AAF Project AAF-02-2021 YorkTrax Review

Executive Summary

Provincial Audit and Accountability Fund Intake 2

2021-10-14

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction and Context

1.1. Introduction

Perry Group's consulting team of IT and Municipal Planning experts were engaged by York Region to support the delivery of two AAF-funded studies, both of which were designed by York Region to look at ways the development approvals process across the region could become more efficient. This work was completed under Intake 2 of the Provincial Audit and Accountability Fund put in place to support municipalities in identifying efficiencies related to digital modernization, service integration and streamlined development approvals.

The two studies were:

1. A review of development application submission requirements across York Region (York) and local municipalities (LMs), with a view toward standardization of forms, drawings, studies, and data submissions across the region.

2. A feasibility study into whether York Region's YorkTrax system could expand to support local municipal development tracking needs.

While two discrete pieces of work, the initiative ran as a single project and the results of study one directly informed study two.

This Executive Summary report presents a synopsis of the results of both studies.

The Perry Group team worked with the York Region Director of Community Planning and Development Services and a project team of staff from the Programs and Process Improvement unit.

The team also collaborated with regional partners through the Regional Planning Commissioner group and directly with staff in each of the local municipalities, conservation authorities, and school boards.

Perry Group Consulting Ltd.

1.2. Context

The two studies by Perry Group occurred in the context of increasing digitization in all aspects of life, which has only accelerated during the COVID pandemic. One only needs to think about how digital options have changed and how people now shop, bank, communicate, find a good show, and book a vaccine shot to recognize the impact on services and society.

Increasingly, government attention has focused upon the digitization of services (think about experiences renewing a driver's license or health card through Service Ontario's online services).

The development industry has, over the last decade, also become heavily digitized and is asking for improved services from municipalities. Thus, the importance of digitization of the planning and development approvals process has come to the forefront – and it is a process that is ripe for digitization.

"Digital Planning", loosely defined, refers to the adoption of digital technology tools and systems combined with a silo-busting business process mindset that ***makes the planning process easier, faster, less labour intensive and more transparent for everyone.***

It is about applying digital capabilities and improving the experience in the following three areas:

- The **Customer Experience** (applicant), by providing:
    - Online application guides to help applicants select a location, identify development type, and follow a step-by-step guide to determine application submission requirements.
    - Online booking and web meetings for pre-consultation and planning meetings.
    - Online application forms, including the submission of supporting documents, drawings, and studies.
    - Online 24/7 "Manage My Application" capabilities – including online status checking, real-time updates and interaction between the applicant and planners and fee payments, ability to start additional permits, and view agency comments.
- The **Staff Experience** (planning staff), by ensuring that:
    - Data submitted online by applicants is automatically inserted into systems, resulting in reduced data entry.
    - Staff can rely on automated workflow and geo-driven constraints and consultation model.
    - There is a single authoritative source of data and reduced duplication.

Perry Group Consulting Ltd.

- Staff can use improved communication tools, e.g., integrated mail and chat (including applicant / agents).

- Digital drawings and markup can replace paper-based methods.

- Automated data, documents and drawings sharing with interested parties / commenting agencies.

- Simplified and real-time reporting and analytics supplies valuable insights.

- The **Community Experience** (resident, business, visitor), including helping citizens:

  - Easily search and find development applications and find out what is proposed.

  - Subscribe to be alerted to new planning applications in an area of interest.

  - Look up details of a specific application – the location, the proposal, drawings, 3D models.

  - Supply comments on, or support for, a proposal.

  - Attend a public meeting digitally and access on-demand public meeting video and supporting materials after the event.

  - Delegate / speak at Committee / Council meetings via web meeting.

Leaders in the digital planning field (such as Edmonton, Calgary, Miami) and, in fact, all municipalities in the United Kingdom, have digitized the planning process and many have been accepting digital submissions for years.

Locally, municipalities in Ontario are much further behind in their journey toward digital planning.

Nonetheless, the Cities of Mississauga and Markham have both launched online portals and moved to purely digital application submission and processing for development applications. So, movement is beginning in the right direction and there is much momentum with municipalities across the province looking to digitize development and permitting processes.

2.0 Findings

The following section presents the consultants' findings from both studies. Later sections supply recommendations and lay out the costs and benefits that can be achieved by implementing the recommendations.

2.1. Study 1: Submission Requirements Standardization Review

The first study was a desktop review conducted by the consultants, which collated and reviewed all forms, checklists, terms of reference and study requirements for all development application types in each of the municipalities. The consulting team reviewed seventy forms and various additional checklists, guides, and other materials.

The review showed that:

In most cases, applicants must complete a form for each application type. This means that customers must duplicate the same information for a project multiple times, across multiple forms. In fact, municipalities often repeatedly ask for the same information from applicants in different forms and formats.

Some local municipalities have reduced the number of forms that must be filled by creating combined application forms to address this issue, but this is not a widespread practice.

- Although much of the data collected by municipalities at the application stage is prescribed in the *Planning Act*, in practice there is significant variability in the form and format in which the data is requested across municipalities.

- Over many years, forms have evolved so they look and feel different and ask questions of applicants in different forms and sequences and request the data be supplied in different formats.

- There is an inconsistency of nomenclature / terminology / naming convention across York Region and local municipalities; for instance, a Heritage Assessment in one municipality may be named a Heritage Impact Statement in another.

These deviations between municipalities means added complexity to navigate the process for applicants that work across different municipalities.

Additionally,

- Much of the data collected through forms can be traced back to local municipal data sources (e.g., questions about Official Plan, zoning and planning constraints that are stored in municipal GIS systems). This creates a situation

Perry Group Consulting Ltd.

where applicants must seek out the information from local municipal sources and then submit it back to the municipality.

- Local municipal staff do not appear to rely on this information when assessing an application, preferring to validate the information through their own research and existing internal sources. This makes the collection of this data from applicants a redundant and wasteful exercise.
- As some of this data is needed (prescribed) by the *Planning Act*, the act itself is an inhibitor to true digital planning.

More broadly speaking, we also noted some variability across municipal practices in the ways that applications are managed, and this could benefit from some standardization. This includes:

- The handling of payments for development approvals – some municipalities accept digital / credit card payments for tens of thousands of dollars, while many do not accept credit cards at all.
- The willingness of municipalities to share information about planning applications that they have received with the public and with partners, with concerns about Freedom of Information and Accessibility for Ontarians with Disability Act compliance and other privacy -related concerns inhibiting the publishing of planning application details.

Finally, as part of Study 1 we looked at the adoption of 3D tools to design and visualize proposed developments across the developer community and in the area municipalities with the intent to consider requiring the submission of 3D models, by applicants as part of development applications.

While it is early days for 3D, we do see a few municipalities moving forward in this space. The City of Vancouver is currently conducting a 2-year pilot to assess the value of 3D for specific development applications. The Cities of Toronto, Mississauga, and Vaughan all currently require 3D models as part of submission for specific application types in specific locations – for example developments within the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC) in Vaughan. Other municipalities such as the City of Kingston and Nanaimo have built citywide 3D models and have experimented with incorporating 3D proposals into those models.

In practice those that have implemented 3D requirements have found that the development community has required some support to meet the requirements. While we recognize and acknowledge there will be a learning curve for the development community, 3D models are valuable in helping plan and expedite the review and approval of development applications specifically in intensification areas (e.g., MTSA's, centres and corridors)

It would be valuable to work collaboratively with local and provincial leaders in the space, such as the Cities of Vaughan, Kingston, and Mississauga to develop a shared standard for 3D data submission and supporting the development community in meeting that standard for development applications in intensification areas.

The study confirms that:

1. The applicant experience is inconsistent across municipalities in York Region because of variability in application forms and application requirements.
2. A sizable portion of the data collected via application forms is redundant, not directly used by planners and is therefore unnecessary.
3. There are significant opportunities to standardize nomenclature, the application process, data requirements and terms of reference that would improve the customer experience and position the partners for simpler data sharing.
4. Changes to the *Planning Act* are likely to be required to support greater simplification of the forms and to support true digitization of the planning process.
5. 3D models could provide excellent value to development application review/approval. This would mean a new standard for the development community to meet, and implementation will require collaboration between municipalities and developers to define a common standard/process that works for everyone.

The study identifies areas to target for improvement and reinforced the importance of collaboration and coordination, along with a need for dedicated resources to drive the work forward.

2.2. Study 2: YorkTrax Expansion Feasibility

The implementation of the York Region YorkTrax development tracking system has been a significant leap forward for York Region – demonstrating terrific value in streamlining and simplifying processes, reducing data management activities within the Region, and establishing authoritative data sources around development and servicing.

The second study set out to assess the feasibility of building on this success to expand the features and capabilities of YorkTrax, and to explore the possibility of expanding the implementation of YorkTrax to meet local municipal needs.

The consulting team collaborated with teams from the Town of Georgina and York Region to evaluate this option. Georgina was selected as the Town does not currently have a system and expressed interest in exploring whether YorkTrax could meet their needs.

The first step was for the consulting team to review the existing as-is processes at both Georgina and York Region to see how they operate and intersect. Using the as-is process input, the consulting team developed and validated improved to-be processes that would result in a more integrated and streamlined process between the Town of Georgina and York

Region. In building this new process, the consulting team was able to identify the requirements needed to support Georgina's to-be processes.

These needs, once documented and confirmed with the teams, were used to conduct a fit-gap assessment against YorkTrax.

YorkTrax was designed specifically to serve York Region requirements so several major gaps in capability and functionality were quickly identified – specifically a) the system has not been designed for use by multiple organizations, and b) some functionality requirements that are present at the local level are not required by York Region and thus have not been built into YorkTrax.

These functions would need to be built by York Region before a local municipality, such as Georgina, could use YorkTrax.

The consulting team also conducted a review of systems currently in use in the nine area municipalities, school boards and conservation authorities.

This confirmed that each of the organizations are in distinct stages of their own journey toward digitization – with very advanced systems in place in the City of Markham at one end of the spectrum, to a lack of systems in the Town of Georgina at the other. Nonetheless, of the nine municipalities, eight have a back-office system in place and there is much work underway in each municipality on digitization of planning processes, and in the larger municipalities to introduce digital planning services.

In practice, there has been significant investment across the region into back-office systems and only two municipalities (Georgina and King) are looking for a new back-office system where YorkTrax could be used.

The following tables summarize the current state in each of the municipalities and commenting agencies.

Municipality	Have a System	Portal	Current State Summary
Aurora	Yes	No	Aurora has long used a commercial back-office system, although the implementation is somewhat undeveloped in the Planning department.
East Gwillimbury (EG)	Yes	No	EG has been using a commercial back-office system for some time.
Georgina	No	No	There is no back-office system in place currently. Georgina is open to using YorkTrax.
King City	Yes	No	King is planning to replace their current commercial back-office system and is open to using YorkTrax.
Markham	Yes	Yes	Markham has a mature, well-developed commercial back-office system. The city is upgrading the back-office system to the latest version.
Newmarket	Yes	In Progress	The Town has implemented a new commercial back-office system and has recently implemented it in Planning. The Town is expanding the system to customers for self-service through the implementation of the back-office system portal.
Richmond Hill	Yes	In Progress	The Town has implemented over the last few years a new commercial back-office system. Currently in process of implementing the portal module for online services.
Vaughan	Yes	In Progress	The City is currently replacing an existing commercial back-office system, moving planning services into another commercial back-office system that is already in use at the City.
Stouffville	Yes	No	The Town is currently replacing the existing Planning back-office system with a new commercial back-office system.

Perry Group Consulting Ltd.

Commenting Agency	Have a System	Portal	Current State Summary
TRCA (Toronto Region Conservation Authority)	None	N/A	TRCA has issued an RFP to select and implement a new planning tracking back-office system. Interested in data exchange concept.
LSRCA (Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority)	Yes	N/A	LSRCA uses an internally developed system for tracking planning. Interested in data exchange concept.
School Boards	Yes	N/A	School boards track application information and units to help with student demand projections on a commercial back-office system. Interested in data exchange concept.
York Region	Yes	N/A	York has been continuously adding new functionalities to YorkTrax since inception in 2017.

In practice, it is important to recognize that planning systems used by local municipalities must support many functions beyond planning, including permitting, licensing, bylaw, and other functions. Thus, to serve local needs effectively, YorkTrax would also need to address those requirements.

2.2.1. Options Evaluation

Working with the YorkTrax team, the consulting team developed effort and cost estimates for addressing the identified gaps, determining what it would cost to expand YorkTrax to meet local requirements, and evaluating what alternative commercial options were available.

The consulting team concluded from their analysis that it would <u>not</u> be suitable to expand YorkTrax for use by local municipalities and that implementing a commercial product would be a faster and more cost-effective route to digitization of back-office processes for the Town of Georgina and King Township.

With the conclusion that a YorkTrax expansion would not be feasible, alternative approaches were sought to achieve the process and data sharing that the Region and partners are seeking.

The consulting team considered, the possibility of each municipality maintaining autonomy to manage their own processes and systems, while creating connections between those systems to allow for increased data sharing and automation.

The most suitable alternative approach identified by the consulting team would follow three technology solution strategies.

1. Ensuring **digital back-office processes** are in place in all municipalities – this means the full implementation of commercial-off-the-shelf solutions for local planning, permitting, licensing systems in all the local municipalities (including new systems in Georgina and King).
2. Connecting partners to simplify the flow of data and the handling of development applications, through the development and implementation of a **data exchange solution** – technology that will connect and automatically transfer data between municipal, partners' and agency back-office systems.
3. Simplifying applicant experiences through the implementation of **planning portals** – with a collaborative and shared/standardized approach where possible.

This provides the benefits that were targeted through a shared system (shared data, duplication reductions, integrated processes, improved customer experiences) while building on the years of investments local municipalities have made in planning, permitting, and licensing systems.

This approach (particularly the data exchange and data standard) is a proven model that is central to the approach adopted in the UK. In the UK, this allows 300+ municipalities to manage their back-end processes and systems independently while connecting to a shared planning portal for the whole country.

3.0   Recommendations

If York Region and its partners choose to advance work on digital planning across the Region, the approach outlined in section 2.2.1 is the recommended approach.

This means:

1. Working to ensure that all municipalities have suitable **digitized back-office processes** in place collecting standardized data using consistent methods.

2. Connecting partners through the implementation of a **data exchange solution.**

3. Simplifying applicant experiences through the implementation of **local municipal planning portals** using a standardized / consistent approach where possible.

In support of this preferred approach, the consulting team makes the following recommendations.

3.1.   Secure Partner Commitment

The consulting team recommends that the Region secure a formal memorandum of understanding, or declaration of commitment to Digital Planning from all municipalities and partners in the Region. There may also be an opportunity to expand the Data Sharing Agreements already in place with local municipalities through the YorkInfo Partnership to capture these added commitments.

3.2.   Establish a Regional Digital Planning Program Team

It is recommended that York Region set up a *Regional Digital Planning Program Team* to drive the program, lead on shared projects, function as advisors, and assist local municipalities with implementing standards for delivering digital planning services.

We recommend that York Region establish, fund and house the team (note that there is potential to explore further funding from provincial programs to advance this next implementation stage).

The team should:

- Lead cross-regional planning standardization efforts (Terms of Reference (TORs), forms, data collection, customer experience, and other digital planning topics).

- Facilitate sharing, promotion, and adoption of digital best practices.

- Lead the data exchange proof of concept and full implementation.

- Support and provide advice to back-office system and portal implementation projects in municipalities (with the goal of consistency and shared learning).

- Take the lead on lobbying the province with respect to changes needed to the Planning Act to support true digital planning concepts.

- Maintain the vision for digital planning, changing, and responding to emerging innovations and the changing operating landscape.

3.3. Implement Standardization Work

The work to standardize data collection and application forms, data exchange and terms of reference across nine municipalities and the Region will need a large effort of coordination. For each organization, there will be many staff in teams, divisions and departments that will have opinions and will want input on standards – the development community will also have their perspectives.

Nonetheless, this work cannot be avoided because it is central to the ability to share data seamlessly between organizations and to making applicant experiences simpler and more consistent across the Region. Gathering this input and achieving consensus will be challenging but critical to move these initiatives forward.

The following areas will require agreement across the Region:

- What data and in what formats will applicants submit data (to support simplification and standardization of online applications). The consulting team has provided guidance on form standardization in our detailed reports.

- What methods for consent, agreement, approval, and authorization can be used that will support implementation of online application forms, that can be consistent between organizations, and acceptable to legal and other stakeholders?

- What data (and documents), in what formats, and at what frequency will exchange via the data exchange occur. The consulting team has supplied guidance on initial data for exchange in our detailed reports.

- What data and in what formats should information about planning applications under consideration be published online for citizen review. The consulting team has provided guidance in our detailed reports.

- What studies and terms of reference for studies can be standardized across the Region and at local municipalities? As part of the deliverables of this project, the consulting team has drafted thirty terms of reference that can be

adopted by the municipalities in York Region. There will need to be some agreement on final wording before TORs can be implemented.

It is expected that the Planning Commissioners group can champion and partner this work, with the *Regional Digital Planning Program Team* leading the charge and doing the work necessary to move this forward.

3.4. Continue Existing and Planned Back-Office System and Planning Portal Work in LMs

The following systems implementation work is already underway and/or planned in local municipalities and that work should continue, led by each respective municipality:

- Stouffville back-office system implementation.
- Newmarket back-office system implementation.
- Vaughan migration to new back-office system.
- Newmarket planning portal.
- Vaughan planning portal.
- Richmond Hill planning portal.

We recommend that the proposed Regional Digital Planning Program Team:

- Work with Markham, Richmond Hill, Newmarket, and other leaders to build lessons learned, share with implementation teams, and provide advice, if requested.

3.5. Initiate New Projects for Back-Office Systems and Planning Portals

We recommend that Georgina and King pursue a joint approach to procurement of a back-office system.

We recommend that the Regional Digital Planning Program Team:

- Work with Markham, Richmond Hill, Newmarket, and other leaders to build lessons learned, share with implementation teams, and provide advice, if requested.
- Assists Georgina and King with a joint back-office system RFP (using supplied requirements which also include recommendations on data exchange and portal), vendor selection and implementation.

- Works with Markham to capture and share Markham experiences for benefit of others, as well as working toward consistency across online applications.
- Facilitates East Gwillimbury, Whitchurch-Stouffville, and Aurora to work collaboratively to define needs and contract with vendor to implement individual but standardized planning portals.
- Works with Georgina and King to harness the learning from other projects, to support the implementation of a standardized planning portal.

3.6. Design, Build, Test and Deploy a Data Exchange Solution

We recommend that the Regional Digital Planning Program Team lead a project to design, prototype, test and deploy the data exchange solution. This work should also be linked into the YorkInfo Partnership – if possible, re-using existing technology, governance and data sharing arrangements.

We recommend that the project begin with a small number of pioneer agencies – two municipalities and one to two agencies (e.g., school boards, conservation authorities).

The suggested implementation plan would involve the following activities:

- Develop detailed technical specifications, complete technical design, and finalize data exchange specification (e.g., data standards).
- Select technology (evaluate existing solutions first).
- Build proof of concept, test with two municipalities and development community.
- Ready data exchange for production.
- Rollout data exchange to remaining stakeholders based on readiness.

3.7. Partner with Vaughan, and others on the Development of 3D Data Submission Standards

We recommend that the Regional Digital Planning Program Team works with the City of Vaughan Planning and GIS teams as they revise their Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC) 3D data submission requirements. Engaging with the City of Mississauga and other leading municipalities through the Southern Ontario 3D working group would also be worthwhile.

This work should occur openly and through the Planning Commissioners and with the York Info Partnership and should be used to set a consistent standard for 3D submissions in local municipalities across the Region.

4.0 Benefits and Efficiencies

4.1. Potential Benefits

As discussed earlier, there are a variety of benefits to be gained from pursuing the recommended approach. These include:

- Process efficiencies and error reduction in back-office processing of applications.
- Reduced administrative overheads freeing staff to work on higher value activities (e.g., eliminating date stamping plans, preparing circulation, submission, and final approval packages)
- Potential reductions in application cycle times / shortened approval timelines from increased transparency, increased parallel processing.
- Improved customer experiences (e.g., availability of service 24/7, reduced travel time, significant reductions in paper and printing costs, reduced unnecessary contacts with planning staff to "check status").
- Achieving a regional perspective on development across all municipalities.
- Improved data quality to work with for policy development, identifying process improvements and performance management.
- Savings from space required to store paper records
- Environmental benefits from reduced number of trips to regional offices by customers and reduction of hardcopy paper documents

4.2. Calculations of Benefits

The consulting team estimated the potential tangible/quantifiable time savings that could be achieved through the implementation of the recommended approach.

Provincial reporting requires these savings to be expressed as dollar values and so the consulting team converted these time estimates using a $60 per hour constant for the cost/value of staff time across all municipalities and agencies, as well as customers.

Estimates show that the Region could achieve potential time savings in the Community Planning and Development Services branch valued at $256,000 per annum in process efficiencies – which manifests itself in reduced data entry and data management costs. This has the effect of freeing staff from data entry tasks to focus on higher value activities (e.g., planning review/approval and customer service).

This cost benefit represents 9.5% of the current cost of staffing the York Community Planning and Development Services service.[1]

Across all stakeholders (including customers, local municipalities, York Region, and other agencies), time savings and cost benefits ramp up significantly and are estimated to be worth up to $2.65 million per year.

The consulting team also looked at how potential cost savings could be attributed to the three components (back-office systems, data exchange and online portals), which results in the following breakdown.

	Potential Cost Savings ($)
1. Back-Office Systems	$71,400
2. Data Exchange	$1,667,710
3. Online Portals	$913,700

This indicates that the most significant efficiencies can be achieved through the implementation of the data exchange (it is important to note that work on back-office systems is a dependency for the data exchange to be successful).

---

[1] 2021 staffing cost for Community Planning and Development Services Branch is $2,681,351

Perry Group Consulting Ltd.

4.3. Potential Implementation Costs

Cost estimates for the implementation of the recommendations are shown below. The key net new costs are associated with staffing the Regional Digital Planning Program Team and the implementation of the data exchange.

	Capital ($)	Operating ($)
1. Digital Planning Program Team (3 staff for a 3-year period)	$900,000	N/A
• Standardization	Included in the budget for program staffing in #1 above	N/A
Existing/Ongoing LM Planned Back-Office and Portal Work	Existing work that is already included in LM budgets	
Net New LM Back-Office and Portal Work	Future LM budget requests	TBD
• Data exchange solutioning[2]	$400,000	$100,000
6. 3D standards	Included in the budget for program staffing in #1 above	N/A
Totals	**$1,300,000**	**$100,000**

[2] Estimates for connector integration setup and configuration, assuming that York already has technologies that can support data exchange.

4.4. Return on Investment

Looking at the benefit to the Region in isolation, an investment of $1.3 million to achieve a return of $256,000 per annum does not look like a good bet – taking over 5 years to break even. This also does not consider other costs that may be added for maintenance, upgrades, and enhancements over the course of that time.

However, looking across the complete stakeholder landscape, an investment of $1.3 million over 3 years that delivers a potential return of over $2.6 million annually, provides a theoretical payback in less than one year – and a strong business case for moving forward. Note of course that benefits will be realized incrementally and that the complete projected benefits will not be fully realized until the solutions are fully implemented, after 3 years.

In addition, there are other intangible benefits – including the potential of accelerating development approvals and increasing the quality of data to support policy setting and decision-making – that have not been quantified at this time, but the value of which should not be discounted.

5.0 Conclusion and Next Steps

We believe there is an opportunity to change the approach and thinking about development applications with a move away from a document and paper centric mindset towards a digital and data centric one. This work can help drive significant improvements to the customer and citizen experience, and radically reduce the administrative overhead of running the process. There is also significant potential to reduce approval times through streamlining and parallel processing.

Through data standardization and data exchange, the Region can achieve many of the benefits of shared information without the overhead, complexity, and inflexibility of a shared system to build and manage.

Once fully implemented, the consulting team's estimates suggest a potential 9.5% quantifiable efficiencies in York Region Community Planning and Development Services staffing costs. On a regionwide scale, quantifiable efficiencies in the Region, municipalities, and other agencies amount to an annual value of $2.65 million.

This approach gives local municipalities the independence, flexibility, and agility they need, while creating the shared data layer necessary to have a complete regional view of development activity.

To achieve this, as discussed earlier, there are three core components.

1. Ensuring **digital back-office processes** are in place in all municipalities – this means bolstering a few municipalities (Georgina and King).
2. Connecting partners together to simplify and automate the handling of development applications, through the implementation of a **data exchange solution**.
3. Simplifying applicant experiences through the implementation of **local municipal planning portals**.

While this study has recommended against the expansion of YorkTrax to local municipalities, YorkTrax has been immensely successful and will continue to be an important part of York Region's development approvals processing and should be connected to the data exchange.

We believe that sharing data programmatically between stakeholders is a crucial step in building a model for increased collaboration between partners in the region through real-time data sharing.

This approach can be replicated to other services (roads, etc.) which cross organizational boundaries as well as to other partners in York which could increase service integration, transparency, reduce duplication and simplify service delivery to customers.