

Appendix 1: Growth Management/Smart Growth References

Documents

American Farmland Trust, *Fact Sheet on Growth Management Laws*, September 1998.

American Planning Association, *The Principles of Smart Development*, September 1998.

Barnett, Jonathan, “Sustainable Development: How to Make it Work,” *Architectural Record*, June 1993.

Berry, Craig, Chris McGetrick, and Hugh Earnest, “Smart Growth in Little Rock,” Presentation for the APA, March 14, 2001.

Bolan, Richard et al., “Can Urban Growth be Contained?” American Planning Association Contrasts & Transitions Conference Proceedings, 1997.

Ceschi-Smith, Marguerite, and Matthew Reniers, “Brantford’s Brownfields Initiative – Reclaiming a Community,” *Ontario Planning Journal*, January/February 2001, vol. 16, no. 1.

Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Strategies for Success: Reinventing Cities for the 21st Century*, January 2001.

Downs, Anthony, *Dealing Effectively with Fast Growth*, Policy Brief No. 67, Brookings Institute, November 2000.

Dunphy, Robert T., “Transportation-Oriented Development: Making a Difference?” *Urban Land*, July 1995.

International City/County Management Association, *Smart Growth for Local Governments*, April 1999.

Keall, M.J. ed., *Development at the Edge: A Symposium Investigating the Integration of Conservation Strategies and Planning and Development on the Fringe of Cities*, Urban Studies Program, York University, February 1986.

Leinberger, Christopher B., *Financing Progressive Development*, www.brookings.edu/es/urban/capitalxchange/article3.htm, May 2001.

Major, Michael J., “Containing Sprawl in the Pacific Northwest,” *Urban Land Archives*, March 1994.

McMahon, Edward T., “Smart Growth Trends,” *Planning Commissioners Journal*, Winter 1999, no. 33.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, *Brownfields Statute Law Amendment Act, 2001*, Province of Ontario, May 17, 2001.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, “Province Moves Forward on Smart Growth to Protect Oak Ridges Moraine, Renew Brownfields,” Province of Ontario, May 17, 2001.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, “Province Seeks Public Input on Ontario Smart Growth,” Province of Ontario, May 17, 2001.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, “Smart Growth and the Oak Ridges Moraine,” Province of Ontario, May 17, 2001.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, “Province to Introduce Legislation that Promotes Cleaner, Healthier Communities,” Province of Ontario, March 2, 2001.

Myers, Phyllis, and Robert Puentes, *Growth at the Ballot Box: Electing the Shape of Communities in November 2000*, The Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, February 2001.

O’Neill, David J., *The Smart Growth Tool Kit: Community Profiles and Case Studies to Advance Smart Growth Practices*, Urban Land Institute, 2000.

Onyschuk, B.S., *Smart Growth – A Model for Toronto*.

Porter, Douglas R., *Newsletter of the Growth Management Institute*, 1998, Vol. 4, No. 2.

Porter, Douglas R., ed. *Profiles in Growth Management: An Assessment of Current Programs and Guidelines for Effective Management*, Urban Land Institute, 1996.

Porter, Douglas R., “A 50-Year Plan for Metropolitan Portland,” *Urban Land*, July 1995.

Porter, Douglas, ed., *State and Regional Initiatives for Managing Development: Policy Issues and Practical Concerns*, Urban Land Institute, 1992.

Province of Ontario, *2001 Ontario Budget Paper E SuperBuild: Building Ontario’s Future*, 2001.

Schmitt, Eric, “Most Cities in U.S. Expanded Rapidly over Last Decade,” *New York Times*, May 7, 2001.

Senate of Canada, Bill 23, *New Urban Agenda Act of 2001*.

Sierra Club, *Smart Choices or Sprawling Growth: A 50-State Survey of Development*, September 2000.

Southern California Studies Center and Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, *Sprawl Hits the Wall: Confronting the Realities of Metropolitan Los Angeles*, 2001.

Staley, Samuel R., and Gerard C.S. Mildner, “The Price of Managing Growth,” *Urban Land*, February 2000.

Starkie, Edward H., and Bonnie Gee Yosick, “Overcoming Obstacles to Smart Development,” *Land Lines*, July 1996, vol. 8, no. 4.

Tomalty, Ray, *The Compact Metropolis: Growth Management and Intensification in Vancouver, Toronto, and Montreal*, Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research, February 1997.

Toronto Life, “Seduction of the Suburbs” issue, May 2001.

Urban Land Institute, *Smart Growth: Myth and Fact*, 1999.

Urban Land Institute, *Smart Growth: Economy, Community, Environment*, 1998.

Urban Land Institute Information Service InfoPacket Series, *Smart Growth, Selected References*, InfoPacket No 392.

USA Today, “Wide Open Spaces,” February 22, 2001.

Websites

American Planning Association, www.planning.org
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, www.mah.gov.on.ca
National Governors’ Association, www.nga.org
Ontario Smart Growth, www.smartgrowth.gov.on.ca
Planners Web, www.plannersweb.com
Smart Growth Network, www.smartgrowth.org
Statistics Canada, www.statcan.ca
United States Census Bureau, www.census.gov

City of Waterloo

Documents

City of Waterloo, *imagine! Waterloo Community Vision*, April 2001.

City of Waterloo, *Capital Budget: 2001-2010 Preliminary*, March 2001.

City of Waterloo, *Staging of Development*, 2001.

City of Waterloo, *Land Supply, Height and Density Study*, October 2000.

City of Waterloo, *Advanced Timing of Infrastructure Policy Report*, August 2000.

City of Waterloo, *Uptown Community Improvement Plan 2000*, March 2000.

City of Waterloo, *Capital Budget 2000-2009*, January 8, 2000.

City of Waterloo, *Annual Review*, 2000.

City of Waterloo, *Growth Management Reports*, 1996-2000.

City of Waterloo, *Project 2007 Report of the Uptown Vision Committee*, November 1999.

City of Waterloo, *Development Charges – Final Report*, July 1999.

City of Waterloo, *Capital Budget 1998-2007*, March 1998.

City of Waterloo, *July 7, 1997, Council Minutes*.

City of Waterloo, *Capital Budget 1999-2008*, November 27, 1997.

City of Waterloo, *Official Plan*, approved 1990, consolidated to 1994.

City of Waterloo, *Waterloo Economic Strategy Report*, June 1991.

City of Waterloo, *Growth Strategy Committee Recommended Policy Report*, August 1990.

Township of Wellesley, *Growth Strategy for the Township of Wellesley*, November 1996.

1988/1989 Growth Management Policy
Environmental Strategic Plan Review
Annual Staging of Growth Report, annual
Advanced Timing of Infrastructure Policy
Development Charge Program By-law
West Side Nodes Policy
Employment Lands Strategy
Managing Waterloo, Overall City Vision

Interviews

Curry, Dan, Policy Planner, City of Waterloo, May 16, 2001.

Rapp, Cameron, Team Leader, Development Services, City of Waterloo, May 16, 2001.

Romanick, Greg, Director of Development Services, City of Waterloo, May 16, 2001.

Woolstencroft, Lynne, Mayor, City of Waterloo, May 16, 2001.

Websites

City of Waterloo, www.city.waterloo.on.ca

Region of Waterloo

Documents

Regional Municipality of Waterloo, *Council Report: Smart Growth and the Region of Waterloo: Planning for our Future*, April 2001.

Regional Municipality of Waterloo, *Preliminary Budget Book 2001*.

Regional Municipality of Waterloo, *Regional Official Policies Plan: Amendment #12 Water Resources and Protection Strategy Future Urban Point Source and Background Documentation*, November 2000.

Region of Waterloo, *Transportation Master Plan Action Plan for Implementation*, April 1999.

Regional Municipality of Waterloo, *Regional Official Policies Plan*, December 1998 Consolidation.

Regional Municipality of Waterloo and City of Guelph, *Putting the Region of Waterloo/City of Guelph on the World Map: An Economic Development Corporation Concept*, July 1998.

Region of Waterloo, *Transportation Master Plan Strategic Options Report*, January 1998.

Region of Waterloo, *Development Strategies: Policy Directions and Settlement Pattern Concept Recommendation Report*, 1993.

Region of Waterloo, *Transportation Master Plan Working Papers*.

Interviews

Eby, Kevin, Director of Community Planning, Regional Municipality of Waterloo, May 16, 2001.

Websites

Region of Waterloo, www.region.waterloo.on.ca

City of London

Documents

City of London, *2001 Operating Budget and 2001 Capital Budget with Forecasts for 2002 to 2005*. February 20, 2001.

City of London, *Official Plan*, January 2001.

City of London, *Environmental Services Water Operating and Capital Budgets and Four Year Capital Forecast*, 2001.

City of London, *2000 Budget*, December, 14 1999.

City of London, *1999 Budget Summary*, December 1998.

City of London, *Downtown Millennium Plan*, November 1998.

City of London, *1998 Budget Summary*, June 1998.

City of London, *Recommended Urban Growth Area Report*, August 24, 1995.

City of London, *Submission to the Arbitrator Greater London Arbitration Process*, March 10, 1992.

Department of Planning and Development, *From Liabilities to Assets Addressing Heritage Building Deterioration in London Report*, City of London, May 14, 2001.

Department of Planning and Development, *A Preliminary Evaluation of Downtown Revitalization Trends*, City of London, April 30, 2001.

Department of Planning and Development, *Vacant and Underutilized Residential Land Inventory*, City of London, April 30, 2001.

Department of Planning and Development, *Rural/Urban Interface*, City of London, March 26, 2001.

Department of Planning and Development, *Capitalizing on Opportunity in London's Heritage and Museum Sector*, City of London, January 29, 2001.

Department of Planning and Development, *London Main Streets Programme*, City of London, September 7, 1999.

Department of Planning and Development, *Evaluation of Planned Commercial Land Supply in the City of London*, City of London, June 24, 1996.

Department of Planning and Development, *Planning Entertainment Uses for Downtown Revitalization*, City of London, April 9, 1996.

Department of Planning and Development, *Community Plan Process Guidelines*, City of London, March 18, 1996.

Department of Planning and Development, *Incentives for Investing in London's Downtown and Heritage Properties*, City of London.

Department of Planning and Development, Planning Division, *Small Lot Study*, City of London, April 2000.

Department of Planning and Development, Planning Division, *Downtown London Community Improvement Plan*, City of London, October 1995.

Department of Planning and Development, Planning Division, *Fiscal Impact of Residential Zoning Changes*, City of London, October 1995.

Department of Planning and Development, Planning Division, *Planning for New Format Retailers in London*, City of London, June 1994.

Currie, Pat, *The Right Mix: From the allure of Wortley Village to improvements on the Wellington strip and new residential growth, south London sets a blinding pace*, The London Free Press, May 7, 2001.

Lawson, Shelley, “Developer Building Environmental Awareness,” *London Free Press*, May 10, 2001.

Main Street London, *Mainstreet News*, April 2001, Vol. 2, Issue 3.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, *Ministry Staff Report on Amendment No. 88*, Province of Ontario, 1996.

Ontario Municipal Board, *OMB File O960206: Amendment No. 88 to the Official Plan for the City of London*.

-----*London’s Economy A Preliminary Review: Presentation Slides and Appendix of Supporting Tables*.

-----*Downtown Rehabilitation and Redevelopment Grant Program Guidelines*.

-----*Upgrade to Building Code: Downtown Renovation Loan Programme*.

Interviews

DeCicco, Ann Marie, *Mayor, City of London*, May 18, 2001.

Fleming, John, Planning Administrator – Policy, City of London, May 18, 2001.

London Area Planning Committee, City of London, May 18, 2001.

Panzer, Rob, Director of Planning, City of London, May 18, 2001.

Websites

www.city.london.on.ca

Town of Cobourg

Documents

----- *Business Retention and Expansion Survey Draft Preliminary Report*, December 1998.

Clark Consulting Services, *Downtown Streetscape Project Principles and Guidelines Final Report*, November 1995.

C.N. Watson and Associates Ltd., economists, *Town of Cobourg Official Plan Amendment Growth Forecast*, January 17, 1997.

Hough Stansbury Woodland Naylor Dance Limited, et al., *West Harbour Waterfront Development Plan*, March 1995.

Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd. et al., *Town of Cobourg Official Plan Background Report*, December 1997.

Malone Given Parsons Ltd., *Market Demand and Impact Analysis (Draft)*, June 2000.

Mutton, Miriam L.R., and J.E. Doubt and Associates, *Victoria Square Final Design and Report*, January 1999.

Ontario Association of Architects, *Cobourg*, October 2000.

Proctor & Redfern Limited, *New Amherst Community Secondary Plan*, May 1997.

RGB Consulting, *Marketing Downtown Cobourg*.

Totten Sims Hubicki Associates, et al., *Cobourg Harbour Land Design Concept*, June 1997.

Totten Sims Hubicki Associates, *Downtown Parking Study Draft Background Report*, April 1992.

Town of Cobourg, *2001 Budget Summaries*.

Town of Cobourg, *2000 Capital Budget Estimates*.

Town of Cobourg, *Official Plan Amendment No. 54: Cobourg West Business Park Secondary Plan*, November 2000.

Town of Cobourg, *Official Plan Amendment No. 50: New Official Plan and Amendments to the Harbour Area, Elgin-Densmore and New Amherst Community Secondary Plans*, January 1999.

Town of Cobourg, *Official Plan Amendment No. 37: Elgin-Densmore Secondary Plan*, November 1992.

Town of Cobourg, *By-Law 27-90: The Cobourg Heritage Conservation District*, February 1990.

Town of Cobourg, *Official Plan Amendment No. 24: Harbour Area Secondary Plan*, May 1989.

Township of Hamilton, *Official Plan*, November 1996.

Yeates, Maurice, *Structure and Change in Retail and Consumer Service Activities and Economic Development in Cobourg*, March 1998.

Interviews

McCaughey, Dean, Member of Council, Town of Cobourg, May 15, 2001.

McGlashon, Glenn, Manager of Planning Services, Town of Cobourg, May 15, 2001.

Websites

Town of Cobourg, www.town.cobourg.on.ca

Portland

Documents

American Planning Association, *Oregon Legislative Summary*, 1996.

City of Portland, *Portland's Comprehensive Plan Revised Discussion Draft*, September 2000.

City of Portland, Office of Transportation, *Comprehensive Plan: Transportation Element*, October 1992.

Davis & Hibbitts, Inc., *1997 Growth Management Survey Summary*, February 1997.

Graves, Bill, “Developers Build Up, Not Out, to Create Denser Neighborhoods,” *The Oregonian*, April 25, 2001.

GTA/905 Development News, “Growth Management, Home Rule Style,” April 2000, vol. 3, no. 16.

Harris, Maya, “Limits to Growth have Curbed Sprawl in Portland Oregon,” *GTA/905 Development News*, March 7, 2001, vol. 4, no. 10.

Knaap, Gerrit, *The Urban Growth Boundary in Metropolitan Portland Oregon: Research Rhetoric and Reality*, www.multnomah.lib.or.us/metro/growth/ugbursa/apa_article.html

Metro Portland, *1997-2017 Land Needs Study*, July 2000.

Metro Portland, *2000 Regional Transportation Plan*, August 2000.

Metro Portland, *Region 2040: Concepts for Growth*, June 1994.

Metro Portland, *Vision 2040: Recommended Alternative Decision Kit*, September 1994.

Metro Portland, *The Nature of 2040: The Region's 50-year Plan for Managing Growth*.

Metro Portland, *Metro Charter*.

Metro Portland, *Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*.

Metro Portland, *2040 Concepts for Growth: Transportation Element*.

Metro Portland, *2040 Framework: Myths and Realities*.

Metro Portland, *2040 Growth Concept Report*.

Metro Portland, *2040 Framework: The 2040 Growth Concept*.

Metro Portland, *2040 Framework: Urban Growth Management Functional Plan*.

Metro Portland, *2040 Framework: Urban Growth Boundary: Background, What Is an Urban Growth Boundary?*

Nokes, R. Gregory, “20-acre Lots Set Just Outside Growth Boundary,” *The Oregonian*, July 25, 2000.

Porter, Douglas, *Profiles in Growth Management*, pp. 216-224, Urban Land Institute, 1996.

State of Oregon, *Oregon’s Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines*, 1996.

Tri-Met, *Beyond the Field of Dreams: Light Rail and Growth Management in Portland*, 1995.

Interviews

Clay, Bob, Chief Planner, City of Portland, June 1, 2001.

Hinman, Jim, Urban Coordinator, Land Conservation and Development Department, *State of Oregon*, May 24, 2001.

Hoglund, Mike, Manager, Urban Growth Management, Metro Portland, June 1 and 7, 2001.

Oeser, Sherry, Manager, Community Development Services, Metro Portland, June 8, 2001.

Websites

City of Portland, www.ci.portland.or.us

Metro Portland, www.metro.dst.or.us

Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, www.lcd.state.or.us

Portland Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, www.portlandchamber.com

Portland Office of Transportation, www.trans.ci.portland.or.us

Portland State University Population Research Center, www.upa.pdx.edu/CPRC

State of Oregon Office of Economic Analysis, www.oea.das.state.or.us

The Oregonian, www.oregonlive.com

University of Oregon, www.uoregon.edu

Baltimore

Documents

American Planning Association, *Maryland Legislative Summary*, 1996.

Baltimore County, *Master Plan 2010*.

Baltimore Metropolitan Council, *Baltimore Regional Transportation Plan and Appendices*, 1998.

City of Baltimore, *PlanBaltimore Executive Summary*, 1999.

Dresser, Michael, “State Awards Pact Allowing Commuters to Use ‘Smart Card,’” *The Baltimore Sun*, April 19, 2001.

Economic Growth Resource Protection and Planning Commission, *1999 Annual Report*.

Harris, Maya, “Baltimore Making Strides Thanks to Smart Growth,” *Novae Res Urbis*, February 16, 2001.

International City/County Management Association, *Smart Growth for Local Governments*, Service Report, April 1999, Vol. 31, No. 4.

Maryland Department of Planning, *2001 Maryland General Assembly Summary of Planning Legislation*, State of Maryland, April 2001.

Maryland Department of Planning, *The Potential for New Residential Development in Maryland: An Analysis of Residential Zoning Patterns*.

Maryland Office of Planning, *Managing Maryland’s Growth Models and Guidelines: Smart Growth: Municipal Implementation*, June 1998.

Maryland Office of Planning, *Managing Maryland’s Growth Models and Guidelines: Smart Growth: Designating Priority Funding Areas*, November 1997.

Maryland Office of Planning, *Managing Maryland’s Growth Models and Guidelines: Urban Growth Boundaries*, August 1995.

Maurer, George, et al., *Making Smart Growth Smarter – Maryland’s Next Steps*, Chesapeake Bay Foundation.

Smart Growth Network, *ECOS/AASHTO Conference on Smart Growth*, December 1, 1998.

State of Maryland, *Smart Growth and Neighborhood Conservation Policy Executive Order*, 1998.

State of Maryland, *Smart Growth Neighborhood Conservation Initiatives*.

State of Maryland, *Senate Bill 229 Job Creation Tax Credit Act of 1997*.

State of Maryland, *Senate Bill 340 Brownfields – Voluntary Cleanup and Revitalization Programs*, 1997.

State of Maryland, *Senate Bill 388 “Smart Growth” and Neighborhood Conservation – Rural Legacy Program*, 1997.

State of Maryland, *Senate Bill 389 “Smart Growth” and Neighborhood Conservation – “Smart Growth” Areas*, 1997.

State of Maryland, *Maryland Rehab Code (Draft)*.

Interviews

Graves, Charles, Planning Department, City of Baltimore, June 6, 2001.

Noonan, Jim, Smart Growth Coordinator, Department of Planning, State of Maryland, May 25, 2001.

Weiss, Mark, Public Policy Scholar, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, May 24, 2001.

Websites

Baltimore County, www.co.ba.md.us

Baltimore County Office of Economic Development, www.bcinfobank.com

Baltimore Development Corporation, www.baltimoredevelopment.com

Chesapeake Bay Foundation, www.cnf.org

City of Baltimore, www.ci.baltimore.md.us

Environmental Protection Agency, www.epa.gov/ecocommunity/case1/smartgrowth.htm

Greater Baltimore Council, www.gbc.org

Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development, www.dhcd.state.md.us

Maryland Department of Planning, www.mdp.state.md.us/planning

Maryland Office of Planning, www.op.state.md.us

Maryland Department of Natural Resources, www.dnr.state.md.us

State of Maryland, www.gov.state.md.us

State of Maryland, *Smartgrowth in Maryland*, www.mdp.state.md.us/smartgrowth

Calgary

Documents

City of Calgary, *Calgary GRAMP: Land Use, Infrastructure & Services Framework Phase I Report and Appendices*, February 2000.

City of Calgary, *Economic Outlook 2000-2005*, 2000.

City of Calgary, *Employment Centres Strategy*, July 1999.

City of Calgary, *The Calgary Plan Municipal Development Plan*, August 1998.

City of Calgary, *Update of the 10-Year Capital Spending Framework 1996-2005*, February 1996.

City of Calgary, *Sustainable Suburbs Study*, July 1995.

City of Calgary, *Calgary Transportation Plan*, 1995.

City of Calgary, *Transportation Plan Info Series #5 and #13*.

City and Community Planning Division, *Long-Term Growth Management Strategy Technical Report: Long-Term Growth Corridors Constraints and Opportunities*, City of Calgary, April 1986.

City and Community Planning Division, *Long-Term Growth Management Strategy Technical Report: Major Municipal Servicing Requirements for Future Residential Areas Office Consolidation*, City of Calgary, November 1986.

Growth Management Technical Committee, *The Short-Term Growth Management Strategy Residential Information Update 2000-2004*, City of Calgary, December 2000.

Planning and Building Department, *Long-Term Growth Management Strategy Summary Report*, City of Calgary, July 1986.

Planning and Building Department, *Long-Term Growth Management Strategy Office Consolidation*, City of Calgary, July 1986.

Interviews

Koch, Barbara, Planning Department, City of Calgary, June 5, 2001, and July 26, 2001

Websites

City of Calgary, www.gov.calgary.ab.ca

Appendix 2: Analysis of Growth Management Policies in Ontario Case Studies

Table 1: Cobourg Growth Management Analysis

Principle	Parameters	Measures	Tools	Policies
Defined urban growth boundary	Define urban growth boundary			Schedule A - development areas designated
	Growth projections			
	Development areas			3.14.1 - development and change of use requiring comprehensive land use plan
Encourage liveable, mixed-use communities	Support mixture and integration of use			3.4.3.2 - open space as key structuring element in new residential areas 5.4 - Neighborhood Planning Areas - open space, educational facilities, convenience commercial
	Provide for a range of housing opportunities and choices			2.5 - provide for choice in housing
Support variety of transportation choices	Allow for transit supportive densities and nodes of density around infrastructure			6.3.2 - development encouraged at densities that support transit; contiguous development encouraged to allow for transit
	Invest in transit, bicycle trails, pedestrian routes			2.5 - encourage pedestrian and bicycle accessibility 4.4.2 - integrate planning for pedestrian and bike paths, focusing on major destinations (ie. parks, core) 6.4.1 - sidewalks on both sides of arterial and collector roads; bicycle movement to be accommodated in right-of-ways; consideration to be given to bicycle lanes 6.4.2 - development of link-node system that connects major pedestrian and bicycle destinations with lands dedicated during time of development 6.5 - rail service provided by VIA
	Investment priority in maintaining existing roads rather than building new			6.3.2 - locate new suburbs near existing transit routes
Preserve, protect and steward open spaces, environmental areas and agriculture	Open space strategies	Table 2 - criteria for designation - local park, district park, park	4.3.1 - parkland hierarchy 4.4.3 - provide both human and natural connections	3.13.1, 4.3.1 - greenlands system and parkland system in place 3.13.2 - Town to maintain, expand and enhance where financially feasible 4.5.1 - preservation of trees and other natural vegetation near environmental constraint areas 4.7.1 - acquisition of land along the lakefront
	Protection of environmental areas	4.2.6 - inventory and analysis of environmental features and functions	4.2.6 - environmental audit for developments within 50 m of environmentally sensitive areas	2.4 - protect the natural environmental heritage 4.2.2 - few uses permitted
	Rural/agricultural protection			
Support a strong and vibrant downtown area	Downtown revitalization initiatives/development		6.6.1 - focus on short-term and on-street parking	2.5 - to maintain and enhance the historic downtown as a central meeting and shopping place 3.7.1 - indicates strong pedestrian focus 3.7.3.2 - mix of uses in a traditional setting 3.7.4 - enhance main central area - focus of shopping, business, public uses 3.7.5 - strengthen the relationship between the central area and the harbour 3.7.6 - discourage convenient location of public parking facilities
	Parks and open space improvements			3.7.5 - enhance connections between central and harbour areas
	Commerical hierarchy			3.7.3.1 - King Street to contain major concentration of pedestrian oriented uses

Strengthen development within existing communities	Investment in existing communities	3.8.3.2 - measure trade area, population, amount of existing space	3.8.3.2 - market impact study necessary to designate new node 5.6.3 - Community Improvement Areas 5.6.5 - acquisition of land to complement CIPs	3.8.3.1 - maintain strength of existing shopping nodes, especially central area
	Infill and reuse of existing buildings		5.4 - Neighborhood Planning Areas - studies regarding new development to protect existing	3.4.3.1, 3.5.3.1 - infill to maintain structure and character of surrounding area
	Development focused within the geography of the existing infrastructure network			7. - new development only where servicing capacity available 7.5.1 - development will be managed efficiently to avoid unnecessary or uneconomic expansion of infrastructure 7.5.2 - where undeveloped lands cannot be serviced by present system or feasible expansions, development is considered premature unless proponent is willing to undertake servicing construction
	Brownfields			
Development decisions that are predictable, fair and cost-effective	Involvement of stakeholders and community members			5.6.5 - work with BIA in Main Central Area 6.5 - work with VIA, CN and St. Lawrence and Hudson Railway regarding rail service
Encourage collaboration in development decisions and strategies	Cooperation and coordination with development industry			
	Cooperation between multiple levels of government			4.7.1 - work with Conservation Authority and other public agencies (i.e. MNR) regarding greenlands system 6.2.2 - work with Province, County and adjacent municipalities to integrate planning for road network
Investment choices that support growth management				2.6 - capital and operating costs at a level that can be borne by residents and businesses; costs of new development covered by charges derived from it

Appendix 2: Analysis of Growth Management Policies in Ontario Case Studies

Table 2: London Growth Management Analysis

Principle	Parameters	Measures	Tools	Policies
Defined urban growth boundary	Define urban growth boundary		Urban Reserves - lands within Urban Growth Area awaiting designation for development	2.6.7 - Council will designate land for urban growth during 5-year OP review 2.6.8 - lands outside the UGA can be considered for expansion purposes
	Growth projections	annual population; housing demand and distribution ; City will maintain 15-20 year supply of industrial and community land		2.6.5 - City will maintain a program of growth forecasting and monitoring; population and housing demand projections will be updated and approved at 5 year intervals; annual interim measures 12.2 - City is to provide a 10 year supply of land for housing
	Development areas			
	Compact Growth			2.4.1 - encourage compact urban form and efficient use of serviced land 2.6.4.1 - City will not extend water and sewer beyond limits of land designated for growth
Encourage liveable, mixed-use communities	Support mixture and integration of use		9.4.3 - Urban Reserve - Community Growth designation	3.1.3, 3.1.4 - medium- and high-density residential locations where transit, shopping, open space, recreational facilities are available
	Provide for a range of housing opportunities and choices	12.2.4 - land supply; supply of affordable housing; demand factors	12.2.2 - large residential developments to have 30% affordable 12.2.4 - Housing Monitoring Report	3.1.1 - support choice in housing (location, size, tenure, design and accessibility) throughout the city 3.2.1 - low density areas permitted multiple-attached dwellings, infill and conversions
Support variety of transportation choices	Allow for transit supportive densities and nodes of density around infrastructure			2.6.7 - growth to be allocated to areas that can be accessed from arterials and that are suitable for transit services 4.1.3 - Shopping Areas to develop in nodal fashion to avoid impact on adjacent land uses and traffic 18.2 - higher density and mixed use development at major intersections
	Invest in transit, bicycle trails, pedestrian routes	18.1 - modal split targets 18.2.11 - transit within 400 m of all contiguous development	18.2.10 - ride sharing programs, common parking areas, employment related strategies, bicycle master plan, pedestrian path system, influencing parking costs	2.11.3 - improve accessibility to major locations through integrated system of bicycle routes and pedestrian paths 18.1 - provide balanced transportation system; development that is conducive to public transit use
	Investment priority in maintaining existing roads rather than building new			2.11.3 - provide for maintenance and improvement of existing road network 18.2.8 - invest in increasing efficiency of existing roads
Preserve, protect and steward open spaces, environmental areas and agriculture	Open space strategies			2.4.1 - natural heritage system to be identified and protected
	Protection of environmental areas		15.3.4 - public ownership of natural heritage areas where necessary; ensure private owners protect; stewardship agreements, conservation easements, education programs, land trusts; ecological buffers; conservation master plans	2.4.1 - valley land of Thames River primary open space resource; programs to increase public ownership; accessibility and use to be pursued
	Rural/agricultural protection		9.1.3 - Urban Reserves	2.4.1 - protect agricultural lands from uses that are not related to or supportive of agriculture 9. - avoid fragmentation of land ownership
Support a strong and vibrant downtown area	Downtown revitalization initiatives/development		2.12.3 - promote the location of entertainment and cultural facilities within downtown; improve accessibility; promote residential development; incentives for physical improvements	2.4.1 - areas near downtown that are appropriate for conversion and redevelopment to high density residential, specialty retail and office uses identified 3.4.3 - higher density of residential uses permitted in the downtown 4.1.2 - encourage high level of transit service 4.2.4 - maintain a compact pedestrian-oriented shopping environment
	Parks and open space improvements			

	Commercial hierarchy		4.2.5 - density provisions	2.4.1 - central area as primary business, office, institutional, entertainment and cultural centre of London; regional commercial facilities 4.1.1 - support the orderly distribution of commercial services 4.3.1 - Regional Shopping Areas, Community Shopping Areas, Neighborhood Shopping Areas - based on size, function and form
	Employment uses			2.4.1 - dominant office employment area in the city; large office developments encouraged
Strengthen development within existing communities	Investment in existing communities			7.7.2 - renovation and rehabilitation of older industrial buildings for new uses 12.1 - promote rehabilitation of existing housing stock
	Infill and reuse of existing buildings			2.4.1 - high- and medium-density residential to appropriate areas within and adjacent to downtown, near Regional and Community Shopping Areas, along major roads and open space area
	Development focused within the geography of the existing infrastructure network			2.6.2 - outward expansion in cost-effective way that optimizes use of existing infrastructure 2.13.3 - intensification of existing communities will contribute to efficient use of existing infrastructure and services
	Brownfields			
	Heritage conservation		13.3 - Heritage Conservation District 13.4.1 - protective by-laws	
Development decisions that are predictable, fair and cost-effective	Involvement of stakeholders and community members			2.6.2 - cost of growth financed by revenues generated by growth 2.13.3 - residents to be consulted in the review of planning applications or studies that may affect their area
Encourage collaboration in development decisions and strategies	Cooperation and coordination with development industry			2.6.2 - City will consider and encourage innovative proposals such as partnerships, cost-sharing and alternative technologies and design standards that reduce costs or allow for more timely delivery of necessary infrastructure 2.6.3 - private sector may be involved in the development, operation, construction and financing of long-term servicing infrastructure; City may explore alternatives for financing oversizing costs until costs can be recovered from future development
	Cooperation between multiple levels of government			
Investment choices that support growth management				

Appendix 2: Analysis of Growth Management Policies in Ontario Case Studies

Table 3: Waterloo Growth Management Analysis (Municipal OP)

Principle	Parameters	Measures	Tools	Policies
Defined urban growth boundary	Define urban growth boundary			2.1.4 - growth will be accommodated subject to the City's financial and physical ability to provide adequate levels of service
	Growth projections	1.6.2.1 - population of 101,000 by 2011	2.5.7 - annual Staging of Development Report	2.1.5 - the land designated for urban growth are sufficient to support the 2011 population forecast; more land has been designated than would require amendments to OP
	Development areas Compact Growth			
Encourage liveable, mixed-use communities	Support mixture and integration of use			1.7.3.22 - encourage development of residential neighbourhoods that includes neighbourhood focal points such as schools, parks and commercial areas 2.2.5 - residential districts to create areas with their own centres of interest and recognizable characteristics 2.2.7 - encourage provision of a wide range of community facilities/services in residential areas
	Provide for a range of housing opportunities and choices			1.7.3.1 - provide for a balanced range of living accommodations to meet a variety of demands and ownership and rental categories for present and future residents 3.1.1.1 - 25% of new residential units to be affordable to a wide range of income groups
Support variety of transportation choices	Allow for transit supportive densities and nodes of density around infrastructure			2.2.10 - high density residential encouraged close to major roads, commercial facilities, major community facilities and public transportation routes 3.2.4.6 - Community Commercial Core access through public and private transportation 4.4.1 - wider use of public transit by encouraging the location of higher densities, offices and employment centres within walking distance of transit
	Invest in transit, bicycle trails, pedestrian routes			
	Investment priority in maintaining existing roads rather than building new			
Preserve, protect and steward open spaces, environmental areas and agriculture	Open space strategies			2.2.9 - development of park and open space corridor from Waterloo Park to UW 3.19 - parks Master Plan
	Protection of environmental areas			2.3.3 - discourage development in Environmental Constraint Areas 2.3.6 - City will act to protect Environmental Areas, including purchasing them 2.3.12 - woodlot protection 2.3.13 - Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas 2.3.14 - Environmentally Significant Areas 3.7.3.8 - work to link open spaces within the City and to those in adjacent municipalities
	Rural/agricultural protection			1.7.3.19 - ensure long-term economic viability of prime agricultural land 2.5.6 - encourage maintenance of agricultural uses on lands designated for future urban use until required for such

Support a strong and vibrant downtown area	Downtown revitalization initiatives/development			1.7.3.36 - promote development and revitalization of Commercial Core Area 2.2.3 - mixed use encouraged 3.1.1.7; 3.2.2.7 - encourage residential uses within and adjacent to the core 3.2.2.9 - encourage and cooperate with private sector regarding Waterloo Town Square and Regina Street areas
	Parks and open space improvements			2.8.2 - urban design in Commercial Core - greening, heritage 3.2.2.11 - encourage the development of Laurel Creek open space system
	Commercial hierarchy			2.2.2 - the Commercial Core/Uptown Area shall be commercial focus
	Employment uses			
Strengthen development within existing communities	Investment in existing communities			1.7.3.32 - to ensure maintenance, encourage rehabilitation, renovation and repair of older buildings 1.7.3.33 - to improve and maintain existing residential, commercial and industrial streetscape and pedestrian environment and/or aesthetic quality of the community 2.13.3 - Community Improvement Areas
	Infill and reuse of existing buildings			2.5.2 - encourage developments that infill or assist in completion of existing communities
	Development focused within the geography of the existing infrastructure network			2.4.7 - oversizing of municipal services permitted to provide for eventual servicing of lands not now designated for urban development but contemplated for development during the economic life cycle of the services 2.5.1 - rate and staging of development to be related to extension or expansion of existing services 2.5.3 - development priority to those areas most easily and economically served
	Brownfields			1.7.3.39 - to encourage the development/reuse of vacant land or buildings
	Heritage conservation			
Development decisions that are predictable, fair and cost-effective	Involvement of stakeholders and community members			1.7.3.24, 2.13 - to involved citizens and BIAs 4.6.1 - work with universities and others regarding pedestrian and bicycling system
Encourage collaboration in development decisions and strategies	Cooperation and coordination with development industry			
	Cooperation between multiple levels of government			
Investment choices that support growth management				1.7.3.30 - direct development and community improvement activities in manner that ensure economy and effectiveness of public expenditures

Appendix 2: Analysis of Growth Management Policies in Ontario Case Studies
Table 4: Waterloo Growth Management Analysis (Regional OP)

Principle	Parameters	Measures	Tools	Policies
Defined urban growth boundary	Define urban growth boundary			7. - settlement area boundaries; City Urban Areas, Township Urban Areas, Future Township Urban Area 7.4.2.2 - municipalities delineate extensive areas of new development where comprehensive community planning is required 7.5 - Rural Settlement Areas; expansion for residential purposes requires Growth Strategy; municipalities encouraged to identify Rural Settlement Areas for potential expansion; Township Growth Strategies to consider industrial/commercial areas for expansion; Growth Strategies for Rural Mixed Use/Agricultural Clusters
	Growth projections	Table 7.1 - forecast to 2016		
	Development areas			
	Compact Growth			
Encourage liveable, mixed-use communities	Support mixture and integration of use			
	Provide for a range of housing opportunities and choices			2.3 - provide housing that meets diverse needs now and in the future 7.6.2.1 - local OPs to provide opportunities for a full range of housing types and densities 7.6.3.1 - area municipalities to include policies regarding affordable housing in OPs
Support variety of transportation choices	Allow for transit supportive densities and nodes of density around infrastructure			11.2.3 - use of density to minimize walking distance to transit stops and to promote transit ridership
	Invest in transit, bicycle trails, pedestrian routes			2.3 - provide integrated transit system with walking, cycling, transit and cars 11.1.7 - Regional roads give preference to HOV lanes 11.1.8 - Region to prepare Transit Strategy that addresses increasing use of public transit and innovative partnerships in the private sector 11.2.3 - transit and trail links to main transit corridors; integration of transit with other transportation modes 11.4.6 - planning for new development will involve consideration of the provision of
	Investment priority in maintaining existing roads rather than building new			11. - existing transportation infrastructure should be used efficiently before constructing new 11.1.10 - protect and acquire abandoned rail corridors for transit, walking and cycling and utility corridors
Preserve, protect and steward open spaces, environmental areas and agriculture	Open space strategies			
	Protection of environmental areas	3.1.4 - regional preparation of watershed studies to include recommendations regarding quantity and quality of groundwater resources	2.2 - watershed plans prior to new community development 3.2.1 - Environmental Impact Statements 3.5 - periodic updating of Regional State of the Environment Report 4.3.8 - Implementation Guidelines for Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas to assist in the implementation of Regional Plan	2.3 - protecting and enhancing the environment and other natural resources, respecting ecological processes and sustainability 3.6.1 - Ecological and Environmental Advisory Committee will advise Region in the review of Environmentally Sensitive Policy Areas and other matters of environmental interest 4. - Region will undertake measures to avoid adverse impact of infrastructure projects on sensitive areas or wetlands 4.1.5 - protection of natural corridors from fragmentation
	Rural/agricultural protection			2.3 - protecting and enhancing agricultural areas 5.1 - designation of additional lands for new non-farm development and the creation of lots for non-farm uses is not permitted on land designated as Agricultural Resource Areas 5.1.2.2 - non-farm business activity not to undermine agricultural nature of the area; property to remain zoned for agricultural uses

Support a strong and vibrant downtown area	Downtown revitalization initiatives/development			7.4.1.4 - Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo to designate Community Core Areas as highest level nodes
	Parks and open space improvements			
	Commercial hierarchy			7.4.1.4 - core areas to be highest level mixed use node 8.3.2 - commercial areas of regional significance: Community Core Areas, Regional Shopping Centres
	Employment uses			
Strengthen development within existing communities	Investment in existing communities			6. - heritage conservation to minimize effects of new development 6.2.8 - local OPs to include protection for heritage resources
	Infill and reuse of existing buildings			7.6.1.4 - area OPs to include targets for new housing through infill, conversion and redevelopment, consistent with Regional projection that 5% of all new units be in built-up areas
	Development focused within the geography of the existing infrastructure network			10.1.1 - Region to prepare Integrated Infrastructure Staging Plan 10.1.2 - municipalities will prepare Development Staging Plans to provide for a continuous 3-year supply of serviced residential land 10.3.1.1 - water servicing hierarchy preference for extension of existing supply
	Brownfields			
	Heritage conservation			
Development decisions that are predictable, fair and cost-effective	Involvement of stakeholders and community members			2.1 - encourage partnerships and coordination among public and private sectors and community 3.1.3 - terms of reference for watershed studies determined in consultation with affected property owners 4.7.3 - Region will cooperate with Province, municipalities, conservation authority, private sector and community to provide advice to landowners wishing to practice good stewardship Natural Habitat Network lands and to develop interpretive programs
Encourage collaboration in development decisions and strategies	Cooperation and coordination with development industry			10. - innovative partnerships and fiscal arrangements with other levels of government and the private sector may provide for low-cost service provision and infrastructure
	Cooperation between multiple levels of government			2.1 - encourage partnerships and coordination among federal and provincial ministries, areas municipalities and Grand River Conservation Authority 10. - innovative partnerships and fiscal arrangements with other levels of government and the private sector may provide for low-cost service provision and infrastructure

Appendix 3: Growth Management Tools

The variety of tools and programs identified during our research are categorized below. While the categories are useful for exploring and understanding the tools, they are not intended to be mutually exclusive as many tools could be included in more than one category.

Funding

When the 2040 Growth Plan was introduced, Metro Portland provided a small amount of **implementation funding** to municipalities, primarily smaller ones, to put the plan into practice. The grants were typically in the area of \$50,000. These have since been discontinued, replaced by technical assistance programs aimed at assisting jurisdictions lacking in the technical expertise necessary to implement the plan.

London’s **Urban Works Reserve Fund** is a voluntary, self-regulating fund financed by developer contributions that is used to finance new infrastructure and servicing. Established in the early 1970s, the fund was an early version of development charges model and today is a supplementary source to the City’s Development Charge Fund. Recently, significant withdrawals from the fund have resulted in the institution of limitations on withdrawals for any one development from it.

The **London Endowment for Heritage Fund** provides grants for conservation and restoration of heritage features of a property.

In order to address a backlog in road improvements, the City of Calgary was able to reach an agreement with the local development industry to incur a special **Transportation Levy** on new development. The levy is applied in addition to development charges at rate of \$17,000/hectare of development and is targeted to road infrastructure.

The City of Waterloo has recently implemented the **Advanced Timing of Infrastructure Policy** to formalize the process related to front-end financing of development services. The policy was implemented in response to the inability of development charge accounts to keep up with high up-front costs of development. While front-end financing has been a common practice in Waterloo, the issue of ensuring fairness in timing for repayment had arisen. The policy outlines a formal process to pre-determine payback timing and conditions to developers, gap financed, if necessary, by debentures. It is modelled on the premise that everyone pays for the cost of development, without placing the burden on the first developer.

Established in 1996, the City of Waterloo’s **Environmental Lands Acquisition Program** has been used to acquire 830 acres of environmentally sensitive land within the City of Waterloo.

The City of London has recently instituted a **sewer improvement tax** to address the need for significant investments in order to upgrade sewer systems in the existing urban area.

Incentives

The State of Maryland’s **Job Creation and Tax Credit Program** is intended to encourage small and medium-sized businesses to invest in smart growth areas by providing income tax credits to businesses that create a minimum of 25 jobs in a priority funding area.

Maryland’s **Voluntary Cleanup and Brownfields Program** is aimed at further developing underutilized areas in urban centres and revitalizing older industrial and commercial areas that present a threat to public health or the environment. The State provides grants and low-interest loans for brownfield development while also limiting liability for redevelopment of these areas. Each project must undergo a public consultation process as part of the program.

Through the **Downtown Rehabilitation and Redevelopment Grant Program**, the City of London provides grants to property owners redeveloping and rehabilitating residential and commercial properties in the core. Annual grants are provided over a 10-year period and are based upon the increase in the municipal property tax that is directly a result of the work undertaken by the owner.

The City of London has also established the **Upgrade to Building Code Downtown Renovation Loan Program**. The program provides assistance to property owners upgrading and improving their properties in order to ensure that older buildings comply with building code requirements. Funded by an interest-bearing revolving reserve fund, the loan commitments are based on the availability of funding.

The City of London provides interest-free loans to property owners undertaking to rehabilitate and improve the facades of commercial buildings through its **Façade Restoration Loan Program**. The loans cover 50% of eligible improvements to a maximum of either \$15,000 or \$625 per foot frontage to a maximum of \$25,000, whichever is greater. Should the properties be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, loans can increase by \$5,000.

The Town of Cobourg has established several heritage preservation incentives. The **Downtown Heritage Tax Incentive District** allows for a 10-year assessment freeze in return for improvements in the form of a grant in lieu. The **Heritage Conservation District Fund** offers a matching grant program for restoration efforts.

Targeted Areas

The State of Maryland designates its funding for local projects to **Priority Funding Areas** (PFAs) - areas where the State and local governments wish to target efforts to encourage economic development and new growth. PFAs are designated by local and county governments and include every municipality in Maryland.

The **Live Near Your Work Program** established by the State of Maryland was established to encourage residents to locate close to their work place. Under the program, the State will provide a minimum cash contribution of \$3,000 to workers purchasing homes in older neighbourhoods known as Live Near Your Work Areas.

Within its Comprehensive Plan, the City of Portland places on emphasis on the importance of regional rail corridors. **Funding priority** for rail transit in these corridors is based upon the population being served, the potential for redevelopment and the level of traffic congestion.

Urban Growth Boundaries

Oregon state law requires municipalities and counties to establish **urban growth boundaries** that include a 20-year supply of land. UGBs are used as a tool for defining what land should be considered for urbanization and what land should be protected. The UGB is reviewed every 5 to 10 years, as required by state law.

The State of Oregon also requires **urban reserves**. These are areas outside of UGBs designated for future development that must contain a 30-year supply of buildable land. Between the land within the urban reserves and the land within the UGB, urban areas plan within a 50-year timeframe.

Oregon also requires the designation of **rural reserves** which are lands outside of the UGB and urban reserves that are never to be urbanized. These lands are located adjacent to urban areas and although they are not needed for urban development, they are likely to experience development pressure. In the Portland metropolitan region, rural reserves are implemented through the regional framework plan and voluntary agreements between Metro, counties, neighbouring cities and the State (in the case of areas outside of the Metro boundary).

The Town of Cobourg and Cities of London and Waterloo have all identified **urban growth boundaries**. The London Official Plan establishes a UGB based on land supply for the next 20 years. The boundary, subject to an Ontario Municipal Board hearing that resulted in a more generous boundary than that initially proposed by the municipality, distinguishes urban growth areas from rural settlement areas and agricultural lands.

Policy Innovation

Maryland's **Building Rehabilitation Program** promotes reinvestment in existing buildings through their rehabilitation and reuse. Responding to concerns that the current construction codes present significant barriers to the redevelopment of existing buildings, the State is seeking to establish new codes that will promote easier redevelopment. The new codes will address perceived lack of uniformity in codes, the unpredictability of codes between jurisdictions, the lack of reasonableness in existing codes and the need for state-wide training in codes for construction professionals and officials.

The City of London uses guidelines to illustrate alternative design solutions for development. The **Small Lot Subdivision Design Guidelines** provide design solutions to encourage alternative forms of development.

The Region of Waterloo announced its intention to prepare a **Smart Growth Study** to outline the staging and servicing of future development for a period of 20-30 years. The process will involve the examination of current and future land needs, existing and required infrastructure, brownfield development, environmental protection and the enhancement and protection of rural and agricultural lands in areas not identified for growth.

For Waterloo’s west side, the focus of significant amounts of recent development, a **West Side Node Study** was prepared in response to conventional forms of development seen by the community as being undesirable. The study proposes innovation through the introduction of a MRX – mixed-use zone – to be applied to two key nodes within the plan and providing flexibility in use with design guidelines.

Calgary’s **Growth Area Management Plans** identify the City’s capital costs of servicing growth over the next 20 years. The initiative is based on a premise of market-based development and ensuring there is choice and competition in development. The approach is to coordinate the form, location and timing of growth and related infrastructure and services in growth corridors, but not necessarily to control it. The GRAMP initiative has two major components. Part 1 is a geographically-based assessment of cost related infrastructure undertaken in order to prepare growth management strategies and policy. Part 2 establishes an operational framework to undertake growth-related cost analysis at three key decision-making points in the land use planning cycle: work programs, policy plans and land use applications. Part 1 has been completed and a draft of the Part 2 framework is pending.

Since the elimination of Regional Planning Commissions, the Province of Alberta has required the preparation of **Inter-municipal Development Plans**. In Calgary there are two rural municipalities, known as Municipal Districts, abutting the municipal boundary: Rocky View and Foothills. The plans are a collaborative process between the rural and urban municipalities to determine a framework for where growth could go and the manner in which to deal with edge conditions. The plans indicate where growth may go in the future and provide a context for potential annexation.

The **Sustainable Suburbs Study** provides a set of design guidelines for alternative development forms that would result in more intensive, compact development. It complements the Calgary Plan that establishes the objective of sensible and responsible infill development. The study was prepared to encourage alternative forms of development. Generally, development patterns in Calgary are conservative and reflect (with the exception of developments such as Mackenzie Town) conventional suburban development patterns.

Cobourg’s **Virtual Site Approval Program** facilitates the approvals process for priority projects. The program involves the preparation of a pre-approved site plan that assists developers through the approvals process and enables them to begin construction within 3 to 6 weeks.

Partnerships

Baltimore’s **Healthy Neighborhoods Initiative** is a pilot program that provides financial resources, training and technical assistance to selective neighborhoods to put in place a program of lending, neighbourhood pride projects, and outreach and marketing suited to the neighbourhood’s needs. It is a joint effort of the City of Baltimore, the State of Maryland, local foundations, banks and community groups.

The Town of Cobourg has a history of working in partnership with private sector developers to meet specific objectives such as medium- and high-density housing or to

build industrial space to address immediate shortages. In these instances, the Town may waive fees.

Rural/Agricultural Protection

The State of Maryland's **Rural Legacy Program** provides funding for the protection and conservation of farmlands and forests from development. Through the program, state funds can be used to purchase conservation easements for large contiguous tracts of agricultural, forest and natural areas that are under development pressure. Local governments and land trusts can identify threatened areas and apply for competitively allocated funds that can be used to complement existing land conservation efforts or to allow for new efforts to be undertaken.

The City of London's **Woodlot Acquisition Fund** allows for the acquisition of important upland woodlots that are likely to be developed although they have been identified for preservation but not designated as environmentally sensitive. The funds can be used only for woodlots within the urban growth boundary.

The City of London has established a **Rural/Urban Interface Policy** addressing issues related to the rural/urban interface – the area in which urban residential land uses meet agricultural or rural land uses. Conflicts have arisen related to the compatibility between farming and residential. The recommended policy approach has been to define the urban/rural interface and require that planning applications consider and mitigate potential conflicts within the fringe areas and refer to City guidelines by which conflicts can be mitigated. This policy is currently under consideration by the City. Research undertaken by the City indicates that in other jurisdictions rural/urban conflicts have been dealt with through the use of Urban Protection Areas (Guelph), setbacks required through zoning (Middlesex-Centre) and Landscape Buffer Specifications (British Columbia and Queensland, Australia).

The Township of Hamilton has adopted an official plan that focuses development into **settlement areas** and establishes a **buffer zone** around the Town of Cobourg to discourage future development pressure on the Town's edges.

Appendix 4
SMART GROWTH AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT IN ONTARIO
Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI)
Position Statement
June 15, 2001

The Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI) supports policies that promote growth management in Ontario.

OPPI believes that an effective Smart Growth strategy for Ontario must be broadly encompassing, clearly articulated, and based upon sound growth management objectives and policies. Further, the strategy must be based upon the same principles as good planning – the orderly development of socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable communities and the efficient and effective use of public investments.

OPPI supports Smart Growth initiatives consistent with the following growth management principles:

- Establishing meaningful settlement area boundaries and implementing effective regional growth management.
- Promoting cities as the engines of the economy – ensuring downtown cores, mainstreets, towns, and cities are healthy and liveable.
- Protecting prime agricultural lands, rural landscapes, and natural resources.
- Linking new transportation, water, and sewer infrastructure to sound and sustainable growth management plans.
- Strategically investing in and efficiently operating a full range of transportation modes.
- Implementing incentive-based systems and performance measures that consider and reflect social, economic, and environmental priorities.
- Ensuring that existing and new communities are healthy places to live and have high standards of air and water quality.
- Investing in the physical infrastructure of existing communities through infill, reuse, and intensification of well-serviced centres and corridors.
- Building healthy communities that respond to the social and cultural needs of existing and new residents.
- Making certain that every community, new or old, has a distinctive sense of place, character, and vibrancy that attract people and investment.
- Ensuring that existing and new communities support the broad mixture and range of land uses, development densities, and housing options that make communities liveable and meet economic and social needs.

- Protecting, acquiring, and restoring open spaces and natural systems that define, characterize, and support communities and regions.
- Ensuring fairness, openness, efficiency, and certainty in the development process.
- Fostering cooperation and partnerships among governments, agencies, citizens, and entrepreneurs in investing in and building communities.
- Promoting education and advocacy regarding the objectives, principles, and implementation of growth management.

OPPI is the recognized voice of the province’s planning profession. Our 2,400 practising planners work for government, private industry, agencies, and academic institutions. Members work in a wide variety of fields, including urban and rural community development, urban design, environment, transportation, health and social services, housing, and economic development. Our members are committed to improving the quality of Ontario environments and communities. Planners have in-depth knowledge of growth and development issues. We believe that OPPI can contribute substantially to the formulation of a Smart Growth strategy.

OPPI is currently sponsoring research on growth management. The goal of this research paper is to highlight best practices with respect to tools and implementation measures available for urban and rural areas to effectively manage growth. This will provide planners, decision-makers, and citizens interested in urban and rural growth management with new approaches to ensure the long-term liveability, economic viability and environmental health of their communities. The anticipated release date is October 2001.

For further information, please contact Loretta Ryan, MCIP, RPP, Manager, Policy and Communications, Ontario Professional Planners Institute at policy@ontarioplanners.on.ca