bracey

[REDACTED]

Oshawa, ON



Durham Region Home Builders' Association
1-1255 Terwillegar Avenue
Oshawa, Ontario L1J 7A4
Tel. (905) 579-8080

December 7, 2020

Finance & Administration Committee
Region of Durham
605 Rossland Road East
Whitby, Ontario L1N 6A3

Re: Green Development Standards in the Region of Durham

The Durham Region Home Builders' Association (DRHBA) proudly represents over 170 member companies that are involved in the construction and renovation industry, and is the voice of the residential construction industry in Durham Region.

The building industry is at the forefront of efficiency and resiliency, and many of our members are currently building to ENERGY STAR® or above code standards. We also have member companies that have either already completed a Net Zero home or have plans to build one in the near term. The Ontario building industry is ahead of the majority of industries in Canada when it comes to efficiency and resiliency, and it is builders themselves that continue to push forward with innovative technologies and building methods.

We were surprised to find this item (Green Development Standards in the Region of Durham) on the Finance & Administration agenda, as absolutely no discussion has been had with industry on this motion. On this fact alone, the committee should vote 'NO' to the motion on the Green Development Standards in the Region of Durham and instead look to work with the industry on a better solution.

The Durham Region Home Builders' Association understands that climate change is a very real concern and has also become a bit of a political hot potato, where councillors want to support change that may impact climate change. However, implementing mandatory standards, such as the Whitby Green Standards, is not the right solution, especially without any consultation with the industry.

DRHBA has formed a committee that has been reviewing the standards, that includes builders, land developers, engineers and architects, and we have reached out multiple times to the Town of Whitby to work together to create a voluntary program with incentives that would help alleviate the affordability concerns generated by a mandated criteria as Whitby. We would like to extend that same invitation to the Region of Durham - we are willing to work with you on a road map to help make housing in Durham Region more efficient and resilient.

However, we must object to the Region moving forward to "formally urge all local municipalities in Durham to adopt green development standards similar to the Whitby Green Standard as the basis for

addressing the sustainability of all new development across Durham Region; and that Regional Council communicate this position to all other Regional governments in Ontario and urge them and their local municipalities to adopt similar green standards for new development."

There are substantial issues with the Whitby Green Standard in its current format. First and foremost, it is the belief of DRHBA that mandating and enforcing standards that go above and beyond the *Building Code Act, 1992* and the *Planning Act*, is not legal. This opinion is supported by Leo Longo, a prominent municipal law attorney with Aird & Berlis, whose legal opinion (attached) supports this. Although The Town of Whitby's solicitor shared Mr. Longo's legal opinion on the Whitby Green Standards, the Town pressed forward anyways. Further to this, the Town of Whitby had to change some of their proposed standards to "preferred" instead of mandatory at their council meeting to stay within the law. All of the subsequent Tiers contain requirements that go above and beyond the Ontario Building Code (OBC) and *Planning Act* and cannot be legally mandated or enforced by anyone other than the province.

Currently, the National Building Code (NBC) and Ontario Building Code (OBC) are working towards creating standards that will address climate change and energy efficiency. We understand that municipalities feel that taking these changes through the proper channels is taking too long and they want to take action now. But there is a reason that change takes time at the national and provincial levels. Achieving Net Zero standards takes time, as there are risks that need to be mitigated before a widespread mandatory implementation of a standard like this can be done; otherwise, homeowners purchasing these homes could be left on the hook to deal with unintended consequences that could have been resolved through proper research and study of these standard prior to mandating them.

It is important to understand that building science has come a long way in the last two decades, and homes are now built as a system. Changing one part of a house could have a drastic impact on another part of the house. There are code committees at both the provincial and federal level that are reviewing and assessing new technologies and methods of building. They are working with builders to test out new products and building methods to ensure that they are safe, work well within the house system, and will provide a healthy environment for families to live in. Both codes also provide lead time to the building industry to ensure that all parties involved know what's coming and what to expect and provide the necessary education and training to all builders, trades, consulting professionals and suppliers involved in the building of a house.

Provincial and national codes are in place to ensure that builders across Ontario and Canada are all working from the same playbook, and are using building methods that have been proven to be effective and safe. The building industry is regulated by the codes, and municipal building inspectors have the skills and knowledge necessary to ensure that all of these regulations have been met. When individual municipalities move out of sync with these codes, it creates a patchwork of regulations throughout the province and makes it difficult for developers, builders, professionals and trades to ensure that they are able to meet these standards. Building officials also do not have the ability/authority to properly inspect and sign off on these additional requirements when these fall outside of the codes that the industry is working with.

In addition, neither Brian Kelly, the Town of Whitby nor the Region of Durham have completed costing on either the Whitby Green Standard or on building a Net Zero home. These programs can

potentially add significant costs to the price of a home, and in a time where affordability is in crisis, it would be irresponsible to mandate adding extra costs that would make homes even more out of reach for first time and move up homebuyers. As DRHBA is a strong advocate for creating more affordable housing, we cannot support an initiative that adds unnecessary costs to housing and impacts delivering supply.

We are available to answer any questions you may have and look forward to further communications with you on this matter.

Sincerely,



Stacey Hawkins
Executive Officer
Durham Region Home Builders' Association

cc:
Johnathan Schickedanz, president, DRHBA
Tiago Do Couto, vice-president, DRHBA
RESCON
Ontario Home Builders' Association

May 29, 2020

BY EMAIL: s.hawkins@drhba.com

Our File No. 157052

Durham Region Home Builders' Association
1 – 1255 Terwillegar Ave.
Oshawa, ON L1J 7A4

Attention: Stacey Hawkins, Executive Director

Dear Ms. Hawkins, Executive Director

**Re: The Whitby Green Standard
Legal Analysis**

Aird & Berlis LLP has been retained by the Durham Region Home Builder's Association ("DRHBA"), an association representing the interests of the residential construction industry in Durham Region, to provide an opinion respecting the Town of Whitby's proposed Green Standard sustainable guidelines ("WGS"). In particular, this opinion will address the legality of the proposed Tier 1 Standards which are described as being mandatory. No opinion is being provided respecting the Tiers 2, 3 and 4 Standards that are discretionary and to be incentivized.

DRHBA has asked for our legal opinion with respect to the following questions in relation to municipal regulation of energy efficiency materials and standards related to the construction of buildings in Ontario:

1. Can municipalities impose on land developers/builders a construction standard for energy efficiency which exceeds the Building Code?
 - a. Can environmental sustainability measures be characterized as "building standards" under the Building Code regarding the "construction of buildings" and subject to s. 35 of the *Building Code Act, 1992* ("BCA" or "Act")?
 - i. Are such measures permitted by subsections 41(7) [site plan] or 51(24) [subdivision] of the *Planning Act*?
 - ii. As site plan and subdivision agreements are not "applicable law", is it lawful for such agreements to link occupancy permits to such energy efficiency construction?
2. Given that the Building Code allows for a variety of measures to conform with its environmental standards, can municipalities require one standard brand of energy efficiency to the exclusion of other approved equivalent standards?
 - a. Would such contravene the federal *Competition Act*?

3. Upon what authority does the Town of Whitby propose to adopt its WGS? Are all provisions in the WGS within the City's legislative authority, particularly the "mandated" Tier 1 requirements?
4. What is the impact of s. 97.1 ("Environmental Standards; Construction of Buildings") of the *Municipal Act, 2001*?

In preparation of this opinion we watched the deputation made at the Special Council meeting held May 11, 2020 and undertook necessary research.

BRIEF ANSWER

We are of the opinion that municipalities do not have the authority to impose on land developers/builders a construction standard for energy efficiency which exceeds the Building Code. The Building Code governs construction-related environmental sustainability measures, which means that such measures are beyond municipalities' regulatory authority. Furthermore, sections 41 and 51 of the *Planning Act*¹ do not grant municipalities the authority to regulate energy efficiency construction as part of their site plan control or draft plan of subdivision processes. Similarly, municipalities do not have the authority to link occupancy permits to energy efficient construction other than to note same be Code compliant.

We also conclude that municipalities do not have the authority to require that energy efficiency be supplied or measured according to one particular brand to the exclusion of other approved equivalent standards that are set out in the Building Code. However, this is not a contravention of the *Competition Act*² as the *Competition Act* does not apply to municipalities.

Like other municipalities, the Town of Whitby does not have the authority to impose construction standards for energy efficiency through its proposed Green Standard. Many of its mandated Tier 1 requirements are beyond the Town's jurisdiction to impose.

Finally, we conclude that s. 97.1 of the *Municipal Act, 2001* only has a narrow and limited impact on municipalities' powers to regulate energy efficient construction of buildings.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

1. Municipalities do not have the authority to impose on land developers/builders a construction standard for energy efficiency which exceeds the Building Code

The Building Code governs environmental sustainability measures, which means that such measures are beyond municipalities' regulatory authority.

Environmental sustainability measures that relate to the construction of buildings are "building standards" under the Building Code and are accordingly subject to s. 35 of the BCA³ which means that municipalities may not pass by-laws include environmental sustainability measures related to building construction.

¹ R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13

² R.S.C. 1985, c. C-34.

³ S.O. 1992, c. 23.

The legal framework for building and construction regulation in Ontario is set out in the BCA. The BCA establishes the duties and powers of those enforcing construction regulations in the province, and also the duties and rights of those subject to construction regulation.

The Ontario Building Code⁴ is a regulation made pursuant to s. 34 of the BCA. Subsection 34(5) of the BCA provides that the purposes of the Building Code are to establish:

- standards for public health and safety, fire protection, structural sufficiency, conservation, including, without limitation, energy and water conservation, and environmental integrity; [emphasis added]
- barrier-free requirements; and
- processes for the enforcement of the standards and requirements.

Subsection 34(1) of the BCA provides the broad authority to make regulations governing standards for the construction and demolition of buildings, including regulations “governing the manner of construction and types and quality of materials used therein”.⁵

The BCA provides a broad definition of “construction” in subsection 1(1):

“construct” means to do anything in the erection, installation, extension or material alteration or repair of a building and includes the installation of a building unit fabricated or moved from elsewhere and “construction” has a corresponding meaning

The Building Code contains the technical specifications for the construction of buildings, including the types and standards of materials and systems that may be used in the construction of buildings.

In 2016, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs amended Part 12 of the Building Code to require energy efficient construction of buildings in Ontario and issued Supplementary Standard SB-12 “Energy Efficiency for Housing” detailing the new energy efficiency standards.⁶

Articles 12.2.1.1 and 12.2.1.2 of the Building Code provide that buildings must meet certain energy efficiency requirements. Article 12.2.1.1 of the Building Code applies to construction for which a permit was applied for before January 1, 2017. Article 12.2.1.2 of the Building Code applies to construction for which a permit was applied for after December 31, 2016.

Sentence 12.2.1.1(2) of the Building Code provide that the energy efficiency of all buildings must conform to Division 1 and Division 2 or 4 of the Ministry’s Supplementary Standard SB-10, “Energy

⁴ O. Reg. 332/12 (the “Building Code”).

⁵ See in particular s. 34(1)3 of the BCA.

⁶ Ontario, Minister of Municipal Affairs, “Energy Efficiency for Housing”, Supplementary Standard SB-12 (Toronto: MMA, July 7, 2016) (“Supplementary Standard SB-12”).

Efficiency Supplement”.⁷ Sentence 12.2.1.2(2) of the Building Code imposes a stricter energy efficiency standard, based on the Ministry’s Supplementary Standard SB-10.

Sentences 12.2.1.1(3) and 12.2.1.2(3) of the Building Code provide that buildings the energy efficiency of buildings must either meet a particular performance level when evaluated in accordance with Natural Resources Canada’s “EnerGuide for New Houses: Administrative and Technical Procedures” or conform to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs’ Supplementary Standard SB-12.

Supplementary Standard SB-12 provides for four different options to measure energy efficiency compliance for housing: Prescriptive, Performance, Energy Star for New Homes v12.1 or v12.6, and the R-2000 (2012) Standard.⁸

While municipalities have some power to enact building by-laws, this power is limited to local matters of administration and enforcement. The BCA is clear that its provisions and the Building Code take precedence over all municipal by-laws respecting the construction or demolition of buildings. Section 35 of the BCA states:

35. (1) This Act and the building code supersede all municipal by-laws respecting the construction or demolition of buildings.

As noted above, the Building Code imposes environmental efficiency standards under Articles 12.2.1.1 and 12.2.1.2, and that such standards and methods for measuring compliance are clearly set out in Supplementary Standards SB-10 and SB-12.

Accordingly, by reason of s. 35 of the BCA, we conclude that a municipality does not have the authority to legislate in relation to environmental sustainability measures that fall within the broad scope of the Building Code, particularly when it comes to prescribing specific construction materials or methods for measuring compliance.

Sections 41 and 51 of the *Planning Act* do not grant municipalities the authority to regulate energy efficiency construction

The Site Plan Control provisions under the *Planning Act* permit municipalities to regulate certain matters related to building and site development. These items are set out in subsection 41(4), which grants municipalities the power to approve site plans, and in subsection 41(7), which permits municipalities to impose conditions on site plan approval.

Subsection 41(4) authorizes municipalities (and/or the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal) to approve plans or drawings containing certain, specified information before development may be undertaken in the municipality. Subsection 41(4.1) establishes a limit on the subject matter and information required in the site plan drawings contemplated in s. 41(4)2, restricting the municipality’s site plan approval power to planning issues and not the manner of construction or standards of construction.

⁷ Ontario, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, “Energy Efficiency Supplement”, Supplementary Standard SB-10 (Toronto: MMA, July 1, 2011) (“Supplementary Standard SB-10”).

⁸ See Chapters 2 and 3 of Supplementary Standard SB-12, *supra* note 6.

Pursuant to subclause 41(4)2(d) of the *Planning Act*, municipalities have the power to regulate in relation to exterior design of residential buildings containing more than 25 units:

(d) matters relating to exterior design, including without limitation the character, scale, appearance and design features of buildings, and their sustainable design, but only to the extent that it is a matter of exterior design, if an official plan and a by-law passed under subsection (2) that both contain provisions relating to such matters are in effect in the municipality;

The relevant meaning of the word “design” is “the selection and arrangement of artistic or functional elements making up a work of art, machine, etc.”⁹

This power is limited by subsection 41(4.1) of the *Planning Act*, which reiterates the division between provincial and municipal areas of regulation set out in section 35 of the BCA. The manner of construction and standards of construction, including construction materials and systems, are prescribed by the Ontario Building Code alone. Subsection 41(4.1) of the *Planning Act* provides:

41. (4.1) The following matters relating to buildings described in paragraph 2 of subsection (4) are not subject to site plan control:

3. The manner of construction and standards for construction.

Subsection 41(4.1) was first added to the *Planning Act* and came into force in 2005 by way of the *Building Code Statute Law Amendment Act, 2002*, S.O. 2002, c. 9 (Bill 124) which provided:

(4.1) The colour, texture and type of materials, window detail, construction details, architectural detail and interior design of buildings described in paragraph 2 of subsection (4) are not subject to site plan control.

Section 41 was again amended by *An Act to Amend the Planning Act and the Conservation of Land Act, 2006* (Bill 51).¹⁰ These amendments included the addition of subclauses (d)-(f) under s. 41(4) and the amendment of s. 41(4.1) to its current form. These amendments represent a refinement of the legislative scheme governing municipal power over matters of site plan control but, because of s. 35 of the BCA, cannot be read as granting municipalities the authority to prescribe matters already dealt with under the Building Code.

Pursuant to s. 51(24), of the *Planning Act*, municipalities must have “regard to” energy efficiency when considering draft plans of subdivision. Subsection 51(24) of the *Planning Act* provides:

51. (24) In considering a draft plan of subdivision, regard shall be had, among other matters, to the health, safety, convenience, accessibility for persons with disabilities and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the municipality and to,

⁹ Canadian Oxford Dictionary, Second Edition

¹⁰ S.O. 2006, c.23 (“Bill 51”).

(l) the extent to which the plan's design optimizes the available supply, means of supplying, efficient use and conservation of energy...

Clause 51(24)(l) has been considered by the then Ontario Municipal Board (the "Board") on few occasions. In one example, the Board found that the criterion in Clause 51(24)(l) had been met based on evidence from an expert planner the lots in the draft plan of subdivision were south facing and had solar gain potential.¹¹ In another case, the Board found that the criterion in Clause 51(24)(l) had been met based on evidence that the subject property's urban location with good pedestrian access to public transit, local shops and amenities would minimize car use, and that "the energy efficiency of new homes often far exceeds that of older homes".¹²

These decisions illustrate that the scope of the authority granted to municipalities pursuant to s. 51(24)(l) is general in nature and does not extend to the complex and technical details contemplated under the Building Code.

As noted, a municipality's authority to address exterior design with respect to its site plan control powers was revised in 2006 by Bill 51. Clause 51(24)(l) was also added to the *Planning Act* by Bill 51 in 2006.

When introducing Bill 51 for second reading, the Hon. John Gerretsen, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing at the time, emphasized the new powers that municipalities would have to consider exterior design aesthetics as part of its site plan control process:

As I've already mentioned, through official plan policies, municipalities could consider the exterior design of buildings. It will allow for consideration of the character, scale and appearance of proposed buildings in relation to the surrounding environment. Quite often in the past, when a municipal council has been dealing with a zoning issue or an official plan matter or a site plan control matter, particularly with respect to site plan control, it could only look at the exterior features surrounding the actual development, but not at issues such as how the development fits into the rest of the community, into the rest of the streetscape. This is one of those powers that I believe in the long run can be very effectively used by municipalities.¹³ (emphasis added)

The scheme set out above clearly draws a line between the design of a building and the "manner of construction and standards for construction" of a building.

While municipalities have the authority to regulate the character, scale and appearance of development through the site plan process, they do not have the authority to regulate the actual materials used in construction.

Similarly, while municipalities may have regard to, amongst other matters, the "means of supplying, efficient use and conservation of energy" as part of the draft plan of subdivision process in a broad and

¹¹ *Re McNally*, (2001) 65 O.M.B.R. 225 at paras. 57 and 66.

¹² *Lehrer v. Bunea*, 2007 CarswellOnt 3355 at paras. 30 and 76.

¹³ Ontario, Legislative Assembly, Official Report of Debates (Hansard), 38th Parl., 2nd Sess. (19 April 2006) (Hon. John Gerretsen).

general sense, a line is drawn by s. 35 of the BCA and accordingly this authority does not extend to include any matters already dealt with under the Building Code as outlined above.

We have considered what has been alleged to be the legal foundation for the WGS. Sections 2, 41 and 51 of the *Planning Act* offer no such foundation to permitting a municipality to mandate the manner of construction or construction standards. As well, other resources referenced in support of the legal jurisdiction for such municipal green standards fail to provide anything but the mention of broad policy objectives and statutory provisions without any detailed consideration and legal analysis.¹⁴

Green Standards are not “applicable law” – Building Permits

Building permits are issued pursuant to section 8 of the BCA. Under this section, a building may only be constructed or demolished once a permit has been issued by the chief building official.

Subsection 8(2) of the BCA directs and requires a chief building official to issue a building permit as long as certain requirements are met, including that the proposed building, construction or demolition does not contravene the BCA, the Building Code and “any other applicable law”. “Applicable law” is defined in sentence 1.4.1.3(1) of the Building Code and does not include site plan or subdivision agreements entered into pursuant to sections 41 or 51 of the *Planning Act*. The content of those agreements are of no consequence to Chief Building Officials in performing their duties.

Further, that “applicable law” definition does not include any reference to by-laws passed under s. 97.1 of the *Municipal Act, 2001*, official plan policies or any green standards or guidelines that a municipality might adopt. Such matters are not to be assessed by a Chief Building Official when determining whether to issue a building permit.

It is unlawful for site plan or subdivision agreements to link occupancy permits to energy efficient construction

Before a building may be used or occupied, a building inspector must issue either a Partial Occupancy Permit or a Final Occupancy Permit.¹⁵ Occupancy Permit requirements are set out in Division C, Part 1, Article 1.3.3.1 of the Building Code. None of the Occupancy Permit requirements listed in the Building Code relate to energy efficient construction.

On this basis, we conclude that municipalities do not have the authority to link occupancy permits to energy efficiency construction through site plan or subdivision agreements.

2. Municipalities do not have the authority to require that energy efficiency be to one standard brand to the exclusion of other approved equivalent standards

¹⁴ See for example “Towards Low Carbon Communities: Creating Municipal Green Development Standards – An Implementation Toolkit for Municipal Staff”, Part 1, Section 2.0 “Legislative and Policy Framework”.

¹⁵ Subsection 11(1) of the BCA provides:

11. (1) Except as authorized by the building code, a person shall not occupy or use a building or part of a building that is newly erected or installed or permit it to be occupied or used until the requirements set out in this section are met.

Municipalities are creatures of statute. Consequently, municipalities may only exercise such powers they have been granted by the province. The statutory scheme created by the province through the BCA, the Building Code, the *Planning Act* and the *Municipal Act, 2001*¹⁶ that is set out above clearly limits the scope of municipalities' authority when it comes to matters related to the construction of buildings.

Notably, one of the purposes of the Building Code pursuant to s. 34(5) of the BCA is to establish "processes for the enforcement of the standards and requirements". Requiring that energy efficiency be to one standard brand, for example, Energy Star, to the exclusion of other approved equivalent standards unlawfully trenches on the provincial authority expressly contained in the BCA.

The *Competition Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-34 does not apply to municipalities. It only applies to the conduct of businesses in Canada.

3. The Town of Whitby does not have authority under the *Planning Act* to impose many of the policies contained in its WGS related to the construction of buildings

The WGS is a set of performance measures proposed to be put in place by the Town for the purpose of establishing green development standards. The WGS has four "tiers": Tier 1 is mandatory set of standards enforced through the site plan control and subdivision process; Tiers 2-4 are described as higher, voluntary standards with a financial incentive.¹⁷

See Attachment "A" to this opinion letter which sets out certain of the Tier 1 requirements which we believe go beyond the town's jurisdiction to impose for the reasons set out herein. It is not a complete listing of all impugned provisions but meant to illustrate the nature and scope of the legal issue.

4. The *Modernizing Ontario's Municipal Legislation Act, 2017, S.O. 2017, c. 10, [Bill 68]* has only limited impact on municipalities' powers to regulate the energy efficiency of buildings

Bill 68 introduced the following new provision to the *Municipal Act, 2001*:

"Environmental standards; construction of buildings

97.1 (1) Without limiting sections 9, 10 and 11, those sections authorize a local municipality to pass a by-law respecting the protection or conservation of the environment that requires buildings to be constructed in accordance with provisions of the building code under the *Building Code Act, 1992* that are prescribed under that Act, subject to such conditions and limits as may be prescribed under that Act.

Conflict

¹⁶ S.O. 2001, c. 25.

¹⁷ See <https://www.whitby.ca/en/townhall/whitby-green-standards.asp>

(2) Despite section 35 of the *Building Code Act, 1992*, if there is a conflict between that Act or the building code under that Act and a by-law to which this section applies, that Act or the building code prevails.

Green roofs or alternative roof surfaces

(3) Without limiting sections 9, 10 and 11, the power described in subsection (1) includes the power to require the construction of green roofs or of alternative roof surfaces that achieve similar levels of performance to green roofs.

Definition

(4) For the purposes of subsection (3),

“green roof” means a roof surface that supports the growth of vegetation over a substantial portion of its area for the purpose of water conservation or energy conservation.”

Section 97.1 permits the Town to pass a by-law respecting the protection or conservation of the environment requiring buildings to be constructed in accordance with the Building Code and BCA. The section specifies that in the case of a conflict between such by-law and the Building Code or the BCA, the Building Code and BCA supersede the municipal by-law.

Bill 68 also made an amendment to the BCA by adding the following provisions to the province’s regulation-making powers set out in s. 34(1):

“39.4 prescribing provisions of the building code for the purposes of section 97.1 of the *Municipal Act, 2001* and section 108.1 of the *City of Toronto Act, 2006*;

39.5 prescribing conditions and limits for the purposes of section 97.1 of the *Municipal Act, 2001* and section 108.1 of the *City of Toronto Act, 2006*;...”

The province appears to have provided for municipalities to pass by-laws in relation to the construction of energy efficient buildings; however this is an extremely narrow broadening of municipal powers. Bill 68 underlines that the intention of the province is to continue to regulate all aspects of building construction in Ontario under the BCA and the Building Code and that these will prevail over municipal by-laws.¹⁸

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the foregoing, it is our conclusion that municipalities do not have the authority to impose on land developers/builders a construction standard for energy efficiency which exceeds the Building Code.

As set out above, environmental sustainability measures related to the construction of buildings are explicitly contemplated in the Building Code, including Supplementary Standards SB-10 and SB-12.

¹⁸ See discussion at pp.9-12 of the 2020 Edition of the *Annotated Ontario Building Code Act*, J. Levitt & J. Mascarin, LexisNexis.

Sections 41 and 51 of the *Planning Act* do not grant municipalities the authority to regulate energy efficiency construction as part of their site plan control or draft plan of subdivision processes. In fact, the manner and standard of construction are expressly excluded from the site plan control provisions in section 41. Moreover, we conclude that municipalities do not have the authority to link occupancy permits to energy efficient construction.

We also conclude that municipalities do not have the authority to require that energy efficiency be measured according to one particular brand to the exclusion of other approved equivalent standards that are set out in the Building Code. However, this is not a contravention of the *Competition Act*¹⁹ as the *Competition Act* does not apply to municipalities.

The Town does not have the authority to impose construction standards for energy efficiency through the WGS. Many of proposed WGS requirements under Tier 1 are *ultra vires* the City's authority.

Finally, we conclude that s. 97.1 of the *Municipal Act, 2001* has a very limited impact on municipalities' powers to regulate energy efficient construction of buildings; i.e. only respecting "green roofs" and "alternative roof surfaces" and only as prescribed under the Building Code.

Should you have any questions or wish to discuss any of the information herein, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

AIRD & BERLIS LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Leo Longo". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Leo" and last name "Longo" clearly distinguishable.

Leo F. Longo
LFL/ly

¹⁹ R.S.C. 1985, c. C-34.

ATTACHMENT "A"

Site Plan Application Checklist

- ELE1.1 – Affordable Housing
 - Site plans cannot impose affordable housing requirements; see *Reemark Holdings No. 12 Inc. (Re)* (1991), 25 O.M.B.R. 451 (O.M.B.)
 - Affordable housing is currently addressed through the Region's collection of DCs for this mandate.
- SW1.2 - Permeable pavement
 - This is generally resolved through water balance analyses in consultation with conservation staff. Mandating these types of surface treatments is not prudent as ground conditions may have low permeability, and therefore permeable surface treatments would provide zero benefit.
 - By-law 1784 says that products that provide infiltration are permitted, not required, as per this guideline.
- TT1.4 - Roundabouts
 - There is currently no requirement for roundabouts in Whitby site plans.
 - Roundabouts are land intensive and more than a road widening.
- ECC 1.2 – Renewable Energy
 - What would be required to determine feasibility?
 - Relates to constructions standards; see OBC.
- ECC1.3 – Passive solar orientation
 - This will be a challenge for planners and their clients.
 - How is "where feasible" determined?
- ECC1.6 and ECC 1.7 – Building Energy Performance
 - Relates to constructions standards; see OBC.
 - Builders are already mandated to build to the Building Code. Anything over and above the building code is voluntary.
- ECC1.8
 - Relates to constructions standards; see OBC.
 - Providing backup generation for multi-unit buildings is already required. Providing spaces that have heat, cooling, water and power over and above this is redundant.

Draft Plan of Subdivision Checklist

ELE1.1 – Affordable Housing

- Affordable housing is currently addressed through the Region's collection of DCs for this mandate.

- ELE1.2– Accessible Design

- Mandating anything over and above the Building Code is not permitted.
- In all subdivision plans, the grading is what dictates the ability to be able to accommodate accessibility features. In many cases, subdivision plans, especially in infill conditions create grading conditions that cannot be made accessible.
- Where necessary, builders already work with homeowners who may require accessible features to be implemented into their homes at the time of purchase.

- TT1.4 – Traffic Control

- There is currently no requirement for roundabouts in Whitby.
- Roundabouts are land intensive, and the loss of land translates to additional costs to purchasers.

- ECC 1.2 – Renewable Energy

- What would be required to determine feasibility?
- Relates to constructions standards; see OBC.

- ECC1.3 – Passive solar orientation

- This will be a challenge for planners and their clients.
- How is "where feasible" determined?