

Implementing the *Growth Plan*:
Examining Opportunities for Local Interpretation
in a Globalizing Region

Jennifer Ann Draper
208 427 098

Submitted to Dr. Susannah Bunce
Faculty of Environmental Studies

*A Major Paper submitted to the Faculty of Environmental
Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master in Environmental Studies*

*York University
Toronto, Ontario, Canada*

July 31, 2008

Dr. Susannah Bunce, Supervisor

Jennifer Draper, MES Candidate

Abstract

This Major Paper examines the implementation of the Province of Ontario's *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe* and utilizes the Region of Peel and its three area municipalities as a case study subject. Premised upon an interest in researching the intersection of governance, sustainability and growth management within a current regional planning context, this paper identifies a highly divergent implementation politics within Peel. Expressions of autonomy and interest in local determination over community planning and growth are unveiled and are shown to be enveloped by local development pressures and differing development emphases. Sustainability and governance form the theoretical foundation of this study and their interplay with growth management is explored as is the applicability of the emerging concept of Multi-Level Sustainability Governance to Ontario's regional planning landscape. The *Growth Plan* holds tremendous potential for changing the urban form of the Greater Golden Horseshoe but relies upon successful and consistent implementation. Although the Province regards the *Growth Plan* as a tool for achieving community sustainability, a shared definition of sustainability remains to be formulated and as such, competing visions of sustainability challenge the foundations of the *Plan*. Furthermore, the *Plan's* goal of consistent implementation is being challenged on three fronts: i) through unfolding scalar tensions; ii) as a result of varying governance objectives; and iii) due to unresolved provincial-regional and regional-municipal governance conflicts. Compliance can be achieved through enforcement measures held in-place by the Province but it is questionable if these will be executed considering the Province's very recent re-entry into regional planning matters. However, with implementation continuing into 2009, municipal governments are just beginning to understand the implications of the *Plan's* policies and new governance and sustainability challenges are bound to arise, thereby beckoning further research into contemporary regional planning in the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	ii
<i>Foreword</i>	iv
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vi
Chapter One - Introduction	- 1 -
Chapter Two - Research Methods	- 6 -
Introduction and Approach.....	- 6 -
Participant Observation.....	- 8 -
Interviews and Content Analysis.....	- 9 -
Policy Implementation	- 11 -
Chapter Three - Literature Review	- 13 -
Introduction.....	- 13 -
Urban Governance and Scale	- 14 -
Governing Sustainability.....	- 17 -
Multi-Level Sustainability Governance	- 18 -
Growth Management Planning and Sustainability.....	- 20 -
Driving Growth Management: Governance or Sustainability?.....	- 22 -
Planning for Sustainability.....	- 24 -
Summary	- 26 -
Chapter Four - Contextualizing the <i>Growth Plan</i>	- 28 -
Introduction.....	- 28 -
Provincial Policy, Sustainability and Growth Management	- 31 -
An Evolving Relationship.....	- 31 -
Smart Growth and Ontario.....	- 31 -
Planning and Growth Management in Ontario.....	- 35 -
The Role of Politics and Governance.....	- 36 -
Growth Plan Emergence.....	- 38 -
Limits on Growth or the Growth of Limits?	- 40 -
Summary	- 42 -
Chapter Five - Implementing the <i>Growth Plan</i> in Peel Region	- 43 -
Chapter Six - Conclusions	- 66 -
Bibliography	- 70 -
Appendix A.....	- 76 -

Foreword

I arrived at FES eager to dive into an integrated program; one where I could complement my applied science background with a broad and theoretically informed understanding of environmental studies. Evolving from my individual Plan of Study, this Major Paper summons each of my areas of concentration: environmental policy, civil society and environmental planning. The individual Plan of Study was designed to capture knowledge from these selected areas of concentration through coursework, field experience and travel, while the research and writing processes engaged to produce this Paper rounded off this capture.

Researching and analyzing a contemporary policy such as the *Growth Plan* necessitates flexibility and adaptation but most importantly, it demands the researcher to draw upon multiple fields in order to situate the inquiry. A significant portion of this Paper is anchored in coursework I completed at the Faculty of Environmental Studies; environmental planning introduced me to discourse theory while policy research expanded my understanding of research entry points and perspectives. This Major Paper allowed me to fulfill four learning strategies while synthesizing two learning objectives and contributed to my overall knowledge of regional planning in Ontario, growth management and environmental planning theories.

Since the implementation process for the *Growth Plan* continues until June of 2009, this paper facilitated examination of the highly politicized environment in which the actors undertaking this implementation are making complex decisions. During my research, I was fortunate to obtain interviews with key actors in Peel and at the Province which has provided unique insights that would not otherwise have been obtained through the limited public correspondence between the province and the

municipalities on *Growth Plan* implementation. Regional planning in the Greater Golden Horseshoe promises to command further study and research because of the increasing significance of this city-region to the world.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply fortunate to have experienced the degree of support and accessibility offered to me, for without, the opportunities for growth would not have been as rich or as deep. At the outset I would like to express my sincerest and warmest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Susannah Bunce. By embracing my research and encouraging me to reveal its contributions, she has taken me on a truly enriching and rigorous academic journey. Of greatest consequence to the development of my narrative voice in this paper are my interview participants: Bram Westfall, Bryan Hill, Ron Miller, Tara Buonpensiero and Kathie Kurtz. I am appreciative of their insights which are clearly rooted in years of experience and as witnesses to tremendous change in the planning system. Their thoughtfulness and care for advancing research on this contemporary subject has not gone unnoticed. I would also like to thank my parents for their on-going support of my evolving professional path and for providing the ultimate destination for relaxation and culinary indulgences.

In closing I would like to thank my husband, Marc-Eric, for his dedication to personal growth and transcendence. Through his ability to see opportunities where others see limitations, he has gifted me a world with fewer boundaries.

Chapter One - Introduction

Regional planning in Ontario has been given a new lease on life. In the past, this province has experienced times of regional planning and times without. According to White (2007), regional planning in the Toronto metropolitan area, "has occurred when the Ontario government wanted it to occur"(44). Since the election of the provincial Liberals in 2003, an ambitious program of regional planning has been unfolding; planners and citizens have witnessed the release of the *Greenbelt Act (2004)*, *Places to Grow Act (2005)*, Bill 51 (2006)¹ and most recently, the drafting of criteria to 'Grow the Greenbelt' (2007).

The political-geographic region which has become the centerpiece of regional planning policies is the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH); one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in North America (Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal, n.d.). Encompassing a total of sixteen municipal boundaries, the GGH is home to nearly two-thirds of Ontario's residents (ibid). Population growth projections for this region are substantial and therefore beckon a coordinated, proactive approach to carefully manage this growth. Sustainability is implicated in this management of growth; the provincial government is committed to sustainable development² and has expressed a quality of life vision through the *Places to Grow Act* that includes economic, social and

¹ Bill 51, an amendment to the *Planning Act*, provides municipalities with additional tools for implementing provincial policies and, "gives further support to sustainable development, intensification and brownfield development." (Legislative Assembly of Ontario, 2005).

² The *Planning Act* (1990) requires that municipalities, planning boards and the Municipal Board have regard to matters of provincial interest including "the promotion of development that is designed to be sustainable, to support public transit and to be oriented to pedestrians..." (Government of Ontario, 1990).

environmental sustainability elements³. Yet, the catalyst to this resurgence of regional planning tools lies not only in altruistic visions of a more sustainable Ontario. As the economic engine of this province, the GGH is tied to the global economy and is seeking ways in which to position itself to receive new sources of investment and trained professionals. This political-economic reality brings rise to a tension of sorts in the planning field: on the one hand the GGH region seeks physical community and infrastructure streamlining in order to be well-positioned in the global economy, whereas on the other, local communities seek to maintain autonomy over their planning directions. This tension has been acknowledged and addressed in the 2006 *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe* (GP) through its parallel examinations of growth management, environmental protection, and economics. This Plan has presented municipalities within the GGH with the task of implementing the concurrent goals without an established regional governance system in place and within a jurisdiction where growth management efforts have yet to bear fruit.

During a period of study in Germany in 2007, I became inspired by the concept of Multi-Level Sustainability Governance (MLSG) and its applicability to the implementation of the GP. Under the GP, municipalities must implement the *Plan's* policies by June, 2009 through an Official Plan Amendment (OPA). Since some municipalities are navigating the GP implementation process with an upper-tier planning authority and the Province, there is an element of multi-level governance occurring. This adds a degree of complexity to the implementation process but also offers opportunity for achieving regional sustainability through the policies and objectives of the GP. The Provincial government has presented regions, municipalities, and citizens

³ The Growth Plan assigns chapters to Where and How to Grow, Infrastructure to Support Growth and Protecting What is Valuable. Economic prosperity is touted as the reason for guiding decisions on community, infrastructure and natural heritage (Province of Ontario, 2006, 6).

with a plan that suggests a vision for a more sustainable Ontario but has yet to define sustainability. MLSG, which is enacted in the European Union (EU), requires a consensus-driven approach to governance once a shared definition of sustainability is established. Roles for each level of government are assigned according to who is best suited for the implementation of the sustainability vision regardless of jurisdictional history. Ontario's planning issues, although not influenced by a supranational body such as the EU, implicate a wide variety of actors and agencies, and as such, it is critical to examine the Province's growth management and regional planning matters from both governance and sustainability perspectives.

The GP implementation process has been selected as an entry point for examining the intersection of sustainability and regional growth management as it reveals much about governance structure, actors and the competing interpretations of sustainability made in the name of the GP. Furthermore, this process clearly identifies the major participants, pressures and local expressions of self-determination. Finally, the political-economic realities of a region participating in the global-economy can be observed within the evolving regional governance relationship of the GGH communities.

A case study has been formed to address the research question and to observe and analyze the on-going GP implementation. Peel Region, located in the western portion of the GGH, has been selected as the geo-political region in which to observe the implementation process because of the unique attributes and dynamics of the three area municipalities and their regional body. Mississauga is nearly completely developed and the majority of development that occurs results in intensification⁴. Brampton has yet to fully develop its supply of greenfields and in 2006 undertook a successful urban

⁴ As defined by GP, intensification is the "development of a property, site or area at a higher density than currently exists..." (Province of Ontario, 2006, 43).

boundary expansion to add 2,430 hectares of formerly agricultural lands to its greenfield supply (Kell, 2006). Caledon is a rural municipality with an established character that residents seek to preserve, yet it faces significant development pressures and political challenges in absorbing the provincially-prescribed growth targets.

This paper is organized in the following manner: first, an examination of the research methods employed is provided in Chapter Two and is designed to assist the reader in evaluating the analysis of the research question; second, the literature review captures the major theoretical informants and emphasize the key points of analysis; in Chapter Four the Ontario planning context is explored from a historical perspective to help situate the GP and its policies; Chapter Five presents the case study analysis, identifies the observed interaction between growth management and sustainability and provides a narrative of the pressures confronting the Region and its municipalities; lastly, an analytical synthesis of the above is presented with a summary of findings in Chapter Six.

This paper stems from an interest in the intersection of governance, sustainability and growth management in the GP for the GGH. As a contemporary regional planning policy that seeks to manage growth under a sustainability agenda, the GP offers a unique opportunity to explore implementation. The research question guiding this exploration is: how is the relationship of sustainability and regional growth management enacted in a highly politicized environment? This research question will be pursued alongside examinations of the major actors and development pressures emerging from the implementation process to date. The primary objective of this paper is to examine the implementation process in Peel region in order to locally observe the intersection of growth management and sustainability. The aim of the GP is to “provide

guidance on a wide-range of issues in the interest of promoting economic prosperity” (Province of Ontario, 2006, 6) and speaks to facilitating a high standard of living and an “exceptional quality of life” (ibid, 9). The *Plan’s* objective and visions are expansive and so the GP is positioned to have a profound effect on the urban and rural fabric of the GGH communities. Yet, the degree of impact is dependant upon the success and consistency of localized implementation – a highly complex task that the Province has delegated to the upper and lower-tier municipalities.

The Province of Ontario regards the *Growth Plan* as a sustainability agenda that has emerged from the Smart Growth movement. In this paper, I explore how sustainability is compromised in the *Plan’s* implementation. My findings demonstrate a highly divergent implementation politics in the three area municipalities illustrated by varied growth issues and differing development emphases. I point to a lack of a clear and shared understanding of sustainability and argue that local fragmentation of the *Plan’s* implementation occurs on three fronts: i) through unfolding scalar tensions; ii) as a result of varying governance objectives; and iii) due to unresolved provincial-regional and regional-municipal governance conflicts.

Through a current examination of localized implementation issues for the *Growth Plan*, my research has contributed knowledge to a new and evolving regional planning process in Ontario. I have endeavoured to extend this contribution to a larger body of literature on sustainability, governance and growth management through the gathering of unique and contemporary research in the globalized setting of the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Chapter Two - Research Methods

Introduction and Approach

To facilitate insight to the structure and framework of my research paper, this chapter will provide guidance on the methods engaged for analysis of the research question. Firstly, it is worthwhile noting how my interest in the GP implementation process evolved from one of an active citizen to that of an academic researcher.

During the winter of 2007, after year-long period of active civic engagement in Brampton's land-use planning matters, and following my transition from planning volunteer to executive committee member for a local environmental non-governmental organization, I realized that my knowledge of civil society was void of an academic foundation. By enrolling in *Structure and Governance of Non Profit Organizations*, I charted a course of learning with a specific goal in mind: to recognize the democratic entry points for civil society into municipal governance. Coupled with another course dedicated to policy research methods, in which I quantitatively evaluated consultation-derived input by civil society into the final *Growth Plan*, I quickly acknowledged that my interest in researching the *Growth Plan* was deserving of a more rigorous approach. In parallel, my recent move to Brampton fuelled me with a desire to contribute to the city's physical and democratic fabric by understanding the implications of the GP implementation process on my community and region. Specific objectives were identified early-on in the paper development process and included garnering an understanding of the implementation process and uncovering what it revealed about contemporary growth management and sustainability in Ontario.

In case study research it is important to provide a practical context for synthesizing the areas of inquiry. Yin (1994) emphasizes this point by noting that case study research seeks to situate a contemporary event within its real-life context. In addition to providing a contextual basis for assessing the implementation of the *Growth Plan*, Peel Region was specifically chosen because of its unique spatial and political qualities. With three area municipalities and a distinct population imbalance, Peel Region is noteworthy because it can provide a multi-dimensional examination of the implementation process while being able to focus on a single, geo-political region.

A qualitative approach was utilized as a framework to address my research question, one which included conducting primary research between May 2007 and April 2008. This primary research involved attendance at a Provincially funded *Places to Grow Act* Summit, a Brampton Mayor's Town Hall on the GP, a Brampton GP workshop, and interviewing planners in the three area municipalities, region and the Ontario Growth Secretariat. Please see Appendix A for calendar and activity details on the primary research. A variety of academic and primary sources of information was gathered to build a position born out of the analysis of this information.

The process used for collecting and interpreting data is framed by an interpretive research perspective (Eisenhardt, 2002); one that accounts for the subjective nature of data interpretation and gives weight to the significance of personal participant-observer involvement in the implementation of the GP in Peel Region. As a constantly evolving process, it was necessary to revisit my research question at key intervals during the research stage.⁵ During the final stages of research it was necessary to revisit the

⁵ My emphasis changed following my first municipal interview (Brampton) from identifying local interpretations to identifying local pressures, actors and influences on the municipalities' approaches to implementation.

research question armed with theoretical research captured from relevant scholarly work.

The proceeding has been organized to provide the reader with a brief overview of the participant observation method deployed, interview technique and a clarification on my interpretation of policy implementation. The latter is necessary because of the timing of this Major Paper⁶ and because of the evolutionary process through which the GP implementation is occurring.

Participant Observation

The scope of my participant observation research includes attendance at a Mayor's Town Hall, a *Growth Plan* 'Summit' and actively participating in a *Growth Plan* workshop in Peel Region. At all meetings, events and workshops, the objectives of my research project were openly shared with meeting participants, thereby adhering to methodological and ethical suggestions regarding participant-observer research (see DeWalt 2002; Johnson, Avenarius and Weatherford 2006).

My role as an observer evolved to that of active participant during the April 3rd, 2008 *Growth Plan* workshop, hosted by the City of Brampton. In this setting, I was assigned to a break-out group concerned with the topic of 'environmental protection', and actively participated in the brainstorming and presentation stages of the workshop. At the outset I informed my group and the workshop facilitators of my research intentions which were warmly received.

⁶ Consultant studies on the municipalities' feasibility of achieving the GP's population, intensification and infrastructure requirements are due back late fall 2008. This timing prevents me from interpreting how sustainability will finally be enacted in meeting the targets of the GP but allows for a preliminary investigation into the interpretation of sustainability during the lead-up to the OPAs.

Interviews and Content Analysis

In the winter and spring of 2008, interviews were conducted to ensure a comprehensive representation of the organizations involved with the implementation of the *Growth Plan* in Peel Region. These interviews included representatives from the Ontario Growth Secretariat⁷, Region of Peel, City of Mississauga, City of Brampton and the Town of Caledon. Details of interview dates, participants and locations can be found in Appendix A.

Through telephone research I was able to quickly identify the senior planners assigned the *Growth Plan* implementation portfolio and conducted interviews accordingly. I also made use of a snowball interview method, where interviewees were asked to suggest other interviewees that may be helpful for the research topic. This method did not prove fruitful as I quickly learned that the implementation portfolios are carefully guarded by senior staff and that knowledge surrounding local interpretation concerns was not disseminated among staff or supporting agencies. All interviews proved useful for obtaining written information following the interview which was for the most part, provided in full.

A significant amount of research was conducted prior to each interview and a prepared list of questions was developed. For the three area municipalities, the same topics and nearly identical questions were asked with only slight modifications for particular circumstances relating to implementation stage and issues. For the interview conducted at the Region, emphasis was placed on the area municipality-regional governance structure and the specific areas in which the Region could contribute to

⁷ The Ontario Growth Secretariat is a division of the Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal charged with the implementation of growth plans released under the 2005 *Places to Grow Act*.

implementation based on the service agreement.⁸ At the provincial level, questions were tailored to their role in providing information and direction to the municipalities and any feedback received to date. Questions for all interviewees were purposely open-ended allowing for the participants to elaborate on their viewpoints or to put forward an assertion. In each instance questions were added since dialogue typically ensued, allowing for more informal conversation to emerge over the course of the interview.

As an ethical procedure, each interview was audio taped upon consent of the interviewee. Each interviewee was given the opportunity to request not to be audio taped before the interview commenced, however, none of the participants refused taping. It is important to note that all participants requested the ability to view any quotes or paraphrased material taken from the interview prior to the submission of this Major Paper. This was handled by sending over an electronic copy of the drafted material for the participant's review and comment. Written notes were taken during the interview and detailed electronic notes taken from the audio tape were used to assist in the analysis of the information and opinions gathered. Although a technical content analysis was not undertaken on my research, particular attention was paid to terms and expressions frequently utilized and whether or not these terms appeared in the supporting legislative planning documents. Equal attention was paid to the existence of a growth discourse⁹ and how it varied between the Province and the area municipalities. This resulted in a stronger understanding of the governance relationship of these actors,

⁸ For details, please refer to Chapter 5.

⁹ Discourse theory, based on the writings of Michel Foucault, interprets discourses that are constructed by multiple and competing sets of ideas and concepts that have been produced, reproduced, and transformed in everyday practices, giving meaning to the material and social world (Richardson, 2002). These socially constructed meanings that are culturally manifested through influences of everyday life and social history act to build behaviours and actions that are unintentional and unconscious (Patano & Sandberg 2005, Sandberg & Foster 2005).

which in turn revealed much about their ability to express local interpretations and pressures during the implementation exercise.

Policy Implementation

To conclude this research methods overview, it is important to expand upon my interpretation of policy implementation and how this was applied throughout the research and analysis of this Major Paper. Since the GP implementation process continues until June of 2009, and in part because of the timing of my interviews, much of what was learned with respect to how sustainability is enacted through growth management was captured through the comments the Region and area municipalities sent to the Province during the various drafts of the *Places to Grow* legislation and ensuing GP policy. Therefore, it is timely that a clarification be made with respect to the interpretation of policy implementation.

It is well understood that policy-makers must rely upon others, such as developers or other governments, to translate their proposals into action and that cooperation between the sectors is necessary in a liberal-democratic environment (Pal, 1992). Implementation is incremental in nature: a teleological process, so it is important to consider the evolutionary nature of policy implementation and move away from a more rational-comprehensive understanding that is rooted in control:

Implementation is evolution. Since it takes place in a world we never made, we are usually right in the middle of the process.... When we act to implement a policy, we change it. In this way a policy theory is transformed to produce different results (Majone and Wildavsky, 1984, 177).

Pal (1992) considers implementation to be an execution process; one that realizes schemes and conceptions and provides elaboration on the policy itself. The

implementation of the GP, as it unfolds before us, is such an evolutionary implementation process; one that seeks to provide legitimation of the *Places to Grow Act* through a successful execution of the *Plans* targets. Yet, this implementation began prior to the release of the final GP. Extensive consultation was undertaken over two years with all three sectors and citizens with the singular purpose of garnering acceptance for the *Plan*. Therefore, in order to address the research question presented in this paper, material gathered during the consultation phase of the GP, particularly written correspondence between Peel Region, area municipalities and the Province has been analyzed from an evolutionary implementation perspective.

The Province recognized the value of extensive consultation when the *Places to Grow* legislation was developed; Porter (1997) assigns equal value to the consensus-building activities and specific policy provisions in growth management programs. As such, this paper has been crafted to shed light on the actors, local conditions and pressures in order to address the research question of how sustainability and growth management interact in this highly politicized implementation environment.

Chapter Three - Literature Review

Introduction

Three, inter-disciplinary areas of focus are explored in relation to growth management in this chapter: urban governance, multi-level sustainability governance and sustainability. This exploration permits an informed evaluation of the research question presented in this paper of how sustainability and growth management interact in a highly politicized implementation environment and maintains focus on the regional growth management context in which to examine the major theoretical informants to the *Growth Plan*.

The exploration of urban governance is the starting point for analysis of the implementation of the GP, since it is necessary to understand the structure in which the *Plan* was written and is now being implemented. In the first section, an emphasis is placed on the centrality of scalar influences to my case study research and to the regional growth management context in which this policy's implementation is unfolding. Next, I introduce the emerging, and European-based topic of multi-level sustainability governance and justify its applicability and transferability to Ontario's regional planning environment. Lastly, and of greatest consequence to addressing my research question, I will provide the reader with an overview of sustainability literature in relation to both governance and regional growth management.

Urban Governance and Scale

With more than 300 city-regions around the world with populations in excess of one million, there is a renewed interest in regional growth management research (Scott, 2000). Contributing to the global increase in large city-regions is the continued decentralization of people and jobs, resulting in a continuing spatial expression of cities that extends beyond metropolitan boundaries and into suburban, exurban and rural areas (Hodge and Robinson, 298). This has resulted in a dynamic mixture of town and country activities which planners must address using a regional growth management framework. Furthermore, evolving city-regions and the increasingly neo-liberalised economic and governance structures enveloping them, has prompted a renewed interest in researching the major theoretical informants to growth management.

Academic examinations of governance at the regional scale tend to focus on regulation, evaluation and implementation and are presented from a managerialist perspective (Wekerle et al., 2007; Bengston et al., 2004; Cortner & Moote, 1999; Hollis & Fulton, 2002). Increasingly, contemporary writing on this topic draws upon informal structures for a complete understanding of governance. According to the Conference Board of Canada, urban governance extends beyond the mechanics of decision-making and into the incorporation of formal and informal roles of local authorities, stakeholders and citizens (2007). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO) definition of urban governance also emphasizes steering processes and the various links among stakeholders, local authorities and citizens. Notably, UNESCO's definition goes on to value the development of strategies that trigger active participation, negotiation among actors, transparent decision-making mechanisms and innovative urban management policies (Kaufmann et al, 2004). Regardless of the

definition attempted for urban governance, four, basic governance principles are desired in any model (Conference Board, 2007, 69):

- Coordination;
- Efficiency;
- Accountability; and
- Responsiveness.

These principles are examinable from a scalar perspective; this perspective is critical to my exploration since spatial, economic and political transformations are scalar processes which interact with governance. In our increasingly globalized economy and with the Ontario government's acknowledgement in the *Growth Plan*¹⁰ that investment in physical infrastructure and communities attracts knowledge workers and foreign investment, the examination of scale takes on an international dimension. This dimension is captured by Jessop (2000), who writes of globalization as the, "creation and/or restructuring of scales as a social relation" and, "the stretching of social relations over time and space so that relations can be controlled or coordinated over longer periods of time...and over longer distances" (Jessop 2000, 340/341). An appreciation for the scale to which governance is contributing to and is influenced by is necessary in a globalizing region.

Brenner (2004) contributes much to this field by studying the linkages between urban governance and state rescaling. Important to this study is the concept of spatial Keynesianism; where standardized administrative structures are established throughout the state's territories and supporting redistributive spatial policies are deployed to address territorial inequalities. Since the 1980's, post-Keynesian spatial policies were introduced to concentrate industrial and infrastructure activities in the most globally competitive city-regions which led to physical, social and economic expressions of uneven geographical development (Brenner, 2004, 2, 13). These expressions result

¹⁰ See, for example, section 1.2.1 "A Vision for the Greater Golden Horseshoe".

from the neo-liberalization of social, political and economic processes, which under capitalism, are not distributed uniformly across the globe and tend to be organized within “regional clusters” with variable spatial expressions of the inequalities (ibid, 13). As regions or territories transform under a variety of influences, scales emerge but also transform as explored in discussions about rescaling and scale jumping (Bunce 2007; Brenner 1998, 2000; Keil 2000; Jessop 2000; Jessop, Peck and Tickell, 1999).

Harvey (1989) observed this neo-liberalization of governance and termed the shift to one of “entrepreneurial urban governance”; one which emphasized growth-oriented approaches to urban and regional policy in order to promote economic development from below (2). With the shift from Keynesian, or centralized administrative foundations, to post-Keynesian governance structures, the relationship between governance and state rescaling processes has been observed; notably the ability of urban governance to serve as a catalyst of state rescaling (Brenner, 2004, 174). From a political-economic standpoint, one of the major reasons for instigating and continuing state rescaling processes is to enhance supranational competitive advantages for territories (Brenner, 176); an aim expressed within the GP for the GGH.

In application to regional planning and growth management, debates over scale and jurisdiction are routine and somewhat inevitable. According to Owens and Cowell (2006), a scalar tension exists when choosing between being strategic (selective) or inclusive across a wide area. Since municipalities in Ontario operate within a jurisdictional web, their responses to urban governance challenges must be multi-jurisdictional and make strong use of civic partnerships (Conference Board of Canada, 2007). Sancton (2000) predicts that Canadian cities will continue to respond to dominant provincial governments and increasingly make use of multi-level governance

skills. According to the Conference Board of Canada (2007), effective governance capacity is, “an enabling condition that can help create an environment needed to propel Canada’s major cities to sustainable prosperity” (67). Hence, it is necessary to situate governance within the investigation of sustainability.

Governing Sustainability

Sustainability has been declared as the ultimate planning goal despite not being clearly defined nor assigned a framework for how it is to be achieved (Briassoulis, 1999).

Gunder (2006) asserts that:

...the definition of sustainability can be and often has been deployed selectively by planners or politicians as a materialization of dominant institutional ideologies supportive of growth and capital accumulation that maintains the existing status quo of class inequalities, with limited regard to the environment (209).

Since the publication of *Our Common Future* by the Brundtland Commission, the term sustainability has been broadly defined using an integrated approach to balancing economic, social and environmental interests; derived from international sustainability policy agendas tied closely to the Earth Summit events (Bunce, 2007; Redclift and Woodgate, 1997). With the publication of critical academic work in the 1970's and 1980's on the limits of growth (see McRobie, 1990; Schumacher, 1973), and with the release of environment-centered reports by global institutions, as Raco (2005) notes, a sustainability discourse emerged. Despite this emergence, a parallel, neoliberal economic agenda surfaced, and sought to position its principles of market efficiency, entrepreneurial communities and resource exploitation on centre stage (Neumayer,

1999). It is not difficult to see why Raco (2005) suggests that sustainability can be used to serve a range of interests and to justify contradictory or divergent agendas (329) or, why Gunder (2006) asks if sustainability is nothing more than an illusion:

...sustainability, in itself, acts as an empty name or label of an ideal that many can believe and identify with. Yet, in doing so, sustainability accommodates a wide range of contestable discourses, each vying to articulate its definitive meaning. (214)

Sustainability agendas that do strive for balanced representation of economic, social and environmental interests have been occurring on both 'shallow' and 'radical' levels.

O'Riordan (1992) observed the "shallow greening of development policy" as one with an anthropogenic focus, whereas radical environmental thinking calls for reductions in economic growth and alienates human beings from the environmental disruption they create (308, 318). The latter interpretation remains outside of mainstream economic discourses to this day.

Given the above, it becomes apparent that the governance of sustainability is plagued by a lack of an agreed upon agenda and an exposure to external interests and interpretations. Therefore, urban governance structures will continue to struggle with the equitable and strong implementation of sustainability agendas unless we look to a governance system that is inherently sustainable.

Multi-Level Sustainability Governance

Increasingly, the study of sustainability and governance leads academics to a relatively new field of research in what is termed multi-level sustainability governance (MLSG). Recognizing the importance of flexibility, responsiveness and adaptation

necessary to confront multi-jurisdictional urban environmental challenges and opportunities, this field of study presents strong potential for injecting sustainability into urban governance frameworks (Dovers and Connor, 2006; Bosselmann, 2003; Carley and Christie, 2000; Smouts, 1999). In essence, MLSG is a trans-national, highly-integrated system of ethically guided leadership for the common pursuit of ecological and societal sustainability. Global in vision and led by an ethic of collective responsibility, multiple levels of traditional state-structured institutions flexibly interact with key partners such as civil society, indigenous cultures and corporations (ibid).

Research on MLSG surfaced from and continues to be rooted in European soil; stemming from the long-standing presence of a supra-national body, the EU. Although growth management in Ontario is not implicated by a supra-national governance structure, MLSG can usefully inform research in this Province by supplanting key institutional and normative shifts required for achieving sustainability in governance structures. "For the foreseeable future, Canadian cities will continue to be the subject of a complex web of multi-level governance in which provincial governments will be dominant" (Conference Board of Canada, 67) . Concern about the state of our urban municipalities has manifested itself at each of our three levels of government in Canada and this concern extends beyond administrative and financial conflicts to the health of urban environments.

Since the three tiers of Ontario's governments are operating within an existing multi-level governance structure, and because the relationship dynamics are far from established, the investigation and research of MLSG within this Province is useful. Primarily, an examination of governmental roles, jurisdictions, efficiencies, effectiveness

and ability to engage the public will assist in the development of, and commitment to, a shared goal of sustainability.

Deriving consensus for a shared goal requires extensive dialogue and cultural understanding. This type of understanding can only be obtained from a bottom-up or ‘subsidiarity’ approach; one that focuses on local perceptions of sustainability and works towards the harmonious blending of these perceptions (Dovers and Connor, 2006). Reasons for maintaining focus on the principle of subsidiarity include political accountability, economies of scale in decision-making and ensuring availability of information to the decision makers (ibid). For the structural changes to institutions necessary for achieving MLSG, the subsidiarity principle is useful in the organization of departments and roles to ensure information distance feedback loops are minimized between decision makers and their impacts on the environment (ibid). With these structural improvements in place, focus is maintained on the shared vision of sustainability and actors are more intimately engaged with their work. This type of arrangement, although potentially difficult to transition to, is inherently sustainable. Considering Ontario’s provincial-municipal relations are currently charting new waters, a window of opportunity exists for anchoring sustainability and using it as the foundational element of their multi-level governance framework.

Growth Management Planning and Sustainability

City-regions suffer from disproportionate geographic to population growth where land consumption outpaces population growth at a rate of eight to ten times (Hodge and Robinson, 2001, 295). This striking feature is compounded by complex jurisdictional governance structures through which city-regions must guide, direct and balance growth

in a sustainable manner. Prior to investigating the relationship between growth management and sustainability, it is necessary to present the definition of a city-region for contextualization purposes. Senior (1966) offers a definition of the city-region that according to Hodge and Robinson (2001) has withstood the test of time and the advent of globalization:

[an]...organically interrelated group of people whose jobs, economic activities, social institutions, leisure time, and mobility are working together in an integrated fashion...[and] represent more than an enlarged scale of city or town, and more even than an amalgam of cities. (9, 11)

City-regions differ from metropolitan regions in that there exist "special forces that impinge upon their growth and development," with dominant growth occurring in their peripheries because of extreme jurisdictional fragmentation (Hodge and Robinson, 2001, 299-301). The management of growth, therefore, is gaining renewed interest in urban sustainability research as the sheer number of city-regions and their magnitude of growth dictate informed and coordinated efforts to offset the negative aspects associated with regional growth.

Cardew (1999) asserts that sustainability and the discourses that attempt to articulate it are "ideological social constructs" (211). Adhering to this position is Gunder (2006), who remarks that the potential for substantial social and environmental change is stifled by a lack of common understanding; one that is needed as a basing point for MLSG. According to Gunder (2006), this very vagueness creates the conditions necessary for an imbalanced application, such as in growth management, to propagate. Willers (2004) has observed this application and found it to be a utilitarian application of the sustainability agenda; one that advocates not "limits to growth [but] the growth of

limits" (1146). Sustainability, therefore, presents opportunities and challenges to the field of growth management because of its inherent flexibility and adaptations in public and private settings. Meanwhile, urban governance presents a similar adaptive character; one which is responsive to political-economic demands and increasingly, environmental demands. Growth management, when conducted at a regional scale, is thereby subject to both governance and sustainability agendas in addition to the myriad of citizen, developer, political and international economic influences. It is therefore important to determine, for the sake of this research, which element steers the regional growth management process in the GGH.

Driving Growth Management: Governance or Sustainability?

Bengston et al (2004) have noted that single techniques or approaches to growth management do not perform as well as when multiple, reinforcing policy instruments are employed (281). Calthorpe (2001) arrived at a similar finding and termed the act of integrating multiple facets at once as 'Regional Design' (43). Through this technique, synergy is created for whole rather than attempting to achieve efficiency of the parts – economy, ecology, history, politics, regulations, culture or social structure (ibid).

According to Bengston et al (2004), the evolution of smart growth strategies in recent years, which are based upon reinforcing policy principles, provides supporting evidence of the need for growth management to move forward using multiple and reinforcing policy instruments (281). Popularized in continental Europe and Britain, the compact city model of planning has become idealized in scholarly work on the environmental benefits of European cities (Beatley, 2000, 2007). Sustainability has become synonymous with the features of the compact city such as higher population densities, mixed land uses,

pedestrian-oriented streets, and denser urban built form to support public transit networks. Land use is an important aspect of the compact city and smart growth movement. Layard (2001) has witnessed a surge in the references to the “ideas, principles and policies underpinning sustainability....from planning policy guidance to good practice guides to inclusions in development plans” (1). Urban form has become an important component of discussions; according to Newman (2005), sustainability objectives now frame the process and direction of planning efforts.

Urban intensification, and its related objectives in the compact city model of development, is understood as a method for implementing urban sustainability objectives (Williams, Burton and Jenks, 1996, 2006). As previously discussed, the practice of regional growth management is also understood to be a tool for implementing urban sustainability on a larger scale by working towards reversing the impact of sprawling, suburban development based on single use zoning and subdivision planning. In Ontario, this is evidenced by the *Growth Plan* which encourages the development of complete communities that are pedestrian-oriented and that can service both the commercial and residential needs of its citizens. The renewed interest in researching and conducting regional growth management in the United Kingdom can be attributed to the centrality of sustainability in planning. It is my opinion that Ontario’s return to growth management planning is driven by a sustainability agenda; one that has successfully linked urban form to the process and direction of planning efforts which are based on sustainability objectives (Newman, 2005).

Planning for Sustainability

The practice of planning has received an injection of legitimacy by virtue of being deemed to play a key role in the quest for sustainability through the application of technical, instrumental and political mechanisms (Cowell and Owens, 2006; Gunder 2006; De Roo and Miller, 2000). The relationship between planning and sustainability is one that exists through policy; research is typically conducted on overt planning procedures (such as physical planning, land-use policies, growth management) and less so on the unintended or longer-term ways in which planning procedures impact the greening of policy (Cowell and Owens, 2006). This is evidenced by the promotion of planning in institutional settings as an instrument of sustainability in a technical-rational manner; sustainability is pursued through new, measurable objectives such as increased densities and mixed-use development (ibid). In fact, redevelopment has become the dominant approach used by planners to achieve sustainability as observed by Gunder (2006). Advocates for sustainable regional growth management, such as Calthorpe and Fultron (2001), encourage the application of networked, mixed-use neighbourhoods at a regional scale in order to, "create order in our balkanized metropolis" (76). Perhaps nervous of appearing overly simplistic, Calthorpe inserts caution by acknowledging the complexities and challenges associated with enacting the design imperatives for creating the post-suburban metropolis. The integration, he continues, of social diversity, environmental protection, and transit for the creation of a regional growth strategy, must, "create an architecture that reinforces the public domain..." (78).

With the advent of compact city development policies translating into land-use policy in Europe and increasingly in Canada it is now possible to study a divergence between theory and practice. Williams (1999) has studied policy failures in the United

Kingdom that reveal weaknesses in intensification strategies – strategies that were viewed as a way of achieving a more sustainable urban form. Williams' research revealed little or no definition assigned to the intensification process and little or no attention paid to the assessment of the localities in which these policies would be implemented. Consequently, Williams found that urban areas could suffer the effects of over-development and 'town cramming', thereby moving further away from sustainability objectives.

There exists a political-economic aspect to sustainability and growth management planning that must be acknowledged in this literature review. This aspect exists because of what Campbell (1999) terms the 'triangle of sustainability' that represents the interconnections and balance sought between economic, environmental and societal needs. By virtue of having three sustainability pillars, conflicts and contradictions between these pillars are not unexpected. Campbell observes that planning professionals define themselves by where they stand on the triangle (1999, 253) which inherently introduces variations in the ways in which sustainability is defined and implemented (Bunce, 2007). As previously noted, the emergence of entrepreneurial urban governance structures has implicated sustainability. While et al. (2004) have observed how local political and economic elite are exposed to internal and external urban environmental forces demanding a 'sustainability fix' for their jurisdiction. The surfacing geographical and jurisdictional conflicts resulting from this political-economic reality demonstrate the contradictions of post-industrial urban economy-environment relations (ibid, 565).

Summary

Governance, sustainability, policy and planning interact freely within both academic and institutional realms. As such, it is necessary to examine the components and scales of this interaction as well as the processes and outcomes. Cowell and Owens (2006) have questioned how these above elements might be expected to interact in the future given the shortcomings of their contemporary interactions. Regional growth management provides ample opportunity for this exploration because of the ever-increasing number of city-regions emerging around the globe and by virtue of its interdisciplinary nature.

Urban sustainability research conducted in the United Kingdom has demonstrated a need for closer collaboration between analysts of planning and the political theorists working towards the greening of the state (Cowell and Owens, 2006). However, this greening is severely limited by an unresolved definition of sustainability and the appropriate interaction of governance structures in which to enact this definition. As this literature review has suggested, the parallel employment of MLSG and the subsidiarity principle offer direction for the effective implementation and management of sustainable regional growth management strategies.

Sustainability, despite having a widely agreed upon triple-bottom line objective, has largely been economistic in application and according to Gunder (2006), this is a core conflict that remains to be resolved. I have noted in this literature review the significance of the neo-liberalized political-economic realities to growth management and sustainability but would now like to point out how intervention in land use persists, despite the notion of the shrinking state under neoliberal regimes (Wekerle et al., 2007). This in itself reinforces the need for continuing to investigate "the major role of *urban*

regions as key sites of contemporary state institutional and spatial restructuring” (Brenner, 2004, 2, emphasis original). It also speaks to the importance of researching sustainability in parallel to regional growth management; environmental scientists and activists have rallied for a prioritization of nature in regional planning since the 1970’s (Bocking, 2005). In contemporary regional growth management, researchers, planning practitioners and citizens are touting sustainability as the vehicle to advance the practice.

This literature review has revealed the key informants to growth management theory and has demonstrated the increasing significance of sustainability. It has also identified the ability to adapt sustainability objectives to competing interests, all within a rational framework that is widely employed in the growth management planning profession. Opportunities for marrying governance and sustainability agendas have also been demonstrated under a MLSG framework, allowing for research into contemporary interactions of these agendas. By formulating an awareness of these interactions, an informed analysis of the implementation of the *Growth Plan* within the jurisdictional setting of Peel Region can be undertaken.

Chapter Four - Contextualizing the *Growth Plan*

Introduction

Canadian urban centres were legislatively and politically disconnected from the towns, villages and countryside that surrounded them until the 1950's. In the 1960's and 70's provincial governments implemented significant changes to the organization of municipal government, including the introduction of new upper-tier structures – known as regional municipalities (Bunting and Filion, 2006, 315-316). The reasoning provided by policy-makers for this introduction included economics of scale, increased equity in tax burden and service delivery, and needed planning authority for future development connecting city and countryside (ibid). Since this time, regional governments have contributed to the governance and execution of urban growth management strategies to varying degrees. Regional governments are effectively sandwiched in Ontario where the provincial government, which is acutely aware of municipal self-determination, must also guide the upper-tier structures in matters of regional interest. In the meantime, area municipalities ensure the regional body acts in their best interests and refrains from stepping outside of their legislated mandate.

Regional planning was born within the school of comprehensive planning, a type of planning that stems from rational-comprehensive planning theory. Comprehensive planning is conducted within three specific functions; creating a master plan, coordination of the specialist planners and coordination of specialist agencies, which together work to reinforce each other's work and to further the public's interest as expressed through the master plan (Altshuler, 1965, 194). The rational-comprehensive planning theory framework is premised upon a single community's objective, deciphered

from the identified collective goals (ibid, 193). With the pre-eminent position assigned to sustainability in the practice of planning, public policies for managing growth have regained prominence (Bengston et al, 2004, 273). The three most common instruments deployed are the public acquisition of land, regulatory approaches and incentive-based approaches (ibid). The very use of incentives beckons the creation of a regional body to coordinate the management of growth and its variety of component policies. Yet, the role of regional bodies in Ontario remains modest at best, restricted in their ability to transcend local boundaries and bridge communities and government (ibid, 282).

The boldest expression of unchecked urban growth, sprawl, is affected by two fundamental factors: the rate of growth and the form of growth (Hare, 2001). Opportunities to exert influence over both the rate and form of growth exist in the public and private realm and are inherently tied to powerful socio-economic trends and economic forces (White, 2007). Notable in Ontario, sprawl is highly regulated by councilors, planners and others embedded within the land-use planning system. These actors may not desire sprawl as an outcome but the regulatory framework, policies and programs that shape the decision-making process are often without 'teeth' to secure the land-uses envisioned. As a result, other, less quantifiable opportunities, such as creating a sense of value in the community, are missed when growth is left to chart its own course (Porter, 1997). According to Porter (1997), growth management is both a political and technical tool for guiding community development. As such, growth management is not simply a planning exercise, but one that follows the ebb and flow of politics, governance and powerful political-economic influences that transcend geopolitical boundaries.

The urban infrastructure and land consumption¹¹ challenges confronting the GGH are familiar to those who have lived, worked or visited the region. Public officials at municipal, regional and provincial levels of government are even more painfully aware of the challenges the current urban form presents and have struggled with the highly politicized issue of regional planning. Historically, the regional development pattern in the GGH was determined by the land-use policies of local municipalities with a number of provincial ministries exerting varying degrees of rarely coordinated influence (Hodge and Robinson, 2001). Although attempts have been made since the 1970's to firmly plant the Province into the role of regional planning, none to date have been successful.¹² So it with great interest that the *Growth Plan* has made it to the implementation stage, considering it bears a scope that extends beyond planning the region. According to White (2007), the *Plan* proposes not only to plan the future of the GGH, but to *change* it by re-directing development from the urban edge into existing urban areas, encouraging the development of complete communities and by establishing a series of new, nodal urban centres and corridors.

This chapter will focus on contemporary regional planning efforts; specifically the emergence of the Smart Growth movement in Ontario during the reign of the provincial Conservative party to the release of the Liberal government's *Growth Plan for the GGH*. The purpose of this exploration is to contextualize the political and governance elements of the *Growth Plan* in order to facilitate an informed analysis of the GP's implementation and to demonstrate the emergence of sustainability in growth management planning.

¹¹ Between 1976 and 1996 the GTA lost an area of farmland equivalent to the size of the city of Toronto (Hare, 2001)

¹² For a detailed account see Frisken (2007) and White (2007).

Provincial Policy, Sustainability and Growth Management

An Evolving Relationship

Historically, the relationship between sustainability and growth management emerged from 1960's America where an increasing interest in environmental protection was witnessed. At that time, the environmental movement embraced the notion of growth management, which explains an emphasis on controlling growth to preserve environmental resources in early programs (Porter, 1997). Overtime, growth management came to be seen as a planning and administrative approach that took on a broader scope of supporting and coordinating the development process (ibid). In essence, growth management has generally come to be regarded as a positive force for guiding community development as opposed to restricting growth (ibid).

Contemporary understandings of growth management reflect the organic and complex nature of urban centres and have evolved from an administrative approach to one that directs growth using multi-faceted approaches (Hare, 2001). An example of such an approach is Smart Growth, a tool that emerged from the United States and exemplifies the on-going, and intensifying relationship between growth management and sustainability.

Smart Growth and Ontario

Emerging from the United States in the late 1990's as a "loosely defined strategy" (White, 2007) and lacking a universal definition, Smart Growth requires that many urban features need to be recognized to improve community livability, the environment and the economy (Hare, 2001). Examples of such features range from the

efficient use of land, provisions for mixed-use and walkable communities, dispersed affordable housing and the conservation of greenspace (ibid). An important distinction, however, does need to be made at the outset, which is to distinguish Smart Growth from growth management. Smart Growth, according to Hare (2001) is an umbrella term, used to capture a set of initiatives with the shared objective of achieving an efficient deployment of development, while growth management is likened to a strategy that is used to guide growth within specific communities.

In keeping with the Conservative tradition of minimizing government intervention in land-use and planning controls, Smart Growth, as a citizen-led community determination project, was adopted as a provincial slogan by the provincial government at the turn of the millennium. In the winter of 2001, the Central Ontario Smart Growth Panel was launched by Premier Mike Harris (Woo, 2003). The panel consisted of provincially appointed members from both public and private organizations along with municipal sector employees who did not represent their specific municipalities (Friskin, 2007). By the spring of 2003, the Central Ontario Panel delivered its final advice to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing after hosting public open house meetings and delivering interim advice that focused on transportation matters (Woo, 2003). The panel's final 2003 report, entitled *Shape our Future*, defined visions for urban intensification, similar to the principles outlined in the GP for the GGH, where emphasis on higher-density, mixed-use residential and commercial development is presented as a mitigating development solution. Six principles of smart growth are presented in *Shape Our Future* and are based on an understanding of sustainability that suits continued growth by balancing and integrating approaches to economic development, social development and the protection of the natural environment (Bunce, 2007). For

example, the report encourages the continued use of existing roads, sewer and water systems, the development of more sustainable forms of transportation¹³ and discourages urban growth in 'significant' agricultural lands and natural areas through the use of growth management tactics in an effort to achieve 'sustainable growth' (Province of Ontario, 2003, 1). This report has been criticized for under-delivering in the area of implementation and in the provision of realistic strategies for achieving the long list of visions and ideals and for placing the onus of interpretation on the shoulders of regional and municipal governments (Friskin, 2007). At the same time, the receipt of the panel's recommendations by the Minister demonstrated a new willingness to address the region's growth struggles (White, 2007), while the panel's work sparked a process of public debate about the future of urban growth in southern Ontario.

White (2007) and Friskin (2007) believe that Smart Growth was an odd choice for Ontario, considering many of the principles were already in place and that regional and municipal governments had begun to plan more compact, transit-oriented and mixed-use communities before the adoption of Smart Growth as a provincial slogan. Despite this odd choice, Smart Growth became the government's tool for addressing the region's urban growth problems and was effective at raising the level of awareness for sprawl and urban investment (Hare, 2001). Unfortunately, because of the broad definition surrounding Smart Growth, not unlike that for sustainability, the concept was threatened by competing interests and in effect has become diluted (ibid). Hare (2001) points us to an example of this dilution in the two camps that have embraced the concept of Smart Growth: environmental preservationists who see the potential for limits to growth and pro-growth developers, who find the concept useful in the promotion of

¹³ In parallel, the report places emphasis on expanding Ontario's economic corridors (highways) and proposes a series of major extensions of existing highways into areas that would intuitively be protected by Smart Growth such as the Oak Ridges Moraine (Winfield, 2003).

growth while being mindful of its effects. According to Frisken (2007), the provincial government at the outset of the 21st century equated growth management to Smart Growth and tied Smart Growth to the encouragement and supporting of economic investment. This is evident in the literature produced by the Province at this time when explaining their vision for both the management and vision of growth: "Smart Growth welcomes growth for its ability to generate the economic strength need[ed] to secure the good quality of life" (Woo, 2003).

The connections between the encouragement of intensified, mixed-use development in existing urban areas and economic development are emphasized in *Shape the Future* in its articulated objective to, "attract and direct balanced growth within existing urban settlement areas, to support compact development and optimize existing infrastructure" (Province of Ontario 2003, 3). White (2007) views this relationship as one that accepts growth as both good and desirable and that the application of planning controls be done in such a way as not to seriously impede growth. By the time the Conservatives left office in 2003, the magnitude of the region's urban struggles prompted the new provincial government to return more visibly to the task of shaping the region's urban growth and to protecting natural areas. The release of Smart Growth in Ontario and its very public development encouraged a discourse of sustainability to enter the realm of growth management, thereby building a platform from which the provincial Liberals could blend elements of conservation and growth through a regional planning document.

Planning and Growth Management in Ontario

The Province plays an important role in regional growth management, one that extends beyond their jurisdictional authority mandated to create planning regions within their territories. In Canada's constitutional arrangements, planning regions have no explicit status and must be "invented" each time one is deemed necessary (Hodge and Robinson, 2001, 318). The Province exercises authority by specifying the extent of powers and responsibilities by assigning (limiting) resources and capacities. These include incentive-capabilities, such as the provision of improved higher-order transit for achieving specific densities; incentives now associated with the implementation of the *Growth Plan*. In essence, the Province determines the ability of regional planning authorities to fulfill their planning and implementation responsibilities and to rise to future challenges. According to Hodge and Robinson (2001), provinces play a critical role in regional planning by (363):

- Setting the boundaries of the planning region;
- Delegating resources;
- Provincially coordinating decisions and actions; and
- Creating an appropriate region-wide governance mechanism.

With this power come associated challenges. The Province, because of its legislative mandate is therefore committed to managing the following key challenges (ibid, 359):

- Setting appropriate regional boundaries initially and allowing for their change in order to cope with new developments and pressures;
- Delegating to the city-regions the appropriate type and amount of governmental resources so that they can plan and implement their plans as well as cope with their common issues and needs;
- Coordinating their own ministerial decisions and actions at the provincial level and meshing these with the planning goals and proposed actions of the city-regions themselves; and
- Creating for their city-regions appropriate region-wide governance mechanisms.

These key challenges are inherently impacted by the political climate of the day which has direct bearing on the ability of a regional planning policy to reach implementation; a feat which to date has not been achieved by any other plan apart from the *Growth Plan*.

The Role of Politics and Governance

For all the talk of regional economies and identities, the region itself has never, nor could it have, initiated a regional planning process. And when provincial politics have not favoured government interventions, the region has not been planned (White, 2007, 44).

In White's 2007 historical examination of the *Growth Plan*, emphasis is placed on the strength and depth of municipal autonomy in Ontario and how regional planning has been a hard sell since the 1970's. Yet, the extent of urban sprawl has reached unprecedented levels in the GGH, as has the public concern associated with its impacts, leading to awareness and support for undertaking a remedy. This awareness was garnered in part by the work of the Central Ontario Smart Growth Panel and because of the political continuity of key public servants and consultants that have gone on to work on the *Growth Plan* (White, 2007).

Although the previous provincial Conservatives built a platform from which the Liberals were able to create a regional planning agenda, in part by raising the level of public awareness and engagement surrounding sprawl, they also weakened the ability of municipalities to extract public benefits from private developers (Todd, 1998). Changes made in development regulations introduced by the Conservatives included the Planning Act, Municipal Act and the Environmental Assessment Act, and must now be reconciled with the visions and objectives of the *Growth Plan*, which require local capacity for

implementation and funding. The provincial Liberals have worked to address this potential hurdle by enacting Bill 51, an act to amend the *Planning Act*. Of significance to growth management is the inclusion of the promotion of sustainable development as a matter of provincial interest (Legislative Assembly of Ontario, 2005). This provides municipalities with the ability to defend planning decisions made in the context of sustainable development, such as requiring more compact, walkable and complete communities to be developed.

Growth management efforts at the local level have been thwarted by senior governments in Ontario because of a lack of coordination between the three levels of government dedicated to community development (Hare, 2001). Growth management requires a high level of coordination and a vision for the achievement of long-term objectives as opposed to short-term development goals. As such, conflicting decisions between agencies and governments restrict the ability of growth management planners to achieve set goals and can result in the inefficient use of land (ibid). This lack of effective governance structures to manage city-regions and urban-rural relationships has not gone unnoticed as evidenced by the multiple attempts made since the 1970's to implement a regional planning agenda. Although regional governments exist in the GGH, such as in Peel Region, a clear definition of growth management roles between the local and regional levels is needed in order to contain urban settlement and protect rural landscapes and uses (ibid). This is why state institutions remain the primary actors in the transformation of local governance and regulation (Todd, 1998) and hence maintain the ability to engage a growth management regime. Yet, establishing a formal regional government structure is not appealing to politicians because of section 92(8) of the *Constitution Act*. This section of the Act grants provinces complete authority over

municipalities, signifying that municipalities capture their authority from the provincial crown and not from a local population (ibid). Politically, this presents an enormous barrier for the acceptance of regional governments in Ontario and explains the carefully selected framework the Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal utilized for gathering support for the *Plan*.

Growth Plan Emergence

Labeled “New-Style Regional Planning” by White (2007), the *Places to Grow* initiative is recognized as the first attempt to counter a prevailing culture of non-planning in Ontario and re-inserts provincially directed regional planning into municipalities. This initiative was developed through the research of the Greater Golden Horseshoe Committee; a grouping of actors plucked from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the relatively new Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal (MPIR)¹⁴, Ministry of Transportation and municipal governments (Bunce, 2007). This committee evolved into a Liberal version of the Conservative’s Smart Growth Secretariat, now called the Ontario Growth Secretariat, and is housed by MPIR.

In July of 2004, MPIR released its first *Places to Grow Act* policy document for comment entitled, *A Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe: Discussion Paper*. The Liberal government’s drive to re-insert itself into the role of regional planning is evidenced by the following justification for releasing the discussion paper:

The McGuinty government will not squander the opportunity to enhance the competitiveness of what will soon become North

¹⁴ The MPIR’s mandate is to be, “responsible for providing a broad framework for planning and coordinating the government’s investments in public infrastructure and for growth planning in the province.” Formed in 2003, MPIR reflects the provincial government’s desire to take a more “enterprising” approach to infrastructure (www.mpir.gov.on.ca).

America's third-largest region. We recognize that urban regions are becoming hubs of commercialization and competition as well as magnets for the highly skilled workers so necessary for innovation and productivity. As urban regions compete for these resources we can no longer afford to think short term or municipality-by-municipality (2).

A draft *Plan* followed in February 2005 followed by the Proposed *Plan* in November 2005. Background research was also released during this time with Hemson's¹⁵ *The Growth Outlook for the Greater Golden Horseshoe*; a firm that is now working intimately with the municipalities within Peel and other regions to verify growth targets and to identify opportunities for intensification. Extensive public visioning encompassed the draft plan process and the *Plan's* final goals were arrived at through this visioning, making the *Growth Plan* unlike other regional plans of the past (White, 2007). This process is indicative of what 21st century regional planning needs to be, "a regional conversation rather than a top-down exercise in power" (Katz, 2000, 119).

Although the *Plan's* key principles were determined through a conversational approach to consultation, provincial regulations are in place to promote compliance. These regulations include ensuring all decisions made under the *Planning Act and Condominium Act, 1998*, shall conform to the *Growth Plan*, as shall the Official Plans of all municipalities and regional governments (Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal, n.d.). Consequences to municipalities for not achieving conformity are not overly authoritative but advocates say that despite this, the *Plan* is still more likely to

¹⁵ Hemson, a consultancy firm that conducts planning and long-range strategy work, in addition to other practice areas related to development and real estate, completed the growth forecasts for MPIR and now works for several municipalities in conducting growth confirmations and intensification opportunity studies.

achieve its goals than an authoritative plan that municipalities may oppose and resist (White, 2007).

Achieving regional planning success involves the survival of elections and changes of government therefore requiring years, even decades, to realize their potential (White, 2007). The *Growth Plan*, in its implementation infancy, does hold promise as it has been received with support in a regional planning environment that has not granted long life to previous initiatives.

Limits on Growth or the Growth of Limits?

Hodge and Robinson (2001) have identified two, distinct interest groups in the political landscape of growth management:

1. Advocate growth as an end in itself and seek greater coordination of public investment and provincial transfer payments in order to remove barriers to conventional growth patterns (favour development); and
2. Seek to redirect traditional growth patterns in order to prevent deterioration in quality of life, the polarization of classes, and environmental degradation; advocate managed growth or sustainable development (317).

These authors note that in the 1970's and early 1990's, group number two was dominant but have since been replaced by group one which is seeking regional economic development opportunities through their actions. Ontario's current regional planning environment is visibly rooted in group one, with economic prosperity and coordinated infrastructure investment acting as catalysts to growth planning in the Province.

The infrastructure investments made in the name of growth management have often been to the detriment of governments seeking to minimize the loss of farmland and greenfields. Blais (2000) attributes planning as the major contributor to the loss of these lands and credits the profession with failing to live up to the goals of sustainability by allowing development to occur in the name of growth management practices (13). Porter (1997) believes the intrinsic values of design with nature¹⁶ remain embodied in growth management programs and that with the new focus on sustainable communities; these forces will become more powerful in managing community growth. This is evidenced in the *Plan* with the task of implementation left to municipalities. Hare (2001) believes this governance relationship is necessary for the communities themselves, since as implementers, they have the autonomy required for tailoring the growth management program to their needs and priorities.

At this point it is necessary to ask the purpose of regional planning in Ontario; are we witnessing a limit to growth or a growth of limits? Todd (1998) observes that local institutions in Ontario tend to take a more reactive approach to “managing rapidly changing land use patterns and infrastructure demands under new forms of production and accumulation” (Todd, 207). The result to date has been a significant proportion of new development occurring at the urban fringe rather than within existing, serviced areas. Furthermore, urban boundary expansions are heavily relied upon to accommodate predicted growth (Hare, 2001); a legislated requirement shouldered by municipalities to maintain a 10 year supply of land¹⁷. Although the *Growth Plan* seeks to redirect portions of growth to within delineated built boundaries, and works to ensure a higher density of development built in greenfield areas, it does not propose a limit on

¹⁶ Porter refers to the McHarg’s 1969 vision of the intrinsic values of regional landscapes in shaping and supporting human settlements (84).

¹⁷ A requirement of the Province as expressed in the Provincial Policy Statement.

growth. By utilizing intensification and higher density development, it could be forwarded that a growth of limits is proposed, since the region is reacting to continued growth through immigration by allowing concessions for future settlement area boundary expansions.¹⁸

Summary

Regional planning and growth management activities are known to benefit infrastructure systems, conserve open space and increase the choices for living, working and travel (Porter, 1997). With increasing place-based competition between cities for investment and growth, local relations of governance have been altered to prioritize this phenomenon (Todd, 1998) and evidence the Province's interest in showcasing the GGH for investment. Yet, municipal autonomy runs so deep in this region that prior attempts at regional planning have been largely unsuccessful. What changed? This chapter has pointed to two shifts which have facilitated the implementation of the *Growth Plan*: the first is the entry of a sustainability discourse into the growth management realm and the second is the deployment of a consensus-driven and consultation-heavy policy development program for the *Growth Plan*. Combined, these new approaches to growth management in Ontario have earned political support and leveraged a heightened awareness and understanding of the *Plan*.

¹⁸ Settlement area boundary expansions may only occur as part of a municipal comprehensive review and are subject to restrictions on intensification opportunities, land supply horizons, agricultural lands and policy restrictions from the Greenbelt, Niagara Escarpment and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plans (Province of Ontario, 2006, 20).

Chapter Five - Implementing the *Growth Plan* in Peel Region

Distinguished by a diverse socio-political character and an intensely varied urban form, the Regional Municipality of Peel (Peel) has engaged me in urban planning affairs since my arrival in 2005. It is unlikely that I could have chosen a more nuanced and textured region in which to examine the on-going *Growth Plan* implementation process. As an active participant observer of Peel and its transcendence from constructive critic to implementer of the *Growth Plan*, I seek to convey to the reader a sense of this highly charged political environment and its impacts on growth management, sustainability, and governance. Although today's implementation work cannot accurately predict the eventual physical expression of Peel, nor can it predict the degree to which compliance will be achieved, it does capture the strength of the actors as evidenced by their shaping of this on-going process.

Created in 1974 and assigned the thorny task of planning a "cohesive municipality that could adequately provide services to residents" ("Tell Council", 2007), Peel has been confined a role not that dissimilar to one of an unwelcome guest. The three area municipalities of Mississauga, Brampton and Caledon have embedded five guiding principles¹⁹ into Peel's Official Plan in order to formalize the relationship (Region of Peel, 1996). Of significance to this study, is the principle that assigns delegation

¹⁹ As outlined in section 1.3.2 of the ROP OP, the Plan must:

- a. Be strategic in nature, setting broad, high-level, long-term policy directions for Peel and incorporating the strategic objectives of the area municipalities;
- b. aim to disentangle area municipal, regional and provincial activities in planning, eliminate duplication and not complicate area municipal planning efforts;
- c. add value to the planning and development process in Peel (i.e. have a distinct, complementary and productive role);
- d. not act as a vehicle for Regional involvement in matters that are established as area municipal planning and servicing responsibilities; and
- e. be prepared with a view to having the Province delegate authority to the Regional, area municipal and/or conservation authority level.

duties to the Province. As such, Peel is limited in its ability to guide the area municipalities in matters of regional interest and must instead look to the Province for enforcement and task assignment.

Contributing to the rich character of Peel is the distinctness of its area municipalities and their varying stages of urban development. Mississauga is mature from a development perspective, with only a small fraction of greenfield land available for future development. In essence, Mississauga was undergoing intensification prior to the release of the *Growth Plan* because of its limited land supply. At the other end of the spectrum lies Caledon, a community that is fiercely proud of its rural heritage and weary of diminishing its character by relenting to the pressures for growth. Brampton, a rapidly growing community with further room to grow, is now seeking to carve out a local response to the provincially mandated intensification and density targets that does not detract its mainstay demographic or curb market demand.

Brampton's growth and its relation to Peel and the Province is worthy of further examination to help set the stage for my observations. In 2007, Peel retained the highest value of building permits in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) with an approximate worth of \$1.8 billion. Within this same year, 67% of those development units belonged to Brampton of which 91% were for single family units. In Mississauga more than two thirds of the building permits were for multiple dwelling units; a testament to their higher density development ("Peel Region Official", 2008). According to the 2006 Census, Brampton was the second fastest growing community in Canada which is in part explained by Brampton's supply of greenfield land available for housing and employment; a supply that is known to be the largest among GTA municipalities (City of Brampton, 2006, 4).

In my research, I have concentrated on five actors: the Province as represented by the Ontario Growth Secretariat at the Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal, Peel Region, and the three area municipalities. I aim to demonstrate through the use of correspondence, presentations, work plans and interviews the uniquely arduous task Peel is charged with in implementing the regionally-applied targets of the *Growth Plan*. Through this research, I wish to share my observations on the varying forms in which local autonomy is exercised, how broader interests impact growth management responses and the manner in which sustainability is being interpreted and enacted through implementation efforts to date²⁰. All of these observations are undeniably enveloped by a complex governance structure, as glimpsed in section 1.3.2. of the Regional Official Plan, and are subject to intense pressures which encouraged me to consider the political context of my research.

My research begins with the release of the proposed *Growth Plan*, at which point the actors in Peel began to consider the local implications of this regional plan. Although the reactions were varied, and spoke to the specific needs and situations of the area municipalities, the comments were coordinated through an existing Planning, Technical and Advisory Committee (PTAC), a common element of Regional governments. Typically, the PTAC acts as an internal sounding board and consensus-deriving environment but it also engages with external actors. Following the February 2005 release of the draft GP, Peel's PTAC held a 'think-tank' to consider the implications of the draft *Plan* which included municipal and regional staff as well as other parties²¹. Later

²⁰ As noted in Chapter Two, many of the consultant studies will not be completed until late fall 2008/early winter 2009 and as such, municipalities like Brampton and Caledon are unable to determine with certainty their ability in meeting the targets of the Growth Plan.

²¹ Representatives from the Ministry of Transportation, Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal, Credit Valley Conservation Authority and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority attended the event.

that year, the regional Building Industry Liaison Team (BILT), whose members include stakeholders from the development industry, met to consider the implications of the draft *Plan*. It became evident early-on that stakeholders, despite being consulted by the Province on the draft and subsequent final GP, are integrated with the regional implementation process and that comments to the Province from municipal governments were derived from a larger community of actors.

It is noteworthy that Caledon and Brampton have pre-existing growth management programs²² which strongly influenced the nature of the comments sent to the Province during the consultation periods of the draft *Plan*. Early signs of conflict emerged during the draft consultation period; a shared one being the Province's disregard for established and nearly complete planning exercises such as the Northwest Brampton²³ study and Caledon's process for determining the need for minor urban boundary expansions necessary for its Village Strategy²⁴. In both cases, Brampton and Caledon had moved forward with a locally derived understanding of sustainable planning and had anticipated the successful implementation of their work. However, this work is now impacted by the policies of the *Growth Plan* and must be altered to suit it.

²² In 2005, Brampton adopted a development permit cap of 5,500 units per year outside of the central area. Yearly reports are released detailing the development outlook and block planning initiatives. "The Brampton Growth Management Program is: A program that coordinates and stages the levels and distribution of development growth in Brampton in conjunction with the planning, budgeting and delivery of the services and infrastructure required to support that growth in a way that minimizes public costs and optimizes public benefits" (City of Brampton, 2006). Caledon developed a tri-nodal growth strategy to direct development into three communities to ensure a geographically balanced distribution of growth and to ease pressures on its largest community, Bolton.

²³ Northwest Brampton, a 2,430 hectare area captured after a contentious urban boundary expansion, will be designed as Brampton's first transit-oriented community.

²⁴ "The Village Study process provides for community appropriate and environmentally sustainable growth by integrating the participation of the Town, the Region and the Conservation Authority and by integrating planning, servicing considerations and environmental considerations" (Town of Caledon, 2004).

Mississauga's experience with the drafts of the *Growth Plan* was markedly different and could be viewed as one that lies partway between indifference and welcoming guidance. Although the City, because of its near build-out, was exercising intensification, it was doing so without regional coordination. A few years before the release of *Places to Grow*, Mississauga identified their urban growth centre²⁵ and initiated residential intensifications strategies as expressed in their Official Plan. Although these strategies were in place, Ron Miller²⁶ noted that the *Growth Plan* "forced" the City to come up with a focused strategy for intensification (Interview, 2008). Interestingly, Mississauga was the only area municipality to not formally comment on the *Plan* through their council and although city representatives attended staff level meetings, they weren't compelled to offer any official comments.

Politically, a different story is painted for Mississauga. In keeping with their long-standing concerns regarding representation²⁷ at the Region, a request for the insertion of a clause in the implementation section of the *Growth Plan* was granted. Referred to as the "Orangeville Clause"²⁸, section 5.4.2.4 grants a lower-tier municipality that holds more than 50% of the region's population the authority to assume upper-tier planning responsibilities providing the allocations and targets are met at the regional level (Province of Ontario, 2006, 37). Although this clause has not been exercised to date, it is nevertheless present and available for execution should Mississauga feel the Region's

²⁵ "Square One", located at Hurontario Street and highway 403, is Mississauga's self-determined, and now provincially recognized, urban growth centre.

²⁶ Ron Miller is the Manager of Long Range Planning and is responsible for the team reviewing the Official Plan for conformity to the Growth Plan.

²⁷ According to Miller (Interview, 2008), Mississauga contains 60% of the region's population and up until recently only held 48% of the regional vote. Recently an extra seat was assigned to Mississauga bringing their representation up to 52%.

²⁸ Orangeville and Mississauga are the only lower-tier municipalities to which this policy applies. By referring to this clause as the Orangeville clause, Mississauga can lightheartedly shift attention away from this political clause which according to Miller, accomplishes very little from a planning perspective (Interview, 2008).

role is no longer relevant to the implementation process. Yet, as Miller explained, the appeal process in place for not meeting regional targets essentially strips Mississauga of any of the power associated with this clause (Interview, 2008). Although important to the politicians, planning staff recognized that this clause added little value to the implementation process (ibid).

At the Regional level official comments were offered through Council and appear to reiterate the concerns of the two municipalities most affected by the *Growth Plan*; Caledon and Brampton. In keeping with the Region's requirement to maintain a distinct and useful role, the Region focused their comments on the apparent lack of human services planning and considerations. With approximately 60% of Peel's operating budget dedicated to human services, it represents the largest part of their business, explained Bryan Hill²⁹ (Interview, 2008). According to Hill, the *Growth Plan* offers a "bricks and mortar approach to community planning", and does not address the "cumulative, historical process – [a] patchwork quilt that is issue oriented" (ibid). Although the Region was not successful in modifying the final *Growth Plan*, it will continue to comment on studies coming from the Province.³⁰

When examining the final comments on the draft *Plan* offered by the Region and the area municipalities, specifically Brampton and Caledon, we see a broader platform from which the comments are delivered. The Region at this stage, in addition to restating its concern over the lack of human services, expresses alarm over policy duplications and the need for Provincial direction in implementing the major tasks of the *Plan* (Region of Peel, 2006). As an upper-tier organization that is legislatively restricted

²⁹ Manager of Urban Policy and of the team responsible for leading the Peel Region Official Plan Review.

³⁰ The Ontario Growth Secretariat is committed to releasing studies intended to help guide upper and lower-tier municipalities in the implementation of the Growth Plan. Studies released to date include Employment Lands Strategies, Built Boundary and Urban Growth Centres.

from delegating tasks, this comment speaks to the confined nature of the regional governance system and to the power of the area municipalities.

Caledon's comments on the final draft *Plan* turn away from local reactions to proposed policies and instead question the Province on the social impact of growth and the community's capacity to sustain it (Town of Caledon, 2005). This sentiment was later proven to be shared by other rural mayors belonging to the Greater Toronto Countryside Mayors Alliance who questioned the Province's view of equating growth with prosperity ("Rural Mayors", 2007)³¹. In contrast, Brampton, which had independently forecasted a population of 725,000 residents by 2031 (City of Brampton, 2006) and was being asked to plan for 700,000³² (Province of Ontario, 2006), was not questioning growth but instead seeking to extend the timeframe in which to achieve the density targets of the *Plan*. Of concern to Brampton was the lack of fiscal tools available to assist in the implementation; a concern that was echoed in Brampton's Mayor's Town Hall, *Growth Plan* workshop and in my interview with a senior growth management planner. The nature of these concerns, although forming only a part of my analysis, do speak to the Region's difficult task of making regional plan amendments that are agreeable to the area municipalities while achieving compliance with the policies of the *Growth Plan*.

My research experience in Peel extends beyond an analysis of the local, regional and combined concerns expressed through the implementation³³ of the draft *Growth Plan*. At this point, I would like to share my observations on the primary research undertaken; research which involved speaking with key planning staff for all five actors

³¹ Caledon Mayor Morrison chairs the GTCMA.

³² The OGS is weary of municipalities inflating their forecasts for the purposes of releasing more greenfield lands (Westfall Interview, 2008).

³³ As discussed in Chapter 2, for the purposes of my research Growth Plan implementation began when the Province released discussion papers on the Growth Plan.

studied in this process, attendance at a Provincial Growth Summit, a Mayor's Town Hall and at a preliminary workshop hosted by Brampton on their response to the *Growth Plan*. Interwoven with these observations are supplementary secondary sources, mostly newspaper articles, which gauge the concerns of the *Growth Plan's* impact on Peel Region. I feel that by identifying the various pressures the municipalities are under, my account will naturally invoke a political element that can be used to demonstrate the tension between local and regional issues; thereby revealing how sustainability, when enacted in a politicized implementation process, is being used for very distinct agendas. Prior to developing the Regional narrative, I would like to recount my experience with the Province.

My first interview was with the Ontario Growth Secretariat. In retrospect, this turned out to be quite useful as I was able to seek responses from the actors in Peel to statements made by the OGS and develop a first-hand impression of the push-pull nature of implementation. I met with Bram Westfall, an Associate in the Partnerships & Consultation branch of OGS. Westfall's branch is dedicated to maintaining dialogue with stakeholders and upper and lower-tier municipalities through regular consultations, training sessions and written communications.

In our conversation, I sought clarity on the intended governance relationship between the Province and municipalities in order to understand the limits to local interpretation of the *Plan*. I learned that the Province, according to Westfall, was not interested in creating a new governance structure and instead sought to retain respect for their municipal "partners" (Interview 2008). Interestingly, any provincial governance modifications are inward looking, with effort dedicated to coordinating the ministries

involved in land-use issues, which have since come to be known as the “G9”³⁴ (ibid). Throughout implementation, the OGS will be working with these nine ministries to ensure their interests are aligned in the various implementation analysis papers to be released and to assist municipalities by providing consistent information for implementation.

The OGS’ primary role is to ensure compliance. Aside from monitoring the OPAs to ensure they apply all of the *Plan’s* policies, this role remains somewhat undefined. In discussing the aspect of enforcement with Westfall, I discovered that enforcement is limited because of the non-prescriptive nature of the implementation process and because of an entrenched respect for municipal self-determination; due in part to the Province’s relatively newly re-established role in regional planning. Westfall indicated that the OGS may be able to incent conformity, considering the intensification targets are minimums, and as such, municipalities are encouraged to reach their potential through aligned infrastructure investments (Interview 2008). Other “carrots” include provincial programs such as Renew Ontario and the gas tax (ibid). On the enforcement side, municipalities such as Mississauga believe that although the OGS has the ability to take municipalities to the Ontario Municipal Board for non-compliance, this power would not be exercised prior to the Province enacting a Minister’s modification³⁵ on the OP (Hill Interview 2008). Bryan Hill, Manager of Long Range Planning at the Region of Peel, spoke to the power of Mayors and how provincial politicians (and by extension provincial staff) must exercise caution when dealing with municipal issues such as the details of

³⁴ According to Westfall, the G9 includes Public Infrastructure and Renewal, Municipal Affairs and Housing, Environment, Economics and Trade, Agriculture, Energy, Health, Natural Resources and Transportation (Interview 2008).

³⁵ The Minister of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing has authority, as granted through the Planning Act, to modify Official Plans to ensure conformity with Provincial policy.

the implementation process (ibid). This enforcement role is clearly compromised by historical governance relationships.

The Province's third role involves the delivery of guiding information to assist municipalities in the implementation process. It became apparent during our interview that the Province had a different expectation from the municipalities with respect to the availability of this information. Despite the Province's responsibility for releasing implementation analysis papers, as outlined in section 5.3 of the *Plan*, it does not appear to be concerned about the timeliness of the delivery of these papers. In fact, it is the opinion of the OGS that municipalities do not require detailed information to conduct their OPAs and instead, require it when conducting more detailed levels of planning, such as the secondary plan development stage (Westfall Interview 2008). This position, when presented to Peel and its municipalities, was not shared. Yet, an important reaction to this issue, which may not have been anticipated by the Province, was gathered from my interview with Hill at the Region of Peel. Noting that the regional government is responsive to its citizens and stakeholders, Hill reminded me of a democratic process that is exercised regularly during OPAs – appeal (Interview 2008). Municipal governments must therefore account for additional time in this process for comment and are understandably eager to receive the information from the Province.

Public consultation, from the perspective of the Province, has been integral to the *Growth Plan* reaching the implementation stage. According to Bram Westfall, the sheer number of public and stakeholder consultation events held during the drafting of the *Places to Grow* Legislation and of the *Growth Plan* were regarded as an investment in acceptance for the *Plan* and used to garner support during implementation (Interview 2008). Outreach has extended to the Ontario Municipal Board, to ensure Directors at the

Board are able to interpret the *Plan* and apply the policies at future hearings in the manner that the OGS intended (ibid). This level of public and stakeholder engagement is occurring at the citizen level as well, with municipal staff recognizing the value of an upfront investment in education and awareness to meeting the compliance deadline of June 16, 2009.

Although the Province has re-inserted itself into the role of regional planning and growth management, my research has uncovered this role to be one that is guiding as opposed to prescribing. This role is possible because of a greater “sophistication around planning and more capacity for planning” as compared to the other jurisdictions³⁶ that may rely more heavily on the use of incentives (Westfall Interview 2008). This sophistication is evidently allowing for local implementations that suit the style of the municipality while still ensuring conformity. By assigning the responsibility of implementation to those most familiar with the policy framework, technical data, political pressures and citizenry, the Province is facilitating an efficient execution of the existing planning instruments and allowing for a continued expression of municipal autonomy within a globalizing region.

From the Province’s perspective, there is a high-level appreciation for the *Plan* and municipalities recognize it to be a tool that can be used to deflect pressure from ratepayers and developers (Westfall Interview 2008). Although this comment was not made in reference to any specific municipality, reviewing the variety of pressures currently impacting the implementation process in Peel Region is significant to academic study.

³⁶ In our interview, Westfall made reference to the United States where incentives regularly are used in planning.

In this study, I found that Mississauga's implementation experience to be the least difficult. Although I won't dedicate a tremendous amount of length to analysis, there are two points of interest worthy of discussion. During my conversation with Miller, two positive outcomes of the implementation exercise to date were revealed: a developed intensification strategy that could secure valuable transit dollars for Mississauga, and, upon compliance, the City will have a policy basis to argue against unwanted intensification (Interview 2008). This second point fits into a larger discourse involving the development industry, planners, citizens and researchers. In this discourse, competing visions of sustainability and growth management are thrust against a broader political-economic reality - one that equates growth with prosperity. From Miller's perspective, the development industry views the *Growth Plan* as "an opportunity for willy-nilly intensification" (ibid). The *Plan*, to some degree, is designed to curb this potential threat through its designation of urban growth centres, designated built boundaries and its emphasis on complete communities.³⁷ Yet, it is not prescriptive and municipalities must undertake detailed studies to determine opportunities for intensification that are compatible with existing and planned infrastructure, transit and human services. The strength municipalities have in resisting intensification outside of planned areas lies in the hands of the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), where competing interests will be presented in the name of the *Plan*. This demonstrates a role of increasing importance for the OMB under the PTG Act and not one of diminishing relevance as first thought when Bill 51 extended additional powers to municipalities. In summary, Mississauga is unlikely to significantly impact Peel's goal of meeting the

³⁷ The *Growth Plan* defines a complete community as one that "meet[s] people's needs for daily living throughout an entire lifetime by providing convenient access to an appropriate mix of jobs, local services, a full range of housing, and community infrastructure including affordable housing, schools, recreation and open space for their residents. Convenient access to public transportation and options for safe, non-motorized travel is also provided" (p 41).

implementation deadline or achieving the policy targets unless a political reason were to emerge, causing the leadership to enforce the "Orangeville Clause".

The City of Brampton's implementation experience presents an interesting contrast to Mississauga's for several reasons, including political, land-use, policy and governance. Brampton offers the most layered glimpse into how the *Growth Plans* policies deeply impact the archetypal community it was intended for: a suburban haven located on the fringe of the urban boundary of the GGH that consumes agricultural lands for residential development. As such, my primary research has led me to believe that Brampton has the most 'work' to do in order to meet the implementation deadline of June 2009.

Prior to conducting my interview with a senior growth management planner at the City of Brampton, I attended a Town Hall Meeting hosted by Mayor Susan Fennell aptly entitled "Brampton's Response to the Provincial *Growth Plan*." A near-capacity crowd of approximately 300 residents and stakeholders attended and the event proved useful from a stage-setting perspective. The evening began with a video presentation entitled "Our Brampton, Our Future"³⁸ which flashed images of post-war sprawl, threatened heritage buildings and made references to the City's lost identity at the (supposed) peak of this threat in the 1970's. This segment lasted but a few minutes while the remaining time was dedicated to singing Brampton's praises, from its early work in growth management,³⁹ to its famous residents,⁴⁰ and finally to its current multicultural draw.⁴¹ To conclude the video, city staff, political figures and stakeholders

³⁸ This video was originally made for an international planning competition that Brampton entered in 2007.

³⁹ According to the video, Brampton implemented Canada's first strategic growth management plan in 1974.

⁴⁰ Images of former Premier William Davis and his home in central Brampton were displayed.

⁴¹ The video makes reference to over 60 cultures and 100 languages present in Brampton.

praised Brampton for its “disciplined growth” and recognized that Brampton’s “good planning is paying off” (City of Brampton, 2007b).

Following the video, the Mayor began her presentation by reminding citizens and stakeholders that the City is “taking notes and that we are listening” to the concerns raised about Brampton’s future (Town Hall 2008). Continuing, she explained how the City has one of the “toughest” growth management programs of any municipality in the GTA. In short, the City developed a growth management reporting and accountability tool in 2003 called the “Development Outlook Report” (City of Brampton, 2006). According to this report, Brampton considers the coordination of infrastructure and growth to maintain service levels, while avoiding fiscal burden, in step with sustainable development principles (ibid, 3). The overall goal of the growth management program is to service new residents while maintaining service levels for existing residents (ibid, 4). This program was supplemented in 2005 with the introduction of a development cap which limits the number of units for development at 5,500 per year outside of the downtown core (ibid). In the year previous to the growth management program, Brampton issued 9,500 building permits; its largest number to date (ibid). With the release of the *Growth Plan*, Brampton has recognized that it can now utilize the development cap as an incentive for meeting the targets of the *Plan* (“Brampton Reaffirms”, 2007).

Following the release of the *Plan*, Brampton quickly established a set of interim growth management policies to assist the City in meeting the upcoming targets. Brampton has been dealing with unprecedented growth, and as such, staff and politicians alike recognized the need for sure footing during the implementation stage of the *Plan*. Some of the policy guidance provided in these interim measures included the

protection of established neighbourhoods from potential over-intensification and the strengthening of policies prohibiting the conversion of employment lands. An OPA was completed in 2007 to give legal strength the interim measures (City of Brampton, 2007a).

Intensification emerged as the most contentious issue of the Mayor's Town Hall; not from the citizens, stakeholders or other attendees, but from the City. Following the affirmation of Brampton's growth management program, the Mayor spoke at length about a "Made in Brampton" approach to implementing the *Growth Plan*. "We are not hav[ing] intensification anywhere and everywhere; the province will have to listen to how Brampton wants to grow" (Town Hall 2008). This position was repeated later on in the evening with the Mayor exclaiming her distaste for Provincial involvement in planning: "The Province has been most destructive to the City's vision; their projects don't adhere to Brampton's standards and they should listen to where and how Brampton wants to grow" (ibid). A contradictory message surfaced towards the end of the evening when the Mayor spoke on behalf of staff by explaining that Brampton desires medium-density development but this cannot be initiated by the city; the market has to demand it (ibid). Self-determination is evidently important to Brampton but not at the expense of curbing market demand. I was inspired to further unlock this 'Made in Brampton' solution to the *Growth Plan* in my supplementary primary research.

I met with Tara Buonpensiero, a senior growth management planner, shortly after the Mayor's Town Hall and was curious to learn of staff's interpretation of the "Made in Brampton" approach. According to Buonpensiero, planning staff recognize that there are targets that must be met but the Mayor would like to craft a position that retains choices for how this is done and to achieve compliance in a way that's best for

Brampton (Interview 2008). Upon further probing, I learned that the City is intent on waiting for the consultant's study on intensification opportunities before committing to specific targets. This position will ensure decisions are not being made prior to the completion of the planning process. This, however, is adding to the strain the Region is under for completing ROPAs in advance of OPAs. The Mayor's sentiments on intensification were echoed by Buonpensiero who spoke about the potential conflict between intensification and open space. The struggle, she explained, is a dual one whereby the city is looking to achieve the "same thing", especially in the urban growth centre⁴² where negotiating open space and new construction needed to reach the assigned target of 200 people and jobs per hectare will be challenging (ibid).

Northwest Brampton was cited as an area in Brampton, where despite efforts to plan for a higher density and transit-supportive community, maximum densities are only reaching 50 residents and jobs per hectare (ibid)⁴³. It was clear from our interview that Brampton anticipates significant challenges in meeting the *Plan's* targets.

Brampton is dedicating a significant amount of resources to their public communications strategy surrounding the implementation process. In addition to the Mayor's Town Hall, five workshops will take place in which citizens and stakeholders will provide input on how they would like to see the *Growth Plan's* policies implemented in Brampton ("How Should", 2008). I attended the first workshop, entitled Challenges and Opportunities, attended by approximately 50 citizens and stakeholders who pre-registered for the event. Following the staff presentation on the *Plan*, breakout groups

⁴² Current estimates place Brampton's urban centre density at 94 residents and jobs per hectare whereas the Growth Plan requires a density of 200 jobs and residents per hectare by 2031 (Interview 2008)

⁴³ I have since learned from Buonpensiero that current densities in Fletcher's Creek, the abutting community to NW Brampton, are as high as 70 jobs and residents per hectare, attributed to a greater number of residents in dwelling units than previously thought (personal communication, July 22 2008).

were formed in which we were required to identify Brampton-specific challenges and opportunities for one of the four, key *Growth Plan* goals⁴⁴. Presentations of the findings were made and recorded by the City's workshop facilitation consultant. Since the workshops are not legislatively required, it is not clear how or if this information will be used but it is clear that Brampton recognizes the importance of public education and awareness. Regular newsletters will be issued throughout the process and a website dedicated to "How Should Brampton Grow?" has been created. As Buonpensiero explained, awareness will ease the implementation process (Interview 2008).

Brampton is cognizant of the challenges it faces in meeting the *Plan's* targets; including significant market shifts, financing the studies and infrastructure required, negotiating competing visions of open space and intensification in the downtown core and for retaining autonomy throughout the implementation process. In essence, Brampton's challenges are broad and require a comprehensive strategy for undertaking the required OPA.

Caledon has come to be known as the "next frontier" to developers according to planner Kathie Kurtz, the Town's representative on the Region's growth management working group (Interview 2008). Known for its forward-thinking environmental policies, Caledon was the co-recipient of TVO's Greenest Town award in 2003 (www.caledon.ca) and has worked to resist the pressures of growth. Kurtz is the manager of the contentious South Albion-Bolton community plan where a freeze has been placed on

⁴⁴ 1. Creating Compact, Vibrant and Complete Communities. 2. Supporting a Strong and Competitive Economy. 3. Optimizing Infrastructure to Support Growth. 4. Protecting Natural Resources.

residential development until 2021⁴⁵ with the intent of allowing community services to “catch up” to the premature residential build-out of Bolton (Interview 2008).

In preparation for the implementation of the *Growth Plan*, Caledon prepared five guiding principles to provide direction to the Town’s provincial policy conformity exercise.⁴⁶ The first principle, “Respect and maintain existing Official Plan policies as much as possible” reveals the desire for Caledon to avoid revisiting previous policy and planning work (Town of Caledon, 2007a). During our interview, Kurtz made reference to examples of such work including the development of “state of the art” aggregate policies and the Mayfield West secondary plan (Interview 2008). In both instances, the Town is seeking to preserve the gains made, “not only for maintaining our progressive position but it’s a workload issue as well.” (ibid)

There is a marked difference between Caledon and the other municipalities of Peel and this lies in the amount of growth desired. At this stage, Caledon has put forward a population forecast for the 2031 planning horizon of 108,000. When combined with Brampton and Mississauga’s forecasts, an unallocated population of approximately 30,000 people results. Town council endorsed Caledon’s 2031 forecast on August 1, 2006 but a ROPA is required prior to receiving formal approval (Kurtz Interview 2008). To date, Mississauga and Brampton are setting aside the unallocated population issue until their intensification studies are complete. However, Brampton recently discovered that preliminary household size findings are larger than expected, which may absorb part or all of the unallocated population for the Region. At some

⁴⁵ Limited in-fill and intensification will be accommodated in Bolton prior to 2021. Bolton’s population forecast has increased by 1,500 people to accommodate a portion of the population that would be generated by the potential development sites within Bolton (Interview, 2008).

⁴⁶ With the enactment of Places to Grow and the *GP*, Caledon’s entire land base is now subject to geographic-specific Provincial Plans including the Niagara Escarpment Plan, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and the Greenbelt Plan (Town of Caledon, 2007a).

point, negotiations may be held to determine who will absorb (any) population shortfall to ensure the Region achieves compliance. Commencing in early 2007, Caledon's mayor wrote a series of columns in the local paper entitled "Tell Council Your Thoughts on Growth Plans" ("Tell Council", 2007). The purpose of these articles was to conduct informal public consultation on the issue of growth and to receive confirmation through responses that citizens support the Town's controlled approach to growth.

Landowners in Caledon are at odds with the Town's position on growth. Kurtz explained that the Town, in keeping with its tri-nodal growth strategy⁴⁷, is seeking to geographically balance the placement of growth which does not always align with land holdings. The balance the Town is looking for requires a slowing of development in the southeast, specifically Bolton, and controlled growth in the Mayfield West and Caledon East nodes. Controlled growth has been touted as the community's desire; a desire that does not exclude growth altogether but is regulated to suit the needs of its residents:

Caledon has a rural character and the residents value that so the growth management strategy that we have is designed to facilitate absorption of an acceptable amount of growth which will meet our needs and fulfill our role in absorbing the provincial growth (Kurtz, April 30, 2008).

Controlled growth, however, is not the preferred option for the major landowners; one of whom has adopted communications strategies designed to counter the Town's controlled growth approach. *Caledon Perspectives* is a relatively new community paper that caught the attention of the local media when it first appeared in its 21st edition (Parnaby, 2008). The paper regularly publishes articles on the negative impacts of

⁴⁷ The tri-nodal growth strategy was approved in 1997 after a lengthy appeal process by Bolton business owners. The OMB sided with the town's desire to have control over their own growth (Kurtz Interview, 2008).

controlled growth to Bolton business owners and unabashedly touts a pro-growth message. Background research has revealed intimate connections between the paper and a developer who has significant land holdings southwest of Bolton. *Perspectives* is registered under a numbered Ontario firm with the same mailing address as Solmar Development Properties while the paper's editor is Solmar's director of marketing and sales. Solmar Development Properties owns 740 hectares of agricultural land and maintains a vision of adding 21,000 more people and 11,000 jobs to Caledon ("Caledon turf war", 2008). Council has told Solmar that the expansion of Bolton into neighbouring farmland won't be permitted for at least 13 years, in keeping with the Bolton development freeze. Of course, once Bolton is permitted to grow, it will have to do so in accordance with the density and intensification targets prescribed by the *Growth Plan*, a style of development that is not popular with Bolton residents and business owners alike (ibid).

The sudden appearance of *Perspectives* has prompted the formation of a local citizens group named "Our Caledon Our Choice", a group that supports council's position on growth ("Caledon turf war", 2008). This group has created a mailing list and encourages citizens in Caledon and surrounding communities to attend critical town hall meetings dedicated to the growth conflict. One such meeting took place on July 8th, 2008 and was provoked by the onslaught of media attention, the lawsuit launched by Solmar against the Mayor of Caledon and by the polarization of the community over the growth issue. The purpose of this meeting was to openly discuss the details of the lawsuit against the Mayor and to determine if council should ask the Province for a public inquiry into the challenges rural municipalities are facing in managing growth ("Caledon's Fight", 2008). The Mayor states, "We are asking for a provincial inquiry into

growth management... because Caledon is a perfect example of a municipality trying to manage growth and the provincial policies in a responsible fashion, and this is what is happening to us" (ibid).

Caledon's on-going and public struggle with development, business and sustainability shines light on the narrative of growth and the interest-laden interpretations of the *Plan* at force during its implementation. Studies were commissioned in Caledon by the Caledon Chamber of Commerce and Solmar which examined the interplays of growth, local labour and sustainability. One such report found that a lack of diversity in housing and a mismatch between the residential labour force and business base is contrary to the principles of the *Places to Grow* legislation ("Caledon's Sustainability", 2008). This study also found that with limited residential growth, business development is deterred from the municipality, which only furthers the commuting trend of Caledon residents to demographically-suited employment opportunities (ibid). *Perspectives* recently published an article on the two reports, completed in 2007, which concluded that Caledon's sustainability is in jeopardy because of its inability to develop in the manner provincial policies intended (ibid). Intent, it appears, is proving to be contentious in this rural setting where municipally-determined population projections are at odds with the growth that has been assigned to the Region and with that intended by developers.

Growth, according to the Province, is not an issue for debate or examination; rather, it is a fact that must be contended with. "[We're] not turning on or off the tap, it's flowing and we're dealing with it" (Westfall Interview 2008). In our interview, Westfall referred to Buffalo and Detroit as examples of urban decay because of declining populations. Growth and sustainability do not appear to be actively debated from the

Provincial level; instead the Province is seeking to ensure future growth happens in a sustainable manner, where sustainability has been equated with intensification and compact development. Within Peel Region, sustainability is also being explored through the lens of growth management and reveals a variety of understandings and abilities in implementing visions of sustainability.

Peel Region offers perhaps the greatest opportunities for exploring sustainability but is restricted in its ability to implement. For example, as part of the *Plan's* implementation process, Peel has made sustainability a focus area in the Peel Region Official Plan Review work program and is preparing discussion papers on energy policy issues, climate change implications and the development of sustainability indicators (Region of Peel, 2007). Although this work will be circulated to the area municipalities, it may not inform the OPAs nor the ROPAs since the Region requires consensus from its municipalities on planning matters.

In the approved provincial policy conformity work plan developed by Caledon, sustainability⁴⁸ was identified as a key topic area that would be addressed through a combination of existing initiatives and the development of a detailed individual work plan. In 2005, Caledon created the Town's Office for Environmental Progress and employed a full-time sustainability coordinator. This office is entrusted with the coordination of existing initiatives and *Plan* conformity on the sustainability front and will be liaising with the Region for joint approaches to sustainability policy papers and projects (Town of Caledon, 2007b). But most importantly, my research has revealed that Caledon's perception of sustainability is deeply tied to controlled growth.

⁴⁸ The Town's understanding of the province's meaning of sustainability encompasses alternative and renewable energy systems, air quality, climate change, conservation of water and energy, adaptive environmental management, sustainability indicators and monitoring and sustainable development patterns and urban design (Town of Caledon, 2007b).

Brampton and Mississauga have given a nod to sustainability in their compliance work plans and also offer us convergent viewpoints on governance. Both cities envision achieving compliance with minimal interference from the Region and the Province.

These above understandings of sustainability confirm some inconsistency within the Region and speak to the external influence of local political pressures on the conformity work plans and priorities. Conflict over growth, as we are witnessing in Caledon, and the Provincial mechanisms in place to achieve compliance, is telling of the administrative, legislative and financial frameworks, developed by senior levels of government, that municipalities must operate within (City of Brampton, 2006). Therefore, despite the strength of the actors shaping this process, these frameworks retain the ability to impact a community's vision of sustainability.

Chapter Six - Conclusions

With the potential for effecting incredible change to the physical form of the GGH, the *Growth Plan* is charting new territory in Ontario's regional planning landscape. Previous attempts at implementing regional planning policies by the Province have not succeeded; due mostly to the power held by municipalities and the Province's failure to recognize that urban governance extends beyond the mechanics of decision-making to the incorporation of the formal and informal roles of local authorities, stakeholders and citizens. In the 1990's, Ontario entered a new phase of growth management with the introduction of a sustainability discourse, a legacy that was founded upon significant investment in public consultation and consensus-led planning on behalf of the Conservative government of the time. The potential for a sustainability legacy however, is compromised by competing visions that have planted preservationists, seeking a limit to growth approach, against pro-growth activists, who utilize the promotion of growth through compact development and intensification projects as a method to improve regional sustainability. Sustainability, according to Gunder (2006), accommodates a wide range of contestable discourses, as evidenced by the case study presented in this Major Paper.

Working towards the reversal of sprawling trends and suburban development based on single use zoning, regional growth management is a tool for implementing urban sustainability on a large scale. Despite the Province's economic emphasis in regional planning matters, the GP expresses a vision of sustainability, one that allows for local implementation and to a limited extent, local interpretation. By assigning the task of implementation to those most familiar with the local issues, the Province is exercising

multi-level governance and is clearly demonstrating a desire to avoid duplicating well-established planning processes.

The Regional Municipality of Peel offers a rich examination into the interactions of growth management and sustainability and exemplifies the complex nature of achieving assigned intensification and density targets on a regional basis. Surprisingly, governance issues between the Province and the municipalities are overshadowed by long-standing conflicts between the area municipalities and the upper-tier authority. The Region must negotiate the opportunities and challenges faced by Mississauga, Brampton and Caledon who share very little in urban form, politics and development pressures. Since growth management is a multi-disciplinary task that relies heavily on the relationships between actors, the pressure exerted on Peel to remain relevant throughout this process has led to an erosion of its ability to implement a strong sustainability agenda. Instead, Peel's role has been essentially stripped down to that of a facilitator and consensus-builder for the area municipalities. Mississauga is the most powerful actor in this equation but seems to demonstrate the least planning-related concerns to achieving conformance with the *Plan*. For Mississauga, sustainability is closely linked with intensification and the opportunities it brings for increased transit investment from the Province. Brampton's concerns are primarily tied to those of self-determination as an expression of sustainability. Growth is not questioned; however, intensification is, as this City must transcend past land-use planning trends and re-orient itself to come to terms with medium and higher-density developments. Municipal self-determination is equally important to the Town of Caledon but on the platform of control over growth. With established projections which may hinder regional population absorption requirements, the Town is in the midst of a very public battle between

developers with significant land-holdings, business community members seeking growth to support commercial activities and residents wishing to preserve the quiet and rural nature of their community. Town council recently voted in favour of seeking the Province's assistance in navigating these politicized waters and in opening up a discussion on the impacts of growth to communities. Sustainability, according to Caledon, is controlled growth, where services are balanced with populations and character is preserved through municipal self-determination.

This Major Paper has demonstrated a highly divergent implementation politics for the *Growth Plan*, and has brought attention to an inherent conflict in a policy that seeks to manage growth under a sustainability agenda. Although the Province has been successful in moving the Plan forward with multiple and reinforcing policy instruments, such as the *Greenbelt Act* and amendments to the *Planning Act*, it may not be well-equipped to deal with non-compliance. With limited enforcement tools, and ones that tend to invoke political responses such as challenging a municipality at the Ontario Municipal Board, or imposing a Minister's Modification on an Official Plan, the Province may be faced with fragmented implementation.

I have demonstrated within Peel Region how the Plan's implementation is compromised on three fronts. First, scalar issues have surfaced through the research, as evidenced by local struggles over spatial expressions of growth that have left the realm of municipal determination. With the Province stepping into the role of growth management, and increasing international dimensions to regional growth, new scalar tensions are confronting municipalities. Secondly, differing governance objectives between Peel Region's upper and lower-tier governments and actors are challenging the regional implementation of the Plan's targets. I have uncovered the varying

interpretations of sustainability in each municipality which works to prevent the successful execution of multi-level governance necessary for implementation. Lastly, unresolved and politicized governance conflicts plague Peel Region and have eroded the mandate and opportunities for the Region to influence regional sustainability.

By undertaking unique and current research on Ontario's first successful regional planning policy, I have sought to contribute knowledge to newly-formed regional planning and governance processes. It is my hope that of equal significance is the contribution I have made to a larger body of literature on sustainability, governance and growth management by exploring their intersections in a contemporary and globalized setting through a local lens. It is my intent to build upon this research in the future by examining the evolving outcomes and expressions of the *Growth Plan's* policies on the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

Bibliography

- Altshuler, A. (1965). The Goals of Comprehensive Planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31(3).
- Beatley, T. (2000). *Green Urbanism: learning from European cities*. Washington: Island Press.
- Beatley, T. (2007). Planning for Sustainability in European Cities in: LeGates, R. and Stout, F. (eds). *The City Reader* (4th edition). London/New York: Routledge.
- Bengston, D., Fletcher, F. & Nelson, J. (2004) Public Policies for managing urban growth and protecting open space: Policy instruments and lessons learned in the United States. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 69 (2), 271-286.
- Blais, P. (2000). Metropole Consultants. *Inching Toward Sustainability: The Evolving Urban Structure of the GTA*. Toronto: Neptis Foundation.
- Bocking, S. (2005). Protecting the rain barrel: Discourses and the roles of science in a suburban environmental controversy. *Environmental Politics* (14), 611-28.
- Bosselmann, K. (2003). The Environmental Governance of the European Union: Institutional and Procedural Aspects of Sustainability. In Lilly, I. and Bosselmann, K. (Eds.) *Repositioning Europe: Perspectives from New Zealand*. Canterbury, New Zealand: NCRE Publications
- Brampton Reaffirms Its Commitment to Managed Growth. (2007, May 30). *The Brampton Guardian*. Retrieved June 24, 2008, from <http://www.bramptonguardian.ca/printArticle/25654>.
- Brenner, N. (1998). Between fixity and motion: accumulation, territorial organization and the historical geography of spatial scales. *Environment and Planning D: Society & Space* 16(4), 459-481.
- Brenner, N. (2000). The urban question as a scale question: reflections on Henri Lefebvre, urban theory and the politics of scale. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24(2), 361-378.
- Briassoulis, H. 1999. Who plans whose sustainability? Alternative roles for planners. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 42 (6): 889–902.
- Bunting, T. and Fillion, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Canadian Cities in Transition: local through global perspectives*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press.
- Caledon's Fight Over Farmland. (2008, July 1). *The Toronto Star*. Retrieved July 2, 2008 from <http://thestar.com/News/GTA/article/452598>

- Caledon's sustainability in jeopardy. (2008, June 26). *Perspectives*. Retrieved July 2, 2008 from <http://www.caledonperspectives.ca/Caledon/Documents/Paper/A07.pdf>
- Caledon turf war about urban sprawl. (2008, June 15). *The Toronto Star*. Retrieved July 2, 2008 from <http://www.thestar.com/printArticle/443683>
- Calthorpe, P. and Fultron, W. (2001) *The Regional City*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Cardew, R. (1999). Two cultures, common purpose. *Australian Planner* 36 (3): 134–41.
- Conference Board of Canada (2007). *The Canada Project Final Report Volume III: Mission Possible: Successful Canadian Cities*. Ottawa: Conference Board of Canada. Retrieved on January 25, 2007, from <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/canadaproject/>
- City of Brampton. (2007a). *City Council Report G65 GP*. Brampton, Ontario.
- City of Brampton. (2007b). *Our Brampton, Our Future* [Video]. Canada: City of Brampton.
- City of Brampton. (2006). *Brampton Growth Management Program Development Outlook Report: Part I: Report 2006*. Brampton, ON.
- Cortner, H.J. and Moote, M.A. (1999). *The politics of ecosystem management*. Washington DC: Island Press.
- Cowell, R. and Owens, S (2006). Governing Space: Planning reform and the politics of sustainability. *Environment and Planning C*, 24, 403-421.
- De Roo, G. and Miller, D. (2000) *Compact Cities and Sustainable Urban Development—A Critical Assessment of Policies and Plans from an International Perspective*. London: Ashgate
- DeWalt, K.M. (2002). *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers* Walnut Creek, AltaMira Press.
- Dovers, S. and Connor, R. (2006). Institutional and Policy Change for Sustainability. In Richard, B.J., and Wood, S. (Eds.) *Environmental Law for Sustainability*. Toronto: Hart.
- Friskin, F. (2007) *The Public Metropolis: the political dynamics of urban expansion in the Toronto Region*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.
- Government of Ontario. 1990. *Planning Act*. R.S.O. 1990, c. P13. Last Amended 2006. Toronto: Queen's Printer. Retrieved on July 09, 2008, from http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_90p13_e.htm

- Gunder, M. (2006) Sustainability: Planning's Saving Grace or Road to Perdition? *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 26, 208-221.
- Hare, M. (2001). *Exploring Growth Management Roles in Ontario: Learning from "Who Does What" Elsewhere*. Toronto: Ontario Professional Planners Institute.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The Urban Experience*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Hodge, G. and Robinson, I. (2001) *Planning Canadian Regions*. Vancouver: UBC Press
- Hollis, L.E. and Fulton, W. (2002). *Open Space Protection: Conservation meets growth management*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy.
- How Should Brampton Grow? Brampton's Response to the Provincial Growth Plan*. [Newsletter](Spring 2008). Brampton: City of Brampton.
- Peel Region Official Plan Review Update*. [Newsletter](February 2008). Brampton: The Regional Municipality of Peel.
- Jessop, B., J. Peck and A. Tickell. (1999). Retooling the machine: Economic crisis, state restructuring, and urban politics. In A. Jonas and D. Wilson. (eds.). *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Johnson, J.C., Avenarius, C., Weatherford, J. (2006). The Active Participant-Observer: Applying Social Role Analysis to Participant Observation *Field Methods* 18 (2), 111-134.
- Katz, B. (Ed.) (2000). *Reflections on Regionalism*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institutions Press.
- Kaufmann, D. et al. (2004). *Governance and the City: An Empirical Exploration into Global Determinants of Urban Performance*. Retrieved January 25, 2007, from www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/pdf/govcity.pdf
- Kell, D. (2006). *Province Applauds Brampton Planning at Municipal Board*. Retrieved March 10, 2008, from <http://www.city.brampton.on.ca/media-releases/06-213.tml>
- Keil, R. (2000) Governance re-structuring in Los Angeles and Toronto: amalgamation or secession? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24(4), 758-781.
- Layard, A. (2001). "Introduction: Sustainable Development – Principles and Practice" In: Layard, A., Davoudi, S. and Batty, S. (eds.) *Planning for a Sustainable Future*. London: Spon Press.

- Legislative Assembly of Ontario. (2005). *Bill 51: An Act to Amend the Planning Act and the Conservation Land Act and to make related amendments to other Acts*. Toronto: Legislative Assembly of Ontario.
- Giandomenico, M. and Wildavsky, A. (1984). Implementation as Evolution. In Pressman and Wildavsky, *Implementation*, 1984. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal (n.d.) *Technical Backgrounder: Municipal Conformity*. Retrieved July 2, 2008 from http://www.placestogrow.ca/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=10&Itemid=15
- Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal (n.d.) *Planning for Growth in the Greater Golden Horseshoe*. Powerpoint presentation received on March 07, 2008.
- Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal (2004). *A Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe: Discussion Paper*. Toronto: Province of Ontario.
- Neumayer E (1999) *Weak Versus Strong Sustainability—Exploring the Limits of Two Opposing Paradigms*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- O’Riordan, T. (1992). The environment. In P Cloke (ed) *Policy and Change in Thatcher’s Britain* (pp 297–324). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Pal, L.A. (1992). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. Scarborough, ON: Nelson Canada.
- Parnaby, T. (2008, June 11). Some Curious Connections Between Local Media and Land Developers in Caledon. *1010 CFRB* Retrieved June 13, 2008 from <http://www.cfrb.com/news/565/734721>.
- Patano, S. & Sandberg, L. A. (2005) Winning back more than words? Power, discourse and quarrying on the Niagara Escarpment. *Canadian Geographer*, 49(1), pp. 25-41.
- Peel Region Official Plan Review Update*. [Newsletter](February 2008). Brampton: The Regional Municipality of Peel.
- Porter, D.R. (1997) *Managing Growth in America’s Communities*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Province of Ontario (2006). *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe* (ISBN 1-4249-0796-9). Toronto: Queen’s Printer for Ontario.
- Province of Ontario. (2003). *Shape the Future: The Report of the Central Ontario Smart Growth Panel*. Toronto: Province of Ontario.

- Redclift, M.R. and Woodgate, G. (1997). Sustainability and Social Construction. *The International Handbook of Environmental Sociology*. Redclift, M.R. and Woodgate, G. (Eds). Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Region of Peel. (1996) *Region Official Plan*. Brampton: Regional Municipality of Peel.
- Region of Peel. (2007). *General Committee Report August 3, 2007*. Brampton, Ontario.
- Region of Peel (2006). *General Committee Report January 4, 2006*. Brampton, Ontario.
- Richardson, T. (2002) Freedom and Control in Planning: Using Discourse in the Pursuit of Reflexive Practice. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 3(2), pp. 353-361.
- Rural Mayors Slam Provincial Growth Plan. (2007, December 21). *The Brampton Guardian*. Retrieved June 24, 2008, from <http://www.bramptonguardian.ca/printArticle/34072>
- Sancton, A. (2000). City Politics: Municipalities and Multi-Level Governance. In Bunting, T. and Fillion, P. (Eds.), *Canadian Cities in Transition* (pp 308-319). Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press.
- Sandberg, L. A. & Foster, J. (2005) Challenging Lawn and Order: Environmental Discourse and Lawn Care Reform in Canada. *Environmental Politics*, 14(4), pp. 478-494.
- Scott, J. A. (Ed.) (2000). *Global City Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Smouts, M.C. (1999). Multilateralism from Below: A Prerequisite for Global Governance in Schlechter, M.G. (Ed.) *Future Multilateralism: The Political and Social Framework*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Tell council your thoughts on growth plans. (2007, October 12). *The Brampton Guardian*. Retrieved June 24, 2008, from <http://www.bramptonguardian.ca/printArticle/34099>
- Todd, G. (1998). Megacity: Globalization and Governance in Toronto. *Studies in Political Economy*, 56, 193-216.
- Town of Caledon (2007a). *Planning & Development Department –Policy Section Report 2007-56*. Caledon, Ontario.
- Town of Caledon (2007b). *2007-2009 Provincial Policy Conformity/5 YEAR Official Plan Review Work Plan*. Caledon, Ontario.
- Town of Caledon (2005). *Planning & Development Department –Policy Section Report 2005-29*. Caledon, Ontario.

- Town of Caledon (2004). *Planning & Development Department –Policy Section Report 2004-72*. Caledon, Ontario.
- Wekerle, G., Sandbert, L.A., Gilbert, L. and Binstock, M. (2007). Nature as a Cornerstone of Growth: Regional and Ecosystems Planning in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 16 (1), supplement pages 20-38.
- White, R. (2007). *The Growth Plan in Historical Perspective: Neptis Papers on Growth in the Toronto Metropolitan Region*. Toronto: Neptis.
- Willers, W. (1994). Sustainable development: A new world deception. *Conservation Biology*, 8,1146–1148.
- Winfield, M. (2003). *Comments on: Shape the Future: The Report of the Central Ontario Smart Growth Panel*. Toronto: Pembina Institute.
- Woo, L. (2003, June) *Making Smart Growth a Reality: Putting Principles into Practice*. Poster Session presented at the Canadian Urban Institute Roundtable Breakfast Semainar, Toronto, Canada. Retrieved June 4, 2008,from http://www.canurb.com/media/pdf/SmartGrowthMAHCUI_06_12_2003.PDF
- Yin, R.A. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2nd Edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Appendix A

Primary Research Details

Interview Details

Buonpensiero, Tara, Policy Planner Growth Management, City of Brampton. 11 March 2008. Brampton.

Hill, Bryan, Manager of Urban Policy, Regional Municipality of Peel, 11 March 2008. Brampton.

Kurtz, Kathy, Senior Policy Planner Planning and Development, Town of Caledon. 30 April 2008. Caledon.

Miller, Ron, Manager of Long Range Planning, City of Mississauga. 3 April 2008. Mississauga.

Westfall, Bram, Associate in Partnerships and Consultations, Ontario Growth Secretariat. 7 March 2008. Toronto.

Public Meeting and Workshop Details

Province of Ontario, Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal, *Places to Grow Summit*. 17 May, 2007. Toronto.

City of Brampton, Mayor's Town Hall Meeting on Brampton's Growth Management Policy, *Brampton's Response to the Provincial Growth Plan*. 27 February, 2008. Brampton.

City of Brampton, *How Should Brampton Grow? Introductory Workshop: The Growth Plan – Challenges and Opportunities for Brampton*. 3 April, 2008. Brampton.